

By Mr. SIMPSON of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4026) granting a pension to Samuel T. Derry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TODD: A bill (H. R. 4027) for the relief of William H. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4028) for the relief of Emogene C. Crawford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BAKER of Illinois: Petition of Maggie E. Lyons and other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Marissa, Ill., in favor of a Sunday-rest law—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Rachel C. Vasey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Petition of citizens of Columbia, Pa.; also petition of citizens of Oxford, Pa., in favor of restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HILBORN: Resolutions of the San Francisco (Cal.) Labor Council, opposing the treaty for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Building Trades Council of San Francisco, Cal., H. C. Hincken, president, favoring the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIDGELY: Petition of Percy Daniels, to accompany House bill No. 3903, favoring graduated property tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: Petition of J. H. Williams and other citizens of Meservey, Iowa, in behalf of Cuban independence—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Gen. Milo L. Sherman, of Iowa; also petition of Thomas L. Green and 37 other ex-soldiers, in favor of the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZENOR: Papers to accompany House bill No. 2384, for the relief of George Washington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2463, for the relief of Henry Bott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, July 24, 1897.

[Continuation of legislative day of Friday, July 23, 1897.]

The Senate reassembled at the expiration of the recess at 10 o'clock a. m.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR ISHAM G. HARRIS.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, as the session is so near a close and the death of my colleague so recent, I can not, before final adjournment, have a day set apart, as is customary, to pay tribute to his memory. Therefore, after consultation with his friends, I desire to indicate a day in the early part of the next session, and I shall name Thursday, the 13th of January, 1898.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (S. 2138) to give the consent of Congress to a compact entered into between the States of South Dakota and Nebraska respecting the boundary between said States; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 79) requesting the President to make investigation into the "regie contract" system.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 2482) for the relief of George A. Dickel & Co., at Nashville, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 2483) for the relief of J. B. Cornell and others; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 2484) for the relief of the Old Dominion Granite Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

THE TARIFF BILL.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 379) to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, yesterday when I was taken from the floor by the recess I was discussing the lumber schedule of the bill, so far as it will have an effect on the farmers of the United States, and especially on the farmers of the State of Nebraska, which I have the honor to represent in part in this Chamber. I will continue the discussion on that line for a moment.

In 1893 the lumber companies, coal companies, and like organizations had formed such combinations in Nebraska to the detriment of the consumers that it became necessary to enact a law for their protection, and the legislature of 1893 passed chapter 49 of the laws of that year, entitled "An act to prohibit lumber dealers, coal dealers, or other persons, companies, partnerships, or associations from entering into any contract or agreement or combination to pool or fix the price at which lumber or coal shall be sold, and to provide punishment for violation of the same." I will ask leave to incorporate in my remarks the entire act, which is short, as a part thereof, and I will not now consume the time of the Senate by reading it.

CHAPTER 49.

An act to prohibit lumber dealers, coal dealers, or other persons, companies, partnerships, or associations from entering into any contract or agreement or combination to pool or fix the price at which lumber or coal shall be sold, and to provide punishment for violation of the same.

Be it enacted by the legislature of the State of Nebraska:

SECTION 1. That it shall be unlawful for any lumber dealer or lumber dealers, coal dealer or coal dealers, partnership, company, corporation, or association of lumber dealers, coal dealers, or any other person or persons, partnership, company, corporation, or association to enter into any agreement, contract, or combination with any other lumber dealer or lumber dealers, coal dealer or coal dealers, partnership, company, corporation, association, person, or party for the pooling or fixing of prices of different and competing dealers and sellers, or to divide between them the aggregate or net proceeds of the earnings of such dealers and sellers, or any portion thereof, or for fixing the price at which any lumber dealer or lumber dealers, coal dealer or coal dealers, partnership, company, corporation, or association of lumber dealers or coal dealers, or any other person or persons, partnership, company, corporation, association, or party shall sell lumber or coal, and in case of any agreement, contract, or combination for such pooling of prices of different and competing dealers and sellers, or to divide between them the aggregate or net proceeds of the earnings of dealers and sellers, or any portion thereof, or for fixing in any manner the price at which any lumber dealer or lumber dealers, coal dealer or coal dealers, partnership, company, corporation, or association shall sell lumber or coal, each day of its continuance shall be deemed a separate offense, and shall be punished as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. That in case any lumber dealer or lumber dealers, coal dealer or coal dealers, or any person or persons, partnership, company, corporation, or association subject to the provisions of this act shall do or cause to be done, or knowingly suffer or permit to be done, any act, matter, or thing in this act prohibited or declared to be unlawful, or shall omit to do any act, matter, or thing in this act required to be done, such lumber dealer or lumber dealers, coal dealer or coal dealers, partnership, company, corporation, or association shall be liable to the person or persons or party injured thereby to the full amount of damages sustained in consequence of any such violation of any of the provisions of this act, together with reasonable counsel fees or attorney's fee, to be fixed by the court in every case of recovery, which attorney fee shall be taxed and collected as a part of the cost in the case; and in any such action brought for the recovery of damages under the provisions of this act the court before whom the same shall be pending may compel any lumber dealer or lumber dealers, coal dealer or coal dealers, partnership, company, corporation, or association of lumber dealers or coal dealers, and any person or persons, partnership, company, corporation, or association subject to the provisions of this act, or any director, officer, receiver, trustee, agent, employee, or clerk of them, or either of them defendant in such action or suit, to attend, appear, and testify in such case; and the court may also compel the production of the books and papers of such lumber dealer or lumber dealers, coal dealer or coal dealers, partnership, company, corporation, or association of lumber dealers or coal dealers, or any other person or persons, partnership, company, corporation, or association, party to any such suit. The claim that any such testimony or evidence may tend to criminate the person giving such evidence shall not excuse such witness from testifying, but such evidence or testimony shall not be used against such person in the trial of any criminal proceedings.

SEC. 3. That any lumber dealer or lumber dealers, coal dealer or coal dealers, partnership, company, corporation, or association, person or persons, subject to the provisions of this act, or any director or officer, or any receiver, trustee, clerk, lessee, agent, or person acting for or employed by them, or either of them, who alone or with any other person, party, partnership, company, corporation, or association shall willfully suffer or permit to be done any act, matter, or thing in this act prohibitive, or declared to be unlawful, or who shall aid or abet therein, or shall willfully omit or fail to do any act, matter or thing in this act required to be done, or shall cause or willingly suffer or permit any act, matter, or thing so directed by this act not to be done, or shall aid or abet any such omission or failure, or shall be guilty of any infraction of any of the provisions of this act, or shall aid or abet therein, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined in any sum not less than \$200, and not more than \$1,000, or imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding six months, or both fine and imprisonment at the discretion of the court, and shall moreover be liable to the suit of the party injured or damaged.

Approved April 10, A. D. 1893.

Barbed wire is of very great importance to the people of Nebraska, and has been from the first settlement of the State. Our people, by force of the fact that Nebraska is a treeless State, have been compelled to use barbed wire to construct their fences. In

1883 the legislature, then in the control of the Republican party, passed a joint resolution memorializing and requesting Congress that the duty be removed from barbed wire and the material it is manufactured from. I will read chapter 111 of the acts of that year:

Memorial and joint resolution requesting that the duty be removed off of barbed wire and the material it is manufactured from.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Whereas the article of barbed wire and the material from which it is made has become so necessary for use that it is indispensable to the people of the State of Nebraska, and especially to the agricultural interest, we do most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States to repeal the duty on the same: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress are hereby requested to use all honorable means to secure the removal of such duty, so it may be placed on the free list.

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and is hereby, instructed to transmit a certified copy of this memorial and joint resolution to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Approved February 21, A. D. 1883.

At that early day the Republican party of Nebraska became committed to free barbed wire. It has never changed its position since, neither in party platform nor by the action of the legislature. While it may not be entirely germane to the discussion, yet I regard the wishes of the Republican party as expressed in my State through the legislature of which it had control as entitled to some consideration in this Chamber when we are considering the passage of a tariff bill.

The duty on barbed wire, as I understand it, is left practically where it was before, at one cent and three-quarters on the pound. If I am mistaken in that I beg to be corrected. I will ask the Senator from Iowa if the tariff on barbed wire is not in this bill as it is under the present law, 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. ALLISON. I will look. I suppose the Senator's statement is substantially correct. There never has been any barbed wire imported.

Mr. ALLEN. There never has been any imported because the tariff is prohibitory.

Mr. ALLISON. The present tariff is prohibitory.

Mr. ALLEN. The present tariff is prohibitory, and the present tariff is the McKinley rate of one cent and three-fourths a pound, as I understand it.

We had this matter before the Fifty-fourth Congress quite fully, and the Democratic party at one time really had serious intentions to make barbed wire free. But the exigencies of politics entered into the determination of the Wilson bill in 1894. It was necessary, to carry out a political purpose, and the farmers' interests in barbed wire were dropped, although I am glad to say the gentleman in whose interest the change was made was not returned to Congress in accordance with the understanding had at the time.

Mr. ALLISON. It is 1½ cents a pound.

Mr. ALLEN. Then it was dropped a quarter of a cent; but it is prohibitory at that rate, for barbed wire can be manufactured and is manufactured in this country and sold at a great profit to the jobbers for less than 1½ cents a pound. I want to repeat that statement so that if anybody does me the honor to read my straggling remarks he may remember it. Barbed wire is manufactured in this country and sold at a profit to jobbers for less than the tax imposed per pound on it.

Mr. ALLISON. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from Iowa says there is no doubt about it.

Mr. ALLISON. That is true of nails; and it is true of a great many articles in these schedules.

Mr. ALLEN. It is true of nails, and it is true of a great many articles. I am glad to hear this confession. If that be true, why keep this duty? Why make the duty prohibitory? Why permit the manufacturer to exact a tax on barbed wire that is in excess of the cost of production and a reasonable profit? It is simply in the interest of the barbed-wire trust. And here we come across one of those powerful engines of destruction again; and the interest of 10,000,000 farmers in the United States, who are compelled to use barbed wire, is placed at the mercy of a barbed-wire trust.

This compels the farmers of Nebraska to pay 3 cents and as high as 4 cents a pound for barbed wire with which to fence their farms and pastures that they ought to purchase in a fair competitive market at 2 cents, or 2½ cents at the outside. By this means there is a drain of hundreds of thousands of dollars annually on them. They must pay the exactions; they must pay what is demanded of them, or their fields and pastures must go unfenced.

The appeal of the legislature of Nebraska, which doubtless was supplemented by a like appeal from other States, seems to have fallen on deaf ears or on unfeeling hearts, for, notwithstanding this and other like appeals, farmers have been bound hand and foot by legislation enacted by the Republican party, and by the Democratic party, too, in 1894, and subjected to the cold mercies of the barbed-wire trust.

How different it is when we are to consider the interest of the

moneyed aristocracy. Nothing the farmers can present in this Chamber is even given respectful attention or respectful discussion, to say nothing about obtaining votes in its favor; but it is all right for the sharks and money gamblers of Wall street to make \$32,000,000 out of sugar stocks since the Dingley bill was reported to the House of Representatives. It was charged a week ago by one of the public journals of this country—a reliable journal—that since the Dingley bill was reported to the House of Representatives a few weeks ago, over \$32,000,000 had been made on the New York stock market by reason of the upward tendency of sugar stock. That is all right, it is said. That is legitimate business according to the idea of certain Senators.

It was all right, according to Republican Senators, for J. Pierpont Morgan and his associates to make \$27,000,000 out of the illegal issue of Government bonds during the late Administration of Grover Cleveland. The bonds were illegal, and no man knew that better than Cleveland when he ordered them issued. There is not a court in the United States having jurisdiction of the subject-matter, if it administered the law honestly, that would not hold those bonds illegal if they were sued on. There was no statute for their issuance. They had no more legal effect, considered as legal instruments, than they would have if they had been issued by me or by some other private individual. And yet \$27,000,000 was made by J. Pierpont Morgan and his syndicate out of the issuance of those bonds, and not one word of condemnation or complaint has been heard from the Republican side of this Chamber.

But, Mr. President, when the farmers of this country, upon whose industry depend for success all other industries, ask for the slightest measure of relief, for the slightest benefit from legislation, they are turned away contemptuously, and we are told gravely that legislation can not create values. It would be well for the farmers of this country to know that the legislation of Russia is as beneficial to them as the legislation of the United States Congress.

I had occasion a few days ago to call attention to the favoritism in this bill. I directed attention to the fact that the Maine lumbering interests were placing New Brunswick lumber in the markets of the United States free of duty. The senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], whom I do not notice in the Chamber at this moment, said I was mistaken about it; that my statement was incorrect. When I asked him why lumber could not be manufactured in Maine and floated down the St. John River, he said that could not be done. Not having visited that section of the country, I was necessarily compelled to accept his statement, although I took it cum grano salis. I now have a telegram from a gentleman who knows something about it, and I will read it. He is a gentleman in Saginaw, Mich., who has interests in Maine and has visited that section of the country and understands what he is speaking of.

SAGINAW, MICH., March 23, 1897.

Senator ALLEN of Nebraska, Washington:

Senator HALE misstated when said could not cut St. John timber in Maine sawmills. I examined that region last summer. There are sawmills at Edmunston and Coners, on New Brunswick side, on Lewis Conta Railroad, and a hundred sawmills could be built on Maine side river, and lumber shipped by rail, taking entire St. John product. I refer to General Alger and Congressman BRUCKER for my reliability; they know. Will read this to Senate so they may see how wrong it is to strike American labor out of bill?

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] had called attention to that singular omission.

All work on this Maine timber is done by Canadians except bosses in lumber camps, and part of Canadians, who come in from Rivière du Loup, St. Philippe, and Quebec. This is really Canadian lumber from Maine stumpage, and they put in logs on Canada side and mark them same as Maine, and bring that lumber in free. Anybody caring for American labor will vote to put it back in bill.

MAURICE QUINN.

Mr. President, that seems to be a satisfactory explanation of the real situation in Maine. I had information long ago respecting this matter that led me to the conclusion stated in this telegram, that lumber manufactured from trees grown in New Brunswick on British soil are marked as Maine logs, cut by Canadian labor, and floated down the St. John River by Canadian labor, and brought into the United States free of duty, on the supposition that they were logs cut by American labor in the State of Maine.

There has been a great deal of pollyfoxing about this matter. Whenever the question has been mentioned here it has been about half explained and dropped; it has been explained in very muddy language and in a very singular manner. I made the open statement several weeks ago, and I repeat it, that the Maine lumber dealers are men not only interested in the lumber camps of Maine, but in the lumber camps in Canada, or at least on British soil, are cutting and floating into this country as Maine logs millions of feet of lumber annually entirely free of duty, and whenever the American consumer of that lumber is required to purchase it he does not reap any of the benefits of the fraud committed on the Government by the previous tariff bills. The price exacted of

him is as high as though the lumber or the logs had not been floated into the United States and received free of duty. This is one of the iniquities, and one of the great iniquities of the pending measure.

Then, Mr. President, we come to another question which is rankly unjust in its application to the United States. We have a treaty with the Hawaiian Islands that expired years ago by limitation, by which they are permitted to bring into this country sugar free of duty. The interests of this country demand the cancellation of that treaty. It has menaced us every year since I have been a member of this Chamber.

It has been denounced by Republicans, by Democrats, and by Populists, too; and yet whenever a measure is introduced here, either as an original bill or as an amendment to some pending bill, to cancel the treaty, it meets with persistent opposition on the other side of the Chamber, or it is speeded into some committee room from which it is never returned; and we are not even treated to a statement of the reasons actuating the Finance Committee. We are treated as children who are not to be informed of what is going on.

The Government loses from seven to eight million dollars of revenue annually from the enforcement of this treaty, and receives nothing in return. The Hawaiian Islands are made the gateway through which are shipped into this country every year thousands of tons of sugar that were not produced in those islands. Sir, it is like pouring water into a spigot and letting it run out through the bung of a barrel. We put a tax on imported sugar, and yet we open the ports of the Pacific to the importation without duty of sugars manufactured in the Hawaiian Islands and in all the islands of the Pacific Ocean.

Why has not this matter been attended to by the Finance Committee? I regret that each member of that committee is now absent, and that there is nobody here representing the committee to look after the interests of the pending bill. I suppose it will take care of itself, or that they will be around about 3 o'clock, when the time comes to vote, and there will be no explanation.

Mr. President, if this kind of conduct keeps on for a few years longer, the people of this country will rise up and curse the Congress guilty of it. The time will come when the people will not be provoked further, when they will not submit to being robbed and deprived of their rights Congress after Congress. The time will come, sir, as it very nearly came a year ago, when the people of the United States in their sovereign might will rise and hurl from power every man who has been unfaithful to his trust, however specious his arguments may be and however much he may try to defend himself before them. Yet, sir, it is true the people can be deceived to some extent; and they have been deceived.

I know of no way of bringing the fact to the attention of the country more forcibly than by reading a paraphrase of Rienzi's address to the Romans, which I find in a Minnesota paper, and I presume it was written by a Minnesotian. How truthfully this Republican points out the fact that he and his fellow-citizens have been deceived! He says:

I came not here to talk. Ye know too well
The story of our weakness. We are fools!
The bright sun rises to his course, and lights
A race of a fool! He sets, and his last beam
Falls on fools! Not such as, swept along
By the full tide of party power, are led
To campaign glory and official fame,
But poor, blind, voting fools, whose leaders are
The railroad kings and millionaires and lords
(And boodlers, ringsters—pie eaters of petty note)
Rich in land tracts as big as several counties,
Strong in their bank accounts, but only great
In that strange spell—a name! which holds a host
Of fools in abject fear; while on each hand
Is open fraud, or legal robbery
(The "vested rights," you know, of vested wrongs),
Robbery, jobbery, favoritism, and fraud.
But none is bold enough to call a halt,
For fear the dear old party will be hurt—
Fools, bound by that strange spell, a party name!

To-day a man, my neighbor—there he stands—
Was cursed like a dog—by one who holds
A mortgage on his home—because, forsooth,
He tossed not high his old straw hat in air
Nor lifted up his voice in whoop-hurrah
For money good in Yurruip. Be we men
With ten-inch patches on our worn-out pants
And suffer such bulldozing? Men, or fools?

I have known deeper wrongs. I that speak to ye—
I had a brother once, a hustler, too,
Who bought a little home with a mortgage on't
At eight per cent, and all the rest you know.
And so it ran for ten or fifteen years,
Until the panic came, and then next thing,
The prices of his products fell so low
He couldn't keep his int'rest up, and then
His little home was gone—in one short hour
The mortgage had gobbled everything!
What did this brother then? Bless your simple heart,
He tightened up his well-worn party collar,
And with a desp'rate look upon his face,
Resistless, to the pie counter pressed his way,
And when he'd eaten, stuffed his pockets well,
Then pinned his party label o'er his heart,
And wisely talked, and strutted to and fro,
Until the spirit of mighty Jefferson
Looked down from heaven's battlements and saw—
Then turned and wept to think what deeds are done
By fools, because of that strange spell—a name!
To think that men who talk in loud protest
'Gainst being robbed by mighty millionaires
Should stand in simpering silence while their pockets
Are drained of every penny by thieving boodlers,
Because, forsooth! these selfsame thieves do wear
Big labels on their breasts, just like unto their own.

Mr. President, that man had a keen appreciation of the frame of mind of certain voters in the United States. In every thieving campaign which has been made, in all the stock jobbing of party politics, many people have been deceived by the simple name "Republican." They have not learned that all the glory and honor of that party departed years ago and that there is nothing but a name left of it. It had a grand history; but, Mr. President, its Lincolns, its Sumners, its Wendell Phillipses, its Greeleys—its great founders—are dead; and in the place of those who marched at its head and were present in its glories and its triumphs come the former camp followers to lead; and, unfortunately for our country, many voters have not yet learned the fact.

I regret to note the fact that party success is made paramount to patriotism. I regret to know that many men, old and gray and wise in the service of their country, are willing to subordinate the interests of their country and their countrymen to party success and party triumph. Before I entered this Chamber, and when my schoolboy learning was fresh with me, I had formed the impression that the United States Senate was a place where demagogy and where pettifogging were absent. I had formed the impression that every Senator, when he took the oath of office, was a patriot and not a partisan; and while he held allegiance to a particular party because he believed in the principles of that party, if it had principles, that he was capable, in the interests of his country, of rising above partisan prejudice and partisan bias and above the decree of caucuses—acting in the true interests of his country, even though it led him from his party.

I regret, Mr. President, to find that I was mistaken, and that this Senate is controlled as absolutely for partisan purposes as a ward caucus would be controlled in any city or village of the land.

Mr. President, to return a moment to a matter which I discussed yesterday, I want to insert in the RECORD an analysis of the vote of the United States last year, including the vote of the State of Ohio, and I will say no more about the State of Ohio than to place this in the RECORD and let those who see fit to read it judge for themselves whether my statement on yesterday was correct or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Without objection, the table referred to by the Senator will be inserted in the RECORD.

The table referred to is as follows:

Paper showing the vote cast in twenty-four States at the recent election, together with a comparison of the vote for McKinley and Bryan with that cast for Harrison, Cleveland, and Weaver at the previous Presidential election.

State.	Vote returned.	Maximum legitimate vote.	Fraudulent excess.	For McKinley.	For Bryan.	Majority.	Harrison.	Cleveland and Weaver.
<i>Uncontested sure States.</i>								
Massachusetts.....	401,368	418,000	278,796	105,711	173,085	202,814	180,017
New York.....	1,423,219	1,500,000	819,836	551,399	268,469	609,459	671,459
New Jersey.....	371,014	377,200	221,367	133,675	87,692	156,068	172,011
Pennsylvania.....	1,188,354	1,094,400	94,000	728,300	427,137	301,172	516,011	469,978
Virginia.....	294,653	315,000	135,294	154,785	19,491	113,256	176,251
Arkansas.....	147,615	216,000	37,512	110,103	72,600	46,974	98,665
<i>Uncontested doubtful States.</i>								
Nebraska.....	223,267	223,500	102,564	115,624	13,060	87,213	108,077
Kansas.....	353,911	350,000	158,541	171,810	13,269	157,241	163,111
Washington.....	92,435	98,400	39,153	51,646	12,493	36,460	48,896

Paper showing the vote cast in twenty-four States at the recent election, together with a comparison of the vote for McKinley and Bryan, etc.—Continued.

State.	Vote returned.	Maximum legitimate vote.	Fraudulent excess.	For McKinley.	For Bryan.	Majority.	Harrison.	Cleveland and Weaver.
<i>Contested States.</i>								
Maryland	240,866	232,152	8,700	136,978	104,745	32,231	92,736	114,662
West Virginia	198,221	189,875	8,300	104,414	92,927	11,487	80,293	88,633
Ohio	1,011,576	920,000	94,500	527,945	478,547	49,400	405,187	418,967
Michigan	544,278	514,528	29,700	293,327	237,251	56,076	222,708	222,088
Indiana	637,284	597,600	39,700	323,719	305,771	17,948	255,615	284,948
Illinois	1,091,166	954,000	137,000	607,130	466,703	140,427	399,288	448,487
Kentucky	445,934	402,600	43,300	218,171	217,890	281	135,441	198,961
Iowa	521,551	444,000	77,500	289,293	223,741	74,552	219,688	216,871
Wisconsin	448,106	416,650	31,400	269,135	185,528	104,607	187,244	170,791
Minnesota	341,539	328,440	13,100	193,501	130,626	53,875	122,736	130,977
Oregon	96,846	89,600	7,200	48,711	46,739	1,972	35,002	41,208
California	294,000	272,000	22,000	146,588	144,776	1,812	118,174	143,485
<i>States not carried by Republican party.</i>								
Tennessee	321,999	291,600	30,400	148,774	168,176	20,600	99,973	160,100
Missouri	674,726	633,600	41,100	304,940	363,632	58,712	226,824	309,224
Texas	540,000	493,800	46,100	164,886	368,299	203,413	74,475	338,836

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, over forty years of my life have been spent on the western side of the Mississippi River. Forty years ago last February, when not quite 10 years of age, I moved to the State of Iowa, then sparsely settled and largely in the possession of savage tribes. But two small spurs of railway had been constructed, and they have since grown into great trunk lines, reaching from Chicago to the far West. I have seen that State and the States west of it settled and developed by a brave band of pioneer men and women. Within the lifetime of men and women of middle age now present the territory comprising the Commonwealth of Nebraska was an unbroken wilderness of prairie, inhabited by rude and savage tribes, warring with each other and on pioneer settlers. It was inhabited by wild animals indigenous to the latitude, and it took great courage and fortitude to push westward and establish homes in that State.

The pioneers of any cause commend themselves to the consideration of mankind. He who carries the torch of civilization into a benighted country and erects the cross of Christ where it was not found before deserves well of mankind, and he who advances the interests of the human race, depriving himself and family of the benefits of an old and well-established civilization and erects a home in a country not peopled before and braves hardships and privations, is entitled at least to respectful treatment at the hands of his fellow-men. And he who erects cities and towns where none existed, builds churches, schoolhouses, academies, colleges, and universities in a land that had been given to savagery but a short time before, merits just treatment at the hands of his Government.

Thirty-five years ago, as I said, Nebraska was an unbroken wilderness of prairie. There was scarcely a schoolhouse or church within its boundaries. A few might have been found scattered along the western shore of the Missouri River, but the State was practically without the benefit of educational opportunities, religious or secular. To-day there stand there many cities and villages that will rival the oldest sections of our country in beauty of architecture and in the thrift, intelligence, and energy of the people, and still these people are encountering many of the disadvantages of pioneer life at the present time. Their work, thus far, has been well done, but it has not been completed, and it will not be until taken up by generations to follow, as the work of civilization has been taken up and completed in older sections of the Union by succeeding generations. Tens of thousands of homes are yet to be built, and tens of thousands are yet to be furnished and ornamented with the necessities and conveniences indispensable to a high state of civilization.

The people I have the honor to represent in part in this Chamber are as brave, intelligent, and God-fearing a people as ever bore aloft the banner of civilization in this or in any other country. They are, the most of them, citizens of the United States to the manner born. They are flesh of our flesh and blood of our blood, and are entitled to fair treatment at the hands of the Congress of the United States.

I have asked nothing for my people that I would not willingly concede to others. I ask just treatment at the hands of Congress for all. I ask that the burden of taxation be lifted from them as far as can be done consistently with the raising of necessary revenue to conduct the affairs of the Government. This consideration they certainly are entitled to, and they are entitled to enjoy their full portion of benefit, if any, to come to the people of the United States through tariff taxation.

I could not, consistently with my sense of duty to them, ask for less, and they should not be content with less. They will not shirk their full share of responsibility in the affairs of our country, however onerous this bill may be and however destructive its provisions. The people of Nebraska are not revolutionists; they are

not anarchists. They are a patriotic, loyal, intelligent, and law-abiding people, and they are prepared to fight their battles at the ballot box, on the rostrum, and wherever intelligence is to prevail, with the weapons of the intellect alone.

Mr. President, I look forward with some solicitude for their welfare. I feel that the imposition of a rate of taxation running, on an average, to 55 per cent ad valorem on articles they will be compelled to consume will be a greater burden on them than they can bear. I feel that they will have just cause to complain, and I do not doubt that this bill will carry with it misery and want to many localities. But, sir, I have performed my duty as far as I could. I have been, and am now, willing to stand here in opposition to the passage of this bill until the silent and sullen majority are forced, by parliamentary tactics within our reach, to relax their hold on the people of Nebraska and the great West and South. I would wage this battle as much for the South as I would for the gallant men and women who inhabit the State of my adoption, and in doing so I would not needlessly do or say aught that would injure the citizens of any other part of this Union.

Mr. President, I realize that this bill is to become a law. Protection has poisoned a small portion of the Democratic party, and the disease will carry off one victim at least. It will be impossible for us to defeat the bill, and in view of the fact that tariff has not been made an issue by the Populist party, to which I owe allegiance, and the further fact that my vote, if cast against the measure, will not prevent its passage, I have deemed it wise and in accordance with the judgment of a conference of Populist Senators and Members of the House, to refrain from voting, as I refrained from voting on the final passage of the bill a few weeks ago.

The tariff must no longer be an issue in American politics, and it will be if this bill should be defeated. The effect of this measure will be to demonstrate to the people that they were in 1896 again hoodwinked and deceived to their detriment. They will learn that the great twin evils, industrial depression and financial paralysis, are to be removed only by the Government turning its attention honestly and patriotically to the solution of the money question on sound and scientific principles. If this Government is to be given over to the money power of Lombard and Wall streets, it will perish from the face of the earth, and on its ashes will be erected an oligarchy, or an aristocracy, if not, indeed, monarchy itself. It behooves the wise, far-seeing, clear-headed, and patriotic people of the United States to stand guard and watch their Government with jealous care. If they do, it will be preserved to bless the generations of their posterity. If they do not, no man can foretell the widespread disaster and devastation it will create.

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President, I had not proposed to say anything more about this bill until I saw a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD purporting to be a schedule of the value of certain sugars prepared by a Treasury official, one of the General Appraisers at New York.

The subject of sugar is a very delicate subject to the other side. It is one upon which the other side of the Chamber do not, I suppose, desire to hear any further argument, thinking, perhaps, that argument on that schedule has been exhausted. The sugar schedule is the most important by far of all the schedules of this bill. It has caused more discussion and attracted more attention than any other, and it will have results, after this bill has passed, of great moment to the people. Behind this schedule stands an artificial legislative trust. Some trusts are natural—for instance, the oil trust; perhaps railroad trusts, to a degree—but this trust is a pure creation of legislation. It originated in legislation, and it draws its daily existence from legislation. By legislation it makes these enormous profits, which cause the common and preferred stock of this institution to bear such large dividends.

Mr. President, I find in the RECORD of the 22d instant a statement prepared by Hon. George G. Tichenor, of the Board of United States Appraisers, showing the sugar differential under the Wilson tariff law and the proposed tariff. The great object, it appears to me, of our friends upon the other side has been not to show that this is a good bill or a good schedule, but to show that the Wilson schedule was worse—a kind of tu quoque argument; but it does not follow that because the Wilson schedule was bad, our friends ought to adopt another bad schedule, but rather that they should disregard the Wilson schedule and adopt a good schedule without reference to other schedules of a bad character.

But this gentleman appears to have based his calculations on a source from which I did not think sugar ingenuity could draw any comfort. The whole calculation is based on St. Croix raw sugar, which represents, according to the note at the bottom of the table, about the medium raw sugars imported in the first four months of the present year, and on refined sugar whose entered value was 2.47. The gentleman takes the sugar of St. Croix, a little island out in the Atlantic, so small in its sugar-producing capacity that it hardly has any place as one of the sugar-producing countries.

The peculiarity of this schedule is that these St. Croix sugars are taken, disregarding the basis upon which the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] places his first schedule, or his Senate amendment schedule, to show that the Wilson law gives more differential than the present proposed conference report. He takes his basis from an unknown island almost (I hardly remembered it) whose sugar-producing capacity is very small, and predicated an argument upon the sugars produced on that little island, and for the purposes of the argument he shows that the sugars in that island are of comparatively little value. He commences at 87 degrees of polariscopic strength, and he gives the ordinary raw sugars of that island at 87 degrees a value of \$1.5375 per hundred pounds, and he goes on down the scale, giving the price of sugar testing 88 by the polariscope as \$1.60 per hundred pounds, and so on. I insert the table as part of my remarks.

The table referred to is as follows:

*Sugar differential under Wilson tariff and proposed tariff.**
[Prepared by Hon. George G. Tichenor, Board of United States Appraisers.]

Degrees.	Average entered value 100 pounds.	Duty on amount necessary to make 100 pounds refined.		Differential per 100 pounds.	
		Wilson tariff.	Proposed tariff.	Wilson tariff.	Proposed tariff.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
87.....	153.75	76.43	170.25	34.87	24.75
88.....	160	78.34	171.99	32.96	23.01
89.....	166.25	80.16	173.58	31.14	21.42
90.....	172.5	81.88	175.04	29.42	19.96
91.....	178.75	83.52	176.38	27.78	18.62
92.....	185	85.06	177.58	26.24	17.42
93.....	191.25	86.50	178.65	24.80	16.35
94.....	197.5	87.55	179.59	23.45	15.41
95.....	203.75	89.11	180.41	22.19	14.59
96.....	210	90.28	181.09	21.02	13.91
97.....	213.125	90.02	181.63	21.28	13.37
98.....	216.125	89.68	182.46	22.62	13.54
99.....	219.375	88.88	182.35	22.42	12.65
100.....	222.5	89	182.50	22.30	12.50

* Based on St. Croix raw sugar, which represents about the medium raw sugars imported in the first four months of the present year, and on German fine refined sugar, whose entered value was 2.47. Duty on 100 pounds German fine under Wilson tariff (40 per cent plus 12½ cents), \$1.113; under proposed tariff, \$1.95. Dutch refined sugar was valued at 2.60, and therefore the differential as against this refined sugar would be 5.2 cents higher per hundred pounds under the Wilson tariff than is stated above, and would be the same as stated under the proposed tariff. Granulated or hard sugars can not be made of sugars below 87 degrees, and therefore the differential on the low grades is immaterial.

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. Tichenor then, taking the number of pounds of raw sugar at these different tests to make a pound of refined, makes the differential under the Wilson law at the 87-degree test to be 34.87 cents per 100 pounds, and under the proposed bill he makes the differential 24.75 cents, giving this bill a differential of about 10 points less than the Wilson Act, and the whole calculation up to 100 will show according to this basis a differential of about 10 points in favor of the proposed conference report over the differential carried in the Wilson bill.

Mr. President, I wish to know how it is possible that this official of the United States has, in the first instance, undertaken to form a schedule showing the differential between the Wilson Act and the proposed conference report, and secondly, how it is possible that he has taken St. Croix sugars as a basis of valuation. He searched the world to find a little island out in the Atlantic that produces sugar of a very low value upon which to make this calculation showing the differential in this bill less than the differential in the Wilson Act.

This gentleman does not agree in the price of sugar at these different polariscopic tests with the distinguished Senator from Rhode

Island [Mr. ALDRICH]. That distinguished Senator took the price of sugar at 88 degrees from an average comparison of the importations for the month of March to be \$1.97 instead of \$1.60. At 89 degrees, instead of \$1.66, as Mr. Tichenor has, he took the value to be \$2.01.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator understands that the table which he is now commenting upon is one taking the price of sugars as shown by the appraisers at New York for the average of four months, and is not an estimate, as I understand it, at all. It is an average on the actual importations and prices.

Mr. CAFFERY. This table was incorporated into the RECORD by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House. He bases his argument upon it to show that the differential carried in the conference report is less than the differential under the Wilson Act. He takes the isolated sugar of the Island of St. Croix as the basis for the price of raw sugar. I contend that this schedule based upon the price of St. Croix sugar is misleading; that the price of all sugars must be taken in order to arrive—

Mr. ALLISON. I think in a measure the Senator's criticism is a just one. I shall, before the debate ends, put into the RECORD a table taking all sugars and showing the differential.

Mr. CAFFERY. I hope the table of the Senator from Iowa will bear out the table of the Senator from Rhode Island. We appear to be in a perfect haze, a labyrinthian maze of prices. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means takes a price which is not in accord with that of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, and again the Senator from Iowa says he will produce a schedule which will show the real price. Will it agree with the schedule prepared by Mr. Tichenor or will it agree with the schedule prepared by the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. ALLISON. The only table which I propose to insert is an official table prepared from the average prices of sugar for four months ending on the 1st day of May. It will be nobody's table except the official table showing the facts; and I will say to the Senator that it has been prepared by Colonel Tichenor from the appraisers' prices.

Mr. CAFFERY. I have no doubt, from the ability shown by Colonel Tichenor in the matter of showing the differential under the Wilson Act, predicated upon the prices of St. Croix sugar, to be much greater than the differential under the pending bill, that Colonel Tichenor will succeed in his last effort as well as he has done in the St. Croix effort.

But the Senator from Rhode Island stated that he took the prices from the importations at the custom-house in New York for the month of March. He gives the prices for the purposes of his calculation. It was necessary for him with his composite ad valorem and specific to show that the price of German granulated and the price of the raws came very near together, and he had a most remarkable success in his effort. It commenced with an ad valorem at the bottom, it had a specific in the middle, it had an ad valorem again toward the top, and it was crowned with a beautiful garland of flowers in the shape of a differential for the sugar trust. The whole labored shaft was surmounted with this crowning glory of a differential for the sugar trust, and every single one of these schedules carries the same beautiful crown, yielding immense profits to the sugar trust.

I wanted to draw attention, and I intend to draw it if I can, to the marked dissimilarity between the Senator from Rhode Island and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means as regards the predicate from which both started. The Senator from Rhode Island took 88 test sugars to be worth \$1.97 a hundred; 89 test, \$2.01. This distinguished gentleman, Colonel Tichenor, of the Board of United States Appraisers, takes the same 88 test at \$1.60, 37 points difference; at 89 he takes \$1.6625. The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island puts it at \$2.01, a difference of over 34 points.

Mr. President, which is which and which is the other? Where do we stand in these schedules? All this elaborate calculation of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is predicated upon this misleading statement of Colonel Tichenor. The statement of the Senator from Rhode Island I take to have represented the approximate prices of raw sugar at 88, 89, 90, and so on, at the period when he took it.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator of course understands that the Senator from Rhode Island, who always takes care of himself, predicated his prices upon a month, namely, the month of January.

Mr. CAFFERY. Yes, sir; the month of March.

Mr. ALLISON. The table of Colonel Tichenor was predicated upon four months' average; so that one has no connection with the other and no relation to the other as respects the average prices and the prices for a particular month.

Mr. CAFFERY. I suppose if Colonel Tichenor, upon the basis of an arithmetical calculation, took his average for four months and the Senator from Rhode Island took his average for one month, on the basis of a pure arithmetical calculation the basis of Colonel

Tichenor ought to be four times as good; but it appears that nobody can agree, not even on the other side, upon their own prices, upon their own starting point.

Here is a statement of the Senator from Rhode Island, made the basis of a most complex and intricate sugar schedule, sustained by a most ingenious and able argument. Here is another schedule of Colonel Tichenor, who has traversed the oceans in search of a good predicate for his calculation. The Senator from Rhode Island and Colonel Tichenor do not agree. Now comes the Senator from Iowa and says that he will solve the whole difficulty by a statement, which he proposes to put in the RECORD later on, containing the true statement of the prices for four months.

Mr. President, is this the way to deal with the Senate, is this the way to deal with the country, to put in the RECORD at this late moment a predicate upon which this involved and artificial calculation is made without the chance of analysis, without the chance of scrutiny? I submit it is not.

I will introduce into the RECORD a statement prepared by Mr. Jacob Schoenhof, showing the real differential under the Wilson Act and the proposed conference report as to the sugar schedule, and from that statement it appears that instead of the Wilson Act carrying a higher differential than the proposed conference schedule, it is just as much less differential in favor of the Wilson Act as the report of Colonel Tichenor carries just that much more.

In other words, Colonel Tichenor makes the differential in the Wilson Act at 88 degrees 32.96, and the true statement makes it 14.85. The real differential at that degree is 14.85 in the Wilson Act and 23.01 in the proposed tariff, shifting the boot on the other leg entirely, making the Wilson Act carry 9 or 10 points less than the proposed tariff instead of carrying between 9 and 10 points more than the proposed tariff. I will offer this paper and have it incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Sugar differential under Wilson tariff and proposed tariff on the basis of prices of raw cane sugar adopted by Senator Aldrich for his calculations in his speech of May 25, 1897.

Degrees.	Average entered value 100 pounds.	Duty on amount necessary to make 100 pounds refined.		Differential per 100 pounds.	
		Wilson tariff.	Proposed tariff.	Wilson tariff.	Proposed tariff.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
88	197	96.45	171.99	14.85	23.01
89	201	96.88	173.58	14.42	21.42
90	205	97.32	175.04	13.98	19.96
91	209	97.64	176.38	13.66	18.62
92	213	97.98	177.58	13.32	17.42
93	216	97.63	178.65	13.67	16.35
94	219	97.41	179.59	13.89	15.41
95	222	97.09	180.41	14.21	14.59
96	225	96.72	181.09	14.58	13.91
97	228	96.31	181.63	14.99	13.37
98	231	95.85	182.46	15.45	13.54

Now, Mr. President, let us look at the peculiarity of the formation of the proposed tariff. The proposed tariff starts at 100 degrees, with 1.825 cents duty, specific. It runs down 3½ points for every degree. Why? Why does it run down 3½ points for every degree? Is there that much difference in the value of a degree? If at 100 the tariff is 1.825, at 99 it ought to be one hundredth less than that, ought it not? But instead of being .01825 it is 3½ points. Can the Senator from Iowa tell me why this sudden jump of 3½ points is made from the top down? Why was not the decline made in proportion to the actual value of each test of sugar as shown by the highest test at 100?

There is a concealed differential there, for as the degrees go down the tariff on the lower grades is made in favor of the trust. The jump is too much, and it is possible for them under this sliding downward scale to import their sugar, say, at 90 degrees, where the tariff is \$1.47, instead of at 96 degrees, where it is \$1.68. There is not that difference in the value of the sugar, and this declining scale, falling very rapidly, is altogether in favor of the importation of grades of sugar carrying the lowest tariff, which will be most beneficial to the trust.

It has been stated that this declension is made to make amends for the extra cost of refining the lower grades, but I submit that that argument has no weight, for the reason that the difference is fixed in the price of the grade and not by any artificial declension in the scale. If 90-test sugar sells for so much, the buyer has discounted in the price the extra cost of refining, as a matter of course, and here is a benefit conferred by this arithmetical declension for which there is no necessity.

I offer a table in connection with this statement showing what ought to be the real declension from 100 degrees down, instead of the artificial declension of 3½ points for a degree. This table has been prepared by Mr. Byron W. Holt, of New York, a very competent expert, and there is no doubt about its correctness, because it is a pure matter of calculation, and anybody can look it over and see.

Table showing the differentials on refined sugar by the schedule reported from the conference committee, including the concealed differentials due to the use of the incorrect increment there adopted of thirty-five one-thousandths of 1 cent.

Degree test.	Duty per pound on raw sugar under conference bill.	Duty per pound on raw sugar with correct increment (0.01825 cent).	Concealed differential in incorrect increment.	Differential, including increment error and 0.12½-0.38 cent per pound.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
100	1.825	1.82500	0.00000	0.50500
99	1.790	1.80675	.01675	.51175
98	1.755	1.78850	.03350	.53850
97	1.720	1.77025	.05025	.55525
96	1.685	1.75200	.06700	.57200
95	1.650	1.73375	.08375	.58875
94	1.615	1.71550	.10050	.60550
93	1.580	1.69725	.11725	.62225
92	1.545	1.67900	.13400	.63900
91	1.510	1.66075	.15075	.65575
90	1.475	1.64250	.16750	.67250
89	1.440	1.62425	.18425	.68925
88	1.405	1.60600	.20100	.70600
87	1.370	1.58775	.21775	.72275
86	1.335	1.56950	.23450	.73950
85	1.300	1.55125	.25125	.75625
84	1.265	1.53300	.26800	.77300
83	1.230	1.51475	.28475	.78975
82	1.195	1.49650	.30150	.80650
81	1.160	1.47825	.31825	.82325
80	1.125	1.46000	.33500	.84000
79	1.090	1.44175	.35175	.85675
78	1.055	1.42350	.36850	.87350
77	1.020	1.40525	.38525	.89025
76	.985	1.38700	.40200	.90700
75	.950	1.36875	.41875	.92375

As a matter of course, Mr. President, it would be perfectly futile for me or for any other man to attempt to have the pending bill recommitted or sent back to conference, but in the face of the enormous advantages enjoyed and to be enjoyed by the sugar trust, I think the duty we owe to the country ought to impel us to have a revision of the sugar schedule. There is no other revision than the cutting off the differential which will satisfy justice and satisfy the needs of the people. This enormous institution defies alike the power of the courts and the power and weight of public opinion. Boldly and defiantly it flaunts its ill-gotten gains in the face of the people of the United States, and goes before Congress and insolently lays before it its demands for protection.

What protection, other than the protection of the law which protects every individual, has this institution a right to ask? Has it a right to demand at the hands of the people of the United States a further lease of power not only to add to the burdens of the people, but to add to the contempt of the people for its nonobservance of law? The antitrust law is an absolute dead letter. It has never been invoked against the sugar trust in an efficient way. The law officials appear to be unable to reach this institution, and the whole United States appears to wither and dwindle in the presence of this gigantic monopoly.

Mr. President, this bill carries an ad valorem or a rate of taxation higher than any act ever carried. If we include sugar in the list of dutiable articles upon the old McKinley Act, you will find that the pending bill carries enormously higher rates than that act. Including sugar, in the McKinley Act the duties are somewhat over 36 per cent. Excluding sugars, those rates are about 50 per cent, as against about 55 per cent under this bill. I would inquire if the time has come which the Senator from Rhode Island spoke of in his opening speech when protection carried to its legitimate results would fail to produce revenue? I wish to know where the revenue is to come from under this bill for at least two years.

There have been importations of wool sufficient, I am told, to keep the woolen mills going for two years. I saw in the paper this morning that \$125,000 of sugar was hastening into the port of New York to be delivered before the new tariff bill is passed and the new duties attached. It is asserted in the public press that at least six months', if not eight months' supply of sugar is on hand now.

Mr. GEAR. I can inform the Senator on that question exactly. There is just four months' scant stock of sugar in this country.

Mr. CAFFERY. When did the Senator get that information?

Mr. GEAR. It is so stated in the report of Willet & Gray, the great sugar paper in the United States.

Mr. CAFFERY. The same report quoted to me by the Senator from Iowa about six weeks ago?

Mr. GEAR. It is published every week regularly.

Mr. CAFFERY. Since the period when the Senator made that remark, I am told the sugar trust has had vessels from every quarter of the globe bringing in sugar.

Mr. GEAR. What the Senator has been told and what the Senator has heard I do not take into account. I go simply by statistics.

Mr. CAFFERY. The Senator goes by Willet & Gray?

Mr. GEAR. Seven hundred and thirty-five thousand tons—

Mr. CAFFERY. He goes by Willet & Gray's statistics.

Mr. GEAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. CAFFERY. It is an organ in the interest of the sugar trust. It is no more to be taken than publications in other prints, and not so much to be taken.

Mr. GEAR. I do not say that it is, but Willet & Gray quote the arrivals, the tons, and we know what the consumption is per capita.

Mr. CAFFERY. So does the Journal of Commerce; so does almost every other newspaper published in New York. It is no more authority than any other paper.

Mr. GEAR. Certainly, but I would suggest to the Senator that these papers all agree, and in addition the Senator can verify it by his own Government statistics published by the Bureau.

Mr. CAFFERY. If the Senator will get the statistics, I should like to see them.

Mr. GEAR. All the Senator has to do is to go to the same place to get them that I do.

Mr. CAFFERY. I have seen the statement in a number of public prints that there was close on to eight months' supply on hand now. I can not name the particular prints, but I can state that I have seen them, and I think one newspaper is about as good authority as another.

Mr. GEAR. No doubt the Senator has seen the old story that the moon is made of green cheese. Yet I do not think he believes it.

Mr. CAFFERY. I have heard the story frequently just as the Senator is now repeating it, and I do not believe his statement or his story.

Mr. President, there is no use to wrangle about these matters. Everybody knows that when the duties are to be made higher the importations are rushed in, and everybody knows that the sugar trust takes care of its own, and the public prints state that there is a very large amount, some of them say an eight-months supply, on hand. But every available pound of sugar in the universe has been bought up and brought into the United States in order to escape the increased duties; and if they did not do that they would not be as wise in their day and generation as the wool people.

There is no doubt about the fact that the wool people have bought up all the wool in the world purchasable, and there is no dispute about the fact that the sugar trust has done likewise; so much so that Secretary Gage was impressed with the equity and justice of levying an excise tax of a cent a pound upon the sugars imported lately, to take from the trust some of its benefits and not permit it to import under a low duty and hold the price up under a high duty, as it certainly will.

I had inquired, before the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR] interrupted me, whether or not the point has been reached where protection would cease to be a revenue getter. The Senator from Rhode Island said protection pursued to its legitimate ends would result in that way.

Mr. President, is not the end at hand? Have not the rates in this bill been raised so high as to prohibit foreign importations? Was there not a note of warning in the address of the South American envoys to this country on some occasion, I think on the assembling of the South Americans at the Philadelphia Museum? Was there not a voice of warning sounded then? Was it not stated that this bill is virtually a declaration of war against the trade of South America? Her wool is taxed. Her hides are taxed. Her tallow is taxed. Where can there be that reciprocity of trade, that free interchange of products, when the exports of those countries into the United States are so highly tariffed? What, again, did Dr. Depew say the other day in regard to the utterance of the French minister when expressions of good will were exchanged between the United States representatives and the French representatives? "Good words are good in their place. Americans talk friendly. They act in a hostile way; but your tariff is hostile to France."

This tariff is a declaration of war against the products of the civilized world. If there is anything that has escaped in these four thousand and odd articles upon the dutiable list of any consequence, I want to know what it is. The poor boon of free bagging and cotton ties was denied to the Southern planter. The Senate voted with a considerable majority to put those articles upon the free list. That poor boon, when the articles, if dutiable, could not yield in excess a million dollars, was denied to the Southern planter.

The delusive boon of a tariff on corn and wheat and oats and barley is given the Northwest. I am very glad that the delusive boon of a tariff on cotton was denied the South. It would have been a mere game of delusion if it had been played out. It would have produced no higher price for cotton and would have been one of those insidious acts which, while it would not yield any real benefit, might have instilled in the Southern mind the poison of protection. I am heartily glad it was knocked out.

Before forgetting it, I wish to allude to a statement made day

before yesterday by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] in a colloquy between him and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES], in which the Senator from Rhode Island said that he would not impose a duty on sugar except for revenue purposes. As to protective purposes, for purposes of protection, the inference is irresistible that he would not impose a tariff. I think that statement ought to be emphasized, so that my own people can understand that the beauties of protection are not for Southern agricultural interests. Let them see that it is only for revenue that our friends on the other side have been forced to grasp sugar and use it to help them out of their difficulties, and then contemptuously cast it aside, as they did in 1890.

It has been intimated and expressed many times on the other side that sugar did not come within the protective principle, simply because it has been produced to a very small extent in the United States, I suppose; and in that particular the sugar planters have been fortunate, because the necessities of the other side have driven them to the imposition of a tariff upon sugar. They may take notice, however, and take heed of the declaration that protection is not for sugar.

The very keystone of the Democratic arch, the theory of tariff for revenue only, is grounded upon a tariff on sugar. The very keystone of the Republican arch is free sugar. The keystone of the Democratic arch is free wool. The keystone of the Republican arch is a high tariff on wool. There are the two principles of taxation right straight before you. The one is produced to an extent to supply about half the needs of the United States, the other to an extent to supply about one-eighth of the needs of the United States. So the difference of three-eighths against sugar as compared with wool is sufficient, according to Republican theory, to cast it into the outer darkness of free trade, and the four-eighths in favor of wool entitles it to a front pew in the Republican church.

This difference can not be emphasized too much. The difference between the Democratic party and the Republican party in a matter of essential principle has its full illustration in the difference between the tariff on wool and the tariff on sugar. The idea of stretching the tariff everywhere where it may produce a revenue finds no lodgment in my mind. The revenue must be produced from articles that put the most money in the Treasury of the Government and the least money into the pockets of individuals. You can not go upon an excursion to find some article here and there that may produce a little revenue in order under Democratic auspices and Democratic doctrine to place a tariff upon it. That is my idea, and I believe it is a correct idea. It is one that I am going to abide by, at all events.

Mr. President, this bill will soon become a law. I am told everything is in readiness to be signed as soon as it passes this body. I think it will share the fate of the old bill of abominations of 1828. That bill was the signal of the defeat of protection. After that bill was passed there was a compromise in 1833, whereby a reduction of the tariff took place gradually until 1842. In 1842 the Whigs were triumphant, and the time for the complete realization of Democratic hopes was delayed a little, but in 1846, when the Democrats again came into power, they carried out, finally, their views of tariff taxation in the bill of that year. In 1857 the whole Democratic idea was essentially realized. They were going according to the platforms and declarations of the party in those days toward free trade.

That was the trend of our party. That was the goal to which all the hopes and aspirations of the old-time Democrats tended. I believe that rates so high as these will be followed by the same fate that overtook the bill of 1828; and the conditions of the United States to-day are such as to hasten and precipitate that result.

We now export in domestic manufactures about one-half of what we export of the produce of agriculture. Some five hundred and fifty-odd million dollars are the gross exports of cereals of the United States per annum, and about \$350,000,000 represents the exports of manufactured products per annum. So it is perceived that instead of being confined to the products of the soil, the Americans are taking the markets of the world in manufactured products. These exports may be cut off and crippled by the passage of this bill, for it is an indubitable fact that if our imports are destroyed or lessened, our exports are crippled almost to the same extent. We can not say, as we have said, that England and Europe are bound to have our cereals. New fields have been opened, new countries have been developed; and when we declare commercial war against the nations of the earth and destroy their imports into our waters, our exports will necessarily suffer. This great growing trade, promising such beneficent results to our people, is seriously threatened by the rates in this bill.

If the bill would produce the vaunted prosperity that is claimed for it, I would say that it were well that everything concerning the bill were done quickly. But an inquiry arises whether the assassination of trade should not make us tremble at the consequences. Will there be no end to this thing? Will there be no retribution against our country for the violation of all laws of

trade—for this declaration of trade war? I think there will be, and I think before two years roll around there will be a universal demand arising from every corner of this Republic for the repeal of a law which in point of iniquity, in point of excessive rates, exceeds and excels the bill of abominations of 1828.

There is one point on which I agree with my silver brethren on this side of the Chamber and on the other side of the Chamber. I never believed, and I do not now believe, that any prosperity can ever be created by tariff taxation of a kind like this. This bill may settle some unsettled conditions; it may help the import trade to some extent, but the vast volume of our trade is domestic. The bill has not and will not disturb enterprises of a purely domestic character. If a company wants to build a railroad from Texas toward the Northwest, what is to prevent it?

Have tariff rates much to do with it? The only impediment and barrier to building a railroad, as affected by tariff laws, has been the very excessive price of steel rails. But the bottom has dropped out of the steel-rail pool, and rails are at a normal price. There is nothing to impede the building of railroads, there is nothing to impede the construction of canals, nothing to impede entering into all the enterprises of a purely domestic character unaffected by importations or by foreign trade. Why the paralysis of trade? What is the cause of the stagnation of trade entirely disconnected with foreign trade?

Some of my friends on this side say it is because they have not the unlimited coinage of silver. I say it is because of the constant assault upon the present standard of value. We are diametrically opposed in view to that, but we both agree as to the effect of a tariff bill as a producer of prosperity. How can a nation be made richer by each individual being made poorer? How can you swell the aggregate of national gain and destroy the separate gain of each individual? Can you make prosperity by piling up money in the Treasury to be taken from the pockets of the people? Is that a way to increase individual wealth? The wealth of this great Republic is in its private citizens, and when you strike at their pockets you strike at the sum total of national wealth.

I do hope that my views in this regard may be falsified. I do hope that we shall have prosperity. But I do not look for it to come from tariff legislation. I look for it to come from entirely normal conditions. I look for it to come from causes outside of tariffs. I do hope that the unexpected may happen—that some avenue may be open whereby the energies of this great people can be utilized to their individual benefit as well as to the national benefit.

Mr. President, I have occupied more of the time of the Senate than I proposed in the beginning. I have run over briefly this sugar schedule and I have brought to the attention of the Senate as well as I could the misleading character of the schedule introduced as a predicate to support the conference report upon the sugar schedule.

I now offer, in connection with the papers already mentioned by me, a statement prepared by Mr. Byron W. Holt. Without reading it, I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the paper referred to will be inserted in the RECORD.

The papers referred to are as follows:

The only pieces of plunder dropped by the trust were the $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents per 100 pounds differential on refined sugar and one-tenth of a cent per pound special reduction on raw sugars testing 87 or below. In the first place, the trust has not, as a matter of fact, dropped all of the $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents per 100 pounds differential. By raising the whole scale of duties it will receive under the conference schedule the same protection upon refined as it would have received under the Senate schedule, namely, \$1.95 per 100 pounds. Therefore it holds on to the $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents for the half year supply of sugar which it has imported in anticipation of the increased duties, and which it now has on hand.

In the next place, the rearrangement of duties because of the change in the increment from .03 cent per pound for each degree to .03 $\frac{1}{2}$ cent gives the trust an advantage in importing ordinary sugars which nearly makes up for its loss by dropping the $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents, and for the loss of the one-tenth of a cent per pound on low-grade sugars. Thus, under the Senate schedule, the difference between the duty on refined sugar and on 92-degree raw sugar (about the average test of imported sugars) is .44 cent per pound. Under the conference schedule the difference is .405. Thus, if importations continue as at present, the trust will have dropped only .035 of .075 cent per pound, which it is pretended that it drops. But because the conference schedule increases the discrimination—already great because of the incorrect Senate increment—in favor of the importation of low-grade raw sugars, it is almost certain that under this schedule the average test of raw sugars imported would drop to 86 to 90. Under the Senate schedule, the difference between the duty on a pound of raw sugar testing 88 and a pound of refined sugar is .56 cent; under the conference schedule this difference is .535 cent; thus, by lowering the test of imported sugars to 88 degrees, the trust would have recovered two-thirds of what it lost by dropping the $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents. When 75-degree sugar is reached, it will be seen that the trust has not only recovered all of the $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents dropped, but one-half of the one-tenth of a cent dropped.

The Senate schedule would have greatly encouraged the importation of low-grade raw sugars. The conference schedule would still further stimulate such importation. There is an enormous amount of concealed protection in the incorrect increment used in both the Senate and conference schedules. With a duty of 1.825 cents per pound on 100-degree raw sugars, the increment should be .01825. Such an increment would neither discriminate in favor of nor against the importation of low-grade sugars as compared with high-grade sugars. With such an increment, the duty on 88-degree sugar would be 1.606 cents per pound. With the incorrect increment used, it is 1.405. This increment then contains, on 88-degree sugar, a protection amount-

ing to one-fifth of a cent per pound. On 75-degree sugar, with the correct increment, there should be levied a duty of 1.398.

The duty on 75-degree sugar under the conference schedule is but .95, showing the concealed protection to be over two-fifths of a cent per pound. There is absolutely nothing in the claims of the trust people that a greater differential should be used for each degree than is obtained by dividing the amount of the duty on 1 pound of 100-degree raw sugar by 100. The difference in cost of refining low-grade as compared with high-grade sugars is expressed in the market price of these sugars, and no attempt, therefore, should be made to express this difference again in the duties levied on these sugars. This incorrect increment contains the "nigger in the fence" in the conference schedule. By means of it the trust appears to have "buncoed" the House and to have made Speaker REED believe that it has let go of the profits, when in fact it has not done so.

There is no pretension that the trust has let go of any of the other unjust duties. Thus, the outrageous duty on all refined sugar, no matter what the test, still remains at 1.95 per pound. As has been shown in the Senate, and not disputed, this duty will absolutely prohibit the importations of all low-grade refined sugars. These are the sugars which compete with the numerous grades of soft sugars produced by the trust and largely used by bakers, preservers, and confectioners. These sugars test from 85 to 94, and therefore contain from about 6 to 15 per cent of water. No importer could afford to import these sugars and pay the same rate of duty upon the water as upon the pure sugar contained in them. There is absolutely no reason why duties levied on both raws and refined should not be graded strictly in accordance with the polariscope test, allowing whatever differential is thought necessary for refined sugars. This is easily the most glaring and outrageous feature of the present sugar schedule.

The trust retains the differential of 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per 100 pounds and the countervailing duty of 38 cents. The countervailing duty is practically so much clear protection for the trust, because it operates against the only refined sugars which compete to any extent in our markets while the countervailing duty on raw sugars will not operate against the sugars used by the trust. The minimum of protection to refiners under the conference schedule will certainly not be less than three-fifths of a cent per pound. The maximum will be close to 1 cent. The average will probably be about seven-tenths, and not less than would have been the average under the Senate schedule.

Not only does the conference schedule rest upon the same false basis as the Senate and House schedule—the incorrect Treasury table of drawback allowances—but it increases the error in the increment used. REED's great "victory" is a barren one. This fact will probably become apparent during the next few days while the Republican papers are proclaiming REED's "triumph."

Under the conference schedule the trust would wallow in protection as never before. Besides the visible protection in the one-eighth of a cent differential and in the thirty-eight one-hundredths of a cent countervailing duty, there is concealed protection in all parts of the schedule. The increment used affords protection varying from two-fifths of a cent per pound on 75-degree sugar to one-sixteenth of a cent on 96-degree sugar. It will undoubtedly yield an average protection of not less than one-fifth of a cent per pound. This incorrect increment in fact contains one of the biggest "steals" ever put into a tariff bill.

The correct deduction of duty to be made for each decrease of 1 degree of saccharine strength is one one-hundredth of the duty on 100-degree sugar. Thus, with a duty of 2 cents per pound on 100-degree raw sugar, the deduction for each degree less than 100 should be two one-hundredths of a cent per pound.

This preserves the parity of the duties on all grades of sugar and does not discriminate in favor of or against the importation of any particular grade. With a duty of 1.825 cents per pound on 100-degree raw sugars the increment should be .01825. Instead of this deduction or increment there was deducted in the Senate bill three one-hundredths of a cent per pound for each decline of 1 degree in saccharine strength. This increment has been increased to three and one-half one-hundredths in the conference schedule. With a duty of 1.825 cents per pound on 100-degree raw sugar the proper duty to levy on 88-degree sugar is 1.606 and on 75-degree sugar 1.398 cents. By using the incorrect increment the conference bill levies a duty of 1.405 cents per pound on 88-degree sugar and only .95 cent per pound on 75-degree sugar. It is evident, therefore, as stated above, that there is over two-fifths of a cent concealed protection on 75-degree sugar and one-fifth of a cent on 88-degree sugar.

It is quite probable that under this schedule the average test of imported sugars would drop from above 92 degrees, where it is at present, to 88 degrees or lower. The refiners would contract for foreign sugars, as they did fifteen years ago, by making an agreement that such sugars should not test above a certain point. The sugar trust could well afford to drop the .075 cent differential in favor of this unfair increment. It did not take Wall Street long to discern this concealed protection. The price of sugar-trust stock rose 10 points within a few hours after the sugar schedule was published, and is now higher than ever before. It is pretended by sugar-trust representatives that an increment should be used which will allow for the increased cost of refining low-grade as compared with high-grade sugars. There is absolutely nothing in these claims. The difference in the market prices of low and high grade sugars expresses the difference in the cost of refining these sugars. Were this not true, refiners would not purchase low-grade sugars. There can, then, be no excuse for allowing for this difference again by an arrangement of duties. The duty should be adjusted in strict accordance with the pure sugar contained in any kind of sugar imported. It is by means of this unfair increment that the trust has "buncoed" the House; that is, Speaker REED.

The fact that the same duty is levied on low as on high grade sugars conceals a liberal supply of protection. Much, if not most, of the foreign refined sugar imported at the present time consists of low-grade sugars testing from 85 to 94 degrees. As the conference schedule would put the same tax upon these sugars, containing from 6 to 15 per cent of water, as it does upon pure refined sugar testing 100 degrees, the importation of these sugars would cease. The trust could then increase its output of low-grade sugars and sell them on its own terms. The average test of refined sugar sold in this country might then decline from about 99, where it is at present, to 96 or 97. In this way the trust would reap extra protection profits of 6 or 8 cents per 100 pounds. There is absolutely no reason why duties levied on both raw and refined sugar should not be graded strictly in accordance with the polariscope test, allowing whatever differential is thought necessary for refined sugars.

The countervailing duty is practically so much clear protection for the trust, because it operates against the only refined sugars which compete to any extent in our markets, while the countervailing duty on raw sugars will not operate against the sugars used by the trust. The minimum of protection to refiners under the conference schedule will certainly not be less than three-fifths of a cent per pound. The maximum will be close to 1 cent. The average will probably be about seven-tenths, and not less than would have been the average under the Senate schedule.

The protection of the trust for the first year under the new schedule is practically unlimited; that is, its profits are limited only by the extent to which it can raise prices without greatly reducing the consumption of sugar. When, about two weeks ago, Secretary Gage proposed his perfectly fair internal-revenue tax of 1 cent a pound on any refined sugar which, after

the passage of the tariff act, shall be produced from sugars imported into the United States prior to this act, one of the trust's representatives, Mr. Gray, of Willett & Gray, laughed at the scheme, and said that it would not work, because the trust would simply raise prices and collect the tax from the consumer. Mr. Willett added that "this result could not be averted by the importation of more sugar from abroad at the lower cost which the passage of the act would have brought about, because the amount needed could not be got immediately from abroad, and hence the raw sugars here would have to be refined, the tax paid, and the price raised."

Willett & Gray's Sugar Journal of July 15 confirms these statements when it says, in speaking of possible importations of foreign refined sugars, that "when considering the influences of these foreign importations it will be necessary to take note that the quantity available just at present is very moderate, and the disposition to import them is even less, while the stock of foreign sugars in this country is being rapidly diminished by the large demand which exists for them. Refiners, therefore, may not, for the present at least, pay much attention to foreign sugars, as they may be obliged to do later on when the workings of the new tariff become fairly adjusted."

It is evident that during the next six months or more the trust will have full control of our markets. No considerable importations are possible, because the world has been drained of sugar to stock up our refineries. The trust has already taken some advantage of the situation by advancing the price of refined sugar to 4½, while the price of 96-degree raw is only 3½. This leaves a net protection of about three-fourths of a cent per pound, or \$30,000,000 a year. It is probable that this difference will be increased rather than decreased during the next six months. Add to this the \$10,000,000 profit on the sugar now on hand, and we see how easy it will be for the trust to make 50 per cent on its nominal capital of \$75,000,000 and over 100 per cent on its actual capital during the next year. Is it surprising that the price of sugar stock should soar?

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, it was not my purpose to participate in this debate. I have cordially cooperated with Senators on this side of the Chamber in refraining from taking any part in the discussion with a view of hastening, if possible, the early determination of this matter. But there has been such an assault made upon one portion of the bill, namely, the lumber schedule, that I feel constrained to make a brief statement in connection with that industry. It was denounced by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] yesterday as the most "infamous schedule" in the measure, which was but reiterating what has been frequently declared on the floor of the Senate during the progress of this debate.

I am aware of the fact that the people of my own State are somewhat divided upon this question, and if I was a protectionist only for Michigan the problem would be a very difficult and embarrassing one for me to solve. However, I do not believe in protection for my State alone, but for all the States; not for one industry, but all industries; not for one portion of the country, but for the whole country, and hence in considering this question I look beyond the State of Michigan to discover, if possible, the magnitude and the needs of this great industry.

Upon such a survey, I find this industry is not confined to the State of Michigan alone or to the States of the Northwest, but it appears from the census of 1890 that it is the leading industry in thirty States of this Union. It is the largest single manufacturing industry in the United States, and to promote its interest there was convened on the 15th of December, 1896, a great national convention at Cincinnati, Ohio, in which there was a representation by delegates from twenty-two States of this Union. As indicating the general interest in this subject, I hold in my hand telegrams from Mississippi, South Carolina, Virginia, New York, North Carolina, Alabama, West Virginia, Missouri, Georgia, and many other States, demanding protection to the great lumber interests of the United States. The following is a fair sample of the general character of these appeals:

HATTIESBURG, MISS., July 6, 1897.

We implore you and other friendly Senators to prevent reduction of \$1 duty on white-pine lumber. Discrepancy in freight rates in favor of Canada over the South has already destroyed yellow-pine industry. Without \$2 protection we can not expect to survive.

B. J. NEWMAN LUMBER COMPANY.

Recurring to the census of 1890, we find the capital invested in the lumber industry in the United States at that time aggregated \$750,000,000. The number of establishments was nearly 24,000, employing 600,000 people, to whom there was paid in wages in a single year \$130,000,000, furnishing the means of livelihood to more than 3,000,000 of our people.

I first had occasion to examine this question in 1888, when a tariff measure known as the Mills bill was under consideration in the House of Representatives; and I then found that in the State of Michigan alone there was invested \$40,000,000 in the lumber industry; that it gave employment to 28,000 people; that it paid in wages annually to the laboring people of my own State \$17,558,500; that \$4,000,000 in addition was annually expended for transportation; and in addition to all this the farmers of Michigan, who are to suffer, it is said, by this duty on lumber, found an enlarged market in the mills and lumber camps of the State for over \$6,000,000 annually of the products of their farms. Such the magnitude and advantages of the industry in Michigan alone.

In the country at large I found \$200,000,000 invested in the lumber industry of the United States, paying annually wages aggregating \$80,000,000, and that the farmers of the country were finding a market for the products of their farms in the camps and

in the mills valued at \$30,000,000 annually. In addition to these sums are the many millions paid annually to manufacturers and merchants, all of which tends to give employment within our borders both to capital and labor and swell the tide of State and national activity.

Such, Mr. President, is the magnitude of this industry in my own State and in the country at large.

RATE OF DUTY.

The rate of duty imposed upon lumber is the lowest of any schedule in this bill, somewhere from 15 to 18 per cent, while the duty on white pine of \$2 per thousand at the average retail price is only 10 per cent, making it among the lowest rates of duty which this bill carries. Further than this, there is no reason why the white pine of Michigan and the Northwest should not have the same measure of protection as the spruce of Maine or the hemlock of Pennsylvania.

DEPRESSION OF THE INDUSTRY.

I also find that this industry has suffered beyond all measure during the last few years. I hold in my hand Dun's Review for January 9, 1897, in which I find a statement of the failures in the lumber industry in the United States. In 1894 there were 314, with liabilities aggregating \$5,997,000; in 1895, 298, with liabilities of \$6,084,000, and in 1896, 493 failures, with liabilities reaching the enormous sum of \$16,314,532, the heaviest loss sustained by any industry in a single year in the United States.

The lumber convention to which I have referred, held in December last, in speaking of the disaster which has overtaken this industry, declared as follows:

Notwithstanding the fact that the consumption was tremendously curtailed throughout this country, and the United States has not in any twelve months since June 30, 1893, consumed to exceed 75 per cent of its annual consumption for several years preceding the panic, the Canadians have continued to gain. Mills have been erected on Canadian soil, and during the year ending June 30, 1896, importations of boards, deals, planks, etc., from Canada amounted to 786,209,000 feet, valued at \$8,505,634. The first three months of the present Government fiscal year showed importations of 225,396,000 feet, which, if maintained for the year, would bring the aggregate to much the highest point ever known.

That in the face of business depression and greatly reduced buying power, that in the face of our own low prices and struggle to dispose of our product, our Canadian competitors should have been able approximately to maintain the volume of their sales, and then to increase them; that while our lumber was lying idle in the piles, vainly awaiting buyers, the Canadian product should have been moved in larger volume than ever before across the border, indicates the danger to American lumber interests from this formidable competition—a competition, let me warn you, that is only just beginning to be felt.

It would be instructive to know the precise magnitude of the American demand for lumber, but let us estimate the requirement for lumber with which the Canadian product comes directly in competition—such as white pine, yellow pine, hemlock, and spruce—at 16,000,000,000 feet in 1892 and 12,000,000,000 feet in 1895-96, and we find that Canada in the former year furnished about 4 per cent of our supplies and in the latter about 6½ per cent, a comparative increase of five-eighths.

Furthermore, during the twelve months ending June 30, 1896, there were imported from Canada 315,464,000 feet of pine saw logs, making a total of supplies received from Canadian forests of 1,101,673,000 feet during that period.

It has been asserted that our Government needs revenues. A little matter of one and a half to two million dollars does not amount to very much, but it would help.

Attention may be called to the importation of boards, deals, and planks alone for the first nine months of the current year, which were almost identical in quantity with the entire 1896 season's outputs of all the Canadian mills in the Ottawa district, the present most important manufacturing district in the Dominion.

I know something of the disaster which has overtaken this industry in my own State, for when visiting the northern portion of the State and the lumber sections during the last year I saw everywhere the mills shut down, their product stacked and unsold, the lumber camps broken up, labor out of employment, or wages reduced, while the Canadian mills were busy day and night and the wages of Canadian labor rapidly advancing.

I hold in my hand a statement showing that in six establishments in the State of Minnesota in 1892 the laboring men received \$578,000 in wages, and in 1896, from the same mills, they received only \$212,000. In other words, the laboring men of these localities lost in wages in 1896 over 1892, \$366,000.

During the year 1896 the data relating to wages are in strong contrast with 1892. Six concerns in Minnesota and Wisconsin show the following decrease in days employed and wages paid:

	Days' employment given all employees.		Amount paid in wages.	
	1892.	1896.	1892.	1896.
1	72,330	42,160	—	—
2	75,300	34,176	\$141,477.75	\$54,935.90
3	53,656	40,230	99,798.53	73,570.95
4	54,187	26,638	87,892.71	39,230.57
5	25,402	24,148	39,585.51	34,282.28
6	136,192	70,296	210,310.92	110,874.74

From this statement it appears that the six concerns in Minnesota and Wisconsin in 1892 furnished 417,047 days' labor to the laboring men of those States, while in 1896 they furnished only 237,648 days of labor; or in other words, the laboring men in the localities where these six concerns are located lost 179,399 days' labor in a single year.

In wages it also appears that these six concerns paid in 1892 to the laboring men in the localities where they are situated \$578,975.42, while in 1896 they paid only \$212,894.44. In other words, the laboring men in these several localities lost in wages in 1896 \$366,080.98.

It also appears that in the year 1896, while the consumption of lumber in the United States fell off 25 per cent, the Canadian importations of lumber into the United States increased more than 46 per cent.

QUANTITY OF WHITE PINE.

But it is urged as a reason for a lower duty on white pine than that fixed in the bill that the forests of white pine in the United States will soon be exhausted. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] exhibited a map which, Senators will remember, conveyed the impression that the supply of white pine was much greater in Canada than in the United States. It is true the Senator corrected the impression which the map conveyed by admitting that the white pine in the United States was in excess of that in Canada; and yet he probably was conscious of the fact that the impression made upon the mind of Senators by the map would be more enduring than anything that distinguished Senator could possibly say.

Turn to the agricultural report of the Canadian Government for the year 1895, and I find a statement, which I will ask to insert in the RECORD without reading, showing that the total amount of pine in Canada is 37,000,000,000 feet; while in the United States to-day it is admitted to be about 50,000,000,000 feet. So the impression intended to be conveyed by the exhibition of the map showing that the Canadian pine far exceeded the supply in the United States was entirely erroneous.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Approximate estimate of the quantity of pine in Canada.

	Feet, B. M.
For Ontario a careful estimate gives 38,808 square miles of pine lands. Assuming half a million feet, board measure, to the mile, which is the Provincial estimate for the land under license, and is probably about correct, while the unlicensed area is not likely to produce more, seeing that the pine grows sparser and smaller to the northward and westward, we have	19,404,000,000
For Quebec a similar estimate gives 31,468 square miles of pine lands. Assuming the same proportionate yield, we have	15,734,000,000
For the Maritime Provinces a similar estimate gives 22,027 square miles of woodland of all kinds. Assuming a fifth part to be pine (probably in excess of the reality), and applying the same measurement, we have	2,200,000,000
Total pine from Atlantic to Rocky Mountains	37,338,000,000

Mr. BURROWS. But the assumption that the white pine will soon be exhausted in the United States is wholly fallacious.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask the Senator if it is not supposed that the estimate of the white pine in the United States is an underestimate?

Mr. BURROWS. Unquestionably, as I shall show.

Mr. DAVIS. I wish to state also, though the Senator may have it in his mind, that the estimate of white pine in existence in the United States is about 40,000,000,000 feet.

Mr. BURROWS. Much in excess of that quantity, I believe; and it has been frequently stated that these estimates made by the Department of Agriculture and from other official sources are under rather than over estimates of the quantity of white pine in the United States.

But apprehension is expressed that the white pine in this country will be destroyed, and in order to preserve it it is proposed to so legislate as to make it unprofitable for the owners of pine to cut it. That is a solicitude on the part of the General Government which the individual citizen will hardly appreciate.

Mr. TELLER. We never made any such proposition as that.

Mr. SPOONER. But you created that impression.

Mr. BURROWS. But what is there of this apprehension. By the census of 1880 it was stated, after careful investigation, that the total supply of white pine in the United States was only 80,000,000,000 feet, and it was estimated that about 10,000,000,000 feet would be cut annually. Therefore, in eight years, if this estimate was correct, the white pine in the United States would have been long ago entirely exhausted. At the end of ten years, however, as appears by the census of 1890, after cutting 10,000,000,000 feet a year, making a total cut of 100,000,000,000 feet in ten years, it was found we still had standing 48,000,000,000 feet after cutting 20,000,000,000 feet more than it was estimated we had in 1880.

In 1890 it was estimated we had 48,000,000,000 feet, and with an estimated annual cut of 10,000,000,000 feet the white pine would of course have been entirely exhausted long before this; yet in 1896 it appears that although we have cut, since 1890, 60,000,000,000

feet, 12,000,000,000 feet more than it was declared we had in 1890, it is estimated that 50,000,000,000 still remain. This demonstrates how unreliable all statistics are touching our standing timber. The Agricultural Department, in its pamphlet numbered 40, frankly says that these estimates are merely speculative and that it is impossible to state with any degree of accuracy the amount of white pine in the United States.

The statement referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE. DIVISION OF FORESTRY, Washington, D. C., April 15, 1897.

There are no statistics of timber standing in the United States available which can claim to be accurate in any mathematical sense, nor would it be possible to ascertain such, if for no other reason than that the methods of utilization, which are largely dependent on changes of local and market conditions, change the amounts of material considered merchantable, harvested, or sawed from a given forest growth, the conception of what constitutes merchantable timber varying.

In the following statement, therefore, only a general survey of the reported facts has been attempted for the purpose of making clear the situation regarding the supply and consumption of coniferous wood in the United States. In this the more or less partial estimates of disinterested parties, combined with a professional knowledge of possibilities or probabilities, have been utilized for an approximation to the truth—a statement of probabilities rather than actualities.

Ever since the publication of the statistics of the Tenth Census regarding the white-pine timber standing—nearly fifteen years—there has been a contention as to their correctness. Time has proven their extreme inaccuracy, for, while then only eight years' supply was supposed to be standing, when the annual cut was 10,000,000,000 feet, we have, with an increased cut, lumbered white pine for sixteen years, and still there is a considerable quantity left.

As stated before, even now there are really no statistics upon which to base a correct prognostication as to the date of this exhaustion. Estimates only are available, and estimates of standing timber are proverbially unreliable, mostly underestimates, and always to be taken with caution.

In all these estimates of standing timber the writer has leaned toward extravagance rather than understatement, and thus the total is found to add up 100,000,000,000 feet of coniferous growth in the Northern States, of which less than half is pine, to satisfy a cut of at least eighteen to twenty billion feet per annum.

Mr. BURROWS. I will insert in the RECORD a statement made by the members of the convention as to the amount of timber in the United States.

The statement referred to is as follows:

With the spruce of the New England States, the hemlock of New York and Pennsylvania, the pine of the Virginias and the Carolinas, the yellow pine and cypress of the entire South Atlantic and Gulf Coast States, the poplar, oak, cottonwood, and white pine of the middle South, the mountain pine of New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Montana, and Idaho, the white pine of the central Northwest, the Douglass fir and cedar of the Puget Sound region, and the redwood and sugar pine of California, it is evident that every part of the United States is in close proximity to one or more sources of timber supply, and the aggregate amount, as set forth in the United States Forestry Reports, is a sufficient reply to those who claim to fear that our forests will soon be denuded.

Especially so is this the case when account is taken of the fact that spruce timber reproduces itself to merchantable size every thirty to forty years, and in these States where the habit of throwing land out into "old field" obtains, it is shown beyond peradventure that several varieties of pine grow to saw-log proportions in less than a generation. It may possibly not be known to all of your committee that many of the so-called treeless States are quite the contrary. One of the largest unbroken bodies of pine timber in the United States is in the Territory of Arizona.

FORESTS CAN NOT BE PRESERVED.

Mr. BURROWS. But this anxiety to preserve the white pine of the United States, while laudable, is nevertheless futile.

Mr. TELLER. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. BURROWS. It can not be preserved.

Mr. TELLER. That is true.

Mr. BURROWS. It can not be preserved because of the elements which will surely destroy it. I remember in 1888 to have made some remarks in the House of Representatives upon this question, and I was aided in my contention at that time by distinguished gentlemen from my own State, at the head of whom was Arthur Hill, known and respected throughout our State; and I hold in my hand his statement in relation to the lumber industry, from which I beg to make some brief extracts bearing upon the question of the preservation of our forests:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 15, 1888.

Hon. J. C. BURROWS, Washington, D. C.:
One defense of the proposition that lumber should be put on the free list is that the lumbermen of this country are destroying the forests, and that this so-called destruction should be stopped in the interest of arboriculture. It is proposed by a repeal of the lumber tariff to invite Canadian competition to the end that the American lumbermen shall be driven out of the business and the forests thus remain uncut.

We do not believe that the magnitude of the industry that it is proposed to strike down is generally understood and appreciated.

If this plan for transferring the cutting of timber to Canada, by legislation, could be effected, it would involve then the destruction of the third largest industry in the country and throw out of work one man in fifteen of those employed in the trades.

In the words of our memorial, "Where would these losses be made good and in what new field would this labor be employed?"

But, as has many times been pointed out by the forestry experts, even if we stop cutting our white-pine and hemlock timber it will not be saved, but rather lost, from being consumed by forest fires.

The Forestry Report of the United States Census of 1880, pages 490 et seq., presented maps and statistics illustrating the continual prevalence of and damage to timber by these forest fires.

I hold in my hand that report on forestry of the census of 1880, showing, as will be observed by this colored map [exhibiting], the extent of the devastation caused to our forests by the prevalence of fires.

As bearing further upon the destruction of our forests, Mr. Hill says:

They sweep through the forest and kill the timber. If cut at once and before bored by grubs this burned timber makes good lumber. If left standing for a year it is unfit for all but the most common uses, and at the end of, say, five years, is worthless. The testimony of Messrs. Rust, Van Schaik, and Hotchkiss before the Tariff Commission (see report, page 955 et seq.) sets forth very fully the manner and extent of these losses from forest fires.

With railroads traversing every portion of the State, and homestead settlers clearingland in the midst of pineries, the strictest statutes against the careless and criminal burning of our forests have been ineffectual to prevent it. Fires prevail every year, and during especially dry years, like 1871 and 1881, they not only damage millions of dollars' worth of timber, but destroy the homes and even the lives of settlers, arresting the attention and evoking the charity of the whole nation.

We have attempted to show that the way to save our forests from destruction was to utilize them, and that to compel lumbermen to cease cutting timber would bring great loss to the industrial community.

The forestry statistics of the census of 1880 show that in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas there was claimed to be 237,000,000 feet of pine, and it is stated that these are in fact underestimates. The cut of the Northwest, as was developed at the January session of the forestry convention of Michigan, will exceed the census estimates by at least 50 per cent, so that we may safely call—

	Feet, B. M.
Pine in above States	300,000,000,000
Cypress (estimated)	50,000,000,000
Pine and allied woods in States north of the Southern States and east of the Rocky Mountains (estimated)	100,000,000,000
In States and Territories west of the Rocky Mountains (census)	350,000,000,000
Total	800,000,000,000

It appears, then, that we have in this country to-day 800,000,000,000 feet of timber belonging to the coniferous family, against only 50,000,000,000 feet, according to the accepted estimates (see Tariff Commission Report, pages 1023 and 1024), in Canada.

A review of the forestry statistics shows that the pine-timber supply of Canada, east of Manitoba, lies next our border; that the upper waters of the streams which supply this timber flow through treeless barrens and morasses, with here and there a worthless and stunted growth of fir. They further show that the pine timber of Canada, like that in the Northwestern States, does not renew itself when cut, other timber taking its place, while the timber from Maine down the entire Atlantic coast, along the Gulf of Mexico, and the timber of our western slope is naturally reproduced after being cut, and will be, unless prevented by fires.

Our great coast belt, then, suited in soil and favored by humidity, constitutes, therefore, our natural timber preserve, and it will continue to supply building material to our people long after the pine forests of Canada and the Northwest are swept away.

With this 350,000,000,000 feet of pine and cypress in the South, and with probably 150,000,000,000 feet of deciduous timber valuable for construction, such as poplar, gum, etc., why should we turn to Canada for our timber supply? Especially why should we do this when we can not find a market in our own country for the lumber which we now produce?

The revenue tables show that the export of lumber and timber during the last fiscal year was 643,000,000 feet, mainly from the Southern States; while the import was only 443,000,000 feet from Canada. And this Canadian lumber comes into direct competition with the Southern product.

At a large Government sale of timber berths at Toronto, December 16 last, an effort was made by the Canadian lumbermen to have the stumpage dues in certain cases reduced. Mr. Charleton, member of the Canadian Parliament, publicly addressed the council which has these matters in charge, and urged as a reason for such action that the southern pine and poplar were invading the northern market so that they could not compete with it unless they had relief. He claimed that 150,000,000 feet of Southern pine came into New York City in direct competition with the Canadian product.

We have learned the exact amount of southern pine arriving in the New York market during the year 1887, and we find it to be 220,599,294 feet, besides 50,000,000 feet of what is known as North Carolina pine.

This lumber, as well as the poplar, comes North on a very narrow margin of profit, not to exceed, say, \$1 per thousand, and it is impossible to stand a reduction of \$2 per thousand and meet this avowed Canadian competition.

Hon. Perry Hannah said at the recent forestry convention that the hard woods of the State would bring more money to the people than the pine forests, and that this money would be distributed among those who most need it, the farmers and settlers. This distribution has only fairly begun, yet the comparatively recent demand for hard-wood lumber has already brought millions of dollars into the State. To surrender this trade to Ontario, lying, as this province does, between Michigan and our main market, the East, would compel the settler to burn his timber as he cleared his lands, as he has done in the past, instead of turning it into lumber at a profit.

To conclude: The facts here stated and the evidence referred to we think plainly shows—

First. That if the forests of the Northern States are not cut and utilized, they will be burned and wasted.

Second. That on account of the magnitude of the lumber business, serious interference with it will give a shock to the entire industrial system.

Third. That the ultimate forest resources of this country relatively exceed those of Canada, and that we are now seeking a market abroad for timber which we should be able to use at home.

Fourth. That the principal timber supply of this country lies in the South comparatively untouched, yielding less than 4,000,000,000 feet in 1880, while it is capable, under proper conditions of forest growth, of producing 10,000,000,000 feet annually without impairment.

Fifth. That the present duty on lumber is much less than on any other article where labor is employed to a similar extent in its production.

Yours, respectfully,

ARTHUR HILL,
W. C. McCLURE,
P. A. O'DONNELL,
MAX HEAVENRICH,
A. T. BLISS,
F. C. STONE,

Committee.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator allow me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ALLEN. For a question.

Mr. BURROWS. Very well.

Mr. ALLEN. I simply want to know who Mr. Hill is.

Mr. BURROWS. Arthur Hill is a very prominent citizen of our State, known and respected by our people. He was then, as now, I suppose, interested in the lumber business.

Mr. ALLEN. In the lumber interests?

Mr. BURROWS. Yes, sir. So, I say whatever may be the desire to preserve the white pine of this country, it will be impossible to do so because, as has been stated, when the fires sweep through the forests the timber must be cut or it will become absolutely valueless. I have a statement in my hand, made by Mr. Eddy, of Michigan, showing that the Government appreciates this fact, and, with leave of the Senate, will insert it in the RECORD.

The statement referred to is as follows:

JULY 21, 1897.

DEAR SIR: Within a few miles of Bayfield, Wis., there is a small Indian reserve known as the Red Cliff Reservation, the timber upon which was damaged by fire last fall to such an extent that the agent of the Government at Ashland concluded that in order to save it from destruction by worms, which would have taken place in the spring and summer, it was necessary during the winter of 1896-97 to cut and manufacture into logs between eight and nine million feet of the timber on said reservation. There has been estimated to be on the tract belonging to the Indians on this reservation somewhere about 100,000,000 feet of pine timber, together with a large quantity of hemlock and hard woods of different kinds.

The eight or nine million feet of logs that were taken from the reservation because of the damage by fire at the present writing remain in a small bay on the reservation, which is a part of Chiquanagon Bay on Lake Superior. There was no preparation for sawing and manufacturing these logs into lumber, and it was decided that they would offer the logs for sale and advertised for bids, but in consequence of the dullness of the lumber and log business which has prevailed for several years, the proposals that were received were found to be insufficient to more than pay for the cost of lumbering these logs, which would leave the Indians of the reservation nothing for their timber. In consequence the logs remain, and much speculation is indulged in as to what the Government will do with them.

I personally visited the place where these logs are stored, examined them, and found them as nice a body of logs as I ever saw in one place. They were marked with "the circle, U. S.," which is the stamp used by the United States Government on logs taken from Government reservations, as I understand it. These logs under the present conditions of the lumber business would not allow anyone to purchase them and pay one cent in advance of what it has cost the Government to cut this timber, manufacture it into logs, and deliver it into the waters of Lake Superior.

This should be very good evidence that the United States Government is itself very deeply interested in a better condition of the lumber business, which it is hoped to be brought about by a protective tariff. There are scattered through Minnesota and Wisconsin many reservations and a great deal of land remaining in the hands of the Government which has upon it large quantities of white-pine timber, but with the conditions that prevail to-day it is absolutely worthless.

Very truly, yours,

W. S. EDDY.

Hon. J. C. BURROWS,
United States Senate.

Mr. BURROWS. The Government, recognizing the fact that it would be a total loss unless cut, have cut this timber in order to preserve it. I repeat, therefore, that the forests can not be preserved, according to the testimony of everyone familiar with forestry, until we can control the forces of nature. Until we can bridle the tempests or quench the fires it is impossible to preserve the white-pine forests of the Northwest.

(1) The facts set forth in the last preceding paragraph demonstrate the error of the theory that American forests would be conserved by admitting lumber free of duty. The coarser portion of the tree is now left to decay, as only the choicer grades can be marketed at a profit. This adds largely to the inflammable material and greatly increases the liability of forest fires. Timber is seldom even in part consumed by fire; it is simply killed, and the destruction is caused by timber worms. Much of our lumber when burned could be saved if the conditions of trade warranted its immediate manufacture. It is the elimination of the value of American timber that largely hastens its destruction.

OWNERSHIP OF PINE.

Another reason urged for striking down this industry is that the pine timber of the United States is owned by a very limited number of individuals. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] in his remarks the other day said that all the white pine was owned by 12 persons. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] on yesterday, if I understood him correctly, said that the ownership was confined to 6 individuals. The Senator from South Dakota, revising his previous statement, said, under date of July 20, that—

One man in Michigan, Mr. Blodgett, owns the standing pine.

This latter statement of the Senator from South Dakota will discredit him in my State with every man of intelligence, as the statement has not the slightest foundation in fact.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BURROWS. I do.

Mr. TELLER. As the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] is not here, I should like to say that the Senator from Michigan knows very well that the Senator from South Dakota on a previous occasion mentioned a few persons, and then alluded to this man as owning the greatest interest—ten millions, as he stated. The Senator knows it was not the intention of the Senator from South Dakota to make a statement that was not true.

Mr. BURROWS. I hope not; but this statement appears in the RECORD.

Mr. TELLER. If it is, the Senator from Michigan knows the Senator from South Dakota did not make any such statement.

Mr. BURROWS. I have given the exact words of the Senator from South Dakota as reported in the RECORD.

Touching these several statements as to the ownership of pine timber in the United States, and in refutation thereof, I read from the Census Bulletin of July 3, 1895, from which it will be observed that our large tracts of timber are owned by 1,186 individuals and corporations.

I also read a dispatch from the editor of the *Timberman* in relation to the number of owners of pine in the Northwest:

A. H. WINCHESTER,
Secretary National Lumber Convention,
1421 G street NW., Washington, D. C.:

Running over list of operating firms, corporations, etc., cutting their own timber or timber owned by their members, we have counted, in the States of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, 195 whose timber resources are important. Michigan, 95; Wisconsin, 68; Minnesota, 92. In haste to reply, have doubtless overlooked many. The number of individual holders would be much greater. We do not include hundreds of small holdings, or those known to be included with larger amounts of hemlock and hard woods, or those held for investment and not operated, on Indian reservations, State and Government lands, etc. We believe the forests of these three States will yet furnish at least seventy-five to one hundred billion feet white-pine products. Remember that the value of other timber largely follows that of white pine.

THE TIMBERMAN,
J. E. DEFEBAUGH.

I also desire to place in the RECORD, in addition to the foregoing dispatch as to number of owners in Michigan, a statement made by a distinguished member of the House of Representatives, Mr. TAWNEY, on the 19th instant, in which he gives the names of the individuals and firms owning white pine in the State of Minnesota, aggregating 66, and in Wisconsin 90. So the statement that the white pine in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota is owned by 12 individuals, or the further statement that the Michigan white pine is owned by one person, is without a shadow of truth.

The statement of Mr. TAWNEY is as follows:

Recently I received a letter from Hon. M. G. Norton, of Winona, Minn., whose reputation for truth and reliability is second to none in our State—transmitting a statement containing the names of 156 individuals and corporations who own standing white pine in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin alone, and with whom he is personally acquainted.

We send you to-day, as per our telegram of this day, a list covering over 150 different owners of white pine in the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota. These are corporations and individuals that we happen to have personal acquaintance with, and know of their being interested in the ownership of lands containing white pine. If we had time to pursue this thoroughly, we think we should develop the fact that there are several thousand owners of white-pine timber lands in this State and Wisconsin. We are constantly running against parties who are thus possessed of land, and among them are included widows and orphans and estates of men who a long time ago made what they called safe investments in this kind of property.

I suppose the idea of Mr. PETTIGREW and Mr. ALLEN was to show that the tendency of the lumber interest was toward a trust and a combination that would be hard on the consumer of lumber. Perhaps there is no other business in the world that is so far from being able to be controlled by a trust or a combination as the lumber business. There is such a diversity of interests that that sort of thing could not possibly exist, and the competition among all the different manufacturers is very sharp and very fierce, so much so that the manufacturers are now giving to the consumers lumber at less than the cost price.

I have also received communications from other reliable gentlemen in Minnesota and Wisconsin and who are thoroughly acquainted with the lumbering business of both of these States. Mr. William Irvine, of Chippewa Falls, Wis., writes that "there are over 500 individual owners of standing white pine in Wisconsin, not counting small holdings of homesteaders and farmers, of whom there are thousands. In addition, there are over a hundred lumber companies owning pine in this State." Mr. S. T. McKnight, H. A. Kelly, B. F. Nelson, and C. T. Smith, of Minneapolis, write me that "there are over 115 corporations and more than a thousand individual owners of pine in Minnesota, including homesteaders and farmers."

Mr. BURROWS. In the light of these declarations it is astounding that the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Nebraska could have so far forgotten themselves as to place on record a statement which has no foundation in fact.

TAX NOT A BURDEN.

But it is stated that this tax on lumber will be a burden on the people; that a duty of 10 per cent on lumber is too grievous to be borne. In the first place, it is not certain that the price will be enhanced, for it will be remembered that the price of lumber advanced in 1890, after the duty had been lowered. As showing where the burden falls and who is to be benefited, let me read an extract from a Canadian authority which will throw some light on this question.

I quote from Pamphlet No. 10, issued during the Ontario general elections of 1894:

The reduction of the duty on lumber from \$2 to \$1 by the act of 1890 resulted in greatly increasing the revenue of the Canadian Government from sales of timber lands. The Canadian manufacturer, then having an easier access to our markets for his coarser grades of lumber, cut and paid his Government for timber that had been previously left to destruction.

The lumber trade is of Dominion concern, and perhaps ranks second in importance in Canada. All the provinces are more or less affected by the prices obtained and the markets available for sawed lumber, but to Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, and British Columbia (all large exporters of sawed lumber) the prosperity of the trade is of vital importance. The United States is practically our only market for sawed lumber and shingles, and its value may be judged from the fact that Canada sent there last year 1,031,000,000 feet of sawed lumber, valued at \$8,900,000, and 357,000,000 shingles, valued at \$734,000, or a total value of \$9,634,000.

The rougher grades of lumber were now capable of being marketed there at a profit, and it has been estimated by Colonel O'Brien, member of Parliament for Muskoka, and corroborated by reports from the Crown timber agents, that from 30 to 50 per cent more white pine is cut and marketed from the same area of licensed territory than was formerly the case. This means a large increase in the revenue of the provinces for material which had formerly gone to waste. It also means a large increase in the employment of labor and markets for produce.

Mr. President, I do not care to dwell further on this matter. I desire to have incorporated in my remarks a letter received from a gentleman in Buffalo, N. Y., showing the extent of the burden which this tax will impose on the farmers of the United States. I will ask to have it printed in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that order will be made.

The letter referred to is as follows:

BUFFALO, N. Y., July 9, 1897.

DEAR SIR: We hope that in your conference committee you will strongly advocate a two-dollar tariff on pine lumber, for the following reasons:

First. Twenty dollars being about an average retail price for pine lumber in this country, \$2 is only a 10 per cent duty, probably as small as on anything in the bill.

Second. Even this is not "a tax on the poor man," as so many speakers have claimed, for only 14 per cent of the lumber consumed in the country is used in the building of houses, barns, fences, etc., as shown in the following table:

Estimated consumption of lumber in the United States.

	Per cent.
Houses, barns, fences, etc.	14
Boxing, crating, scaffolding, and other temporary purposes.	27
Cars and other railroad purposes.	31
Boat building, sidewalks, patterns, etc.	20
Miscellaneous	8
Total	100

Third. It is undisputed that the American product, and not the imports from Canada, makes the price, and therefore a tariff on Canadian lumber will not and can not change the price to the consumer in this country.

Fourth. A two-dollar rate would not be prohibitory, as recently asserted, for there is practically no other outlet than the United States for Canadian lumber, which might therefore as well pay the \$2 per thousand revenue to this country as to be admitted at \$1.

We sincerely hope that you will acquiesce in the House rate of \$2.

Very truly, yours,

GRATWICK, SMITH & FRYER LUMBER CO.

Hon. J. C. BURROWS,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

Mr. BURROWS. I submit a brief statement from the pen of the Hon. E. J. HILL, member of Congress from Connecticut, who for twenty-two years was a retail dealer in lumber. Mr. HILL says:

The great market for lumber in the United States is in New England, and I never saw the price of lumber affected to the extent of 25 cents per thousand feet by a tariff.

The retail lumber dealers of New England at their annual convention this winter passed unanimously a resolution calling upon Congress to place a two-dollar duty on lumber.

The segregation of white pine as a factor of debate has little foundation in fact, as since the use of dry kilns became general the yellow pine of the South has taken the place of many of the lower grades of white pine. The dry kiln is to yellow pine what the cotton gin was to cotton.

When the duty was \$2, in 1875, I paid \$10.50 for spruce. This year, when there is no duty, the price is \$13.50.

The \$2 on rough lumber will especially help the Southern lumbermen and others who are far from the New England market, as it will offset the freight they have to pay to put their product in the market.

The Canadians will have to send their pine to the United States because they have no other available market. England will take only the highest grades.

I have sought, Mr. President, thus briefly to allude to the salient points of attack on the lumber schedule, and to present in outline the magnitude of the lumber industry in the United States, and point out some of the benefits which accrue to our farmers and workmen by its successful prosecution.

As suggested to me by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], my statement as to ownership of timber does not include the white pine held by the farmers throughout the Northwest, on the sale of which the owners depend for payment of their holdings.

Mr. President, I do not care to say anything further in relation to the lumber schedule; but I insist that, instead of being the most infamous, it is really the most meritorious, or at least equally meritorious with the other schedules of this bill.

It has been said during the course of this debate that the owners of these forests have stated that they are to be advantaged by the passage of this bill. Whether the particular statement alluded to was made or was not made I do not recall, but it is undoubtedly true that this measure will advantage all the industries and all the people. It will inure to the benefit of the manufacturer, securing the home market for his products; it will advantage the woolgrowers, for their flocks will be increased and their value enhanced; it will benefit the farmers by an increased demand for the products of agriculture, and I trust it will restore to the laboring people of this country the uncounted millions of which they have been robbed by four years of disastrous free trade.

My attention has been called to a statement made by the Senator from South Dakota when I was absent from the Chamber, which I can not pass unnoticed. He alluded to a distinguished citizen of my State, Mr. John W. Blodgett; and after declaring him to be a man of fortune, stated, "He is the man who manipulates the elections of Senators in Michigan." I do not know or understand the purpose of that remark or the inference which the Senator intended to have drawn from it. If, however, it was intended to intimate that the election of Senators in my State was secured by any other than honorable methods, the statement was a slander upon the people of my State and the legislature from whom I hold my commission.

I know Mr. Blodgett, and know him well. He is a gentleman of high character, of unimpeachable integrity, and so secure in the public regard that nothing which the Senator from South Dakota can possibly say will detract one iota from his good name.

A word more and I am done. I desire to detain the Senate but a few moments with some general observations.

Mr. President, when on the 4th of March, 1897, the Democratic party went out of power and William McKinley became President of the United States, such was the financial and industrial condition of the country that the incoming Executive felt constrained in the performance of a public duty to summon Congress in extraordinary session to provide the necessary revenue for the support of Government, and to restore, if possible, the industrial activity which during the four years of President Cleveland's Administration had become seriously impaired or destroyed.

The House of Representatives, with unexampled alacrity, responded to that summons, and on the 1st of April sent to the Senate a revenue measure designed to remedy existing conditions. For nearly four months that bill has engaged the attention of the Senate; and while under the rules governing this body an earlier disposition could hardly have been secured, yet the delay was unfortunate, in that it enabled importers to flood our markets with foreign goods so as to minimize the revenues which may be derived for the next fiscal year and postpone the era of returning prosperity.

While it is undoubtedly true that the opposition consumed no more time than was necessary to thoroughly discuss the items in the various schedules, yet the delay would have been greatly augmented had not this side of the Chamber wholly refrained from participating in the debate, to the end that the earliest possible action might be secured. More than that, we realized the fact that it was utterly idle to discuss the conflicting theories of protection and free trade. No debate, however extended or elaborate, can possibly harmonize the conflicting and irreconcilable differences between parties upon that question.

It was equally idle to discuss the details of the measure except so far as was necessary to explain its provisions, for this great act, say what you may about its details, will in the end stand or fall in the public judgment not on its specific or ad valorem rates, but upon the general results attending its enactment. If in its practical workings it shall accomplish the beneficent purposes for which it is enacted, as declared in its title, namely, "to secure revenue and encourage American industries;" if it shall bring sufficient revenue for the support of the Government and such encouragement to American industries as to insure a revival of business and the restoration of American wages to American workmen, then no amount of criticism here or elsewhere, no recital of ad valorem on the hustings will be sufficient to destroy public confidence in the wisdom of this measure, dislodge it from public favor, or induce the American people to again abandon the policy of protection and resort to the disastrous policy of free trade.

I have no purpose, therefore, to detain the Senate a moment in the discussion of these theories or to explain the reasons for the various provisions of the bill. I rise more especially to say one word in relation to a declaration made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Vest] in the opening of the debate, and repeated by other Senators, to which I desire to call attention, for the Senator from Missouri made an assault upon this bill which strikes at the measure as a whole by declaring that its enactment is a needless burden upon the American people, because there is already a surplus in the Treasury, including the reserve, of something over

\$230,000,000. The Senator from Missouri, under date of May 25, said:

The Senator from Rhode Island, an expert in regard to the tariff, has been very careful not to speak of the condition of the Treasury of the United States when he alludes to the want of revenue to pay the expenses of the Government.

* * * * *
If there be to-day enough money to carry on the Government, why the necessity of increasing taxation?
* * * * *

Mr. President, what is the condition of the Treasury of the United States? Let us see what the necessity is for increasing tariff taxation.

On May 21, 1897, the cash balance in the Treasury available was \$229,350,650.50. Taking from this the gold reserve of \$100,000,000, it leaves, as a matter of course, \$129,350,650.50 idle money in the Treasury available for any governmental purpose.

Mr. President, the fact that there is a surplus in the Treasury does not make a revision of our tax laws unnecessary, unless it appears that such surplus is derived from existing revenue laws and that these laws are sufficient to provide ample revenue for the support of the Government. If the surplus in the Treasury is not the accumulation of revenues derived from existing tax laws, but rather the proceeds of the sale of bonds, and evidence only of increased indebtedness, then sound business judgment demands prompt revision of the tariff on lines to insure revenue sufficient for the support of the Government and guard against the possibility of any further increase of the public debt.

The measure about to become a law, it is believed, will accomplish this end. The present tariff, either as a revenue measure or a promoter of domestic industries, has been a frightful failure. I do not stop to recount the long catalogue of disaster brought to the nation and the citizen in every walk of life from the humble laborer to his employer. All these are disclosed in the records of the Treasury Department or indelibly stamped on the hearts and homes of the American people. I propose, without detaining the Senate longer, to submit some official data taken from the books of the Treasury, showing the result of the Wilson Act so far as the fiscal operations of the Government are concerned.

I hold in my hand a statement of the Treasurer of the United States, showing the revenues and expenditures of the Government from the 1st of March, 1893, three days before the Cleveland Administration came into power, until the 1st of March, 1897, during which time it appears that the expenditures exceeded the revenues by \$184,000,000, and in only one quarter, that of September, 1894, did the revenues of the Government exceed its expenditures. Every other quarter shows a deficiency.

Net ordinary revenues and expenditures of the Government from March 1, 1893, to March 1, 1897, by quarter years.

Quarter ending with—	Revenues.	Expenditures.	Surplus.	Deficiency.
1893.				
March (1 month).....	\$34,115,809.99	\$31,633,482.23	\$2,482,327.76	
June.....	91,071,703.49	92,224,241.93		\$1,152,538.44
September.....	80,870,621.90	98,430,694.59		17,560,072.69
December.....	71,052,926.95	90,946,114.10		19,893,187.15
1894.				
March.....	72,791,502.85	89,807,551.82		17,016,048.97
June.....	73,006,987.55	88,340,919.32		15,333,931.77
September.....	98,972,676.42	98,623,233.40	\$349,443.02	
December.....	61,211,058.11	88,324,246.70		27,113,188.59
1895.				
March.....	77,991,042.75	85,951,043.43		7,959,973.68
June.....	75,215,297.83	83,291,801.76		8,076,503.93
September.....	87,390,864.90	95,445,734.09		8,054,869.19
December.....	81,880,927.46	87,360,517.12		5,479,589.66
1896.				
March.....	81,606,402.88	86,566,455.61		4,960,052.73
June.....	76,098,005.14	82,806,739.26		6,708,734.12
September.....	80,156,963.29	104,358,937.73		24,201,974.44
December.....	77,466,938.77	91,053,550.69		13,586,611.92
1897.				
February (2 months).....	48,717,991.43	59,065,445.95		10,347,454.52
Total.....	1,269,617,701.71	1,454,235,082.70	2,826,770.78	187,444,151.77
Net.....				184,617,380.99

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES, March 3, 1897.

But it will be said that this deficiency began under the McKinley Act. That is true. It began because of the election of 1892, when it was determined that the Government was to abandon the policy of protection and go to the policy of free trade, which necessarily lessened importations in anticipation of lower rates, and reduced revenues. Consequently I submit an official statement

showing the revenues and expenditures and the deficiency from February, 1893, to January, 1897, by months, and ask to have it incorporated in my remarks.

Revenues and expenditures under McKinley Act.

	Revenues, exclusive of postal.	Expenditures, exclusive of postal, principal of debt, and premium.	Surplus revenues.	Deficiency in revenues.
1893.				
March	\$94,115,810	\$91,633,482	\$2,482,328	
April	28,415,368	33,238,886		\$4,823,518
May	30,928,858	30,210,787	718,071	
June	30,717,102	28,775,469	1,941,633	
July	30,905,776	30,675,889		8,770,113
August	29,890,855	33,305,228		9,414,343
September	24,582,750	25,478,010		895,254
October	24,553,395	29,588,792		5,035,397
November	23,979,401	31,302,026		7,322,625
December	22,312,027	30,058,261		7,746,234
1894.				
January	24,082,739	31,309,670		7,226,931
February	22,269,299	26,725,374		4,456,075
March	24,842,798	31,137,560		6,294,762
April	22,692,364	32,072,836		9,380,472
May	23,066,994	29,779,141		6,712,147
June	26,485,926	25,557,021	928,905	
July*	34,809,340	36,648,583		1,839,243
August*	40,417,606	31,656,637	8,760,969	

* Large receipts from whisky in anticipation of increased tax.

Revenues and expenditures under Wilson Act.

	Revenues, exclusive of postal.	Expenditures, exclusive of postal, principal of debt, and premium.	Surplus revenues.	Deficiency in revenues.
1894.				
September	\$22,621,229	\$30,323,019		\$7,701,790
October	19,139,240	32,713,040		13,573,800
November	19,411,494	28,477,189		9,065,785
December	21,866,137	27,135,461		5,269,324
1895.				
January	27,804,400	34,523,447		6,719,047
February	22,888,057	25,696,035		2,807,978
March	25,470,576	25,716,957		246,381
April	24,247,836	32,990,676		8,742,840
May	25,272,078	28,558,214		3,286,136
June	25,615,474	21,683,020	\$9,932,445	
July	29,069,698	38,548,064		9,478,366
August	28,952,697	32,588,185		3,635,488
September	27,549,678	24,320,482	3,229,196	
October	27,901,748	34,503,425		6,601,677
November	25,986,503	27,199,253		1,212,780
December	20,288,938	25,814,317	474,021	
1896.				
January	29,237,670	32,529,341		3,291,671
February	26,059,228	26,749,956		690,728
March	26,041,149	27,274,994		1,233,845
April	24,282,893	28,987,382		4,704,489
May	24,643,718	28,426,593		3,782,875
June	27,794,219	25,444,789	2,349,430	
July	29,029,209	42,088,468		13,059,259
August	25,562,097	35,701,677		10,139,580
September	24,584,245	26,579,535		1,995,290
October	26,282,830	33,978,277		7,695,447
November	25,210,696	33,260,720		8,050,024
December	25,857,114	23,812,665	2,044,449	
1897.				
January	24,316,994	30,269,389		5,952,395
February	24,400,997	28,796,057		4,395,060

It is worthy of notice in this connection, that if we had relied entirely upon the Wilson law for revenues to maintain the Government, the country would have been bankrupt long ago. If the Wilson bill had been the only reliance for the payment of the running expenses of the Government, it would have taken every dollar from the Treasury of the United States, every dollar of the reserve, every dollar of paper and coin, all our fractional silver, and every penny, and would have left the Government bankrupt by more than \$47,000,000.

I submit the following table:

Cash in the Treasury, including gold reserve, July 1, 1893	\$122,462,290
Revenues fiscal year—	
1894	\$297,722,019
1895	313,390,075
1896	326,976,200
1897 (June 1)	309,949,400
	1,248,037,694
	1,370,499,964
Expenditures fiscal year—	
1894	367,525,280
1895	356,195,298
1896	352,179,446
1897 (June 1)	342,501,108
	1,418,401,132
Deficiency	47,901,148

This disastrous condition was averted only by the sale of bonds, and I will ask to have printed a statement showing the amount of bonds issued and sold during the Cleveland Administration, the proceeds derived therefrom, equaling \$294,000,000, which went into the Treasury, and out of which this surplus is made to appear.

Receipts of the Treasury from the sale of bonds between March 1, 1893, and March 1, 1897, by quarter years.

Quarter ending with—	Amount.
1894.	
March	\$58,660,917.63
December	58,719,710.20
1895.	
March	47,476,131.36
June	17,640,113.26
September	311,812.27
1896.	
March	106,820,349.66
June	4,535,262.41
Total	294,164,296.79

Proceeds of the sale of bonds between March 1, 1893, and March 1, 1894, on account of principal, premium, and accrued interest.

Principal	\$262,315,400.00
Premium	31,138,886.74
Interest	710,010.05
Total	294,164,296.79

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES, March 5, 1897.

Instead, therefore, of the revenues having been sufficient under the operation of the Wilson Act, the condition of the Treasury to-day with its surplus is shown to have been brought about by increased indebtedness; and I will submit another table from official sources showing the amount of the public debt on the 1st of March, 1893, at the beginning of the free-trade period, to have been \$963,000,000, while on the 1st of March, 1897, it was \$1,225,000,000, or an increase of \$262,000,000 in four years.

Public debt of the United States, exclusive of certificates and notes issued on deposits in the Treasury March 1, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, and 1897.

Year.	Interest-bearing.	Matured.	Bearing no interest.	Total.
1893	\$585,034,260	\$2,335,305.26	\$375,912,187.37	\$963,281,752.63
1894	625,872,000	1,871,020.26	379,612,995.17	1,007,356,015.43
1895	685,043,800	1,779,300.26	381,787,366.92	1,068,610,527.18
1896	822,615,170	1,667,630.26	375,491,679.14	1,199,774,479.40
1897 (March 1)	847,364,950	1,358,210.26	376,714,549.14	1,225,437,709.40

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES, March 3, 1897.

Such is the result of the free-trade policy. A bankrupt Treasury, increased public debt, prostrate industry, and labor deprived of profitable employment.

But history is only repeating itself. This generation now has had an object lesson in free trade which will not soon be forgotten.

If we turn, on the other hand, to the era of protection from 1861 to 1893, the results are entirely reversed. I submit a table showing the receipts and expenditures of the Government from 1865 to 1893, and upon an examination of this table it will be found that in no single year were the expenditures in excess of revenues; and that under the policy of protection the revenues were always ample for the expenses of Government except during the years of the civil war.

Receipts and expenditures of the Government—Recapitulation of revenue by fiscal years.

Year.	Customs.	Internal revenue.	Direct tax.	Sales of public lands.	Miscellaneous sources.		Total revenue.	Total expenditures, including premium.	Excess of revenue over expenditures.
					Premiums on loans and sales of gold coin.	Other miscellaneous items.			
1856	\$64,022,863.50			\$8,917,644.93		\$1,116,190.81	\$74,056,699.24	\$69,571,025.79	\$4,485,673.45
1857	63,875,905.05			3,829,486.64		1,259,920.88	68,965,312.57	67,795,707.66	1,169,604.91
1858	41,789,620.96			3,513,715.87		1,352,029.13	46,655,365.96	74,185,270.39	*27,529,904.43
1859	49,565,824.38			1,756,887.30	\$709,387.72	1,454,596.24	53,486,465.64	69,070,976.74	*15,584,511.10
1860	53,187,511.87			1,778,557.71	10,008.00	1,088,590.25	56,064,607.83	63,130,598.39	*7,065,990.56
1861	30,582,125.64			870,058.54	33,030.90	1,023,515.31	41,509,930.39	66,546,644.89	*25,036,714.50
1862	49,056,397.62		\$1,795,331.73	152,209.77	68,400.00	915,122.31	51,987,455.43	474,761,818.91	*422,774,363.48
1863	69,059,642.40	\$37,640,787.95	1,485,103.61	167,617.17	602,345.44	3,741,794.38	112,607,290.95	714,740,725.17	*602,043,434.22
1864	102,316,152.90	109,741,134.10	475,648.96	588,333.29	21,174,101.01	30,331,401.25	264,626,771.60	865,322,641.97	*600,695,870.37
1865	84,928,290.60	209,464,215.25	1,200,573.03	996,553.31	11,683,446.89	25,441,556.00	333,714,605.08	1,297,555,224.41	*963,840,619.33
1866	170,046,651.58	309,226,813.42	1,974,754.12	665,031.03	98,083,055.68	29,036,314.23	558,632,620.06	520,809,410.99	37,823,209.07
1867	176,417,810.88	266,027,537.43	4,200,233.70	1,163,575.76	27,787,320.35	15,067,522.15	490,634,010.27	357,542,675.16	133,091,335.11
1868	164,464,599.56	191,067,589.41	1,788,145.85	1,348,715.41	29,203,629.50	17,745,403.59	405,638,083.32	377,840,284.86	28,297,798.46
1869	180,048,426.63	158,356,490.86	765,685.61	4,020,344.34	13,755,491.12	13,997,338.65	370,943,747.21	322,865,277.80	48,078,469.41
1870	194,538,374.44	184,899,756.49	229,102.88	3,350,481.76	15,295,643.76	12,942,118.30	411,255,477.63	309,653,560.75	101,601,916.88
1871	206,270,408.05	143,098,153.63	590,855.37	2,388,646.68	8,892,839.95	22,093,541.21	383,323,944.89	292,177,188.25	91,146,756.64
1872	216,370,286.77	130,642,177.72		2,575,714.19	9,412,637.65	15,106,051.23	374,106,867.56	277,517,062.67	96,589,804.89
1873	188,089,522.70	113,720,314.14	315,254.51	2,882,312.38	11,560,530.89	17,161,270.05	333,738,204.67	290,345,245.33	43,392,959.34
1874	163,103,833.69	102,409,784.90		1,832,428.93	5,037,665.22	17,075,042.73	289,478,755.47	287,133,873.17	2,344,882.30
1875	157,167,722.35	110,007,493.58		1,413,640.17	3,979,279.69	15,431,915.31	288,000,651.10	274,623,302.84	13,376,348.26
1876	148,071,984.61	116,700,732.03	93,798.80	1,129,466.95	4,029,280.58	17,456,776.19	287,482,039.16	258,450,797.33	29,022,241.83
1877	130,956,493.07	118,630,407.83		978,253.68	405,776.58	18,091,655.46	269,000,586.62	238,600,008.96	30,340,577.69
1878	130,170,080.20	110,581,624.74		1,079,743.37	317,102.30	15,614,728.09	257,763,878.70	236,964,325.80	20,799,552.90
1879	137,250,047.70	113,561,610.58		924,781.06	1,505,047.63	20,585,697.49	273,827,184.46	266,947,882.63	6,879,301.83
1880	186,522,064.60	124,009,373.92	30.85	1,016,506.60		21,978,525.01	333,526,610.98	267,612,957.78	65,883,653.20
1881	198,159,676.02	135,264,385.51	1,516.89	2,201,863.17		25,154,850.98	360,782,292.57	290,712,887.59	100,069,404.98
1882	220,410,730.25	146,497,595.45	160,141.69	4,753,140.37		31,703,642.52	403,529,250.28	257,981,439.57	145,547,810.71
1883	214,706,496.93	144,720,368.98	108,156.60	7,955,364.42		30,796,065.02	398,287,581.95	265,408,137.54	132,879,444.41
1884	195,067,489.76	121,586,072.51	70,720.75	9,810,705.01		21,984,881.89	348,519,899.92	244,126,244.33	104,393,655.59
1885	181,471,939.34	112,498,725.54		5,705,966.44		24,014,055.06	323,690,706.38	290,226,365.11	33,464,341.27
1886	192,905,023.44	116,805,936.48	108,239.94	5,630,999.34		20,989,527.86	336,439,727.06	242,483,138.60	93,956,588.46
1887	217,286,893.13	118,823,391.22	32,892.05	9,254,286.42		26,005,814.84	371,403,277.66	267,324,179.97	104,079,097.69
1888	219,091,173.63	124,206,871.98	1,665.82	11,262,017.23		24,674,446.10	379,266,074.76	267,324,179.97	111,941,894.79
1889	223,832,741.69	130,881,513.92		8,098,651.79		24,297,151.44	387,050,688.84	299,288,978.25	87,761,710.59
1890	229,668,584.57	142,606,705.81		6,358,272.51		24,447,419.74	403,080,982.63	318,040,710.69	85,040,271.94
1891	219,522,205.23	145,686,249.44		4,029,335.41		23,374,457.23	362,612,447.31	365,773,905.35	28,838,541.96
1892	177,452,964.15	153,971,072.57		3,261,875.58		20,251,871.94	354,937,784.24	345,023,330.58	9,914,453.66
1893	208,365,016.73	161,027,623.93		3,182,089.78		18,254,898.34	385,819,628.78	383,477,954.49	2,341,674.29
1894	131,818,530.62	147,111,332.81		1,673,637.30		17,118,618.52	297,722,019.25	367,525,279.83	*69,806,260.58
1895	152,158,617.45	143,421,672.02		1,103,347.16		16,706,438.48	313,390,075.11	356,195,298.29	*42,806,223.18
1896	100,021,751.67	148,762,864.74		1,005,523.43		19,188,060.54	326,976,200.38	352,179,446.08	*25,203,245.70

* Expenditures in excess of revenue.

Not only this, but I submit another table showing the reduction of the public debt during this period of protection from August, 1865, when it amounted to \$2,756,431,571, to the end of the period of protection in 1893, when it had been reduced to \$888,969,475, or a decrease of \$1,917,000,000 of the public debt

during that time. It is worthy of note in this connection, that during this period of reduction of the public debt the burdens of taxation were reduced by many millions, so that no citizen felt the weight of the Government except in the blessings it bestowed.

Analysis of the principal of the public debt of the United States.

Year.	Debt on which interest has ceased.	Debt bearing no interest.	Outstanding principal.	Cash in the Treasury July 1.	Total debt less cash in Treasury.	Annual interest charge.	Total interest-bearing debt.
1856—July 1	\$209,776.13		\$31,972,537.90	\$21,006,584.89	\$10,965,953.01	\$1,869,445.70	\$31,702,761.77
1857	228,872.92		28,699,831.85	18,701,210.09	9,998,621.76	1,672,767.63	28,490,958.93
1858	211,042.92		44,911,881.03	7,011,689.31	37,900,191.72	2,446,670.28	44,700,838.11
1859	200,099.77		58,496,837.88	5,091,603.69	53,405,234.19	3,126,166.28	58,290,738.11
1860	201,449.77		64,842,287.88	4,877,885.87	59,964,402.01	3,443,687.29	64,640,838.11
1861	199,999.77		90,580,873.72	2,862,212.92	87,718,660.80	5,062,630.43	90,380,873.72
1862	280,195.21	\$158,591,390.00	524,176,412.13	18,863,859.96	505,312,552.17	22,048,509.59	365,304,828.92
1863	473,048.16	411,767,456.00	1,119,772,138.63	8,421,401.22	1,111,350,737.41	41,854,148.01	1,079,531,634.47
1864	416,335.86	455,437,271.21	1,815,784,370.57	106,332,093.53	1,709,452,277.04	78,863,487.24	1,357,930,763.50
1865	1,243,771.29	458,060,180.25	2,680,647,869.74	5,832,012.98	2,674,815,856.76	137,742,617.43	2,221,311,918.29
1865—August 31	1,503,020.09	461,616,311.51	2,844,649,626.56	88,218,055.13	2,756,431,571.43	150,977,697.87	2,381,530,294.96
1866—July 1	935,092.05	439,969,874.04	2,773,236,173.69	137,200,009.85	2,636,036,163.84	146,068,196.29	2,332,331,207.60
1867	1,840,615.01	428,218,101.20	2,678,126,103.87	169,974,892.18	2,508,151,211.69	138,892,451.39	2,248,067,387.63
1868	1,197,340.89	408,401,782.61	2,611,687,851.19	130,834,437.96	2,480,853,413.23	128,459,508.14	2,202,088,727.69
1869	5,260,181.00	421,131,510.55	2,588,452,213.94	155,680,340.85	2,432,771,873.09	125,523,998.34	2,182,069,522.39
1870	3,708,641.00	430,508,064.42	2,480,672,427.81	149,502,471.60	2,331,169,956.21	118,784,960.34	2,045,455,722.39
1871	1,948,902.26	416,565,680.06	2,353,211,332.32	106,217,263.65	2,246,994,068.67	111,949,330.50	1,934,096,752.00
1872	7,925,797.26	430,530,431.52	2,253,251,328.78	103,470,798.43	2,149,780,530.35	103,988,463.00	1,814,794,100.00
1873	51,929,710.26	472,099,332.94	2,234,482,963.20	129,020,932.45	2,105,462,030.75	98,049,804.00	1,710,483,950.00
1874	3,216,500.26	509,543,128.17	2,251,690,468.43	147,541,314.74	2,104,149,153.69	98,796,504.00	1,738,930,750.00
1875	11,425,820.26	498,182,411.69	2,232,284,531.95	142,243,361.82	2,090,041,170.13	96,855,690.50	1,722,676,800.00
1876	3,902,420.26	465,807,196.89	2,180,395,067.15	119,469,726.70	2,060,925,340.45	96,104,209.00	1,710,885,450.00
1877	16,648,890.26	476,764,031.84	2,205,301,332.10	186,025,980.73	2,019,275,351.37	93,160,643.50	1,711,888,500.00
1878	5,594,560.26	456,875,682.27	2,256,205,892.53	256,823,612.08	1,999,382,280.45	94,654,472.50	1,794,735,650.00
1879	37,015,630.26	410,835,741.78	2,245,495,072.04	249,080,167.01	1,996,414,905.03	83,773,778.50	1,797,643,700.00
1880	7,621,455.26	388,800,815.37	2,120,415,370.63	201,088,622.88	1,919,326,747.75	79,638,981.00	1,723,998,100.00
1881	6,723,805.26	422,721,954.32	2,069,013,569.58	249,363,415.35	1,819,650,154.23	75,018,695.50	1,639,567,750.00
1882	16,290,805.26	438,241,788.77	1,918,312,994.09	243,289,519.78	1,675,023,474.31	57,300,110.75	1,463,810,400.00
1883	7,831,415.26	538,111,162.81	1,884,171,728.07	345,389,902.92	1,538,781,825.15	51,436,709.50	1,338,229,150.00
1884	19,656,205.26	584,308,868.31					

ERA OF PROTECTION.

During this era of protection the country made marvelous progress in industrial life, until in 1890 it was confessed by every one the world over that the American Republic stood in the very van

of the industrial nations of the world. I submit without reading a table prepared by Hon. Carroll D. Wright, the official head of the Department of Labor, showing the growth of the country under protection from 1860 to 1890:

Totals for the United States.

Items.	1860.		1870.		1880.		1890.		Per cent of increase, 1860 to 1890.
	Total.		Total.	Per cent of increase.	Total.	Per cent of increase.	Total.	Per cent of increase.	
Population.....	31,443,321		38,558,371	22.63	50,155,783	30.08	62,622,250	24.86	99.16
Persons engaged in gainful occupations <i>a</i>			12,505,923		17,592,099	28.09	22,735,661	30.72	
True value of real and personal property.....	\$16,159,616,068		\$30,068,518,507	86.07	\$43,642,000,000	45.14	\$65,037,091,197	49.02	302.47
Value of products of industry:									
Manufacturing and mechanical.....	\$1,885,861,676		\$4,232,325,442	124.42	\$5,349,191,458	26.39	\$9,056,764,996	69.31	380.25
<i>(b)</i> Farm.....			2,447,538,658		2,212,540,927	c 9.60	2,460,107,454	11.19	
Fishery.....	12,924,002		11,096,522	c 14.14	43,046,053	287.92	44,277,514	2.86	242.60
Mineral.....	<i>(d)</i>		152,598,994		369,319,000	142.02	587,230,662	59	
Total.....	1,898,785,768		6,843,559,616	260.41	7,974,027,438	16.52	12,148,380,626	52.35	539.80
Average number of employees in establishments engaged in manufacturing and mechanical industries	1,311,246		2,053,996	56.64	2,700,732	31.49	e 4,050,785	49.99	208.03
Annual amount of wages paid	\$378,878,966		\$620,467,474	63.76	\$969,462,252	51.41	\$1,799,671,492	91.56	375
Number of establishments reporting the above employees	140,433		252,148	79.55	253,502	.54	322,638	27.27	129.75
Resources of national banks	f \$16,797,644		\$1,510,713,237	8,893.60	\$2,105,786,626	39.39	\$3,141,487,495	49.13	18,601.95
Savings banks:									
Number of banks.....	278		517	85.97	629	21.66	921	46.42	231.29
Number of depositors.....	693,870		1,630,846	135.04	2,335,532	43.21	4,258,893	82.35	513.79
Amount of savings deposits.....	\$149,277,504		\$549,874,358	298.36	\$819,106,973	48.96	\$1,524,844,506	86.16	921.48
Coin in United States, including bullion in Treasury	\$235,000,000		\$25,000,000	c 89.36	\$494,363,884	1,877.46	\$1,152,471,638	133.12	390.41
Paper money in United States	207,102,477		697,868,461	236.97	711,565,313	1.96	991,754,521	39.38	375.97
Total.....	442,102,477		722,868,461	63.51	1,205,929,197	66.83	2,144,226,159	77.81	385.01
Farms:									
Number.....	2,044,077		2,659,985	30.13	4,008,907	50.71	4,564,641	13.86	123.31
Value of land, fences, and buildings.....	\$6,645,045,007		\$9,262,803,861	39.39	\$10,197,096,776	10.09	\$13,279,252,649	30.23	99
Value of implements and machinery.....	246,118,141		336,878,429	36.88	406,520,055	20.67	494,247,467	21.58	100.82
Value of live stock on hand.....	1,089,320,915		1,525,276,457	40.02	1,500,384,707	c 1.63	2,208,767,573	47.21	102.77
Total.....	7,982,528,140		11,127,618,732	39.40	12,108,010,445	8.81	15,986,832,330	32.04	100.27

a Persons 10 years of age and over. *b* Not reported. *c* Decrease. *d* Included in manufacturing and mechanical industries. *e* Does not include officers, firm members, or clerks and their salaries. *f* For the year 1863.

NOTE.—The improvement in statistical methods, the greater care bestowed on the enumeration at recent censuses, and the inclusion of certain factors omitted at earlier periods, as well as the inflated value of currency in 1870 as compared with gold, will not permit of the use of the above figures to show the exact increase.

The last annual message of President Harrison, sent to Congress in December, 1892, showed continued and increasing prosperity up to the hour of election of that year.

Mr. President, I close as I began, by stating that this measure, in my judgment, will not be weighed by its ad valorem, but by the results which it shall bring to the country. If the protective policy fails now, it will be the first time in the history of the Government during its century of existence. Every period of protection in this country has been attended with prosperity, while every era of free trade has been accompanied by widespread disaster.

Some time, of course, will be required to absorb the surplus which the importers have brought to this market, but the dawn of prosperity is at hand. The sun that sets to-day over the grave of free trade will rise to-morrow upon the resurrection of a new industrial life. The country is to be congratulated that the English policy is to be abandoned and that the American system of protection is to be reestablished. I confidently hope and believe that this measure will bring back to the country and all its people a new era of individual and national prosperity.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on this day approved and signed the act (S. 2138) to give the consent of Congress to a compact entered into between the States of South Dakota and Nebraska respecting the boundary between said States.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate adjourn to meet at three minutes past 1 o'clock Saturday. I do this in order that the records may appear correct. We are in recess now as though sitting on Friday, and we should adjourn so as to have the session Saturday.

Mr. MORGAN. What I understand the Senator wants is to inaugurate a new legislative day?

Mr. ALLISON. That is all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Iowa that the Senate do now adjourn to meet at three minutes past 1 o'clock Saturday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock p. m. Saturday, July 24, 1897) the Senate adjourned to meet at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m., Saturday, July 24, 1897.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, July 24, 1897.

The Senate met at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m. The Vice-President being absent, the President pro tempore took the chair.

On motion of Mr. FAULKNER, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of yesterday's proceedings was dispensed with.

WILLIAM HOWETT.

Mr. TELLER, from the Committee on Claims, reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1992) entitled "A bill for the relief of William Howett, of Tyrrell County, N. C.," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887. And the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act, and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

CHESTER B. SWEET.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2257) for the relief of Chester B. Sweet, of California, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims; which was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2485) granting a pension to Mrs. Irene Burghardt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2486) granting an increase of pension to John M. Odenheimer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2487) granting an increase of pension to Edward L. Berthoud; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2488) for the relief of Elias Gilbert; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 2489) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Richard Severn, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MORGAN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2490) for the relief of heirs of Margaret Kennedy, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McBRIDE introduced a bill (S. 2491) for the relief of Owen N. Denny; which was read twice by title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 2492) for the relief of the legal personal representatives of Henry H. Sibley, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 2493) to amend an act providing for the printing and binding and the distribution of public documents, approved January 12, 1895; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 2494) granting a pension to Mary A. Colhoun; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 2495) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 2496) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Nathan M. Trail, alias David Wilson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2497) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Cook; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2498) granting a pension to Sarah Anderson (colored), of Annapolis, Md.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2499) for the relief of the legal representatives of Alfred B. Mullett, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2500) for the relief of the legal representatives of Miss Anna Ella Carroll, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2501) for the relief of Milton F. Colburn, administrator of the estate of Gilbert Colburn, deceased, late of Annapolis, Md.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2502) for the relief of Gotlieb Feldmeyer, of Annapolis, Md.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

JAMES S. CRAWFORD,

On motion of Mr. PENROSE, it was

Ordered, That leave is hereby given for the removal from the files of the Senate of the petition and other papers submitted by James S. Crawford in support of his claim for relief.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES—PREVIOUS QUESTION.

Mr. MASON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules is hereby directed to report an amendment to the rules providing for the ordering of the previous question.

STATISTICS OF ELECTIONS.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, yesterday there was a colloquy between the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] and myself in regard to the elections of 1896. I refer to the matter at this time, not for the purpose of again taking it up or of making comment of any kind about it, but only that I may offer and have printed without comment and without taking the time to have them read, unless it should be demanded, certain figures which have been sent to me bearing on the subject.

I offer first a communication which I have received from Mr. Delos H. Smith, with certain statistical information attached, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

I offer in the next place a statement furnished me at my request by the assistant librarian of the United States Senate, Mr. James M. Baker, giving certain figures in regard to the elections in various States.

I offer in the third place, and ask to have printed in the RECORD, a printed statement on the same subject prepared by Mr. O. P. Austin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Without objection, the matter submitted by the Senator from Ohio will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 23, 1897.

DEAR SIR: I listened to your controversy with Senator ALLEN to-day, and the proposition of 1 voter to 5 of the population, as Senator BUTLER and

others argued, struck me as absurd; and to satisfy myself as to this matter I have referred to the census report for 1890, and find that the following tables, taken from the Republican Handbook for 1894, are correct:

Vote, by States, from 1876 to 1892.

[The vote is that cast for Presidential electors.]

ALABAMA.

Population in 1890, 1,513,017.
Voting population, 324,822—white, 184,059; colored, 140,763.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.
1876	102,989	68,708		
1880	91,185	56,221	4,642	
1884	93,951	59,591	873	612
1888	117,320	57,197		593
1892	138,138	9,197	*85,181	239

* Populist.

ARKANSAS.

Population in 1890, 1,128,179.
Voting population, 257,868—white, 188,296; colored, 69,572.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876	58,071	38,669			
1880	60,775	42,436	4,079		
1884	72,927	50,895	1,847		
1888	85,962	58,752		614	10,613
1892	87,752	46,974	*11,831	113	

* Populist.

CALIFORNIA.

Population in 1890, 1,208,130.
Voting population, 462,289—white, 390,228; colored, 72,061.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.
1876	76,468	79,279		
1880	80,426	80,348	3,392	
1884	89,288	102,416	2,017	2,920
1888	117,729	124,816	5,761	
1892	118,151	118,927	*25,311	8,096

* Populist.

COLORADO.

Population in 1890, 412,198.
Voting population, 164,920—white, 161,015; colored, 3,905.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876		(*)			
1880	24,647	27,450	1,435		
1884	27,723	36,290	1,958	761	
1888	37,567	50,774		2,191	1,296
1892		38,620	†53,584	1,687	

* By legislature.

† Populist.

CONNECTICUT.

Population in 1890, 746,258.
Voting population, 224,062—white, 220,116; colored, 3,976.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876	61,934	59,034			
1880	64,415	67,071	868	409	
1884	67,199	65,923	1,688	2,305	
1888	74,920	74,584	4,234		240
1892	82,395	77,032	*809	4,026	309

* Populist.

DELAWARE.

Population in 1890, 168,493.
Voting population, 47,559—white, 40,007; colored, 7,552.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876	13,381	10,752			
1880	15,275	14,133	120		
1884	16,964	12,951	6	55	
1888	16,414	12,973		400	
1892	18,581	18,077		564	13

FLORIDA.

Population in 1890, 391,422.
Voting population, 96,213—white, 58,068; colored, 38,145.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.
1876	22,927	23,849		
1880	27,964	23,654		
1884	31,766	28,031		72
1888	39,561	26,550		403
1892	30,143		*4,843	570

* Populist.

Votes, by States, from 1876 to 1892—Continued.

GEORGIA.

Population in 1890, 1,837,353.
Voting population, 398,122—white, 219,094; colored, 179,028.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876	130,088	50,446			
1880	102,470	54,086	969		
1884	94,667	48,603	145	195	
1888	100,449	40,446		1,808	
1892	129,386	48,305	* 42,939	988	+ 2,363

* Populist.

† Scattering.

IDAHO.

Population in 1890, 84,385.
Voting population, 31,490—white, 29,525; colored, 1,965.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Populist.	Prohibition.
1892		8,599	10,520	288

ILLINOIS.

Population in 1890, 3,826,351.
Voting population, 1,072,663—white, 1,054,463; colored, 18,200.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876	258,601	278,232			
1880	277,321	318,037	26,358	443	
1884	312,355	337,474	10,910	12,074	
1888	348,371	370,475		21,703	7,134
1892	426,281	389,288	* 22,207	25,870	

* Populist.

INDIANA.

Population in 1890, 2,192,404.
Voting population, 595,066—white, 581,987; colored, 13,079.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876	213,526	208,611			
1880	225,522	232,164	12,986		
1884	244,900	238,463	8,293	3,028	
1888	261,013	263,361		9,881	2,694
1892	282,740	255,615	* 22,198	13,644	

* Populist.

IOWA.

Population in 1890, 1,911,896.
Voting population, 520,332—white, 517,006; colored, 3,326.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876	112,121	171,326			
1880	105,845	183,927	32,701		
1884	177,316	197,089		1,472	
1888	179,877	211,958		3,550	9,105
1892	196,367	219,373	* 20,616	6,322	

* Populist.

KANSAS.

Population in 1890, 1,427,096.
Voting population, 383,231—white, 370,688; colored, 12,543.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876	37,902	78,322			
1880	59,801	121,549	19,851	25	
1884	90,132	154,406	16,341	4,495	
1888	102,745	182,904		6,779	37,783
1892		157,241	* 163,111	4,553	

* Populist.

KENTUCKY.

Population in 1890, 1,858,635.
Voting population, 450,792—white, 387,371; colored, 63,421.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.
1876	159,696	97,156		
1880	149,068	106,306		11,499
1884	152,961	118,122		1,681
1888	183,800	155,134		5,225
1892	175,461	135,441	* 23,500	6,442

* Populist.

Votes, by States, from 1876 to 1892—Continued.

LOUISIANA.

Population in 1890, 1,118,587.
Voting population, 250,563—white, 130,748; colored, 119,815.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876	70,508	75,315			
1880	65,067	38,637	439		
1884	62,540	46,347			
1888	85,026	30,701		127	39
1892	87,922	13,311	* 13,332		

* Populist.

MAINE.

Population in 1890, 661,086.
Voting population, 201,241—white, 200,609; colored, 632.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876	49,917	66,300			
1880	65,171	74,039	4,408	93	
1884	52,140	72,209	3,953	2,160	
1888	50,482	73,734		2,690	1,345
1892	48,024	62,878	* 2,045	3,062	336

* Populist.

MARYLAND.

Population in 1890, 1,042,390.
Voting population, 270,738—white, 218,843; colored, 51,895.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876	91,780	71,981			
1880	93,706	78,515	818		
1884	96,932	85,699	531	2,794	
1888	106,168	99,986		4,767	
1892	113,866	92,736	* 796	5,877	† 27

* Populist.

† Scattering.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Population in 1890, 2,238,943.
Voting population, 665,009—white, 657,042; colored, 7,967.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876	108,777	150,063			
1880	111,960	165,205	4,548	682	
1884	122,481	146,724	24,433	10,026	
1888	151,855	183,892		8,701	
1892	176,813	202,814	* 3,210	7,539	649

* Populist.

MICHIGAN.

Population in 1890, 2,093,889.
Voting population, 617,445—white, 611,008; colored, 6,437.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876	141,095	166,534			
1880	131,597	185,341	34,895	942	
1884	149,835	192,609	42,243	18,403	
1888	213,469	236,387		20,945	4,555
1892	202,296	222,708	* 19,892	14,069	

* Populist.

MINNESOTA.

Population in 1890, 1,301,826.
Voting population, 376,039—white, 374,027; colored, 2,009.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876	48,799	72,962			
1880	53,315	93,903	3,267	286	
1884	70,144	111,923	3,583	4,084	
1888	104,385	142,492		15,311	1,007
1892	100,579	122,736	* 30,398	14,017	† 107,077

* Populist.

† Fusion.

MISSISSIPPI.

Population in 1890, 1,289,600.
Voting population, 271,080—white, 120,611; colored, 150,469.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876	112,173	52,605			
1880	75,750	34,854	5,797		
1884	76,510	43,509			
1888	85,471	30,096		218	222
1892	40,237	1,406	* 10,259	610	

* Populist.

Votes, by States, from 1876 to 1892—Continued.

MISSOURI.

Population in 1890, 2,679,184.
Voting population, 705,718—white, 667,451; colored, 38,267.

Election.	Democ- ratic.	Repub- lican.	Green- back.	Prohibi- tion.	Union La- bor.
1876.....	203,077	145,029
1880.....	208,609	153,567	35,135
1884.....	235,988	202,029	2,153
1888.....	261,954	236,953	4,540	18,589
1892.....	268,628	226,702	* 41,183	4,298

* Populist.

MONTANA.

Population in 1890, 132,159.
Voting population, 65,415—white, 61,948; colored, 3,467.

Election.	Democ- ratic.	Repub- lican.	Populist.	Prohibi- tion.
1892.....	17,534	18,838	7,259	517

NEBRASKA.

Population in 1890, 1,058,910.
Voting population, 301,500—white, 297,281; colored, 4,219.

Election.	Democ- ratic.	Repub- lican.	Green- back.	Prohibi- tion.	Union La- bor.
1876.....	17,554	31,916
1880.....	28,523	54,979	3,950
1884.....	54,391	76,912	2,899
1888.....	80,552	108,425	9,429	4,226
1892.....	24,943	87,227	* 83,134	4,902

* Populist.

NEVADA.

Population in 1890, 45,761.
Voting population, 20,951—white, 17,002; colored, 3,949.

Election.	Democ- ratic.	Repub- lican.	Green- back.	Prohibi- tion.
1876.....	9,308	10,383
1880.....	9,613	8,732
1884.....	5,578	7,193	26
1888.....	5,326	7,238	41
1892.....	711	2,822	* 7,267	85

* Populist.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Population in 1890, 376,330.
Voting population, 118,135—white, 117,889; colored, 246.

Election.	Democ- ratic.	Repub- lican.	Green- back.	Prohibi- tion.	Union La- bor.
1876.....	38,509	41,539
1880.....	40,794	44,852	528	180
1884.....	39,183	43,249	552	1,571
1888.....	43,456	45,738	1,593	42
1892.....	42,081	45,658	* 236	1,297

* Populist.

NEW JERSEY.

Population in 1890, 1,444,933.
Voting population, 413,530—white, 398,966; colored, 14,564.

Election.	Democ- ratic.	Repub- lican.	Green- back.	Prohibi- tion.	Union La- bor.
1876.....	115,962	103,517
1880.....	122,505	120,555	2,617	191
1884.....	127,798	123,440	3,496	6,159
1888.....	151,508	144,390	7,933
1892.....	171,066	156,080	* 985	8,134	1,397

* Populist.

NEW YORK.

Population in 1890, 5,997,853.
Voting population, 1,769,649—white, 1,745,418; colored, 24,231.

Election.	Democ- ratic.	Repub- lican.	Green- back.	Prohibi- tion.	Union La- bor.
1876.....	521,949	489,207
1880.....	534,511	555,544	12,873	1,517
1884.....	563,154	562,005	16,994	25,016
1888.....	635,965	650,338	30,231	626
1892.....	654,869	609,350	* 16,429	38,190	5,037

* Populist.

Votes, by States, from 1876 to 1892—Continued.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Population in 1890, 1,617,947.
Voting population, 342,653—white, 233,307; colored, 109,346.

Election.	Democ- ratic.	Repub- lican.	Green- back.	Prohibi- tion.	Union La- bor.
1876.....	125,427	108,417
1880.....	124,208	115,874	1,126
1884.....	142,952	125,068	454
1888.....	147,902	134,784	2,789	147
1892.....	132,951	100,946	* 44,732	2,636

* Populist.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Population in 1890, 182,719.
Voting population, 55,959—white, 55,769; colored, 190.

Election.	Repub- lican.	Populist.	Prohibi- tion.
1892.....	17,519	17,650	875

OHIO.

Population in 1890, 3,672,316.
Voting population, 1,016,464—white, 990,542; colored, 25,922.

Election.	Democ- ratic.	Repub- lican.	Green- back.	Prohibi- tion.	Union La- bor.
1876.....	323,182	330,698
1880.....	340,821	375,048	6,456	2,616
1884.....	368,280	400,082	5,179	11,069
1888.....	396,455	416,054	24,356	3,496
1892.....	404,115	405,187	* 14,850	26,012

* Populist.

OREGON.

Population in 1890, 313,767.
Voting population, 111,744—white, 102,113; colored, 9,631.

Election.	Democ- ratic.	Repub- lican.	Green- back.	Prohibi- tion.	Union La- bor.
1876.....	14,149	15,206
1880.....	19,948	20,619	249
1884.....	24,604	26,960	726	492
1888.....	26,522	33,291	1,677	363
1892.....	14,243	35,002	* 26,875	2,281

* Populist.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Population in 1890, 5,258,014.
Voting population, 1,461,869—white, 1,436,996; colored, 34,873.

Election.	Democ- ratic.	Repub- lican.	Green- back.	Prohibi- tion.	Union La- bor.
1876.....	366,294	384,184
1880.....	407,428	444,704	20,668	1,939
1884.....	392,785	473,804	16,992	15,293
1888.....	444,327	523,585	20,708	3,877
1892.....	452,264	516,011	* 8,714	25,123	898

* Populist.

RHODE ISLAND.

Population in 1890, 345,506.
Voting population, 100,017—white, 97,756; colored, 2,261.

Election.	Democ- ratic.	Repub- lican.	Green- back.	Prohibi- tion.
1876.....	10,712	15,787
1880.....	10,779	18,195	236	20
1884.....	12,391	19,030	422	628
1888.....	17,530	21,969	1,251
1892.....	24,335	27,069	* 227	1,565

* Populist.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Population in 1890, 1,151,149.
Voting population, 235,606—white, 102,657; colored, 132,949.

Election.	Democ- ratic.	Repub- lican.	Green- back.
1876.....	60,866	91,870
1880.....	112,312	58,071	566
1884.....	69,890	21,733
1888.....	65,825	13,740
1892.....	54,698	13,384	* 2,410

* Populist.

Votes, by States, from 1876 to 1892—Continued.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Population in 1890, 328,808.
Voting population, 90,765—white, 96,177; colored, 588.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Populist.
1892	9,081	34,888	26,512

TENNESSEE.

Population in 1890, 1,767,518.
Voting population, 402,476—white, 310,014; colored, 92,462.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.
1876	133,106	89,566		
1880	128,191	107,677	5,917	43
1884	133,258	124,078	957	1,131
1888	158,779	138,988	4,749	5,969
1892	136,477	99,973	*23,622	4,856

* Populist.

TEXAS.

Population in 1890, 2,235,523.
Voting population, 535,942—white, 434,010; colored, 101,932.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876	104,803	44,803			
1880	156,428	57,893	27,405		
1884	225,309	93,141	3,321	3,534	
1888	234,833	88,280	4,749		29,459
1892	239,148	81,444	*99,638	2,165	

* Populist.

VERMONT.

Population in 1890, 332,422.
Voting population, 101,697—white, 101,369; colored, 328.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.
1876	20,350	44,428		
1880	18,316	45,567	1,215	
1884	17,531	39,514	785	1,752
1888	16,788	45,192		1,459
1892	16,325	37,902	*43	1,424

* Populist.

VIRGINIA.

Population in 1890, 1,655,980.
Voting population, 378,782—white, 248,035; colored, 130,747.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.
1876	139,670	95,558		
1880	128,586	84,020		
1884	145,497	139,356		138
1888	151,977	150,438		1,678
1892	163,977	113,256	*12,274	2,798

* Populist.

WASHINGTON.

Population in 1890, 349,390.
Voting population, 146,918—white, 141,934; colored, 4,984.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Populist.	Prohibition.
1892	29,844	36,470	19,105	2,553

WEST VIRGINIA.

Population in 1890, 762,794.
Voting population, 181,400—white, 172,198; colored, 9,202.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876	56,495	42,045			
1880	57,391	46,243	9,079		
1884	67,317	63,096	810	939	
1888	78,677	78,171		1,084	1,508
1892	84,468	80,285	*4,165	2,130	

* Populist.

Votes, by States, from 1876 to 1892—Continued.

WISCONSIN.

Population in 1890, 1,686,880.
Voting population, 461,722—white, 459,893; colored, 1,829.

Election.	Democrat.	Republican.	Green-back.	Prohibition.	Union Labor.
1876	123,926	130,070			
1880	114,649	144,400	7,986	69	
1884	146,459	161,157	4,598	7,656	
1888	155,232	176,553		14,270	8,552
1892	177,335	170,791	*9,909	13,132	

* Populist.

WYOMING.

Population in 1890, 60,705.
Voting population, 27,044—white, 26,050; colored, 994.

Election.	Republican.	Populist.	Prohibition.
1892	8,454	7,722	530

I have also compared the figures given in these tables as the "voting population" with the census report above referred to, of males 21 years old and over, and find them correct.

According to these figures, it is shown that Senator ALLEN's own State of Nebraska stands 1 voter to 3.51, and Senator BUTLER's State of North Carolina 1 to 4.72. I also find the following: New York, 1 to 3.39; Ohio, 1 to 3.51; Colorado, 1 to 2.50; Pennsylvania, 1 to 3.59; New Hampshire, 1 to 3.18, and California, 1 to 2.61; and so on, through the whole list.

In Ohio the increase in population during the last decade was 47,425 per year; and at the voting proportion of 1 to 3.61, the voters would have increased about 78,660 from 1890 to 1896, or 13,110 per year; so that the voters in Ohio in 1896 must have been about 1,085,000, or about 93,000 more than the number voting in 1896.

It is the general estimate that there is one family to every five persons, but the estimate of one voter to every five persons is not correct. In very many families there is more than one voter, and all are supposed to have at least one.

Yours, very respectfully,

DELOS H. SMITH.

Hon. JOSEPH B. FORAKER,
United States Senator.

SENATE LIBRARY, Washington, D. C., July 24, 1897.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your request that I furnish you with the vote of the State of Ohio since 1880, I beg to hand you herewith a table showing this vote, together with the vote of several other States. I am sorry to say that the State of Nebraska is not given in this table, and I find it impossible to prepare it by the time you wish it.

Most respectfully,

JAMES M. BAKER.

Assistant Librarian United States Senate.

Hon. JOSEPH B. FORAKER,
United States Senator.

Votes of several States from 1880 to 1896.

ILLINOIS.

Election.	Republican.	Democrat.	Populist.	Prohibition.	Total.
1880	318,037	277,321	*26,358	443	622,159
1884	357,469	312,351	10,776	12,074	672,670
1888	370,475	348,371	77,134	21,703	747,833
1892	399,288	426,281	22,207	25,870	873,646
1896	607,130	464,523			1,071,653

* Greenback.

† Labor.

Population in 1880, 3,077,871; in 1890, 3,826,351; average increase, 24.32. Males 21 years of age and over in 1890—Native white, 665,103; foreign white, 389,300; colored, 18,200; total, 1,072,603.

INDIANA.

Election.	Republican.	Democrat.	Gold Democrat.	Populist.	Prohibition.	Total.
1880	232,164	225,522		*12,986		460,672
1884	238,463	244,990		*8,293	3,028	494,774
1888	263,951	251,013		+2,694	9,881	536,899
1892	256,335	282,817		22,198	13,044	554,394
1896	327,739	309,318	2,148			639,205

* Greenback.

† Labor.

Population in 1880, 1,973,301; in 1890, 2,192,404; average increase, 10.82. Males 21 years of age and over in 1890—Native white, 508,759; foreign white, 73,228; colored, 13,079; total, 595,066.

KENTUCKY.

Election.	Republican.	Democrat.	Populist.	Prohibition.	Total.
1880	106,306	149,008	*11,490	258	267,731
1884	118,122	152,961	*1,691	3,139	275,913
1888	125,134	183,800	+622	5,225	314,781
1892	135,441	175,461	23,500	6,442	340,844
1896	218,055	217,797	5,013		440,870

* Greenback.

† Labor.

Population in 1880, 1,648,690; in 1890, 1,858,635; average increase, 12.73. Males 21 years of age and over in 1890—Native white, 357,637; foreign white, 29,744; colored, 63,421; total, 450,792.

Votes of several States from 1880 to 1896—Continued.

MARYLAND.

Election.	Republican.	Democratic.	Gold Democrat.	Populist.	Prohibition.	Total.
1880	78,515	93,706				172,221
1884	85,748	96,866		578	2,827	186,019
1888	99,986	106,168			4,776	210,930
1892	92,736	113,866		796	5,877	213,275
1896	136,959	102,754	2,507			242,220

Population in 1880, 934,943; in 1890, 1,042,390; average increase, 11.49. Males 21 years of age and over in 1890—Native white, 176,600; foreign white, 42,243; colored, 51,895; total, 270,738.

MICHIGAN.

Election.	Republican.	Democratic.	Gold Democrat.	Populist.	Prohibition.	Total.
1880	85,336	131,496		*34,895		353,081
1884	192,069	189,351		*41,490	18,403	406,223
1888	236,387	213,469		+4,555	20,945	475,356
1892	222,708	202,296		19,892	14,069	458,965
1896	293,327	237,251	6,930			537,508

* Greenback.

† Labor.

Population in 1880, 1,636,937; in 1890, 2,063,889. Males 21 years of age and over in 1890—Native white, 363,535; foreign white, 247,473; colored, 6,437; total, 617,445.

MINNESOTA.

Election.	Republican.	Democratic.	Populist.	Prohibition.	Total.
1880	93,903	53,315	*3,267	286	150,711
1884	111,685	70,065	*3,583	4,684	190,017
1888	142,492	104,385	+1,097	15,311	263,285
1892	122,736	130,579	30,398	14,017	267,730
1896	193,455	139,477	3,209		336,141

* Greenback.

† Labor.

Population in 1880, 780,773; in 1890, 1,301,826. Males 21 years of age and over in 1890—Native white, 152,872; foreign white, 221,155; colored, 2,009; total, 376,036.

OHIO.

Election.	Republican.	Democratic.	Gold Democrat.	Populist.	Prohibition.	Total.
1880	375,048	340,821		*6,456	2,616	724,967
1884	400,082	368,280		+5,179	11,069	787,159
1888	416,054	396,455		3,496	24,356	840,379
1892	475,187	404,115		14,852	26,012	850,166
1896	525,989	474,880	1,857			1,002,726

* Greenback.

† Labor.

Population in 1880, 3,198,062; 1890, 3,672,316. Males 21 years of age and over in 1890—Native white, 772,096; foreign white, 218,446; colored, 25,922; total, 1,016,464.

WAS THERE FRAUD IN THE ELECTION OF 1896?—IF SO, WAS IT IN REPUBLICAN OR DEMOCRATIC STATES?—SOME STARTLING FIGURES SHOWING SYSTEMATIC SUPPRESSION OF REPUBLICAN VOTES—THE SOUTH WOULD HAVE GIVEN A MAJORITY FOR MCKINLEY, AS DID THE NORTH, COULD HER VOTERS HAVE HAD FAIR TREATMENT—A NONPARTISAN DISCUSSION OF THE ELECTION RESULTS BASED UPON OFFICIAL FIGURES.

The final count by Congress of the electoral vote, coupled with the various charges which have been made by different people of excessive votes in certain of the Northern States and suppression of the Republican votes in the South, suggests a careful study of the figures of the election in the light of those of other elections and records of population as well as votes.

Governor Altgeld and Senator ALLEN have charged a fraudulent excess of votes in nearly all of the close States which were carried by the Republicans in the late campaign, including Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Kentucky, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Oregon, California, West Virginia, Maryland, and even Pennsylvania. Senator ALLEN published as an official document a paper containing a charge of this character, and also introduced a resolution calling for an investigation, but has not up to this time made any move in the way of even asking consideration for his resolution.

Fortunately, it is possible by examining the figures of the census of 1890 to get a pretty fair idea as to whether the alleged vote in any State was actually in excess of the number of voters in the State. The census of 1890 shows the number of males above the age of 21 in each State, and it is reasonable to assume that there has been a very material increase in the number of males of voting age in all parts of the country, and especially in the Mississippi Valley, in the six years between the date of the census and the election of 1896. This makes it comparatively easy to examine in an intelligent way the charges of fraud as made by Senator ALLEN and Governor Altgeld.

Let us examine a few of these charges.

In Ohio Mr. ALLEN charges that the "fraudulent excess" of votes in 1896 was 94,500. Let us see. Ohio, according to his figures, gave 1,011,576 votes. There were in Ohio in 1890, according to the census, 1,016,464 males of voting age, or more than 5,000 in excess of the number of votes cast in 1896. Ohio increased her population 14.83 per cent in the decade from 1880 to 1890, and it is reasonable to assume that, with the great prosperity which has attended her development of manufactures in the natural-gas region in the past few years, the increase of population from 1890 to 1896 has been, at a very low estimate, 10 per cent, which would bring the male population of 21 years and upward up to 1,117,000, or 106,000 in excess of the number of votes cast; yet Mr. ALLEN charges officially, but admits that he does not know by what process he arrives at the conclusion, that 94,500 "fraudulent excess" of votes was cast in that State.

In Indiana and Illinois the total number of votes cast in 1896 slightly exceeds the total number of males above 21 years of age shown by the census of 1890

in those States. In Illinois the excess of votes in 1896 above those of voting age in 1890 in that State is less than 19,000. Illinois gained in population in the decade from 1880 to 1890 24.32 per cent. In view of the great number of people drawn to Chicago during the World's Fair period, many of whom remained there, it is reasonable to suppose that the rate of gain since 1890 has been quite as rapid and that the increase of population and in the number of persons of voting age is fully 16 per cent. This would bring the number of males of voting age in the State up to 1,243,000, or 232,000 in excess of the number of votes actually cast.

In Indiana the increase of population has been much more rapid, probably, than in Illinois, because of the wonderful development of the natural-gas region of that State, where industries have been extremely active and prosperous, even while there was depression and absolute inactivity in nearly all other parts of the country. The total male population of Indiana above 21 years of age in 1890 was 595,066, but with the phenomenal growth of population which it has had since that time, it has probably increased 100,000, so that there is every reason to believe that the total number of voters in the State was, in 1896, nearly or quite 700,000, while the total number of votes cast was only 637,284.

THE VOTERS DID NOT ALL VOTE.

It is unnecessary to pursue in detail the investigation of the relation of the votes cast to the voting population in all the States charged with a "fraudulent excess" of votes in Senator ALLEN's official paper. The following table gives the number of males of voting age in each of the States in question in 1890 and beside it the number of votes cast in 1896. When it is remembered that the natural growth of population in these States in the six years since the census of 1890 is from 10 to 15 per cent, it will be seen that in no case was the vote actually cast in 1896 nearly as large as the number of males over the age of 21 years which must have been in these States on November 3, 1896:

Table showing the number of males of voting age in 1890 and the number of votes cast in 1896.

State.	Males above 21 years of age in 1890.	Votes cast in 1896.
Pennsylvania	1,461,869	1,188,354
Maryland	270,738	240,866
Ohio	1,016,464	1,011,576
Michigan	617,455	544,278
Indiana	595,066	637,284
Illinois	1,072,663	1,091,166
Kentucky	450,792	445,934
Iowa	520,332	521,551
Wisconsin	461,722	448,106
Minnesota	376,036	341,539
Oregon	111,744	96,846
California	462,289	294,000

The student of the above table should bear in mind constantly that it is entirely proper to add from 10 to 15 per cent to the figures of the first column in order to obtain approximately the number of male persons of voting age in the States in question at the time of the vote about which Mr. ALLEN complains, November 3, 1896.

THE VOTE OF 1892 WAS A LIGHT ONE.

There is another way of looking at it, and a way which Senator ALLEN seems to have entirely overlooked. He apparently bases his assumption as to the number of votes to which each State is entitled upon the number of votes cast in 1892, since he includes in his table the figures of that election and compares those of 1896 with them. Had he taken the trouble to examine the figures of the Presidential elections during the past twenty years, he would have found that the vote of 1892 was the lightest in proportion to the population that has been cast in a Presidential election for many years, perhaps the lightest at any time since the close of the war. Certainly the percentage of gain in the total vote in 1892 over the preceding Presidential election is lighter than has been the case in any Presidential election since 1872. The following table gives the number of votes cast in each Presidential election since 1868, the increase in the number of votes, and the percentage of increase:

Table showing the total vote cast in each Presidential election since 1868, the gain in the number of votes in each election, and the percentage of gain in the number of votes cast.

Year.	Total vote cast.	Gain over preceding Presidential election.	Per cent of gain.
1872	6,466,165	741,479	12.9
1876	8,412,753	1,946,588	30.1
1880	9,309,406	796,653	9.4
1884	10,044,885	835,479	9.1
1888	11,380,860	1,335,975	13.3
1892	12,059,351	678,491	5.9
1896	13,951,283	1,891,932	15.6

It will be seen by a study of the above table that the vote of 1892 was an unusually light one, being a gain of but 5.9 per cent over that of the preceding Presidential election. This is the lowest gain made at any time in the quarter of a century which this table covers. The vote of 1892 was evidently the lightest in proportion to the voting population that has been given within the period in question.

It would not be surprising, therefore, if the increase in 1896, compared with 1892, should be an unusually large one, especially in view of the fact that the interest in the election was more intense than was perhaps ever felt before, at least in the memory of the present generation. An examination of the percentage column, however, will show that the actual increase over 1892 was only 15.6 per cent, while in 1876 the increase over the preceding Presidential election was 30.1 per cent, and the increase in 1888 over that in 1884 was 13.3 per cent, nearly as much as 1896, on which occasion the interest in the campaign was unusually great and the efforts to rally every vote, by both sides, were exceptional. A study of this table will show to those who examine it that it can not be successfully charged that the total vote of the nation in 1896 was excessive or out of proportion in its increase, especially when it is remembered that the vote of 1892 was unusually light and that the percentage of gain is estimated upon that light vote.

In order to give, however, those who assume an excessive vote in certain States the full advantage of every fact, let us examine the votes in the States

of which Mr. ALLEN complains and compare them with the vote of 1892, confessedly a light vote. Pennsylvania increased her vote in 1896 18.4 per cent as compared with the vote of 1892, and Mr. ALLEN complains that there was a "fraudulent excess" of 94,000 in Pennsylvania's vote. He makes no complaint, however, of the fact that the State of Montana, which was as earnest for the free coinage of silver as was Pennsylvania against it, increased her vote 21.9 per cent. Indiana increased her vote 14.7 in 1896 as compared with 1892, yet Mr. ALLEN, whose party carried South Dakota, makes no complaint of the fact that South Dakota increased her vote 17.1 per cent, nor does he refer to the fact that Indiana, in the election of 1876, when she went Democratic, increased her vote 23.3 per cent.

Iowa increased her vote 17.6 per cent, and Mr. ALLEN charges 77,500 "fraudulent excess" of votes, but makes no comment on the fact that North Carolina, a Populist State, increased her vote 17.8 per cent, nor does he refer to the fact that Iowa in 1876 increased her vote 35 per cent. California increased her vote 9.1 per cent in 1896, as compared with 1892, and Mr. ALLEN charges 22,000 "fraudulent excess" of votes, but makes no reference to the fact that his own State, Nebraska, increased her votes 11.1 per cent in the same election. Maryland increased her vote 12.9 per cent in 1896, as compared with 1892, and although Mr. ALLEN charges a "fraudulent excess" of 8,700, he raises no objection to the fact that ten States, giving their votes to the Populist-Democratic candidate, increased their votes in a much greater ratio than did Maryland, nor does he refer to the fact that Maryland herself, in 1888, when she went Democratic, gained 13.5 per cent over her own Presidential vote in the preceding election. Ohio, of which Mr. ALLEN complains as casting 94,500 "fraudulent excess" of votes, increased her vote 19.1 per cent in 1896 over 1892, yet Mr. ALLEN contemplates with entire calmness the fact that Wyoming, a State as ardently for the free coinage of silver as was Ohio against it, increased her vote 25.8 per cent in the same election. He also complains bitterly of Minnesota, which he says cast 12,100 "fraudulent excess" of votes in the election of 1896, but he omits to call attention to the fact that Minnesota's vote in 1896 was actually 8.9 per cent less than her own vote in the Presidential election of 1892. Her vote in 1892 was 374,807, and that of 1896 341,539, a falling off of 33,000 votes, but as 107,000 of the votes of 1892 were cast by the Union Labor party, which afterwards merged with the Populist, Mr. ALLEN makes no complaint of the vote of 1892, which was a gain of 42.1 per cent over that of 1888, while the 1888 vote was a gain of 38.4 per cent over that of 1884. Illinois increased her vote in 1896 24.9 per cent over 1892, and Mr. ALLEN charges a "fraudulent excess" of votes amounting to 137,000. Yet he offers no complaint over the fact that Mississippi increased her vote 31.9 per cent, or that Florida, the birthplace of Populism, increased her vote 30.5 per cent in 1896, as compared with 1892; nor does he refer to the fact that Illinois also gained 25.8 per cent in 1876. The highest percentage of gain in any State in which Mr. ALLEN charges a "fraudulent excess" of votes is Kentucky, where the gain was 31.1 per cent, as compared with 1892, and the "fraudulent excess" charged is 43,300. Mr. ALLEN does not, however, offer any objection whatever to the fact that Idaho, which supported the free coinage of silver as enthusiastically as the Kentuckians opposed it, increased her vote in 1896 52.5 per cent, as compared with 1892, nor does he refer to the fact that Kentucky herself gained 36.1 per cent in the year 1876 and 24.7 in 1888, and also omits to mention that his own State, Nebraska, gained 50.7 per cent in 1888. It may be interesting to see some of these figures side by side, as follows:

Table showing the percentage of gain in 1896, compared with 1892, in votes cast in Presidential elections.

REPUBLICAN STATES—GAIN IN 1896 OVER 1892.	DEMOCRATIC STATES—GAIN IN 1896 OVER 1892.		
California	9.1	Nebraska	11.1
Maryland	12.9	South Dakota	17.1
Indiana	14.7	North Carolina	17.8
West Virginia	16.3	Tennessee	20.2
Iowa	17.6	Montana	21.9
Michigan	18.8	Wyoming	25.8
Ohio	19.1	Missouri	24.8
Wisconsin	20.4	Florida	30.5
Illinois	24.9	Mississippi	31.9
Kentucky	30.1	Idaho	52.5

WHERE THE REAL FRAUD WAS.

It must be apparent to anybody who takes the trouble to examine the above figures that the charges of fraud in the election in the States carried by McKinley are false. Nobody, whatever his political sentiments may be, can doubt that if he examines carefully these figures, which are taken from the official publications.

But how about the South, where the Democracy is always triumphant by one process or another?

It is a notorious fact that in the extreme Southern States the colored voters have been disfranchised by one process and another until their participation in national and State elections has practically disappeared. This has been accomplished by various processes at various times, that process which combines the greatest success with the greatest showing of virtue having finally been hit upon in amendments to the State constitutions which require an educational test as a qualification for voting. With a clause in the State constitution requiring each voter to be able to read or "satisfactorily explain" a clause in that instrument itself, and the jury which is to determine whether the reading or "explanation" is well done being "packed" beforehand, it is easy to see that the average colored voter in the South stands little show of an opportunity to cast his vote. This requirement exists in several of the Southern States. In others there is also an educational test in the form of a law which requires a separate ballot box for each candidate with his name printed on the outside, the voter being required to place his ballot for each candidate in its proper box.

In order to prevent the successful coaching of voters not able to read the names upon the boxes, the custom is to change the location of the boxes from hour to hour, or more frequently if necessary, thus making it absolutely impossible for the voter who can not read to know whether he is putting his ballot in the right box. In some cases it is found more convenient to count the votes cast for Republican candidates as cast for Democrats, and vice versa, but those are now exceptions and the "educational test" is becoming the popular method in the South for keeping the negroes away from the polls. It sounds well, prevents charges of violations of law, and yet does the business most effectively. That the experiments which the people of the South have been making in the last twenty years in the line of "how to exclude the black vote from the polls" have been highly successful will be seen from the following votes and figures taken from the official records of the Government. Seven of the extreme Southern States, which contain in themselves more than one-half of the entire colored population of the country, are selected as an example. These States occupy the extreme southern belt, and in them the art of depriving the negro voter of his right of suffrage seems to have attained its highest perfection.

SUPPRESSING REPUBLICAN VOTES IN THE SOUTH.

The States whose vote will be examined herewith are South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana. Twenty years

ago the art of suppressing the negro vote was in its infancy. In the Presidential election of 1876 the total vote returned from these States amounted to 989,114. Since that they have gained, according to the United States census, 3,335,405 in population. Yet in the year 1896 they report only 791,011 votes cast, an actual loss of 198,108 votes. Here is an example for those who admire the art of suppressing votes. A gain of 3,306,465 in population and at the same time a loss of 198,108 in the number of votes. A gain of 66 per cent, as shown by the official figures, and at the same time a loss of 20 per cent in votes, as also shown by the official figures.

That this reduction in the number of votes was caused by keeping away colored Republican voters from the polls is shown by the fact that the percentage of the vote cast for the Republican tickets in these States has dwindled year by year until it has reached as low a figure as 4 per cent in Alabama in 1892, 3 per cent in Mississippi in 1892, while in Florida and Louisiana no votes were recorded for the Republican Presidential candidates in that year. Not contented with this, the vote was brought down in many of those States even lower in 1896 than in 1892, the number of votes cast being actually less in the recent election than in any which had preceded it.

The above statements are verified by the following figures, taken from the official records of the Government. They indicate the population of those States in 1870 and 1890, as shown by the United States census, and also show the total vote in each State in the Presidential elections of 1876 and 1896, as shown by official returns:

Table showing the population in 1870 and 1890, and also the vote in 1876 and 1896.

State.	Population.		Vote.	
	1870.	1890.	1876.	1896.
South Carolina	705,606	1,151,149	182,766	68,998
Georgia	1,184,109	1,837,353	130,534	162,744
Florida	187,784	391,422	46,776	44,740
Alabama	969,992	1,513,017	171,697	194,576
Mississippi	827,922	1,239,060	104,778	69,513
Arkansas	484,471	1,128,178	96,740	149,454
Louisiana	726,915	1,118,527	145,823	101,046

The above table, it will be seen, shows a large gain in the population in each of the States in question from the census of 1870 to the last census of 1890. It also shows, however, that in every case except two the vote of 1896 was much less than that of 1876. The total population in these States increased from about 5,000,000 in 1870 to nearly eight and a half millions in 1890, yet the total vote fell from 339,000 in 1876 to 791,000 in 1896.

The detail of the vote by States, with the gain in population and loss in votes, is shown in the tables which follow:

Table showing, by States, the gain in population in twenty years and gain or loss in vote in the corresponding period.

State.	Gain in population in 20 years.	Gain or loss in vote in 20 years.
South Carolina	446,540	*113,828
Georgia	643,244	*17,770
Florida	263,038	*2,636
Alabama	516,025	+22,879
Mississippi	461,638	*95,265
Arkansas	643,708	+52,714
Louisiana	391,672	*44,777
Total	3,366,462	+195,003

* Loss. † Gain. ‡ Net loss.

Table showing, by States, the percentage of gain in population in twenty years and the percentage of gain or loss in vote in the corresponding period.

State.	Gain in population in 20 years.	Gain or loss in vote in 20 years.
South Carolina	Per cent. *63	Per cent. *62
Georgia	*53	+10
Florida	*108	+4
Alabama	*51	*13
Mississippi	*55	+57
Arkansas	*132	*54
Louisiana	*53	+31

* Gain. † Loss.

ELECTION FIGURES—THE STORY OF THE PRESIDENTIAL CANVASS OF 1896 IN A NUTSHELL.

The canvass of the electoral vote for President and Vice-President in the two Houses of Congress presents some interesting figures. The popular and electoral votes were as follows:

	McKinley.	Bryan.
Popular vote	7,105,959	6,454,943
Electoral vote	271	176
States	23	22

The number of votes cast shows that the majority of McKinley over Bryan and plurality over all indicates a decisive victory for the Republican party. Old party lines were obliterated, and a high principle was vindicated by men

who believed in the honor of the nation above mere party adherence. The total result of the canvass is exhibited in the following figures:

Total popular vote.....	13,875,653
McKinley over Bryan.....	651,016
McKinley over all.....	336,255
National Democratic vote.....	132,870
Prohibition vote.....	131,870
Socialist Labor vote.....	36,260
Free silver people.....	13,873
Popular vote 1892.....	12,591,351
Increase in four years.....	1,284,202
Electoral vote for Watson.....	27

Bryan received the total Populist vote of 1892, in addition to which was the Republican silver vote, as well as the vote of those Democrats who "voted first and read the platform afterwards." This accounts for the large number of votes cast for him. From Missouri he received the highest number of electoral votes—17. The votes of nine States were given him the highest of which had only four electors. The canvass indicates a divergence in the votes of States contrasted by the moral lines of wealth and population. For McKinley the votes from the prosperous, conservative, and largely wealthy and populated States were almost unanimous. Bryan's strength lay in those States consisting mainly of territory and not of people. The figures and facts show that after all, while the plurality of Mr. McKinley was great, yet the comparisons of territories make it still more significant.—*St. Joseph Herald.*

Mr. ALLEN. I simply wish to state in connection with what has been said by the Senator from Ohio that I placed in the RECORD this morning, though in yesterday's proceedings, an analysis of the vote of the State of Ohio in 1896, which I trust will be read in connection with what the Senator has placed in the RECORD.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE HOLMAN.

Mr. TURPIE. Mr. President, at this late stage of the session I will not ask the Senate to designate a day for the hearing of eulogies in the case of our late colleague in the House, Hon. W. S. Holman. Early in the next session I will ask the Senate to appoint a day for the delivery of such memorials.

THE TARIFF BILL.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 379) to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, the precise purpose for which I desire to take the floor this morning is to explain as well as I may be able the situation we occupy in giving a vote of concurrence in the report of the committee of conference upon a very grave question of practice, law policy—constitutional law—which is suggested by a remark made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] in charge of the bill, and who has the largest responsibility for it, I believe. On the 21st day of July he said what I will read. Debating the clauses of the bill that relate to taxing bonds and the transfers of stocks, he said:

Mr. ALLEN. It occurs to me that it requires some explanation at the hands of the committee. This matter was presented to us—

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It was considered in and came forth from the Republican caucus.

Mr. ALLEN. Yes; as the action of the Republican caucus. It was presented here very vigorously by the Senator from Iowa. It was said that it would provide from four and a half to five million dollars of revenue; that the Government needed the revenue. Now, why was it yielded in conference? I think we are entitled to more than mere silence on the part of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALLISON. It was claimed on the part of the House, and I think with very great force, that under the Constitution we could not tax one class of bonds by means of an excise without taxing all bonds, and that being true, and the revenue as estimated by the Department to be derived from the other branch of the case being very small relatively, it was thought best to abandon the whole scheme at the request of the House of Representatives, who believed the tax should not be levied.

Mr. ALLEN. Does the Senator yield the view that you can not tax one class of property without taxing all?

Mr. ALLISON. That was not my statement. My statement was that an excise tax levied upon one class of property must be levied upon that class as a whole and not upon a portion of it, and we had specially exempted the bonds of certain corporations, such as building associations, etc. The question was raised, and I thought with very great force, that you can not tax one bond without taxing all bonds.

A question of that gravity, presented in this formal way and acted upon by a committee of conference, is now brought before the Senate for the purpose of being affirmed or disaffirmed by the vote we shall give upon the conference report. It is, of all the questions I have heard debated in the Senate since I have had the honor of a place here, the most serious and the most dangerous to the people of the United States. The question presented is whether or not the Government of the United States in taxing bonds or stock or any property of that description must tax all the bonds and all the stocks without exception in the United States, or else it has not the constitutional power to tax any.

That is the broad, simple proposition which is now submitted for the consideration of the Senate upon the report, and while I expect the vote of the Senate will in one sense be an affirmation of the statement made by the Senator from Iowa, I desire to enter here now on my own behalf, and, I have no doubt, on behalf of every other Democrat on this floor, my earnest protestation that the doctrine and the statement of it, and the action that is taken

upon it in affirmation of it, is a destruction of the power of Congress to tax property that ought to go under taxation.

I have never heard the doctrine advanced before that no exemption from taxation could be made by an act of Congress; but that is what this proposition is, that because the stocks of certain companies, building and loan associations, and the like, very few of them, were exempted from the provision of the proposed statute, therefore we have not the constitutional power to tax any other stocks or any other bonds.

Inasmuch as the power of taxation in the hands of Congress reaches over a great number of subjects and in various forms, it is a very important inquiry for the Congress of the United States always to make, as the judiciary are always bound to make it when a case is presented, as to the extent of the taxing power in the hands of the Congress of the United States.

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution provides:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

The Senator from Iowa appeals to the law of uniformity in support of his proposition that we have not the constitutional power to levy this tax upon stocks and bonds and the transfer of stocks. It is the law of uniformity. He does not appeal to the law of apportionment, the law of numbers. He does not say that because this tax is not apportioned among the States according to population, therefore it is unconstitutional, as was held with respect to the income tax by the Supreme Court on the case that arose under the Wilson Act. That is not the ground of the contention of the Senator from Iowa at all. He plants himself simply and only on the question of uniformity. The tax must be uniform throughout the United States, and because it is a tax upon bonds, to preserve the uniformity, it must be a tax upon all bonds of every kind and condition.

The number of times that rule has been violated by the Congress of the United States could not easily be counted up in a week's effort. If the law and the Constitution are as the Senator from Iowa contends, if on this newly discovered ground of unconstitutionality the amendment which was put into this bill, first by the action of the Republican caucus, then by the action of the Republican committee and by the entire and undivided vote of the Senate, is unconstitutional on the ground that it is not uniform in its operations upon all bonds, all stocks, and all transfers—as to transfers, however, there was no exception at all—sir, we had better close up our doors and stop legislation on the subject of levying taxes, whether they are excises, imposts, or duties. It matters not about the form; we had as well quit the business.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I ask the Senator from Alabama to yield to me a moment that I may ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to print as a document a comparison of the present tariff act of 1894 with the rates proposed by House bill 379 amended by the Senate, and as it is now in the Senate. It is a comparative statement prepared by Charles H. Evans, an expert who has been for a long time connected with this kind of work. This statement has been submitted to the majority members of the Finance Committee, and I presume there is no objection to its printing. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that it may be printed as a document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I should like to make an inquiry. What do I understand the document to be?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It is a detailed comparison between the law as it stands now and the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I wish to say that if it is a comparison which deals with ad valorem, I do not think Mr. Evans or any other expert can state accurately what the comparison between the present law and this bill is so far as it relates to ad valorem equivalents.

Mr. WHITE. If I may be permitted to make a remark, of course there may be a difference of opinion as to whether that system is possible of absolute accuracy, but we have heretofore had ad valorem estimates, and this statement will be of use to those who have confidence in that class of work. There is no objection to having it printed. It does not receive the indorsement of the Senator from Connecticut as being absolutely correct, but we ought to have permission to have it printed.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I did not make an objection to its printing. I simply wished to say before it was printed that a calculation as to the ad valorem equivalents under this bill must be a matter of conjecture, and that that can not be ascertained until after a year's importations and figuring out the ad valorem upon them.

Mr. MILLS. All these ad valorem equivalents are made on the imports of the year preceding; and it has been done under all the tariff bills that we have had under consideration. Whenever we have considered a tariff bill we have had a comparative statement.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It is always the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. ALLISON. There is no objection to the printing, I think. I suppose the statement was carefully prepared by Mr. Evans. But I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Connecticut that it is impossible to do more than make a mere conjecture as respects the ad valorem under this bill. Of course I do not object to the request of the Senator, but I ask leave in the same connection to submit a resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the request of the Senator from Arkansas will be complied with, and the statement will be printed as a document.

Mr. ALLISON. With the leave of the Senator from Alabama, I ask that a resolution be adopted in this same line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution presented by the Senator from Iowa will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be, and they are hereby, directed to prepare a comparative statement of the customs laws from 1890 to 1897, inclusive, together with official statistics and official data relating thereto; and the provisions of the Senate resolution of March 19, 1897, are hereby continued in force for this purpose.

Mr. COCKRELL. What will that book contain?

Mr. ALLISON. It will contain what was printed in 1894, with the present paragraphs added in the same connection, so that the three laws will appear by paragraphs in consecutive order. It will also contain some data respecting importations, I should state.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection to the present consideration of the resolution, the question is on agreeing to the same.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The order for printing the statement I presented I believe was made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was made.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, as I have interrupted the Senator from Alabama, and others have done so, I want to interrupt him one moment more to say that I make no contention as respects this constitutional question. I have not examined it at all with any care, and therefore make no contention about it, and I am not to be held responsible for any contention. I am glad to have the Senator from Alabama elucidate it, so that if there are any doubts in the mind of anyone, he may make it clear.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator from Alabama will permit me, I understood the Senator from Iowa the other day, when I asked him whether he took any stock in that objection, to say that he did.

Mr. ALLISON. I do.

Mr. WHITE. And he went on to affirm his faith in it. But he may of course have seen the light since.

Mr. ALLISON. I am seeing the light now, and I will probably see more light from the Senator from California. I only wished to put in a suggestion to the Senator from Alabama that he need not argue the question in order that any contention of mine may be dissipated, because I make no contention about it.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I am exceedingly gratified that the honorable Senator from Iowa is not willing to become sponsor for this doctrine, to which we understood on our side of the Chamber he was thoroughly committed. He stated that as the ground, and the only ground, upon which the House conferees had insisted upon the rejection of these items from the tariff bill. However, inasmuch as there seems to be an opinion of that sort entertained, possibly by some other members of the committee of conference, for which the Senator from Iowa declares that he is not in any way responsible, that does not relieve me from the necessity of saying something more about it, and stating the reasons upon which I predicate my denunciation of it as a doctrine that is destructive of the power of Congress to tax anything.

I have adverted to the fact that this objection, or this difficulty, or suggestion, or whatever you please to call it, coming from the committee of conference, can not rest on any other ground, and is not attempted to be rested on any other ground, than the doctrine of uniformity in taxation. Let us inquire how far the Congress of the United States is bound to observe uniformity in taxation. If we should say that Congress is bound to observe the doctrine of uniformity in taxation by taxing all imported property, this bill would instantly go out of legal existence upon that constitutional point as to almost every feature in it, because there is neither uniformity nor equality in this taxation.

Equality is one of the elements in the burdens of taxation that is required by the Constitution of the country, and of all constitutions of government in civilized countries. It is a doctrine that is founded upon the principles of our own Government, that every citizen should bear equally the burdens of the Government, and

that no discriminations or peculiar privileges shall be granted to anybody. That is the recognized doctrine of political and moral philosophy. But that does not touch the question of uniformity.

The question of uniformity has reference only to the locality in which the tax is to be assessed. It is that you shall not levy a tax which shall be a burden upon one part of the people of the United States and not be a burden upon another part of the people of the United States according to locality.

The doctrine of uniformity of taxation came up in the cases that went before the Supreme Court of the United States called the Cotton Tax cases. It was objected against the levy of a specific excise upon cotton that it was not uniform, for the reason that cotton was not grown in all parts of the United States; that the tax fell upon the producer, and that therefore there was no uniformity in the taxation.

That case went to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the court was equally divided upon the question and could not reach a decision. The subject remains as yet undecided. I refer to it now for the purpose of showing the importance of uniformity and the reasons for it in connection with the power of taxation. But the Supreme Court have held in other cases that the question of uniformity depended upon the property taxed and not upon the locality in which it was taxed; that if the substance was taxed uniformly in all parts of the country, so that wherever it was found it would pay its tax, that was the degree of uniformity required by the Constitution of the United States and fully met all the requirements of that instrument on the subject.

Now I come to the question of uniformity of taxation as applied by the committee of conference. I turn to the free list in this bill. The duties that are imposed here, except those parts that relate to internal duties, are all of them duties that we classify as tariff duties, duties upon imports, as they are mentioned in the Constitution of the United States. When we come to the property that is in the free list, articles imported into the United States, we find in section 2, between paragraph 464, relating to acids, arsenic, arsenious, and so on, a number of articles are named, down to paragraph 705, relating to zaffer. There are hundreds, yes, thousands of articles imported into the United States that are property, and this bill exempts them from taxation. What right have we to refuse to exempt importations from taxation upon the ground that it violates the uniformity required by the Constitution of the United States? We have always done so; nobody has objected to it.

Many people insist that the free list shall be very greatly enlarged. I do not, however. But what right have we to make an exception of any property imported into the United States if we must tax all property or tax nothing?

When you examine the free list, you will find that imported goods in varying conditions are admitted on the free list, while the same articles of goods not exactly in the same condition as to manufacture, and so forth, are put on the dutiable list. You take the same articles, and, because of the condition that the articles may be in, you draw the discrimination and make an exemption from taxation of all articles that are in the condition prescribed in this act, and yet articles of the same nature inherently, and in every respect the same, except as to the condition of manufacture in which they are found, are put under the dutiable list. There is discrimination. There is the absence of uniformity in respect of the very articles themselves. And if we can not exempt anything, because such exemption would destroy uniformity of taxation, this bill is full of unconstitutional taxes.

So, testing this position by the bill that is before me now, there can not be any doubt at all that the rule of uniformity is violated, and is properly violated, because these articles put upon the free list are considered and provided for as articles exempt from duty.

The argument that this part of the bill as it passed the Senate is unconstitutional because it exempted the bonds of building and loan associations is bad, unless it is unconstitutional to admit any property on the free list.

It would be unconstitutional, under that argument, to tax the importation of any article of clothing because this bill permits \$100 worth of wearing apparel to come in free of duty.

I do not think it was ever heard until this paltry excuse for the abandonment of the tax on bonds and transfers of stock was invented by the conference committee to shelter themselves against criticism and against inquiry—until that was invented I do not think that anybody ever before insisted that you could not put any article that you chose upon the free list, and thereupon create an exception under the statute so that that article should not be taxed. Well, sir, the subject is so absolutely plain as that it is impossible almost to debate it. The statement of it is quite enough to answer any argument that can be made upon the subject.

The power to exempt from taxation any article is an essential and elementary part of the power of taxation. No government, I think, has ever deprived itself, or attempted to deprive itself, of the sovereign power of exempting and excusing certain articles and certain people from the burden of taxation. There is not a

State in the American Union that has not observed this practice continually, and many of their constitutions, including the constitution of the State of Alabama, are far more stringent in respect of the assessment of property or the taxation of property, as to the rules of uniformity and equality and justice, than the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, there is a very interesting case, interesting to all the Democrats of the United States, to say the least of it, in 8 Wallace, that we have oftentimes predicated our political platforms upon. We have often affirmed the doctrines that are stated in the case in 8 Wallace, of *Veazie Bank against Fenno*, though we have not been able to realize the effect of the decision made in *Veazie Bank against Fenno* for the reason that the decision in that case was not predicated actually upon the facts. It was predicated upon an assumption of an intention on the part of Congress merely to levy and collect a tax upon the circulation of State banks, whereas the purpose of the law was, and everybody could see it except the Supreme Court of the United States, to tax the State-bank issues out of existence.

In the argument that was made even by the court it was admitted, tacitly, I grant you, that if it did appear upon the face of that act that the purpose of the law was to tax the State-bank issues out of existence—to prohibit them—that would be an invasion of the rights of the States to charter banks of issue, and therefore it would be unconstitutional. But the act on its face professed to be merely an act to tax the issues of State banks as property.

At the time that law was passed and since that time we had statutes that enabled the Government of the United States to tax the circulation of the national banks. Well, banks of issue are banks of issue, whether they are State banks or whether they are national banks, and that being so, how did it turn out that we had the right to tax the State banks upon their issues, and also, having the right to tax the national banks upon their issues, we could tax the State banks under that act and say nothing about the national banks? What becomes of the doctrine asserted upon the floor of the Senate here that when you undertake to tax a bank and bank issues you must tax all banks and all bank issues?

It is exploded absolutely. The doctrine has no foundation in the laws of the country or in any rational construction of any statute we have ever enacted. It has no foundation in the practice of the country. It is an absurdity; and it is an excuse, a very thinly veiled excuse, for the striking out of this tax upon bonds and transfers of stock which, it is enough to say, receives no recognition, as I believe, from any right-thinking man. I do not wonder the Senator from Iowa is disposed to get away from that proposition.

I will read an extract from *Veazie Bank vs. Fenno*. Among the concluding expressions of that decision may be found the following:

But in the case before us the object of taxation is not the franchise of the bank, but property created, or contracts made and issued under the franchise, or power to issue bank bills. A railroad company, in the exercise of its corporate franchises, issues freight receipts, bills of lading, and passenger tickets; and it can not be doubted that the organization of railroads is quite as important to the State as the organization of banks.

But it will hardly be questioned that these contracts of the company are objects of taxation within the powers of Congress, and not exempted by any relation to the State which granted the charter of the railroad. And it seems difficult to distinguish the taxation of notes issued for circulation from the taxation of these railroad contracts. Both descriptions of contracts are means of profit to the corporations which issue them, and both, as we think, may properly be made contributory to the public revenue.

There is the broad power of taxation exercised by the Congress of the United States to break down and drive out of circulation the issues of the State banks. The Democracy have always objected to that.

In a recent convention—I believe it was the first one which nominated Mr. Cleveland—we put in the specific demand upon the Congress of the United States for the repeal of the tax upon the issues of State banks as being violative of the Constitution of the country. We have always opposed it; and here stands the justification of our opposition. We have contended that it was the right of any State to charter a bank of issue; and that being so, the Congress of the United States could not drive the issues of that bank out of circulation without violating the constitutional rights of that State.

While it might not be, strictly speaking, an instrumentality of State government, it was an instrumentality for the purpose of enabling the people to conduct their business; it was a lawful instrumentality, constitutional, and confirmed by long practice under the Constitution, and for many years in the provinces before the Constitution was ordained; it was a power which the State never gave up to issue these bills. Now, they can be taxed. They can be taxed as bank notes issued by State corporations or by private banks; and yet the contention is made here that they can not be taxed unless in the same bill you also tax the issues of national banks, for they are banks of issue. The absurdity of the proposition is very apparent; and I think that I shall not spend any more time upon any effort to prove that it is an absurd and untenable proposition.

We are now left to consider the naked question why it was that the committee of conference struck out the provision of this bill on the subject of the taxation of bonds and the transfer of stock. What the Senate put in that bill was embraced in paragraph 856, and it extended from page 230 to page 241 of the bill. It was a very elaborate system; all of the machinery necessary for the collection of taxes upon bonds and upon the transfers of stock was provided for and copied out of the old statutes of the United States when such taxes were formerly levied upon our people. This machinery has undergone investigation on the part of the courts in various cases. Its validity has been affirmed by the courts and its convenience has also been affirmed by the Treasury Department for the purpose of collecting taxes on bonds and stocks and various other things. So there is no fault in the machinery. It is all perfect.

How did this measure, so carefully and so ably drafted, originate? Sir, it came from the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], whose ability as a lawyer and legislator I think no gentleman will question. It is his invention, or rather it is his application of an old invention of taxation, oftentimes ratified and confirmed, to the subject of raising money by taxation out of bonds and out of transfers of stock. Now, we have asked ourselves, to begin with, is that a legitimate subject of taxation? Can any man, any common man, or any great political economist, inform me of a reason why bonds and stocks should not be taxed?

Bonds are the outcome of property. As was said in *Veazie Bank vs. Fenno*, they are the product of property; they are the embodiment of values, and are sustained by mortgages and liens upon property. They are transferable oftener than otherwise by mere delivery, like bank notes; they pass current from hand to hand as money, or as property of the very highest value amongst the people of the United States. All of this vast scheme of gambling in Wall street and other places in New York is predicated upon two things, the issue of bonds and the issue of stocks of incorporated companies. The millions of dollars that they represent, no man, I suppose, knows, but it is a fabulous sum.

How did bonds and stocks get to be property at all? How did a piece of paper, issued by a corporation as a certificate of stock or as an obligation to pay money, become property? And how is it that it has become the most valuable property in the United States and in the whole of the civilized world, and is more sought after than any other species of property that any person can name? How did all this occur? It is not the bonds of private men that are circulating in this way. We do not find the bonds of any of the Goulds or the Astors or the Vanderbilts circulating in the market upon their private responsibility and credit. Nobody hears of such bonds as those. These bonds are all issued by corporations.

How did the corporations start? First, they went to the legislatures of the different States of the Union and obtained a license, a privilege, a charter, as it is called, which empowered them to issue bonds, which bonds were required to be predicated upon some kind of security in every case almost, if not in every case. They applied to the powers of the States to get a license or the privilege to issue these bonds; and without that license or privilege expressly given them by statute the bonds could not be issued. They would have no legal validity. Hence they go to the people through their representatives and get their consent that they may issue these bonds.

The corporations from which the bonds issue, in almost every case, either by direct provision or by some contrivance, have the faculty of immortality, the undying capacity of survival from generation to generation, having in that respect very large advantages over any partnership or trade organization or any body of individuals or any human beings. We take them and except them out from the ordinary category of human infirmity, from the restrictions that are placed upon human operations, and give them these great privileges for, as we suppose, great public ends. This is not done in every instance for the purpose of enriching the stockholders in the corporations.

Whenever one of them is chartered, like a railroad company or a bank or a corporation for manufacturing or any other kind of operation, it is upon the idea that in their corporate capacity, in their aggregation, they contribute such benefits to the country at large as that it becomes our true policy to give them these privileges under certain restrictions which we impose in the charter. There is no corporation in the United States to-day, whether created by Congress or by a State legislature, that has not some pledge of public service involved in its very organization and in the purposes of its existence. The men who comprise the body of the corporations are exempt from personal responsibility for their debts.

They are bound only to the extent of the money or property that they have put into the common pool; they have no personal responsibility; not in one case in a hundred thousand is there the imposition of personal responsibility on the stockholders. So they can aggregate their capital; they can combine their powers; they can unite their energies for the purpose of making money

and doing many other things, and when we come to try them upon the rules which obtain between man and man, or between a man and his government, they are exempt from personal responsibility for the engagements of their agent or any factor of the corporate body.

What has been their history in the United States? Thousands and hundreds of thousands of them have perished and gone into bankruptcy, and they have dragged many thousands, yea millions, of people down into hopeless poverty and distress; but the greater and stronger, the more powerful corporations, those that have attracted the attention of the rich capitalists of the world, have grown rich beyond compare, rich beyond computation, and have grown powerful as they have grown rich. Whenever those corporations attract to themselves the power of the money kings of the world, then immediately they commence to grow powerful and rich, and their bonds go out on the market and are transferred from hand to hand, sometimes mounting up to as much as three and four and five hundred per cent premium upon their face value. The gilt-edged bonds that are held in the markets of the United States are all at a premium. That means simply that the accumulations of profits have been so great that the value of the bonds or the stocks which represent those profits has gone up, sometimes up to six and seven hundred per cent, above the face value of the stocks or the bonds.

I do not know, Mr. President, whether in the indulgence of this spirit, or rather the cultivation of this spirit, of speculation through corporate power and influence we have not inflicted upon the United States very dire evils from which, perhaps, we shall never be able to escape. There is one thing certain, any man can name ten great corporations in the United States that have more money and more financial power than the Treasury here at Washington City. They have more income than we derive from taxation. They have more power over men and institutions and the destinies of whole regions of the United States than the Government of the United States itself can exercise. Congress does not compare in the aggregate of its powers with the combined powers of these corporations when their interests all lead them in a certain direction.

If you please, take the 4,500 national banks in the United States, each one a point of concentration for the capital that was originally subscribed, a point of concentration for borrowing and for lending, and a point of concentration for the lodgment, the deposit, of the money of the people, who go to those banks for the convenience of having their money taken care of, and contribute their capital in this way to the enlargement, the expansion, of the real money power of those 4,500 corporations, until it becomes far more powerful than the 25,000 men that we have in the Army of the United States, or than the twenty-five or thirty vessels that we have upon the seas.

When you come to measure power, by which you mean the control that one man or set of men has over another man or set of men, I am not wrong in affirming that the national banks of the United States, all of which are run by the same machinery, in the same direction, by the same impulse, to the same result, have more power over the people of the United States to-day than the Army and Navy have. There are presidents of great banks in the United States to-day who can control the destiny of the people of the United States with more facility and more absolute certainty than the President of the United States can do it. That is our situation.

More than that, those bonds and stocks furnish a fund of speculation, as it is called, which is nothing else than gambling, with all the attendant immoralities of gaming, in which great and splendid men engage in the marts of trade in buying and selling these bonds on margins and otherwise, where the most frantic speculations are continually occurring, where men meet in the exchanges in New York City, and when one looks down upon them from the gallery he sees a mass of confused and excited men who have become utterly irrational, to all appearances, in their greed of speculation and in the excitement of the game which they are playing with those bonds and those stocks. That is another trouble that the Congress of the United States can not control by penal statutes, the State Legislatures can not control, and public opinion can not control, powerful as that is. It is absolutely beyond the power of control, so far as we know, of any human agency.

What are they dealing upon? Property created by corporations—bonds and stocks—which the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Veazie Bank vs. Fenno* said are property, and only property. Now, we ask ourselves the question whether that kind of property can be taxed. The conference committee says, "No; you can not tax that kind of property unless you tax all bonds; if you undertake to deal with the subject of taxing bonds by an act of Congress, you must not exempt any bonds at all."

If a church should put out bonds for the purpose of building its edifice, or if a benevolent institution should put out bonds to borrow money for the purpose of assisting the poor and starving of the slums of the cities, you must not except that. If you under-

take to tax bonds, you must tax every bond that is held in the United States. Otherwise, according to this contention, you are violating the Constitution of the United States. If by your duties on imports you undertake to tax any one thing that is imported, you must make no exception, you must have no free list, but you must tax all. Otherwise you can not tax any.

Mr. President, that objection being out of the way, let us look at the question of the policy of this taxation. Suppose that the Congress of the United States were to perform its duty, and were to tax the bonds issued by the corporations, which I have been trying to describe, at the same rate that it taxes the plow, the hoe, the trace chains, and the gear with which the farmer does his work, at the same rate at which it taxes the food and the sugar he lives upon, at the same rate it taxes the different beverages that he may find it convenient to drink or profitable or healthy to drink—suppose that we should undertake to tax this property in the hands of these gambling magnates of Wall street, who could object, upon grounds of morality or grounds of public policy, to that tax being levied?

Nobody could object to it except a Republican conference committee; and when they make the objection, they come in with the paltry excuse that if you tax one bond you can not exempt any other; that because you exempted the bonds of building and loan associations, where the poor of the country are trying by combining capital to build up houses for themselves and their families to live in—because you make that exemption in favor of the homestead, you thereby so flagrantly violate the Constitution of the United States that your tax on the highfliers in Wall street becomes unconstitutional.

It is the first time I have ever heard that that class of men have made a direct appeal to the protection of the Constitution of the United States. They generally act in defiance of it. Now they come around when we want to tax them, and they say, "You can not tax us because you exempt building and loan associations"—a gambler on Wall street, who is using his millions of dollars in this fraudulent and corrupt combination known as the sugar trust, says you can not tax him unless at the same time you tax the little corporations out of which a poor man borrows money enough to put some weatherboarding around the house which contains his family and shingles over their heads. That is the pass to which we have come; that is the lamb that is muddying the water below where the wolf stood; that is the excuse, and the only one, which this wise and able committee could find for striking out the tax on bonds and the tax on the transfer of stocks.

As I said, the junior Senator from Massachusetts framed this amendment, following the copy of the old statutes, which have so oftentimes been held to be valid and right, and carried it into the caucus of the Republican party long after the framework of this bill had been matured by the Republicans of the committee of the Senate. He insisted that these bonds and these transfers of stock were legitimate subjects of taxation, and the caucus agreed with him that they were, and they reported to the Committee on Finance, and the committee came in here, very much to our astonishment and greatly to our gratification, and presented this form of taxation, which they said would add eight or nine million dollars to the revenues of the country.

Mr. President, if it would add eight or nine million dollars to the revenues it would, or it ought to, lift that much of burdens off of the people. That was a distribution of the burdens of the Government falling with slight and almost imperceptible weight upon that class of men in the country who were best able to bear it, they being a class of men who have derived all their wealth under corporation laws, which the people have consented to. Then where was the injustice of the Senate voting that tax upon bonds and upon transfers of stocks? Where was the immorality of it? Where was the inequality of it? What great public policy was violated when the Republicans in the Senate came up magnanimously and proudly and concluded that they were men enough and had independence enough about them to put some taxation upon this hitherto exempt class?

Why, sir, we rejoiced at it; and, as I observed the other day, if anything could have removed my objections to many of the items of this bill, that one feature of it would have been its redeemer in my estimation. We passed it through here; nobody dissented, everybody agreed. It went into conference between the two Houses and was stricken out, and the feeble and paltry reasons which have been here stated and abandoned and exploded were the reasons upon which that committee stood in striking out these eight or nine million dollars of revenue coming out of these bonds and transfers of stocks.

Mr. President, circumstantial evidence is generally very strong. I have no reason for saying that the sugar trust invaded that committee directly or indirectly and caused them to abandon this taxation, which is aimed right at them; but I noticed, and we all have noticed, that immediately upon the action of the committee being understood in the country sugar stock went up with a bound, and we were told here yesterday and we have been told

here to-day that there were \$30,000,000 made within four or five days in the city of New York in the increased price of sugar stock.

What does it all mean? It means that they knew that they had commanded the committee of conference of the Republican party of this Congress to abandon that taxation upon bonds and the transfer of stocks. If this taxation had been imposed and collected out of the transfers of the sugar stock, speculation in it would at once have ceased, the whole country would have subsided into quietude, and those stocks would have sought their actual level in the markets upon the basis of their actual value. They are not ahead of their actual value now; they are not up to it. It is the expectation of the holders of these stocks and bonds, the stocks particularly, that they will go up to 150.

But a very large amount of revenue would have been yielded to the country by the gamblers, who are able to pay it without any sort of distress, and then we should have had the satisfaction of knowing that the Congress of the United States in imposing taxation upon the people did not find themselves constrained and compelled to strike out the tax simply because it fell upon the sugar trust. Sir, if this sugar trust had not been provided for by a high duty in this bill, that excitement in Wall street which made the speculators \$30,000,000, and has lost that much money to the people, would not have taken place.

When we hear of these enormous fortunes piled up by gambling operations in Wall street upon stocks and upon bonds, do we understand that the winners are simply levying so much upon the riches of the losers? Not so, Mr. President.

The winners live upon riches worked out of the soil of the country and out of the factories and the mines and the forests at the low rates of wages, ranging from 50 cents to \$3 or perhaps \$2.50 a day. That is the money these men earn. That is the money the gamblers pocket. The poor, deluded people, held in the leash by party fealty, will follow their flag although it leads them straight into the pit of poverty and destruction.

This committee takes it upon itself to strike out the tax upon the sugar-trust bonds and the transfers of sugar-trust stock. It has assumed that responsibility. It has assumed it upon excuses which it itself has withdrawn and refused to be responsible for in debate on the floor of the Senate.

Now, sir, having done so, I am here for the purpose of making the charge against the Republican party upon these facts, that they have intentionally stricken down a measure introduced by one of the leading Republicans in the Senate, approved by their own caucus, recommended by their own committee, passed without a division in the Senate, which taxed the corporations, the sugar trust, millions of dollars. They have assumed the responsibility of striking out the tax, and I charge it upon them that they have done this under the command of the sugar trust. That one statement, proved as it is in law and in fact and upon evidence which can not, I think, be disputed, is enough to condemn this bill, and there is nothing that can hold men to vote for it under these circumstances except simply the party whip.

It makes no difference about the people. Let them be sacrificed. Why not? They can recover from it after a while, and perhaps before they find out what struck them. Through the providence of God in giving us this rich and splendid country they will recover. Let them alone and let them suffer! All the riches of the dealers in money and credit come from the sufferings of the poor and from their toil, after all. How many of the gamblers in Wall street ever planted a grain of corn or sowed a handful of wheat, or followed a plow, or drove a wagon, or dug a ditch or a well to get water for himself and his family? How many of these diletant fellows, born with gold spoons in their mouths, educated in the fine universities, and congregating in Wall street, taking advantage of their party discipline, having bought their places in the party influence as men buy their seats on the stock boards, for so much money, ever did one of those things?

The hard-handed men I am trying to defend and protect are compelled by stress of your law and by the stringency of Republican party rule to submit to great wrongs. Nine millions of the burden of this tax is rolled upon their shoulders when the committee, the caucus, and the Senate voted to roll it upon the shoulders of these men, so much better able to bear it.

That is one feature, not the most distressing feature in the bill, however, after all. The bill in the beginning was not a necessary measure. There is no occasion for tearing up the existing tariff laws of the United States root and branch when, under all the disadvantages from hard times all over the world, the tariff bill which first came in in 1894 has gone on until the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] this morning admitted that there was only \$47,000,000 deficit, and that we are fast pulling out. He called it \$47,000,000 deficit. That is his own way of calculating it. But the figures are just as large as he could possibly make them.

When it is said that during the time the Wilson Act has been in operation it has lacked \$47,000,000 of paying all of the expenses of the Government of the United States, it must be remembered that

during that period the expenses of the Government of the United States have increased very rapidly. When we first brought the subject under discussion, the whole country was thrilled with the accusation of a billion-dollar Congress. Now we pass bills in billion-dollar Congresses without stint; we pass them right away, without the slightest possible difficulty or objection.

Why is it? It is because the expenses of the Government, legitimate or otherwise, but most of them legitimate, require an expansion of the expenditures of the country. Notwithstanding the increase of necessary expenditures, it appears that the Wilson Act, under all these disadvantages, has fallen short only \$47,000,000 in the nearly four years that it has been in operation. Let that measure alone. Let it stand as the law of the land, to which all the industries of the country are adjusted, and it will very soon produce revenue enough to meet the most expanded extravagance of expenditure.

But how much have we got to-day with which to meet that supposed deficit? The last statement of the condition of the Treasury of the United States and the receipts of the Government is dated the 23d day of July, 1897. That was yesterday. It was given out by the Secretary of the Treasury, and in it he states that the available cash balance, including gold reserve, in the Treasury yesterday was \$235,791,748.01. Now, with that amount of idle money in the Treasury, far in excess of any debts that we are owing and are compelled to pay, let me ask why it is necessary to tear down the Wilson Act and put in its place a tariff law that very largely increases the burdens of taxation? Are the people in such a rich condition that they hold out to us in their prosperity an invitation that we shall sink the knife deeper into them and draw more blood from them? Are they rich, filled with abundance and prosperity, looking to us with hopeful eyes, glorying in the flag, in the country, and in the future? Is that the situation now?

If that be true, let me ask you why there are 300,000 men to-day lingering around the mouths of the mines where they have been working heretofore, many of them begging bread, because of a quarrel between themselves and the mine owners about a few cents difference in the hard earnings of mining men way down in dark pits in the bowels of the earth? If the people are prosperous, let us ask ourselves about that class of people. Who are they? Are they all vicious men? Are they turbulent, unworthy citizens? Do they come out of the mines to their houses and their homes where their wives and children are literally begging them for bread because they are too lazy to work or too dishonest to comply with their contracts? Is it depravity on the part of these men which drives them out of the mines and causes them to refuse to labor?

No, Mr. President, it is oppression; it is wrong; it is injustice; it is denial of just compensation to the laborer. With these men who employ them the laborer is no longer entitled to his reward. In the midst of the prosperity which the Senator from Michigan looked forward to with such prophetic eye this morning, now about to blaze out upon the world, the men who labor in the mines would be glad to get on their knees and thank God that they have the comfortable assurance of bread and meat for their children, to say nothing of milk and coffee, for the next six or eight months to come, as a reward of their daily toil.

Do not let us deceive ourselves with false hopes of prosperity. There is one class of men who are prosperous. They are the winners on the sugar stock, whom you refused to tax, and the sugar bonds that are out.

The winners were prosperous within four or five days to the extent of \$30,000,000. Suppose you would stop that operation by interposing a tax upon the transfers of stocks and bonds and the like of that, and by taxing their securities. Then you would find that these men, instead of investing their money and their genius and their skill in these paper securities, which the gamblers of Wall street handle like men do the cards in a deck, would put their money into mines and factories and other business, and they would lend it upon reasonable interest to men, young men and old men, too, who want to build up substantial prosperity, and the whole country would rejoice at such a distribution of its capital in their hands.

But just so long as we would hold off the hand of taxation, just so long as we encourage them by announcing to them that we refuse to tax them, the gamblers will rush into Wall street as the gold miners are rushing to-day into the Klondyke, in Alaska. They go there for a very different purpose, however. They expose neither life nor limb, nor is there danger of starvation, in Wall street. They go there for the purpose of amassing the millions that are to be made by gambling and speculation upon these very stocks, and we stand by and instead of taxing them, we refuse to do it. After we had made up our minds to do it, and the Senate had voted unanimously to put a tax upon the stocks, here comes a committee of conference, awed by the holders of the sugar stocks and trust bonds, and says: "You can not do it. Our friends will not stand it. It is objectionable." You gentlemen

have shouldered that responsibility, and it is never going to fall off your shoulders.

The people will hold you up to it, and that one item of responsibility, to say nothing about pine timber or anything else, will crush this bill into dust and ashes when the people get a chance at it at the next election. They are not deceived. They do not fail to understand the situation, nor, sir, do they fail to feel it. They are quiet; they are subdued; they are patient; they are long-suffering; but the time is near at hand when the people, laying their hands upon the power that belongs to an American freeman in the ballot box, will say to the men who rob them in Wall street and the men who sustain the robbery by refusing to exercise the power of the law to repress them, "Go hence; we know you not." Nevermore will that party, nevermore ought that party to command the confidence of the people of the United States after, in the conference committee, betraying them thus upon the subject of the tax on stocks and bonds.

There is no use now of disputing about who is responsible for the sugar trust. There is no use in arguing about the extent of its strength and power. When those men can come before great Senators, many of whom have been here for twenty or thirty years, and compel them to bow to their will, undo their deliberate work, reverse what they have done in solemn voting in the Senate, and by their votes strike out this just and honest tax, it is time for the balance of us to look out to see what else they can compel men to do. For my part, I despair of ever being able to check them until the people shall rise in the majesty of their might and power and command the Congress of the United States to exercise its clear and full powers of legislation for the repression of these inequalities and this enormous injustice between men.

The Wilson Act ought not to be driven to the wall. The \$235,791,748.01 heretofore taxed out of the people of this country and now housed up in the Treasury here and in the subtreasuries at other places ought to be put into circulation—every dollar of it. We have not got much over \$1,000,000,000 of circulation, including all kinds of money, and nearly a third is taken out of circulation and housed up in the Treasury; and there it is. What are you going to do with it? It is bearing no interest; it is earning nothing; it is entirely sequestered.

Why leave it there? Why tax the people to the enormous amount provided in the pending bill? It has not got a name, I believe—yes, the Dingley bill. Why tax the people to the enormous amount of the excessive taxation imposed upon them in the Dingley bill when you have lying in the Treasury a fund of \$235,000,000 and more than that? Why not use it? Why extract more from the people? Why raise the price of goods across every counter in the United States? We find that the prices of goods are going up every day, but that does not relieve against the scarcity of money.

Mr. ALLEN. Sugar has gone up.

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, sugar, of course. Sugar is the special pet of this operation. That is giving the poor man a comfortable breakfast table. He will have to put in a half teaspoonful less sweetening in his coffee if he expects to keep pace with this improvement in legislation and in public policy. It is the only chance he has. He can starve himself; he can go naked, and his children can not go to school or Sunday school in respectability, but it makes no difference. "The country grows," says the Senator from Michigan. Yes, it grows and grows, and when it has gone through a certain degree of growth and these men then want to stop it, they have nothing to do but to lock up some more money in the Treasury of the United States, shorten the currency amongst the people, let property and labor go down, and then they will find that certain parts of the country will grow, but certain other parts will shrink in order that they may grow. That is the feast to which this bill invites us. This is the public difficulty we are trying to be relieved against.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from Alabama permit me to make a suggestion? The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] said that the condition of the country in 1893 was brought about by the menace of the Wilson Act. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Alabama, as I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Michigan, to the fact that the Government was bankrupt before the close of the Harrison Administration.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; President Harrison escaped from the duties of his office just in time to avoid becoming responsible for a bankruptcy which occurred during his Administration; but we all remember that at the close of the first Cleveland Administration the great difficulty in this country was to get rid of excessive taxation and surplus money. They paid off the public debt as fast as they could come to it, and yet the money in the Treasury was piling up continually, and they had a great surplus, and Mr. Cleveland's efforts were directed, as were those of the Democratic party, to a reduction of the surplus.

When we got Mr. Harrison, it did not take very long to reduce it. When he went out he left a balance against the Government instead of in favor of it. All the surplus was gone, and \$60,000,-

000 in the special fund in the Treasury for the redemption of national-bank notes was seized and carried into the general Treasury of the United States. That was the situation.

Now we have got back, and under the Wilson bill and with the borrowing of money on bonds we are now \$235,791,748.01 ahead of the music, and the Republican party is desiring simply to increase that sum.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator from Alabama will allow me, I have here a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, which, I think, is appropriate to the present discussion. With the permission of the Senator from Alabama, I will call his attention to a letter which was written to the Hon. JOHN W. GAINES, of the House of Representatives, by the present Secretary of the Treasury, containing a copy of the original order made by Secretary Foster in reference to the issuance of bonds. I suggest to the Senator that it might be inserted without reading as a part of his remarks.

Mr. MORGAN. I am very much obliged to the Senator from California for his industry in looking up this piece of hidden history. For years and years we have been trying to trace this thing up in the Senate of the United States on some responsible foundation, and here it all is. It shows the provision Mr. Harrison had made for the issue of the very bonds which Mr. Cleveland afterwards sold:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1897.

SIR: I desire to procure the original letter, or certified copy thereof, written by Mr. Secretary Foster February 20, 1893, addressed to the Chief of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, of which the following purports to be a copy:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1893.

"SIR: You are hereby authorized and directed to prepare designs for the 3 per cent bonds provided in a Senate amendment to the sundry civil bill now pending. The denominations which should first receive attention are 100s and 1,000s of the coupon bonds and 100s, 1,000s, and 10,000s of the registered bonds. This authority is given in advance of the enactment in view of pressing contingencies, and you are directed to hasten the preparation of the designs and plates in every possible manner. I inclose a memorandum for your guidance in preparing the script for the body of the bond.

"Respectfully, yours,

"CHARLES FOSTER, Secretary.

"The CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING."

The original is now in the hands of the director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, which I called for and read this morning. I desire to use the original letter or certified copy thereof this evening, and will be specially obliged if my request can be complied with at once.

Yours, very respectfully,

JNO. W. GAINES.

Hon. LYMAN J. GAGE,
Secretary of the Treasury.

The reply I received reads as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1897.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of this date, requesting the original letter, or a certified copy thereof, written by Mr. Secretary Foster February 20, 1893, addressed to the Chief of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, authorizing the preparation of certain plates. In compliance with said request I submit below a correct copy of the letter in question, also a copy of the text of the proposed bond.

[Copy of letter.]

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1893.

SIR: You are hereby authorized and directed to prepare designs for the 3 per cent bonds provided in a Senate amendment to the sundry civil bill now pending. The denominations which should first receive attention are 100s and 1,000s of the coupon bonds, and 100s, 1,000s, and 10,000s of the registered bonds. This authority is given in advance of the enactment, in view of pressing contingencies, and you are directed to hasten the preparation of the designs and plates in every possible manner. I inclose a memorandum for your guidance in preparing the script for the body of the bond.

Respectfully, yours,

CHARLES FOSTER, Secretary.

The CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING.

TEXT OF THE BOND.

"WASHINGTON, April 1, 1893.

"This bond is issued in accordance with the provisions of section — of an act entitled 'An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1893, and is redeemable at the pleasure of the United States after the 1st day of April, A. D. 1898, in coin of the standard value of the United States on said March 3, 1893, with interest in such coin from the day of the date hereof at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, payable semi-annually on the 1st days of October and April in each year. The principal and interest are exempt from the payment of all taxes or duties of the United States, as well as from taxation in any form, by or under State, municipal, or local authority."

Respectfully, yours,

L. J. GAGE, Secretary.

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES,
House of Representatives.

I am opposed to the policy of Harrison and Cleveland both upon that point. There never was any occasion for it, and the pretended occasion that arose for doing it was the repudiation of one of the terms of the contract contained in the bonds, that they were payable in the lawful money of the United States. The repudiators who stood here and repudiated the obligations of the

Government of the United States and resorted to the gold standard, in order to burden the people still more heavily, turned around and threw up their saintly hands in horror and scorn at the thought that we were not ready to pay all our obligations in gold, and refused to coin the silver bullion in the Treasury, out of which they ought to have made the payment.

Now, these facts are all floating out of the darkness and coming to light, and may I not humbly and fervently hope to God that the people of the United States will appreciate and understand the situation thus put upon them by the combination of the money power which has compelled this conference committee to untax these bonds which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] declared should be taxed, the caucus declared should be taxed, and the Senate declared should be taxed?

Mr. ALLEN. I wish to suggest also that at the close of Mr. Harrison's Administration the Administration was indebted to the sinking fund \$40,000,000, which had not been paid.

Mr. MORGAN. Forty million dollars, and they were indebted to the fund for the redemption of national-bank notes to the extent of \$60,000,000, making \$100,000,000. They were indebted all around, but those debts were covered up, and a large number of contracts were made under appropriations for the Government of the United States that had to go unpaid. The Government was in an actual state of bankruptcy, although not apparently so on the face of the paper.

I fear that I am doing the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] very serious injustice. I know he has been in his seat for some time waiting to take the floor upon this subject. I did not observe that the Senator was here or I should have suspended my remarks before this time. I desire to call his attention to the fact, and I apologize to him for having occupied the floor very much longer than I expected or is just to myself. So I yield the floor to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, although tariff legislation is very important, I think too much importance is attached to tariff legislation at this time. I do not believe that any tariff legislation can relieve the distress which is produced by a different cause. There is a great deal of discussion over tariff legislation which seems to be entirely irrelevant. We are to have a protective tariff, and on that all are agreed, no matter how much they deny it, because they all act in the same line; they all introduce bills which put duties on competitive articles, and, as a rule, articles not produced in this country, are put on the free list. All bills are on the same general form. Consequently they are all protective legislation. I think most of the injustice which has arisen from tariff legislation, it being conceded that we shall have protective tariffs, is the inequality, the injustice, in making discriminations against classes and against interests.

It has grown, probably, out of two theories, one side having the protective theory and the other the free-trade theory. The members coming from certain sections, following the free-trade theory, neglected to secure protection for the articles produced in their sections until it became a Democratic doctrine, under Mr. Cleveland's Administration, that labor on the farm was not to be protected; it was to be left in competition with coolly labor; but labor in the shops was of a different and higher character and should be protected. Consequently the Wilson bill was framed largely on that basis. It was entirely a sectional bill. The Wilson bill, however, would have produced sufficient revenue for the support of the Government if the Supreme Court had adhered to the decisions of a hundred years and maintained the income tax. In that case it would have amply provided for revenue.

This bill is not so sectional as the Wilson Act or the McKinley Act. It has reached out and granted protection to articles produced on the farm, the fruits of California, and articles produced in the mines—lead, borax, soda ash, etc. It has also protected wool produced by the farmer, and has attempted to protect hides. Do you tell me that it is the Democratic theory that the man who raises sheep, who works in the sun to herd them and to feed them, is not as much entitled to protection as is the man who works in the shop in New England, and that the man in Texas is not as much entitled to protection as the man in Massachusetts?

Any protection whatever upon either wool or woollens falls largely upon the poorer classes. It adds to the cost of clothing. Any protection, I say, rests very largely upon them. Consequently it should be cautiously levied. But there is no caution about the levying of taxes upon woollens, and the Democrats vote for that. Why? Because it protects labor in the shops. But they will not vote for the corresponding protection for labor on the farm. It seems to me the man who will not claim protection for labor on the farm, and who represents farmers, misrepresents his constituents.

I believe much of the injustice of taxation has been because the representatives from all sections did not insist upon having the articles they produce protected equally with the articles that are produced in the shops of the East; it was because they did not insist upon equality.

The best declaration, the best platform, ever written on the subject of tariff was the Chicago platform, which in many respects was a revelation and a new Declaration of Independence, and it will make its way in the public mind as time passes on. Behold what it says:

We hold that the tariff duties should be levied for purposes of revenue, such duties to be so adjusted as to operate equally throughout the country and not discriminate between class or section, and that taxation should be limited by the needs of the Government honestly and economically administered.

There is in that no discrimination between classes or sections. If that could be done, if you could have that kind of a tariff, it would be stripped of many of the objections. I concede the fact, which is well known, that it is almost impossible to equalize taxation by import duties alone, because the farmer produces all your exports. He buys all your imports. He pays all your foreign obligation by his wheat and cotton. If you wish to protect American labor throughout, it is necessary to protect him by an export duty, which has been inaugurated and carried into successful operation by Germany in recent years. It is perfectly practicable. If the tariff could be adjusted so that it would benefit all sections alike and not discriminate between classes or sections, if it should be on the basis of equality according to the Chicago platform, who would object to it? What would the objection be?

That is the situation so far as the tariff is concerned. Now, it is assumed that we are going to get great prosperity out of this tariff bill. It is an impossibility. We did not get prosperity out of the McKinley Act. The President of the United States told us in his message in 1891 that it was the increased output of silver under the act of 1890 that had saved the country from disaster and produced prosperity, and not the McKinley tariff act, and he told the truth. In all cases it has been more money that has produced prosperity. It was more money, put out under the act of 1878, which made the boom in 1880 and 1881 and continued to make a boom until that amount got to be inadequate.

The amount of money put out under the Bland Act and under the act of 1890 saved the country from disaster and produced all the boasted prosperity which is claimed for the tariff. It was not the tariff. It was more money, more opportunity. A shrinking volume of money means falling prices. Falling prices mean stagnation. Stagnation in business means enforced idleness and want of opportunity. That is what ails this country. There are millions of people out of employment. By this means you lose more every month by enforced idleness and want of money than you can gain from any tariff you can frame.

This bill is objectionable in one especial respect. We tried to remedy it. There is now in the Treasury an unhealthy surplus amounting on yesterday to \$235,791,748. That is an unhealthy surplus. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means tells us that the bill as reported by the conference committee will produce a large surplus. We tried to have an amendment adopted providing that any surplus above \$100,000,000 should be used to retire United States bonds. We insisted that that should be done, but we were voted down. It is within the power of the Administration, perhaps, to do it now, and it is also in the power of the Administration to use the surplus for an injurious purpose. We hope it will not be done.

But the promised prosperity to come from this bill can not come. You may manufacture more, but you can not get any more money from the people than they have. You have taken their money from them and you can not get it again—they have not got it. They are going to Alaska or anywhere. Why should not men go to Alaska? Let them all go who can get there. What will be the result? Probably 75 per cent of them will die and 98 per cent will fail. Why do they go? Because they can not live here and get employment. If I were a young man, I would rather die than be without opportunities in a country. What ails this country is want of opportunity. The money kings have taken it away. It has been taken away by the gold oligarchy, the most intolerant enemy of human progress and human learning that ever was conceived in the vicious mind of man.

Every professor of economy in the colleges of Great Britain advocates bimetalism as necessary to prosperity. They are allowed to do it there. They are not interfered with. The Government of Great Britain does not interfere with them, because that country is above public opinion so far as this question is concerned. It is a great moneyed oligarchy, and it allows people to hold their own beliefs. How is it in this country? We have seen emanating from our colleges everywhere publications constantly advocating the single gold standard and defending the theory that gold is money per se; that it is not the law that puts the stamp on it, but the metal per se that is money. That is taught in the colleges throughout this country. I wondered why it was; what influences made them teach such a heresy as that; what fetish worship had reduced our colleges to that degree in opposition to the learned men of all the rest of the world. We now know.

One of the most eminent college professors in the United States,

Professor Andrews, the president of Brown University, was appointed by Mr. Cleveland one of the commissioners to the Brussels monetary conference as a gold man from a gold college. He went as such to Europe. He found it his duty to investigate the question, and he came to the conclusion as an honest and intelligent investigator that bimetalism is essential to the prosperity of the world, that gold monometallism means general disaster, and that there is no hope for prosperity in the future but through bimetalism. Bold and honest, he wrote a book, and he delivered some lectures. He promulgated his theories in a modest, convincing, logical, learned manner. What was the result?

A few weeks ago there was a meeting of the directors of that institution. A member of the other House is a member of the directory. They there resolved that the conduct of the president had deprived them of large donations and that they could not get donations from the rich if he was allowed to teach the doctrine of bimetalism. A committee was appointed. They investigated it and called his attention to the fact that if he would keep quiet he might stay; that otherwise he would destroy the institution. That was the effect of what they told him. He wrote a letter, the like of which can not be surpassed, perfectly simple, asserting his manhood, his scholarship, and his independence, and he tendered his resignation, which they received. He would not stay there and teach a doctrine which would degrade his fellow-men.

Now, here they are invading every source of information. They have the public press and they are degrading their colleges. They are making war on civilization itself to propagate a theory which means slavery. The contraction of the money volume and a continuous fall in prices means universal slavery, and that is what is intended by it.

Now, it is said the bill will bring prosperity. I want the bill passed. I wanted the Wilson bill passed. I refrained from voting when my vote would have defeated it. I wanted it passed because I wanted the Democrats to see that they could not frame a bill that would give universal prosperity. They became convinced, and seized upon the money issue. They made the issue more money. I want the rank and file of the Republican party convinced that no legislation, however good, however well it may be devised, can relieve the horrible situation produced by gold contraction. They will have the bill and I will vote for it myself. They shall have the bill, but they will have an elephant so far as carrying out their pledges are concerned.

I understand that the President proposes to send in to-day a message for a currency commission on the ground that Congress is incompetent to grapple with the money question. I understand that that is to be sent in. It looks to me as though that was another affidavit for continuance of the time when good times should be inaugurated. We shall wait, then, until the commission reports before we get good times; but if they can postpone it another year to see what a commission can do short of doing right, it will be strong evidence that the American people can be easily fooled.

I do not believe that this affidavit of continuance will be granted. I believe that the American people will begin to hold them responsible for some of their promises, which have been broken right along, month after month, for the last year.

Now, we have this great, grand promise. Let it come. "The bill is no worse than any preceding bill, and it is better than some. It is not so sectional as many. It is less sectional. I believe that the principles of the Chicago platform with regard to legislation will hereafter be recognized and carried out to a greater extent, and that we shall have protective-tariff legislation as long as we raise revenue from imposts, and that ultimately each section will contend for its interests."

Now we have got the best the Republican party can do. We have their bill. We have their word that it will bring prosperity. I predict a failure for it. It can not bring prosperity, because numbers can not be contradicted; figures will not lie. There is not enough money to produce prosperity, and it will not come under the falling prices, no matter what your tariff laws are.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 3 o'clock has arrived, when, by unanimous consent given yesterday, the vote is to be taken on concurring in the report of the conference committee upon House bill 379.

Mr. COCKRELL and Mr. WHITE called for the yeas and nays; and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHANDLER (when Mr. CANNON's name was called). On this question I am paired with the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. CANNON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea" and he would vote "nay."

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. If he were present, I would cast my vote for the bill.

Mr. WALTHALL (when Mr. GEORGE's name was called). My colleague [Mr. GEORGE] is paired with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. BERRY (when Mr. GRAY's name was called). The Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] is absent and paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM]. If the Senator from Delaware were here, he would vote "nay."

Mr. HARRIS (when Mr. KENNEY's name was called). The Senator from Delaware [Mr. KENNEY] is absent on account of illness, and desired me to announce that he is paired on this question with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE].

Mr. TILLMAN (when Mr. McLAURIN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. McLAURIN] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLINGTON]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. MARTIN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANTLE]. The junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] is paired with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. KENNEY]. It has been arranged that we transfer our pairs so that the junior Senator from Pennsylvania and myself can vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. PASCO (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. WILSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEITFELD] and vote "nay."

Mr. ALLEN. I am authorized to state that the junior Senator from Idaho does not desire to stand paired or to be counted in this vote at all.

Mr. PASCO. I was informed otherwise yesterday by one of his colleagues.

Mr. ALLEN. I have it from him direct.

Mr. PASCO. I understood the Senator himself to state otherwise yesterday. But in that event I will withdraw my vote.

Mr. PENROSE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. KENNEY]. As explained by the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], that pair has been transferred to the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANTLE]. I will therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. PASCO (when Mr. RAWLINS's name was called). The Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS] is necessarily absent, and he went away paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HANNA].

Mr. HANNA (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS]. I was not advised of his having left. I withdraw my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I am authorized to announce that if the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANTLE] were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. HANNA. I desire to state that if the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS] were present, I would vote "yea."

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to make a statement respecting the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEITFELD]. When he left here, I had a note from him stating distinctly that he occupied the same attitude as other Populist Senators on this measure. I am informed, however, that the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER] has a telegram authorizing him to be paired. Therefore I will withdraw any statement I have made.

Mr. PASCO. After the statement of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] with reference to the attitude of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEITFELD], I will renew the announcement of the transfer of pairs and vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER. I rise to announce the pair of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLINGTON] with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. McLAURIN], and to say that if the junior Senator from Maryland were present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 30; as follows:

YEAS—40.

Aldrich,	Foraker,	McBride,	Pritchard,
Allison,	Frye,	McEnery,	Proctor,
Baker,	Gallinger,	McMillan,	Quay,
Burrows,	Gear,	Mason,	Sewell,
Carter,	Hale,	Morrill,	Shoup,
Clark,	Hansbrough,	Nelson,	Spooner,
Davis,	Hawley,	Penrose,	Stewart,
Deboe,	Hoar,	Perkins,	Thurston,
Elkins,	Jones, Nev.	Platt, Conn.	Warren,
Fairbanks,	Lodge,	Platt, N. Y.	Wetmore.

NAYS—30.

Bacon,	Faulkner,	Mitchell,	Turley,
Bate,	Gorman,	Morgan,	Turner,
Berry,	Harris,	Murphy,	Turpie,
Caffery,	Jones, Ark.	Pasco,	Vest,
Chilton,	Lindsay,	Pettus,	Walthall,
Clay,	Mallory,	Roach,	White.
Cockrell,	Martin,	Smith,	
Daniel,	Mills,	Tillman,	

NOT VOTING—19.

Allen,	George,	Kyle,	Teller,
Butler,	Gray,	McLaurin,	Wellington,
Cannon,	Hanna,	Mantle,	Wilson,
Chandler,	Heitfeld,	Pettigrew,	Wolcott.
Cullom,	Kenney,	Rawlins,	

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report of the conference committee on the bill (H. R. 379) to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States is concurred in. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

Mr. ALLEN. I insist, Mr. President, that the rules of the Senate shall be enforced.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will do his best to enforce the rules of the Senate.

Mr. THURSTON subsequently said: Mr. President, I had no opportunity to speak on the conference report. I ask to have certain published articles printed as among my reasons for voting for the report.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and that order will be made.

The matter referred to is as follows:

REVENUE FROM THE MCKINLEY AND WILSON LAWS COMPARED—THE TREASURY STATISTICS—MANY MILLIONS MORE REVENUE FROM THE REPUBLICAN MEASURE THAN THE DEMOCRATIC—STATEMENTS OF THEORISTS REFUTED.

[Washington correspondence of the New York Mail and Express.]

The free-trade theorists are dusting up their old stock of falsehoods for use in the discussion of the tariff bill in the campaign. They are trotting out that ancient statement in which they have asserted thousands of times, in the face of the figures which prove the contrary, that the McKinley law was a failure as a revenue producer, and that the Wilson-Gorman Act was more successful in producing revenue than the McKinley law. They are coupling with this the more recent statements, which indicate that the exportation of manufactured goods has increased greatly under the Wilson law, and are citing this fact in substantiation of their theory that the protective system at home closes the doors of other countries to American productions.

FALSE STATEMENTS.

Neither of these statements bears analysis in the light of official figures. Neither in customs receipts, internal-revenue collections, nor total receipts has the Wilson law produced in the thirty-four months in which it has been in operation as much as was produced by the McKinley law in the corresponding months of its history. Up to the past three months, in which the Wilson law produced an abnormal revenue because of excessive importations, it had fallen more than \$90,000,000 behind the McKinley law in its production of customs receipts alone and over \$140,000,000 behind it in its total revenue produced. Even under the abnormally large receipts of the past three months, produced by reason of the excessive importations, the customs receipts under the Wilson law in its first thirty-four months are \$80,987,166 less than those under the McKinley law in the corresponding period of its existence.

In view of the fact that these false statements in behalf of the Wilson Act, and indirectly attacking the McKinley law, are being revived and are likely to be used in the coming political discussions, the following figures from the official publications of the Treasury Department will be valuable. They show the customs receipts month by month under the Wilson law since its enactment compared with the rates of the corresponding months of the history of the McKinley law; also the total Treasury receipts from all sources, month by month, under the two laws. These statements are taken from the official publications of the Treasury Department, and their accuracy can not be questioned.

Customs receipts.

WILSON LAW.		M'KINLEY LAW.	
1894.		1890.	
September	\$15,564,990	October	\$24,934,114
October	11,962,118	November	15,227,641
November	10,260,692	December	16,104,533
December	11,203,049	1891.	
1895.		January	23,897,953
January	17,961,916	February	18,954,382
February	13,334,691	March	15,373,522
March	14,929,789	April	12,591,090
April	12,453,086	May	11,995,141
May	12,474,558	June	14,168,745
June	12,130,443	July	15,468,153
July	14,076,984	August	15,164,674
August	15,629,047	September	14,120,940
September	14,653,967	October	13,980,687
October	13,773,055	November	12,659,029
November	11,455,314	December	13,836,555
December	12,169,172	1892.	
1896.		January	17,459,265
January	16,390,796	February	16,782,419
February	13,906,393	March	16,415,312
March	13,344,215	April	13,709,889
April	11,815,731	May	13,121,391
May	10,949,793	June	14,618,495
June	11,351,808	July	17,205,153
July	12,157,330	August	18,271,668
August	12,329,495	September	17,209,947
September	11,374,116	October	16,386,558
October	11,105,493	November	14,239,379
November	9,930,385	December	16,308,334
December	10,779,412		

Customs receipts—Continued.

WILSON LAW—continued.		M'KINLEY LAW—continued.	
1897.		1893.	
January	\$11,276,874	January	\$21,102,476
February	11,587,260	February	16,936,395
March	22,833,856	March	19,664,874
April	24,454,351	April	15,418,637
May	16,885,011	May	15,424,853
June	21,599,052	June	14,964,390
		July	14,683,909
Total	467,465,248	Total	548,452,414

In the production of internal revenue the Wilson law was as unsuccessful as it was in the matter of customs collections. Its internal-revenue receipts fell far short of those in the corresponding months of the McKinley law, being in its first thirty-four months \$382,722,453, while the internal-revenue receipts in the first thirty-four months of the McKinley law were \$433,772,458.

The following table shows the total receipts under the Wilson law in the first thirty-four months of its existence, ending June 30, 1897, compared with the corresponding thirty-four months of the history of the McKinley law:

Total receipts thirty-four months.

WILSON LAW.		M'KINLEY LAW.	
1894.		1890.	
September	\$22,621,228	October	\$39,222,174
October	19,139,240	November	28,678,674
November	19,411,463	December	31,106,164
December	21,866,136	1891.	
1895.		January	36,810,233
January	27,804,369	February	29,273,173
February	22,888,057	March	29,027,455
March	25,470,575	April	25,465,231
April	24,247,836	May	27,289,305
May	25,272,078	June	31,631,845
June	25,615,474	July	34,158,244
July	24,069,697	August	28,773,981
August	28,952,606	September	27,165,554
September	27,549,678	October	28,448,562
October	27,901,748	November	26,802,887
November	25,986,533	December	27,646,155
December	26,288,937	1892.	
1896.		January	39,383,748
January	29,237,670	February	30,688,944
February	26,059,228	March	28,836,036
March	26,041,146	April	26,971,224
April	24,282,893	May	28,228,398
May	24,643,717	June	30,958,617
June	27,794,219	July	34,314,331
July	29,029,909	August	33,473,058
August	25,562,096	September	31,797,628
September	24,584,244	October	31,288,540
October	26,282,829	November	28,729,895
November	25,210,693	December	33,000,963
December	25,857,114	1893.	
1897.		January	35,003,932
January	24,316,994	February	29,698,142
February	24,400,997	March	34,115,509
March	36,217,662	April	28,415,367
April	37,812,135	May	30,928,857
May	39,797,390	June	30,717,101
June	36,584,708	July	30,905,776
Total	904,200,652	Total	1,041,048,677

It will be seen by the totals of the above table that the total receipts under the Wilson law in the thirty-four months in which it has now been in operation fall over \$137,000,000 below the receipts of the corresponding months of the operation of the McKinley law.

SOME OF SENATOR VEST'S FIGURES—THEY ARE NOT VERY RELIABLE ON THE TARIFF QUESTION—SAMPLES OF INACCURACIES GIVEN IN DETAIL.

[From the Ohio State Journal, May 31, 1897.]

If the arguments which the Democrats are to offer in opposition to the pending tariff bill in the Senate are to be gauged in their accuracy or convincing power by that of their chief spokesman, Senator VEST, which he presented in his opening speech against the tariff bill, they will have little effect with members of the Senate or with the country.

Senator VEST, in his opening speech, attacked the protective theory, bringing forward as a chief argument against it the recent statement of the Bureau of Statistics and of free-trade representatives generally that the exports of manufactured articles from the United States have increased more rapidly under the low-tariff law now upon the statute books than they did under the protective tariff. In support of his statement, he presented a table, saying:

I ask permission to insert a table, for the correctness of which I have the highest official authority, showing the enormous increase in the exports of our metallic manufactures from the year 1886 to 1896, the increase being conspicuous under the derided Wilson law.

That table, as it appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of his speech, is as follows:

Article.	Fiscal year—		
	1886.	1891.	1896.
Agricultural implements:			
Mowers and reapers.....	\$1,288,000	\$1,587,000	\$2,889,000
Plows and cultivators.....	322,000	597,000	680,000
All other parts of.....	750,000	1,035,000	1,075,000
Total.....	2,360,000	3,219,000	4,644,000
Brass and manufactures of:			
Carriages, cars, and parts.....	150,000	297,000	1,026,000
Clocks and watches.....	1,928,000	4,911,000	2,747,000
Copper manufactures.....	1,366,000	1,580,000	1,639,000
Cycles, and parts of.....	109,000	190,000	819,000
Instruments and apparatus for scientific purposes.....	480,000	1,576,000	2,717,000
Iron and steel manufactures:			
Cutlery.....	112,000	146,000	188,000
Firearms.....	1,779,000	859,000	734,000
Builders' hardware, etc.....	2,466,000	3,858,000	6,140,000
Machinery, sewing.....	2,585,000	2,899,000	3,051,000
Other machinery.....	4,469,000	13,425,000	22,513,000
Nails.....	294,000	440,000	821,000
Scales and balances.....	281,000	318,000	377,000
Stoves and ranges.....	196,000	248,000	304,000
Wire.....	335,000	860,000	1,788,000
All other.....	2,284,000	3,987,000	8,193,000
Total.....	14,801,000	27,010,000	44,109,000
Lamps, chandeliers, etc.....	546,000	509,000	730,000
Musical instruments.....	871,000	1,326,000	1,209,000
Total.....	22,618,000	40,618,000	63,516,000

A comparison of the above table, as presented by Senator VEST, with the official figures of the Statistical Abstract of the United States, a publication prepared by the Bureau of Statistics under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, shows that of the 66 statements which it contains no less than 30 are inaccurate, or at least fail to correspond with the official publications of the Statistical Abstract. Of the 32 statements which relate to the exports of the year 1896 under the Wilson law, only 12 correspond with the figures of the 1896 issue of the Statistical Abstract.

While many of the discrepancies in the statements of Senator VEST's table, quoted above, are comparatively small, they are of themselves sufficient to cast a doubt upon the accuracy of the statements offered in so important a subject as that under discussion by the Senate, while in a number of cases they are so great as to render the statement absolutely valueless for comparative purposes. For instance, his statement of the value of "cycles and parts" exported in 1896 puts the figures at \$3,796,000, while the official figures of the Statistical Abstract show the exports of "cycles and parts" in 1896, \$1,898,012. It may be remarked also in this connection that the large showing which the Senator is able to make for the totals of his table are due in part to the fact that in the preceding years referred to in the table, 1886 to 1891, "cycles and parts" are not classified under that head, the manufacturer of this particular class of article having not assumed such proportions as to warrant a separate classification. His statement of the value of the wire exported in 1896 is \$1,788,000, while the statement of the Statistical Abstract gives the amount as \$1,506,885, the gain made by Senator VEST's figures thus being 18 per cent over the official figures. His total of iron and steel manufactures exported is given at \$44,109,000, while that of the Statistical Abstract is \$41,160,877.

Not only are Senator VEST's statements of the value of exports in various years and of various articles inaccurate, measured by this official publication, but an analysis of the official statements show that in nearly every case the percentages of growth of exportation of manufactures under the protective law was more rapid than under the Wilson law.

The following are a few examples of the growth of importations under the Wilson law, compared with the growth under the protective tariff:

Mowers and reapers: The exportation of mowers and reapers in the fiscal year 1894 under the McKinley law is shown by the 1896 volume of the Statistical Abstract to have been \$3,261,892; in 1896, after two years of the Wilson law, the exportations were \$3,212,423, or an actual falling off. From 1891 to 1894, however, under the McKinley protective tariff, there was a gain in exports of mowers and reapers of over 100 per cent, the exports from 1891 being \$1,579,976 and those for 1894, as already indicated, \$3,261,892.

Plows and cultivators: The 1894 exports of plows and cultivators amounted to \$539,721, and in 1896 to \$746,604, an increase of \$206,883, while from 1892 to 1893, a single year, under the McKinley law, the increase of exports of plows and cultivators was \$246,655, thus being greater in one year under the McKinley law

than in two years under the Wilson law. It may be added that the 1896 exports under the Wilson law were less by \$132,130 than they were under the protective-tariff law.

All other agricultural implements: The exportation in 1894, under the McKinley law, amounted to \$1,226,302, and in 1896, under the Wilson law, to \$1,217,746, an actual falling off again, while there had been a steady gain under the protective tariff from 1886 up to the enactment of the Wilson law, the figures for 1894 being nearly double those of 1896, which are shown by Senator VEST's table to be \$750,000. Thus it appears that in the item, "All other agricultural implements," the exportations have doubled under protection and fallen off under the Wilson law.

Brass manufactures: The exportations under the McKinley law in 1894 were \$808,427, and those of 1896, \$872,396, a gain of less than 10 per cent for the period of the Wilson law. In 1891, the first year of the McKinley law, the exports of brass were \$296,349, and in 1894, its last year, \$808,427, showing an increase of 180 per cent.

Carriages, cars, and parts of: According to Senator VEST's table, the exports of carriages and cars and parts of in 1896 were but a little over one-half of those of 1891, the first year under the McKinley law, his figures being, in 1896, \$3,747,000, while those of 1891 are \$4,911,000.

Senator VEST's list of articles might be followed through to the very end with similar results to those indicated above. In practically every case the official figures show either a falling off in exports of the articles, item by item, under the Wilson law or that the percentage of gain is less than was made under protective-tariff laws in preceding years. It is proper to add that in all cases the figures above relate to the "fiscal" years, both in the statements made by Senator VEST and in the figures quoted from the Statistical Abstract.

CAUSES OF INCREASED EXPORTS—GAIN IN VALUE BUT NOT IN VOLUME UNDER THE WILSON LAW—THEORIES OF LOW-TARIFF ADVOCATES ANALYTICALLY CONSIDERED.

[From the Chicago Inter Ocean.]

WASHINGTON, June 6.

The free traders on the Democratic side of the Senate continue to "work" the Treasury figures, which show an increase in exportations, making this now their chief argument against the protective theory, as exemplified in the pending tariff bill. Senators CAFFERY, GRAY, JONES, and VEST have, during the last week, expatiated at length upon the remarkable growth in the exportations of American manufactures under the Wilson law, and assume that this increase is due, in some mysterious way, to the reduced duties on importations which the Wilson law provides.

While it is a fact that the total value of exportation of domestic manufactures has increased since the enactment of the Wilson law, the gentlemen who parade figures, sometimes correct, sometimes incorrect, upon this subject are very careful to omit details as to the causes. An analysis of the foreign commerce of the United States in manufactured articles since the enactment of the Wilson law furnishes an array of facts which not only fails to sustain their theory but proves that the causes of increase are due to the opening of new markets abroad by reason of this country's reduction in the tariff rates.

CAUSES OF INCREASED EXPORTS.

There are three distinct causes for the increase in exportation of domestic manufactures in the United States during the past two or three years:

1. The enormous importation of manufactured goods from abroad, thus compelling American manufacturers either to seek a market outside of their own country or else suspend operations.
2. The increased prices received for certain articles which have been for years exported in large quantities, this advance in price making a much larger increase in the receipts than in the actual increase in exportation of the articles themselves.
3. The special demand abroad for the styles more readily supplied by the natural resources of the United States than by any other part of the world.

That the increase in importations of manufactured goods under the reduced rates of the Wilson law should have had the effect of forcing American manufacturers to seek a market abroad is apparent by an examination of the statistics of imports since the Wilson law went into effect. The importations classified by the Statistical Abstract as "articles manufactured ready for consumption" and "articles of voluntary use, luxuries, etc.," increased in the fiscal year 1896 over \$80,000,000, compared with 1894, the last fiscal year under the McKinley law. The importations of articles manufactured ready for consumption in 1894 amounted to \$99,320,455 and in 1896 to \$160,203,651, while in articles of voluntary use, luxuries, etc., the increase was from \$69,697,719 in 1894 to \$89,282,219 in 1896.

DOUBLED BY INCREASED IMPORTS.

This enormous increase of \$80,000,000 in the importation of manufactured articles is of itself sufficient to much more than crowd the manufactured goods to the amount of increase thus boasted of. The exportation of domestic manufactures in the fiscal year 1894 under the McKinley law was \$183,728,808, and in 1896, \$228,571,178, showing an increase of exportations of manufactured articles equal to only about one-half of the increase in importations of manufactured articles.

To put it in a single sentence, this was an increase of over \$80,000,000 in importations of manufactured goods and an increase of \$40,000,000 in exportations of manufactured goods. Every dollar's worth of increase in exportation of domestic manufactures was preceded by \$2 worth of increased importation of foreign manufactures.

That the increase of exportation of domestic manufactures is largely due to the increase of importation of manufactured articles from abroad is further shown by the fact that during the enormous importations of last March and April, which have exceeded any months in the history of the country, the exportation of manufactured articles has also been greater than in any other months in the history of the country.

OFFICIAL FIGURES QUOTED.

This fact is further shown by the official figures of the Bureau of Statistics, which indicate that in the very articles in which occurred the large increase in exportation of manufactures in the first two years of the Wilson law the increase in importations was much greater.

The increase of exportations on twenty chief articles of manufacture in 1896 amounted to \$35,470,376, as compared with 1894 under the McKinley law, while the increase of importations of these very same classes of articles in 1896 was \$74,294,632, as compared with 1894 under the McKinley law. These articles are manufactures of cotton, copper, flax, hemp, glass, iron, steel, leather, paper, wood, rubber, tobacco, and wool, also agricultural implements, art works, chemicals, fish, soap, and grease.

The increase of importations in these articles alone in 1896 from 1894 was more than double the increase in the exportations in the corresponding years, and this is true with a large proportion of the manufactured articles which have shown an increase in exportation.

Another cause of the apparent increase in exportations is the fact that the prices obtained abroad for certain lines of manufactures of this country have very largely increased in the last two years, thus making a phenomenal increase in the receipts, while in point of fact there has not been an increase in the exportations of the articles themselves.

While nobody objects to the fact that American manufacturers are getting prices abroad for their goods, the theory of the free traders assumes that low tariff will open new markets and increase the quantity of exportations. It is a remarkable fact, however, that the articles which in 1896 show the largest increase in exportation as measured by dollars show an actual falling off in exportation as measured by quantities.

COMPARISON OF VALUES AND VOLUME.

For instance, the figures of the Statistical Abstract show an increase of \$18,000,000 in the receipts for illuminating oil exported in the fiscal year 1896, as compared with the fiscal year 1894, the last year under the McKinley law, yet the quantity exported in 1896 was actually less than in 1894. The value of illuminating oils exported in 1894 was \$30,676,217 and in 1896 \$48,630,920. Here is an increase of 60 per cent in the number of dollars received for a single article, while the quantity was actually reduced from 730,000,000 to 716,000,000 gallons.

The same is true of naphthas, which increased materially in the number of dollars received, but fell off 20 per cent in the number of gallons exported.

The same conditions are apparent in other articles—for instance, sole leather, of which was exported in 1896 \$7,474,021 in value, being an increase of 16 per cent over 1894, while the number of pounds actually decreased a full million, being 41,818,503 in 1896, against 42,877,497 in 1894.

When it is remembered that these articles are the very ones which furnish the bulk of the increase in the total values of manufactured exports, it will be seen that the assumption that actual exportations have increased under the Wilson law is not only erroneous but misleading.

FIGURES UNDER HIGH AND LOW TARIFF.

The gentlemen who are insisting that the low tariff caused an increase in exportation of manufactured articles do not seem to have looked further back than the last two years to see whether there had been a corresponding increase of exportation of manufactures under protection. Had they done so, they would have found some figures which would have spoiled their theories.

For instance, Senator VEST, who recently called special attention to the increase in exportation of manufactures of iron and steel, would perhaps be astonished to find that the exportation of bar iron increased from 1892 to 1894, under the McKinley law, 134 per cent, while from 1894 to 1896, under the Wilson law, it increased only 18 per cent.

The exportation of iron plates and sheets increased from 1892 to 1894, under the McKinley law, 972 per cent, and from 1894 to 1896, under the Wilson law, fell off 78 per cent.

The exportation of steel plates and sheets increased from 1892 to 1894, under the McKinley law, 470 per cent, and from 1894 to 1896 only 38 per cent.

The exportation of steel rails and bars increased from 1892 to 1894 95 per cent, while the increase from 1894 to 1896 was but 44 per cent.

The exportation of wire increased from 1892 to 1894 71 per cent, and from 1894 to 1896 only 58 per cent.

The above figures relate to pounds, not values. Similar facts could be cited as to a great number of other articles.

FOREIGN PROTESTS AGAINST THE NEW TARIFF ARE HARMLESS—WAY THOSE NATIONS HAVE—AMERICAN DUTIES ARE ALWAYS NATURALLY OBJECTED TO—RETALIATION BY THE DISSATISFIED GOVERNMENTS IS SURE TO PROVE UNPROFITABLE TO THEM.

[From the Chicago Inter Ocean.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 27.—(Special telegram).

Will the "protests," so called, of foreign nations against the tariff which the United States is about to establish be seriously considered by Congress in the final shaping of the tariff bill, or if not considered, will the enactment of the tariff law be followed by any adverse results in our commercial or other relations with those countries?

This is a question which members of Congress are asking each other seriously just now, and are also asking Government officials whose records are relied upon to show the history of former occasions of this sort and their result. The opponents of the bill are pluming themselves upon the fact that sundry countries have either by diplomatic utterances or discussions in their legislative bodies and the press expressed dissatisfaction with certain features of the proposed tariff law and a disposition to make a protest of some sort against it. While this is true as regards a number of countries, it does not give the experienced tariff students or legislators the slightest uneasiness. It is no new thing to them. Similar protests have come to them and to the Government time after time, in former considerations of tariff measures, and they have been politely received, as these are, carefully "filed" in a convenient pigeonhole, and never heard from afterwards, either in the framing of the bill or in their bearing upon future commercial relations of those countries with the United States.

A ONE-SIDED PRACTICE.

This custom of filing protests against pending tariff measures is altogether a one-sided one as relates to the United States and the nations which have made these protests. Tariff laws come and go with other nations, and the United States pays not the least attention. A protective-tariff system grows apace in Europe and elsewhere, and such nations as France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Spain, and others which are now scolding about our proposed new tariff, increase year by year or from period to period their protective tariff rates; but in all these cases the world over, the United States never entered a protest of general character against anybody's tariff laws or proposed tariff legislation.

There have been occasions in which attention has been called to certain of their laws or regulations which seemed to bear unjustly upon a single industry in the United States or to discriminate against productions of this country as compared with those of other countries, but there is no case on record in which the Government of the United States has offered any protest to a general tariff measure proposed by other countries which would bear with equal weight upon all nations sending their products to the markets of those countries.

That any nation should assume to offer a protest against a proposed law by another nation, which law is to bear with equal weight upon the productions of all nations, article by article, seems rather absurd; but that these protests should come from nations which themselves have a high and steadily growing protective tariff adds much to the interest, not to say the impertinence, of such a proposition. It seems a little curious, for instance, to observe that Italy, which collects about \$5,000,000 a year tariff on American petroleum and equally high rates on many other articles, should be offering a protest, either officially or otherwise, against tariff legislation by the United States.

INCONSISTENCY OF GERMANY.

Some people might suppose it a trifle inappropriate that Germany, which collects a tariff of \$285.60 per hundred kilos on certain grades of clothing and 1,200 marks per hundred kilos on

other articles of a similar character, should be assuming to offer a protest against tariff measures of any other country. There might seem a slight impropriety in a protest from France, which places a duty of \$289.50 per hundred kilos on smoking tobacco and 3,600 francs per hundred kilos on cigars and cigarettes. So, also, there might appear reason for criticism upon a protest from Spain, which in her tariff places a trifling duty of 1,300 pesetas on every four-seated coach or calash imported and 975 pesetas on each omnibus and diligence.

But there is a practical business side to this question of protests against our tariff, and especially as to the probability of any action following these protests. It is one thing to make a bluff while a measure of this character is under consideration and quite another to "call" the tariff and commercial hand of such a nation as the United States, especially under the circumstances existing in our commercial relations with those countries which are reported as hinting at retaliation in case their protests are not regarded.

NATIONS THAT GRUMBLE.

Among the countries which are reported as offering objections, either officially, unofficially, or in public prints, in reference to our new tariff are Japan, China, Austria-Hungary, Germany, France, Italy, Turkey, Greece, Spain, Netherlands, Switzerland, Argentina, Mexico, Canada, and possibly Brazil. Less than half this number have filed formal protests at the State Department, but there have been sundry grumblings and mutterings among the others, either in their legislative bodies, in the individual utterances of their representatives here and elsewhere, or in the public press.

The practical business question with regard to these people and Governments is whether they can afford to take any retaliatory steps against a tariff which makes no discrimination as between countries, or which does not discriminate against any one of them individually. If they were to attempt retaliation by adverse legislation which should exclude American products from their markets, or discriminate against our productions in any way, it would be expected, and very properly, that the United States would return the compliment by excluding or discriminating against the products of the country which had taken such action.

The practical business results of an occurrence of this kind would be that nearly every one of the countries in question would suffer a greater loss in the sale of her products than would the United States. Of the fifteen countries included in the above list, thirteen sell more goods to the United States than they buy from us, and the total sales of the fifteen countries in question to the United States are hundreds of millions of dollars greater than are our sales to them. The result would be that if they should undertake to exclude our goods from their ports similar action on our part would cut off a much larger market for their producers than would their action affect the markets of our own producers.

MERELY A BLUFF.

An attempt at retaliation by the countries in question, with possibly two exceptions, would therefore be much more disadvantageous to them than to the United States. Hence the improbability that the nations which are offering these protests have the slightest expectation that their action will be anything more than a mere bluff, or be followed by any attempt at retaliation by them in case their protests are unheeded.

A few examples of the commercial relations existing between some of the nations in question and the United States will be sufficient to show that there is no probability that they are going to endanger their own business and the markets for their own producers by any steps which might possibly close the ports of the United States against their productions. In the statements which follow a ten-year period has been covered in showing the commercial relations between the United States and the countries in question, in order to give a fair average showing of the sales of those countries to people of the United States and the return sales of our products to those countries.

It will be observed in the statements which follow that in practically every case the countries now suggesting retaliation which would affect commercial relations have sold us very much more of their productions than we have sold to them, and therefore any action on their part disturbing or closing these relations would cut off a larger market for themselves than they would destroy for us. Japan has sold to us in the past decade \$212,790,200 worth of goods and bought from us \$45,007,117 worth of our productions. China's sales to us in the past ten years are \$189,246,849, and her purchases from us \$54,219,710. Austria-Hungary's sales to us in the past ten years are \$83,301,481 and her purchases from us \$10,993,224.

The total sales of the fifteen countries which are reported as complaining, formally or otherwise, of our tariff have been in the past ten years \$4,843,943,523, while their purchases from us in the same length of time have been only \$3,059,220,782. Thus they have sold us in the past decade \$1,784,722,841 worth of goods in excess of

what they have bought from us, or an average of \$178,472,284 per annum.

TABULAR STATEMENT OF THE CASE.

The following table shows our purchases from and sales to each of the countries in question during the past decade:

	Imports into United States (1888-96) from protesting countries.	Exports from United States (1888-96) to protesting countries.
Greece	\$10,184,800	\$1,512,584
Turkey	46,978,714	1,732,357
Argentina	57,905,788	57,235,506
Austria-Hungary	83,301,481	10,993,224
Switzerland	138,919,678	232,482
China	189,246,849	54,219,710
Italy	207,502,145	143,397,604
Netherlands*	212,743,794	313,708,200
Japan	212,790,200	45,007,117
Mexico	230,772,832	138,182,178
Canada	386,006,478	463,071,742
France	603,428,302	586,500,336
Brazil	733,723,990	120,677,691
Spain*	753,600,426	230,355,338
Germany	868,766,566	832,455,064
Total	4,843,943,523	3,059,220,782

* Including colonies.

EDITOR KLETT FAR AWAY FROM THE TRUTH—THE CINCINNATI CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SPEECH A GLITTERING (?) ARRAY OF TARIFF INACCURACIES—OFFICIAL FIGURES PULLED ON THE GENTLEMAN.

[Special by telegraph to the Cincinnati Times-Star.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 3.

If the attacks which are being made by representatives of foreign countries upon the new tariff bill are to be gauged in their accuracy or the reliability of their statements by that recently made at Cincinnati by Editor Klett, of the Argentine Republic, they will have very little weight with the people of the United States.

The attack in question was made in a speech before the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce on Monday, June 26. Mr. Klett is quoted in the dispatches, which cover a portion of his remarks, as "editor of the most prominent newspaper in his country, and a specialist in wools, hides, and skins."

Mr. Klett bewails the fact that the United States is placing a duty upon the two principal products of his country which are exported to the United States, viz, wool and hides, and adds that "We have over 100,000,000 sheep, which produce every year about 250,000,000 kilos of wool, and this article has always been imported into the United States free of duty, the same as we have imported free of duty your machinery and your petroleum."

To crowd into a single sentence as many inaccuracies as this "specialist in wools, hides, and skins" has here presented is, to say the least, an exercise of a capacity beyond that of the most erratic members of his profession in the United States. His statement that their wool has always been imported into this country free of duty is pronounced absolutely inaccurate and misleading by the most experienced and careful Treasury experts. "Such a statement," said one of the oldest Treasury officials, discussing the matter, "is certainly grossly erroneous. I have been following tariff laws and tariff operations myself for many years, and I know that during all the years that I have had to do with tariff laws no class of wool has been upon the free list until the enactment of the Wilson law. Certainly a statement that any class of wool 'has always been imported into the United States free of duty' is far from being accurate."

An examination of the tariff laws covering the period since the introduction of the protective system by the Government shows that a protective duty has always been levied against foreign wools until the enactment of the Wilson law.

Editor Klett's statement with reference to the commerce between the United States and his own country is equally misleading. In his remarks he says:

The imports from the United States to the Argentine Republic in 1896 amounted to \$11,210,475, and the exports from the Argentine Republic to the United States amounted to \$3,401,362.

The official statement of the Treasury Department covering the importations from Argentina into the United States and the exports from the United States to the Argentine Republic show that the exports from the United States to the Argentine Republic in the fiscal year 1896, instead of being \$11,210,475, as stated by Mr. Klett, were \$5,979,046, and instead of the importations from Argentina being \$6,401,362, as stated by Mr. Klett, they were \$9,313,385. This puts the shoe entirely upon the other foot, showing that the present balance of trade is favorable to the Argentine

Republic instead of being favorable to the United States, as claimed by Mr. Klett.

Another of the numerous inaccuracies of Mr. Klett's statements is with reference to the admission to his own country of the products of the United States, regarding which he says: "We import free of duty your machinery and your petroleum." An examination of the Argentine tariff, revised for the year 1896, as published by the international customs tariff bureau at Brussels and accepted by the United States Treasury Department as accurate, shows that, instead of our machinery and petroleum being imported free into the Argentine Republic, the tariff rates of that country on "machinery of all kinds of the value of 100 pesos and more, and extra parts thereof," are 10 per cent ad valorem; "machines and materials for public illumination and for public water-works and sewers," 5 per cent ad valorem; on vehicles, 50 per cent ad valorem, and on carts for conveyance of cereals, 10 per cent ad valorem. Instead of petroleum being imported free, as stated by Mr. Klett, this official publication shows that it is dutiable at 1½ centavos per liter. This is equivalent to over 5 cents (silver) per gallon. These statements relate to refined petroleum, only the crude article being admitted free. The only class of machinery admitted free of duty is that used in agriculture.

Editor Klett's criticisms upon our tariff are looked upon as especially unique in view of the fact that his own country levies a tariff on nearly every article entering its ports and upon a large number of articles exported. Wools and hides, of the duty upon which he especially complains, are subjected by his own Government to an export duty of 4 per cent ad valorem on every pound going out of the Argentine Republic, while the imports levied by his own Government upon tanned skins are 40 per cent ad valorem, which is higher than the rates on either tanned or raw hides named by the pending bill. On other articles imported from the United States into Argentina the rates of duty range even higher, being 50 per cent on leather bags, boots or shoes, ready-made or in pieces, vehicles, furniture, harness, clothing, hats and caps, and many articles of this class.

If Editor Klett is no more accurate in his assertions as to the prospective effect of our new tariff law on our commercial relations with his country than with his statements upon subjects upon which he ought to be entirely familiar, his predictions will be of little value.

WORKING WOMEN AND WORKINGMEN'S WIVES—HOW THE TARIFF AFFECTS THEM—TESTIMONY OF WOMEN AS WITNESSES—THE WILSON-GORMAN ACT RESPONSIBLE FOR HARD TIMES—PROTECTION, NOT FREE SILVER, THE TRUE REMEDY—LABOR'S PROTEST.

In the conflict against cheap money let us not forget cheap labor. Cheap money and repudiation would bring national dishonor. Cheap labor would bring national disgrace.

Before the present silver agitation men, women, and children throughout the country were out of labor and hungry; cheap or dear money will not help these to help themselves unless they can be afforded an opportunity to work.

What is the matter? At the close of the last Republican Administration labor was more fully employed and at a better wage than at any time in the history of this or any other nation. What caused the change? The present Democratic Administration, with its free-trade policy, is the cause. It is because the industrial life of the nation is stricken down, as well as because its financial integrity is assailed, that we urge voters and women everywhere to stand by the Republican party and the man, William McKinley, who will restore and uphold that bulwark of American prosperity; protection to American labor and industry.

If protection were the only issue in this campaign, it would be enough to stir the heart and the energies of every good citizen for the success of the Republican ticket, which means labor and bread for thousands of people, men and women, who are out of employment by reason of vicious economic laws, passed at the behest of Democratic free traders.

The woes of the wage-earning man—reduced pay, short hours, out of work, empty dinner pail, hungry children, weary wife—with these we are familiar; they are with us continually. But it may not be known or remembered that there are over 3,000,000 women wage earners in these United States. Not one of these hard-working, intelligent, and self-respecting women has escaped the effects of the blight which has come to the industrial life of the nation. Some have accepted reduced wages; others are out of work and living on savings made under the McKinley tariff bill. Other poor unfortunates have fought against adversity as long as they could, and have finally gone to the wall. The blight continues and will continue until protection to our industries is restored.

If women could only see and know the change that has come to wage earners since the repeal of the McKinley bill, they would see

that this question of dry economics has a human side, a home side, a heart side.

Poverty always exists; distressing scenes could have been witnessed any day during the past twenty years; but these conditions were produced by accidental causes and personal conditions wholly independent of economic laws. The poverty to which we now call attention is not of this sort. It is the poverty produced by business depression, directly caused by the overthrow of protection. And such poverty! Mothers, with babes in their arms, starving because husband and father has no work. Young girls, hungry and defenseless, with nothing to do and nothing to eat. Those who are well fed do not know what it is to be hungry. Oh, the shame of it; that hundreds of men and women and children, white and black, native and foreign, should crowd and jostle each other and fight for a chance at the counter where charity dispenses soup and bread! These scenes have been enacted in all of our great cities since protection was stricken down. Such scenes will continue and intensify until protection is restored. The whole industrial system has been affected; no one interest is independent of others. If one is weakened, all suffer. When the factory "shuts down," the woman operative has no "pay-day envelope" from which to take money for holiday or everyday clothes and pay her board, or, if she be a home-keeper, her rent and grocery bills.

When the shopkeeper's receipts are thus depleted, he cuts down the wages of the girl who stands behind the counter, or tells her he needs her no longer; the butcher and the baker do the same; the dressmaker, the milliner, the plain sewer, the sewing-machine operative, women bookkeepers, stenographers, and typewriters, all are in less demand, and reduce their expenses to the limit of actual necessity. Farm women must sell their butter and eggs and other produce, if at all, at lower price. Girls, boys, men, and women are thus daily added to the army of the unemployed, to be supported by those who still exist on lowered wages from the paralyzed industries which were formerly in healthy and happy activity, or the famishing host must be humiliated and fed by charity.

Believing that all wage earners, especially women, are better off in every way under the American policy of protection which prevailed under the Administration of President Harrison than under a free-trade policy, and knowing that testimony from living witnesses, given in the high forum of the United States Senate, would be the best evidence which could be presented to the American people, Mrs. J. Ellen Foster went to Massachusetts and Rhode Island, and through the courtesy of superintendents of rooms and foremen of departments in factories she was allowed to see the women at their work. They came to her in their working clothes with the dust of the loom upon them. She told them that she thought their testimony would help to defeat the Wilson bill. She told them that she would take them to Washington and bring them back to their homes again. They asked, "What shall we say?" She answered, "Just tell the Senators the way things are." To their plea that they could not make speeches, she replied, "You will not have to make speeches; simply tell the condition of work and wages which you know to be true."

The testimony of these women wage earners, with questions and answers, as it was given before the Senate committee, is pregnant with industrial thought. An examination of the testimony shows that, even before the Wilson bill was passed, and while it was pending, the evils apprehended from it embarrassed the great manufacturers of the country and brought calamity to the wage earners. The moment that business began to adjust itself to the free-trade policy, labor and wages felt the shock. Manufacturing industries refused to run a wheel beyond present orders. There was less to do and less wages were paid.

This is not all that the testimony of these women wage earners shows. Their testimony emphasizes what has been claimed by advocates of protection, that wages and conditions of living under the American protective-tariff system are on a higher level than those under the merciless economics known as the "living wage" of the Old World. The testimony of these women is a solemn protest against the statement of the Chief Executive of this nation, who said, "Wages must find their level." And a noted Congressman of the West, voicing this sentiment, said on the floor of the House of Representatives, while the Wilson bill was pending before that body, he "would have wages have their natural play over the world."

Against this "play of wages" we protest. We require and demand higher wages than are paid elsewhere in the world because of the larger life which American institutions have given to women as well as to men. The elevation of labor, which is both the cause and the result of political liberty, has elevated women. Labor can not be elevated except through good wages, and wages which increase as productive wealth is increased.

In the degradation of labor, women are crowded to the wall first. The "play of wages all over the world" means that the labor of hard-working, intelligent, self-respecting women, who

are bearing their full share of the country's work and are daily adding to its wealth, shall be put in competition with the work of the beast-of-burden women of the Old World.

The rate of wages paid determines the respect in which labor is held; the respect in which labor is held is a never-failing index of woman's position in the social order. A nation may always be rated by the character of its women. By the adoption of free trade, the labor of women and of men is degraded.

TESTIMONY.

[Senate Mis. Doc. No. 160, Fifty-third Congress, second session.]

Mr. ALDRICH presented the following report of hearing of wage-earning women before Senators JUSTIN S. MORRILL, John Sherman, WILLIAM B. ALLISON, and NELSON W. ALDRICH, minority members Finance Committee United States Senate, March 29, 1894.

There were present also Senator JOSEPH R. HAWLEY, of Connecticut, and Senators GEORGE F. HOAR and HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts, and others.

Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, of Iowa, with sixteen wage-earning women of Massachusetts and Rhode Island, appeared, and presented the following witnesses:

Mrs. Harriet Branch, East Greenwich, R. I., woolen sewer:

Q. Mrs. Branch, what is your employment?

A. I am a woolen sewer.

Q. Where do you work?

A. I have had no work for the last three weeks, but I have not lost my situation. I expect to go back as soon as the work increases. The mill has not stopped altogether.

Q. How long have you been a woolen sewer?

A. I have worked in the Phoenix Woolen Mills for ten years.

Q. What wages did you receive at the mill?

A. My pay was \$9 and \$10 a week. I now earn \$3, and sometimes \$1.90 per week in plain sewing; some weeks not anything.

Q. Do you know the cause of the reduction at the mills?

A. I do not; the only thing I know is that the reduction is so I have not got work. If I have no work, I can not earn the money. The girls in our mill feel terribly about the reduction. There are twenty-five or thirty in my room alone that are supporting the mother, father, or children. Of course, when they get only \$4 a week, you can tell yourself how far \$4 a week will go with a family of two or three.

Q. (Senator ALDRICH.) Have you any family dependent on you for support?

A. I support myself and my daughter, 14 years old. She does not work in the mill; she goes to school. All I have is what I make for myself and her.

Q. Were you born in this country?

A. I was born in Scotland.

Q. (Senator ALLISON.) How do you get on in this country as compared with the old country?

A. In the old country we were kept down by not having the money to spend. Of course, in this country we have much better advantage of getting along and being one with the people. In the old country we had not that. As long as we appear as ladies in this country, we can be ladies; but in the old country it is different. Here women have a dignity, and they do not like to go elsewhere. In the old country the servant girls are considered above the mill hands. There the working class are a certain class, and they are kept distinct.

Miss Florence Briggs, Anthony, R. I., cotton weaver:

Q. At what do you work?

A. I make cotton cloths; I am a weaver.

Q. How long have you done this kind of work?

A. I have worked twelve years in the place where I am now.

Q. What wages do you make?

A. Only \$6.50 or \$7 now, where before the cut down I got \$8 and over.

Q. Do you work by the day or by piecework?

A. By piecework.

Q. When were your wages cut down?

A. A short time ago; I think it was in January. The works have not stopped; they have been running full time, but they talk of stopping if this Wilson bill is passed.

Q. Are any of your family dependent on your support?

A. I help to take care of my mother and myself. Our small farm is the only other means of support.

Mrs. Mary Brooks, Fitchburg, Mass., cotton weaver:

Q. Where do you live?

A. Fitchburg, Mass.

Q. What do you do?

A. I am a cotton weaver.

Q. How long have you been in this country?

A. I have only been in this country three years. I came from Glasgow. There I worked at weaving cotton, just the same work as I do here.

Q. What were your wages there and here?

A. I have a dollar here for a shilling at home for the same kind of work.

Q. (Senator ALDRICH.) How did you live in Glasgow as compared with Fitchburg?

A. We do not live over there the same as we do here. Smaller rooms, smaller houses, not the same comforts. For two years I made \$10 a week here, and since the cut-down \$7.50 a week. The cut-down came last fall. I do not know why. The mill stopped for two months—shut down—and then put down prices, besides.

Q. (Senator ALLISON.) Do you support anyone besides yourself?

A. I have two little boys to care for besides myself; the youngest one 3, the oldest one 5. I pay for their keep out of the wages I make. I could not do this there. That is the reason I am here. My mother came along with me.

Q. (Senator ALLISON.) What did you state about the wages in Scotland?

A. The wages there were about a shilling as compared with a dollar here. That was the ordinary pay there. I could save nothing at home. That was by the piece. We only ran two looms at home.

Q. (Senator ALLISON.) Could you have any musical instruments?

A. No; we could not have any musical instruments or spend anything out of the bare necessities of life. I lived there the same way as the others. There was as much labor over there in working as here.

Q. Is it any better here?

A. Yes, indeed; the first nine months I was here I saved \$150, besides keeping myself and children. Over there I could not save enough to bring me to this country without the help of my mother. If I had not had my mother to help me, I do not believe I would ever have gotten here.

Miss Hattie Freeman, Woonsocket, R. I., worsted worker:

Q. Where do you live?

A. Woonsocket, R. I.

Q. What do you do?

A. I work in the Harris Woolen Company, Rhode Island. I am a worsted sewer.

Q. What pay do you get?

A. I make \$7.50 a week. It is day work. We have short time, but no reduction in price. The mill had a reduction, but not the sewers. Besides short time, they have been stopped, and then they started again; but they expect another reduction of 20 per cent; that is what they had before. The sewers get the most day pay; the weavers make the most by piecework.

Q. Do you support anyone besides yourself?

A. I take care of my mother, and we can live comfortably on what I make. I pay \$9 per month rent for six rooms for just me and mother.

Mrs. Amy Lees, New Bedford, Mass., cotton weaver:

Q. What do you do?

A. I am a cotton weaver.

Q. Where have you worked?

A. In this country and in Lancashire, England. I have worked seven years in this country.

Q. What was your pay there, and what is it here?

A. Over there I made 15 and 16 shillings a week off three looms. Here \$8.50 off seven looms.

Q. (Senator ALLISON.) What about the cost of living there and here?

A. It costs more to live here than there, because we have better and more things to eat here than there.

Q. Why?

A. We could not afford them in England.

Q. Would you like to go back to England to live?

A. No; I would sooner be in this country.

Alice Jukes, Cambridge, Mass., net and twine maker:

Q. In what industry are you engaged?

A. I have been fifteen years with the American Knitting and Twine Company. I work on a knitting machine. The work is piecework.

Q. How much can you make in a week?

A. Before the reduction I made \$8 a week. I make \$6.50 to \$7 now. I am on full time, but reduced wages, and expect more reduction if the Wilson bill goes through.

Q. In what branch of the business are you engaged?

A. I make gilling nets. They are made out of linen. There are a number made of cotton, but the greater number, probably, is made of linen flax.

Q. (Senator ALLISON.) Do you know the wages paid in England for work similar to that which you do here?

A. Yes; the pay over there is 6 shillings a week for the same work on the flax machine. Here we get \$7 in place of 6 shillings.

Q. Were you able to live as well on what you received there?

A. No, indeed. You can exist on 6 shillings a week, but you can not live on it, because it is not living. We survive; that is all. It is the custom of the country. But of course you do not get any chance of becoming any better.

Q. Do you support anyone besides yourself?

A. I have my mother to take care of. I help to take care of her. My sister works in the same mill, and with her help we keep home.

Q. Have you been able to save anything?

A. Yes; I have been able to save since I have been in this business, and we have built a house with the money we have got. With another reduction, of course, we could not save. We saved up \$1,000 between us, and we paid that much on the house we built.

Q. Do you live in the house you built?

A. Yes; we live in our own house.

Mrs. Agnes Pohlman, Fitchburg, Mass., cotton weaver:

Q. Mrs. Pohlman, what do you do and where are you from?

A. I am a cotton weaver, from Fitchburg, Mass., but I do not work there just now, because the mills are shut down. They have had a very hard time there since last summer—lots of suffering, with no work. If the mill is shut down, all the business is shut down; everything is down. So we had very hard times since last summer, and we had lots of poor to help. It is just as bad there now. I could not get work, and that is the reason I am not working now.

Q. (Senator ALDRICH.) Is anyone dependent on you?

A. Yes; my boy. He goes to school. I am able to take care of him when I get work.

Q. Are you from Germany?

A. Yes; I was born in Germany. I did not work very much there, because I was very young when I came from there.

Q. (Senator ALDRICH.) What about the manner of living there and here?

A. I know we could not live there as we live here, and if I had to go there and work, I would not do it, because we can live higher here. I wish we could soon have our good old times again, so that people could get work and live like they used to do. There are a lot of women out of work in our place.

Miss Hannah E. Ryan, New Bedford, Mass., cotton spinner:

Q. Miss Ryan, tell the Senators about your work.

A. I am a spinner in the New Bedford Cotton Manufacturers' Company. I have worked there thirteen years.

Q. Were you born in this country?

A. I was born in New Bedford.

Q. What are your wages?

A. My wages now are \$5.50 a week. Two years ago I got over \$6, but we were cut down in October, and they now speak of another cut-down if the Wilson bill passes. If we do not kill the Wilson bill, it will kill us. The girls in the mill know if the bill passes we will be reduced again. We can not live on less than \$5 a week.

Q. Have you anyone to support?

A. Yes; I have my mother and brother and sister to support. My brother works part of the time, but work is slack. In July it started with work for four days in the week.

Miss Annie M. Devereaux, Providence, R. I., jeweler:

Q. What is your work, Miss Devereaux?

A. I am a chain maker in the jewelry establishment of the Kent & Stanley Company, Providence.

Q. Do you work by the day or by the piece?

A. I work by the piece. I average \$9 a week, usually more, but I have been on short time a long while and do not make so much. The wages are the same, but it is short time. The loss is in short hours—same pay, but short hours.

Q. Do you know the cause of short hours?

A. Because our business is dependent upon the general prosperity of other trades. The general depression has affected us. I live at home, and there is no one dependent on me.

Miss Emily S. Young, Providence, R. I., jeweler:

Q. What is your work, Miss Young?

A. I am a shipping clerk for the manufacturing jewelers Potter & Buffington, Providence. I have worked there sixteen years, not in that department, but for the firm. My work is by the day or week.

Q. What do you receive per week?

A. I receive \$10 a week.

Q. Is your business good at the present time?

A. In all the years that I have worked there, I have not known them to work so short hours as they are working now; never. Of course now and then a day or job work, but the shop seems almost closed.

Q. (Senator ALDRICH.) Could you estimate the reduction?

A. At least 50 per cent from now and two years ago.

Q. Miss Young, are you dependent on yourself for support?

A. Yes; I am dependent on myself for support; my sister and I together support ourselves.

Miss Mary J. Ryan, Woonsocket, R. I., cotton weaver:

Q. Miss Ryan, please state your business.

A. I am a cotton weaver. I have worked twenty-three years for the Social Manufacturing Company. I have always done weaving.

Q. What has been your average wages?

A. I averaged \$10 a week until September, 1893. In October \$9 a week—\$1.50 a day.

Q. Why did your wages fall from \$10 to \$9?

A. The depression in business, owing to the tariff question, caused the works to be stopped for two weeks, and for four months following the work was slack. They stopped last October. Then they ran on full time, but had a scarcity of work.

Q. (Senator ALDRICH.) Explain what you mean by that.

A. I mean that you can run four or five or six looms, but if you have only two or three looms you will be there and your time will be taken up, but you will not earn so much.

Q. Do you know why the work was slack during the time you have mentioned?

A. I was never told why the work was slack, but I learned through the press.

Q. (Senator ALDRICH.) Have you been able to save anything from your wages?

A. Yes, I have been able to save something in these years, but I have not saved anything for nine months. If this Wilson bill goes into effect, we suppose our wages will be reduced.

Miss Edith Wolstoncraft, Taunton, Mass., cotton weaver:

Q. Please state what kind of work you do.

A. I work at the Whittenton Manufacturing Company, on gingham weaving.

Q. What wages can you make?

A. I can make \$8 on the average a week.

Q. Have you ever worked in any other country?

A. I was born in England. I worked in England. I worked on velvets at home, at Oldham. I made from 16 to 18 shillings a week. I had two looms. I work two hours more now a week than I did at home. Fifty-eight hours now; fifty-six over there.

Q. (Senator ALDRICH.) Who do you support besides yourself?

A. I have my mother to keep. We are able to get on pretty well and keep house. I get on better in this country. I could not keep my mother at home. It is better living here. I would not go back again and work there.

Mrs. Elizabeth Tyler, Boston, Mass., carpet weaver:

Q. Mrs. Tyler, please tell the committee where you work.

A. I work at the Roxbury Carpet Mills. It was twenty-one years last November since I began there.

Q. What wages do you get?

A. I average my wages for 1892 and 1893, up to the last of August, at eight dollars and some odd cents. Since that time the average pay up to the present time has been about \$3.50. I formerly made something over \$8 a week. I work by the piece.

Q. What was the cause of this difference?

A. The mill has been closed down twice; the first time six weeks, the last time four. There was a 10 per cent reduction on the 9th of October.

Q. (Senator ALDRICH.) Have you always worked in this country?

A. I was born in England. I worked there for the John Bright concern.

Q. (Senator ALDRICH.) How do wages paid there compare with wages paid here?

A. They paid a penny a yard, which would be equal to 2 cents; whereas our former price here was 3½ cents for weaving a yard. It is now 10 per cent less.

Miss Margaret Wright, Boston, Mass., carpet setter:

Q. Miss Wright, what is your avocation?

A. I work in the setting room of the Roxbury Carpet Works. I have worked twenty years in that one place. I am a carpet setter.

Q. Have you had steady work?

A. We shut down from last August to the last of October, going back to 10 per cent reduction. If this Wilson bill goes into effect, it means further reduction for us, and it means not steady work, which we have not had since last April. I do not only speak for myself, but for all the girls who work in the department with me. I happen to be the fortunate one who was chosen by the girls in my department to come here. No one of the company had anything to do with it. I think if this bill goes into effect it will lower our wages and bring us to the standard of old country people. It is degrading the working people. In the department with me there are 84 girls; a great many with invalid mothers, brothers, and sisters dependent upon them. I can say that in Roxbury in September, and especially during November and December, the suffering was something terrible. There are some seven or eight hundred people dependent on the Roxbury mill; not only the people who work there, but also the people who keep stores. We hope the bill will not pass.

The bill did pass and their worst fears were realized.

QUICK WORK IN PASSING A TARIFF LAW—A HISTORY OF TARIFF LEGISLATION FROM THE DAYS OF WASHINGTON SHOWS THAT THE PRESENT CONGRESS IS GOING AHEAD MORE RAPIDLY THAN ANY PREVIOUS CONGRESS, IN SPITE OF THE FACT THAT THE SENATE IS PRACTICALLY UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE DEMOCRATIC ORGANIZATION.

[Bureau of the Baltimore American.]

WASHINGTON, June 20.

People who are complaining of what they assume to be the slow progress of the tariff bill will probably be surprised to know that no Administration since that of Washington ever placed upon the statute books a tariff measure within as brief a period of its inauguration as will that of President McKinley. There is every reason to suppose that the tariff bill will go upon the statute books before the end of July, probably much sooner than that. If this shall happen, President McKinley will have an opportunity to attach his signature to a general tariff measure earlier in the history of his Administration than has any President since George Washington signed the first tariff act on July 4, 1789.

This remarkable record which is likely to be made with reference to the present tariff bill is made more remarkable by two facts: First, that every year's development of our commerce and manufactures adds to the complications and difficulties in framing a tariff measure; and second, the fact that the party in control of the Administration controls only one branch of Congress.

The first tariff act placed upon the statute books was signed by George Washington July 4, 1789. Not only was it the first tariff act under the Constitution, but the first protective-tariff measure indicating in its preamble that "It is necessary for the support of Government, for the discharge of debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures that duties be laid on goods, wares, merchandise imported," etc. The consideration of this act occupied but about two months' time, as Washington was not inaugurated until April 30, and the work upon the tariff bill did not begin, of course, until after that time. This tariff act was, of course, very brief, the space occupied being probably less than one-twentieth of the bill now under consideration. Several other tariff measures were adopted during Washington's Administration, most of them being an increase upon the rates named by the first measure.

John Adams, who became President March 4, 1797, did not sign the tariff bill enacted under his Administration, which increased the rates of duty on sugar, molasses, wines, etc., until May 13, 1800, over three years after his inauguration.

Jefferson, who was inaugurated March 4, 1801, did not attach his signature to a general tariff measure until March 26, 1804, the bill passed at that time having for its object an increase in the revenue to supply funds for the war with the Barbary powers. This act increased the ad valorem rates, and on the following day a similar act, increasing the specific rates, was signed, both of them being more than three years after Jefferson's inauguration.

Madison was inaugurated March 4, 1809, and the first important tariff, to increase duties 100 per cent on account of the war with Great Britain, was signed July 1, 1812, more than three years after his inauguration. He also signed a general tariff act April 27, 1816, three years after his second inauguration.

Monroe was inaugurated March 4, 1817, and signed his first and only general tariff act May 22, 1824, more than seven years after his first inauguration.

John Quincy Adams was inaugurated March 4, 1825, and signed a general tariff act May 19, 1828, more than three years after his inauguration.

Jackson was inaugurated March 4, 1829, and signed his first general tariff act July 14, 1832, more than three years after his inauguration, while the Clay compromise reduction act was signed March 2, 1833.

Van Buren's Presidential term, which began March 4, 1837, was not marked by the enactment of any important tariff legislation.

William Henry Harrison, who was inaugurated March 4, 1841, issued, on March 17, a call for a special session of Congress, to begin May 31, indicating by the proclamation that the subject to be considered was the financial difficulties of the Government. The tariff act finally passed by the Congress which that proclamation called into special session did not become a law until August 30, 1842, or fifteen months after the date named for the beginning of the special session.

Polk's term of service began March 4, 1845, and the "Walker tariff," which was the special tariff feature of his term, did not become a law until July 30, 1846, sixteen months after his inauguration as President.

The Taylor Administration, which began March 5, 1849, did not witness the enactment of any general tariff legislation, owing to the fact that the Democrats controlled the House of Representatives during the first two years of his term as President, and he lived less than half of the term.

Pierce, who was inaugurated March 4, 1853, signed, on March

3, 1857, the last day of his term as President, the only general tariff measure enacted during his four years in the White House.

Buchanan, during his four years, which began March 4, 1857, signed no general tariff legislation until March 2, 1861, two days before the close of his term. This act, signed two days before his retirement, was the Morrill tariff act, a thoroughly protective measure, whose passage was made possible at that time because of the fact that a large number of the Southern Democratic members of the Thirty-sixth Congress had withdrawn, leaving Congress in the control of the Republican party, which thus placed a tariff act upon the statute books two days before the inauguration of Lincoln.

President Lincoln, who was inaugurated March 4, 1861, signed his first general tariff act on August 5 of that year, and this was followed by the passage, in July, 1862, and June 3, 1864, of other tariff measures to which his signature was attached.

Grant, who became President March 4, 1869, signed, July 14, 1870, his first general act relating to revenues, by which the internal-revenue taxes were reduced, this being followed by another reduction on June 6, 1872.

President Hayes, who was inaugurated March 4, 1877, signed no general tariff legislation, the House being Democratic in the first Congress under his Administration and both branches Democratic in the latter half of his term.

The Garfield-Arthur Administration, which began March 4, 1881, did not witness the enactment of any general tariff legislation until March 3, 1883, two full years after the inauguration.

Cleveland's first term was not marked by the completion of any general tariff legislation, the Mills bill, which passed the Democratic House in 1888, failing in the Senate, which was so closely divided politically, that it was found impossible to pass through it a measure satisfactory to the Administration, the substitute which was adopted by the Senate being rejected by the House, where the Democratic divisions on the tariff question, now so strongly marked, were then beginning to make themselves apparent.

Benjamin Harrison's term began March 4, 1889, and the first general tariff act passed under his Administration was signed October 1, 1890, eighteen months after his inauguration.

Cleveland's second term, which began March 4, 1893, with his own party in control of both branches of Congress, did not witness the completion of its tariff measure until August 28, 1894, nearly eighteen months after he took the oath of office.

A study of the above history of the tariff from the beginning of the Government down to the present time will indicate to those who have been inclined to criticize what they assume to be the slow action of Congress that, instead of its action being unusually tardy, it has been unusually prompt, and especially so in view of the fact that the party in control of the Administration controls only one branch of Congress—a condition under which it has seldom been possible to pass a tariff measure, even in a much greater length of time than has been or is likely to be occupied in the present instance.

AMERICAN TARIFF FROM 1789 TO 1897—A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE TARIFF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES AND THEIR EFFECT UPON THE INDUSTRIES OF HER PEOPLE—SOME TIMELY AND INTERESTING INFORMATION—COMPARATIVE EFFECT OF THE PROTECTIVE AND FREE-TRADE PRINCIPLES AS TESTED IN THE HISTORY OF THIS COUNTRY.

[By O. P. Austin.]

Congress being about to enact a new tariff law, a brief history of the tariff legislation in the United States from the adoption of the Constitution down to the present time may be of interest.

A "tariff," under the general acceptance of the term in political economy, is a tax levied upon goods coming into a country from other parts of the world. The theory upon which governments claim the right to tax articles brought in from abroad is that if persons from outside of the country or government desire to enjoy the benefits of trade with the people of that government, they ought to contribute in some degree to its support. All citizens and business interests of a state or government are expected and required to, directly or indirectly, contribute to the support of the government, and it would be injustice to those contributing at home to the support of the government to allow people outside of that government to come in and do business in competition with those who do pay taxes without contributing in some way to the support of the government.

Therefore governments have for centuries insisted upon placing a tax upon articles coming in from abroad, thus accomplishing the first object, and at the same time adding to the revenues of the government. This view has been modified in two ways; first, by the class known as "free traders," who insist that the tariff should not be used to protect those citizens of the home government who help support it, but that the taxes should be placed upon those articles which everybody must use, and thus distribute the burden of raising revenue among all the people of the home

government. The protectionists believe that the tax should be so levied that those outsiders coming in to engage in the advantages of trade among our people should pay a proper share of the expenses of the government of that people with whom they thus have advantage of trade, and that the tax should also be so adjusted as to prevent ruinous competition by outsiders with the people at home who manufacture goods and thus give employment to the people of their own country.

There are two general methods of fixing the rate of tariff taxation which shall be levied upon goods coming into the country. One of these is known as the "ad valorem" method; the other is known as the "specific" method. By the ad valorem system the custom-house officers are required to collect as the tariff a given percentage of the actual value of the goods imported. By the specific system the custom-house officers are required to collect a specified sum for each pound or yard or given quantity of each article coming in. To illustrate, under the ad valorem system of the present law the rate of duty collected on cattle above 1 year old is 20 cents ad valorem, or 20 per cent of the value named by the importers or determined at the custom-house. Under the specific rate of the McKinley law the tariff collected on the same class of animals was \$10 per head. On grindstones the present law collects a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem, or 10 per cent of such valuation as may be named by the importers or fixed by the custom-house authorities, while the McKinley law collected a rate of \$1.75 per ton. The ad valorem system has proven unsatisfactory because unscrupulous persons importing goods would name as their value a sum very much less than their real worth, and thus make the amount of duty which they must pay very much less than that contemplated by the law.

The rate of duty on cattle, as indicated above, is, under the present law, 20 per cent ad valorem; but by fixing the nominal value of cattle imported at \$6 or \$10 per head, the person importing them would only be compelled to pay a duty of from \$1.20 to \$2 on each animal, while the specific rate of \$10 per head under the McKinley law applied, no matter how low a valuation the importers might choose to name. It is generally admitted by the Treasury Department and the customs officers that the losses to the Government by reason of undervaluation on articles imported under the ad valorem duties of the present tariff law have been from \$30,000,000 to \$50,000,000 per annum in tariff taxes which should have been paid had importers been honest in giving proper valuation of their goods.

With this brief explanation of the tariff idea and the systems of its enforcement, it will be interesting, now that the country is about to adopt a new tariff, to state briefly the tariff history of the United States.

PRIOR TO 1789.

Prior to the adoption of the Constitution no tariff taxes were collected by the General Government. Under the Confederation, the States, jealous of their own rights, were unwilling to give to the General Government the control of their ports and the raising of revenues on articles coming into the States.

Each State, therefore, fixed its own tariff rates, some of them seeking to gain an advantage over the others by allowing goods to come in without taxation, and some levied no tariff taxes on goods coming into certain ports. The result was that while the tariff duties collected averaged from 2½ per cent to 5 per cent of the value of goods imported, they were collected by all sorts of methods. At some ports no duties were collected at all, and the industries of the country were prostrate, the people idle and poor, and money scarce and of uncertain value. This condition resulted in dissatisfaction, riots, threats of return to a monarchical government, lack of revenue for the General Government, and a demand upon the part of the most thoughtful citizens for a closer union and a system which would protect the people and encourage industries and manufactures among them.

1789 TO 1815.

The first subject discussed by the First Congress under the Constitution was the tariff question. A large majority of the First Congress were farmers, and they saw the necessity of encouraging and protecting manufacturing industries of that character, beginning with 1789, so that they might be free from dependence upon foreign nations for farming implements, machinery, clothing, and arms for their protection and absolute independence, and at the same time make a home market for their products. The result was the adoption of a tariff whose preamble recognized the protecting theory in the following words: "Whereas it is necessary for the support of the Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and for the encouragement and protection of manufactures that duties be laid on imported goods, etc., therefore be it enacted, etc."

This tariff was discussed and supported by the leading men in the early history of the Government, and President Washington, in his first annual message, said, in speaking of our nation as a free people: "Their safety and interests require that they promote

such manufactures as tend to render them independent of others for essentials." In his last annual message he said: "Congress has repeatedly, and not without success, directed their attention to the encouragement of manufactures." Other Presidents who followed him—Adams, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe—also recognized and commended the importance of the protective-tariff system. The tariff of 1789 was not materially changed until 1812, when the war with Great Britain required additional funds, and the tariff rates were then nearly doubled.

The immediate effect of the tariff of 1789, based upon the protection theory, was prosperity in agriculture and wonderful increase in commerce and revival of old industries and the creation of new ones, the multiplication of our merchant marine, the raising of a sufficient revenue to pay the expenses of the Government and give relief to its creditors, and create contentment and industries among the people generally. The increase of the duties in 1812 was followed by an enormous increase in the manufacturing industries of the country, due in some degree to the fact that England ceased to export to the United States during the war period, and also the improvement in the manufactures and consequent employment of those supplying the employees of the manufacturing establishments with food and clothing.

This was so apparent that President Madison, in a special message to Congress, urged "the deliberate consideration of the means to preserve and promote the manufactures which have sprung into existence and obtained an unparalleled maturity throughout the United States."

The tariff during the above period was collected in part by the specific and part by the ad valorem method, but averaged probably about 20 per cent of the value of the articles upon which it was placed, though that of the first tariff was much lower than this.

1816 TO 1824.

The free-trade theory took possession of the public mind in 1816. It was another case similar to that which the present generation has witnessed, when the people of the United States in the prosperous year of 1892 decided to adopt free trade. The result in 1816 was similar to that of 1892. The tariff was transferred to articles not produced in the United States, and was what is commonly known as a "revenue tariff," or, in other words, was adjusted merely to produce revenue and not to protect home industries. The result was great destruction of industries; labor idle; great distress; sheriff sales in great numbers throughout the country; high prices for manufactured goods; low prices for American farm products; deficit in the revenues; debt-creating period; balance of trade against us; money of the country contracted from \$110,000,000 to \$45,000,000; great reduction in the value of taxable property.

Benton gives this picture of the times:

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

1824 TO 1833.

The low-tariff experience of 1816 to 1824 was so unsatisfactory that a thoroughly protective tariff was adopted in 1824, being about the first real protective-tariff measure. The duty which it levied averaged 36 per cent of the value of the articles on which the tariff was placed, and the result was much development of industry, labor employed, prosperity, peace, contentment, Government revenues plenty, money good and plenty, money-making and debt-paying period, great increase in taxable values, Jacksonian protection era, slave question becoming a dangerous political issue, free trade adopted as an ally to slavery.

Commenting on the experiences of this first thoroughly protective tariff measure, Major McKinley, in one of his speeches in Congress calling attention to the prediction of disaster made by the opponents of protection at that time, says:

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

1833 TO 1842.

In 1833 the low-tariff theory again took possession of the public mind sufficiently to give a control in Congress and a "Democratic revenue tariff" was adopted under the lead of Calhoun. This abandoned the protective theory entirely, the duties averaging less than 18 per cent, and resulted in gradual closing down of American factories, labor idle and poor, very low wages, low prices of farm products, destruction of industry, panic of 1837, bankruptcy, soup houses to feed the idle workmen, industry, agriculture, and commerce paralyzed, money poor and scarce, reduction in the volume of currency, States unable to pay interest on debt, deficit in the National Treasury, the nation unable to borrow money at

home or abroad, and debt-creating period. The experiences were similar to those which are fresh in the minds of the people of the United States to-day. The National Treasury became bankrupt and the credit of the United States very low; the revenue fell off largely and the Government was compelled to borrow money to pay current expenses, as is the case under the Wilson tariff to-day.

1842 TO 1846.

The result of the low tariff experiences from 1834 to 1842 was the return of the protectionists, then the Whig party, to power and the passage of a protective-tariff measure with an average rate of duty of about 25 per cent, which was vetoed by President Tyler, but passed over his veto. Under this protective tariff came a development in industries, revival of agriculture, increase in immigration, money good and plenty, a revenue sufficient for all expenses of the Government, and a wealth-producing period. Carey, commenting upon this period in the national history, says:

Labor was everywhere in demand, planters had large crops, and the domestic market was growing with a rapidity that promised better prices. The produce of the farm was in demand and prices had risen. The consumption of coal, iron, wool, and cotton and woolen cloth was immense and rapidly increasing, while prices were falling because of the rapidly improving character of the machinery of production. Production of every kind was immense, and commerce, internal and external, was growing with unexampled rapidity.

1846 TO 1861.

The slave power of the South, recognizing the prosperity and increased strength which the protective tariff gave to the Northern industries, rallied and obtained control of Congress, and what is known as the "Walker revenue tariff," a Democratic measure with low rates of duty, levied purely for revenue and adjusted so as to prevent protection, was adopted in 1846. The same inevitable results followed as always before under free trade or very low duties, though they were postponed for some years by external causes. It can be stated truthfully that for some years after the repeal of the tariff of 1842 there was an apparently increasing prosperity; but the apparent success which seemed to follow the tariff of 1846 was wholly due to external adventitious causes.

But as soon as these unusual and accidental resources were cut off there followed the same disastrous results as always before under free trade or very low duties. Many industries were destroyed, business was paralyzed, total ruin overtook tens of thousands of the most successful merchants and manufacturers of the country, and armies of toilers were hurled from the factory or the shop into the streets to steal or starve. Our exports of cotton, rice, tobacco, corn, and pork diminished, the demand for ships and for labor fell off, and immigration, which had trebled under the workings of the tariff of 1842, greatly declined.

Not content, however, with the disasters in the manufacturing sections of the country, the North, which had followed the Walker tariff of 1846, the Southern Democracy succeeded in passing an act in 1857 still further reducing the tariff rates, bringing the rates down to an average of about 15 per cent. This was followed by great panic, failures of banks and commercial houses, almost total destruction of American industry, poor prices for farm products, high prices for foreign manufactured goods, little employment, low wages, soup houses opened to feed the idle workmen, bankruptcy, "wild-cat" State-bank failures, almost total disappearance of the circulating medium; in the value of American securities; debt-creating period; little gold or silver left in the country.

From this time to 1861, when the protective tariff was enacted by the Republicans, the public debt increased nearly \$46,000,000, and the expenditures exceeded the receipts by \$77,334,116 in the same time.

1861 TO 1894.

From 1861 to 1894 the protective system prevailed by reason of the fact that the Republican party, which assumed control in 1861 and adopted a protective tariff, remained constantly in control of one or both branches of Congress, making it impossible for the Democrats to repeal the protective-tariff system and reenact their free-trade theory into law.

The tariff adopted in 1861, known as the Morrill tariff, was a thoroughly protective measure, averaging 36 per cent. In 1872 the necessity for very large revenues ended with the close of the war and reduction of the public debt, and the tariff was modified by a reduction of about 10 per cent in nearly the entire schedule, making the average duties about 27 per cent. Even this reduction was followed by a depression, and in 1875 there was another readjustment which was followed by a slight recovery. In 1883 the rate was again revised, the rate of duty averaging about 29 per cent. This was followed by general prosperity and plentiful revenue.

By 1890, the public debt having been greatly reduced, it was possible to make a still further reduction in the tariff and the revenue, and the McKinley tariff was adopted, the rates of duty averaging about 24 per cent on the total importations, and being levied more essentially with a view of protection than any of the tariffs which had preceded it. The result of this was an increase of industry and employment, increase of wages and Government

revenues, great prosperity, payment of public debt, numbers of foreign factories transferred to our country, great increase of industry in the South, contentment, peace, money-making period, money plenty and good, and balance of trade in our favor.

1894 TO 1897.

In 1894 the Democrats, having obtained control of the House, Senate, and Presidency, passed a low-tariff act whose duties, averaging about 21 per cent, were collected by the ad valorem system, thus enabling importers by fraudulent valuations to really get a much lower rate than that nominally fixed by the act itself. The effect of this tariff is so fresh in the minds of the public as to need little comment.

From the moment that it became known that a Democratic tariff was to be enacted, alarm took possession of the public mind, especially in business circles, and depression was followed by panic; result, banks closed by hundreds, business establishments by thousands suspended, manufactories closed their doors or reduced wages. The actual enactment of the ad valorem low-tariff act was followed by constant deficiencies in the revenues of the Government. In the first twenty-eight months in which the law was in operation the Treasury deficit amounted to \$120,954,456 and the Government was compelled to borrow \$260,000,000 to meet its running expenses and protect its credit.

THE NET RESULT.

The result of these experiences was that on November 3, 1896, the people of the United States voted by an overwhelming majority to restore to power the party which has, during its entire existence, favored a protective tariff and given to the country such a tariff whenever it had the power to do so. This protective measure, whether given by the Republican party under its present name, or by its predecessors, the Whigs and Federalists, has, as is seen by the history cited above, always brought prosperity to the country. There is therefore good reason to believe that the protective tariff which the Republicans hope to be able to place upon the statute books will in good time bring again the prosperity which former protective tariffs have always supplied.

CAN NOT BE DONE IN A MINUTE.

It must be remembered, however, that great movements of this kind can not be completed in a moment. The Republican party does not control the Senate of the United States to-day, and it is extremely uncertain whether it will have a clear majority in that body in the next Congress. Should it not be able to cast a majority of the votes in the Senate, no one can foretell how successful it will be in passing a thoroughly protective tariff measure, or how promptly action can be had. The framing and consideration by both branches of Congress of a tariff measure is a long and laborious task.

The Democratic party, which was successful in November, 1892, did not place its tariff measure upon the statute books until August 28, 1894, nearly two years after the election in which it obtained control of the House, Senate, and Presidency. It must not be expected, therefore, that the Republican success in November, 1896, will or can possibly be followed by such prosperity as a protective tariff can give until time is had to consider, frame, and, if possible, pass a measure of that kind. This must necessarily be the work of months, and these months can not begin until after the inauguration of President McKinley and the placing in his hands of the power of calling together the Congress elected simultaneously with himself in November, 1896.

Patience, therefore, will be necessary, intelligent patience, by which the people will understand that the prosperity which has been promised can not be expected until time is had to inaugurate President McKinley, to call Congress together and frame a tariff measure, pass it in the Republican House, place it before the Senate and see whether it can be passed in that body, whose control by the Republican party is yet in grave doubt, and if passed, place it upon the statute books and put it in operation a sufficient length of time to enable the manufacturing industries to feel its protective effect, the agricultural interests to receive the impetus which will follow from increased industries in the manufacturing centers, and the business world to recover from the depression, deficiency, and disasters which have accompanied the years of Democracy and low tariff with which the country has been struggling since the election of 1892.

MINERS' STRIKE DUE TO THE LOW TARIFF RATES—NOVA SCOTIA COAL REPLACED THE WEST VIRGINIA PRODUCT—STRIKING COINCIDENCE BETWEEN THE REDUCTION OF DUTIES AND LOWERING OF WAGES—BLOW TO MANUFACTURES AFFECTED THE MARKET FOR THE BITUMINOUS ARTICLE—BRYAN'S PLEA FOR FREE COAL.

[Special dispatch to the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 11.

The close relation between the Wilson tariff law and the present strike of the coal miners is the subject of much comment among tariff students and members of Congress generally. That the

reduction which that law made in the tariff on coal caused great reductions in the wages of miners is easily shown, and that the drop in wages was practically coincident with the reduction in duties upon coal is generally recognized by those familiar with the subject. President Ratchford, of the United Mine Workers' Association, in a communication to the New York Herald, dated July 3, says:

A miner's wages in the western Pennsylvania field ranges from 54 cents to 47 cents per ton in thin-veined districts, and from 30 cents to 28 cents a ton in the thick veined. In 1893 the mining rate in thin vein was 79 cents, and thick vein 65 cents per ton. During the same year the rate in Ohio and Indiana was 70 cents and 75 cents, respectively; now it is 51 cents, with a reduction proposed in Ohio to 45 cents per ton. This ratio holds good in a general way all along the line. Illinois, a portion of Iowa, eastern and central Pennsylvania and the Virginias are all equally affected.

These figures indicate a reduction in rates for mining of from 20 cents to 30 cents per ton since 1893. It was in August, 1893, that the Congress which framed the Wilson tariff law met, and the work on the bill which reduced the coal tariff 35 cents per ton was begun. It was promised that the bill would take the entire duty off coal, and the bill as framed by the Ways and Means Committee and passed by the House did remove the entire rate of 75 cents per ton and placed coal upon the free list. The Senate, however, restored a part of the duty on coal, making the rate 40 cents per ton, and the bill, when it became a law, reduced the tariff rates on bituminous coal 35 cents per ton, the rate under the McKinley law having been 75 cents per ton and the rate named by the Wilson law being 40 cents per ton.

The fact that the entire reduction of wages of which miners are complaining has occurred since the beginning of work upon the Wilson tariff law, and that the reduction is nearly the same as the reduction made in the tariff by that act, is of itself a remarkable coincidence, and would probably warrant the assumption that the tariff reduction caused the reduction in wages.

It is not necessary, however, merely to assume this or to depend upon theory to indicate that the reduction in tariff caused the reduction in rates for mining. It is susceptible of proof from facts known to every man interested in or acquainted with coal mining and coal operations of the past three or four years. Before the passage of the Wilson tariff bill, a visitor to Newport News, the seaboard terminal of the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway, might have seen at any time from four to a dozen coasting vessels lying at the docks awaiting the arrival of coal trains from Virginia and West Virginia loaded with coal destined to be shipped to New York and New England. No sooner had the Wilson tariff bill taken effect than all these vessels disappeared as completely as though they had been engulfed in midocean.

FOREIGN COAL ADMITTED.

The reason for this transformation scene was simply this: The rate of duty on coal under the McKinley law was such as to exclude foreign coal from New England or Eastern ports; but the reduction of the rates to 40 cents per ton by the Wilson law permitted Nova Scotia coal to enter the Northeastern Atlantic ports at such low rates that the West Virginia coal could not compete with it. The Nova Scotia coals are cheaply mined, and as the mines, many of them, extend under water, it is practicable to load the coal directly on vessels and thus place it in any of the Eastern ports at very low prices.

The result of this reduction in the tariff was that the Nova Scotia coal took the place in the East of that from the West Virginia mines, and the West Virginia mine owners and operators were compelled to seek a market elsewhere. Railroad rates to the West were reduced, and coal which had formerly gone to New England went West, and came in competition with the coal of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. The price of coal in the Western markets tumbled. Then followed a rate war between railroads and between mines and mine owners. A reduction in wages for mining at the East was followed by reductions in the West until miners' wages became lower than they had ever been known under the protective policy of the Republicans.

Other causes, also resulting from the Wilson law, have operated with equal certainty in keeping down the prices which it was possible to pay for mining. The activity and prosperity of the miner primarily depends upon the activity and prosperity of the manufacturer, since machinery is moved by steam, in the production of which coal must be consumed. Whatever increases the number of mills and gives employment to mill hands increases work for the miner, but whatever reduces the number of mills in operation, shortens the number of hours, or diminishes the number of operatives is as much against the interests of the miner as it is against the interests of the mechanic.

REDUCED COAL DEMAND.

The suspension or reduction of work in factories, business establishments of various kinds, and industries of all sorts in all parts of the country, resulting from the operations of the Wilson law, caused a great reduction in the demand for coal, and combined with the depressing effect of importations to still further reduce the demand for the labor of the miners and the prices paid

for their services. While the amount of coal actually imported is only about 4,000,000 tons a year, or sufficient to throw out of employment about 8,000 miners, the loss in markets to American mines by the suspension of manufacturing was much greater.

The present strike of the coal miners is looked upon with great alarm by Democratic leaders here. It calls attention directly and pointedly to the fact that their legislation is beyond question responsible for the reduction of wages, all of which, according to President Ratchford, have occurred since the inception of that legislation. Not only is the Democratic party responsible for the reduction of 35 cents per ton which caused this reduction in wages, but many of the men now most prominent in its council and as its leaders urged and even demanded a removal of the entire duty on coal, placing it absolutely upon the free list, which would doubtless still further have reduced the wages of miners.

Mr. William J. Bryan, whose name and theories are to be especially prominent in the approaching State campaigns, was one of the most earnest and active members of the wing of his party which demanded the removal of the entire duty upon coal, saying in a speech in Congress January 13, 1894:

The duty on coal is indefensible. * * * The duty on coal is nothing but a subsidy which the people along the seacoast are compelled to pay to the transportation companies. * * * Take the tariff off from coal, so that the New England manufacturers can buy it for less, and they can manufacture more cheaply; and then, by cutting down the tariff on the products of their factories, we can compel them to sell at a lower price to the people of the South and West.

THE COAL MINER AND THE TARIFF.

The wages paid to coal miners and laborers in coal mines in the United States slightly exceed \$100,000,000 per year. There are in round numbers 300,000 of them, and they get out, on the average, about 500 tons of coal each. The annual product of their labor is nearly or quite 150,000,000 tons.

What is the matter with the coal miner? He knows that he suffers, but why does he suffer? A plain statement of facts will perhaps help him to understand one of the causes of his present poverty and distress.

Before the passage of the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill a visitor to Newport News, the seaboard terminal of the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway, might at any time have seen from four to a dozen coasting vessels lying idle at the docks awaiting the arrival of coal trains from West Virginia loaded with coal destined to be shipped to New York and New England. No sooner had the Wilson-Gorman tariff taken effect than all of these vessels disappeared as completely as though they had been engulfed in midocean.

What was the reason for this transformation scene? Simply this: The tariff on coal under the McKinley Act was 75 cents a ton, but the Wilson-Gorman Act reduced the duty from 75 cents to 40 cents, thus opening our northeastern Atlantic ports to Nova Scotia coal at prices with which our own mines could not compete. Then what happened? The Chesapeake and Ohio road reduced its freight rate on coal to Chicago, and the coal which would have displaced Nova Scotia coal, having now no other outlet, was loaded on cars and sent West to come into competition with Western coal in the Chicago market.

The price of coal at Chicago tumbled. Then followed a rate war between the railroads and a reduction in the wages paid to Western miners, which was met by a reduction in wages for mining at the East, with the ultimate effect of making wages lower than they have been for many years past. And all this sorrow and trouble is directly chargeable to the Wilson-Gorman tariff, and to no other visible cause.

The miner of coal has evidently two paramount interests in life. Poorly paid at best, exposed to peculiar perils and hardships, and sorely pressed by the destructive competition between the Eastern and Western coal fields for the great market of the extreme Northwest, he wants in the first place to have as much coal used as possible; and he further wants to have all the coal that is burned in the United States mined at home.

The prosperity of the miner primarily depends upon that of the manufacturer, since machinery is moved by steam, and for the production of steam coal must be consumed. Whatever increases the number of American mills and gives employment to mill hands makes work for the miner; but whatever reduces the number of mills in operation, shortens the number of hours, or diminishes the number of operatives is as much against the interests of the miner as it is against the interests of the mechanic.

The wretched experience of workingmen during the last four years has shown that the prosperity of the manufacturing industries of this country is very largely affected by tariff legislation. A tariff for protection, like the McKinley tariff, makes good times; but a tariff for revenue only, like the Wilson-Gorman tariff, makes very bad times.

The workingmen of this country have found that out; and in 1894 700,000 Democrats, mostly workingmen who had voted for Mr. Cleveland in 1892, stayed at home and refused to vote, while 300,000 more voted the Republican ticket. Times have not improved during the last two years, but have been growing rather worse

than they were; and the coal miner has been one of the chief sufferers from the state of affairs brought about by a foolish tariff.

The Democratic party has nothing to say about the tariff, but has gone off on a new issue, that of the free coinage of silver. Republicans are told that they must not talk about the tariff, either.

Yet it is certain that the miner's lot will be no better than it is now until we have a revision of the tariff of such sort as to start up the idle mills and factories of the United States and make an increased demand for coal.

The miner wants work; but how is he to get it when the mills are shut down, and when, in consequence of diminished production, the railroads have less freight to carry than usual, and so burn and buy less coal than they otherwise would? Manufactures and transportation are the two kinds of business most closely bound up with coal mining, and all three thrive or languish together. It is said that 2 per cent of the cost of manufacturing, in all its branches, is for fuel or power, which the miner alone can supply.

The way in which a tariff for revenue only hurts manufactures and transportation is by encouraging the importation of foreign goods rather than encouraging our own people to make our own goods at home. If McKinley and Hobart are elected next November, the Republicans will make such changes in the tariff as will protect all American industries, including coal mining. A proper revision of the tariff by a Republican Congress will open up the mills which are now closed, thus giving employment to multitudes of idle men and making more work for the miners.

It is sometimes said that the effect of a tariff for protection is to make high prices, and it has been objected to upon this ground. This is not true. The general effect of a tariff for protection is to make all manufactured articles cheaper by stimulating invention and securing cheaper methods of production. But if it were true, how could the advocates of free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 consistently urge this reason for opposing a protective tariff, when they say that the reason why they want free coinage is that prices are too low and money too dear?

The trouble with the free-silver Democrats is that they wanted one thing four years ago, and now they want another. Then they wanted cheap goods; now they want cheap money. If cheap goods were a good thing then, why are they not a good thing now? But we can not have cheap goods and cheap money at the same time.

This silver question, which the Democrats have invented in order to divert attention from the failure of their new tariff law, and to afford some sort of excuse for the hard times without charging it up to that law, is a question which concerns the miner (and workmen generally) only in one way. The miner needs plenty of work, and he also needs good wages. The silver men tell him that "free silver," as they call it, will make work plenty and wages better. Wages will have to be better if prices are higher, or the miner can not buy as much food and clothing with his wages as he does now.

If prices double, as it is claimed by some that they will, wages will have to double also, or the workingman will be worse off under free coinage of silver than he is now. The miners' experience with the mine owners ought to convince them that the mine owners will not double their wages if free coinage should become a law. Therefore the miner has no interest in free coinage. His interest is all bound up in the revision of the tariff.

Every intelligent miner understands that the trouble with coal mining in the United States is the competition between the Eastern and Western mines. When the Eastern mines put the price of coal down so as to take the markets of the Northwest, the Western mines have to reduce the price to meet this cut. When the Western mines have put the prices down so as to get the market away from the Eastern mines, the Eastern mines still further reduce the price of Eastern coal. In this way the miner is ground between the Eastern and Western millstones.

The present Democratic tariff lets in coal free from British Columbia and from Nova Scotia. To whatever extent foreign coal is burned in American furnaces, the demand for American coal is reduced and American miners are thrown out of work. But the amount of coal imported—something less than 4,000,000 tons a year—is not so large that this can be said to be the greatest evil resulting from foreign competition with our American mines.

That is bad enough, since it means throwing about 8,000 miners out of work, which means a yearly loss to American miners of about \$2,500,000 in money. But what is worse is the extension of the area of competition between the Eastern and Western mines, by bringing the product of the Nova Scotia mines into the problem as a disturbing factor, thus reducing the wages of all American miners.

Mr. Bryan said in Congress January 13, 1894:

The duty on coal is indefensible. * * * The duty on coal is nothing but a subsidy, which the people along the seaboard are compelled to pay to the transportation companies. * * * Take the tariff off from coal, so that the New England manufacturers can buy it for less, and they can manufacture more cheaply; and then, by cutting down the tariff on the products of their factories, we can compel them to sell at a lower price to the people of the South and West.

IRON AND STEEL WORKERS AND THE TARIFF.

The growth of the iron and steel industry under twenty years of a protective tariff may be seen by a glance at the following:

Item.	1870.	1880.	1890.
Capital.....	\$121,772,074	\$209,904,965	\$414,044,844
Average number of employees.....	77,555	140,798	175,506
Total wages.....	\$40,514,981	\$55,451,510	\$95,736,192
Tons of product.....	3,655,215	7,265,140	18,216,215

The theory of the McKinley law was not to increase the duty upon the articles of the iron or steel schedule, but, as far as possible, to reduce it. This was done wherever it could be without destroying or crippling the industry. The modifications were all with a view of greater harmony and for the purpose of giving additional work and wages to those who toil, whether on the farm or in the factory.

Increases were only made in cases like tin plate, where by so doing we could secure for the American wage earner a new and fruitful field of labor. McKinley saw that half of our large imports of iron and steel was made up of the influx of tin plate which had never borne an adequate rate of duty, and he merely placed tin plate where it properly belonged in the schedule. By so doing he gave the American workmen a new occupation. This was established regardless of the sneers of William J. Bryan, who, in a speech in Congress, March, 1893, ridiculed the idea of the United States producing tin plate.

Now, however, he is confronted with an established industry which even the Wilson-Gorman law has failed to destroy, but which, had it been allowed to stand without reduction of duty, would have been far stronger and more prosperous than it is at the present time. In spite, however, of free-trade interference, we are making tin plate in the United States, and the consumers of the article who offered the increased duty are now strongly in favor of the home production.

And why should they not be?

The consumers of tin plate are getting a cheaper and a better article, and best of all, it is American. In short, the canners of salmon, upon whose woes Mr. Bryan wasted so much of his eloquence, are happy; and the commentations of the oyster and green-corn men have changed to anthems of praise for McKinley and American tin plate. The poor workman's dinner pail is no longer an object of Democratic sympathy, possibly because allusions to it may remind wage earners that it has been none too full during these panicky Democratic times.

There are now probably 200 tin-plate manufacturing in the United States. The capacity of these mills per annum, in round figures, is about 5,000,000 boxes. Thus, in less than four years, the tin-plate industry has so developed as to be ready to supply the entire home market as soon as all the mills get in working order. And this in spite of the serious effects of the reduction of duty in 1894 by the Wilson law, which retarded the growth and gave our foreign rivals hope.

And what, pray, has the Wilson law done for our iron and steel workers—for the men who, under McKinley's tariff law, earned more than one hundred million honest dollars, as good as the best in the world? It reduced wages. It threw some out of work all the time and many part of the time. It cut down the fat envelope Saturday night. It made that envelope look more than once as though the steam hammer had flattened it out.

That is what the Wilson law did in a general way for the iron and steel worker.

Specifically, in one year after its enactment, the Wilson law doubled the importation of bar iron; it destroyed the cotton-tie industry and closed up the factories; it about doubled the imports of steel ingots, blooms, etc.; it increased the imports of tin plate; and the iron and steel schedule was not injured to the extent of the wool schedule and the woolen and worsted schedule. Nevertheless, the imports were increased \$5,000,000—a useless proceeding, for we might as well have employed our own labor—and in common with all business this great industry, in which probably over half a million of our people are directly or indirectly interested, has been crippled and the consuming power of an army of workers cut down.

The safety and future happiness of every iron and steel worker in the United States is only assured in the election of McKinley and Hobart. It is a matter in which not only the wage earner but his entire family are interested. It is his duty to see to it that he is not drifted from the vagaries of free trade, which has already brought about him so much misery, to the vagaries of free silver, which will result in making his last condition much worse than his first.

More than one-third of the iron and steel in the world is now made in this country. The reason why this is so can be stated in a single word—protection. The production of iron and steel, like

that of silver, has been increased and cheapened by new processes of manufacture during the past thirty or forty years. The improvements in the blowing engine and the hot-blast stove have been marked. The substitution of coke for coal in smelting pig iron has become almost universal.

Bessemer steel was not made in this country before 1864, nor open-hearth steel before 1868; now nearly all American steel, the product of which in 1895 aggregated 6,114,834 tons, is so made. The old puddling furnace is rapidly becoming obsolete. We have better machinery for handling iron in process of manufacture, and for founding, forging, and rolling it. We have better coke, most of which now comes from Connellsville; and the development of the Lake Superior mines has given us better ores.

Few persons perhaps realize how many varieties there are of iron and steel industries. Before 1867 we made iron rails, of which the largest output in any one year was in 1872—806,866 tons. In 1887 we made 3,139,640 tons of Bessemer steel rails. Steel rails have gradually been substituted for iron rails, until now 85 per cent of the trackage of American railways is provided with them.

Then there is the manufacture of heavy armor plates, in which we now lead the world, at least in quality. Even the Russian Government has purchased ours because they are the best.

We make steel ships. We make steel bridges. We use iron and steel in erecting buildings. It is said that the time is close at hand when our annual product of structural steel will be a million tons.

In making nails and spikes we began with the manufacture by hand, and then perfected nail-cutting machines. Until 1883 our cut nails were of iron; since then they have been largely steel. Now we are substituting wire nails for them. In 1895 we made 2,129,894 kegs of cut nails, but of wire nails 5,841,403 kegs—more than twice as many.

These wire nails were the equivalent of 260,777 tons of steel wire. As much more is used for wire fencing. Much wire is also required for the manufacture of steel cables. Most of the wire used by the telegraph, the telephone, and electric railways is of copper; but not all of it.

The basis of tin plate is iron. Of tin plates and terne plates we made 86,519 tons in 1895. The improved methods now in use have killed the small furnaces, forges, and blacksmith shops once common in the United States. With their disappearance and the substitution of machine for hand labor, the price of iron and steel has immensely fallen. A protective tariff does not operate, as some persons think, to enhance prices, but merely transfers the seat of manufacture from foreign lands to our own shores and saves to our own people the profits which we should otherwise pay to strangers. In 1870 the average price of Bessemer steel rails was \$106.75 a ton in currency. The duty then imposed was \$28 per ton, and to-day the price of steel rails is \$28 per ton—the exact amount of the tariff upon them twenty-five years ago.

In the past thirty-five years the production of pig iron in Great Britain has about doubled, while that of the United States has increased twelvefold. We passed her in 1890. We passed her in the manufacture of Bessemer steel rails in 1879, and in the production of Bessemer steel ingots in 1884. We have got the lead, and we shall undoubtedly retain it. The demand for iron and steel in the arts is constantly and rapidly increasing. We want more machinery, more railroads—especially electric roads—more steel bridges, more wire fencing, more steel ships, more gas and water and sewer pipes, more American tin plate. This great industry is still in its infancy in America.

The census of 1890 showed that the number of establishments turning out pig iron, crude steel, rails and plates, and blooms and billets in the United States was 709. They had invested in them \$414,044,844 of permanent capital. They employed 175,506 men and boys, to whom they paid in wages, in one year, \$95,736,192. They converted raw material to the value of \$327,272,845 into higher forms, and the value of their total output was \$478,687,519. These statistics do not include mining of iron. Our iron mines employed \$109,766,199 of capital and 38,227 workmen in addition.

**THE FARMER AND THE TARIFF—WHAT FOUR YEARS OF "RE-
FORM" HAS DONE FOR HIM.**

From 1890 to 1892 this country was prosperous. From 1893 to 1897 it has suffered. In the first period mills were open, new industries were being started, manufacturing plants increased their capacity, labor was employed, wages were high, and employment easy to find. In the last period mills were shut down, old established industries languished, manufacturing plants decreased their output, labor was thrown out of employment, wages were reduced, and men turned tramps while seeking work.

In the first period our laboring population bought freely of the necessities, comforts, and even the luxuries of life. In the second period they practiced pinching economy, having only money to buy the barest necessities, and too often less. In the first the farmer had a good market for all that he raised and at living prices. In the second he finds fewer to purchase the products of

his labor, and prices have fallen below not only a remunerative point, but below actual cost of production.

Whence comes this deplorable change? The land is just as fertile, our population just as energetic, the seasons have smiled on the husbandman, and our natural resources are just as great. Is the trouble in our currency system? Not at all. We have exactly the same system in both periods. Is it a lack of money with which to do business? Not at all. The money in circulation in 1892, which was entirely sufficient when all business was booming, amounted to \$1,601,347,187. The amount in circulation at the same date in 1895, when everything was in a condition of stagnation, was \$1,601,968,473.

Then what is the trouble? In November, 1892, the American people voted to give full control of all branches of the Government into Democratic hands. The moment the result of that election was known it became apparent that a radical change in our tariff policy was impending. From that day manufacturers began to restrict their operations. Long before Democracy took charge and began to arrange the new schedule there was restriction of production and shutting down of works in anticipation of what was coming.

During the period of uncertainty before the Wilson-Gorman law became effective every business man so arranged his affairs as to have as small a stock on hand as possible. He wanted to wait for the cheaper goods which Democratic speakers had promised from every stump in the country. This meant fewer orders for the manufacturer, and he in turn laid off his men. Here the business paralysis started. The mere threat of Democratic legislation was sufficient to change a busy people from activity to idleness.

When the threat became a law, orders went abroad instead of to our own manufacturers; fires were started in English mills instead of American, and the author of the Wilson bill went to London to be dined and wined at a state dinner by the London Board of Trade. Grateful men. But did anyone hear of American manufacturers, workingmen, or farmers spreading a banquet for him? Hardly.

What promises were made by Mr. Bryan, Mr. JONES, Mr. Wilson, and every man who was responsible for the new tariff? You can recall them; but have you seen any of them fulfilled? Where is the prosperity? Where those magnificent "markets of the world?" Where that dollar wheat and the thousand other pleasing fancies with which the American people were deluded in 1892?

Let us see what the hard facts are so far as the farmer is concerned. During 1890, 1891, and 1892, the last three years prior to the time it became certain that the protective policy was to be abandoned, prices of all farm products were satisfactory. During the succeeding three years, those under tariff reform or the threat of tariff reform, prices have fallen to depths heretofore believed impossible. To appreciate what the change has been for the farmer, let us take the average farm prices of the various products of agriculture as returned by farmers themselves to the United States Department of Agriculture at the close of each year. These figures are from the official report of the Secretary:

	1890.	1891.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.
Corn.....per bushel..	\$0.506	\$0.406	\$0.394	\$0.365	\$0.457	\$0.284
Wheat.....do.....	.838	.839	.624	.538	.491	.509
Oats.....do.....	.424	.315	.317	.294	.324	.199
Rye.....do.....	.629	.774	.548	.513	.501	.440
Barley.....do.....	.648	.540	.472	.411	.442	.337
Potatoes.....do.....	.777	.371	.673	.590	.538	.266
Cotton.....per pound..	.088	.073	.084	.070	.046	.076
Tobacco.....do.....	.077	.084		.081	.068	.069
Horses.....each.....	67.00	65.01	61.22	47.83	36.23	33.07
Cattle.....do.....	14.76	15.16	15.24	14.66	14.06	15.86
Sheep.....do.....	2.50	2.58	2.66	1.98	1.58	1.70
Hogs.....do.....	4.15	4.60	6.41	5.98	4.97	3.35

Take these figures and average them into groups of three years each, the first representing three years of protection, the second three years of tariff reform, and you get this picture of the condition of the farmer under the two policies:

	Average price.	
	Three years of protection, 1890-1892.	Three years of tariff reform, 1893-1895.
Corn.....per bushel..	\$0.435	\$0.262
Wheat.....do.....	.767	.513
Oats.....do.....	.352	.272
Rye.....do.....	.650	.485
Barley.....do.....	.553	.397
Potatoes.....do.....	.607	.464
Cotton.....per pound..	.081	.064
Tobacco.....do.....		.072
Horses.....each.....	64.61	39.06
Cattle.....do.....	15.05	14.86
Sheep.....do.....	2.58	1.75
Hogs.....do.....	5.05	5.10

But some one will say the question of the rates of duty on these products cuts no figure, because we are an exporting and not an importing nation, so far as agricultural products are concerned. That is true. Only barley and tobacco are imported to any considerable extent. The farmer's benefit from protection does not lie in the duties on his products, but in the home market which it builds up for him. Every new industry which is developed and every enlargement of the plant of old-established concerns means more mouths for the American farmer to feed, more demand for his products, and better prices. The figures quoted show what the reverse means for him.

The Democratic platform holds out no promise of any enlargement of this home market. A return to protection, increased manufacturing, more and better wages, more consumption of farm products, better prices, and general prosperity will follow the election of McKinley.

Mills, not mints, are needed.

THE MECHANIC AND THE TARIFF—WHAT FOUR YEARS OF "REFORM" HAS DONE FOR HIM.

From 1880 to 1892 the 5,000,000 or more persons engaged in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits in the United States were busy and prosperous. During those twelve years the cities of the United States pushed ahead at a marvelous rate. The building trades were especially prosperous. Carpenters, bricklayers, plasterers, stone masons, and painters were well employed at good wages.

Magnificent buildings went up in all the large cities and millions of surplus funds were put into permanent structures of all sorts. Skilled labor was in great demand. There was no lack of currency with which to prosecute these enterprises. The wages paid were the highest known, and they were paid in gold, or in money as good as gold.

The same may be said of manufacturing. While general observation and the figures easily obtainable in individual cities show the prosperity of the building trades, we have the official census return of manufactures. Here are the figures:

	1880.	1890.
Capital	\$2,780,766,895	\$6,139,397,785
Number employed.....	2,700,732	4,476,884
Total wages.....	\$930,402,252	\$2,171,750,183
Value of products.....	\$5,349,191,458	\$9,056,764,996

In spite of an alleged appreciating currency, over 120 per cent more capital was invested in mills and factories and workshops in 1890 than in 1880. Nearly 66 per cent more persons were given employment. For each hundred persons employed in 1880 we find an additional 66 persons in 1890; and for each hundred dollars of manufactured product in 1880 we find an additional \$70 in 1890, or an increase of 70 per cent.

There was no lack of money with which to do this enormously increased volume of business.

How about wages?

Wages increased not only actually with the increase of the number employed, but at a still greater rate relatively. While the number employed did not double, the wages paid more than doubled, the increase being 131 per cent. In short, every man, woman, and child thus engaged went home each Saturday night with more actual money (good sound money) in his or her pay envelope in 1890 than in 1880, and what was true in 1890 was likewise true down to the year 1892.

We therefore had money enough, work enough, and a rising wage.

Defeated on all sides by the tremendous array of facts on this point, the free-silver advocates are now trying to change their battle ground. They declare that the workingman is getting less and less of the profit of labor and capital in combination as his share, and that the manufacturer is getting more and more. This assertion is absolutely false. The reverse is true. The average annual wage per hand paid in 1880 was about \$100 more than the average paid in 1870, while the average in 1890 was \$137.28 more than in 1880.

Including mechanics, there were added to this class of bread-winners 2,500,000 between 1880 and 1890, or 250,000 for each year. In manufacturing alone over \$3,000,000,000 of new capital was invested, or \$300,000,000 annually. And yet the claim is advanced that the country was suffering from a contraction of currency. This is not true; but if it were, it would merely prove that confidence and hope are after all of more value as aids to progress than currency.

Then people were ready to invest; now they hold back. Then wage earners were receiving full money for their work, and their consuming power was almost double what it is now.

It is claimed by those who are capable of making estimates that in 1892 the value of our manufacturing product had reached

\$10,000,000,000. Had the McKinley law remained in force, and had there been no financial disturbance, the close of the present year, 1896, should have seen this amount \$12,000,000,000.* Instead of that, careful estimates by reliable authorities bring out the startling fact that the products of our factories did not exceed \$5,000,000,000 in 1895—a falling off of nearly one-half. Since nearly 90 per cent of this amount represents the earnings of labor, it will be seen how seriously the masses of our people have been affected by three years of "reform."

Every free-trade prediction and promise failed of fulfillment. The markets of the world, which were to be ours, have taken two or three hundred millions less of our products than they did in 1892. There is simply nothing in this free-trade experiment but trouble for our producers and for our workingmen. It has been truly said that every blow at any product of labor, whether it be coal, which gives employment to the miner, or steel rails, which keep puddlers at work, or wool, which adds to the income of the farmer, or cloth, which gives work to the tailor, is a direct blow to labor and the laborer.

Look to-day over the whole broad field of American industry, and what do we find? Diminished production, falling prices, increased foreign importations, and, as a result, labor in distress, out of work, and starving. Look where you may, it is the same. The textile industries of New England, the iron and steel districts of the Middle States, the mines of the Northwest, and the lumber camps along the Canadian border—all give evidence of great distress. The cry is iterated and reiterated: Open the mills and factories, start the furnaces, cut the lumber, dig the ore! Give us employment! It is work and wages, not the intricacies of the money question, which interest these victims of three years of "reform."

AMERICAN WOOLGROWING UNDER TWO TARIFFS.

Among the sufferers from the existing financial depression in the United States, none perhaps has more reason for dissatisfaction than the woolgrower.

From 1890 (when the McKinley tariff took effect) until 1895 (under the Wilson-Gorman tariff passed in 1894) the price of wool, as shown by the Statistical Abstract of the United States, declined nearly 50 per cent. Fine wool, which brought 33 cents per pound in 1890, brought only 17½ cents in January, 1895. Medium wool fell from 37 cents to 20 cents and coarse wool from 31 cents to 18 cents per pound.

It is no wonder that those who have hitherto found sheep farming profitable are discouraged and clamoring for a change. What is the change which they want? Is it a change from Cleveland to Bryan, or from Cleveland to McKinley? There should be no difficulty in determining the answer to this question.

The friends of free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 will of course contend that the decline in the price of wool is chargeable to "the crime of 1873." It is not true. They might as well undertake to hold the crime of 1873 responsible for earthquakes, cyclones, fires, floods, famines, and pestilence.

WHY HAS WOOL DECLINED?

The real reason for the decline in the price of wool, as of all other farm products, is the increase in the supply as compared with the demand. The law of supply and demand absolutely controls the price of everything in the world. It is to trade what the law of gravitation is in the physical world. In one word, the law of supply and demand is as follows: Whenever the demand for any commodity increases, relatively to the supply, prices go up; but whenever the supply increases, relatively to the demand, the prices go down.

The production of wool has been steadily increasing for a long series of years. In 1857 Australia produced only 30,000,000 pounds of scoured wool, but in 1893 it produced 250,000,000 pounds—an increase of 733 per cent. The Argentine Republic produced in 1857 only 10,000,000 pounds of scoured wool; in 1893 it produced 110,000,000 pounds—an increase of 1,000 per cent. The Cape of Good Hope in 1857 produced only 10,000,000 pounds of scoured wool; in 1893 it produced 50,000,000 pounds—an increase of 400 per cent. The supply of wool in the world to-day is about six times as great as it was in 1860.

From these figures, which are cited only by way of illustration, it is evident that the supply of wool has increased at a greater ratio than the demand. Of course the price of wool has fallen. It could not be otherwise. More sheep are raised, the annual wool clip is larger, and the universal, unchangeable, irresistible law of supply and demand has operated, as it always operates under these conditions, to bring the price down. No tariff laws, no coinage laws, can hinder the operation of a larger economic law of nature.

* Had the same rate of increase in the number employed kept up, we should now be giving work to a million or more additional hands, instead of having that number out of a job.

THE DECLINE PARTIALLY ARRESTED.

It follows from what has been said that it would have been unreasonable to expect, even of the McKinley tariff, that it would more than partially arrest the decline in the price of wool of which the American woolgrower complains. The McKinley tariff took effect October 6, 1890. At that date fine wool was quoted in the Eastern markets at 33 cents, medium wool at 37 cents, and coarse wool at 31 cents per pound.

For about a year thereafter the average price of wool at different seasons of the year remained about the same; but it fell in 1892, owing to the disturbance in the market due to the unprecedented yield of wool in Australia in 1891. The decline was greatest in fine wool, which fell in January, 1892, to 30 cents, and in July to 28 cents per pound, but rose to 29 cents in October.

The McKinley tariff, however, had the effect to check the decline in the price of wool in the United States, as compared with the decline elsewhere. It did this by checking the importation of woolen goods manufactured abroad. The importations of woolen goods in the fiscal year 1890 into the United States were valued at \$54,165,427; in 1891 they were valued at \$43,235,499—a diminution of importations in a single year to the amount of \$10,930,018. In 1892 they were valued at \$35,792,905—a further diminution in two years, in the valuation of imported woolen goods, of \$17,487,514.

The usual estimate of the quantity of wool used in the manufacture of woolen goods is 3 pounds of wool for every dollar of valuation. On this basis, the amount of wool required to make the goods imported in 1890 was 162,496,232 pounds; in 1891 it was 129,703,227 pounds; and in 1892 it was 107,378,715 pounds. The decrease in the use of foreign wool in the form of manufactured goods in two years was therefore equivalent to 57,118,567 pounds. This decrease in the supply of foreign wools increased the demand for native wools, thus benefiting the American woolgrower in two ways at once: first, by enlarged sales, and second, by better prices.

For this double blessing the American woolgrower had the McKinley tariff to thank. The intelligent well-informed woolgrower of the United States understands it.

THE TIDE TURNED AGAINST THE AMERICAN WOOLGROWER.

But in the fiscal year 1893, after the election of Grover Cleveland, when the threats of the antiprotectionists were beginning to take practical form, the tide of reduction of imports was reversed.

The valuation of imported woolen goods in 1893 was \$36,987,904; in 1894 it was only \$19,219,034; and in the first nine months of the fiscal year 1896 (ending March 31, 1896) it was \$42,988,472.

The fiscal year 1894 was one of general wreckage of business, under the malign influence of the prospective industrial revolution foreshadowed by the advent of the Democratic party to power in all departments of the Government. Importers held aloof, as much as possible, from the foreign markets, in order to get the benefit of a reduction of duties under the approaching era of so-called "tariff reform." American manufacturers greatly abated production, in anticipation of overwhelming foreign competition, and the consequence was decline in the price of woolen goods. Under the circumstances, importations suffered a sudden and heavy collapse.

In 1895, however, after the passage of the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill, the United States have proportionately benefited the foreign woolgrower and manufacturer. In a letter from Theodore Justice, of Philadelphia, an acknowledged authority, bearing date October 2, 1895, he observes:

Is it any wonder that American wools are no higher in the markets of the United States than they were in July, while foreign wools averaged more than 20 per cent higher and are still advancing? How is this transfer of prosperity from the United States to Europe regarded there? Foreign mills are better employed than for many years.

Many of them are running to their full capacity. So great is the demand in Great Britain and upon the Continent, that the large surplus which appeared to be overloading the European markets in the spring has been absorbed, and wool in Europe is scarce and difficult to procure. This activity in foreign wool markets is mainly owing to orders for goods formerly made in the United States. In spite of the great advance in the price of foreign wool and the increase in the cost of foreign goods, they are still being entered and passed through our custom-houses at the lowest prices on record.

This facility and increase of importations is due not a little to the substitution of ad valorem rates for the specific duties which were in the McKinley tariff.

The threefold influences at work through importation to carry down the prices of American wool may be stated thus:

	Pounds.
(1) Excess of imports of raw wool for year ending August 31, 1895, the first full year of the free-wool law, over the year ending August 31, 1894, the last year of the McKinley law.....	190,000,000
(2) Excess in the imports of shoddy, waste, rags, etc., for the year ending August 31, 1895, over the year ending August 31, 1894, on the basis of 3 pounds of unwashed wool to each pound of shoddy, waste, etc.....	50,000,000
(3) Excess in the importations of manufactured wool, exclusive of shoddy, waste, rags, etc., imported in the first year of the Wilson Gorman law, over the imports of the last year of the McKinley law, on the basis of 3 pounds of unwashed wool to each dollar in value.....	90,000,000
	330,000,000

It thus appears that the excess of imports of raw wool, and of wool represented in its manufactures, comparing the last year under the McKinley Act and the first year under the Wilson-Gorman tariff, amounted, in round numbers, to the enormous quantity of 330,000,000 pounds.

American woolgrowers were deprived of a market equal to that excess of importations. Our flock masters could not endure the pressure of such overmastering competition, and American prices gave way perforce, even while European prices of wool were rising from the effect of scarcity in foreign countries. The wholesale slaughter of unprofitable sheep followed as a necessity imposed upon flock masters by the logic of inexorable events growing out of the Wilson-Gorman tariff.

Reverting to the law of supply and demand to which reference has already been made, it appears, from the facts stated in the present review of the contrasted effect upon woolgrowing in this country of the McKinley and the Wilson-Gorman tariffs, that the question is between the home supply and the foreign supply of the home demand for woolen goods. The supply of this demand by home-grown wool tends to raise the price of native wool. Its supply by foreign wool tends to lower the price of native wool.

Without contending that a protective tariff can override the universal law of supply and demand, we do contend, and it must be admitted, that it has power to change the conditions of supply and demand in such a way as to encourage home production, both of the raw material and of the manufactured product. Under a protective tariff home production is encouraged and American farmers and manufacturers reap the benefit which otherwise accrues to the foreigner.

It only remains to remark again upon the absurdity of attributing the decline in the price of wool or any other agricultural product to "the crime of 1873." The crime of 1894 has been far more potent in this direction than the fictitious and fanciful "assassination of silver."

THE WOOL INDUSTRY—THE REPUBLICAN POLICY VS. THE DEMOCRATIC POLICY.

WILLIAM M'KINLEY TO OHIO WOOLGROWERS, SEPTEMBER 14, 1896.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The last three years have been years of great trial, not only to the woolgrowers of your country, but to the entire country. You have seen your flocks disappear and your fleeces diminish in value to an extent that prior to 1892 you would not have believed was possible.

I remember in 1891 to have delivered an address in Cadiz to the assembled farmers of Harrison County, in which I undertook to predict what would happen if we had free wool in the United States. There were few men in that great audience who believed my prediction then. What do you think of it now, farmers of Harrison County? [Cries of "We think it is right!"]

In 1891 you had, according to your banners displayed here today, 153,503 sheep of an average value of \$5 per head. In 1896 you have but 92,000 sheep, worth only \$1.50 per head. In 1891 you received from 30 to 32 cents per pound for your wool; in 1896, for the same grade of wool, from 14 to 16 cents per pound. This enormous loss to a great industry is truly astounding, and calls for serious consideration and prompt remedy, if one can be found, and the only remedy we have in the United States is by the ballot; and if it is protection you want, you know what party carries the banner of protection.

Prior to the enactment of the Wilson tariff law you had enjoyed, almost without interruption, from the beginning of the Government a tariff on your

Mr. BRYAN. I therefore, Mr. Chairman, denounce as fallacious, as unworthy of consideration, the only reason that can be given in support of the tariff on wool as a protective tariff and for protective purposes.—*Congressional Record*, volume 23, page 2126.

Mr. BRYAN. Out in Nebraska there was a time when we had almost one sheep for each man, woman, and child. We look back to it as the "mutton age" of Nebraska. [Laughter.] But, alas, that happy day has passed. The number of sheep has continually decreased, until now, if every woman in the State named Mary insisted upon having a pet lamb at the same time, we would have to go out of the State to get lambs enough to go around. [Laughter and applause.]

No; it is not because of the importance of the industry, nor is it because it is an infant industry. You may go back into history, sacred or profane, as far as tradition runs, and you will find the record of the sheep. Homer tells how Ulysses escaped from the cave of the Cyclops by means of a sheep. We read in the Bible that when Isaac was about to be offered up, away back in the patriarchal days, a ram was found caught by the horns in a thicket and offered in his stead; and further back than that, in the fourth chapter of Genesis—I think in the second verse; my Republican friends of course will remember [laugh-

product to protect you from the competition of the cheaper lands and the cheaper labor of other countries. By that act your product was made free and opened up to the unrestricted competition of all the wool of the world. What makes that act more indefensible is, first, that it was wholly unnecessary, and second, that it was singling out one of the greatest industries of the country for immediate sacrifice, leaving other industries having no greater claim upon the consideration of the Government practically unharmed.

No class of our citizens have suffered so much from the tariff as the woolgrowers of the United States, and none were more deserving of generous treatment than they. So inexcusable was this act that the President, who favored a reduction of tariff all along the line and believed in free raw material, was unwilling to sign the bill, and used these characteristic words against it:

It may well excite our wonder that Democrats are willing to depart from this (free-raw-material doctrine) the most Democratic of all tariff principles, and that the inconsistent absurdity of such a proposed departure should be emphasized by the suggestion that the wool of the farmers be put on the free list and the protection of tariff taxation be placed around the iron ore and coal of corporations and capitalists.

But this did not avert the fatal blow. Less organized than other industries in the country, you were unable to secure the recognition to which you were justly entitled, and your great product was made the victim of free trade.

In all the years in which the Republican party was in power you know that it gave protection to wool, and in the act of 1890 gave to this industry increased protection. That law—the law of 1890—gave to every agricultural product of this country, every farmer's product in this country, the best protection ever had. Every protection that could be given to them against outside competition and to preserve the home market was always cheerfully and generously accorded by the Republican party.

The platform of the national Republican party singles out the wool industry and makes of it special mention as entitled to full protection under our revenue laws. This is the language of the national platform:

To all our products—to those of the mine and field, as well as those of the shop and factory—to hemp, to wool, the product of the great industry of sheep husbandry, as well as to the finished woolsens of the mill, we promise the most ample protection.

And what the Republican party promises it is in the habit of performing. It does not make promises to be broken. It says what it means and means what it says. If clothed with power in all branches of the Government, it will give to this

ter)—it is recorded of the second son of the first earthly pair, "Abel was a keeper of sheep." And from that day to this—

Mr. SIMPSON. I want to ask the gentleman if we are to understand that this is a sacrifice you are offering up on the altar of protection?

Mr. BRYAN. No, sir; we are only beginning an attack which will be continued just as long as there is anything to remedy. [Applause.]

But I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, that from that day to this the sheep has been the constant companion of man in all his travels, and it has differed from its modern owner, perhaps, the most in that it is recognized as the symbol of meekness. [Laughter.]—*Congressional Record*, volume 23, page 2126.

Mr. BRYAN. I have often thought how perplexed the sheep must have been after the passage of the last bill (the McKinley bill) when they got together and consulted among themselves as to how they were going to increase the amount of their wool now that the tariff had made it necessary. [Laughter.] But nobody, Mr. Chairman, has said to this House that protection would reduce the price of pasturage in this country, nor has anybody claimed that it would so moderate the climate as to do away with the necessity for winter feeding.

The theory, Mr. Chairman, upon which this is justified might as well be met here as anywhere; and I want to state, as emphatically as words can state it, that I consider it as false in economy and vicious in policy to attempt to raise at a high price in this country that which we can purchase abroad at a low price.—*Congressional Record*, volume 23, page 2126.

Mr. BRYAN. The people throughout the country declared in favor of free wool and a reduction of the tariff, and the farmers want free wool because they can not be hoodwinked and deceived any longer, as these gentlemen seem to think.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Then why keep it from them?

Mr. BRYAN. I would like to have it now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Well, let us have it now.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman can not bring free wool too soon to suit me.—*Congressional Record*, volume 26, page 893.

Mr. PICKLER. I will help you this far. I am in favor of protecting all industries alike to a reasonable extent. I am not in

great industry fair and just protection with all other industries of the country.

But, my fellow-citizens, what we want, whether we produce wool or any other agricultural product—what we want is to preserve the splendid home market to our own American producers. It is the best market in the world. There is no other market like it, and upon every principle of justice and fair play it belongs to us and nobody else before us. Protection to the farmer has been recognized from the beginning of the Government until now.

As showing the importance of your industry, it is only necessary to say that in 1892 there were 700,000 woolgrowers in the United States—700,000 people whose chief occupation was that of woolgrowing. There were probably one-fourth as many more who were owners of small flocks of sheep in the United States. This industry employed besides those who owned the flocks, it is estimated, at least 500,000 laborers, representing, with those who were dependent upon them, nearly 2,500,000 people.

There were 700,000 farms, averaging 160 acres each, devoted to this industry, and the mountainous regions and the vast plains of the great West, which are not adapted to other kinds of farming, have been utilized in this great industry and made valuable. Every one of these farms, comprising 160 acres of land—112,000,000 acres in all—have been seriously injured by placing wool upon the free list.

In one of the agricultural papers of the West I have seen the statement that in Oregon, Utah, Washington, Idaho, and western Montana there were 6,710,746 sheep, which were worth in 1892 \$13,421,000, and which in 1896 were worth only \$6,710,000. In 1892 we had 47,273,553 sheep in the United States, valued at \$125,000,000. In 1895 we had 38,298,000, valued at \$65,000,000. The total imports of woolen goods in 1892, under the Republican protective-tariff law, were a little above \$37,000,000, and in 1895, under the Wilson tariff law, the imports amounted to more than \$60,000,000.

HIS OWN WORDS OF 1888 RECALLED.

On April 2, 1888, in presenting the minority report in opposition to the Mills tariff bill in the National House of Representatives, I said:

Wool on the free list is a deadly assault upon a great agricultural interest, and will fall with terrible severity upon a million people, their households, and dependencies. It will destroy invested capital, unsettle established values, wrest from flock masters their lifetime earnings, bankrupt thousands of our best and most industrious farmers, and drive them into other branches of agriculture already overcrowded. It is a vicious and indefensible blow at the entire agricultural interests of the country.

Alexander Hamilton, in his report upon manufactures made

favor of making the farmer bear all the brunt, as you make him to do in this bill, and yet give protection to the manufacturers in the East. [Applause.] That is what you do by this bill.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Pickler] was complaining to-day because we would not allow the egg producers of this country to tax the egg consumers, and as long as he asks a tariff on eggs, he must submit to it on manufactures.

Mr. PICKLER. Would not the gentleman do well to take more care of the woolgrowers and egg producers, and let the representatives of the consumers of these products take care of them? The gentleman had better take care of the farmers of the Northwest, whom he in part represents.

Mr. BRYAN. If the gentleman who represents the farmers of South Dakota would help to take care of the farmers instead of standing up for 98 per cent duty on the woolen goods which his people wear, and for an average of 50 per cent on the tariff schedules, he would do them better service.

Mr. PICKLER. Our people do not pay a cent of that. We do not wear broadcloth out there. [Laughter.]—*Congressional Record*, volume 26, page 227 (appendix).

Mr. BRYAN. Wool, for instance, is the chief raw material in the woolen industry, and it has been placed upon the free list. Whether the tariff on wool has raised the price of wool to the sheep grower above the point it would have reached without a tariff is a question which has been discussed rather than settled. Speaking for myself, it is immaterial, in my judgment, whether the sheep grower receives any benefit from the tariff or not.—*Congressional Record*, volume 26, page 226 (appendix).

BRYAN FAVORED THE WILSON-GORMAN BILL AFTER CLEVELAND DENOUNCED IT.

Mr. Bryan favored the Wilson-Gorman bill, even after it had become so obnoxious that some of its former friends could not support it, when Grover Cleveland said of it:

It may well excite your wonder that Democrats are willing to depart from this the most Democratic of all tariff principles, and that the most inconsistent absurdity of such a proposed departure should be emphasized by the suggestion that the wool of the farmer be put on the free list and the protection of tariff taxation be placed around the iron ore and coal of corporations and capitalists.

Tom L. Johnson, in his speech in the House of Representatives against the Wilson bill, as amended by the Senate, denounced it because it imposed

to Congress one hundred and four years ago, said:

This idea of an extensive domestic market for the surplus produce of the soil is of the first importance. It is, of all things, that which most effectually conduces to a flourishing state of agriculture.

Thomas Jefferson said:

Experience has taught me that manufacturers are as necessary to our independence as to our comfort. The duties we lay on all articles of foreign manufacture which prudence requires us to establish at home, with the patriotic determination of every good citizen to use no foreign article which can be made at home, secure us against a relapse into foreign dependency. My own idea is that we should encourage home manufacturers to the extent of our own consumption.

I have said that the home market is the best market. You know that from experience, and the home market is made better by increasing our factories and giving employment to idle workmen. Put every idle man in the country to work and your consumers will be increased; and when your consumers are increased, then your market is improved and the better the price you receive for your product.

You remember that in 1892 it was repeatedly stated that free wool would increase the price of wool to the American wool-grower [a voice, "That's the biggest lie that was ever told"], but then you heard them tell it. There may have been some farmers who thought that was true. There are none who think so now. It was said that if we opened up this country to the free use of the wool of the world, the farmers would be benefited. It was done, and with what benefit you know better than I can tell you.

Now they tell you that free silver is the panacea for all your ills, and you have the same money in circulation now that you had four years ago, but the woolgrowers have not got as much of it as they had then. As free wool degraded your industry so free silver will degrade your money. You have already been fleeced by loss of your flocks, and you do not propose to be fleeced further by loss on your money.

We have opened up our mills to the wool of the world, and both the wool and the woolen mill have suffered. The American farmer has seen his wool displaced by the foreign clip. The American woolen manufacturer has seen his goods disappear from the American market to give place to the foreign market. The American farmer has thus lost directly in the price of his wool and almost as severely by the blow dealt to the home market for a food product through the diminished consumers resulting from idle mills. The American farmer will not tamely submit to this injustice and wrong. The American workingman in the woolen mills will indignantly repel that legislation whose effect is to degrade his labor.

a duty on sugar and removed the duty from wool. He said:

You can not disguise it from the people, for the people know it already, that the purpose of this sugar tax is to put millions and millions into the pockets of men who are already millionaires by robbing the people.

In opposing the same measure Bourke Cockran said:

The iron industry will march to greater activity under this bill than the wool industry.

But Mr. Bryan was so bent upon getting at the farmers' wool that he voted for the Wilson-Gorman bill, with all its iniquitous discriminations. The record of that vote is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 26, page 8482.

RESULTS OF FREE WOOL.

Mr. Bryan got free wool for the farmer. The results are no longer a matter of discussion. They are clearly set forth in the following:

	Price August 1, 1892, second year of McKinley law.	Price August 1, 1896, second year of Wilson-Gorman law.	Cents per pound lower.
XX Ohio, washed	29	17	12
Ohio medium, washed	33	19½	13½
Ohio coarse, washed (½-blood)	32	18½	14
Ohio fine, unwashed	20½	12	8½
Ind. and Mo. fine, unwashed	19½	11	8½
Ind. and Mo. medium, unwashed (½-blood)	25½	14½	10½
Ind. and Mo. coarse (½-blood), washed	24½	15	9½
Oregon and Colorado fine, shrink 70 per cent	17	8	9
XX Ohio, scoured	60	35	25
Ohio medium, scoured	55	33	22
Ohio (½-blood), scoured	43	25	18
Oregon and Colorado fine, scoured	57	30	27

Average American decline in two years 42½ per cent.

SOUTHERN DEMOCRATS ABANDONING FREE TRADE—SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RECENT VOTES IN CONGRESS ON THE TARIFF BILL—A BRYANESE FALSEHOOD EXPOSED—ALL OF THE SOUTHERN MEMBERS WHO VOTED FOR PROTECTION ARE NOT IMPORTATIONS FROM THE NORTH, BUT NATIVE SOUTHERNERS—SOME POPULISTS WHO ARE ALSO PROTECTIONISTS.

[Bureau of the Baltimore American.]

WASHINGTON, June 13.

Nothing has more disturbed the Democratic leaders in and out of Congress than the fact that the large number of Democratic members from the South have, within the past few days and weeks, cast their votes in favor of a protective tariff, and that no less than one-third of the members of Congress from south of Mason and Dixon's line have either voted directly for a high rate of protection in the pending tariff bill or refused to cast their votes against it. Thirty-two Southern men in the House voted for the Dingley bill, and five others from that section—Populists—refused to vote against it; while in the Senate, as is well known, numbers of Southern Democrats and Populists have voted for either higher rates of protection than were originally placed in the bill or than those reported from the Finance Committee.

That this growth of protective sentiment in the South is a genuine one, and largely the result of the development of manufacturing industries in that section, is apparent; but the necessity for excusing and minimizing it has led Mr. Bryan's organ, the Omaha World-Herald, and other papers to assert that the protective vote from the South is cast by men not natives of that section, and not representing its real sentiment.

A BRYAN FALSEHOOD.

In a recent issue the Omaha World-Herald, commenting upon this subject, says:

During the last decade a great deal of Northern capital has been invested in Southern manufacturing enterprises, and it is natural that the investing capitalists, after years of paternalism in the shape of protection, should still cling to it. The voices from the South crying for protection are voices that have been imported into that section from protection-nurtured New England, and are not the voices of Southerners. * * * The protectionists in the South are those who have left the sterile hills of New England and wandered down South to broaden their field of operations.

This statement is interesting, and especially so because it is untrue. Its untruthfulness adds to its interest because it shows to what desperate straits the Democratic leaders are forced in attempting by falsehood, as well as otherwise, to rescue the free-trade theory from destruction by members of their own party, and by men who have been lifelong members of it.

This assertion that the Southern votes which have been cast for the protective-tariff bill, or for especially protective features proposed or adopted; were cast by men not natives of that section—carpet-baggers—is absolutely untrue. Five Democrats voted for the tariff bill in the House—KLEBERG and SLAYDEN, of Texas, and BROUSSARD, DAVEY, and MEYER, of Louisiana. Six Democrats have voted for high protective features of the bill in the Senate—BACON and CLAY, of Georgia; TILLMAN and McLAURIN, of South Carolina; McENERY, of Louisiana, and MARTIN, of Virginia.

Every one of these, with the possible exception of MEYER of Louisiana, who does not indicate his birthplace in the autobiography published in the Congressional Directory, is a native-born Southerner, and has lived all of his life in that section.

ALL ARE NATIVE SOUTHERNERS.

Senator McENERY was born at Monroe, La.; was nominated by the Democratic party as lieutenant-governor in 1879, by the same party for governor in 1884, by the same party for governor in 1892, and by the same party for Senator in 1896, being elected as a Democratic Senator with the clear understanding that he was a protectionist in sentiment, and would so vote in the Senate. Mr. MEYER of Louisiana, who voted for the tariff bill in the House, has spent practically his entire life in the South—educated in Virginia, serving as a Confederate officer, and elected term after term to Congress as a Democrat.

Mr. DAVEY, of Louisiana, who voted for the tariff bill in the House, is a native of New Orleans, held various offices in that State as a Democrat, and was elected to Congress as such. Mr. BROUSSARD, of Louisiana, who also voted for the Dingley bill in the House, is a native of Louisiana, has held many positions in Louisiana under the Democratic party, and was elected to Congress as a Democrat. Mr. KLEBERG, of Texas, who voted for the bill in the House, is a native of that State, served in the Confederate army, was elected to the State senate as a Democrat in 1882, held a Federal office as a Democrat by appointment of President Cleveland, and was elected to Congress as a Democrat.

Mr. SLAYDEN, of Texas, who is a native of Kentucky, was elected to the Texas legislature as a Democrat, and to Congress as a Democrat, yet voted for the Dingley bill in the House. Senator McLAURIN, of South Carolina, who voted for high protection in the Dingley bill in the Ways and Means Committee, and voted for a high rate of protection in the House and in the Senate on certain

features of the bill, is a native of South Carolina, was elected attorney-general of that State as a Democrat, and four times elected to Congress as a Democrat. Senator TILLMAN, of South Carolina, who voted for a high rate of protection on cotton, and thus enabled its adoption by the Senate, is a native of South Carolina, was nominated for governor in that State by the Democratic convention and elected, and was elected to the Senate of the United States as a Democrat.

Senator BACON, of Georgia, who led the successful fight for the protection of cotton, and also voted with the Republicans for a high rate of protection on lumber, is a native of Georgia, was president of the State Democratic convention in 1880, elected a Democratic Presidential elector in 1868, was a Democratic member of the Georgia house of representatives for fourteen years, and was elected to the United States Senate as a Democrat. Senator CLAY, of the same State, who voted with Mr. BACON for protection to cotton and lumber, is also a native of Georgia, was chairman of the State Democratic executive committee, and still holds that position, and was elected to the Senate as a Democrat. Senator MARTIN, of Virginia, voted with the Republicans for a high protection on lumber. He is a native of Virginia, and his Democracy has never been questioned.

THE POPULISTS.

Senator BUTLER, of North Carolina, Populist, who voted not only for protection to cotton but has sundry other high-protection amendments to the tariff bill now pending, is a native of North Carolina, was a Democrat prior to 1892, since which he has been a Populist, and is now chairman of the national committee of that party. Five Southern Populists in the House refused to vote against the protective-tariff bill—FOWLER, MARTIN, SHUFORD, SKINNER, and STROWD, of North Carolina—all of them being natives of the State they now represent.

It is thus apparent from the examination of the personal history of the Democrats from the South who have voted for the protective features of the tariff bill that in every case they are natives of that section and lifelong Democrats, and that of the six Southern Populists who voted for or refused to vote against the protective features of the tariff bill every one is a native of the South and formerly a Democrat.

The same rule in most cases applied to the 30 Republicans from the South. The Republican party has in Congress to-day a greater number of members from south of Mason and Dixon's line than ever before, with the possible exception of a single Congress shortly after the close of the war. Four of these—PRITCHARD, of North Carolina; DEBOE, of Kentucky; ELKINS, of West Virginia; and WELLINGTON, of Maryland—are in the United States Senate. Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. DEBOE, and Mr. WELLINGTON are native-born Southerners, and Mr. ELKINS a native of Ohio.

The South has 27 Republican members in the House. Six of these are from Maryland, and of these, 2 are natives of Northern States. Four members are from Kentucky, all natives of that State, and 2 from Tennessee, both natives of the South; 2 are from Virginia, both natives of that State, and 3 are from North Carolina, all natives of that State. Of the 50 Southern votes in Congress cast for, or refused to be cast against, the protective features of the tariff bill now pending, only 7 are by men who are natives of the North, while 4 of the Northern votes cast for the protective tariff bill in the House—BARHAM, of California; LACEY, of Iowa; DOLLIVER, of Iowa, and MORRIS, of Minnesota—are natives of the South.

FIGURES TELL THE STORY.

The Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth Congresses have contained a much larger number of Republicans from the South than any Congress which has preceded them for many years. The tariff experiment of four years ago, which proved unsatisfactory in other parts of the country, seems to have been equally so in the South. The following table shows the number of Republican Representatives in each of the past ten Congresses from the South, covering a period of twenty years:

Forty-fifth Congress	11
Forty-sixth Congress	4
Forty-seventh Congress	12
Forty-eighth Congress	15
Forty-ninth Congress	12
Fiftieth Congress	16
Fifty-first Congress	17
Fifty-second Congress	4
Fifty-third Congress	7
Fifty-fourth Congress	23
Fifty-fifth Congress	25

Adding to the 25 Southern Republican members in the Fifty-Fifth Congress the 6 Southern votes cast by Democrats and Populists for the protective tariff bill, it will be seen that the Southern protective element of the Fifty-fifth and Fifty-fourth Congresses was practically double that which has existed in any preceding Congress since reconstruction days.

With nearly one-third of the Southern representation in the

House either voting for a protective tariff measure or refusing to vote against it, and with leading Southern Democrats denouncing free trade and free raw materials and asking for increased protection upon the products of their fields, mines, and workshops, there certainly is ample justification for the statement that protection is gaining ground in the South.

FARMERS TO GET SEEDS ON A NEW SYSTEM—NEW PLANTS TO BE URGED—SECRETARY WILSON'S INTELLIGENT, PRACTICAL IDEA—TO DIVERSIFY FARM PRODUCTS—VEGETABLE FOODS NOW BROUGHT FROM OTHER LANDS OR NOT USED HERE AT ALL WILL BE GIVEN A FAIR TRIAL—CONSIDERABLE ATTENTION WILL BE PAID THE SUGAR BEET, ABOUT WHICH THERE IS INCREASING INQUIRY EVERYWHERE—MARKET ABROAD FOR AMERICAN DAIRY PRODUCTS.

[From the Pittsburg Commercial Gazette.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 14—(Special.)

No question has been more frequently asked by members of Congress since the new Administration came into power than that relating to the respective attitude of the Agricultural Department, especially with regard to the distribution of seeds to the farmers of the country. As everybody knows, this has been a vexed question during the past four years, and that Secretary Morton persistently opposed appropriations for this purpose and the distribution of seeds to the farmers of the country under the custom which had so long prevailed. "Are we going to get our seeds?" is the interrogation of every member of Congress, especially those from the agricultural sections, to the new Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wilson. To these inquiries the Secretary invariably responds, "Yes; but it will be under a different system, and one which will, I hope, develop new resources and a greater diversification of agricultural industries and agricultural products."

RESULT OF A STUDY OF FOOD PLANTS.

Secretary Wilson is bringing to the management of the Agricultural Department a happy combination of practical experience as a farmer, a scientist, and a Congressman. His long years of practical farm life were followed by experience in Congress, and since that time a scientific study and practical experimentation in his work as director of the State experiment station of Iowa. In the few days in which he has been in charge of the Department, he has set on foot a line of work which it is believed will supply to the farmers of the country, through the usual channels of distribution by members of Congress and the experiment stations, an entirely new application of the system of seed distribution, and one intended not only to diversify and increase the production of the farms, but to add largely to the value of farm products and keep at home enormous sums of money which we are annually sending abroad for agricultural products, while at the same time making a home market abroad for the products of the farmers of the United States.

Mr. Wilson's experience as the head of the experiment station of his own State, in which he coupled practical experience as a farmer with intelligent scientific observation and knowledge of the various kinds of agricultural products, has resulted in a marked improvement in the value and diversification of farm products in Iowa, and plans which he has already outlined to the members of Congress with whom he has talked show to them that this intelligent system is to be applied to the entire agricultural system of the United States. Corn, which in his own State brings no more than 10 or 15 cents per bushel for marketing, is, in his opinion, worth several times that if properly fed, and he has already put on foot plans for the investigation of the experiments made in this line in various States, especially with reference to the utilization of these and other farm products for feeding sheep, a system through which he believes the agricultural products may prove more valuable than in the past, especially by reason of the difficulty farmers have had in procuring other classes of food animals to which to feed the enormous grain crops which this country has produced during the past few years.

LESS FAT AND MORE LEAN.

But it is not to this line alone that he is confining his experiments and researches and plans. In the distribution of seeds, he is preparing to supply the farmers of the country with the class of plants which have proven exceptionally valuable in other parts of the world and in experiments which have been conducted in a few of the States of this country. The people of the world now, Mr. Wilson finds, are demanding nitrogenous foods and not requiring such quantities of the class of food obtained from the fat-producing grains which have sent American lard all over the world, but for which the demand has of late somewhat fallen off. In other words, fats are less in demand, and the nitrogenous products which furnish juicy chops and outlets and palatable, strength-producing steaks are now more demanded.

Leguminous plants, which are deep rooted and rich in nitrogen, Japanese beans, field pease, and pod-bearing plants generally, are

found to be more valuable where they have been tested in this and other countries; and so the farmers of the country this year will find their seed packages of an entirely different character from those they have been accustomed to receive. In the experiments made in the State of Iowa during the last few years all the world has been ransacked for varieties of nitrogen-producing plants with which to supply the demand which the new order of things in the consumption of animal food has created.

Field peas from Canada, Japanese beans and clover from the Orient, a peculiar class of pod-bearing plants from the South, and other products of various portions of Europe, where these matters have been carefully and scientifically studied, have all been brought into requisition in the experiments made by him, and so successfully that he is preparing to apply this information to such other sections of the country as are likely to find it useful.

In the experiments which have been made in certain of the agricultural stations, especially those of Iowa, it has been found that by a combination of these deep-rooted plants it is practicable to furnish a succession of crops which shall give from the opening of the season until snowfall a constant supply of nitrogenous food for animals, which adds very greatly to their value for food. It is in the hope and expectation of applying this system to the great stock-producing area, with such modifications as soils, climate, and surroundings may suggest, that the new Secretary of Agriculture will surprise the farmers of the land when they open their seed packages which they are to receive under this Administration.

SUGAR-BEET PROTECTION.

But it is not in this alone that Mr. Wilson has given his attention during the first few days of his work. He has found in his work, as have many others who have had occasion to study the interests of the farming element, that no subject engrosses the farmers of the country more than that of sugar-beet production. From the North and the West especially the demand for sugar-beet seeds and opportunity for experiment in sugar-beet production has been very great, and now the demand has come from the South, where many of the farmers believe that it is practicable to grow the sugar beet.

This statement is not limited to the farmers and those directly interested in agriculture. The capitalists and business men of the towns and cities stand ready to invest large sums of money in beet-sugar factories, provided it is found that the beets can be raised successfully in their sections of the country. With this in view, Secretary Wilson has arranged to distribute beet seeds to every county in the United States in which beet culture seems at all likely to succeed. Contracts have already been made for a very large quantity of seeds of the best varieties of sugar beets, and the work of distributing them will begin very soon.

This seed will go to the experiment stations of the various States, and from thence be sent to each county, with instructions to those receiving them to send the beets thus produced to the experiment station of that State for analysis. Instead of discouraging the farmers of this country in their ambitions to produce the sugar for which \$100,000,000 are now annually sent abroad, as seems to have been the case under the recent Administration, every encouragement will be given to the experiments and to the investment of funds by those desiring to cooperate with the farmers in the production of the sugar supply of the United States.

In addition to this, Secretary Wilson has also set on foot a line of inquiries which he hopes and expects will materially increase the market abroad for the dairy products of the United States. He is impressed with the belief that the United States might furnish to England and other parts of Europe many million dollars' worth of dairy products which they now draw from other parts of the world, and that it can readily be accomplished by studying the tastes and demands of those markets. The form of package, method of preparation and sorting, and these minor details which seem unimportant in themselves, but which finally determine the selection of almost any class of articles, are already being studied under orders which were given by Mr. Wilson during the very first days of his occupancy of the desk of the Secretary of Agriculture.

REPUBLICAN PARTY THE REAL FRIEND OF BIMETALLISM—BACK OF CONFERENCES—EARLY ON RECORD AS FAVORING INTERNATIONAL ACTION—REVIEW OF WORK OF PREVIOUS COMMISSION SHOWS LITTLE TO CREDIT OF DEMOCRATS.

[From the Chicago Inter Ocean.]

That the Republican party in the United States has been on all former occasions, as it is to-day, foremost in the movements in favor of international action in behalf of silver is entirely apparent from a study of the history of the earlier conferences and preliminary work which preceded them.

At every step in the progress of legislation or official action with reference to the proposed international conference of 1897 the professed friends of silver in the Democratic, Populist, and Free Silver parties have embarrassed rather than assisted the work, their

speeches in Congress and their utterances in the newspapers having, from first to last, insisted that no conference could probably be brought about, and that, if held, no results could be obtained. When this is compared with the action of the Republican leaders, both in the present case and in the former conferences, the contrast is startling.

PREVIOUS CONFERENCES RECALLED.

Four international monetary conferences looking to an increased use of silver and the restoration of bimetalism have been held in the past thirty years. The first was held at the invitation of France and met in Paris June 17, 1867. The second met at the invitation of the United States at Paris August 16, 1878. The third was called by the United States and France jointly and held in Paris in 1881, and the fourth was called by the United States and met at Brussels November 22, 1892.

A fifth might have been held in 1893 had President Cleveland chosen to call together again the delegates to the conference of 1892, who adjourned with the understanding that they should meet again in case any of the nations represented chose to call them together. Mr. Cleveland, however, although urged to take this step to reassemble this conference, which had made considerable progress at its first meeting, omitted to do so, and it now remains for a Republican President, his successor, to again call a conference. The preliminary steps for such action have already been taken in the appointment of the commission named on Monday last.

The first international conference upon this subject was called, as above indicated, in France, and was held during the Paris Exposition in 1867. The primary object of this was the establishment, if practicable, of an international silver coin. The United States was represented at this conference by a Republican, Gen. Samuel E. Ruggles, of New York, appointed by a Republican President, and at the recommendation of the leading members of the party. The work of that conference, although not successful as regards the object for which it was called, is looked upon by bimetalists generally as extremely important.

WORK OF THE SECOND COMMISSION.

The next step in behalf of bimetalism was also the work of the Republican party. It was the appointment of a commission under joint resolution passed by a Republican Senate, whose members were to make an inquiry "into the change which has taken place in the relative values of gold and silver and the causes thereof, whether permanent or otherwise," and "into the policy of the restoration of the double standard in this country, and if restored, what the legal ratio between the two coins, silver and gold, should be." This was not an international commission.

The Republicans present in this commission were Senator JONES, of Nevada; George S. Boutwell, George Willard, of the House of Representatives, and Prof. Francis Bowen, of Harvard College. The secretary of the commission also was a Republican, Hon. George Weston, of Maine. The Democratic party was represented by Lewis V. Bogy, RICHARD P. BLAND, Randall L. Gibson, and William Groesbeck. Three members of this commission, headed by Senator JONES, reported in favor of the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 15½ to 1, the standard of the Latin Union. The other members of the commission, including Mr. Groesbeck, Mr. BLAND, Mr. Boutwell, Mr. Bowen, and Mr. Gibson, presented separate minority reports, but did not concur in the recommendation for the new ratio of 15½ to 1.

While the report of the commission of 1876, which was appointed by President Grant, did not lead to Congressional action, it was quickly followed by an international monetary conference. This conference was brought about through legislation inaugurated by a Republican Senate, supported by the Republican votes in the House. The conference was called by a Republican President, and distinguished Republicans formed a majority of the representation of the United States in it.

The invitations to various nations to meet delegates from the United States at Paris, August 17, 1878, was accepted by eight nations. The delegates from the United States were ex-Governor Fenton, of New York, chairman; Gen. Francis A. Walker, W. S. Groesbeck, and S. Dana Horton, the latter being appointed as secretary of the delegation, but given the same rights on the floor of the conference as the members of the commission. All these gentlemen, with the exception of Mr. Groesbeck, were Republicans.

PRESIDENT GARFIELD'S SENTIMENTS.

The next international silver conference was held at the joint invitation of the United States and France, April 18, 1881, the call for the conference and the appointment of delegates therat having been made by a Republican President, and all of the delegates, with one exception, being Republicans. The delegates were William M. Evarts, Allen G. Thurman, Timothy O. Howe, and S. Dana Horton, whose offices at the former conference and whose writings on bimetalism had attracted much attention.

Not only was a majority of the delegates chosen from the Republican party, but the Republican President of that date (Garfield), in his inaugural address a few months earlier, indicated the earnestness of his party in behalf of international action by saying, with reference to the disparity between gold and silver: "I confidently believe that an arrangement can be made between the leading commercial nations which will secure the general use of both metals."

The fourth and last international conference on bimetallism was held at Brussels November 22, 1892, having been called by a Republican President, Benjamin Harrison, authorized by an amendment attached to the sundry civil bill by the Republican Senate, and the representation of the United States on the commission being, as on all former occasions, made up largely of Republicans. The delegates of the United States were WILLIAM B. ALLISON, JOHN P. JONES, Henry W. Cannon, Prof. E. Benjamin Andrews, Edwin H. Terrell, and James B. McCreary.

TEXT OF INSTRUCTIONS.

The instructions to these delegates, prepared by a Republican Secretary of State, John W. Foster, were:

It is the opinion of the President [Mr. Harrison] and, as he believes, of the people of the United States, with singular unanimity, that the full use of silver as a coined metal, at a ratio to gold to be fixed by agreement between the great commercial nations of the world, would very highly promote the prosperity of the people of all the countries of the world. For this reason your first and most important duty will be to secure, if possible, an agreement among the chief commercial nations of the world looking to international bimetallism, that is, the unlimited coinage of gold and silver into money of full debt-paying power at a fixed ratio in coinage common to all the agreeing powers.

The report of the American delegates on their return shows that the form of expression prepared by these delegates, "That in the opinion of this conference it is desirable that some measure may be formed for increasing the use of silver in the currency system of the nations," received the approval of nearly every one of the nations there represented. This conference had by far the largest attendance of any which had theretofore been held.

HAS GOLD "APPRECIATED"?—STARTLING FIGURES UPON THE WORLD'S GOLD PRODUCTION—THE GOLD MONEY OF THE WORLD IS FOUR TIMES AS MUCH FOR EACH PERSON AS FIFTY YEARS AGO—ENORMOUS INCREASE IN PRODUCTION AND COINAGE.

[By O. P. Austin.]

Has gold "appreciated"?

The advocates of the free coinage of silver say that it has. Like the man who thinks his own train in motion because the one alongside is moving in an opposite direction, the silver men insist that instead of all other prices (including that of silver) having fallen, the price of gold has really risen, and the price of everything else has stood still. They assert that there has been a steady change in the ratio of a dollar in gold to a given quantity of grain, cotton, clothing, food, and silver, and argue that since one dollar in gold will buy more of all commodities in the markets of the world to-day than it did in 1873, gold has advanced in value, while the value of other articles has stood still. Hence their constant assertion that "gold has appreciated."

Let us see. To appreciate means to increase in value. Anything which increases in value does so either because it has grown relatively scarce or because each individual needs more of it for his daily use.

Now, has this happened about gold? Fifty years ago the world had a billion people, in round numbers; now it has a billion and a half. The population has increased 50 per cent in fifty years.

Has the gold of the world increased at the same rate as the population? If so, have we any right to assume that gold has appreciated? If it appears that it has increased more rapidly than the population, would it not rather depreciate than appreciate?

GOLD PRODUCTION HAS GREATLY INCREASED.

Let us examine the figures from the best authorities of the world, Soetbeer, Mulhall, Preston, and others. Mulhall indicates that the amount of gold in the world, coined and uncoined, fifty years ago amounted to less than \$2,500,000,000. Taking his figures for 1890 and adding the production since that date, the gold in the world to-day, coined and uncoined, is shown to be over \$7,000,000,000. Thus it will be seen that the world apparently has about three times as much gold to-day as it had fifty years ago.

If there had been no increase in population in the meantime, there would thus be three times as much gold for each person now as there was a half century ago. But the population has increased 50 per cent, so there is apparently twice as much gold in the world for each individual as there was at that time.

GOLD COINAGE HAS GREATLY INCREASED.

But this is not all. Fifty years ago only 33 per cent of the gold of the world was coined into money. Now 66 per cent of it is coined. So it appears that, while the per capita of gold has been

doubled, the proportion of that gold which is turned into coin has also doubled.

This means that there is four times as much gold coin for each individual in the world to-day as there was fifty years ago.

Does this look as though there was a scarcity of gold? If gold coin is four times as plentiful for each individual to-day as it was fifty years ago, is it reasonable to assume that the legitimate need for more of it as a medium of exchange is greater now than it was then? If not, how can it be shown that it has "appreciated"?

There is another way of looking at it. Of the total money of the world fifty years ago only 20 per cent was gold. Now nearly 35 per cent of the money of the world is gold. Had the demand for money increased more rapidly than the gold increased, there would have been a greater proportionate growth of the other kinds of money, either silver or paper or both, for both are plentiful and are constantly used for currency everywhere. But their proportion has decreased, while the proportion of gold has increased.

"But," say the friends of silver, "the mere fact that gold money has increased does not prove that it is sufficient to meet the wants of business, because since the crime of 1873 in this country and similar crimes about the same date in other countries the quantity of silver money has decreased."

SILVER AND PAPER MONEY HAVE ALSO INCREASED.

Let us see about that. Preston, the Director of the United States Mint, estimates that the world's silver money in 1873 was \$1,817,000,000. He estimates the world's silver money to-day to be \$4,070,500,000, of which amount \$3,440,700,000 is full legal tender. Thus the silver money of the world has apparently more than doubled since 1873. This shows the utter fallacy of the argument of the silver people that silver money has been reduced since 1873. It is interesting in this connection also to note that the paper money of the world has trebled in the past half century, having been in 1848, according to Mulhall, \$1,300,000,000, and in 1890, \$3,875,000,000.

There is still another light in which this currency question should be considered. If the value of a house "appreciates," the rent increases proportionately. If it depreciates in value, the rent falls. This rule applies equally to the rent of money, usually termed interest. This test ought to determine the actual value of money and show whether it is scarce or plentiful. In the past fifty years rates of interest have fallen from one-fourth to one-half, according to the locality, thus indicating that there is less scarcity of money to meet business demands than was the case fifty years ago.

The increase in the gold of the world has been something enormous in the past half century. Prior to 1845 the average production seldom exceeded ten millions a year. Since that time it has been from one hundred to two hundred millions a year. Thus the rate of production increased tenfold, and in some years twentyfold, and had in fifty years trebled the amount of gold in the world and quadrupled the amount of gold coined for each individual.

HAS THE GOLD INCREASE KEPT PACE WITH THE NEEDS OF BUSINESS?

"But," says somebody, "the business of the world has increased enormously meantime, at a much greater rate than the gold has increased, and since the amount of gold has failed to keep pace with business, gold has naturally appreciated."

Let us examine that subject. It is true that the business of the world has increased enormously. The value of the industries of the globe is to-day, according to Mulhall, three times what it was fifty years ago, and the commerce of the world is six times as great as it was at that time. In that same period gold has only trebled.

This would seem to give color to the claim that the increase in gold had not kept pace with the demands of commerce.

NEW BUSINESS METHODS REDUCE THE DEMAND FOR COIN.

But another and very important factor comes into the problem just at this point. That factor is the matter of banking facilities and the use of the medium of exchange which passes between them and their customers and takes the place of the more bulky and less convenient coin. Fifty years ago the man who engaged in commerce carried with him the gold with which to make his purchases. He went by stagecoach and sailing vessel, and the gold in his leather belt lay idle weeks or months while the tedious journey was being made.

Now he deposits his money in bank, the banker loans a given proportion of his deposits to those who desire its immediate use, and it is kept in active circulation meantime. The owner of the gold takes in its stead a slip of paper, a draft or bill of exchange, good wherever he may present it; and if he wants more, it is transferred half way around the world on his demand by telegraph in the twinkling of an eye. The banking facilities of the world have increased tenfold in the past fifty years, and instead

of most of the business being done by a hand-to-hand exchange of money for property, 95 per cent of the business is performed with that comparatively new medium of exchange, banking paper, whose elasticity, convenience, and power of instant transfer has revolutionized business and reduced enormously the proportionate demand for gold or other metallic money in the great business transactions of the world.

The use of this new medium of exchange grows nearer to the masses every day. A recent investigation by the Comptroller of the Currency showed that nearly 60 per cent of the payments made to retailers, such as butchers, grocers, clothiers, and general dealers, are now made in checks instead of by the use of money itself. The money which these checks represented had been deposited in the banks by the owners, but only a given proportion of it was kept in stock by the bankers, who know by experience that only a certain percentage of their deposits will be called for at one time, and are thus able to loan out a large share of the money deposited, and so keep it in active circulation.

Thus the stock of money, which has itself enormously increased, is multiplied many times by the fact that it is used over and over again, with ten or twenty times the frequency that it was a half century ago.

This system, which has grown up during the period in which business has so greatly increased, changes radically the relations of ready cash to the volume of business. It was a premonition of this change in business customs which led Mill, in his Principles of Political Economy, Volume II, Book III, to say:

The proposition respecting the dependence of general prices upon the quantity of money in circulation must, for the present, be understood as applying to a state of things in which money—that is, gold or silver—is the exclusive instrument of exchange and actually passes from hand to hand at every purchase, credit in any of its shapes being unknown. When credit comes into play as a means of purchase, distinct from money in hand, the connection between prices and the amount of circulating medium is much less direct and intimate, and such connection as does exist no longer admits of so simple a mode of expression.

Under this system the commodities whose value is expressed in terms of the standard of value are exchanged for other commodities whose values are also expressed in the same terms, while actual money, apart from its use as a common denominator of value, does not enter into the transaction. As this great medium of exchange increases, the need of coin decreases.

LABOR THE TRUE MEASURE OF VALUE.

But there is one more test of the actual value of the gold, a test which does not depend upon theories or tedious inquiry as to quantities of money or methods of business transaction. This test is a simple one, but the most important, the most accurate and far-reaching of all those which have been applied.

This most important of all tests is the amount of gold which a given quantity of labor will buy.

The real standard of value in the world is labor. It is this which produces all commodities, the necessities as well as the comforts and luxuries of life. The food we eat, the clothes we wear, the houses in which we live, the necessities which a half century ago were considered luxuries are all the result of labor, and the money which is paid for them measures the hours of labor which produces them. Labor is, then, the real standard by which to measure gold.

If a day or an hour of labor will buy less gold to-day than it did fifty years ago, then it may be properly said that gold has "appreciated." If it will buy more gold to-day than it did fifty years ago, then gold has depreciated, and if each grain of gold which an hour of labor buys will also purchase more of manufactured commodities than it did fifty years ago, then the laborer has again multiplied the value of his time and skill.

Let us see about that. A committee of the United States Senate, known as the Aldrich committee, made a thorough investigation a few years ago into the question of wages and prices, and after a long and thorough research made a report, the accuracy of which is everywhere accepted. That investigation showed that a day's labor in nearly all the trades would, in 1890, buy about double the amount of gold that it did fifty years earlier, and do it with less hours of work in a day.

For instance, plasterers who, in the good old free-silver days of 1840, got \$1.50 per day were paid \$3.50 in 1890; blacksmiths who received \$1.50 per day in 1840 got \$3 in 1890; painters whose wages in 1840 were \$1.25 in 1890 were paid \$2.50; wheelwrights who earned \$1.25 in 1840 got \$2.50 in 1890; engineers who received \$2 per day in 1840 were paid \$4.25 in 1890, and so on. Taking eleven representative classes of workmen engaged in the particular industries as a basis, it was found that the average rate of wages advanced from \$1.30 per day in 1840 to \$2.37 in 1890, or that an hour of labor would earn nearly twice as much gold in 1890 as it did in 1840.

GOLD HAS DEPRECIATED RATHER THAN APPRECIATED.

How, then, can it be asserted that gold has "appreciated?" It has depreciated, and that highest and noblest of all standards,

human labor, will to-day buy more of it than it did fifty years ago, while the depreciated gold thus purchased can in turn be exchanged for more of other commodities which have still further depreciated by the improved methods of production, manufacture, and transportation which the ingenuity of the human mind has produced in the wonderful age in which we are living.

TRUE AND FALSE BIMETALLISM.

Three distinct notions are included in the conception of bimetallicism. They are as follows:

First. In order that a monetary system shall be truly bimetallic, silver and gold coin must both circulate as money.

Second. They must circulate at par with each other.

Third. The parity between them must be real and not artificial. It must be due to an equality in commercial value between the silver contained in a silver dollar and the gold contained in a gold dollar.

We have not in this country, at the present time, true bimetallicism; because, although gold and silver both circulate as money, and although they circulate at par with each other, the parity between them is not real, but fictitious. The Government has undertaken to maintain the silver dollar at parity with gold by means of legislation. It has declared that silver dollars shall be a legal tender for the payment of all debts, public or private, to any amount. This is in effect a loan of public credit—as truly as if the Government had agreed to redeem silver dollars (as it redeems United States notes) in gold.

With this explanation and understanding we may be said, even though we have not true bimetallicism, to have a modified and limited bimetallicism, although gold is the legal standard of valuation.

The issue in the present campaign may be stated as follows: Shall we preserve or abandon the modified bimetallic system which we have, under which the country has enjoyed such unparalleled prosperity? And if we decide to make a change in our monetary system, shall it be to true bimetallicism or to silver monometallicism?

The Republican party, in its platform, has declared itself in favor of true bimetallicism. It is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money, and in favor of making the silver dollar not merely nominally but actually worth as much as a gold dollar; but without a change in the coinage ratio, it does not believe that this can be done except by international agreement. The change which the Republican party desires, and which it has pledged itself to bring about if possible, is a change from limited and modified bimetallicism to bimetallicism true and complete.

The advocates of free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 on the other hand, are not true bimetallicists, because (1) they do not declare themselves in favor of an increase in the value of the silver bullion contained in a silver dollar from 53 cents to 100 cents in gold; (2) while they favor making silver dollars, each of which contains 371½ grains of pure silver, a legal tender for 100 cents, they overlook the fact that the coinage of an "unlimited" number of dollars of that weight would strain the credit of the Government to a point at which the silver dollar would not be accepted by the public at its face valuation, and it would accordingly cease to circulate at parity with gold; (3) the consequence would be that gold would be hoarded or sent abroad in payment for imports and interest, and the only coin in actual circulation would be silver.

The friends of free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 are, therefore, really—though some of them are not aware of the fact—advocating a change of our monetary system from our present modified and limited bimetallicism to practical silver monometallicism.

The only escape from this conclusion is in the assertion that the effect of free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 would be, by increasing the demand for silver bullion, to raise its market price, so that 371½ grains of silver bullion (the amount of pure silver in a silver dollar) would be exchangeable at par for 23.22 grains of gold bullion (the amount of pure gold in a gold dollar). Some of those who advocate free and unlimited coinage believe this; others do not.

There is not only a complete absence of proof that this effect would follow; there is every reason to think the contrary. The difference between the coinage ratio of gold and silver (16 to 1) and the commercial ratio (31 to 1) is too great to be thus overcome.

By "coinage" ratio is meant the comparative weights of gold and silver dollars; a silver dollar weighs sixteen times as much as a gold dollar. By "commercial" ratio is meant the comparative weights of gold and silver bullion of equal value, uncoined, in the markets of the world.

Moreover, the last published report of the Director of the Mint shows that from January 1, 1878, to June 30, 1895, the number of standard silver dollars coined was, in round numbers, 423,000,000, or about fifty-three fifty-fourths of the total number coined since

the foundation of the Government, and yet the bullion value of the silver dollar declined, in the face of this immense production of dollars, from 93 cents in 1878 to 53 cents in 1896. How would unlimited coinage have prevented this decline.

From this statement of the distinction between true and false bimetalism, it is evident that the friends of free and unlimited coinage of silver at the present legal ratio, 16 to 1, are not genuine bimetalists. The Republican party, in common with genuine bimetalists everywhere, is opposed to the free coinage of silver at any other ratio to gold than the commercial ratio. The Republican party, therefore, is the party of genuine bimetalism.

The Republican party is the friend of the silver dollar, since it desires to maintain it at parity with gold. The advocates of unlimited coinage are not its friends, because the effect of their policy, if adopted, would be to reduce its purchasing power to 53 cents.

The Republican party, if it is the friend, as we claim, of the silver dollar, is the friend of every man who has a silver dollar or who hopes to earn one; it is the friend of the miner, the mechanic, the farmer, the merchant—in a word, of all the people, without distinction of fortune or occupation.

WORKINGMEN TO WORKINGMEN—OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE MEXICAN COMMISSION OF THE TRADE AND LABOR ASSEMBLY OF CHICAGO, ILL.—HOW LABOR FARES IN A FREE-SILVER COUNTRY—FACTS WHICH INTEREST EVERY WORKINGMAN AND HIS FAMILY.

The workingmen of the United States, whether members of labor organizations or not, will be interested in an investigation into the conditions of labor and laboring people in the Republic of Mexico which has been made by a commission appointed for this purpose by the Trade and Labor Assembly of Chicago.

The claim that free coinage of silver would be advantageous to the laboring men of the United States has been so persistently urged by the advocates of free coinage, and Mexico has been so steadily pointed out as the most prosperous free-silver country in the world, that it was not unnatural that the labor organizations of the country should deem it proper, and indeed almost indispensable, to examine into the condition of labor in Mexico, in order to enable their members to intelligently decide for themselves what their own attitude should be upon this important question.

It was felt, and very properly, that the labor organizations of the country owe it, both to their own members and to workingmen generally, to bring about an unprejudiced investigation of this subject, made from their own standpoint and by men of their own choosing, without a possibility of prejudice or partisan bias in behalf of any political organization.

To this end the commission was made up of men selected from both parties, whose absolute fairness and strict devotion to the interests of labor was beyond question. Patrick Enright, a Sound-Money Democrat, a member of the executive board of the Iron Molders' Union of North America, a veteran in the history of local labor organizations, whose name has been well known to the laboring men of Chicago for nearly a quarter of a century, was one member of the commission.

Paul J. Maas, a Free-Silver Republican, general organizer of the American Federation of Labor, also organizer of the seventh district of the International Typographical Union, and well known in labor circles, was the other commissioner.

It will thus be seen that the commission represented both the great parties and both sides of the great issue of the campaign, the currency question, while their personal standing and their devotion to the interests of labor place their report upon such a high plane that no man can question its absolute good faith and reliability.

The commission was appointed in August, 1896, shortly after the issues of the campaign had been sharply defined and it became apparent that the currency question would be an important feature for consideration, especially so to the laboring men of the country. Its members proceeded to Mexico without any flourish of trumpets or desire to attract attention, but for the sole purpose of making a thorough personal investigation upon which they could report intelligently, faithfully, and accurately to those in whose interests they were sent.

Their report was presented to a special meeting of the Trade and Labor Assembly of Chicago on October 12, 1896. It was listened to with great interest, because every man recognized its extreme importance to himself and his family and to the laboring people of the United States, irrespective of party or of the class of employment in which they might be engaged. So absolutely fair and unprejudiced was the report found to be that it was, after its reading, adopted by the assembly with but two dissenting votes and made a part of its permanent record, and its publication and distribution, for the benefit of the laboring men of this country, was authorized.

Every workingman and every citizen interested in the pros-

perity of labor in this country should read this nonpartisan report made by laboring men to laboring men and determine for himself whether the labor conditions in the country pointed out by the friends of free silver as the most prosperous silver-using country in the world are such as to warrant the adoption of its financial system in the United States.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS.

CHICAGO, ILL., October 10, 1896.

To the officers and members of the Chicago Trade and Labor Assembly.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: We, your committee, sent to Mexico to investigate the condition of the laboring classes of that country, present the following as the results of our observations and investigations:

It was painfully evident to us that the toilers of Mexico, from the time of the Spanish invasion to the present, have had no change for the better in their social conditions. In the comforts and necessities of life they are down to the minimum, and in no time in history could their condition have been more deplorable or the race would be extinct.

The principal inducement offered capital to invest in Mexico is the cheap native labor to be found and no danger of strikes or their consequent evils to the investor. This is one of the strongest points advanced in soliciting investments for Mexico, which statements we have gleaned from native newspapers and literature sent broadcast to the world. To this we respectfully call the attention of the workingmen, as it gives a true status of the condition of labor as it exists in our sister Republic, where, in that country, the only thing that the toiler has to offer to maintain his existence—his labor—is the cheapest commodity in the country. To take advantage of this, the foreigner is invited to enter and take, and, with unbridled sway, enrich himself on the general misery of the toilers. For labor creates all wealth, and the creator of all wealth, aye, even the Creator of the universe, if possible, would be dethroned to subserve the interests of man in his greed for affluence and power, and in no country among the civilized nations is this fact so manifestly true as in the United States of Mexico.

HOSTILITY TO LABOR.

The Carpenter of Nazareth dignified labor. He proclaimed it honorable for all to eat bread by the sweat of their brow. But the haughty and indolent Castilian and his hybrid progeny of Mexico have perverted the noble words of Him who was ever the friend of the poor and lowly. In Mexico to don the raiment of toil is to wear the garb of servility. There class distinction is carried to a degree parallel to the castes of India. There the native toiler believes that he is born to live and die a veritable beast of burden, and seemingly is contented with his lot. But that contentment, so harped on by certain writers, is the contentment akin to the burro, which, manifesting neither joy nor sorrow, performs its task with the impressive indifference of an automaton.

The first stop made by your committee was at El Paso, Tex., where we investigated the wages paid and the conditions of the American laborers. From that point we crossed an imaginary line (the Rio Grande River being dry), over the only international street railway in the world, to the city of Juarez, formerly called Paso Del Norte, and but 2 miles distant from El Paso. At this place a complete change met the eye, everything assuming a Mexican air, and we realized that the time had arrived when the real duties of our mission began. We took observations of the people as to their appearance, mode of living, social conditions, wages paid, and prices of commodities, and were surprised at the contrast as compared with conditions, etc., in El Paso. Here we first saw the cotton clothing and sandals as worn by the peons. The clothing on many of these people was perforated and abbreviated in a manner sufficient to show their bronze skin as the sandals showed their feet.

LIFE OF THE POOR LABORER.

The two peoples, as to their habits, tastes, customs, and modes of life, are such that a comparison is unnatural. Life is regarded from very different standpoints, as they live under different conditions, inasmuch as the Mexican laborer is apparently content with the four bare walls of his 10-foot-square adobe hut, with nothing inside but the ground to sleep on, a shawl or blanket to cover or wrap himself up in, a dish of tortillas (corn pancakes) and frijoles (beans) for his frugal meal, and in a large number of cases a little pig, a dog, and a chicken or two of the gamecock order sharing his scant quarters, while the American laborer across the line has all the comforts of home and many of the luxuries of life.

Mexico, with all its boasted natural resources, charming climate, picturesque scenery, traditions, prehistoric ruins, its many and ancient churches, is attractive and interesting to the traveler, but the northern half of the country, from El Paso to Siloa, a distance of nearly 1,000 miles (aside from its many high mountains, which no doubt contain rich deposits of coal, silver, or gold), is a barren

desert, with nothing but rocks, sagebrush, and cactus to meet the eye, and presents anything but the ideal abiding place where civilization could eke out an existence, and nothing to bear out the moss-covered chestnut that health, wealth, and a contented people live and thrive there. Excepting in the towns along the lines of the railroad, not a bird or animal was seen, and a few peons and burros we saw were half starved and the picture of misery and dejection.

WAGES ARE VERY LOW.

Wages in Mexico, except to skilled and steady mechanics—all ways foreigners—are very low. On railroads, engineers (Americans) on passenger trains receive \$210 per month, while the firemen (Mexican) receive \$1.85 per day; freight engineers (American), \$250 per month; firemen (Mexican), \$1.50 to \$1.75 per day; passenger conductors (American), \$160 per month; brakemen (Mexican) \$1.50 per day; freight conductors (American), \$200 per month; brakemen (Mexican), \$57 to \$63 per month; Pullman conductors, \$80 per month (American money), and the porter \$30 per month (American money), with \$5 per month extra for being able to talk Spanish.

The national soldiers (or regular army) of Mexico, called rurales, and who are all ex-bandits, receive \$1 per day. In a broom factory near the depot at Jimenez the men are paid 50 cents; women and children, 25 to 37½ cents per day. In the cotton mills, cottonseed-oil mills, and soap factory at Torreon men are paid 37½ to 50 cents, and women and children 25 cents per day. A carcador (public carrier) has a rate of 12½ cents per hour; but you can hire him for from 25 to 37½ cents per day.

At Leon, where nearly all the leather goods in Mexico are manufactured, the peon gets his leather cut for shoes, harness, or other goods to be made by him, and takes the material to his hut, where the whole family assists him, the same as in the sweat shops of Chicago. For making shoes he receives \$1 and upward per dozen pairs. On other leather goods he receives 37½ to 50 cents per day for his labor, working as long as daylight lasts, averaging twelve to fourteen hours per day. Common laborers can be hired for 18 to 50 cents per day.

House servants, male or female, receive \$3 to \$5 per month and board themselves. In or near cities peons live in adobe houses and pay a rental of \$3 a year for the ground that the house stands on. When leaving this for another location all "improvements" the peon has made go to the landlord or owner of the land, who pays no taxes whatever on the land. Building lots in cities, 50 by 125 feet, cost \$25 per foot front and up, or a smaller patch of ground—a verrea, 3 feet square—at the rate of \$2.50 to \$3.50 per verrea.

ANCIENT METHODS STILL IN USE.

The chief industry of Mexico is mining, and the way mines are worked is certainly as primitive as can be. Very few mines are worked from the side of a hill; a shaft is generally sunk. The drilling is done by hand, one peon holding a long steel chisel, while the other uses a sledge hammer or stone to drive the chisel into the rock. After blasting, peons break up the larger rocks into smaller ones, while others crush the same into a coarse powder by rubbing it on flat stones or breaking it with a hammer. This is then shoveled into bags and carried to the surface, a peon climbing a number of timbers with notches cut in them (called monkey ladders), 200 to 400 feet high, with 250 to 325 pounds of pulverized ore on his back.

To watch a gang of peon laborers at work putting up a new building will break the heart of an American laborer. All building is done with a species of stone called tepatate, which is quarried with an ax or hatchet, and which hardens by exposure to the elements. All material is carried to the patio or open court in the middle of the proposed new building on the backs of peons and burros, a trench is dug and the foundation commenced, one peon mixing a native cement in a hollow log with a stick, while another carries stone to the trench for the mason. When the structure has reached the height of about 5 feet above the ground, a scaffold is made on the outside of the building of wooden beams securely tied with ropes, across which other beams are laid, and the laborer carries the material up a series of inclines.

The inside of the building is filled with dirt and rubbish as fast as the walls go up. The hod carrier carries the cement to the stone mason in a bag, while another carries up stones or adobe bricks (size, 6 by 11 by 3 inches), generally carrying 16 or 18 of these bricks at a time, or a stone weighing from 25 to 200 pounds. This work is very tedious owing to the method. After the building is completed the dirt and rubbish with which it is filled on the inside is removed in bags and carried away on burros' backs to some dumping place, while the scaffold is used by stonecutters to carve the front of the building, an art in which they are very skillful, and receive 87½ cents to \$1 per day.

In the mines, as well as on buildings, the owners or builders endeavored to introduce modern ladders, but the peon would not use them, fearing to risk his life on the rounds, and when wheelbarrows were brought for his use he filled the box of the same and carried the loaded wheelbarrow away on his head.

The stone quarries in Mexico are from 1 to 50 miles away from the cities, but the stone, as fast as quarried, or as a use has been found for it, is carried on the backs of peons and burros to the cities. Your committee met one of these peons carrying a stone 3 by 3½ feet square and 4 inches thick, which he was carrying from a quarry nearly 20 miles away. Twenty minutes later we met a number of burros, each carrying two such stones, and learned from the attendants that the peon had left the quarry at the same time as did the burros with their load.

The native (or laborer) of Mexico is but a child in intelligence, and if left to his own resources would be helpless to make a livelihood. While he is an adept imitator, he has no idea of doing anything to better his own condition, and does not take up modern or advanced means of brightening his existence, but retains all the primitive characteristics of centuries ago when Cortez first invaded that country.

To this day the peon sweeps the public streets with whisk brooms and carries the sweepings away in a bag on his head or back. Where there is a running stream of water, the women do the family washing, otherwise it is done in a hollow log. The women, whether of high or low degree, paint and powder in a manner comical to behold, and have not yet acquired the artistic touch of their American sisters. Everybody smokes cigarettes at all times and places. The peons cut grass or grain with a sickle or knife.

One mystery that presents itself for solution in the habits of the peon is that he lies on the cold ground or flagstones day or night with impunity from catching cold or contracting rheumatism, while the traveler in that country, to be comfortable, must wear a light overcoat and light woolen underwear, and have blankets for covering on the bed. Very early in the morning one meets large numbers of the natives barefooted, in cotton shirt and knee pants, seeming to be quite comfortable.

HOPELESS AND AIMLESS MEN.

Your committee, on learning of the low price paid for labor in Mexico, looking at that fact from a humanitarian standpoint, and that the laborer was worthy of his hire, was shocked, to say the least. But later, when we saw that although it took but 20 or 25 cents per day to keep a peon family of five and all members worked, and that to pay him more was his ruination, we were somewhat relieved. If a peon's wages are raised, he will only work until he earns a certain amount, and then quit and not do another stroke while he has a cent of money. Consequently they are totally unreliable and dear workmen. This condition was brought about by the inattention and lack of interest manifested in them as workers by their indolent masters. Thus, among the great nations of our advanced civilization, Mexico has been marking time while other nations have been marching on.

The peon is polite and kind, if one is to judge from the demeanor manifested when he meets a friend or in fondling children, and we feel warranted in saying that under proper conditions they are capable of being a splendid race of people. And if there is anything to the philosophy that some of us have been schooled in, which runs:

God of the just, Thou forcest the bitter cup,
We bow to Thy behest and drink it up.

Or—

The path of sorrow, and that path alone,
Leads to the land where sorrow is unknown.

Then the Mexican laborer will enjoy eternal bliss with the best in the great immortality in the life beyond.

THE COSTUME OF POVERTY.

Millinery is a scarcity in Mexico, excepting in the city. Your committee did not see a female with a hat on until we reached the City of Mexico, and there only on the heads of the "400" and the foreigners. As a rule, even there the women were bareheaded, their hair greased, yet nicely dressed. All wore a serape (a long shawl), which cost about \$1.50, which is worn about the upper part of the body, and so arranged as to serve three purposes: (1) It is wrapped around the breast and shoulders and takes the place of a waist or basque; (2) by being drawn loosely over the chest acts as a receptacle for carrying their babies, instead of on their backs, as the squaw carries her papoose; (3) In a few instances the ends of this serape served as a covering for the head.

A man's chief article of dress is his sombrero, often costing as much as \$35, while the balance of his clothing would make a crazy quilt turn green with envy, owing to its variety of colors and assortment of patches, making it a hard problem to solve as to which is the original garment and which the patch. No stockings are worn by either sex, and only about one-third wear sandals, which are made from a piece of sole leather and tied to the feet with straps. These sandals cost from 12 to 20 cents per pair. The average cost of the necessities of life for a peon family of five is 25 cents per day, and clothing for the same costs about \$20 per year.

Street cars in Mexico are as good as can be expected, consisting principally of the small cars formerly used in American cities.

These cars are drawn by one or two mules in a level country and by three or four mules in a hilly country. The fare is 6, 8, 12, and 15 cents for first-class passage, and two-thirds of that amount for second class. After 7 p. m. the fare is doubled. All the cars are run on the side of the street, up one street and back on another.

Land in Mexico is not taxed, and a man can preempt as much land as he can hire peons to keep other squatters off of. It is not even necessary for him to till or work any part of the land, but if it is intended to use any land for agricultural, mining, or manufacturing purposes, the Government will grant concessions to the owner in the shape of admitting machinery or agricultural implements free of duty for a number of years.

PRIMITIVE METHODS.

The cactus, which grows in abundance, is used by the peons in many ways. The broad leaves are dried, ground into a flour between stones, and a sort of pancake made. The fruit called tunas, which resembles a russet apple, is sweet and cooling to the taste. For fodder for the burro the cactus is dried in the sun after having the thorns burnt off, while other species are used as a fence around the hut.

The tequila, which resembles the century plant, and grows wild in abundance, is tapped at its base for the sap, from which the native whisky is made.

Nearly all towns and cities are from one-half to 3 miles away from the railroad stations, so that the peon has work to carry baggage and freight from the depot to town. Your committee saw a cargador (public carrier) trotting along the highway with a large trunk on his back, another with a half dozen hand satchels, another with an iron safe, another with forty adobe bricks, another with two bales of hay, one with two barrels of fruit, one with a crate of crockery or of vegetables, another with two 10-gallon kegs or stone jars of water, and four peons carrying a piano. Their wonderful power of endurance and strength of limb is a mystery, and prove them to be veritable beasts of burden in the carrying trade of that country, and, together with the burro, the railroad's only competitors.

LABORERS WORK LONG HOURS.

The day's work in Mexico runs from ten to fourteen hours. The bakers work twenty hours, and laborers who take work to their homes work as many hours as they please. The Mexican laborer works easily compared with the American laborer, except the carrier, who bears enormous burdens on his back all day without manifesting fatigue. The question of shorter hours in Mexico is a long way off, for in a country where labor is so cheap and plentiful that it is offered as an inducement to bring foreign capital in, its toilers will be compelled to work as many hours as they are physically able. But for organized labor, the American workingman would be in the same condition to-day as his Mexican brother.

The prevailing style of architecture in the cities of Mexico is of a Moorish-Spanish order. All of the buildings in the business and residence portions of the cities have inner courts, called patios, which give them the form of a hollow square. The inner and outer walls of these courts and the street sides of the buildings are handsomely frescoed, while the galleries are lined with a profusion of tropical and semitropical flowers, and large palms are always to be found in the center of the patios. In the interior arrangement of the buildings the system of ventilation is very poor; the inner rooms get their light from the door, of which the upper half is of glass.

Shopkeepers live above or in the rear of their stores, and those with palatial residences in the suburbs live in Paris most of the time. But those whose incomes compel them to live in the second or inner patio exist in a partial eclipse of the light of day. The fronts of the buildings are flat, seldom over two stories high; some have small balconies, and all windows on the street floor are heavily barred, where the young cavallero may steal on tiptoe and breathe the sweet words of love to his best girl, who is safely immured behind those prisonlike walls and windows, to guard her against the contamination of the outer world.

The sameness of the house fronts gives them a monotonous appearance, which tires the eye in roaming the cities. Most of the houses are from one hundred to three hundred years old, except the adobe houses and huts. From the poorly lighted and poorly ventilated arrangement of the houses it would be impossible for the people to maintain good health were it not for the pure, light air that envelops the table-lands. All the buildings and huts that we entered seemed to be charged with a peculiar odor. Whether it was the age of the buildings, the material they were built of, or the poor sanitary arrangements, we were unable to ascertain.

MILITARY DISCIPLINE.

Mexico is not primitive in everything. Many of its present laws and customs could be profitably adopted in this country. First of all, its system of police and soldiers to guard life and property is

certainly perfect, excepting the pay, which is only 18 and 37½ cents per day, with uniform furnished. In any city in the Republic of Mexico a person is safer, either on the street or indoors, by day or night, than a person in the city of Chicago at police headquarters in the middle of the day. Housebreaking, robberies, holdups, or murders are an unknown quantity in Mexican cities. But if one of these crimes is ever committed the guilty party is immediately apprehended, taken before an officer of the day, where he is ordered shot on the spot. The only crimes committed are petty thieving and picking pockets.

The gentry who ply this vocation are rounded up frequently, when half of them are taken from the jail and, under guard of a squad of soldiers, sent to a neighboring town—which the prisoners never reach. The soldiers return in a few hours, report that their prisoners attempted to escape and were shot. This method of dispensing justice acts as an object lesson to the remaining prisoners and is a system which has purified Mexico of crime and criminals. The other pickpockets may be set free or ordered sent to another town at a later date.

The libel and slander laws of Mexico are very severe. If a person libels or slanders another, either by mouth or pen, on complaint being made to any policeman the guilty party is arrested and lodged in jail until he has proved the charge made by mouth or pen.

NOBODY IS TRUSTED.

All business in Mexico is transacted on a strictly cash basis; no credits are given or allowed to anyone or for any purpose whatever; commercial paper and promises to pay are unknown, and if a merchant has a stock of goods, be it large or small, every article is paid for. Consequently no business failures have occurred in that country in years.

The compulsory school law of Mexico works admirably. It requires children between the ages of 7 and 15 years to attend the public schools ten months of the year. Statistics of Mexico show that where ten years ago 75 per cent of its people could not read nor write, now 66 per cent can.

Another admirable feature of Mexican business life is that all places of business are closed daily from 1 to 3 o'clock p. m. to permit everybody to go home to dinner, while stools and chairs are provided in all stores for the use of both the clerks and customers. The worst feature of Mexican business life is that no fixed price is put on any article, but the merchant will tell the truth as to the exact quality of the goods to be purchased. If the buyer offers one-half or one-third of the price originally asked, the article can generally be bought.

Wages are paid every Wednesday and Saturday.

SOCIAL INEQUALITY.

Every town or city in Mexico has from one to a dozen public parks, which are kept up by the Government, in which semi-weekly and triweekly concerts are given by Government bands. On Sunday morning, in the City of Mexico, military bands play in the principal public parks for three hours, commencing at 10 a. m. During the first hour and a half the peon is privileged to promenade in the park and listen to the music, after which time he is ordered out by the police to make room for the so-called better classes, who then appear on dress parade until the close of the concert. At each entrance to the promenades police stand guard to drive away the unfortunate native should he hover too near. This manifestation of social inequality your committee considers wrong to those who are the real wealth producers of the country, who cultivate the soil, bring treasures from the mines, and carry loads as beasts of burden, and in consideration of this should be permitted to occupy a higher plane in the social arrangements of Mexico.

TAXES FOR EVERYBODY.

All mercantile business in Mexico is taxed 6 to 8 per cent of actual sales. A set of books must be kept of receipts and expenditures, which are examined by the tax collector as often as that worthy comes around, who fixes the amount of taxes to be paid and affixes revenue stamps for the amount of taxes paid on the books.

Any advertisement or announcement in stores, windows, houses, or public places must have a 2-cent revenue tax stamp affixed to permit its display. Even the gambling houses and lotteries are taxed one-third of their business.

Although but one-fourth of the natives of Mexico are married, no divorces or separations occur. They are a very affectionate people, and, whether of high or low degree, are polite almost to a fault. In their domestic relations they are happy—no family jars, no family skeletons. This felicity takes the place of the green-eyed monster that has wrecked many homes of the so-called better classes in America. Aged couples manifest much affection for each other. It is common to see them walk the streets with hands joined and acting with the simplicity of little children. Your committee was told that the reason the natives do not go through the marriage ceremony was that it costs too much. Still the civil fee for the poor class is but \$1.75 for the judge and

registration fee, while for the better class the cost is from \$10 to \$20. The church fee is much higher.

The church does not recognize a civil marriage and the state does not recognize the church marriage. On inquiring what is necessary for a peon to take unto himself a wife and go to house-keeping, we were told, "A picture of a hidalgo, a bunch of Chile peppers, and an almuda of maize (25 pounds of corn)." As a consequence, these people live together like cattle more than human beings, and it is but five years ago that a law was passed in the City of Mexico compelling men to wear pants, as the breechcloth previously took the place of that necessary garment.

THE POOR ARE PRACTICALLY ENSLAVED.

The haciendas (or plantations) are owned by the very rich, and cover an area of from 10 to 100 square miles. Farming and agricultural implements are very primitive. The plow is a crooked stick or beam, and scratches the ground to a depth of 3 or 4 inches. This "plow" is drawn by two oxen, while the harness is a broad strap or rope, passing over the forehead instead of the shoulders of the oxen. Planting is done by poking a hole into the ground with a stick, dropping the corn into it, and the seed is covered by the peon in stepping from hole to hole.

On these immense tracts of land the natives or peons have lived for centuries, and are forced to buy all their necessities of life at the hacendado's (land owner's) truck store. On the hacienda the peon gets from 18 to 25 cents per day for his work and a hut to live in, if he builds it himself. The peon gets no money except on feast days and for religious offerings. By this system the peon is always in debt to the hacendado. Generation after generation of peons live on the same hacienda, and always under the same conditions.

This form of slavery has been forbidden by law for a number of years; but two-thirds of the peons do not know it, as they can neither read nor write, and their masters take good care not to teach them this fact. The peon can not leave the hacienda while owing the hacendado any money, and Mr. Hacendado sees to it that when settling up accounts there is a balance due him, which keeps the peon perpetually in his service and his debt. This relic of the baronial system has made the hacendado lord and master of every man, woman, and beast within the bounds of his extensive possessions.

Right here a quotation from Aristotle, from his first book of politics, is most fitting, which reads:

The science of the master reduces itself to knowing how to make use of his slave. He is the master not because he is the owner of the man, but because he makes use of his property. The slave constitutes part of the wealth of the family.

This is exactly the position of the hacendado and the peon of Mexico to-day. The peon is simply worked for the advantage of others, subject to the most intolerable privations and bondage. Not one of them will ever reach a state of independence. So in the midst of the magnificence of the hacendado's power we only see a confused mass of enslaved, who work to furnish supplies and a life of ease and luxury for the consumption of the great landowners of Mexico. The peon, thus bound to the soil, is considered the creature of his master and a veritable fixture to his possession by destiny.

After three hundred years of "isms," Mexico is now emerging from an arrested development, and has a good future before it. Under this republican form of government, which, in fact, is a military despotism, the great masses of the working people have little social and absolutely no political standing. The machinery of the Government, in its legislative functions, can and does exercise an unbridled sway with impunity. Organized labor is unknown here, which is considered a great blessing.

But that country to-day that has the best system of trade organizations and the greatest number of union men per capita of its population is the foremost in wealth, progression, and the happiness of its people. The true test of civilization and greatness of a nation depends on the intellectual and moral worth of its working classes. All laws inscribed on the statute books of nations bearing on the welfare of the toiler have had their germs planted in the soil of trades unions and by them quickened into life in presentable forms for adoption, and that country which has done the most on these lines stands at the head of civilization.

BEGGARS EVERYWHERE.

The cry is raised that there are no poorhouses in Mexico; but that is no indication of the absence of poverty, as your committee can fully testify without fear of contradiction, as the voice of the mendicant supplicating alms rang in our ears all through the country, and poorhouses would be a blessing to many of the wan faces and gaunt, emaciated forms that crossed our path while there. Often in witnessing these and other distressing scenes we wished that many of our friends in the ranks of organized labor could look through our eyes and behold conditions it would be doubtful for them to otherwise believe.

There are no manna trees in the land of the Montezumas where

you can pick three meals a day off their branches, or, if one is too tired to reach for the fruit, lay under its broad branches and wait until the fruit drops into your mouth; nor is it a Schlaraffenland, where roasted poultry is flying through the air or baked white-fish or broiled trout in its streams, nor even does milk and honey flow there.

Instead, in the 1,200 miles of the country your committee traveled through, going and returning, only a few fertile tracts of land occur, clothed with sage brush and cactus, and supposedly watered by a spring from a neighboring mountain. Under the influence of such a spring some vegetation bursts forth and covers a more or less extensive area, but has long ago become the halting place of some prospector or small farmer, and in several places such an oasis supported a considerable population. By means of irrigation some corn and cotton are cultivated, and owing to the short crop of corn in Mexico, brought about by an extended season of drought, President Diaz recently issued a proclamation taking the import duty off American corn, and millions of bushels of our corn is shipped to Mexico as a result.

BUTTER \$1 A POUND.

In the cities of Zacatecas and Guanajuato, with populations of 40,000 and 70,000, respectively, we failed to get butter and potatoes on the tables of the best hotels. On inquiry we were informed that if we paid \$1, a pound of butter would be purchased for our exclusive use.

Your committee would caution American workmen against going to Mexico without sufficient funds to bring them back, or to have employment secured before going there, or they will be obliged to subsist on cactus and the sap of the tequila plant while doing the country. On asking an American who was conducting a prosperous business in one of the cities which your committee visited why it was that the foreigners all seemed to be making money no matter what business they were engaged in, he, with characteristic Yankee frankness, replied: "The laborer here is different from the laborer in the States. Here labor is cheap, and we have no brains to contend with."

According to a census taken in September, 1895, Mexico has a total population of 13,000,000 people, of which number nearly 6,000,000 are Indians and 4,500,000 are a mixed race of Indians and Spaniards—this is the peon class. Together they represent about 85 per cent of the total population of the country, and directly contribute not one cent to the support of the Government. The Government is supported and maintained by the balance of its population—2,500,000—who are designated as the white race, and consists of Spaniards, Englishmen, Germans, French, Italians, and Americans.

The mission intrusted to your committee is a peculiar one. We were sent to study the social and financial conditions of a far-away people. We are plain toilers, inured to the hard knocks of the factory and workshop, and none are better qualified to investigate or feel and sympathize with the workers of another country than men from our ranks. We did not go loaded with credentials to be entertained by people of the better classes, or yet as scholars to describe the monuments of historic interest, or to have our poetic fancies inspired by the landscapes and azure skies, or build up wasted energies in the healthful air of that southern clime, but to go among the common people, who are of our own class, and study conditions from that standpoint.

PLAIN STATEMENT OF FACTS.

Hence this epistle does not abound in high-sounding platitudes on the sublime and beautiful of that country; but on facts that still exist and are ready to speak for themselves to those who will go and seek as we have done; and should they do so, they will feel as we do, that the American workingman is a prince compared to the workingman of Mexico; that in this country all stand equal in social and political life, and in that political right they should exercise with care the faithful discharge of their duties, unprejudiced and unbiased, by supporting such principles as will do the greatest good to the greatest number, irrespective of party politics or the machinery of either party, who may manipulate conditions and measures for personal gain, to the detriment of the whole people.

Fellow-workers, appreciating the honor conferred upon us, we thank the Chicago Trade and Labor Assembly for the confidence reposed in us by sending us on so important a mission, and believe that we have fulfilled the duties assigned to us free from prejudices, as in this report we have simply held the mirror up to nature and chronicled events and conditions just as we have found them.

In conclusion, we submit comparative tables of the average prices of commodities of life and wages paid in the different cities visited by us.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

P. ENRIGHT,
P. J. MAAS,
Committee.

Comparative table of average wages per day, prepared by commission and made part of its report.

Occupation.	American money.			Mexican money. <i>a</i>		
	Chicago, Ill. (union scale) (1,500,000).	El Paso, Tex. (10,000).	Ciudad Juarez (30,000).	Zacatecas (40,000).	Guanajuato (70,000).	City of Mexico (335,000).
Teamsters	\$1.75	\$0.75		\$0.75	\$0.50	\$1.00
Street cars:						
Drivers	2.25	b .50	\$0.50	.50	.75	.75
Conductors	2.25		.50	.75	.75	1.00
Miners		2.00		.87½	.75	.75
Printers	3.00	1.50	.75	.87½	.75	1.25
Pressmen	3.50	1.00		.50	.37½	1.20
Press feeders	1.75	.50		.37½	.25	.87½
Bookbinders	2.75			.87½	.50	1.00
Iron molders	2.50	2.50		1.00-2.00	.87½	1.00-2.00
Cigarmakers	c 8.00	d 11.00		e .37½-.50	.50	d 6.00
Cigarette makers—females				.37½	.25	.50-.62½
Barbers	2.75	f .60	1.00	1.00	.87½	f .50
Bakers	2.00	2.00	.87	1.25	.50	1.50
Shoemakers	2.50	1.50		.87½	.62½	1.25
Carpenters	2.80	3.50	.75	1.00	.75	1.25
Bricklayers and masons	4.00	5.00		.87½	.75	.37½
Plasterers	4.00	2.50		.75	.50	.87½
Hod carriers	2.00	1.50	3.00	1.00	1.25	2.75
Clerks	2.25	3.00		.37½	.50	.75
Wood workers	2.25	3.00		.87½	.75	1.25
Harness makers	1.50	2.00		.87½	.75	1.25
Horseshoers	3.25	2.50		1.00	.75	1.50
Blacksmiths	3.00	2.75		.75	.87½	1.50
Waiters	2.25	1.00		1.50-2.50	1.75	3.00
Cooks	3.25	1.25		.50	.87½	1.00
Machinists	2.75	2.50		.50	.50	1.25
Tailors	1.50	1.00		.50	.37½	g 7.00
Painters	2.75	3.00	1.00	1.25	.75	1.25
Butchers	2.00	1.25		.87½	.62½	.75
Engineers, stationary	1.00	2.50		1.25	.87½	1.00
Firemen, stationary	1.00	2.00		.37½	.37½	.87½
Musicians	3.00	2.00		h .50	.37½	1.75
Cab and hack drivers	1.75	1.00		.75	.50	1.00
Common laborers	1.25	b 1.00	1.00	.50	.50	.37½
Helpers:						
Miners		.50		.75	.50	.62½
Molders		1.00		.56	.37½	.37½
Cigar makers		.50		.25	.25	.50
Bakers		1.00		.75	.50	.50
Shoemakers		.50		.50	.50	.37½
On buildings		1.00		.37½	.37½	.75
Horseshoers		1.00		.87½	.75	.87½
Blacksmiths		1.25		.75	.62½	.37½
Machinists		1.25		.37½	.37½	.50
Painters		1.00		.37½	.37½	.50
Tailors		.50		.37½	.25	.50
Butchers		.50		.37½	.37½	.50

Blanks denote no journeymen are employed.

a Equal to 5¼ to 54 cents American money.
b Mexican money.

c Per 1,000 and up.
d Per 1,000.

e Women.
f Per cent.

g A suit.
h Per hour.

Comparative prices of commodities of life in Mexico.

[Prepared by the commission and made a part of its report.]

Commodity.	American money.			Mexican money.		
	Chicago (1,500,000).	El Paso (10,000).	Ciudad Juarez (30,000).	Zacatecas (40,000).	Guanajuato (70,000).	City of Mexico (335,000).
Calico, per yard	\$0.05	\$0.04	\$0.10	\$0.27	\$0.14 to \$0.17	\$0.14
Black cashmere, per yard	.25	.75	1.50	1.20	.90 to 1.05	.90
Two-quarter sheeting, per yard	.22	.15	.30	.65	.55	.50
Jumpers and overalls	.20 to .50	1.00	1.50	1.25		
Bleached muslin, per yd	.06	.05	.10	.25	.25	.20
Unbleached muslin, per yard	.05	.05	.11	.12	.22	.20
Oilcloth, per yard	.15	.20	.50	.75	.65	.75
Red tablecloth, per yard	.25	.60		1.00		1.25
Blankets, per pair	3.50	5.00	6.00	5.50	5.50	6.00
Shawls, wool	4.00	.75	1.50	3.00	3.00	3.00
Hosiery	.15	.50	.25		.25	.40
Half hose	.15	.25	.25		.25	.33
Cotton underwear, suit	1.00	1.00	1.50			
Flannel underwear, suit	2.00	2.00	4.00	1.88	1.00	3.00
Hickory shirts	.50	.50	.50			7.00
Linen shirts	.75	1.00	2.00	.87		1.25
Handkerchiefs, bandana	.05	.05	.10	2.50	2.00	1.75
Handkerchiefs, linen	.15	.10	.10	.18	.12	.12½
Suit of clothes, wool	15.00	7.00 to 15.00	15.00 to 35.00	a .75 to 1.00	a 1.25 to 1.50	12.00 to 15.00
Men's hats, felt	2.00	5.00	b .25	b .50	b .75	c 2.00
Ingrain carpet, per yard	.60	1.25	d .25	d .38	d .40	1.20
Stove, No. 7, cook	9.00	8.00	15.00	e 20.00		e 28.00
Iron bedstead, single	3.25	3.00	6.00	9.00	10.00	9.00
Kitchen table, oak, 6 feet	3.50	2.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.00
Sewing machine	40.00	65.00	f 15.00	f 14.00		
Single harness	10.00	16.00	25.00	15.00	35.00	35.00
Wagon	65.00	70.00	100.00	g 90.00	g 100.00	120.00
Saddle	5.00	15.00	25.00	35.00	15.00	25.00
Winchester rifle, .44	11.00	13.00	20.00	30.00	32.00	25.00
Colt's pistol, .44	13.00	12.00	25.00	25.00	30.00	25.00
Powder, per pound	.20	.40		1.50		.50
Table cutlery, per half dozen	1.25	1.25	2.00	3.00	4.00	4.00
Pocket cutlery, each	.75	.75	1.50	1.00	1.50	1.50
Ax	.60	.85	1.25	1.25	1.50	2.00
Iron shovel	.40	.75	.75	.85	1.00	.80
Pickax	.62	.85	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.25
Handsaw, 2½-inch	1.15	1.25	2.00	1.50	2.50	3.00
Cooking utensils, set	12.00	5.00	25.00	(h)	(h)	30.00
Hundred-piece set china	6.50	9.00	25.00	(i)	(i)	40.00
Plates, cups, saucers, each, per dozen	.75 to .85	1.00	1.50	3.50	3.00	1.25

a Cotton drill. *b* Straw. *c* Mexican felt. *d* Matting. *e* Mexican pottery. *f* Hand. *g* Cart. *h* Stoneware. *i* Pottery.

Comparative prices of commodities of life in Mexico—Continued.

Commodity.	American money.		Mexican money.			
	Chicago (1,500,000).	El Paso (10,000).	Ciudad Juarez (30,000).	Zacatecas (40,000).	Guanajuato (70,000).	City of Mexico (335,000).
Table lamp	\$0.50	\$0.25	\$0.75	\$1.50	\$1.12	\$1.50
Watch, silver, 7-jewel	10.00	4.00	8.00	a 12.00	a 14.00	12.00
Clock	3.00	2.00	6.00	10.00	6.00	7.00
Plow	4.00	3.00	5.00	9.00	12.00	15.00
Reaper	65.00	50.00	-----	250.00	200.00	225.00
Boots, pair	-----	3.00	1.00	b. 12 to .25	b. 12 to .25	2.00
Shoes, pair	2.00	4.00	b. 25	b. 20	4.00	5.00
Kitchen chairs, each	.40	.90	2.50	-----	3.50	3.00
Bread, per pound loaf	.05	.10	.01	.02	.06	.07
Flour, per pound	.02	.03	.04	.06	.05	.08
Butter, per pound	.18	.25	.50	.50	.75	.55
Sugar, per pound	.05	.06	.12	.08	.12	.10
Tea, per pound	.40	.75	.50	1.00	2.00	1.50
Coffee, per pound	.25	.25	.42	.34	.30	.38
Milk, per quart	.05	.10	.06	.06	.04	.09
Sirup, per gallon	.30	.75	.75	-----	-----	4.00
Rice, per pound	.06	.08	.10	.08	.07	.09
Meat, per pound	.10	.10	.06	.10	.12	.20
Canned fruit	.12	.16	.35	-----	1.00	1.50
Canned vegetables	.09	.12	.25	-----	1.00	.60
Poultry, each	.30	.13	.25	.20	.25	.17
Ham, per pound	.12	.12	.28	.50	.60	.35
Bacon, per pound	.12	.12	.23	-----	.60	.30
Fish, per pound	.10	.20	-----	.50	.25	.31
Corn, per pound	.00	.01	.01	.01	.01	4.0
Beans, per pound	.04	.03	.04	.03	.06	.10
Potatoes, per pound	.00	.01	.93	.03	.07	.05
Apples, per pound	.02	.04	.00	.03	-----	.06
Cabbage, per pound	.00	.04	.12	.15	e. 15	.05
Cheese, per pound	.12	.15	.25	d. 10	.32	.40
Tomatoes, per pound	.00	.03	.06	.01	-----	.01
Melons, each	.15	.12	.08	.25	.17	.30
Turnips, per pound	.01	.04	.12	.01	-----	.01
Soap, per pound	.05	.10	.12	.10	.11	.17

Blanks denote that such goods are not for sale.

a Sandals.

b Homemade.

c Gilt.

d Per head.

McKINLEY'S STAND OPENS CUBAN CELLS—MANY AMERICANS RELEASED IN THE PAST TWENTY DAYS—SPAIN AND WEYLER VERY FRIENDLY NOW—POSSIBLY SHERMAN'S DECIDED UTTERANCES CAUSED THE CHANGE—"NO ARMENIA NEAR US," WERE SECRETARY'S WORDS, AND DOUBTLESS THE SPANISH GOVERNMENT TOOK THE HINT AT ONCE—AMERICANS' RIGHTS RESPECTED.

[From the Florida Times-Union.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 28.

Far be it from me, the faithful correspondent of a faithful Democratic paper, to thrum the tuneful lyre in fulsome praise of a Republican Administration, but the new President and his staff of collaborators have got hearts in them as big as a meetin' house.

CUBAN PRISONS OPENING.

Without any intention of reflecting upon the late Administration or unduly praising the new one, it becomes the duty of the faithful chronicler of events, especially those in which the people of Florida feel a deep interest, to say that there has been a marked and gratifying change in the attitude of this Government with reference to American citizens in Cuban prisons since the new Administration came into power.

In the twenty days since McKinley assumed the duties of his office as many American citizens have been released from Cuban prisons as had been released under President Cleveland in twenty weeks of the closing period of his term. Only three more American citizens now appeal from Cuban prisons to the Government of the United States for their protection or release.

While there are probably a dozen American citizens still in Cuban prisons, several of these have preferred not to agitate their cases through appeals, which might result even more disadvantageously than their present conditions. The members of the *Competitor* crew, who are still in prison, are now undergoing trial with assurances of all the protection and privileges to which American citizens are entitled. So that of the entire number who were confined in Spanish prisons in Cuba when the present Administration came into power, twenty working days ago, only three now remain in the list seeking for protection of this Government, and if the rate of releases is continued as in the past, another week will see every one of these a free man.

STRONGLY DEFINED CHANGE.

The change in the attitude of the Spanish Government and the governor-general and military commander of Cuba since the new Administration came in has been strongly marked. Under the Cleveland Administration the releases averaged possibly one a month, and those were cases in which the men were charged with the most trifling offenses or mere suspects, many of whom had been held on vague and unimportant charges for many months.

For instance, the two American citizens released in the month of December, 1896, were colored boys, born in Key West, and charged with the terrible crime of being "voodoos." Another of

the dismissals in the closing months of the Cleveland Administration, that occurring in October, 1896, was also a "voodoo" case, while another was dismissed with the remark, "We have no charge against you," and still another with the statement that there were no grounds for complaint.

When the trifling character of these charges is compared with those made against the men who have been released since the present Administration came into power, the change in the attitude of the Spanish authorities becomes more evident. Most of the latter were charged with aiding the insurrection by direct cooperation; one was captured in an insurgent hospital and another was charged with purchasing and concealing arms and ammunition for the benefit of the insurgents, yet there has been no delay since the incoming of the new Administration in granting to every American citizen within Cuban prisons either the fullest right of trial under the guarantees of treaty relations or a prompt dismissal from imprisonment.

DESIRE FRIENDLY RELATIONS.

How this remarkable change in the attitude of the Spanish authorities has come about the officials of the State Department do not indicate in detail. It is known, however, that both the Spanish Government and General Weyler, who is governor-general as well as military commander, have developed a marked change in attitude since March 4. It is known that the high officials of the Spanish Government promptly indicated to Minister Taylor their strongest desires for absolute friendliness between that Government and the new Administration of the United States Government, and that General Weyler also shows a decided change in attitude with the incoming of the new Administration.

Whatever may have been the real intentions of the Spanish Government during the closing year of the last Administration, and whatever may have been their instructions to General Weyler, it is known that he was largely a law unto himself in the Island of Cuba and that if the Spanish Government indicated to him the desire for justice to American citizens, which it outwardly professed, its desires and instructions were absolutely disregarded by him.

This is shown by his refusal to release or grant trials to American citizens in Cuba during all the time he had been in charge there up to March 4, 1897, the result being the death, if not the murder, of citizens of the United States imprisoned in that island. That there has been since March 4 a remarkable change in his attitude as well as that of his Government is shown by the fact that every third day, on an average, has since that time witnessed the release of an American citizen in Cuba, many of whom had been held in confinement for many months.

McKINLEY'S STRONG UTTERANCES.

What has been the cause of this remarkable change in the attitude of those who were holding American citizens in imprisonment without opportunity for trial can not be learned in detail, as, of course, a large share of the work of the State Department is necessarily withheld from the public. Probably it may have

been in part the direct statements of the Secretary of State to the Spanish minister here, or through our minister in Spain and our consul in Cuba. Probably it may have been in part the terse, vigorous utterances of President McKinley's inaugural, in which he said:

It will be our aim to pursue a firm and dignified foreign policy, which shall be just, impartial, ever watchful of our national honor, and always insisting upon the enforcement of the lawful rights of American citizens everywhere. Our diplomacy should seek nothing more and accept nothing less than is due us.

Probably it may have been in part the vigorous utterances of Secretary Sherman during the closing days of his service as Senator, when he said, on February 23, 1897:

I trust in God the time will never come when I shall see an American citizen wronged of his rights and persecuted and prosecuted unjustly by any power, great or small. I am opposed to wrong and violence and tyranny wherever it is exercised, and when it is inflicted upon a citizen of the United States I will stand by him if I am alone.

Or perhaps that other expression from him on February 28, 1896, in which he said:

We do not want an Armenia near our shores, and if one shall be established there it will be overtrown.

Mr. ALLISON subsequently said: Owing to the pressure of the debate to-day, I was not able to present two or three tables relating to the sugar schedule which I should be glad to have inserted in the RECORD, if there is no objection. I ask unanimous consent that these three tables be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the request made by the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. PETTUS. I should like to know who made the tables. Who is the author?

Mr. ALLISON. Colonel Tichenor prepared two of the tables. I myself prepared the other. I submit them to be printed in the RECORD without comment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the order will be made. The order is made.

The tables referred to are as follows:

Degree.	Average entered value.	Duty on 100 pounds.						Differentials.					
		Act of 1894.		House.	Senate committee.		Senate.	Conference.	Act of 1894.	House.	Finance Committee.	Senate.	Conference.
		Cents.	Per cent.	Cents.	Per cent.	Cents.	Per cent.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	
75	88.65	35.46	40	\$1.00	66.49	75	\$0.90	\$0.95	56.29	40.82	104.92	62.99	55.65
76	94.84	37.94	40	1.03	71.13	75	.93	.985	56.34	38.34	99.44	60.32	52.35
77	101.04	40.42	40	1.06	75.78	75	.96	1.02	53.53	35.97	94.12	57.76	49.10
78	107.22	42.88	40	1.09	80.41	75	.99	1.055	51.80	33.72	89.01	55.33	46.16
79	113.42	45.37	40	1.12	85.065	75	1.02	1.09	48.14	31.58	84.03	53.01	43.26
80	119.61	47.84	40	1.15	89.71	75	1.05	1.125	45.59	29.55	79.23	50.78	40.48
81	125.81	50.32	40	1.18	94.36	75	1.08	1.16	43.12	27.63	74.61	48.68	37.84
82	132	52.80	40	1.21	99	75	1.11	1.195	40.75	25.83	70.18	46.69	35.34
83	138.19	55.28	40	1.24	103.64	75	1.14	1.23	38.48	23.94	65.91	44.61	32.95
84	144.38	57.75	40	1.27	108.285	75	1.17	1.265	36.29	22.55	61.81	43.04	30.70
85	150.57	60.23	40	1.30	112.93	75	1.20	1.30	34.20	21.09	57.89	41.39	28.59
86	156.77	62.70	40	1.33	117.58	75	1.23	1.335	32.21	19.73	54.13	39.84	26.60
87	162.96	65.18	40	1.36	122.22	75	1.26	1.37	30.30	18.50	50.57	38.43	24.75
88	169.15	67.66	40	1.39	126.87	75	1.29	1.405	28.48	17.35	47.13	37.03	23.01
89	175.34	70.14	40	1.42	131.51	75	1.32	1.44	26.76	16.33	43.81	35.63	21.42
90	179.96	71.98	40	1.45	135.99	75	1.35	1.475	25.18	15.43	40.59	34.23	20.01
91	185.125	74.05	40	1.48	140.79	75	1.38	1.51	23.64	14.62	37.46	32.83	18.62
92	190.29	76.12	40	1.51	145.60	75	1.41	1.545	22.14	13.85	34.73	31.43	17.42
93	195.46	78.18	40	1.54	150.41	75	1.44	1.58	20.69	12.99	32.04	30.03	16.35
94	201.42	80.57	40	1.57	155.22	75	1.47	1.615	19.18	12.33	29.29	28.63	15.41
95	207.18	82.87	40	1.60	160.03	75	1.50	1.65	17.61	11.77	26.58	27.23	14.59
96	212.75	85.12	40	1.63	164.84	75	1.53	1.685	16.08	11.20	23.92	25.82	13.81
97	215.89	86.35	40	1.66	169.65	75	1.56	1.72	14.50	10.67	21.61	24.41	13.07
98	219.06	87.62	40	1.69	174.46	75	1.59	1.755	12.97	10.19	19.30	22.90	12.45
99	222.15	88.86	40	1.72	179.27	75	1.62	1.79	11.38	9.74	17.00	21.39	11.85
100	223.71	89.48	40	1.75	184.08	75	1.65	1.825	10.53	9.33	14.70	19.88	11.30
Refined	247	*111.30	40	1.87	202.45	75	1.95	1.95	21.82	12.50	21.15	8.65	12.50

* Plus one-eighth of a cent.

The values in the second column are the averages of the following sugars:

Raw—Centrifugal and molasses sugars from Cuba, Brazil, Egypt, Jamaica, Barbados, Santo Domingo, Demarara, and St. Croix (West Indies).

Muscovado sugars from Antigua, Dominica, Montserrat, Nevis, St. Kitts, Brazil, Jamaica, Barbados, and St. Croix, during the four months ending April 30, 1897.

Refined—Dutch refined, German refined (fine grade), and German granulated (first marks) during the same period (2.47).

The differential under the conference report on 100 pounds of sugar testing 96 degrees (which is the grade of sugar chiefly imported) is 1.41 cents over one-eighth of 1 cent. The following table shows on this basis the total differential on the respective weights of such sugar:

On 100 pounds	\$0.0141
On 1,000 pounds	.14
On 10,000 pounds	1.41
On 100,000 pounds	14.10

On 1,000,000 pounds	\$141.00
On 10,000,000 pounds	1,410.00
On 100,000,000 pounds	14,100.00
On 1,000,000,000 pounds	141,000.00
On 3,000,000,000 pounds	423,000.00

The duty on this 3,000,000,000 pounds is 1.95 cents per pound, making the total cost of same equal to 4 cents per pound and probably over, or a cost of \$120,000,000, while the differential, as above stated, is \$423,000.

Degree.	Average entered value.	Duty on 100 pounds.					Duty on amount necessary to produce 100 pounds refined.					Differentials.						
		Act of 1894.		House.	Finance Committee.	Senate.	Conference Committee.	Act of 1894.		House.	Finance Committee.	Senate.	Conference Committee.	Act of 1894.	House.	Finance Committee.	Senate.	Conference Committee.
		Cents.	Per cent.	Cents.	Per cent.	Cents.	Per cent.	Cents.	Per cent.	Cents.	Per cent.	Cents.	Per cent.	Cents.	Per cent.	Cents.	Per cent.	Cents.
75	88.75	31.5	100	59.06	90	95	46.20	146.68	86.71	132.01	139.35	65.10	40.82	115.74	62.99	55.65		
76	85	34	103	63.75	93	98.5	49.24	149.16	92.31	134.68	142.64	62.06	38.34	110.14	60.32	52.35		
77	91.25	36.5	106	68.44	96	102	52.18	151.53	97.93	137.24	145.81	59.12	35.97	104.52	57.76	50.19		
78	97.5	39	109	73.12	99	105.5	55.02	153.78	103.16	139.67	148.84	56.28	33.72	99.29	55.33	47.16		
79	103.75	41.5	112	77.81	102	109	57.77	155.91	107.52	141.99	151.74	53.53	31.58	94.03	53.01	43.26		
80	110	44	115	82.50	105	112.5	60.43	157.95	113.31	144.22	154.52	50.87	29.55	89.14	50.78	40.48		
81	116.25	46.5	118	87.19	108	116	63	159.87	118.12	146.32	157.16	48.30	27.63	84.03	48.68	37.84		
82	122.5	49	121	91.87	111	119.5	65.47	161.67	122.74	148.31	159.66	45.83	25.83	79.71	46.69	35.34		
83	128.75	51.5	124	96.56	114	123	67.85	163.56	127.21	150.39	161.04	43.45	23.94	75.24	44.69	32.95		
84	135	54	127	101.25	117	126.5	70.14	165.45	131.50	151.96	164.90	41.16	22.55	70.85	43.04	30.10		
85	141.25	56.5	130	105.94	120	130	72.33	166.41	135.61	153.61	166.41	38.97	21.09	66.84	41.39	28.59		
86	147.5	59	133	110.62	123	133.5	74.42	167.77	139.54	155.16	168.40	36.88	19.73	62.91	39.84	26.60		
87	153.75	61.5	136	115.31	126	137	76.43	169	143.30	156.57	170.25	34.87	18.50	59.15	38.43	24.75		
88	160	64	139	120	129	140.5	78.44	170.15	145.25	157.15	171.99	32.96	17.35	55.33	37.03	23.01		
89	166.25	66.5	142	124.99	132	144	80.16	171.07	147.78	158.17	173.58	31.14	16.33	52.03	35.63	21.42		
90	172.5	69	145	129.67	135	147.5	81.88	172.07	150.14	159.14	175.04	29.42	15.43	48.81	34.23	20.01		
91	178.75	71.5	148	134.36	138	151	83.52	172.88	152.65	160.14	176.38	27.78	14.62	45.99	32.83	18.62		
92	185	74	151	139.04	141	154.5	85.06	173.55	154.65	161.14	177.58	26.24	13.85	43.17	31.43	17.42		
93	191.25	76.5	154	143.73	144	158	86.50	174.12	156.32	162.14	178.65	24.80	13.08	40.35	30.03	16.35		
94	197.5	79	157	148.42	147	161.5	87.85	174.58	158.05	162.64	179.59	23.45	12.33	37.53	28.63	15.41		
95	203.75	81.5	160	153.11	150	165	89.11	174.94	160.05	163.14	180.41	22.19	11.77	34.62	27.23	14.59		
96	210	84	163	157.80	153	168.5	90.28	175.17	161.05	163.64	181.09	21.02	11.20	31.71	25.82	13.81		
97	216.25	86.25	166	162.49	156	172	91.02	175.30	162.15	164.14	181.63	20.02	10.67	28.80	24.41	13.07		
98	216.125	86.45	169	167.18	159	175.5	89.68	175.30	163.15	164.14	182.46	19.02	10.19	25.89	22.90	12.45		
99	219.375	87.75	172	171.87	162	179	88.88	175.22	164.15	164.14	183.35	18.02	9.74	22.98	21.39	11.85		
100	222.5	89	175	176.56	165	182.5	89	175	165.15	164.14	184.25	17.02	9.33	20.07	19.88	11.30		
Refined	247	111.30	187	202.45	165	185			165.15	164.14	185.00	16.02	8.65	17.17	18.62	10.85	10.85	

Average value of raw St. Croix (West Indies) sugars during four months ending April 10, 1897, and upon the average value of Dutch refined, German refined (fine grade), and German granulated (first marks), 2.47 during the same period.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. ALLEN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. LODGE. Before that is done, I desire to make a report from the Committee on Printing in order to have printed some copies of the tariff bill. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will withhold his motion until I can do that and dispose of one or two other small matters from the Committee on Printing.

Mr. ALLEN. I will do that, Mr. President.

Mr. LODGE. I send to the desk two resolutions for which I ask present consideration.

Mr. COCKRELL. I insist, Mr. President, that the report shall not be read until there is order in the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Order must be maintained on the floor of the Senate and in the galleries. Business will not proceed until order is restored. [A pause.] The Secretary will read the resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. With the number of persons moving about the floor of the Senate we can not hear, and I insist upon order. There are seats for all in the Chamber, or if not, there is room in the cloakrooms.

Mr. VEST. Or outside.

Mr. ALLEN. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask the Senator—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. MASON. I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution, and I ask that it may be acted upon.

Mr. HALE. Regular order, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair can not entertain the resolution at the present moment.

Mr. HALE and others. Regular order!

Mr. MASON. What is the regular order?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] has moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. The question is on that motion. [Putting the question.] The yeas appear to prevail.

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

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

Mr. PASCO (when his name was called). I desire to announce my pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. WILSON]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 23; as follows:

YEAS—46.

Aldrich,	Elkins,	McEnery,	Quay,
Allen,	Fairbanks,	McMillan,	Sewell,
Allison,	Foraker,	Mason,	Shoup,
Baker,	Frye,	Morrill,	Spooner,
Burrows,	Gallinger,	Nelson,	Stewart,
Carter,	Hale,	Penrose,	Teller,
Chandler,	Hansbrough,	Perkins,	Thurston,
Clark,	Hawley,	Pettus,	Turner,
Cockrell,	Hoar,	Platt, Conn.	Warren,
Cullom,	Lodge,	Platt, N. Y.	Wetmore.
Davis,	McBride,	Pritchard,	
Deboe,		Proctor,	

NAYS—23.

Bacon,	Gorman,	Mitchell,	Turley,
Bate,	Harris,	Morgan,	Vest,
Berry,	Jones, Ark.	Murphy,	Walthall,
Butler,	Lindsay,	Roach,	White.
Caffery,	Mallory,	Smith,	
Chilton,	Mills,	Tillman,	

NOT VOTING—21.

Cannon,	Hanna,	Mantle,	Wellington,
Clay,	Heitfeld,	Martin,	Wilson,
Daniel,	Jones, Nev.	Pasco,	Wolcott.
Faulkner,	Kenney,	Pettigrew,	
George,	Kyle,	Rawlins,	
Gray,	McLaurin,	Turpie,	

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After nine minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR ALASKA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The unfinished business is the resolution reported by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS] from the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration at this time of House bill 3950, which is a bill to amend the act providing a civil government for Alaska. It is a brief bill, and will take but a minute.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota to proceed to the consideration of the bill named by him?

Mr. HOAR and Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Let it be read for information.

Mr. PASCO. I suppose it is understood that the bill is not to disturb the regular order?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands. The bill will be read for information, subject to objection.

Mr. BERRY. The unfinished business is not to be set aside, I understand, by the consideration of the bill of the Senator from North Dakota?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the request is for unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. PASCO. I want to know if objection can be made at any time?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection may be made at any time after the reading of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill (H. R. 3950) to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act providing a civil government for Alaska," approved May 17, 1884, to create the office of surveyor-general for Alaska, and for other purposes, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That section 8 of an act entitled "An act providing a civil government for Alaska" be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the words "the commissioner provided for by this act to reside in Sitka shall be ex officio register of said land office, and the clerk provided for by this act shall be ex officio receiver of public moneys, and the marshal provided for by this act shall be ex officio surveyor-general of said District."

SEC. 2. That there shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a surveyor-general for the District of Alaska, embracing one surveying district.

SEC. 3. That the surveyor-general of Alaska shall receive a salary at the rate of \$2,000 per annum.

SEC. 4. That the President is authorized and empowered, in his discretion, to divide said Territory into two land districts and to designate the boundaries thereof, and he is also authorized and empowered to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a register of said additional land office and receiver of public moneys therefor, and in case of the creation of such additional land district the surveyor-general shall serve in both districts.

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.

MAP OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. GEAR. I ask unanimous consent at this time for the consideration of a joint resolution which will not take any time. If it does, I will withdraw it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The title of the joint resolution will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. R. 60) providing for the publication and distribution of the map of the United States.

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

Mr. TURPIE. I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. GEAR. All right.

SENATE PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. JONES of Nevada. I have three resolutions which I am instructed to report by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the reports? The Chair hears none.

Mr. JONES of Nevada. I am instructed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] on the 23d instant, to report it with an amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be allowed and paid to John Irwin, jr., late clerk of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, from the contingent fund of the Senate, \$700, as compensation for his services in the preparation of the Appendix to Senate Election Cases, authorized by concurrent resolution of March 21, 1894.

The amendment reported by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was to strike out "\$700" and insert "\$600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

DOCUMENTS IN SENATE TERRACE.

Mr. JONES of Nevada. I am instructed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] on the 22d instant, to report it favorably and without amendment. I ask for its present consideration.

By unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms be authorized to employ a competent person to index and arrange the documents in the file rooms of the Official Reporters in the Senate terrace, such person to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate a sum not to exceed \$300.

Mr. COCKRELL. What is that for?

Mr. TELLER. That is a resolution which I introduced. The documents which our Official Reporters have to go to in making up their RECORD have been very much disturbed and disarranged by some work which has been done in the room where their documents are located, and the Sergeant-at-Arms thinks it is necessary to have them rearranged. The Reporters are very anxious to have it done.

Mr. JONES of Nevada. I made an examination of the matter and found how much the whole work will cost, and the officers estimate that about \$300 will cover it. The resolution is limited to a sum not to exceed that amount.

Mr. TELLER. It is very important that the work should be done.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

DIGEST OF DECISIONS AND PRECEDENTS.

Mr. JONES of Nevada. I am instructed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] on the 16th instant, to report it favorably and without amendment. I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 278, second session Fifty-third Congress, being a "Digest of decisions and precedents of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States relating to their powers, privileges," etc., with certain addenda and revisions, be reprinted and indexed, under the direction of the Committee on Printing, for the use of the Senate. Any special services required and rendered in the execution of this order shall be paid for out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Resolved, That 100 additional copies be printed and bound for distribution by the compiler.

Mr. HOAR. Should not that resolution contain a clause to add any decisions which have been made since the original document was printed?

Mr. JONES of Nevada. I think the resolution includes that.

Mr. COCKRELL. Ought not that resolution to come from the Committee on Printing?

Mr. JONES of Nevada. It was considered by the Committee on Printing in the first instance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution has been before both the Committee on Printing and the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the resolution be again read.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is a very queer resolution. It simply authorizes this compilation, and there is no appropriation made for the printing of it. It is to be a revision, and I do not understand what can be done under this resolution if it shall be agreed to. Let the resolution be read again, so that we may see what can be done under it.

Mr. HOAR. The resolution merely provides for the reprinting of a former document.

Mr. COCKRELL. Have we the right to pay for this work out of the contingent fund of the Senate if it exceeds \$500? I think it will be sure to exceed \$500 in cost.

Mr. JONES of Nevada. The cost is not to exceed \$500; and I think we have a right to pay up to that amount.

Mr. BERRY. I object to the further consideration of the resolution. It is not in order.

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

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 379) to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

PAY OF EMPLOYEES.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask for the present consideration of House joint resolution No. 82, to which I think there will be no objection. I ask that it may be read, and if any Senator objects to its consideration I will withdraw it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read for information, subject to objection.

The Secretary read the joint resolution (H. Res. 82) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives on the day following adjournment; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

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

UNIVERSITY OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. HAWLEY. On behalf of the absent Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLINGTON] who is chairman of the Committee to

Establish the University of the United States, I ask an order to print a report of the committee, giving a carefully prepared historical and argumentative account of all movements in the direction of a national university. I have the approval of the Committee on Printing, and I have an estimate of the cost.

Mr. WALTHALL. What is it?

Mr. HAWLEY. A report of the Committee to Establish the University of the United States; a majority report, probably. It came to me from the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WALTHALL. There has been no meeting of the committee this session.

Mr. HAWLEY. I will state what is the request made of me. He instructed a gentleman familiar with this subject to prepare a full historical and argumentative statement of what has been done since the beginning of the Government, etc., the arguments of leading friends of the movement throughout the United States.

Mr. WALTHALL. That has been done several times.

Mr. HAWLEY. If so, the documents are exhausted and the statements are incomplete.

Mr. WALTHALL. I object, Mr. President. There has been no meeting of the committee.

Mr. HAWLEY. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

The Senate resumed the consideration of executive business. After twenty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution authorizing the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to close the present session by adjourning their respective Houses on Saturday July 24, at 9 o'clock p. m., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 82) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives on the day following adjournment; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

PRINTING OF TARIFF LAW.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of Congress 50,000 copies of the tariff law of 1897 in pamphlet form with paper cover, to be apportioned as follows: 25,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 10,000 copies for the use of the Senate, and 15,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

COMPILATION OF TREATIES.

On motion of Mr. LODGE, the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 64) providing for a compilation of all treaties now in force between the United States and any foreign government.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution; which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That a competent person be employed, under the direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to make a compilation of all the treaties now in force between the United States and any foreign Government. Said compilation shall contain the full text of the treaties now in force, together with a citation of any decision which may have been made in regard to said treaties by the Supreme Court of the United States or any court of Federal jurisdiction. The said work shall also contain a list, in chronological order, of all the treaties at any time made by the United States with other foreign countries, with a reference to the page and volume where the text of the same may be found, the whole to be carefully indexed by countries and by subject-matters. There shall be printed 1,500 copies of said volume: 1,000 for the use of the House of Representatives and 500 for the use of the Senate.

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

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CUSTOMS LAWS.

On motion of Mr. ALLISON, the Senate reconsidered the vote by which the resolution this day submitted by him, providing for the preparation of a comparative statement of the customs laws, was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be, and they are hereby, directed, during the recess of Congress, to prepare a comparative statement of the customs laws from 1890 to 1897, inclusive, together with official statistics and official data relating thereto; and the provisions of the Senate resolution of March 19, 1897, are hereby continued in force for this purpose.

ALFREDO H. HUGNET.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read,

and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate of the United States:

In response to the resolution of the Senate of July 16 instant, as follows:
 "Resolved, That the President be requested to send to the Senate, if in his opinion it is not incompatible with the public interests, all the information in possession of the Government relating to the arrest of Alfredo H. Hugnet, a citizen of the United States, on or about the 6th of September, 1896, and his imprisonment in Habana, Cuba, by Spanish authority, and the charges that were preferred against him, if any, and as to the process under which he was arrested and imprisoned, and the place and manner of his imprisonment, and his treatment while he was in prison. If he was released, whether any and what conditions were imposed upon him as the conditions of his release from prison."

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of State and the correspondence requested.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
 Washington, July 24, 1897.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was read:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be authorized to close the present session by adjourning their respective Houses on Saturday, July 24, at 9 o'clock p. m.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry upon that resolution. It has been the uniform practice of the Senate since I have been here, without any variation at all, when a resolution of this character came from the House, to refer it to the Committee on Appropriations. That practice, of course, has interpreted the will of the Senate heretofore upon matters of this kind, and it is predicated, if I may be permitted to say so, upon this state of law: A motion made in the Senate by any Senator to adjourn, whether under the rule to the next day or to a day certain from any previous time, is a motion that that Senator has a right to make as a privileged question whenever somebody else is not on the floor or whenever the Senate is not dividing, and to have it acted upon without debate.

That is a motion originating in this body; it is the privilege of a Senator; but the House of Representatives can not make a motion in the Senate to adjourn. The House can only send us their resolution; and every resolution that comes from the House of Representatives is open to debate and open to amendment. It being a resolution from the House of Representatives and not originating in this body, it is not controlled by the rule of the Senate which relates to motions that do originate in this body.

Then, of course, the House can not impose upon the Senate the consideration of any question as a matter of privilege and as also a matter that must be considered by us without debate, because if the House could do that, or if we could do the same thing in respect of the House, the House could at any moment at all interrupt the business of the Senate and compel us to stop it, no matter how important it might be in our estimation, and proceed without debate to the consideration of a subject that they themselves submitted to us.

The rules in regard to adjournment found in Jefferson's Manual and those found in our rules of procedure relate to matters of adjournment that arise, as I have stated, within each House, and not to the concurrent action of the two Houses. I maintain, sir, that no concurrent action can be had between the two Houses except by a vote of the Senate, on which vote every Senator has the right to offer his amendment. Oftentimes I have seen the day changed here. When the House has suggested a certain day, I have seen the day changed by the action of the Senate to a different time, and I have heard uniformly as much debate about it as the Senate chose to engage in. I make the parliamentary inquiry whether the resolution is not subject to a reference to a committee, and also whether it is not subject to amendment and to debate?

Mr. ALDRICH. It seems to me that the parliamentary inquiry is simply a hypothetical question. If the Senator raises the point of order that the resolution is not in order, then he might expect the presiding officer of this body to decide that question. But it seems to me that it is no part of the duty of a presiding officer to answer hypothetical questions. I did not understand that the Senator from Alabama made any point of order in regard to the present consideration of the resolution. If that matter is before the Senate, either upon a point of order or in any other way, I shall be glad to make some suggestions upon the other side of the question.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not make the point of order because I desire to give the Chair an opportunity to express his opinion upon the parliamentary situation, and because there is a regular order before the Senate which might interrupt the resolution, and which would interrupt it, no doubt. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON] is entitled to the floor and will take it upon the pending resolution. Strictly speaking, the adjournment resolution is

not in order because it interferes with the regular order now before the Senate, and I therefore, at the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island, make that preliminary question.

Mr. ALDRICH. It seems very clear that the reason given by the Senator from Alabama why the resolution is not in order would not hold. If it can not ever displace the regular order, a resolution of adjournment never could be considered by this body, and we would be kept in continuous session. That seems to me very clear. It appears to me that if a resolution of final adjournment is not a privileged motion, no privileged motion can be made in this body.

Mr. MORGAN. It is not so stated.

Mr. ALDRICH. Under the rules of the Senate any question relating to adjournment—

Mr. MORGAN. It is not classed as a privileged motion.

Mr. ALDRICH. Is always in order and takes precedence of all other motions.

Mr. MORGAN. Can the Senator point out in Jefferson's Manual or in any rule of the Senate where a motion for the final adjournment of the two bodies is a privileged motion?

Mr. ALDRICH. The last clause of the twenty-second rule, I think, states distinctly that all questions relating to adjournment take precedence of all other motions, and must be considered and proceeded with without debate.

Mr. MORGAN. That does not make it a question of privilege.

Mr. ALDRICH. It does make it a question of privilege—

Mr. MORGAN. I do not think so.

Mr. ALDRICH. Because it gives such motions precedence over all other motions and all other business, without debate.

Mr. MORGAN. The House has no privilege on the floor of the Senate. Privileges belong to members of this body.

Mr. ALDRICH. But this resolution is here and it is to be proceeded with under the rules of the Senate and in accordance with the ordinary rules of parliamentary law. It must be disposed of, and such resolutions have always been disposed of in the ordinary course of business without discussion and immediately.

Mr. BERRY. No; not without debate.

Mr. MORGAN. I appeal to the Senator from Iowa, who has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations for years, if these resolutions have not uniformly been referred to the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Alabama allow me to read to him one Senate rule which I think has escaped his memory for the moment?

Mr. MORGAN. Very good.

Mr. HOAR. Very seldom anything escapes it. It is the fifth clause of Rule VII:

The presiding officer may at any time lay, and it shall be in order at any time for a Senator to move to lay, before the Senate any bill or other matter sent to the Senate by the President or the House of Representatives, and any question pending at that time shall be suspended for this purpose.

Now, if the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. MORGAN. If the Senator will allow me just one moment, it was my recollection of the existence of that rule that caused me to say that I doubted as to whether it was not in order for the matter coming from the House to be considered; that is to say—

Mr. HOAR. That was the foundation of what I was about to say.

Mr. MORGAN. Now, if the Senator will allow me to change—

Mr. PASCO. I should like to ask what is before the Senate?

Mr. MORGAN. Is the resolution before the Senate?

Mr. ALDRICH. It has been laid before the Senate.

Mr. PASCO. It is not yet before the Senate.

Mr. CULLOM. It was laid before the Senate by the Chair.

Mr. PASCO. It was simply read; that is all.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair under the rule did lay the concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives before the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. Then I move to refer it to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HOAR. The rule requires that any matter from the House of Representatives may be laid before the Senate at any time by the Chair in his discretion or may be called up by any Senator in his discretion. This matter has been laid before the Senate by the Chair in his discretion, and the pending business was interrupted for that purpose. The Senator from Alabama says with great propriety, and with that exactness of comprehension that distinguishes him, that in such a case it has been the habit of the Senate to move to refer a resolution of this class to the Committee on Appropriations. That is true. But if that be true, it involves the proposition, and it is also equally true, that the Senate may make any other proper disposition of it.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not doubt that.

Mr. HOAR. And I move, if it be in order, that the Senate concur in the resolution of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MORGAN. A motion to refer has precedence.

Mr. PASCO. Mr. President—

Mr. HOAR. I desire my motion, if it be in order, to be stated by the Chair as the pending motion before the Senator from Florida proceeds.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that the Senate concur in the resolution of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PASCO. Mr. President, I do not think that this resolution can be now considered if an objection is made, and I call attention to Rule XIV, clause 5, which reads:

5. All resolutions shall lie over one day for consideration unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

I admit, Mr. President, that a bill, or a message from the President, or a message from the House of Representatives can be presented to the Senate; but it does not necessarily follow that it comes up at once for consideration. That matter is controlled by the rule I have read. It can only be taken up for consideration to-day by the unanimous consent of the Senate.

If the Senator from Alabama enters an objection, all of these motions which are being made now by the Senator from Massachusetts, by the Senator from Alabama, or by any other Senator, necessarily go over until the next legislative day. They can not now be considered unless by the unanimous consent of the Senate it shall be otherwise ordered.

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

Mr. PASCO. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. Does the Senator think that that rule applies to a resolution of the House of Representatives that we adjourn to-night?

Mr. PASCO. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SPOONER. And that it should lie over until Monday next?

Mr. PASCO. Undoubtedly; it can only be considered by unanimous consent to-day.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Of course.

Mr. PASCO. When the House of Representatives sends over such a resolution as that, they are supposed to understand the rules of the Senate and they are supposed to understand that this matter can not be considered here to-day except by unanimous consent. If a bill should come over to the Senate from the House of Representatives to-day, under the rule of the Senate it could not even be read the first time to-day, for the first clause of Rule XIV provides:

1. Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for one day.

It matters not whether it comes from a committee of the Senate, whether it comes from the House of Representatives, or whether it comes from a Senator on this floor; it can be laid before the Senate, and it remains on the table until the next day, under the rules of the Senate, if there is objection to immediate action. The Senate can proceed at once to the consideration of a bill, a joint resolution, or a message from the House to the Senate only by general consent, and we can, if we see fit, by unanimous consent, act now on this resolution, but not otherwise.

These are positive and direct rules; and if there are any exceptions to them, the burden of pointing out those exceptions is upon Senators who contend that the course prescribed by them should not be followed. If these are privileged questions, then the question of privilege must be shown by some other rule which sets forth that they are privileged questions.

The rule to which the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] called attention has no reference whatever to this matter. That was simply as to the precedence of motions in the Senate—matters relating to the adjournment of the Senate. They do not deal with the question of concurrent resolutions coming here from the House of Representatives, but simply with the question of the adjournment of the Senate, and I call the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to the third clause of Rule XXII, which says:

When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—

To adjourn.

To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.

* * * * *

Which several motions shall have precedence as they stand arranged. Those motions are simply with reference to the adjournment of the Senate, not to the final adjournment of the two Houses of Congress. The latter is a constitutional function. The manner in which the two Houses of Congress shall be adjourned is laid down in the Constitution of the United States. Neither of the two Houses can adjourn for more than three days at a time without having the consent of the other.

Now, I call attention to the third paragraph of Rule XXII. It reads:

To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.

Not the two Houses of Congress, but "when the Senate adjourn." Rule XXII applies simply to the question of the adjournment of the Senate.

Mr. President, what are we acting on? We are acting on a resolution coming over from the House of Representatives. The form of that resolution comes from Jefferson's Manual, and I call attention to the language to be found on page 146 of the Senate Manual. Other matters are referred to in the early part of the sentence, and then it goes on to say:

In other cases it is declared by the joint vote authorizing the President of the Senate and Speaker to close the session on a fixed day, which is usually in the following form.

Then follows the very form which the House of Representatives has sent over here:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, That the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives be authorized to close the present session by adjourning their respective Houses on the — day of —.

That is a concurrent resolution, and, as I have already said, it must, under Rule XIV, clause 5, lie over one day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct. Mr. President, that is the law.

Mr. ALDRICH. Is the Senator aware—I suppose he is—that under the clause which he has read it has been the uniform practice in the House of Representatives—and there are numerous decisions upon that point—that a motion made in that form is at all times a privileged motion?

Mr. PASCO. I stated before that the burden of showing that this is a privileged motion is upon a Senator who contends that it is a privileged motion, and that must be shown by the rules of the Senate. Whenever a Senator can point to a rule which makes this a privileged question, then he will have carried his point. The law is as I have stated.

What is the practice? I have been in the Senate a little more than ten years, and I have seen a number of these final adjournments. As the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] stated a little while ago, there has been a uniform practice which has prevailed with reference to these matters. When a resolution for final adjournment has come over from the House of Representatives, it has invariably, without a single exception, been referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Appropriations—

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator is mistaken about that. I remember when the last tariff bill was under consideration, at the close of a session like this, the resolution for final adjournment was referred to the Committee on Finance. Such resolutions are simply referred as a matter of convenience to the committee having charge of the business before the Senate at the close of a session. The Senate could refer this resolution to a committee unquestionably, if it saw fit to do so.

Mr. PASCO. It may be that such resolutions have been referred to another committee. That is not a question of substance. Perhaps it would have been better if I had said that such resolutions are invariably referred to a committee. The remark of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] confirms that statement. It is a matter of little consequence whether such a resolution is in every case referred to the Committee on Appropriations or whether there was a single exception when such a resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance. I will admit that, as it is not a point of substance.

Mr. ALLISON. Such resolutions have generally been referred to the Committee on Appropriations for the reason that the Committee on Appropriations generally has the information necessary to inform the Senate when it will be possible to adjourn; that is to say, we can not adjourn until the appropriation bills have been passed, and of course the Committee on Appropriations usually is in possession of information in relation to those bills before the Senate can be placed in possession of such information. That is the reason for such a reference. But now certainly there is no reason to refer this resolution to the Committee on Appropriations because all of the appropriation bills have been disposed of, and there is certainly no reason to refer the resolution to the Committee on Finance, because that committee clearly has disposed of the only important question before it at the present session.

Mr. PASCO. The resolution might very properly be referred to the Committee on Rules; but the particular committee to which such a resolution should be referred is not a matter of importance.

The point I made was that during the more than ten years I have been here such resolutions have been referred exactly as stated by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. The committee has taken charge of them, and I do not remember—though my memory may be at fault—a single instance where such a resolution has been reported back on the same day it was sent to the committee; but the reference has always been made; and it could be made now, it could be made to-day by general consent, or it can be made on Monday by a vote of the Senate.

But it can not even be referred to a committee if a single objection be made, for an objection now carries the resolution over until Monday. But if nobody makes the point—and I do not know that it has been made—I think the rule should be carried out, and that

the resolution should lie over until the next legislative day before it is considered.

Mr. MORGAN. I make the point.

Mr. President, I wish to say just a word in reply to a remark made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON]. Has any motion made in this body to adjourn to a day certain or any other motion of adjournment ever been referred to a committee? Has anybody ever heard of a motion to adjourn in this body being referred to a committee? What have we been doing here during all these years in referring resolutions coming from the House of Representatives to committees, if the House of Representatives had the privilege of having them passed upon instantly, without a reference and without debate?

That is the reason why I said, Mr. President, that the House of Representatives has no privileges on this floor of that kind. They are privileges, so far as they exist, of Senators. If we are going to lay down a precedent here for the sake of a matter of convenience, or to get rid of an inconvenience, it is going to come back to plague us very much. There is no reason on this Saturday afternoon why the Senate of the United States should violate all the precedents and all of its rules and, on the demand of the House of Representatives, pass upon this resolution to-day, when I have got the right to interpose an objection to it, it being a resolution—and there being no exception at all—and to say that this resolution cannot be considered against my objection to-day.

There may be reasons of the most important character why that resolution should not be considered to-day, and I do object most solemnly and most seriously that the House of Representatives has no right to send anything here that takes away from me the privilege, under the rules of the Senate, of having a matter of this kind, originating in another body, laid over for consideration until to-morrow. I have got that right, the right given to me in the rules of this Senate, derived expressly and directly from the Constitution of the United States, and the Senate has affirmed it, has granted it to me. I stand here a Senator from Alabama demanding it, and if you take it away from me, you simply violate the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama speaks of this question as if it were a question of the privilege of the House of Representatives to require the Senate to take up and act summarily upon certain business. It is not at all a question of the privilege of the House of Representatives. It is a question of the privilege of the Senate entirely, and that privilege of the Senate is a privilege inherent in the subject itself.

Mr. MORGAN. There is no such thing, if the Senator will allow me, as the privilege of the Senate. There is the privilege of a Senator, but not of the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. I think it is a privilege of the Senate; and I think, Mr. President, that this is a very serious and important claim made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], and absolutely unheard of in our whole parliamentary history—the claim that this body has so tied itself up by its rules that it can not adjourn without the consent of every single member, although the Capitol may be on fire; although, as was the case three or four times during the Revolutionary war, the enemy was at the gates of the city; although, as was the case at least once during the war of 1812, the enemy was at the gate; and although, as might have happened half a dozen times during the late war, the soldiers of the rebellion might have been at the gate—

Mr. MORGAN. If the Senator will allow me, under such circumstances, did he ever hear of any difficulty in getting everybody to consent to an adjournment?

Mr. HOAR. I think there might possibly be a time when, out of 90 Senators, there would be one traitor who desired the destruction of the Government and the destruction of the Senate itself.

Mr. MORGAN. He could not keep the balance of them in the Chamber, could he?

Mr. HOAR. I think the right of this body to deal with this subject as a question of the highest privilege never has been questioned till this moment, and, as I have said, it is a right of the body itself and a right growing out of the character and nature of the subject itself. When Rule XXIV provided that all motions relating to adjournment should be decided without debate, it meant to cover unquestionably, as nobody will doubt, every motion relating to adjournment which could be made under the rules of the Senate. Does anybody suppose it was meant to exclude from that provision the higher and more important motion for a final adjournment which requires the assent of the House of Representatives?

Mr. PASCO. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. PASCO. The Senator says all motions to adjourn. If he will refer to page 19, Rule XXII—the rule which I presume he intended to refer to—he will see that it does not say any such thing. It says, "Which several motions."

Mr. HOAR. "And the motions."

Mr. PASCO. No, sir. "Which several motions shall have precedence as they stand arranged;" and the several motions are the motion to adjourn, the motion to adjourn to a day certain, and so forth.

Mr. HOAR. The latter portion of the clause is what I referred to. Mr. ALDRICH. There is a semicolon there.

Mr. HOAR. The motions relating to adjournment, etc., shall be decided without debate.

Mr. PASCO. It reads "which several motions," and then it refers to them. It is the same thing.

Mr. HOAR. I understand that it does not. I do not put that clause as controlling this question in terms, but there is undoubtedly a rule providing for motions made in the Senate when a measure is pending. My proposition was that when the Senate had carefully provided for the immediate consideration, to the exclusion of all other business and without debate, of all of the motions which its own rules provide for an adjournment, it is preposterous to suppose that they meant to require this body to go on for days perhaps in debate, or to put off on a single motion to another day for debate, the more important, and sometimes more necessary, motion, which, under the Constitution, requires the consent of the other House.

Therefore, when a concurrent resolution for adjournment comes here, it is laid before the body at the discretion of the Chair, or at the discretion of any single member who may call for it. When it is before the body, the motion to concur is in substance and effect a motion made by a Senator to adjourn, with all the privileges and with the entire standing in all respects that the motion would have if it were a simple motion to adjourn from day to day.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question just there?

Mr. HOAR. I will when I finish the sentence I have begun.

Mr. President, what I have stated has been the universal practice of this body, certainly ever since I have studied its history. Resolutions for final adjournment frequently come here from the other body, according to my recollection, on the very day when the final adjournment takes place; or such resolutions have been sent over by this body to the other House on the very day when final adjournment takes place. I can remember certainly one or two instances, and I think the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] will remember them, where motions which have been adopted by both bodies have been rescinded by the bodies when it has been necessary by reason of some delay in the passage of appropriation bills to revoke the adjournment resolution, and it has been done from half hour to half hour during the night.

Mr. MORGAN. And they have been oftentimes amended, too.

Mr. HOAR. And oftentimes amended, too.

Mr. MORGAN. Our rules absolutely prohibit any amendment of a motion to adjourn, and if our rules apply to it—

Mr. HOAR. I am not speaking as to the rule.

Mr. MORGAN. If our rules as to adjourning apply to resolutions for final adjournment, how could we ever get an amendment?

Mr. ALDRICH. You say they do not apply.

Mr. MORGAN. No; they do not apply at all. Parliamentary law applies.

Mr. HOAR. I like always to be courteous, but I hardly think it is fair to ask a Senator who is on the floor to yield for a conversation between the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. MORGAN. Here is a resolution coming from the House of Representatives inviting us to concur with them in agreeing to adjourn to-night at 9 o'clock.

The Senator says that is not debatable. Now, supposing that that resolution comes in, and the Senator from Iowa should rise and state here, "I think it would be very unfortunate for the Senate to adjourn, because we have an unfinished appropriation bill or an unfinished resolution relating to an appropriation bill which the Senate ought to act upon before we adjourn."

Mr. HOAR. That applies equally to every daily motion to adjourn.

Mr. MORGAN. No; that would not be debatable, according to the proposition insisted upon by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, motion is made to adjourn at 5 or half past 4, and a Senator says, "If you will stay another half hour, we can get to such a place, and then we will adjourn." That is done by unanimous consent. It is not done under the rule, and undoubtedly any Senator would obtain unanimous consent here if he would state with reasonable brevity any grave and serious reason. My proposition is that this is a question of the highest privilege, and when it is before the Senate it has, from the nature and necessity of the subject, all the privileges and all the qualifications and is subject to all the rules which apply to a motion to adjourn made in the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to state for the information of the Senate,

as I am satisfied the other side of the Chamber must be unaware of the fact, that a Presidential message sent to Congress a few moments ago states that it is most necessary that we should pass a law providing for the appointment of a currency commission at this session, and it can not be that the President will look with satisfaction upon an adjournment as early as 9 o'clock to-night. I am somewhat surprised that the motion to adjourn has thus been pressed. It seems to me that it will embarrass my friends on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, it seems to me that when the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] admits that the resolution can be amended he thereby admits that it is open to debate. A motion to adjourn in the Senate can not be amended and can not be debated. No word can be said in regard to it if objection is made and the rules are enforced. But here is a resolution that is open to amendment, and if the Senator from Alabama sees proper to offer an amendment that the time shall be changed to 10 o'clock, or until Monday, he has a right to give the reasons why the other hour would be the better time.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Arkansas pardon me for one statement?

Mr. BERRY. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. A motion to take a recess or to adjourn to a day certain in the House of Representatives is not debatable.

Mr. BERRY. It is not here.

Mr. HOAR. Not here, but it is a common form of filibustering in the other House to move to take a recess for five minutes—

Mr. BERRY. That part of it is debatable.

Mr. HOAR. No.

Mr. BERRY. I beg the Senator's pardon. The Speaker issued a book some time ago in which he expressly states that it is debatable. If I had the book before me, I could show it.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will allow me one moment—

Mr. BERRY. Permit me for a moment, and then I will yield to the Senator from Massachusetts. I repeat, that the rule read by the Senator refers to a motion to adjourn from day to day or to a day certain by the Senate; and such motions are not debatable. It has no reference to a joint resolution or a concurrent resolution coming from the other House, and the very moment, I repeat, you admit that it can be amended, you are bound to admit that it is debatable. If the Senator from Iowa should come in here and offer an amendment and say, "Mr. President, I move to amend the resolution and make it 9 o'clock Monday night, because an appropriation bill is pending which can not be disposed of by 9 o'clock to-night," every man in the Senate knows he has a right to say it, and yet, according to the construction of the rule made by the Senator from Massachusetts, he would not be permitted to open his mouth in regard to it. It is not true. It does not apply to a concurrent resolution, and I think anyone who will read the rules and the decisions made in the House of Representatives will come clearly to that view.

I am sorry the Senator from Alabama did not state why he objected. We all know what is behind this. We know the reasons why an adjournment is desired by some Senators, and why the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Kansas do not desire an adjournment at so early an hour. A resolution has been pending here for a good many days on which they have sought to get a vote, and have asked unanimous consent that a time be fixed for a vote. It is with reference to the Union Pacific Railroad. The Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Kansas insist that unless that resolution is passed the Government will lose \$50,000,000, probably, before we come here in December. They have a right to have a vote on the proposition. If a majority of the Senate are against it, they can move to lay it on the table. If a majority of the Senate are for it, it ought to be voted upon.

Yesterday, when Senators on the other side were so desirous of having a vote on the tariff bill, there were some Senators here who proposed to make conditions about the vote; that an agreement should be had on the Pacific railroads resolution; but there were a number of other Senators who said that they would not mix up the two; that it was not right and proper to establish a rule in the Senate by which one measure should be made to depend upon another. Therefore the Senator from Alabama withdrew his opposition to a vote on the tariff bill.

I insist that he has a right to have a vote on the resolution and to see whether a majority of the Senate is in favor of it or not. Do the Republican Senators wish to establish a precedent in this body that it can be delayed, by refusing unanimous consent, prevent votes on important motions of this kind? If so, they will establish a precedent which will be used hereafter in a great many cases where it ought not to be used. Now, you have had a vote on the tariff bill. You passed it. This resolution is an important one. It is important, if it passes at all, that it shall be passed during this session, and if you will indicate any hour between now and 9 o'clock when the Senate can express its opinion on the Pacific railroad resolution, I have no doubt you can get unanimous consent to pass the adjournment resolution, and do it without a viola-

tion of the rules of the Senate. It seems to me the proper thing would be for the Senator from Kansas to ask unanimous consent to fix some time between now and 9 o'clock when a vote may be taken on the Pacific railroad resolution.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. President, about two weeks ago some of the Senators on the other side moved to take up the resolution which, as I have stated, in my judgment would put a stop to the best possible solution of the Union Pacific Railroad situation. Senators on the other side knew that there were just about six days in which the resolution could be considered without running its consideration into the report of the conference committee. For all those six days the Senators on the other side who profess to desire a vote on the question took up the time of the Senate and the time of the country in discussing it.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from Nebraska allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. THURSTON. Certainly.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to ask who it was that objected to taking up the resolution for consideration in the first place?

Mr. THURSTON. I was opposed to taking it up, and I voted against taking it up, but it was taken up, nevertheless, and, as I say, Senators on the other side, for six long days, knowing that probably those were the only days which could be given at this extraordinary session for the consideration of the resolution, occupied it practically all themselves, to the exclusion of every other Senator on this floor who had asserted a desire to discuss the resolution upon the other side.

If Senators on the other side had been content at the beginning of the discussion to show a disposition to divide time fairly upon this floor, and had not used it all up themselves to the exclusion of the opposition, had not occupied it in filling the RECORD of the Senate with all their wild assertions upon the subject, I think there would have been no difficulty about making a fair and equitable arrangement for its discussion and its final determination.

I have been accustomed all my life to practice at the bar. At the bar it is always considered that in equity and justice, for fair play, the advocates of both sides shall have equal opportunity and equal time before they shall ever be required to submit their case to the judge or jury. It would be a matter nonprofessional in character for an advocate to take up all the time in sight and then insist that the case should go to the jury without giving the other side an opportunity to be heard.

I hope the Senate will permit this discussion to go on until there has been fair debate on the part of at least three Senators on this side who desire to be heard, not to the great and extraordinary and unnecessary length that the Senators on the other side of this question were heard, but for fair debate, for a reasonable presentation, for a chance to answer the many hours' debate with which the RECORD has been filled.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator from Nebraska permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. THURSTON. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. I am one Senator who has desired to speak on the Pacific railroad resolution. I have not had an opportunity to do so. The Senator from Nebraska says there are three who wish to speak against the resolution. I am ready to forego whatever time I might use in speaking on it, and I ask the Senator from Nebraska to state how much time he and his two confederates need in discussing the resolution, and then I will ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to fix an hour for voting on the resolution, giving all the time that may be necessary.

Mr. THURSTON. I do not yield to a Senator who uses the language which the Senator from North Carolina has used on this occasion. I have no confederate, Mr. President, on this floor or elsewhere.

Mr. BUTLER. I did not mean it in an offensive sense. I mean the Senator's assistants, or his colleagues, or his friends.

Mr. THURSTON. There are Senators on this floor, and many of them, who believe with me that in this whole Pacific railroad resolution there is simply a desire to put the railroad in the possession of the Government at a price so great that the Government can never dispose of it again, to lose all it has there now and to lose all it has a chance to secure.

I am ready when the resolution comes up to discuss it fairly and decently, both as to method and as to time. It is for the Senate to say whether it desires to stay here at this session for the purpose of permitting fair debate.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, as a member of the committee, I fully agree with part of the remarks made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON]. I well remember that he entertained us with a speech on this question some weeks ago, and that he did not then have time to go fully into the subject. I believe, sir, that he is entitled to the time he required. I believe, as he does, that the gentlemen, whether they are on the other side of the House or on this, should have ample time to debate this very important question.

This is a matter involving millions of dollars to the people of

this country. It is not a question which should be hurried through in the closing hours of Congress. Ample time should be given to debate the question.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator from New Jersey permit me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. No one desires to cut off Senators, but that to which we object is passing the adjournment resolution until a vote is had upon the Pacific railroad resolution.

Mr. SMITH. I will come to that.

Mr. BERRY. Take a week if necessary.

Mr. ALDRICH. I rise to a question of order. I am aware that the presiding officer of the Senate has oftentimes and now exercised the widest latitude in permitting discussion of parliamentary questions, but it seems to me this is going way beyond anything required by the necessities of the case.

The question is whether this is a privileged motion, and that is the matter which is now pending before the Chair. The Pacific railroad question may be an important one, but it has nothing to do, so far as I can see, with the question of order. I take it for granted that neither the Senator from Arkansas nor any other Senator means to say that this question must be decided on account of something that is to be done or not to be done in connection with the Pacific railroads.

Mr. BERRY. No, Mr. President—

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senate is not to be kept here, I take it, on the suggestion of any man because his precise views as to what ought to be done or may be done with this question—

Mr. WHITE. Will my friend the Senator from Rhode Island permit me to suggest that there is a message from the President upon the table which ought to be read, so that we will not bring ourselves into conflict unnecessarily with an Executive recommendation, and I understand a bill pursuant to the message is scheduled to pass elsewhere before 7 o'clock to-night.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from California can, if he sees fit, insist that the Senate shall stay here and hear the message and act upon it, if that is his view, but I submit that this discussion is not in order. I make the point of order that it is not in order, and I request the presiding officer of the body to confine Senators, if they are to discuss the question, to the merits of the matter before the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator from New Jersey allow me for just one moment?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. The question is, Is it in order to debate the proposition to adjourn?

Mr. ALDRICH. Whether it is a privileged motion.

Mr. TELLER. Whether it is a privileged motion.

Mr. BERRY. The motion is to refer it to the Committee on Appropriations, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. TELLER. We are debating it now—

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. I understand that the Senator from Alabama objected to the consideration of the resolution to-day.

Mr. BERRY. That is correct.

Mr. ALDRICH. The question now before the Senate is whether he has a right to object to this; whether it is a privileged question to the extent that it is entitled to consideration, and whether it goes over under a single objection. That is the entire question, as I understand it.

Mr. TELLER. I understand we are discussing the question—

Mr. SMITH. That is just what I am discussing, and I propose to go on. I am right up to that point.

Mr. TELLER. That is what I wish to say. If the Senator is discussing what he thinks is the question, he has a right to discuss it in any shape he desires to. If it is a debatable question, he is the rule in the Senate for himself. Nobody else can say he is not in order, unless he transcends the decencies and proprieties of debate. That is the only instance where he can be called to order in the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, as I have said, I agree with the Senator from Nebraska so far as he went, as regards the importance of this question. The amount of money involved is so great that the question should not be disposed of in the closing hours of a Congress, and I ask him and the other members of this body what is the objection to delaying action upon the matter until next Congress, and possibly save to the American people many million dollars?

I should like to ask him whether I am right that the resolution only puts off the question until another session, so that he and I and others may have a chance to debate it as we should. Is that asking anything unreasonable, unjust, or unfair?

As I understand it, if the resolution is not acted upon these railroads can be sold and will be sold before Congress again meets, and I say that in my judgment a transaction of this kind should not be hurried along. I can not for my part understand why any

Senator should stand in his place on the floor and seek to prevent the passage of any resolution that will postpone final action on this question for the next Congress to deal with. I think that is a right which ought to be accorded to every Senator.

If there is any verbiage about the resolution which is wrong or will militate against the interest of the Government, I am willing to vote with the Senator from Nebraska to have it amended, so that at least we may put off action on the sale of these properties until Congress meets again.

Mr. President, so far as the resolution is concerned which came over from the House, I believe, sir, as others do here, that the question of adjournment, according to our rules, means simply the adjournment of the Senate, and the question simply resolves itself down to whether a resolution can be acted upon, whether it is for adjournment or for any other purpose, without, under our rules, being referred to a committee, and whether under objection it would not be obliged to go over for a day.

But I trust that it will not be necessary to debate that question or to delay the adjournment of Congress, but that the Senator from Nebraska will be willing to have the resolution of the Senator from Kansas so amended that final action on the sale of this great property, where so many millions of dollars of the people are involved, may at least go over until another Congress, when a fair opportunity for debate can be had.

I understood when the resolution was reported that it was the unanimous recommendation of the Pacific Railroads Committee. While a member of that committee, I was not present, but that is the impression I have. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will yield and will not delay a resolution which will protect the Government and the people from the proposed sale until we meet here again.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, this is practically a motion for final adjournment. The discussion proceeding technically upon another point is practically to that effect. While I may not be in order to make the motion, I suggest to Senators that with the message of the President of the United States on the table, which has not been read, it is certainly not consistent with the respect due to that official that we should proceed with that discussion until we hear what the President has to say. I think there can be no stronger illustration of the truth of the proposition that any motion which looks to final adjournment is necessarily a debatable motion.

A motion for adjournment from day to day is not debatable because that which the body does not attend to on that day can be attended to another day; but when the proposition is made to finally adjourn a body, the necessity of the case requires that the body shall have the opportunity, after conference and consultation and debate among its members as to whether or not its business has been finally concluded. I say the fact that we have upon the desk an unread message from the President of the United States pending this motion is the strongest illustration which could be presented of the truth of that proposition.

If I am in order, I desire to call for the reading of the message of the President of the United States.

Mr. ALLEN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Is there a message on the table or in the possession of the Chair from the President of the United States which has not yet been laid before the Senate?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will answer the Senator from Nebraska by the statement that there is a message from the President on the table, to be laid before the Senate at the first opportunity.

Mr. ALLEN. Then I suggest the propriety of its being laid before the Senate before we proceed further.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is a point of order pending before the Senate which it is the duty of the presiding officer to decide.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island is mistaken.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Chair can listen to statements made by Senators for his own information, and for his own information only. I suggest that this discussion upon every possible question, the President's message, the currency, and the Pacific Railroad, has no place here if we are a body governed by rules and by ordinary parliamentary law. I trust the presiding officer of the body will enforce that law and thus rule.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will decide any point of order that is submitted to him.

Mr. ALDRICH. I understand the Senator from Alabama raised a point of order. If he did not, then the concurrent resolution is before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama made a motion to refer the concurrent resolution to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MORGAN. First objecting that under the rules the resolution coming from the House of Representatives must go over

one day, unless by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeds to its consideration.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is the point of order. That is what I understood to be the question raised by the Senator from Alabama.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The point of order was not taken by the Senator from Florida or the Senator from Alabama. If it is, the Chair is ready to rule upon it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I understood that was the point raised.

Mr. PASCO. The Senator from Georgia has called for the reading of the message of the President of the United States. Aside from the point that he has made, that as a matter of respect to the President the message should be laid before the Senate, he has a right to demand the reading under section 5 of Rule VII. I hope that the call which he has made will be responded to, and that the message will be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Florida makes the point of order that the resolution shall lie over one day under Rule XIV, the Chair is prepared to decide the point of order now.

Mr. PASCO. The Senator from Alabama made that point, I understand.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama insist on his point of order?

Mr. MORGAN. I do.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that he finds three rules of the Senate which seem to affect this question. The first one is Rule IX, which I read:

Beginning with the first subject on the Calendar next after the last subject disposed of in proceeding with the Calendar, * * * the following motions shall be in order at any time as privileged motions, save as against a motion to adjourn, or to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

By that language there is a plain intimation that a motion to adjourn is a motion of higher privilege than any of the motions mentioned in Rule IX.

Rule XIV, to which the Senator from Florida [Mr. Pasco] refers, provides that—

All resolutions shall lie over one day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

The Chair does not feel that that language includes or covers or is intended to cover a motion or a resolution providing for adjournment, in whatever form such motion or resolution is offered. That rule, in my opinion, has no reference to any other matters except to the ordinary business and the ordinary resolutions which come before the Senate which are not resolutions of high privilege. If not taken out of the rule (meaning No. XIV) by the ordinary proceedings and practices of the Senate, it would be taken out of the rule by the rule subsequent to it, Rule XXII, which is as follows:

When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—
To adjourn.
To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.

And a few other motions, all of which motions, "and the motions relating to adjournment, to take a recess, to proceed to the consideration of executive business, to lay on the table, shall be decided without debate." Rule XXII would take this resolution or any motion to adjourn out of the jurisdiction of Rule XIV. In other words, this motion or resolution is not such as is contemplated by Rule XIV. It is a motion of high privilege. It is taken out of the class by Rule IX and Rule XXII.

It certainly could not be said or argued that simple motions to adjourn, or to commit, or to take a recess, or any of the motions mentioned and embraced under Rule XXII, if they were simply called resolutions, would have to lie over one day. That seems impossible, and would make any motion or resolution made in the Senate of the United States impossible to be acted upon at any time except after being laid over for one day.

This motion or this resolution is thus privileged by the rules themselves, and directly excluded from the operation of Rule XIV, section 5. Neither can this resolution be thus taken out of our own rules (the Senate rules) because it comes from the House. When it comes from the House it is brought here under the Senate rules, and becomes subject to them. It involves the adjournment of the Senate. It is not a resolution providing for any other matter except to adjourn at a time certain, and therefore it relates to adjournment and nothing else. Suppose the resolution now before us were put in another form, like this: "That the Senate, when it should adjourn, should adjourn to meet at 9 o'clock to-night?"

Is there any Senator who would feel or insist that such a resolution would not be competent for present consideration without lying over one day? It would then come, as this House resolution comes, under the application of the twenty-second rule, and would not be subject to the rule as to "lying over." The question of debate and the restriction of Rule XXII as to debate involve another question that the Chair need not rule upon at this time. The Chair does rule that the point of order made by the Senator from Alabama and supported by the Senator from

Florida, that the fourteenth rule is applicable to this resolution, is not applicable thereto, and thus the Chair overrules the point and says the resolution is not such a one as is required to lie over under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN. I appeal from the Chair's decision, and that appeal is debatable.

Mr. LINDSAY rose.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska appeals—

Mr. ALDRICH. I think I addressed the Chair.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN. I was recognized.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. ALLEN. Wait a moment. I do not see how the Senator from Rhode Island gets under me here.

Mr. HOAR. You sat down.

Mr. ALLEN. No; I did not sit down without yielding the floor to the Senator from Kentucky.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair recognized the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Chair said "Senator from Nebraska." I suppose he meant "Senator from Rhode Island."

Mr. ALLEN. I appealed from the Chair's decision.

Mr. ALDRICH. And I moved to lay that appeal on the table.

Mr. ALLEN. And before anything was done the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY] addressed the Chair and I yielded the floor to him. Now, how the Senator from Rhode Island can get in through the Senator from Kentucky and myself on that motion I am not exactly informed. I yielded to an interruption on the part of the Senator from Kentucky, and I yield now to the interruption of the Senator from Kentucky, who desires to address the Chair.

Mr. LINDSAY. I do desire, Mr. President—

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. HOAR. I rise to a question of order, which is that an appeal itself is not debatable.

Mr. ALLEN. This precise question was decided here in 1893, during our silver debate, as being debatable. It was decided that an appeal from the decision of the Chair was debatable.

Mr. SPOONER. Was it decided by the Senate or the Chair?

Mr. ALLEN. It was decided by the Senate and by the Chair.

Mr. ALDRICH. I presume Senators have some rights in this matter. The Senator from Nebraska took an appeal from the decision of the Chair and resumed his seat. I rose and addressed the Chair and the Chair stated that he recognized me. I then moved to lay the appeal on the table. I do not see, after that, how the Senator from Nebraska can claim to resume the floor, and especially if he yielded to somebody else to make a speech.

Mr. ALLEN. The statement of the Senator from Rhode Island is not correct, as his statements are not usually correct when partisan purposes underlie his action. I appealed from the ruling of the Chair. The Senator from Kentucky interrupted me and asked to address the Chair. I submitted to the interruption of the Senator from Kentucky and yielded temporarily to him. In the meantime, without addressing the Chair, the Senator from Rhode Island undertook to make his motion. I now again yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President—

Mr. ALLEN. I shall retain the floor unless the Chair rules that I may surrender to—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair had no intimation or information whatever that the Senator from Kentucky desired to be heard. The Chair did listen to the appeal and statement of the Senator from Nebraska and then recognized the Senator from Rhode Island, for what purpose he did not know.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, I am rising to a question of privilege that does not concern this matter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. ALLEN. No, sir; I do not.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from Alabama has a right to rise to a question of privilege.

Mr. PETTUS. I desire to state to the Chair, anyhow, that he is keeping a messenger from the House waiting at the door when there is no privileged question going on.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not yield to the Senator from Alabama, however gratifying it would be to do so under ordinary circumstances. I desire again to submit to an interruption on the part of the Senator from Kentucky, if he desires to interrupt me.

Mr. LINDSAY. I do desire to interrupt him, and I did address the Chair.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to hear you all.

Mr. ALLEN. I now distinctly yield to the Senator from Kentucky for an interruption.

Mr. ALDRICH. What became of the motion which I made under the rules, and which the Chair has already stated was made by me under his recognition?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that he will be pleased, since his decision is involved, to hear what the Senator from Kentucky has to say. The Chair understands the order of business to be that an appeal has been taken from the decision of the Chair, and the Senator from Rhode Island has moved to lay the appeal on the table. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. President, if this concurrent resolution is a privileged resolution, it is because, as I think, it is inherent in the Senate, independent of its rules and in disregard of its rules, to take immediate action upon such a resolution. There is no question that by the letter of Rule XIV the resolution either goes to a committee or lies over one day before action can be taken upon it. Now, then, if it is a resolution not covered by Rule XIV, that fact must arise out of Rule IX or Rule XXII. Rule IX provides in regard to precedence of motions—

First. A motion to proceed to the consideration of an appropriation or revenue bill.

Clearly that does not apply to this particular resolution.

Second. A motion to proceed to the consideration of any other bill on the Calendar, which motion shall not be open to amendment.

It is not claimed that it is saved under that provision.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts will state his question of order.

Mr. HOAR. My point of order is that an appeal to the Senate on a question itself undebatable is not debatable. The ruling of the Chair appealed from was on an undebatable question, and there has subsequent to that come a motion to lay on the table, which is undebatable. I insist that the rules of the Senate be executed in that regard.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. President, the logic of the Senator is—

Mr. HOAR. Let the Chair rule upon my point of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will hear the statement on that question of the Senator from Kentucky, because both the appeal and the motion to lay the appeal on the table are nondebateable under the twentieth rule.

Mr. LINDSAY. That is the very proposition I propose to contest. The logic of the Senator is that if the Chair erroneously decides that a motion is not debatable, and an appeal is taken from that supposed erroneous decision, then the Chair is bound to decide that the appeal is not debatable, and by that circuitry of reasoning the first error projects itself all along and prevents the Senate from ever undertaking to convince the Chair or to compare its own views upon a question of supreme importance like this. Of course I submit to the ruling of the Chair, but that is the logic of the proposition made by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair assumes that the statement—

Mr. BACON. Will the Chair permit me to make one suggestion?

Mr. LINDSAY. I am waiting for a ruling as to whether I am in order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair stated that he asked the indulgence of the Senate to hear the Senator from Kentucky on a nondebateable question in order that he might have his statement laid before the Senate. When he is through, the Chair will decide that the question before the Senate is the motion to lay upon the table the appeal of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. LINDSAY. Now, then, the fourth motion of privilege:

A motion to place such subject at the foot of the calendar.

Each of the foregoing motions shall be decided without debate and may be submitted as in the nature and with all the rights of questions of order.

They may be decided without debate, because the rule in express terms gives the Chair the power and authority to decide them without debate, not because there is anything inherent in the power of the Senate to cut off debate, but because the Senate has provided that these particular motions may and shall be decided without debate.

As the concurrent resolution does not come within either of those classes, it does not follow from Rule IX that it may be decided by the Chair without debate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair feels it proper to say to the Senator from Kentucky that he has made no such ruling. The only ruling the Chair made was that the point of order taken by the Senator from Alabama and debated by the Senator from Florida, that all resolutions shall lie over one day for consideration unless the Senate shall otherwise direct, did not apply. That is the full ruling of the Chair, and the only ruling.

Mr. LINDSAY. The ruling of the Chair, as I understood it, rested upon Rule XXII. I have argued to the Chair that literally

this is a concurrent resolution, which, under Rule XIV, must lie over one day.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I must rise to a question of order. It is time, certainly, that some of the rules of the Senate were enforced in regard to this matter. This matter is not in the discretion of the Chair any longer. He has made his decision, and the question is whether the Senate will sustain the decision of the Chair.

Mr. HOAR. The pending question is a motion to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. ALDRICH. The pending question is a motion to lay upon the table the appeal made by the Senator from Nebraska, and upon that the Senator from Kentucky is clearly out of order, either for the information of the presiding officer or of the Senate. I ask again that the rules of the Senate may be enforced.

Mr. LINDSAY. Now, Mr. President, there seems to be—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state it is not in order to debate an appeal when a motion to lay the appeal on the table is pending.

Mr. PASCO. I should like to ask how the Senator from Rhode Island got the floor to make that motion when the floor at that time was held by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. GEAR. The Chair recognized him.

Mr. PASCO. Two Senators can not occupy the floor at the same time. If the Senator from Nebraska was occupying the floor and holding the floor and making a speech, the interjection of those words of the Senator from Rhode Island into the record did not constitute a motion and can not be recognized as such.

Mr. GEAR. The Senator forgets that the Chair recognized the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH].

The VICE-PRESIDENT. How shall the vote be taken on the appeal?

Mr. PASCO. If the Chair recognized the Senator from Rhode Island through a misapprehension, supposing the Senator from Nebraska had given up the floor, that does not constitute a motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair made a full statement upon that matter. He had recognized the Senator from Nebraska and did not hear any suggestion that he had farmed out any portion of his time to anyone else. When the Senator from Nebraska had taken his seat, the Chair recognized the Senator from Rhode Island, who moved to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. HOAR. I call for the yeas and nays on the motion to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to make a statement before this matter is gone over roughshod. I will not consume much of the time of the Senate in doing so, however. I simply want to suggest that I appealed from the decision of the Chair and was on my feet addressing the Chair.

Mr. HOAR. You could not address the Chair.

Mr. ALLEN. When the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY] interrupted me and asked me to yield to him, which I did, and he addressed the Chair, and during that time the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], without addressing me or the Chair or anybody else—

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no.

Mr. ALLEN. Popped up like a jack-in-the-box and made his motion, without obtaining possession of the floor.

Several SENATORS. Regular order!

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to lay upon the table the appeal from the decision of the Chair taken by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], on which the yeas and nays have been called for. Is the demand seconded?

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

Mr. BUTLER (when his name was called). Under the transfer of pairs heretofore announced between my colleague [Mr. PRITCHARD] and myself, pairing the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. McLAURIN] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLINGTON], my colleague and I are at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

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

Mr. HANSBROUGH (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. I should vote "yea" if he were present.

Mr. BURROWS (when Mr. McMILLAN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. McMILLAN] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. MALLORY. I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR], but I transfer that pair to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE], and vote "nay."

Mr. PASCO (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. WILSON], but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEITFIELD], and vote "nay."

Mr. PENROSE (when his name was called). My pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. KENNEY] having been transferred as already explained, I vote "yea."

Mr. THURSTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CULLOM (after having voted in the affirmative). I voted without thinking of the pair I have with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]; but I will let my vote stand, and take the liberty of transferring my pair with the Senator from Delaware to my colleague [Mr. MASON], who is not present.

Mr. LINDSAY (after having voted in the negative). I understand the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN] has not voted. I have a general pair with that Senator, and withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 20; as follows:

YEAS—36.			
Aldrich,	Elkins,	McBride,	Pritchard,
Allison,	Fairbanks,	McEnery,	Quay,
Baker,	Foraker,	Mills,	Shoup,
Burrows,	Gallinger,	Morrill,	Spooner,
Carter,	Gear,	Murphy,	Stewart,
Clark,	Hale,	Nelson,	Teller,
Cullom,	Hawley,	Penrose,	Turner,
Davis,	Hoar,	Perkins,	Warren,
Deboe,	Jones, Nev.	Platt, Conn.	Wetmore.
NAYS—20.			
Allen,	Caffery,	Mallory,	Turley,
Bacon,	Chilton,	Morgan,	Turpie,
Bate,	Cockrell,	Pasco,	Vest,
Berry,	Harris,	Pettus,	Walthall,
Butler,	Jones, Ark.	Roach,	White.
NOT VOTING—33.			
Cannon,	Hanna,	Mantle,	Smith,
Chandler,	Hansbrough,	Martin,	Thurston,
Clay,	Heitfeld,	Mason,	Tillman,
Daniel,	Kenney,	Mitchell,	Wellington,
Faulkner,	Kyle,	Pettigrew,	Wilson,
Frye,	Lindsay,	Platt, N. Y.	Wolcott.
George,	Lodge,	Proctor,	
Gorman,	McLaurin,	Rawlins,	
Gray,	McMillan,	Sewell,	

So the appeal from the decision of the Chair was laid on the table.

Mr. ALLEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President.

Mr. GALLINGER. The record shows that there is a quorum present.

Mr. WHITE. I desire to inquire what was the statement of the Chair? Was the motion upon which the last vote was taken a motion to lay the appeal from the decision of the Chair upon the table?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. To lay the appeal upon the table, and 36 Senators voted in the affirmative and 20 in the negative.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let us have a vote on the resolution, Mr. President.

Mr. MORGAN. I move to refer the resolution to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let us have a vote on that.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] has moved to concur in the resolution of the House of Representatives, and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] moves to commit the resolution to the Committee on Appropriations. The motion of the Senator from Alabama is the motion before the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to lay the motion on the table.

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

Several SENATORS. That would carry the resolution with it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not so understand.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that if the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island should be adopted, it would carry the resolution with it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I withdraw it. Let us have a vote on the resolution.

Mr. PETTUS. On one occasion, many minutes ago, I called the attention of the Chair to the fact that there was a messenger standing in front of the Chair from the House of Representatives. The rules of this Senate require that such a message should be received at any time when the Senate is not dividing.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The point of order is well taken. The Chair will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 3950) to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act providing a civil government for Alaska," approved May 17, 1884, to create the office of surveyor-general for Alaska, and for other purposes; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives providing for final adjournment at 9 p. m. to-day.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. Mr. CULLOM. It seems to me the Senator from Nebraska ought not to do that, when it has just been decided that we have a quorum present.

Mr. ALLEN. The rules of the Senate require whenever the absence of a quorum is suggested that the roll shall be called.

Mr. CULLOM. I understand that; but it seems to me, after the announcement which has just been made, which showed much more than a quorum present, the Senator would hardly be justified in announcing at once that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALLEN. I will be the judge of the propriety of my own conduct.

Mr. CULLOM. You have the right to do that technically, but it seems rather a strange performance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The rule is absolute on that subject. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aldrich,	Davis,	McEnery,	Smith,
Allen,	Deboe,	Mallory,	Spooner,
Allison,	Elkins,	Mills,	Stewart,
Bacon,	Fairbanks,	Morgan,	Teller,
Baker,	Foraker,	Morrill,	Thurston,
Bate,	Gallinger,	Murphy,	Turley,
Berry,	Gear,	Nelson,	Turner,
Burrows,	Hale,	Pasco,	Turpie,
Butler,	Hanna,	Penrose,	Vest,
Caffery,	Hansbrough,	Perkins,	Walthall,
Carter,	Harris,	Pettus,	Warren,
Chilton,	Hawley,	Platt, Conn.	Wetmore,
Clark,	Hoar,	Pritchard,	White.
Clay,	Jones, Ark.	Quay,	
Cockrell,	Jones, Nev.	Roach,	
Cullom,	McBride,	Shoup,	

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair announces that 61 Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PROPOSED MONETARY COMMISSION.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I move that the message from the President of the United States, which lies upon the desk of the Vice-President, be now laid before the Senate. In support of that motion I call the attention of the Chair to the fifth paragraph of Rule VII, which I will read.

Mr. ALLEN. Does the Senator know what the purport of the message is?

Mr. BACON. What I know of it has not been ascertained by its official communication to the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN. Does the Senator know officially or otherwise?

Mr. BACON. I think it is proper that the Senate should have the information. The rule is—

Mr. GEAR. I make the point—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] has the floor.

Mr. BACON. The rule is as follows:

5. The presiding officer may at any time lay, and it shall be in order at any time for a Senator to move to lay, before the Senate, any bill or other matter sent to the Senate by the President or the House of Representatives, and any question pending at that time shall be suspended for this purpose. Any motion so made shall be determined without debate.

I now move, Mr. President, that the message of the President of the United States be communicated to the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senate has heard the motion, and the Chair will entertain it. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia. [Putting the question.] The motion is agreed to; and the Secretary will read the message of the President of the United States.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask for a division.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It is too late; the result has been announced.

Mr. ALDRICH. It will take less time to read the message than to take the yeas and nays.

Mr. BACON. I hope the message will be read.

Mr. TELLER. Let us have order so that the message can be heard when it is read.

Mr. MORRILL. I withdraw the request for a division, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does any other Senator desire to make a request for a division? There appears to be none.

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

Mr. COCKRELL. The question has been decided. Let the message be read, please.

Mr. PASCO. Very well; I will withdraw the call.

The Secretary read the message of the President, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my message convening the Congress in extraordinary session I called attention to a single subject—that of providing revenue adequate to meet the reasonable and proper expenses of the Government. I believed that to be the most pressing subject for settlement then. A bill to provide the necessary revenues for the Government has already passed the House of Representatives and the Senate and awaits Executive action.

Another question of very great importance is that of the establishment of

our currency and banking system on a better basis, which I commented upon in my inaugural address in the following words:

"Our financial system needs some revision; our money is all good now, but its value must not further be threatened. It should all be put upon an enduring basis, not subject to easy attack, nor its stability to doubt or dispute. The several forms of our paper money offer, in my judgment, a constant embarrassment to the Government and imperil a safe balance in the Treasury."

Nothing was settled more clearly at the late national election than the determination upon the part of the people to keep their currency stable in value and equal to that of the most advanced nations of the world.

The soundness of our currency is nowhere questioned. No loss can occur to its holders. It is the system which should be simplified and strengthened, keeping our money just as good as it is now with less expense to the Government and the people.

The sentiment of the country is strongly in favor of early action by Congress in this direction, to revise our currency laws and remove them from partisan contention. A notable assembly of business men with delegates from twenty-nine States and Territories was held at Indianapolis in January of this year. The financial situation commanded their earnest attention, and after a two days' session the convention recommended to Congress the appointment of a monetary commission.

I commend this report to the consideration of Congress. The authors of the report recommend a commission "to make a thorough investigation of the monetary affairs and needs of this country in all relations and aspects, and to make proper suggestions as to any evils found to exist and the remedies therefor."

This subject should receive the attention of Congress at its special session. It ought not to be postponed until the regular session.

I therefore urgently recommend that a special commission be created, non-partisan in its character, to be composed of well-informed citizens of different parties who will command the confidence of Congress and the country because of their special fitness for the work, whose duty it shall be to make recommendations of whatever changes in our present banking and currency laws may be found necessary and expedient, and to report their conclusions on or before the 1st day of November next, in order that the same may be transmitted by me to Congress for its consideration at its first regular session.

It is to be hoped that the report thus made will be so comprehensive and sound as to receive the support of all parties and the favorable action of Congress. At all events, such a report can not fail to be of value to the executive branch of the Government, as well as to those charged with public legislation, and to greatly assist in the establishment of an improved system of finance.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, July 24, 1897.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—

Mr. HOAR. The message goes to the Calendar.

Mr. TELLER. I do not know whether or not it is in order to debate the message at this time. I do not desire to be out of order; but if it is in order to debate it, I should like to say a few words in relation to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Colorado that the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], that the resolution for final adjournment be referred to the Committee on Appropriations is in order unless the Senate shall decide to take up some other matter. The motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] was that the message be read.

Mr. TELLER. I will not infringe the rules of the Senate by debating the message if it is not in order to debate it.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama to commit to the Committee on Appropriations the resolution from the House of Representatives for final adjournment.

Mr. TELLER. Would it be in order to refer the message to the Committee on Finance?

Mr. HOAR. By unanimous consent.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there such a request or such a motion?

Mr. HALE. Regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. TELLER. What is now the regular order, Mr. President?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The regular order is the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. HALE. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MORGAN. I suggest, if the Chair will permit me, that when the message was read it was put into the possession of the Senate for at least two purposes—one its printing and the other its reference to a committee; and until that is disposed of, of course the Senate still has jurisdiction of it. It is in the possession of the Senate and can not be taken out against a motion to refer or a motion to print just by anyone—

Mr. HALE. I call for the yeas and nays, and I call for the regular order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The regular order is the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MORGAN. I insist that the regular order at this time is the motion to refer. If nobody has made it, I will make it. [A pause.] I withdraw the motion.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays are demanded.

Mr. WHITE. Is that a debatable question?

Mr. HALE. It is not debatable.

Mr. WHITE. I believe the Chair has recognized me.

Mr. HALE. I object to debate and call for the regular order. I call for the yeas and nays on a motion that is not debatable. I ask the Chair to enforce the rule.

Mr. WHITE. Do I understand the Chair to hold that it is not debatable?

Mr. BERRY. The Chair has not so held.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair has not so ruled, and the Chair recognizes the Senator from California.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

Mr. WHITE. I so understood, and I can not understand why the Senator from Maine is trying to yea and nay me off the floor.

I simply wish to say that now that the message has been read, the propriety of the motion of the Senator from Alabama is manifest. It appears that the President of the United States has ascertained that a commission ought to be appointed, and that it ought to report back to Congress on the 1st of November. Now, how is it possible for this to be done and the people of the United States to be relieved, as suggested by the President, if the tactics pursued by the other side of the Chamber are followed out and if an adjournment is forced to-night, that the railroad proposition may go through?

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from California permit me? I desire to call his attention to the fact that the President of the United States in the message specifically says that in his opinion the matter suggested in the message should be attended to at this extraordinary session of Congress and ought not to be postponed until the regular session.

Mr. HOAR. I rise to a question of order. The Senator from California is not, under the indulgence of the Chair, suggesting for the instruction of the Chair matters relating to the ruling—

Mr. WHITE. That is correct. I am not attempting to do so.

Mr. HOAR. He is undertaking to debate a matter not before the Senate and one that is undebatable. I demand that the question be put, under the rule.

Mr. WHITE. The difficulty with the Senator from Massachusetts is, first, that I am not attempting to debate a nondebatable matter, and secondly, that there is no matter at present submitted to the decision of the Chair. So two slight infirmities attach to the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. I rise to a question of order.

Mr. WHITE. I believe I have the floor.

Mr. HOAR. I rise to a question of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts will state his point of order.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Maine raised the point of order that a motion to commit a nondebatable motion is itself undebatable, and called for the yeas and nays on the motion to commit. Thereupon—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands—

Mr. HOAR. I beg pardon of the Chair. Thereupon the Chair said he would hear the suggestion of the Senator from California, who is now proceeding out of order, it seems to me, to discuss the merits of the currency question.

Mr. WHITE. I respectfully suggest that the Senator from Massachusetts did not state what the Chair remarked.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will rule on the point of order.

Mr. ALDRICH. In order that there may be no question about it, I make the point of order. I raise the point of order that debate upon a motion to refer the resolution is not in order, and that the Senator from California is not now in order.

Mr. WHITE. I submit the question to the Chair. I understand it has been ruled upon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair has not ruled upon the question at all. The Chair is ready to rule on the question whenever it is raised.

Mr. ALDRICH. I raise it now.

Mr. WHITE. I have no disposition to consume time unduly. I regret that my suggestions have been so unfavorably received by those to whom they were made in good faith. I will take the ruling of the Chair.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is the motion to recommit a concurrent resolution of the House. The Chair knows no rule that does not permit the question to be debated, if Senators see fit to debate it. There is no such rule. The Chair does not know—

Mr. ALDRICH. Then I ask the presiding officer to submit the question to the Senate.

Several SENATORS. Oh, no.

Mr. WHITE. I hope the Chair will not submit the question to the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not know why he should not.

Mr. WHITE. The Chair has ruled upon it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not understand that the Chair has ruled upon it at all.

Mr. TELLER. The Chair is right.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not think he is.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Alabama moved to refer the matter to the Committee on Appropriations. We had not official

notice of the request of the President of the United States. We have succeeded in passing a tariff bill, and it has been found apparently that the prosperity prophesied has not yet come, and the President now suggests another means of accomplishing what we all desire. His message is brought to the Senate, and there seems to be an effort upon the other side of the Chamber to avoid the consideration of the matter which he has thus submitted.

I am surprised, especially when we are told that a bill will be brought here from elsewhere, that there should be this effort to defeat the wishes of the President of the United States, and I trust that my friends on the other side of the Chamber will take a different position and will promptly act in accordance with his suggestion, even if they do not get many votes elsewhere.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I desire to submit simply a word on the motion of the Senator from Alabama, and to say that in my judgment we ought to stay here, in accordance with the request of the President of the United States, and determine speedily the question whether or not we shall have a monetary commission. I regret exceedingly that there has been manifested on the other side a disposition to hold the message of the President of the United States from the Senate until after action on the concurrent resolution coming from the House of Representatives, and that it was forced finally with great reluctance from that side of the Chamber; but we have had the benefit of the President's advice.

The President, the Chief Executive of this nation, believes it good policy for Congress to remain here in extraordinary session until the important question of appointing a monetary commission shall be determined. I believe the Republican party as represented in this Chamber ought to follow the advice of the Chief Executive, the head of their party. They may say hereafter that they did not have the vote to pass a bill of this kind; that they were powerless in the premises; but the vote taken to-day shows that there are 44 Republicans, within 1 of a majority; and they have one member of the Senate on this side of the Chamber who always votes with them, thereby having a clear majority of 1, and they can, if they see fit, comply with the reasonable request of the President in his message. I believe this matter ought to be attended to now.

I presume, however, that unless we can keep this session going until after 9 o'clock, which I presume can not be done, we will find our friends on the other side hastily adjourning Congress, and this fall we will hear them talking from the stump and we will hear through the press that they did not remain because they could accomplish nothing by doing so; and for the purpose of forestalling as far as I can any assertions of that kind I wish to announce that in my judgment they have a clear majority in the Senate and can pass any measure the President may recommend.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I wish to ask the Senator if he desires that the matter of the President's message shall be acted upon by the Senate without reference to a committee?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly not.

Mr. HOAR. Very well. Then I should like to ask another question. Will the Senator allow me to ask unanimous consent that the President's message be referred to the Committee on Finance?

Mr. ALLEN. I wish to see the message take the ordinary course.

Mr. HOAR. That is the ordinary course, I suppose.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator does not want us to pass such a measure.

Mr. ALLEN. I want the message to take the ordinary course, whatever that is.

Mr. HOAR. With the leave of the Senator from Nebraska, of course, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALLEN. Objecting for the time being—I may withdraw my objection later—let me ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question.

Mr. LINDSAY. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. ALLEN. In just one moment. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he believes or will guarantee that the Committee on Finance will return a bill in accordance with the recommendation of the President of the United States before the first Monday in next December?

Mr. SPOONER (to Mr. HOAR). They have the majority on that committee.

Mr. HOAR. Certainly I can not guarantee what will be the action of a committee the majority of whom I suppose are my political opponents.

Mr. ALLEN. No. The trouble with the Senator from Massachusetts is that he is undertaking to bury the message of the President out of sight, so that it may not be resurrected or heard from until Congress convenes on the first Monday of next December.

If the Senator from Massachusetts or any member of the Finance

Committee—and there are several members here—will guarantee that they will take the message and return a bill within the next ten days in accordance with the recommendation of the President in the message, I will make the forty-fifth man, the majority, to stay here and consider that proposition at the present Congress, and you shall not have it said truthfully when the present Congress adjourns that you did not have a majority in the Senate to consider a proposition of that kind.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, I understood him to say that he thought the message of the President of the United States ought to take the ordinary course.

Mr. ALLEN. Yes; I did say so.

Mr. HOAR. Now, having said that, I suppose the ordinary course would be the reference to the Finance Committee, and I do not think it is the ordinary course to exact of that committee a promise as to what they are going to do. At any rate, I see the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] on the floor and possibly what I have to say is emphasized by that fact. It is rather presumptuous—

Mr. LINDSAY. The Senator from Colorado is not a member of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TELLER. I am not a member of that committee.

Mr. HOAR. I beg pardon. The Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from California are.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. If the Senator—

Mr. HOAR. Let me finish my sentence. I think it would be a wonderful presumption for me to undertake to make promises for the Senator from Arkansas, except, I suppose, I may safely promise that he will go wrong on any financial question.

Mr. ALLEN. I was simply undertaking to call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the fact that the senior Senator from Massachusetts wants to get rid of the message. The Senator from Massachusetts knows quite well that if a reference is made of the message to-day we will not hear from it until the next session of Congress. If I were judging of motives which I have no right to judge at this time—

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator from Nebraska permit me?

Mr. ALLEN. In a moment. If I were judging of motives I would say that that was the purpose of the Senator from Massachusetts in making the suggestion, that it was to get rid of an unpleasant subject. Now I will yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CLAY. I believe the President suggested in his message that we ought to act immediately upon a measure providing for this monetary commission. I desire to ask the Senator from Nebraska if it is not true that the House of Representatives have been in session four or five months, and is it not true that they have not worked more than fifteen or twenty days, and is it not true that the Administration has had ample time to send in a message of this kind and have it passed on before this period?

Mr. ALLEN. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. CLAY. I desire to ask the Senator if it is not true that every circumstance shows that it is the desire of the Administration that this matter shall not be acted on at this session, and it has been simply sent here on the eve of adjournment, with no expectation that it will be acted on at this session?

Mr. ALLEN. I would not impeach the motives of the President of the United States. I believe him to be a high-minded, honorable gentleman. I do not agree with him respecting his financial or tariff policies. But it is somewhat singular that this message should come here within an hour of the time a concurrent resolution comes from the other branch of Congress for final adjournment at 9 o'clock to-night.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama—

Mr. ALLEN. And I am informed that under the whip and spur of the Speaker of the House, at 10 minutes past 6 o'clock a bill for a currency commission will pass the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOAR. I will ask the Senator another question. I asked him just now if he would give unanimous consent that this matter should be referred.

Mr. ALLEN. I am informed that the bill has already passed the House.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator be one to give unanimous consent to have a bill for the purpose of creating this commission put upon its passage at once, without debate?

Mr. ALLEN. So far as I am concerned, I will give unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill that may come from the House of Representatives to-night.

Mr. HOAR. That is not my question. The question is whether the Senator from Nebraska will give unanimous consent to pass the bill without debate.

Mr. ALLEN. That signifies nothing. There is more pollyfoxing and more attempt to evade the question. The Senator from Massachusetts knows quite well that such a thing has not been done in this body as to bring in a bill of that importance and put it upon its passage without debate. The Senator from Massachusetts himself could not resist the temptation to debate the

question, although unanimous consent might be given that it should not be debated.

Mr. President, let the bill come here. Let us avoid sending this message, to a committee if need be. Let that bill be placed before the Senate and discussed in an orderly manner, and let us determine within a reasonable time whether the President of the United States shall have the commission he desires. I think it is due a coordinate branch of the Government, the President of the United States, that we pay heed to his request in the message that has just been laid before us, although I can not support such a bill. I see no occasion for Senators on the other side to run away from this question.

I believe the action of the Senate, if it shall adjourn in the face of this message, will be without a precedent in the history of Congress. Here the President appeals to us as the sole legislative body of the nation for a currency commission, which he says is needed and whose report he wants before Congress convenes in December that he may thoroughly digest it and lay the result before Congress in his annual message, and in the face of a recommendation of that kind, coming from that high source, we find Republican Senators filibustering and violating the rules of the Senate to force an adjournment contrary to his wishes and his will.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I understand that this is a debatable question. I believe the Chair is right about it, and I wish to say simply a word or two.

It seems to me that we are not making any progress in any direction. I believe it is the sentiment of the country, notwithstanding the message of the President, that we should adjourn. The President has sent a message here of which I will not speak now, because I should not have time, except to say that, so far as I am concerned, I never expect to vote for the suggestion the President has made. I know very well that such a measure will take a great deal of debate, and I know very well that the friends of the Administration do not propose, notwithstanding the suggestions of the President, to attempt to pass it now.

I know another thing that I think the Senate and the country might just as well recognize. On account of the opposition to the resolution of the Senator from Kansas concerning the Pacific railroads it is not going to pass at this session. I am myself in favor of that resolution, but we all know that if there is a desire to defeat it, it can be defeated. I think that that desire exists very largely on this side of the Chamber. If I can get a chance to vote for it, I intend to vote for that resolution, but it seems to me that everyone might recognize the fact that we are not going to pass the resolution. Neither are we going to comply with the request of the President and do anything with his message. We are simply staying here for nothing. It appears to me that the proper thing for us to do, if we can not get consent to vote on the railroad proposition, is to adjourn. If we could get that consent, we could settle and dispose of everything here in fifteen minutes.

Mr. BERRY. I suggest to the Senator from Colorado that he ask consent.

Mr. TELLER. I will ask, then, whether we can not now act upon and dispose at least of the pending motion, and whether we can not then get consent to vote without further debate upon the resolution which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS] has in charge? If any Senator thinks he ought to debate it, let that Senator tell us just how long he wants to debate it, so that we may know, and let us see if we can not agree that we will then take the vote. Of course if Senators insist upon debating it at length, we would pass 9 o'clock and would have to amend the resolution.

I ask if we can not have unanimous consent to vote between this hour and 9 o'clock on the Pacific railroads resolution?

Mr. BERRY. Say at 8 o'clock.

Mr. TELLER. Well, at any time between this and 9.

Mr. THURSTON. For the reasons I have already stated, it being so manifestly unfair; it being a great question which I believe involves the interests of my section of the country more than any other, I must object.

Mr. TELLER. I was very certain that we could not get unanimous consent, but we never know anything until we try it and settle it.

Now, it seems to me that we shall gain nothing by staying here, unless the Republicans here say that they want to stay to discuss the question of a monetary commission; and I understand a bill will come from the other House in fifteen or twenty minutes providing for a commission. They have given it, of course, on that side the care and attention they give to such questions; but that may not be sufficient for us. Of course everybody knows that it will have to be debated here, and debated at length for days.

I am willing with the Senator from Nebraska to stay here, much as I dislike to stay, and settle this financial question. I think it would have been a great deal better to have referred the whole thing to the Indianapolis convention, because evidently the Presi-

dent has a great deal more confidence in the Indianapolis convention than he has in Congress.

Mr. LINDSAY. Which Indianapolis convention?

Mr. TELLER. The last one, which was composed of what are called the National Democrats, which the President says adopted so favorable a report that we ought to take it in hand and substantially adopt its recommendation, I suppose. They declared there that they were in favor of the retirement of the greenbacks. They were in favor of maintaining in all its integrity and purity the gold standard. I understand that this puts the Administration squarely on that line.

Mr. COCKRELL. And they declared in favor of giving to national banks the control of the currency.

Mr. TELLER. Of course the control of the currency by the national banks is a part of the programme. This puts the Administration in line financially with that movement. Everybody knows that so great a change in the monetary system of the country can not be brought about without a tremendous contest. There are a great many men who have heretofore considered themselves Republicans and have trained up to the present moment with the Republican party who will stop and think a good while before they will consent to the retirement of the greenbacks and the establishment firmly of the gold standard and the turning over to the national banks of the entire control of all the currency in this country save gold and silver.

Mr. President, if the Republicans here want to stay, and will say so, I will vote against final adjournment; I know of a number of other Senators who will vote against it, and we will take this question up and settle it.

Mr. HOAR. That is, the message?

Mr. TELLER. The message. We have been charged for months with disturbing the business of the country by our talk about finance. If we are to abdicate our power as legislators and turn it over either to the Indianapolis convention or to this committee of ten, or whatever the number may be, we had better do it right off; the sooner we can do it the better. We can do it just as soon as our consciences will allow us, after having expressed our disapprobation and our contempt for such a suggestion. But it can not be done under weeks. Yet I am willing to stay here, if necessary, until next December, and let this session go into the next. Now, the question is, If we are not going to do that, why not adjourn?

Mr. COCKRELL. That is right.

Mr. TELLER. We are not going to have any railroad legislation unless you stay here for another week. You can not keep a quorum unless it is understood that the proposed financial legislation is to come up, and then possibly we may keep a quorum; but I doubt very much whether a majority of the Administration supporters can be kept here to consider the question.

I appeal to the Senate whether we had not better consider this session practically closed, and let the responsibility of nonaction upon the railroad question rest with those who have control of the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN. Does not the Senator think that the saving of \$50,000,000 in the Pacific Railroad matter is worthy of the Senate remaining here for a week or two?

Mr. TELLER. In my judgment, the saving of \$50,000,000 would be a great thing to the American people.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President—

Mr. TELLER. When you have established the gold standard, it will not make any difference whether you have \$50,000,000 or \$100,000,000, you will be in greater distress than you are now. I will hear the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. COCKRELL. I was going to ask how a Senate resolution could save the country \$50,000,000?

Mr. TELLER. I do not believe myself that it is anything but the expression of our opinion, and I believe it will count for nothing at all.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will permit me, does he not think the President of the United States would follow the advice of the Senate far enough to hold this matter up until December?

Mr. TELLER. Over in Great Britain they have a way of voting a lack of confidence in the Government. If the message the President has sent here is not a declaration on his part of a lack of confidence in Congress, I do not know what could be. Having sent it here and said to us, "Gentlemen, you are unfit and incapable of legislating upon the monetary questions of the country, except that you take the advice of the Indianapolis convention, or else take the advice of the ten men I know, who know more than you do, and whom I am going to select." I do not believe he will pay any attention to a simple declaration of the Senate that will be passed with very decided opposition, and practically with the unanimous opposition of his side of the Chamber. So there is no practical use in staying here. I want to say to the Senator from Nebraska that if the \$50,000,000 are going they are going anyhow.

Mr. ALLEN. We ought to protest against it.

Mr. TELLER. The President can save \$50,000,000 now if \$50,000,000 can be saved when the resolution passes. He has had all the facts presented to him by various Senators here on this floor, and if he believes that \$50,000,000 can be saved, he will save it perhaps. If he does not, let the responsibility rest with him. We are not obliged to stay here, in my judgment, to pass a Senate resolution that is not binding on him. If it were a resolution that would compel him to act, it would be different; but we can not pass that. Everybody knows it would have been useless to attempt it; it would never have gone beyond the Senate. I will not say anything derogatory of any other legislative body, but everyone knows it would have stopped right here.

Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss the financial question. I do not intend unnecessarily to delay the Senate. It seems to me that we have reached a point when, without somewhat lowering the dignity of the Senate, without getting into an unseemly scramble, we have got to quit, and if there is any responsibility for the failure to take up and follow the President's suggestions and pass such a measure, let it rest with his friends.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator from Colorado pardon me a moment?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. I think the Senator from Colorado is mistaken when he says that we are powerless and are forced to adjourn. Everybody knows that when the question to adjourn comes up, that that is a test question of the Pacific Railroad resolution. I think a majority of the Senate is in favor of the Pacific Railroad resolution, and that is the only test vote we will get on that resolution. Therefore, if every Senator who is in favor of that resolution will vote against adjourning, I do not believe the Senate can be adjourned.

Mr. TELLER. I do not know whether a motion to adjourn would be a fair test vote on this question or not. I hardly think it would; but I think perhaps a fair test vote might be had by moving to lay it on the table.

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will allow me, I can say that it would not be a fair test. If the resolution comes to a vote, I intend to vote for it. I voted for it in committee after I had very thoroughly examined it, and I have not heard anything on the floor of the Senate to change my mind about it. I shall vote for the resolution, and yet I shall vote for final adjournment.

Mr. TELLER. I understood the attitude of the Senator from Ohio on the resolution, and I thought very likely he would feel, as I know some Senators do who are with him on the resolution, that it is useless to attempt to stay here, and it might not be, as the Senator from North Carolina thinks it would be, a fair expression. I do not believe it would.

Mr. BUTLER. If the Senator will pardon me, I will say that I thought this matter was in such form that every Senator who favored the resolution would vote against adjourning if there was a chance to pass the resolution. I did not intend to misrepresent any Senator. I was simply expressing my own feelings. I am very anxious to adjourn, and I would vote to adjourn if the Pacific Railroad resolution was not up.

Mr. FORAKER. I said what I did in view of what had been said by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON], that the discussion on that resolution has not ended, and that others are anxious to participate in the debate on his side. I foresee that if the matter were regularly taken up and considered and debated there would be a great deal of time consumed before a vote could be reached. So I shall be compelled to vote for final adjournment.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator is a friend of the resolution. Why should we not stay here two or three days, none of those favoring the resolution debating it, but simply allowing those who oppose it to speak, and thus get a vote on it?

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I think it ought to be perfectly manifest to us all now that unless we all change our minds, it will be useless to attempt to secure further legislation at this called session. Unless we intend to stay here indefinitely, there is no use, now in attempting any of these things.

I am heartily in favor of the resolution of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS]. He and his friends on the committee have presented the resolution, and they have presented it strongly, and it has gone before the country. Now, it is perfectly manifest to me that that resolution can not be passed at this session. It is further manifest to me that if it were passed it would not be worth the paper upon which it is written, for, because of the opposition that is made to it from the other side of the Chamber, the President would not regard it as of any binding force. It is merely a declaration of the Senate and has no force or effect as a law; and when it would be so largely voted against as is indicated upon the opposite side, I do not think it would be persuasive even, and that is the only force it could have—a persuasive force.

I wish we could pass it, for I should like to have the little benefit that might be derived from it; but I do not honestly believe we can. It seems to me, therefore, that the better course would be

for us to have some understanding about the matter, and then make arrangements for final adjournment.

I believe that the country and the friends of the Senator from Kansas and others will be perfectly satisfied with the course they have pursued, and will see that they have gone to the end of their power in trying to secure action upon the resolution.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I wish to say with regard to this resolution that it seems to me very astonishing that gentlemen who are opposed to it are so anxious to fly from it. If it has no force, if it has no effect, if it is a mere fulmination on the part of the Senate, why should they so zealously oppose any action whatever that puts them upon record with regard to it?

I know from personal knowledge from the attorney of the reorganization committee that if this resolution should pass, their schemes would drop and be abandoned. The resolution might not possibly have any effect in controlling the action of the President. I purposely made it a simple resolution of the Senate, because I thought it was possible to pass something of that kind through the Senate. I knew that it was absolutely impossible for any resolution of that kind to pass both Houses, and that an attempt to pass a joint or concurrent resolution, which, after passing here, would fail in the other House, would be used by everybody as an index that it was a failure, that no action was taken, and that they could go ahead with their schemes.

I say if this resolution is passed it will have a most positive and decisive effect; it will postpone action in this matter until Congress can further consider it, and therefore I have been very desirous to have some action taken. I think the record has been clearly brought before the country. I think the Senate sees clearly where the responsibility for nonaction is. I have endeavored to do my duty fairly, without imputing improper motives to any man, in a manly way, regretting my inability to compete in parliamentary tactics with older members of the Senate; and I have striven to do this in a manner that made me feel that I was complying with the oath which I took when I entered this Chamber. I believed it was my duty.

My knowledge of these affairs for many years has been somewhat close and intimate. It has not been so close and intimate, perhaps, as that of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON], who has known all about these things until it seems to have become second nature in his case. I do not impute to him any improper motives, but he looks at these things from a different standpoint. That is all well enough and fair enough. I have not endeavored to occupy much time of the Senate. I have been desirous of a fair and free and full discussion, and we on this side have been met with all kinds of parliamentary artifices and all kinds of subtle tactics in order to prevent the consideration of this question. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to leave this question to the country and to the people.

I regret, Mr. President, that this great measure, the tariff, has been used as a barricade behind which people who are seeking to sandbag the Government of the United States have sought refuge. It is an evil omen that the friends of that measure should regret that this great measure is to be launched upon the great ocean of human affairs like—

That fatal and perfidious bark,
Built in th' eclipse and rigg'd with curses dark.

It is an unfortunate thing that such should have been the case. So far as the tariff is concerned, I came here without any desire to interpose any unreasonable or improper obstruction to it; but I believed what was declared to us by gentlemen on the other side, who said that we should have a moderate tariff; that the extremes of the McKinley law would not be carried out. I had hoped that that would be the case. Unfortunately, it has not been the case; but the responsibility is clearly fixed; it does not belong to this side of the Chamber; and I have nothing to complain of and nothing to regret. But on this other matter, in relation to the Pacific railroads, I have the most profound regret that the great Senate of the United States should fly from a question of this kind and seek refuge behind a measure of that sort.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, as to the matter of final adjournment, I have but one concern outside of that which has just been under discussion. Those of us on this side of the Chamber who differ with the majority on the other side as to the financial system of this country have been generally considered as those who would stand in the way of the alleged or proposed reforms suggested in the message of the President of the United States. I desire, before the Senate adjourns, that the responsibility for not taking up that message and for not acting upon it shall rest exclusively with the Republican party.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], and possibly others, have said that they would stay here with the Republicans of this body and give them full opportunity to consider and discuss this question and to pass their bill if they had the needed votes. Mr. President, I wish to add my name to that list. I have been here continuously for

nearly eight months, and am exceedingly anxious for a time to return to other avocations; but nevertheless, if it is the desire of Republican Senators in this body to take up the message of the President and endeavor to carry out the suggestions contained therein, I pledge myself to stay here with them unto the end, and help to make a quorum to the last; and not to interpose any factious delay to any effort they may wish to make to pass whatever measure they may inaugurate for the purpose of carrying out the suggestions of the President of the United States.

In other words, Mr. President, I desire simply that the Republican party shall take the responsibility of refusing to act upon this suggestion of the President of the United States. I have no object in the world in interposing any objection to such adjournment as Republican Senators may decide upon whenever they are ready to say that they do not desire to consider this question at this extra session of Congress.

I want it distinctly understood, in order that my action so far may not be misconstrued, that, in moving to have the message of the President read and in what I have said, I am not myself in favor of the suggestion contained in that message; but I am not willing that it should go out to the country that those who believe with me have interfered in any way with the consideration of this measure if the Republicans of this body see proper to consider it.

I understand the bill has already been passed by the House of Representatives, and will be here for consideration if Republican Senators desire to consider it. If they do not desire to consider it, and are ready to say to the country that they do not wish to consider it, then I am ready to adjourn.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I think the statement made by the Senator from Georgia should be responded to frankly from this side of the Chamber. So far as I know, there is not a Senator sitting on this side of that aisle who expects any action upon this message or any currency legislation at this session of Congress, or any consideration of the subject. So far as the responsibility of that position is concerned, I think we are all ready to accept it fully. I hope now that by unanimous consent a vote may be taken upon the question of final adjournment.

Mr. BACON. The statement on the part of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, representing, as I have no doubt he does, his party, is entirely satisfactory to me. ["Question!" "Question!"]

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], unless it is withdrawn.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. President, I am sorry to hear the statement made by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH]. I am not in sympathy with the movement on either side of this Chamber to secure a political advantage by putting the responsibility for final adjournment on the one side or the other. It was the policy of the Administration to postpone the consideration of the currency question until the tariff bill should be disposed of. No one expects there will be any legislation during this Administration which will essentially change the laws relating to the coinage of gold and silver.

But the country had the right to expect, and the country did expect, that so soon as the tariff question was disposed of the currency question would be taken up, considered, and settled, in order that during the remainder of this Administration the people should have that sense of confidence which will put them to work to restore prosperity under existing conditions, and conditions which are not to be changed.

Now, after passing a bill increasing the taxes of the people, operating unequally, and in many respects oppressively, we are told by the Republican party that they have done all they expect to do; that there is not a man on the other side of that aisle who intends or desires for the present to take up and consider the currency question; but that it is to go out to the people that they are to have another period of business suspense, that the condition of uncertainty is to be prolonged another year, and, in that way, returning prosperity—if there be returning prosperity—cruelly and unnecessarily retarded.

Mr. President, it is no use to talk about Senators being tired of the city of Washington. Republicans chose to take up the tariff bill in the beginning of the Administration. No obstructive tactics have been resorted to by the opponents of the measure. They have passed their bill before the middle of summer, and there is time, if they intend to commit the currency question to a commission, to take up and attempt to pass an act providing for the appointment of the desired commission.

It may be the opposition would be so pronounced the bill could not pass, but there should be an attempt in good faith to pass such a bill; and I protest that it is dealing unfairly with the business of the country to take up our hats and leave the capital with the announcement that this important question of the currency is not to be considered until next year, and is probably to run all through the next year, so that one-half of this Administration will be gone before a condition of confidence and repose to the business community shall be secured.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I desire to put on record my belief, in opposition to that of the Senator from Kentucky, that there was not a man in this country, certainly no considerable number of men, who expected that these currency matters would be taken up at this present session.

Mr. TELLER. Not even the President?

Mr. HOAR. I do not think the President thought so at the beginning of the session. The President said nothing about it in his message at the beginning of the session when we assembled. So far as I know, it was not heard of.

Undoubtedly as the session went on there has been a pressure on the President to send in this message for the present consideration of Congress; but I do not believe there is any considerable number of persons in the country now who expect consideration of that subject. I do not believe the Senator from Kentucky himself will say so; and I would like to ask him this question: "Will you say, on your responsibility as a Senator, that when you came here you expected there would be action at the extra session by legislation on this great question of the currency?"

Mr. LINDSAY. I will answer the question. When the President's message came in at this extra session and recommended tariff legislation and utterly ignored the question of currency legislation, I was disappointed, and the country was disappointed. ["Question!" "Question!"]

Mr. President, the question will not be put so long as I choose to persist in presenting my views to the Senate.

Mr. CULLOM and others. Go ahead.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. LINDSAY. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. In the presence of the Senator from Massachusetts I want to read what the President says in his message. He says:

This subject should receive the attention of Congress at its special session. It ought not to be postponed until the regular session.

I hope the Senator will remember that this message was sent in after the tariff bill had been passed.

Mr. HOAR. And not when the session assembled.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. President, it is an open secret that for the past two or three weeks this message has almost each day been on the eve of being sent in to Congress, and nothing except the pressure of the gentlemen managing the tariff bill on the other side has kept it away from the two Houses of Congress. It is a fact known to everybody that gentlemen from all parts of the country have been here since this Congress has been in session urging that some action should be taken in regard to currency legislation; but whether I expected, or the Senator from Massachusetts expected, or anyone else expected that this Congress would do its duty by considering both these great propositions of tariff and currency, and give the country at least three years' rest, there is no excuse for our running away now, in the face of the demand of the President that action shall be taken looking to a settlement of this disturbing and perplexing question. The President asks us to consider it, and the responsibility for refusing his request can only rest on one side of this Chamber, and that is on the side to which the President has the right to address himself.

We are informed that the House of Representatives did not hesitate to consider the subject. It is said that a bill providing for a commission is already on its way to this end of the Capitol, but Senators announce that we can not even stay to test the willingness of the Senate to consider this all-important proposition now. It makes no difference who is hurt or who receives advantage politically.

The business interests of the country will suffer until this important matter is considered and the country is informed authoritatively, as I believe, what kind of legislation we are to have on the subject or that we are to have no legislation at all. If nothing is to be done, business will adjust itself to existing conditions. If anything is to be done, it ought to be done at once, so that the conditions shall be established upon which business is to revive, if it is to revive at all.

I say again to the Senator from Massachusetts that I was disappointed, and the country was disappointed, when the message of the President came in to this extraordinary session and made no reference to the currency question, and the country will be disappointed, and justly disappointed, if, in the face of the message which came here this afternoon, we refuse to take any action at all, even to initiate the change of the currency laws by appointing or refusing to appoint the commission which the President asks us to appoint.

Mr. STEWART. Just one word, Mr. President. I think the allusion to the proceedings of the Indianapolis convention will relieve the whole matter of obscurity, because they are in print and are public. I have read them. When they are published, the country will be satisfied that we went away and did not stop to fool.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I expected that some embarrassment of this kind would result from the indisposition of some

Senators on the other side to have an investigation into the Pacific railroads abomination. It seems that because the Committee on Pacific Railroads thought it proper, thought it was their duty, unanimously to request the President of the United States to suspend the execution of the agreement for the sale of the sinking fund to Mr. Fitzgerald and company, Senators have found that very much in their way, and they have determined that no such expression shall go from this body at the present session, knowing full well that if this agreement can be executed by the time we meet here again in December the railroad will be sold out for \$28,000,000, no higher bid being made for it, to a combination which have already agreed, and agreed before they made the proposition to the President, that they would price and capitalize it at \$100,000,000 of 4 per cent bonds, \$75,000,000 of 4 per cent guaranteed stock, and \$61,000,000 of common stock, making the value of that property as they appraise it \$236,000,000.

There is too much in that for us to expect that there is going to be peace and comfort anywhere in the neighborhood of an effort to break it up. The committee have done their duty, and Senators on this floor have tried to do their duty in calling this subject to the attention of the President of the United States. It is before him, perhaps, in just as strong form as if the Senate were to vote formally the request which the committee have made. He will consider it and take his own responsibility upon that. But it is not within the horoscope of our vision, at least, that any President, under the circumstances, can deal with the question and take up this subject where Mr. Cleveland left it, and carry his contract into execution, and expect to escape the condemnation of every honest man in the United States. That is a pretty plain proposition which I am stating, but it is the exact truth.

Now, I find it is impossible for us to get even this expression of opinion from the Senate. I see now that Senators are disposed to run away, as the Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS] said, from this afflictive condition of affairs, and we have not the power to hold them. Not only so, but in their haste to get away from this matter they trample upon a recommendation made by Mr. McKinley. I have great respect for Mr. McKinley personally and officially. I have profound regard for him in both of those capacities, although I have no sort of sympathy with his political convictions upon the subject of the tariff or the subject of the finances as I understand them.

But I intend, so far as I am concerned, to treat him with decorum and propriety on all occasions, as I would treat any honorable President of the United States or any man in that office, whether he were honorable or not. The office dignifies the man to a position where none of us can afford to treat his recommendations, seriously made, with absolute indifference, or, to speak more plainly, with contempt.

It is complained here on both sides of the Chamber, by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY], and also by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], that the President of the United States, in the opening of this extraordinary session of Congress, made no intimation in his message that he expected to draw the finance question under consideration. He did not make such an intimation. It is also said that there has been great pressure brought to bear upon him by the friends of the tariff to get him to withhold and keep back this message on the currency question. That may be true, and it may not be true. It is asserted on this floor, and it is not denied.

At all events, the message has remained until the very day that every Democrat and every Republican in Washington City expected that we would finally adjourn. Now, on the eve of the adjournment the President of the United States comes in with this earnest request; this real supplication that we shall not adjourn; that we shall stay here and pass his recommendation into a law on the subject of raising a financial commission.

The bill on the subject of the tariff has been signed. It has become a law. It is now a law, not more than four or five hours old, to say the most of it; and when it was not more than three hours old, or two hours old perhaps, this message came and found its way to the House of Representatives, and we are informed now by Senators that a bill is even on its way here, predicated upon that recommendation, put through the House under that jack-screw process by which everything passes that is wanted to pass and nothing passes that is not wanted.

The President in sending this message in after the tariff bill was signed, and after pretty fair debate on it in the Senate of the United States, of which we have not complained at all, has avowed to-day that that bill is not what the country wants to relieve it from distress, or at least is not all that is wanted. That is only a part and parcel of a combined scheme—tariff taxation and finance—one part of which was sent to the Congress of the United States in the beginning of this session and the other part held back until the first part was enacted, without any intimation, says the Senator from Massachusetts, that he intended to make this new effort to relieve the country from its distress and its suffering.

Here we are, then, with a confessed failure certified to on the

part of the President of the United States, expressing his opinion that the tariff by itself is not enough. Prosperity is not to be expected from it. It requires finance, and it must be supplied in a hurry, because it must come in here before the meeting in December, that we may then have the recommendation of this great commission, of whatever number it is—ten, I believe—instructing us what we ought to do for the preservation of the financial security of the country and to restore prosperity through its assistance.

That is an unfortunate condition, and already it has led to a disseverance of the Republican party. There is a broad line of division between Republicans, the President on the one hand contending that the financial measure ought to be the subject of immediate consideration before the extraordinary session terminates, and a Senator on this floor saying, "He does not know what he is talking about; we prefer to go home and consider it next winter." That is a bad break in the first five months of the Administration—a mighty bad break. I can not say that I am sorry, but it is bad politics. I think the President of the United States is not a first-rate politician. If the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HANNA] had been managing this matter as a campaign affair, he would have had all his voters at the polls on the day of election. Perhaps he would have had some he did not expect or was not entitled to; I do not know about that; but he would have had all he was entitled to at the polls, and they would have voted. They would have put in their ballots, a record would have been made, and triumph secured.

Here is the President of the United States, on the eve of a great and triumphant movement, coming up in the hour of battle without his troops in order and all of them in rebellion—a terrible rebellion going on in the Republican ranks. They ignore, they treat with contempt and disdain this recommendation of the President of the United States, that it is necessary for the restoration of the prosperity of the country that you should have a finance commission to come and advise you what to do.

I think the Senate of the United States is going to turn a reluctant ear toward the advice of any commission outside of this body or outside of Congress. These ninety men who are sent here from the different sovereign States of this Union are supposed to be competent to take care of its affairs in all directions and in every direction, and if, in fact, they are not competent to do so, it would be a good thing to decimate the tribunal or drive out half or, perhaps, all of its membership and supply our places with selected commissioners appointed by the President of the United States, who may have the sense, the patriotism, and the fidelity to come here and enact laws that would save this country from its great distress.

Now, my opinion on this subject is not worth very much, I am sure. It is only worth as much as an opinion is worth that a man has founded on the laws of God and of man and of human experience. That is all it is worth. I can quote these; I can refer to them without presuming to be the author of any of these ideas; and guided by these ideas, I agree with the Senator from Colorado that your difficulty has been that you have neglected the real foundation of all financial success and security, in that you reject absolutely one of the metals as a money metal which has been ordained by divine wisdom for the very purpose of providing money for the world.

Perhaps these remarks challenge a smile, or even a sneer, from men who have no respect for God or man. I do not doubt that they do. Nevertheless they are true, and we will live to see it. The time is coming around when we will find that the real liberties of the people of the United States are connected with that fundamental doctrine, and that when we allow the men who can control the finances of the world to strike one of the money metals dead, we to that extent enslave ourselves to their will and power. The only way to get out of it is to bring that money metal back to life and let it have its due course and proper weight. That is the only way.

The President does not agree with that. The President believes in the national banks. He believes that the four thousand and odd national banks if they are allowed to issue all the money that is wanted by the people upon the faith and security of the bonds of the United States at 100 cents on the dollar, with that money they can bring prosperity back to the country and drive out the noninterest-paying greenbacks and silver certificates and supply the currency of this country through the banks at a large and oftentimes very usurious rate of interest. They want the money placed in that condition and in those hands where the law prohibits a man from mortgaging his real estate to a bank for money.

The real estate in the United States is worth a great deal more than the personal estates. Personal estate is good security for a bank loan, and indorsed paper is good security for a bank loan—mere credit. One of these gamblers in New York can go and put up his collaterals and get all the money he wants. The owner of the best piece of land in the United States can not get \$10 from

a national bank upon a mortgage of the land. The law prohibits it.

Now, under these circumstances, where the people are driven off from all opportunity of borrowing money from the banks—I am talking about the industrial classes—where they are cut off from all opportunity, based upon the value of their property, to get credit, to borrow money, of course the banks and the bankers have by that means the unoccupied and uncontested field of circulation. They have no competition. With the value of all the paper money in the country brought to the gold standard, and that value converted into bank credit and allowed to be used by the bankers in this way—

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from Alabama can hardly expect to proceed with so much competition in the way of oratory in the Chamber. Conversation is so loud that it is impossible to hear him.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order, so that the Senator from Alabama may be heard.

Mr. MORGAN. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Wisconsin. The fact is, I do not speak to the Senate very often. I am talking to the reporters and the people. It makes very little difference whether the galleries hear me or whether the Senate hears me.

The President at the last moment in the session urges upon us that we shall put the country in control of the national banks. That is his proposition, and the question has been all the time between the national banks and the people. The 4,000 national banks represent heart and core the oppression of the money classes against the people. The people are cut off from access to loans, because they can not pledge their real estate to get any loans. The law prohibits it. The people are taxed continually to sustain the banks. They are not even made to give security for the deposits which they very often break into and steal and rob the people of.

This controversy is between the national banks and the people to-day, and the President takes the side of the national banks. That his party is not willing to stand up here and have a commission of national bankers come in and recommend this scheme is not very distressing to me. I do not think it is very distressing to them, either. They are getting to be a very independent set of men. I find of late years that a great many Republicans in this Chamber have got to doing their own thinking and their own acting, and they do not take a matter of advice sent in here by the President of the United States.

Now, finding this imbroglio, this tangle, this inextricable difficulty we are in, I think perhaps I can do something toward relieving by withdrawing my demand for the yeas and nays on my motion to refer the resolution, and by consenting, as my colleagues on the committee seem to think I ought to consent, that I will not undertake now to press the resolution to a vote so far as I am concerned; but I am not in charge of it. I might as well confess that we have been filibustered out of our rights, and I do so with becoming modesty and some grief.

I therefore withdraw my demand for the yeas and nays. I have a proposition to make to the Senator from Rhode Island. He seems to be very unhappy about getting away from Washington. I will ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that we take a recess until five minutes or ten minutes before 9 o'clock, so as to give us a chance, if we want to concur in the resolution of the House.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let us concur first and then take a recess. We will not have a quorum here to concur a few minutes before 9 o'clock. I am quite willing to agree to a recess being taken, but I should like to have the resolution concurred in.

Mr. ALLISON. Let us take a recess to a quarter to 9 o'clock after agreeing to the resolution, I suggest to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MORGAN. I submit to Senators if they do not think that is a very heavy appeal to make to me. I want to say something of my personal connection with these things or the interest I feel in conjunction with my distinguished friend from Iowa who reported the Pacific Railroad resolution.

Mr. GEAR. No; I beg pardon.

Mr. MORGAN. You voted for it, which is the same thing.

Mr. GEAR. I voted for it in committee.

Mr. MORGAN. I have been here now since the 15th of March, working day and night, doing my very best, trying to serve the country as well as I knew how, and all this time I have had to bear the pressure of the House locked out, where my constituents were debarred from the privilege of any representation at all, with no chance to pass any bill or to have any debate. And more than that, Mr. President, I feel another sorrow in my heart and a very profound one. I do not often speak of it.

It is getting to be now so heavy that I do not like to talk about it. We have been prevented from giving the expression of this great Republic, this magnificent country, in favor of men who sigh, and long, and pine, and fight, and die for liberty, whose

children and wives are sold upon the bench like slaves to the officers of the Spanish army, and where little children are taken and flayed alive in the presence of their mothers. We have been locked up so that we could not even reach Cuba with our voice. I feel that the pressure is very heavy. But, sir, I respect every gentleman on the Republican side of this Chamber. I respect him personally and politically, and I have not the slightest disposition to interfere with their views about any subject at all that relates to the conduct of their own party affairs.

I will then change my proposition. I ask now the unanimous concurrence of the Senate in the House resolution to adjourn tonight at 9 o'clock, and after that other Senators can move for a recess if they choose to do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Alabama for unanimous consent for concurrence in the House resolution? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF TARIFF ACT.

Mr. COCKRELL. I submit a resolution for which I ask present consideration, providing for the printing of a thousand additional copies of the new tariff act, to be placed in the document room and to be accessible to all Senators. It will cost about \$32.

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

Resolved, That there be printed for the files of the Senate document room 1,000 additional copies of the act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States, as approved July 24, 1897.

MRS. ADONIA HUARD.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1131) granting a pension to Mrs. Adonia Huard, of New Orleans, La., widow of Hypolite Huard, deceased, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

THANKS TO THE VICE-PRESIDENT.

Mr. COCKRELL. I offer a resolution for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BACON in the chair). The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby cordially tendered to Hon. GARRET A. HOBART, Vice-President of the United States, for his able, impartial, and courteous discharge of his duties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

THE NATIONAL PARK.

Mr. THURSTON. I ask unanimous consent to consider a resolution which I present at the request of the Committee on Territories. If it leads to any debate, I will withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Territories be authorized as now constituted, either by full committee or such subcommittee as may be appointed by the chairman thereof, with the full power of such committee, to investigate the present condition and management of the National Park and to make full inquiry as to what legislation is further necessary to fully preserve and protect said National Park.

Second. That said committee or subcommittee shall have power to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to examine witnesses under oath touching the matters which they are hereby empowered to investigate, and may hold their sessions and conduct their said investigation during the recess of the Senate at such place or places as they may determine; and the necessary and proper expenses incurred in the execution of this order shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said committee.

Mr. COCKRELL. Under the rule, the resolution goes to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. THURSTON. I stated that if there was any objection to the present consideration of the resolution, I would withdraw it.

Mr. COCKRELL. It must go there. It is not subject to objection; it goes there under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

RECESS.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate take a recess until a quarter to 9 o'clock.

Mr. ALDRICH. I would suggest that we have unanimous consent that no business be done between a quarter of 9 and 9 o'clock.

Mr. ALLISON. There will be no business done unless something is necessary.

Mr. WHITE. I hope there will be no attempt to pass the currency bill during that time. [Laughter.]

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Senators, I can not adequately express my appreciation of the sentiments of the resolution relating to the presiding officer. I can only say that I am profoundly grateful for the numberless courtesies extended to me from every Senator on this floor, for I have received nothing else during the

four months in which I have presided over this body, and I thank everyone of you for your kindness and your consideration, so fully, so freely, and so generously extended.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess until a quarter before 9 o'clock to-night. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. COCKRELL. And no business is to be done after that time except mere formal matters.

The Senate accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) took a recess until 8 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.

The Senate reassembled at the expiration of the recess, at 8.45 p. m.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. C. R. MCKENNEY, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. Res. 81) authorizing the appointment of a monetary commission, and providing for its expenses; in which the concurrence of the Senate was requested.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. R. 64) providing for a compilation of all the treaties now in force between the United States and any foreign government.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had appointed as members of the committee on the part of the House to wait on the President, Mr. GROSVENOR and Mr. McMILLIN.

The message also announced that the House had passed the concurrent resolution of the Senate providing for the printing of 50,000 copies of the tariff law of 1897, in pamphlet form.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 81) authorizing the appointment of a monetary commission and providing for its expenses was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

THANKS TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE.

Mr. PASCO. Mr. President, I take great pleasure in offering the resolution which I send to the desk and ask may be unanimously adopted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida offers a resolution, which will be read.

The resolution was read, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to Hon. WILLIAM P. FRYE, President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and able manner with which he has presided over its deliberations during the present session.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. ALLISON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed to join a similar committee appointed by the House of Representatives, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses, having completed the business of the present session, are ready to adjourn, unless he may have some further communication to make.

The VICE-PRESIDENT appointed Mr. ALLISON and Mr. TURPIE as members of the committee under the resolution.

PROPOSED MONETARY COMMISSION.

Mr. STEWART. I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings of the Indianapolis convention referred to in the President's message be printed as a document. It is in the Library, I understand, and the reporters can obtain it and furnish it to the printer.

Mr. PETTUS. I inquire what message the Senator refers to?

Mr. STEWART. The currency message. The President refers to the subject as following out the recommendation of the Indianapolis convention. I should like to have the proceedings of that convention printed and go with the message.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada, that the proceedings of the Indianapolis monetary convention be printed as a document?

Mr. PETTUS. I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. CULLOM. I believe there was no order made by the Senate with reference to the President's message which came in to-day. I move that that message be referred to the Committee on Finance and printed.

Mr. PETTUS. I will withdraw the objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois that the message of the President be referred to the Committee on Finance and printed? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLEN. I suggest to the Senator from Nevada that the Senator from Alabama has withdrawn his objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The objection made to the request of the Senator from Nevada is now withdrawn. Is there any objection to the request? The Chair hears no objection, and the order is made.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to have 10,000 copies printed.

Mr. PASCO. I renew the objection made by the Senator from Alabama.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The order had been made before the Senator from Florida interposed his objection.

Mr. PASCO. I did not understand that the request was again renewed after the Senator from Alabama withdrew his objection. I think the objection is in time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It would be in time, the Chair would state, so far as the order was concerned, but there is no reason, the Chair supposes, why, if the objection is pressed, the decision should stand. The Chair trusts that Senators will come to some arrangement among themselves as to what should be done.

Mr. STEWART. I will limit it to 2,000 copies.

Mr. PASCO. If the question is open, I object to the printing of the document.

Mr. STEWART. If the objection is pressed, I will withdraw the request and let it go. I think it would be a good thing to have it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is interposed, and the order heretofore made is withdrawn.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

At 8 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m. Mr. ALLISON and Mr. TURPIE appeared at the bar, and

Mr. ALLISON said:

Mr. President, your committee, in accordance with the Senate resolution, have communicated with the President and informed him that the two Houses are now ready to adjourn without day unless he should have some further communication to make. The President desires us to express his sincere congratulations to the Senate and the House, and he says he has no further communication to make to Congress.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT (at 9 o'clock p. m.). Is there any further business before the Senate?

Mr. CULLOM and others. Nothing further.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Senators, under the terms of the concurrent resolution, it only remains for me, as President of the Senate, to announce the adjournment of the Senate, and I now therefore declare that the extraordinary session of the Senate is at an end, and that the Senate stands adjourned without day.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 24, 1897.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Mack A. Montgomery, of Mississippi, to be attorney of the United States for the northern district of Mississippi, vice Chapman L. Anderson, to be removed.

Abial Lathrop, of South Carolina, to be attorney of the United States for the district of South Carolina, vice William Perry Murphy, to be removed.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

John C. Lynch, of California, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of California, to succeed O. M. Welburn, removed.

Philemon B. Hunt, of Texas, to be collector of internal revenue for the fourth district of Texas, vice James L. Doggett, removed.

Henry A. Rucker, of Georgia, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Georgia, vice Paul B. Trammell, removed.

John C. Entekin, of Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the eleventh district of Ohio, vice Samuel M. McMillen, removed.

James D. Brady, of Virginia, to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Virginia, vice William Ryan, removed.

ASSAYER AND MELTER.

William S. Clanton, of North Carolina, to be assayer and melter of the United States assay office at Charlotte, N. C., to succeed William E. Ardrey, removed.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Stephen J. Loughran, of Des Moines, Iowa, to be receiver of public moneys at Des Moines, Iowa, vice William H. Turbett, removed.

Henry D. Bowman, of Las Cruces, N. Mex., to be receiver of public moneys at Las Cruces, N. Mex., vice James P. Ascarate, resigned.

INDIAN AGENT.

Jay Lynch, of Dayton, Wash., to be agent for the Indians of the Yakima Agency in Washington, vice Lewis T. Erwin, resigned.

COMMISSIONER.

L. B. Shepherd, of Alaska, to be a commissioner in and for the District of Alaska, to reside at St. Michaels, to fill one of the four additional commissionerships created by the act of Congress approved June 4, 1897, vice William J. Jones, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Wainwright Kellogg, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 13th day of July, 1897, vice Lieut. Commander Edward P. Wood, promoted.

Lieut. Commander Walton Goodwin, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 21st day of July, 1897, vice Commander Charles O'Neil, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Hugh Rodman, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 13th day of July, 1897, vice Lieut. Wainwright Kellogg, promoted.

PROMOTIONS IN REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Engineer in Chief John Wilkie Collins, of New York, to be captain of engineers in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States. Office created by act of Congress approved June 4, 1897.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL.

Quinby Vance, of Hermosa, N. Mex., to be surveyor-general of New Mexico, vice Charles F. Easley, resigned.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Robert A. Cameron, of Alva, Okla., to be register of the land office at Alva, Okla., vice Frank P. Alexander, resigned.

POSTMASTERS.

Monroe B. Morton, to be postmaster at Athens, in the county of Clarke and State of Georgia, in the place of James O'Farrell, removed.

Amelia Williams, to be postmaster at Glenwood Springs, in the county of Garfield and State of Colorado, in the place of W. T. Beans, removed.

Mary B. Griswold, to be postmaster at Guilford, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut, in the place of George E. Meigs, deceased.

Hiram J. Dunlap, to be postmaster at Kankakee, in the county of Kankakee and State of Illinois, in the place of William T. Gongar, removed.

Ernest G. Howell, to be postmaster at Geneva, in the county of Kane and State of Illinois, in the place of Mary A. Herrington, removed.

William D. Page, to be postmaster at Fort Wayne, in the county of Allen and State of Indiana, in the place of W. W. Rockhill, resigned.

Willard M. Dunn, to be postmaster at Waterville, in the county of Kennebec and State of Maine, in the place of Frank L. Thayer, removed.

Oramel Murray, to be postmaster at Pittsfield, in the county of Somerset and State of Maine, in the place of Henry F. Libby, removed.

C. H. Mead, to be postmaster at West Acton, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of H. A. Littlefield, removed.

Frank M. Filson, to be postmaster at Cameron, in the county of Clinton and State of Missouri, in the place of Beauregard Ross, resigned.

Jefferson Swanger, to be postmaster at Milan, in the county of Sullivan and State of Missouri, in the place of John N. Shepler, removed.

J. F. Naugle, to be postmaster at Meyersdale, in the county of Somerset and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of William H. Hay, removed.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 24, 1897.

COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION.

Percy C. Hennighausen, of Maryland, to be commissioner of immigration at the port of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland.

PROMOTION IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Engineer in Chief John Wilkie Collins, of New York, to be captain of engineers.

NICARAGUA CANAL COMMISSION.

Rear-Admiral John G. Walker, United States Navy; Capt. Oberlin Mathies Carter, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and Lewis M. Haupt, of Pennsylvania (an engineer from civil life), to be members of the Nicaragua Canal Commission provided for in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1897, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes."

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Norman H. Farquhar, to be a commodore.

Commander Charles O'Neil, to be a captain.

Lieut. Commander Walton Goodwin, to be a commodore.

Lieut. Wainwright Kellogg, to be a lieutenant-commander.

COMMISSIONERS.

George D. Greene, of Montana, to be a commissioner to examine and classify lands within the land-grant and indemnity land-grant

limits of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company in the Helena land district in Montana.

Miles Cavanaugh, of Helena, Mont., to be a commissioner to examine and classify lands within the land-grant and indemnity land-grant limits of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company in the Helena land district in Montana.

William R. Manning, of Newton, Iowa, to be a commissioner to examine and classify lands within the land-grant and indemnity land-grant limits of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company in the Helena land district in Montana.

L. B. Shepherd, of Alaska, to be commissioner in and for the District of Alaska, to reside at St. Michaels.

CLERK OF DISTRICT COURT OF ALASKA.

Albert D. Elliot, of Washington, D. C., to be clerk of the district court for the District of Alaska.

ASSAYER.

William S. Clanton, of North Carolina, to be assayer and melter of the United States assay office at Charlotte, N. C.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Andrew L. Morrison, of New Mexico, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of New Mexico.

John C. Lynch, of California, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of California.

Philemon B. Hunt, of Texas, to be collector of internal revenue for the fourth district of Texas.

Henry A. Rucker, of Georgia, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Georgia.

John C. Entrekin, of Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the eleventh district of Ohio.

James D. Brady, of Virginia, to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Virginia.

MARSHAL.

Creighton M. Foraker, of New Mexico, to be marshal of the United States for the Territory of New Mexico.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL.

Quinby Vance, of Hermosa, N. Mex., to be surveyor-general of New Mexico.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Robert A. Cameron, of Alva, Okla., to be register of the land office at Alva, Okla.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Henry D. Bowman, of Las Cruces, N. Mex., to be receiver of public moneys at Las Cruces, N. Mex.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Morris D. Wickersham, of Alabama, to be attorney of the United States for the southern district of Alabama.

William D. Wright, of Tennessee, to be attorney of the United States for the eastern district of Tennessee.

Abail Lathrop, of South Carolina, to be attorney of the United States for the district of South Carolina.

POSTMASTERS.

Abel Landry, to be postmaster at Napoleonville, in the parish of Assumption and State of Louisiana.

Harry H. Mitchell, to be postmaster at Clinton, in the county of Henry and State of Missouri.

Frank Sigel Jones, to be postmaster at Sarcouxie, in the county of Jasper and State of Missouri.

Peter C. Van Matre, to be postmaster at Warrensburg, in the county of Johnson and State of Missouri.

Henry Mayer, to be postmaster at Vicksburg, in the county of Warren and State of Mississippi.

Seth G. Wells, to be postmaster at Erie, in the county of Neosho and State of Kansas.

I. H. La Mar, to be postmaster at Petersburg, in the county of Pike and State of Indiana.

Richard W. Box, to be postmaster at Pulaski, in the county of Oswego and State of New York.

Fielding Smith, to be postmaster at Lancaster, in the county of Coos and State of New Hampshire.

James M. Wright, to be postmaster at Richmond, in the county of Ray and State of Missouri.

Blanton W. Burford, to be postmaster at Lebanon, in the county of Wilson and State of Tennessee.

John J. Leedom, to be postmaster at St. Paris, in the county of Champaign and State of Ohio.

Dwight H. Bruce, to be postmaster at Syracuse, in the county of Onondaga and State of New York.

James M. Cox, to be postmaster at Adrian, in the county of Bates and State of Missouri.

George N. Winner, to be postmaster at Palmyra, in the county of Burlington and State of New Jersey.

W. B. Morton, to be postmaster at Harrison, in the county of Boone and State of Arkansas.

Amelia Williams, to be postmaster at Glenwood Springs, in the county of Garfield and State of Colorado.

Mary B. Griswold, to be postmaster at Guilford, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut.

Hiram J. Dunlap, to be postmaster at Kankakee, in the county of Kankakee and State of Illinois.

Earnest G. Howell, to be postmaster at Geneva, in the county of Kane and State of Illinois.

William D. Page, to be postmaster at Fort Wayne, in the county of Allen and State of Indiana.

Willard M. Dunn, to be postmaster at Waterville, in the county of Kennebec and State of Maine.

Oramel Murray, to be postmaster at Pittsfield, in the county of Somerset and State of Maine.

C. H. Mead, to be postmaster at West Acton, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Frank M. Filsom, to be postmaster at Cameron, in the county of Clinton and State of Missouri.

Jefferson Swanger, to be postmaster at Milan, in the county of Sullivan and State of Missouri.

J. F. Naugle, to be postmaster at Meyersdale, in the county of Somerset and State of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

[Continuation of legislative day of Thursday, July 22, 1897.]

The recess having expired, the House (at 12 o'clock m., Saturday, July 24) resumed its session.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SIMPSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SIMPSON of Kansas. I desire to correct the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] is recognized.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the House take a recess until half past 3 o'clock this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine moves—

Mr. DINGLEY. I will modify my motion and say 3 o'clock.

Mr. SIMPSON of Kansas. Am I not to be allowed to correct the RECORD this morning? I desire to correct the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that can be done after the recess.

Mr. McRAE. I hope the gentleman from Maine, before his motion is put, will state some reason why this recess should be taken.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine moves that the House take a recess until 3 o'clock.

Mr. DINGLEY. What was the suggestion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE]?

Mr. McRAE. I should be glad if the gentleman would make a statement to the House as to why this recess is to be taken. If there is nothing else to be done, some of us would like to start for our homes this afternoon. If there is anything else to be done, we should be glad to know what it is and when it will be taken up.

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman is aware that the Senate has made an order providing for a final vote upon the conference report on the tariff at 3 o'clock this afternoon, and that the engrossed bill must come back here and be laid before the House and signed by the Speaker.

Mr. McRAE. That is all true. If there is nothing else to be done except that, then I can see no objection to the recess; but if there is anything else to be done, why not proceed with it now?

Mr. DINGLEY. I am not aware of anything demanding immediate consideration.

Mr. McRAE. Will the gentleman be kind enough—

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I hope the gentleman from Maine will modify his motion so that the House shall meet at half past 3. Everybody in the House wants to be over in the Senate during the calling of the roll on the tariff bill; and we can not be there and here at the same time.

Mr. DINGLEY. In accordance with the gentleman's suggestion, I will modify my motion so as to say half past 3 o'clock.

Mr. McRAE. If the gentleman will allow me, I will be a little more direct, and will ask him whether it is the purpose to take up, as has been stated in the press, the bill providing for a currency commission, after the passage of the tariff bill, if it should pass.

Mr. DINGLEY. I am not able to answer the question, because no such proposition as yet has been presented.

Mr. McRAE. There has been such a proposition presented to the House. A bill of that kind has been introduced, and there has been a good deal of talk about the matter by those who pretend to know.

Mr. DINGLEY. I am not able to inform the gentleman at this hour—

Mr. McMILLIN. It is very desirable there should be some intimation on that subject. Quite a number of gentlemen wish to

go home this afternoon who, if any important business is to come up, would remain.

Mr. DINGLEY. I am not able to give any definite information on the subject.

The SPEAKER. The subject of the nearness of the possible adjournment of the two Houses having been mentioned, the Chair desires to say that in his opinion it is the duty of every member to remain here until the close of the session; otherwise the House may find itself without a quorum, and whoever may not be here will be blamed to that extent. The Chair hopes that the House and all the members of it will govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. McRAE. We have been kept here for four months on the theory that nothing should be done at this session except the passage of the tariff bill; and certainly we now have a right to be informed whether it is the purpose of the Speaker and the other side to do anything further after the passage of that bill.

Mr. DINGLEY. It is exceedingly important, in order to maintain a quorum, that members should remain here until the close of the session.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. DINGLEY, it was agreed to; and accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until half past 3 o'clock p. m.

The recess having expired, the House resumed its session.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

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 amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 379) to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States. [Applause.]

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (H. R. 379) to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States.

CORRECTION.

Mr. SIMPSON of Kansas rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas desires, if there be no objection, to correct the RECORD.

Mr. SIMPSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, by the kind indulgence of the Chair, I rose to correct the RECORD. It seems now that the correction needs correcting. The correction which I desired to make yesterday was that where I had used the word "brutal," designating the majority of the House as a "brutal majority," the word "frugal" appeared, and I wanted the word "brutal" substituted. To-day my correction appears with the word "prudent" instead of the word "brutal." [Laughter.] I want to correct that error. It appears that some person is unable to distinguish between the sound and the meaning of those words. There is a great difference; and with the kind indulgence of the Chair I will give the reasons why I have used this word instead of the other.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to be indulgent to that extent. [Laughter.] And the Chair would suggest that this incident shows the great advantage of making these corrections of the RECORD at the desk, so that there can be no mistake about them. Making them in public, with other observations mingled with them, is apt to lead to confusion.

Mr. SIMPSON of Kansas. I trust that this time they will get the word correctly.

Several MEMBERS. Spell it.

Mr. SIMPSON of Kansas. I am not going to start a spelling school here for the benefit of the Republican party. [Laughter.]

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to report a concurrent resolution for final adjournment. [Applause.]

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be authorized to close the present session by adjourning their respective Houses on Saturday, July 24, at 9 o'clock p. m.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like three or four minutes on this resolution, which is a very important one. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the resolution to adjourn sine die will be voted for by the solid Republican majority. With bowed heads we must return to our constituents and tell them that the prosperity promised by the Republican party is to be realized by an increase of taxation and by the enactment of Republican legislation which lessens the ability of the

people to bear the additional burdens to which they are to be subjected. [Applause.]

The increased hardships which the new tariff law will impose upon the people is not all we must suffer.

Retaliation, which may lessen our exports, is boldly threatened. I read a telegram from the Associated Press, which tells us of this new impending evil. It is as follows:

CLAMORS FOR RETALIATION—A TARIFF COALITION OF EUROPEAN COUNTRIES PROPOSED.

BERLIN, July 21.

The Kreuz Zeitung, of this city, in an article directed against the Dingley tariff, clamors for retaliation, and asks the Government to form a tariff coalition with Austria, France, Italy, Spain, and Holland for the purpose of keeping American grains, meat, cotton, and petroleum out of all those countries. This proposal has attracted attention throughout Europe.

We must tell our people of this, and we must also tell them that every pledge of the Republican party has been violated. [Applause.] That the promise by the Republican platform of the convention which nominated the present Executive in favor of the heroes and patriots who are fighting for liberty in that beautiful isle, the gem of the ocean, almost in sight of our shores, was only a political evasion for the purpose of reaching the warm and patriotic hearts of the American people.

We must go to our homes and read day by day of the slaughter of Cuban patriots by Spanish butchers.

We must tell the people who have been crushed by the financial legislation that the bill which was passed by the Senate to enable them to once more regain a commercial standing and renew business efforts was halted at the door of this House and the Representatives of the people denied an opportunity to give consideration to this important measure.

We must tell our constituents, Mr. Speaker, that we have sat for nearly five months in this House, and every effort on our part to give relief to the people has been denied, and every measure for their benefit has been throttled or voted down by a relentless Republican majority. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a proper occasion to congratulate this House of Representatives and the people of the United States of America upon the auspicious closing of the special session of Congress. Looking back over the history of this period I believe that every candid observer of political events will say that no better management of the affairs of a government has ever been manifested than by the present Administration and the two Houses of Congress. I believe, sir, that had we not adopted the policy we did adopt at the opening of this session, had we not acted with that unerring and unflinching courage which has marked the administration of this House, the tariff measure which, in my judgment, will bring relief to the people of this country, probably could not have been passed.

And as day after day and hour after hour I have witnessed the agonizing struggles of gentlemen upon the other side, I have been driven to believe that they too are conscious of the fact that it is only as the inevitable result of the present management of the House of Representatives that a measure has been passed which the people of this country will celebrate to-night and from this time forward. [Applause on the Republican side.] Mr. Speaker, it comes with singular grace from the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] to talk about the increase of taxation upon the people of the country.

Why, sir, the property of the United States, the real and personal property of the United States, is worth to-day, as compared with what it was worth when the election was held last November, more than enough to compensate for all the "taxes" under the McKinley law for the next twenty years to come. [Applause on the Republican side.] The gentleman talks about the prosperity that was promised the country. Why, sir, is the gentleman riding through the world with his eyes shut, or is he so blinded by partisan prejudice that he is incapable of seeing what is going on around him?

The giants of progress, the giants of steam, of electricity, of agriculture, of mining, are standing ready harnessed for the great race that they are eager to enter upon. [Applause on the Republican side.] Labor, agricultural industry, prosperity, enterprise, crushed under the administration of the Democratic party, are springing to the relief of the country, and on every hand the music of the coming regeneration of labor and industry is heard in the air. [Applause on the Republican side. Derisive cries on the Democratic side.] Oh, it is easy to sneer.

That is the true milk upon which Democrats thrive. Calamity, hunger, poverty, starvation, misrule—they understand those things, and when they see them passing away they always wail; they always express their regret. Republicans of the House of Representatives, you have stood together like a Macedonian phalanx in this mighty battle; you have contributed of your brain, of your patience, of your study, of your toil, and the people of the United States, recognizing what has been achieved here, will reward the

party that has been true to its platform principles and true to the behests of the people. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Speaker, before that I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I understand—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Maine yield?

Mr. DINGLEY. It is hardly worth while at this time. After we get through with the resolution, if the gentleman wants to ask a question—

Mr. SWANSON. I simply wanted to get some information before I vote on this proposition. It provides for an adjournment of the two Houses at 9 o'clock to-night. A message from the President has come in, and I would like to know, before voting on this question, whether it is contemplated—

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, that is not a question for me to answer. I decline to yield further, and ask the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman demands the previous question.

The previous question was ordered, under the operation of which the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. DINGLEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

CURRENCY COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my message convening the Congress in extraordinary session I called attention to a single subject—that of providing revenue adequate to meet the reasonable and proper expenses of the Government. I believed that to be the most pressing subject for settlement then. A bill to provide the necessary revenues for the Government has already passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, and awaits Executive action.

Another question of very great importance is that of the establishment of our currency and banking system on a better basis, which I commented upon in my inaugural address in the following words:

"Our financial system needs some revision. Our money is all good now, but its value must not further be threatened. It should all be put upon an enduring basis, not subject to easy attack nor its stability to doubt or dispute. The several forms of our paper money offer, in my judgment, a constant embarrassment to the Government and imperil a safe balance in the Treasury."

Nothing was settled more clearly at the late national election than the determination upon the part of the people to keep their currency stable in value and equal to that of the most advanced nations of the world.

The soundness of our currency is nowhere questioned. No loss can occur to its holders. It is the system which should be simplified and strengthened, keeping our money just as good as it is now, with less expense to the Government and the people.

The sentiment of the country is strongly in favor of early action by Congress in this direction, to revise our currency laws and remove them from partisan contention. A notable assembly of business men, with delegates from twenty-nine States and Territories, was held at Indianapolis in January of this year. The financial situation commanded their earnest attention, and after a two days' session the convention recommended to Congress the appointment of a monetary commission.

I commend this report to the consideration of Congress. The authors of the report recommend a commission "to make a thorough investigation of the monetary affairs and needs of this country in all relations and aspects, and to make proper suggestions as to any evils found to exist and the remedies therefor."

This subject should receive the attention of Congress at its special session. It ought not to be postponed until the regular session.

I therefore urgently recommend that a special commission be created, non-partisan in its character, to be composed of well-informed citizens of different parties, who will command the confidence of Congress and the country because of their special fitness for the work, whose duty it shall be to make recommendations of whatever changes in our present banking and currency laws may be found necessary and expedient, and to report their conclusions on or before the 1st day of November next, in order that the same may be transmitted by me to Congress for its consideration at its first regular session.

It is to be hoped that the report thus made will be so comprehensive and sound as to receive the support of all parties and the favorable action of Congress. At all events, such a report can not fail to be of value to the executive branch of the Government, as well as to those charged with public legislation, and to greatly assist in the establishment of an improved system of finance.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, July 24, 1897.

[The reading of the message was greeted with applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Rules to submit a privileged resolution, which I send to the desk.

Mr. TERRY. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Iowa, as representing the Committee on Rules. The Clerk will read the report of the committee.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thought a parliamentary inquiry was always in order.

The SPEAKER. All parliamentary inquiries are not always in order at all times. [Laughter.]

Mr. TERRY. My inquiry is whether that message is not subject to the point of order of being rather "dilatory"? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no doubt that the House will see the impropriety of calling a remark like that a parliamentary inquiry. No doubt every member present will see its impropriety. [Laughter.] The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred House resolution No. 83,

have had the same under consideration, and ask leave to report the following substitute therefor:

Resolved, That it shall be in order, immediately on the adoption of this resolution, to proceed to the consideration of House joint resolution No. 81, authorizing the appointment of a monetary commission and providing for its expenses; and after sixty minutes' debate thereon, the previous question shall be considered ordered on said resolution to its final passage."

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it will be observed—

Mr. McMILLIN. If my friend will permit me, I suppose we will not be cut off from the twenty minutes on a side for debate on the adoption of this report?

Mr. HENDERSON. I will say frankly to my friend from Tennessee that my purpose was to ask the previous question on this report, and take a vote without delay, leaving the sixty minutes on the adoption of the resolution to commence at once.

Mr. McMILLIN. I trust the gentleman will not do that. We have so short a time under the resolution that the sixty minutes and forty minutes combined will be an exceedingly brief time for the consideration of so important a question. I hope he will not cut us off. I realize, of course, that he has power to do so if he sees fit.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will say to my friend from Tennessee that the House having fixed the hour for adjournment—we having this resolution to pass on, and I can not foretell how many votes may be had on it—being advised, too, that it is the intention of the Speaker to announce the committees to-night, and we do not want to cut him off from that opportunity—I think the House would be wise in limiting the debate to the sixty minutes fixed in the report of the Committee on Rules, and not ask for the forty minutes additional time on the adoption of the report.

Mr. McMILLIN. I realize the gentleman's power and the power of the House to shut us off if they see proper, but at the same time we protest that it is very unfair to take such a course on a measure of this importance, which should have ample opportunity for discussion. I say this in all kindness, but in all candor, to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not intend to gag the House, and if gentlemen on the other side of the House desire the forty minutes' debate, in addition to the sixty minutes, I will ask the previous question on the adoption of the report now, and let the debate go on for the forty minutes first.

Mr. McMILLIN. We prefer that.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then I ask the previous question on the adoption of the report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] has twenty minutes, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] the same.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, this House, as controlled by the majority, is in sympathy with the Executive, representing the majority sentiment of this country, and it means business. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I am not going to drag politics into the brief time at my command, except in so far as discharging the business of this House in the interests of the country is political. All of you understand the purport of the message from the President which has just been read. It has been held back until the great work of this session has been done. That work has been tirelessly and fearlessly performed, and has now been consummated. The President now calls our attention to still another matter, namely, the setting of experts at work to investigate the great monetary question, which reaches every home and every heart and every thoughtful mind. The question is now, Shall we listen to this advice of the President, adopt the resolution, and authorize the appointment of this commission? This is all that I desire to say at this time, and, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

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

A bill (H. R. 3950) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act providing a civil government for Alaska," approved May 17, 1884, to create the office of surveyor-general for Alaska, and for other purposes; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 82) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives on the day following adjournment.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of Congress 50,000 copies of the tariff law of 1897, in pamphlet form with paper cover, to be apportioned as follows: Twenty-five thousand copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 10,000 copies for the use of the Senate, and 15,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

CURRENCY COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] is recognized for twenty minutes in the negative.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. If this rule is adopted, it will not be proper then, will it, to undertake to offer a substitute for the resolution when it comes before the House for discussion?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not, although he has not examined the question.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, while gentlemen on the other side are consulting, is it in order to ask unanimous consent to pass the joint resolution just sent in from the Senate, to print 50,000 copies of the tariff bill?

The SPEAKER. It is not usual, but if nobody desires to discuss the resolution—

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I think it extremely unfortunate that the House should attempt to settle so important a question as this in such a manner. We have acquiesced quietly here for the last four months in the Republican policy of considering nothing but the tariff, and now, upon the eve of adjournment, you present here a rule limiting to sixty minutes the discussion of what we consider the most important issue before the American people. And it is extremely unfortunate—this practice which has grown up of relegating to commissions the settlement of great public questions.

It is a practical admission that the House of Representatives is incompetent to discharge the duties imposed upon it by the people. You attempted to settle the question of a Presidency by a commission, and the stench of its action rose to heaven. You attempted to settle the question of the tariff by a commission, and the effort proved abortive. Now for the first time in the history of the Republic, when a great question of finance confronts us, the House of Representatives say, "We are unable to discharge the duties imposed upon us by the people, but must relegate them to the same class of men who made the house of God a business mart." I am not in favor of any such thing.

This bill provides for the selection of experts. You have, or will have, a committee charged with the duty of investigating and reporting to this House what is desirable so far as the currency of this country is concerned. It is nothing more nor less than a sop to Cerberus. It is an effort to escape responsibility. It is seeking to evade the logic of the Democratic position. You know that we are correct, and you are trying to postpone the evil day a little longer. In other words, it is nothing more nor less than an effort to control the elections in Ohio. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Everybody knows that this commission will amount to nothing. You propose to appoint a lot of bankers, in obedience to the demand of a convention—

Mr. BRUCKER. Mr. Speaker, allow me interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I have but four minutes.

Mr. BRUCKER. I want to observe that everybody knows that this resolution will not pass the United States Senate, that it is simply introduced here at this late hour as claptrap to assist Senator HANNA in the campaign in Ohio.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I know it will not pass the other body, but it is offered for the purpose of enabling the chairman of the national Republican committee to fasten to himself the Republican vote in Ohio.

I was going to say that you propose to appoint a few bankers to go into this question, in obedience to the demand of the Indianapolis convention, a body composed of recalcitrant Democrats. They did not even admit Republicans to participate in their deliberations.

You are going to select a few individuals who have surrounded the ordinary rules of trade which so much occultism they now claim a man must grow gray in the calculation of usurious interest before he knows what barter and trade signifies. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If this Congress is not competent to correct the currency system of the United States, why we ought to resign and go home. One of the specific rights delegated by the States to the Federal Congress was to coin money and regulate the value thereof; and here we come, in the evening of this extraordinary session, with the confession that we are not competent to deal with the most vital question confronting the American people.

I am not surprised, Mr. Speaker, that that is the case so long as the Republican party is in control; but if you will allow the Democratic party to suggest to you a remedy, they will tell you what to do. If you will consider my bill, providing for the free, unlimited, and independent coinage of both gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, you will not need any commission. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.] The campaign of 1896 was fought upon this question, and the present Executive somersaulted on this question to receive his nomination and election.

Mr. McMILLIN. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DOCKERY. In the two minutes allotted to me I desire to say that I am opposed to this rule, and also to the bill for the creation of a currency commission. I am opposed to this proposition because, in my view, it is not offered in good faith. It comes to this House for consideration, a resolution having already been adopted to adjourn Congress at 9 o'clock this evening. But five hours remain of the session, and yet the Executive, by a dilatory message which has been read at the Clerk's desk, challenges this great question to the attention of the representatives of the people. I am opposed to this measure because it devolves upon a commission duties which properly belong to Congress. I am opposed to a currency commission, Mr. Speaker, because the division line between the American people on the monetary question is already so clearly defined that this proposition becomes a subterfuge, intended to tide the Republican party over the ensuing November elections. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, the issue dividing the American people and the two great political parties is fully understood. The Republican party, in its national convention, declared in favor of a continuance of the gold standard until such time as the United States could secure the aid of foreign governments to restore silver. The Democratic party, in national convention, declared for the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the consent of any nation on the face of the earth, or even upon the political necessities of MARK HANNA in the coming Ohio campaign. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.] On these lines the contest of 1896 was fought to its conclusion.

The logic of the Republican victory means the issue of long-time bonds to retire the greenback currency, to retire the Sherman notes, and even the silver dollars, and that gold alone will remain as the money of redemption. The Democratic party would reform the monetary situation as required by its pledges, by the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver; and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that when the Republican party shall have accomplished the "reforms" demanded by its platform, the people will repudiate that party and its policies of dear money and high taxes and indorse the position so ably championed by William J. Bryan in the campaign of 1896. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McMILLIN. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this special message of the President of the United States is but a just ending to the action of this Congress. After having made the burdens heavier upon the laboring men of the United States in everything that goes to make up life in the things that they use, we find now that here, in the closing hours of this Congress, the President of the United States advocates in clear and unmistakable language that he favors the retirement of the Treasury notes and greenbacks, and would leave us to the tender mercies of a high protective tariff, the single gold standard, and the perpetuation of the national banking system upon the people of this country if his suggestions are carried out. He advocates, further, the formation of a non-partisan commission, composed, as he tells us, of business men.

We know what he wants when he alludes to those renegades from the Democratic party, with other gold bugs that met at Indianapolis, many of whom had been honored by the Democratic party, and suggests that what they have asked be incorporated into law by Congress. What is it that they ask? It is the wiping out of the Treasury notes and greenbacks; and I say here I do not believe that enough men on that side of the House and on this can be found who will carry out the suggestion of the Republican President of the United States. We are now reaping the benefits of Republican prosperity. We were told that confidence would be unbottled as soon as McKinley was inaugurated, and prosperity would flow all over this country, bringing happiness to our people.

The men who voted for McKinley presented a sad commentary on this, when some two weeks ago we found the men who had marched and voted for McKinley formed on a public square in a city in his State and took the McKinley uniforms and made bonfires of them and announced that in the future they would vote for Bryan and Democracy.

This light from burning McKinley uniforms illumined the principles of the Democratic party. In my opinion, the disaffection in Ohio will lead to the defeat of the Republican candidate in Ohio for Senator, the distinguished chairman of the Republican national committee. Will this legislation protect the miners who are striking by the thousands and asking for higher wages? We will meet you upon that battle ground when Congress convenes next winter, and you Republicans on that side will join with us to defeat the request of your President, for you dare not wipe out the greenbacks and Treasury notes—the money of the people—and you know it. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McMILLIN. I would ask the gentleman in charge of the resolution to occupy a part of his time.

Mr. HENDERSON. Finish your time. I do not know that I will have any applications for time.

Mr. McMILLIN. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND].

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, soon a very remarkable session of the Congress of the United States will be closed. "Business" is to be done within the next few minutes with a rapidity truly extraordinary. For nearly four months nothing has been done in this House; prosperity has been lacking in the country; platform pledges have been disregarded—if platform pledges made at St. Louis were made for anything but votes—and now, after resolving to end this session at 9 o'clock this evening, the Republican majority in the House of Representatives is pluming itself upon discharging a patriotic duty in passing a resolution which it knows will die in the Senate Chamber, as it ought to die.

This may be business; this may be patriotism; this may be honesty; this is Republicanism. Why, if there was something to be done, was not the time that has been wasted utilized in the doing of it? Why go through the hypocritical performance of talking about your desire to do something, of voting here now as if you desire to do something? Did you desire to pass this resolution? Did you desire to have this commission created? If so, why did not you act months ago? Was it rank cowardice? Was it childish fear? Did you fear that your iniquitous tariff bill might fail in the Senate unless you practiced this little subterfuge, this scheme of cowardice and deception? Prate about the bravery of your party! Prate about devotion to the pledges you have made! Prate about your desire to do something for the country!

Ah, when you do least the country is best off, and when you do most the country suffers most. You have shown yourselves to be party leaders of deception, of pretense, of cowardice. It is cowardly to hold back such measures until you are right upon the eve of adjournment. But your schemes will not bear the light of day. You dare not submit them to discussion in this House, and you hope by some means to escape discussion in the country. Shame upon the leaders of the party that once knew a Lincoln! Shame upon those who represent here the party that once was noted for its virility and courage, the party that once appealed to the American people by its dash, by its daring, by its devotion to its declared principles, whether right or wrong!

Now you hide, and prevaricate, and quibble. Well, we are more than willing to meet you before the country. Here Representatives are muzzled. Here arbitrary power prevails and controls. But abroad among the masses, among the gallant American citizens, among the true-hearted people of this land of all parties, there is still free speech. There is no power to suppress it when you and we pass out into that great arena; and there, in the coming elections and in the elections to follow—there, from this hour on until we win complete victory—we will meet you at every crossroads; we will defy you upon every stump; we will strip bare your skeletons; we will show that your tariff bill just passed, about which you boast so much—the bill which is to herald in prosperity for the few and adversity for the many—is the most iniquitous, the most villainous, the most oppressive tariff bill ever made; and this pending resolution of hypocrisy is a fit companion piece for it. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] that I have had some applications from gentlemen who desire to be heard on this resolution, and I now yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, judging from what our friends on the other side have said, the time allotted to the discussion of this resolution seems to them small. They forget that we have not undertaken to inaugurate here a discussion of the financial question. The Constitution of the United States charges the President with the duty of submitting his views upon public measures to Congress, and he has asked Congress for authority to appoint a commission to report to him; so that observations made here about Congress abdicating its authority are not applicable to the situation in which we are placed.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Do you remember the tariff commission? [Laughter.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do. Ordinarily, Mr. Speaker, a proposition of this sort would excite neither extended debate nor a division of the House, and even now our friends on the other side find themselves, in the brief time that is given for discussion, compelled to resort to old-fashioned Democratic oratory, in which the outrage of the new tariff and the iniquities of MARK HANNA are the only things prominently mentioned. [Laughter.] It appears that a frame of mind becomes easily possible to men in which they find it perfectly natural to disparage the motives of gentlemen who sit around them, and to impeach the integrity of everybody within political reach. [Laughter.]

It has produced in our Democratic brethren a steady progress toward a mental condition in which their consciences have grown somewhat morbid and their emotions have gone into a trust that

has driven their other faculties entirely out of business. [Laughter. Applause on the Republican side.] Of course, it leaves them entirely unable to understand the drift of political events, so that there are scores of men in this House who are to-day in the same state in which the chairman of their last national committee found himself—unable to tell how the election was going before it was held, and unable to understand how it had gone after it was over. [Laughter. Applause on the Republican side.]

Even occasionally in these debates we hear gentlemen talk of the immense number of votes that the Democratic candidate for the Presidency got. Of course he got a good many votes. The very minute his management took possession of the Democratic headquarters and began to do a wholesale Populist business there he was certain to get millions of votes, because he had behind him a compact political party that had no experience in revolt. It seems queer that men should consider what might have happened as more significant than what actually did happen.

Of course it gained some and lost some. It is to the everlasting honor of the old Democratic party that it lost so much, and it is to the honor of the Republican party that it gained so little. And if we may put our personal feelings aside, it is a matter of very small solicitude that the remnant of the political organization which followed the Democratic standard of last fall is now floundering about in the "bad lands" of our politics, under a leadership that has already become ridiculous as an organizer of book agents and a holy terror to the lyceum platform of inland cities. [Laughter.]

I see every reason for encouragement. We are not only upon the edge of better times in this country, but in my judgment a sure and steady revival of industrial enterprises is to-day going on on all sides of us. In New York City there is a style of lawyers known to the profession as "ambulance chasers," because they are on hand wherever there is a railway wreck, or a street-car collision, or a gasoline explosion, with their tender of consolation and their offers of professional service. I say to my friends on the other side that the hour is at hand for the end of the business of the "ambulance chaser" in American politics. [Laughter and applause.]

Governor Boies, of my own State, is right. The questions that were submitted last year to the American people will never be submitted under better auspices than they were at that time; and the American people, in my humble judgment, will never follow a political banner that is absolutely worthless except as a flag of distress. [Laughter and applause.] We have had a great deal of conversation about various political questions; but there are one or two things that are absolutely settled; and one of them is that no man will in the future gain a leadership among the American people who undertakes to set class against class, man against man, the poor against the rich, labor against capital, the unsuccessful against the successful in the race of life. There is no limit to the degradation of that style of politics.

This was well illustrated in the last campaign when a conspicuous political leader deliberately advised the working people of the United States to put on a false badge of their political faith, to live the lives of liars and hypocrites for five months in order that at the end of that time they might enjoy the luxury of voting to cut in two the value of the standard coin in which the wages of American labor are paid. [Applause.] If our friends of the Populist party were disappointed at the way the farmers of the Northwest and the great industrial centers of this country voted, it only shows that there are a great many people left in this country who believe that there still remain fair opportunities for the children of American people in the avenues and enterprises of American business.

It may be that we have not heard the last of the silver debate; it may be that new light may break out of the progressive experience of the world; but whatever may be the fortune of politics, we are never again likely to see the silver question made the nucleus for reckless, incoherent, and irresponsible agitation.

The ancients used to treat the wind as a divine thing, and to worship it accordingly under various names. It was a very mild and harmless form of paganism. But this world has had altogether too much of it. [Laughter and applause.] And remembering all that I heard last year, and all that I have heard in this session of Congress, I venture the prediction that the day is far distant when we shall come as near as we did last fall to an apotheosis of the organs of human speech, a deification of the winds of heaven. [Loud laughter and applause.]

Mr. McMILLIN. I now yield one minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, this measure is either a reflection upon the intelligence of the Republican party or else it is an apology for its conscience. Those men who were considered as the incarnation of financial intelligence in the United States twelve months ago come now to Congress desiring authority for the appointment of a commission to enlighten the 357 members of this body, who ought to be able themselves to settle the question.

Do the people of the country demand this measure? No, sir; but the power of patronage has become so great it seems that Congress has but one duty, and that duty is to register the will of the Executive. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I repeat, if this bill is necessary, if the House can not act upon its own volition, let the country know why the President did not recommend to the House more than four months ago the appointment of such a commission or the consideration of such a question as that now presented. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER. Two minutes.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, no one in that short time can give an adequate idea of the effect of the resolution which is sought to be passed in this hasty manner; but I will state briefly the objections that appear to me to be the most potent against it. First, it is a cowardly shifting of the responsibility that ought to be shouldered by the men elected to Congress on this question. There is no excuse for the House appointing a commission to roam around throughout the country investigating this question, at an expenditure of a hundred thousand dollars, when they are elected to discharge this duty themselves. It was never contemplated when we were running for Congress that we would take this shifting position and shirk duty.

A MEMBER. And are paid for it.

Mr. McMILLIN. Yes; as suggested, we are paid to do this and should not pay others to do it. On the assembling of this session of Congress we were told that the only thing on which Congress was asked to legislate was the revision of the tariff. The Speaker refused to appoint the committees on this ground. But after we have passed a resolution to adjourn within a few hours, it now turns out that we are asked, and we propose, in response to that invitation, to lay the foundation for legislation affecting the entire currency of the country. We are urged to take up the currency question without committees, and pass the commission resolution without investigation or the right to amend.

In this same message in which the President recommends that certain wise men of the North, South, East, and West shall consider the matter and recommend to Congress what should be done he informs us that we already have a currency every dollar of which is perfectly sound and the character of which challenges the admiration of all the world. What more, then, could he desire? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If the currency is already sound and satisfactory and challenges the admiration of the world, this commission to consider the matter is not needed. If the currency system is wrong, Congress has the power and it is its duty to deal with it, and for one I propose never to surrender its prerogatives or shift or shirk its responsibilities. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.]

It is to be presumed that before another day, or, at any rate, before the adjournment of the House to-day, the committees of the House will be announced. What is the reason, if that is to be done, that the Committee on Banking and Currency, or the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, or both combined, can not be authorized by the House to sit during the time intervening between now and the regular session in December, and make a report in the way the Constitution contemplated it should be done? If we are to appoint a commission to make recommendations, why not appoint it from the body of the representatives of the people, who were sent to legislate on these important questions? And let us do it. If an investigation is to be made, let it be done by those already paid.

No, sir; it turns out that some of that contingent of the Democratic party which broke away from our ranks, bolted our nomination, and voted for Mr. McKinley last November, have become impatient and have assembled at Indianapolis, and the President says they recommended that this thing be done, and their discontent is so manifest that he wants this commission appointed.

But, sir, what recommendation about the currency does he make? Does he believe in destroying the greenbacks or keeping them? Does he believe in extending the national-bank privileges, or does he believe in curtailing the national-bank privileges or powers? Does he believe in destroying the currency already issued—what is known as the notes issued under the Sherman Act? We are left absolutely in the dark and in doubt; and the President himself seems not to have made up his mind as to what ought to be done concerning this all-important question.

Mr. Speaker, let the Congress of the United States grapple with it, or let the people know that they are unable to do so, in order that they may have the chance, in all justice to themselves, to kick you out and send somebody here who is competent to deal with the question. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HENDERSON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to answer all that has been said on the other side during this discussion,

but I want to point out to the House how little good, sound judgment and common sense there is in the statement that Congress has abrogated its authority, and that this measure proposes to turn over to somebody else the duty which is incumbent on the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Why, sir, is this anything of a novelty in American legislation? Is there anything new or wonderful in the appointment of a commission to investigate a great fact or set of facts and to bring the information before the legislative body for its action? As a matter of course, Mr. Speaker, when a political party knows enough, when its members are sufficiently wise to have exhausted all the sources of information, and gathered all the knowledge of mankind, it is not important that they should proceed to learn any more.

The Democratic party has been in power here during two Presidential Administrations, and it has never known enough to do anything on these great questions, or at least it has not done anything. To-day, if a system of legislation for the currency of the country were precipitated into this House of Representatives, there would be somewhere from three to five grand divisions of the minority upon every one of the questions, largely due to the superior knowledge that those gentlemen have, and partially due to the ignorance of some of them in the estimation of the others.

Why, Mr. Speaker, here in this House we remit great questions to committees. I want to refer to another question. In 1882 we referred the whole tariff question to a commission, and we authorized that commission to formulate the statute.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. And when Congress met the Republican party disregarded their recommendations.

Mr. GROSVENOR. We authorized that commission to formulate the statute. Why, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] will not be relieved from the responsibility of his high position. If a report should come here at the end of this investigation, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN], in his capacity as a Representative of the sovereign people of his State, will be heard from in passing upon every one of these questions. The President of the United States has seen fit to make good one of his party promises.

I do not wonder that that makes a profound sensation on the Democratic side of this House. They are unused to a thing of that kind. They never had a President within my recollection who cared a fig for his platform promises after the election was over. But the President of the United States is not afraid of the people of the country. He is not afraid to gather information from all sources. I for one wish to say in this connection that I do not believe that there is any necessity for any considerable legislation upon this question whatever. I am one of those who believe that our system is just what the President says it is—the best in the world.

It has withstood the assaults of the Democratic party from 1861 down to the present time. There is not a law upon the statute books of the United States that was not put there by the Republican party and assailed and assaulted by the Democratic party. I therefore do not believe that any great change is necessary, but I do believe that in the outcry from the country, largely the result of Democratic protestations, it is well that we should have this information.

[Here the hammer fell.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message from the President, by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced the approval by the President of an act (H. R. 379) to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States.

The announcement was received with prolonged applause on the Republican side.

CURRENCY COMMISSION.

Mr. HENDERSON. We are doing business so fast, my Democratic friends, that it makes your heads swim. [Applause on the Republican side.] The tariff bill has been signed, and the country is going on doing business while you are uncomfortable and do not know what to do about it. You are charging us and the President with bad faith in this matter. This bill can easily pass the Senate to-night, long before the hour set for adjournment. Any man who is in favor of the proposition can see that it requires no time for discussion, for the proposition is a simple one.

I learn that the presiding officer of this House has ordered this resolution engrossed. This will expedite it. As soon as it is stamped with the approval of this House, it will be sent to the other House, and can be signed by the President to-night. You have seen in the last few moments how the President treats such matters.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will my friend allow me to ask him a question right there?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes; cheerfully.

Mr. McMILLIN. What authority is there for the engrossment of the resolution before its consideration is entered upon?

Mr. HENDERSON. The time-honored authority of custom. It

is done again and again by your people and by ours, when they mean business. [Applause on the Republican side.] If you have any more easy conundrums, let us have them.

Now, one gentleman said that this is an act of cowardice, a cowardly makeshift, taking it away from the legislative body and sending it to a commission. You might as well move to abolish all the Departments of the Government which make recommendations to Congress as to the legislation required to run the Government.

This is simply a special commission to make recommendations to the President, who is to transmit to Congress their views and the information that they get. We advocate nothing. We will hear what they have to say. We lay down no policy. We will not commit ourselves to the abolition of the greenbacks or to any special financial policy; but we propose to let these experts investigate and give us light, and, God knows, you gentlemen who are "kicking" need all the light that you can get on this financial question. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] You ought not to object to it.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HENDERSON. No; I can not yield to you all the time. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, I will tell you another thing. I have been alarmed to hear something said about MARK HANNA and the State of Ohio! I was not aware until statesmen on the Democratic side spoke about it that MARK HANNA was interested. But I do not blame you for fearing MARK HANNA. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Depend upon it that the great Buckeye State, following its illustrious leader, William McKinley, will keep MARK HANNA at the other end of the Capitol to worry you. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We did not worry about MARK HANNA, and we did not worry about Mr. McKinley either, when we determined to recommend this resolution. Some gentlemen have spoken of our carrying out the recommendations of the Indianapolis convention of Sound Money Democrats. If you did not mean that you did not mean anything. It has no reference to that convention, but to the non-partisan business men's convention that made these recommendations. That and that only. You are getting confused.

My good friend from Pennsylvania, Brother ERMENTROUT, says he will not prophesy; but the bowels of Missouri are big with prophecy this afternoon. Both gentlemen from Missouri prophesy that the work of this campaign, this great campaign in the interests of labor and of this country, will wipe us out at the next general election. We heard that prophecy four years ago from Missouri, and the gentle breezes of the next election gave us this House by nearly 2 to 1. We heard that prophecy from Missouri before the last election, and the cyclone that swept over the country swept McKinley into the White House. Oh, we do not worry about your prophecies! Ah, my friends, the blazing furnaces, the loaded trains, the whirl of wheels, the sturdy arms of busy labor, will answer your prophecies, and will bless the party that had the courage to attend to business and only to business, as we have been doing and are doing now. I ask for a vote, Mr. Speaker. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. McMILLIN. The yeas and nays.

Mr. HENDERSON. Let us have the yeas and nays, and save time.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 129, nays 101, answered "present" 10, not voting 113; as follows:

YEAS—129.

Alexander,	Curtis, Kans.	Hilborn,	Morris,
Babcock,	Davenport,	Hill,	Mudd,
Baker, Md.	Davidson, Wis.	Hitt,	Northway,
Bartholdt,	Davison, Ky.	Hopkins,	Olmsted,
Belden,	Dingley,	Howe,	Otjen,
Belford,	Dolliver,	Howell,	Overstreet,
Belknap,	Dorr,	Hull,	Parker, N. J.
Bennett,	Dovener,	Jenkins,	Payne,
Bingham,	Ellis,	Johnson, Ind.	Pearce, Mo.
Bishop,	Evans,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Pearson,
Booze,	Fenton,	Joy,	Perkins,
Bromwell,	Fletcher,	Kirkpatrick,	Pitney,
Brown,	Fowler, N. J.	Knox,	Prince,
Brownlow,	Gardner,	Lacey,	Pugh,
Brumm,	Gibson,	Landis,	Ray,
Burleigh,	Gillett, Mass.	Loud,	Reeves,
Burton,	Graff,	Low,	Robbins,
Butler,	Griffin,	Lybrand,	Royse,
Cannon,	Grosvenor,	McCall,	Russell,
Capron,	Hager,	McDonald,	Shannon,
Clarke, N. H.	Hamilton,	McEwan,	Shattuc,
Cochrane, N. Y.	Hawley,	McIntire,	Simpkins,
Coddling,	Heatwole,	Marsh,	Smith, Ill.
Colson,	Hemenway,	Mercer,	Smith, S. W.
Connolly,	Henderson,	Miller,	Snover,
Cousins,	Henry, Conn.	Mills,	Southard,
Crump,	Henry, Ind.	Minor,	Southwick,
Curtis, Iowa	Hepburn,	Moody,	Spalding,

Steele, Stevens, Minn. Stewart, N. J. Stewart, Wis. Stone, C. W.	Sulloway, Tawney, Updegraff, Walker, Va. Wanger,	Warner, Weaver, Weymouth, White, N. C. Wilson, N. Y.	Yost, Young, Pa.
--	--	--	---------------------

NAYS—101.

Adamson, Baird, Baker, Ill. Ball, Barlow, Bartlett, Bell, Bodine, Brantley, Brenner, Ohio Brewer, Broussard, Brucker, Brundidge, Burke, Campbell, Carmack, Clardy, Clark, Mo. Clayton, Cochran, Mo. Cooney, Cooper, Tex. Cowherd, Cox, De Armond,	De Graffenreid, De Vries, Dinsmore, Dockery, Ermentrout, Fitzpatrick, Fleming, Fox, Gaines, Griggs, Gunn, Handy, Henry, Miss. Henry, Tex. Hinrichsen, Howard, Ala. Jett, Jones, Wash. Kelley, King, Kleberg, Lamb, Lanham, Lentz, Lewis, Ga. Lewis, Wash.	Linney, Little, Lloyd, Love, McCormick, McCulloch, McDowell, McMillin, McRae, Maddox, Mahany, Martin, Meekison, Meyer, La. Miers, Ind. Moon, Osborne, Pierce, Tenn. Ploverman, Rhea, Richardson, Ridgely, Robb, Robertson, La. Robinson, Ind. Sayers,	Settle, Shafroth, Simpson, Sims, Smith, Ky. Stallings, Stark, Stokes, Tex. Strait, Sullivan, Sulzer, Swanson, Tate, Terry, Todd, Underwood, Vandiver, Vendler, Wheeler, Ky. Williams, Miss. Young, Va. Zenor.
--	--	--	--

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—10.

Bankhead, Barney, Benner, Pa.	Broderick, Clark, Iowa Cooper, Wis.	Crumpacker, Dalzell, McClellan,	Wheeler, Ala.
-------------------------------------	---	---------------------------------------	---------------

NOT VOTING—113.

Acheson, Adams, Allen, Arnold, Bailey, Barber, Barham, Barrett, Barrows, Beach, Benton, Berry, Bland, Botkin, Boutelle, Bradley, Brewster, Brosius, Bull, Castle, Catchings, Chickering, Connell, Corliss, Cranford, Cummings, Danford, Davey, Davis,	Dayton, Elliott, Epes, Farris, Fischer, Fitzgerald, Foote, Foss, Fowler, N. C. Gillet, N. Y. Greene, Grout, Grow, Harmer, Hartman, Hay, Hicks, Hooker, Howard, Ga. Hunter, Hurley, Jones, Va. Kerr, Ketcham, Kitchin, Knowles, Kulp, Latimer,	Lester, Littauer, Livingston, Lorimer, Loudenslager, Loving, McAleer, McCleary, Maguire, Mahon, Mann, Marshall, Maxwell, Mesick, Mitchell, Newlands, Norton, Odell, Ogden, Otey, Packer, Pa. Peters, Powers, Quigg, Rixey, Sauerhering, Shelden, Sherman, Showalter,	Shuford, Skinner, Slayden, Smith, Wm. Alden Sparkman, Sperry, Sprague, Stone, W. A. Strode, Nebr. Strowd, N. C. Sturtevant, Sutherland, Talbert, Taylor, Ohio Taylor, Ala. Tongue, Van Voorhis, Vincent, Wadsworth, Walker, Mass. Ward, White, Ill. Wilber, Williams, Pa. Wilson, S. C. Wright.
---	--	--	--

The following pairs were announced:
Until further notice:

- Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. DAVIS.
- Mr. BARRETT with Mr. CASTLE.
- Mr. BELDEN with Mr. LESTER.
- Mr. BEACH with Mr. HUNTER.
- Mr. BARHAM with Mr. SIMS.
- Mr. ODELL with Mr. DAVEY.
- Mr. GROW with Mr. RICHARDSON.
- Mr. HICKS with Mr. OTEY.
- Mr. HOOKER with Mr. CATCHINGS.
- Mr. BARROWS with Mr. MAGUIRE.
- Mr. MAHON with Mr. BENNER of Pennsylvania.
- Mr. SPRAGUE with Mr. EPES.
- Mr. STRODE of Nebraska with Mr. BENTON.
- Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE with Mr. MCCLELLAN.
- Mr. MITCHELL with Mr. HAY.
- Mr. BREWSTER with Mr. MAXWELL.
- Mr. CHICKERING with Mr. GREEN.
- Mr. EDDY with Mr. BERRY.
- Mr. VAN VOORHIS with Mr. MCALEER.
- Mr. WILBER with Mr. CRANFORD.
- Mr. BARNEY with Mr. SPARKMAN.
- Mr. SAUERHERING with Mr. NORTON.
- Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts with Mr. NORTON.
- Mr. MESICK with Mr. BREWER.
- Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. ELLIOTT.
- Mr. SPERRY with Mr. HOWARD of Georgia.
- Mr. CLARK of Iowa with Mr. MARSHALL.
- Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. SUTHERLAND.
- Mr. POWERS with Mr. LIVINGSTON.
- Mr. LOVERING with Mr. WHEELER of Alabama.
- Mr. WARD with Mr. TALBERT.
- Mr. ACHESON with Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
- Mr. COLSON with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. KITCHIN.
Mr. ADAMS with Mr. LATIMER.
Mr. HARMER with Mr. ALLEN.
Mr. FOSS with Mr. SLAYDEN.
Mr. DAYTON with Mr. JONES of Virginia.
Mr. LITTAUER with Mr. HUNTER.
Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. BANKHEAD.
For this day:
Mr. DALZELL with Mr. BAILEY.

On this vote:
Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire with Mr. HARTMAN.
Mr. BOUTELLE with Mr. CUMMINGS.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, Mr. EPES has been called away from the city on important business. Before going he requested me to say that if he were present, he would vote "no" on this question.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BAILEY, and I therefore withdraw my vote. I voted "aye."

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. BAILEY, has been called away from the city by the death of a friend. If he were present, he would vote "no."

Mr. BARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Florida, Mr. SPARKMAN. I am informed that he has not voted, and I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, finding that I am paired with the gentleman from New York, Mr. KETCHAM, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BRODERICK was recorded in the affirmative, but withdrew his vote and responded "present."

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. BENTON, is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote against this rule.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire whether Mr. LOVERING, of Massachusetts, has voted?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. He has not.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I have a pair with him, and therefore I have not voted. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "no."

Mr. CLARK of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I find that I have been paired by the Clerk with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. MARSHALL, and I therefore withdraw my vote. I voted "yea."

Mr. DOVENER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. DAYTON, is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. I was just outside of the railing, but inside of the room, and was expecting and desiring to vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Was the gentleman listening, and did he fail to hear his name called?

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. Listening to hear my name? I was not. The call passed me inadvertently.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman can not be permitted to record his vote.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.
Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker—
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution will be read. The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., First. That the President is hereby authorized to appoint a monetary commission of eleven members, who shall be persons specially fitted, by experience, training, and study, for the consideration of subjects coming before said commission.

Second. Said commission shall investigate and report what changes, if any, are necessary and expedient in our present banking and currency laws, and what further legislation, if any, is desirable relative to our national banking system and our Government paper currency of notes and certificates, and may in connection therewith report a codification of existing laws on these subjects.

Third. Said commission may take testimony and listen to arguments, in their discretion, and may require, and shall be entitled to receive, information from any Department or office, etc., of the Government on any matter within its or his special jurisdiction and coming within the scope of their investigations.

Fourth. Said commission shall meet for organization in the city of Washington at such time as the President may appoint, and may hold their subsequent sessions at such times and places as they may determine, and shall report to the President, for transmission to Congress, not later than November 15, 1897.

Fifth. Copies of all bills relating to banking and currency or the circulating notes of the Government presented in either House of Congress during the Fifty-fourth Congress and the first session of the Fifty-fifth Congress shall be furnished by the Clerks of said Houses, respectively, to the commission hereby created.

Sixth. That there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$100,000, or so much thereof as shall be necessary, for the compensation of said commission and for all reasonable expenses connected therewith, to be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, including the compensation of such clerks, stenographers, and typewriters as may necessarily be employed.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution seeks to embody in concise and comprehensive form the recommendation of the President of the United States. To gentlemen who have said that the President has been dilatory in this matter,

I desire to say that in his first official utterance and in the discussion of the very first subject therein dealt with he calls attention to this question and suggests the formation of a commission, such as this resolution contemplates, and, with a frankness characteristic of the man, with directness and clearness of purpose, he states the exact time when he desires that this subject shall be considered. In the President's inaugural address, near the opening of it, he says:

With adequate revenue secured, but not until then, we can enter upon such changes in our fiscal laws, etc.

"With adequate revenue secured, and not until then," is the time, and not until within the last two hours have we been certain that adequate revenue would be secured, and immediately, as soon as adequate revenue is secured, the President of the United States, in good faith, asks the Congress of the United States to proceed to the next question in which the people of this country are interested, namely, the propriety or necessity of a revision of the fiscal laws of the nation.

That some revision is necessary we will all concede. About what is necessary many of us will differ. The present banking and currency system of this nation was the outgrowth of the war, called into existence to meet certain exigencies and under exceptional circumstances. The national banking system was designed very largely, in the first instance, to afford a market for the bonds of the nation at a time when a market was necessary. And it served that purpose completely and well. It has given to this nation a perfectly safe system. But it is rigid in many of its qualities: and it has not adapted itself perfectly to the rapid changes and developments of a great and progressive nation. It has not grown as fast as the nation has grown: and some changes in it are necessary.

The system of national paper currency, originating with the greenback as an emergency measure in the war, has come to embrace five kinds of paper money, each differing from the others, each having qualities peculiar to itself, and some of them possibly endangering the credit of the nation—some of them anomalous in character, such as are known and used by no other nation, and which have proved a matter of inconvenience, if not danger, in the administration of the Government.

Mr. BRUCKER. Will the gentleman allow a question for information?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I have made such promises as to the disposition of my little time that I must decline to yield.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not blind to the fact that there are many men who believe that there is something in the currency system of this country that imperils the safety, I may say, of our financial system—something that affords one of the forces that delay the return of prosperity. I do not myself share to any great extent in that belief. I rather believe that, with a tariff essentially American in its character upon the statute books, with abundant revenue secured, with the spectacle presented to the world of this country paying off and diminishing rather than increasing its debt, our credit will be so established abroad and the confidence of the people will become so firmly fixed at home that the wheels of industry will revolve and prosperity return.

But I know there are many men who believe differently. I know there are men who maintain there is something necessary to be done in relation to our financial system; and it is a fact that the man who believes himself sick is just as much in need of treatment as the one who is actually sick. The hypochondriac is just as wretched himself and just as useless in the community as the confirmed invalid. If there is anything wrong in our system, if there is anything defective in the currency of the country, it is well that we should know it and the proper remedy be applied. If there is nothing essentially defective, if the system is safe, then it is well that the people of this country should understand this in a way that they will believe it.

Now, how are we to accomplish this? Are we to do it simply by the investigations of the Secretary of the Treasury and by acting upon his report? Successive Secretaries of the Treasury have commented upon the system, pointed out the particulars in which they think some legislation should be enacted. Yet their suggestions have received no practical attention either from Congress or from the country. Shall we rest simply upon the action of committees of the two Houses? You know and I know that session after session the committees of both Houses charged with these matters have deliberated and reported, yet nothing has gone upon the statute books.

Is it not essential, is it not proper, that some measure should be adopted which shall attract the attention of the people of the country and arouse their confidence in such a way that they shall press upon Congress for whatever is necessary to be done in relation to the matter?

The proposition of this bill is not that we shall delegate to any commission our functions, but simply that we shall call in to our assistance, that the President of the United States shall call in to

his assistance as well, the best minds throughout the country, for the purpose of gathering up information and making suggestions.

The proposition is that we lift this question above the sphere of party politics, that we create a commission nonpartisan in its character, composed of men best fitted to deal with the question, to investigate and make recommendations: that we shall not leave the matter simply to a committee of this House composed mainly of lawyers; that we shall not leave it to the Secretary of the Treasury, a banker; but that we shall invite the cooperation of the level-headed business men of this country and ask from them what their verdict is as to whether this system needs revision, or does not, and if it does need revision, in what respect it needs it. And when that report is presented, it will go to our committee for their review and come to us for our final action.

That is all the proposition embraced in this resolution. That is all that is sought to be done. We seek simply to gather the necessary information, and to gather it at a time when committees of this House can not gather it, and to have it here on the threshold of the meeting of this body next December. We seek to disseminate information throughout the country and to form a healthy public sentiment which shall determine possibly the will and wishes and convictions of the people based on knowledge, based on the investigation of experts, based on the research of level-headed men, and not subject to the prejudice that naturally arises in the minds of the people against any proposition tinged with partisan politics.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to what particular changes are necessary, in what respect this system can be improved, this resolution involves no question and no consideration. Any particular financial scheme may be presented to the commission when formed. No particular project is involved in this proposition. We simply propose to open the door for anyone to come and present to a commission of high character, one commanding the confidence of the people, their various schemes and plans, to be winnowed by the commission, which will send to us the wheat and not the chaff.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, in the short time that I have (and I have given it nearly all away, and am perfectly willing to give the rest of it) I want to call the attention of the House to the main proposition submitted here. To speak with perfect candor, there is not a man in this House who believes that this measure will become a law. There is not a member of this House who believes that at this session of Congress this resolution can obtain the force of law. There must be, then, some other object in bringing it forward now. It does not go out as a part of the platform of the Republican party, it goes out as a suggestion made by the President in his letter of acceptance.

Now, let us understand clearly and distinctly what it is proposed to do. I have no disposition whatever to make a political talk about this question. Gentlemen on the other side of the House know, and I know, that if this proposition carried with it the idea of retiring the greenbacks it could never pass this House. But you propose to create a commission, composed of eleven men, to go over this country from place to place with their clerks and their assistants, to do what? Simply to take the judgment and the opinion of other men. That is all there is in it. You have one commission roving in Europe to-day. Now you propose to create another commission—a body of eleven men to be selected by the President.

Now, let me submit this question: Suppose we should be fortunate enough, by means of the commission now in Europe, to bring about the restoration of silver. Is there any man who will not recognize at once that such a conclusion reached would have a great bearing on this question? Now, suppose this commission started on its road, and suppose at the same time the commission in Europe should be fortunate enough to reach a conclusion, which one of these commissions is first to report here? Who is to bring the question before the House for its consideration? If they should fail in Europe, and no result is reached, what is your commission here to do? If they should succeed in Europe, and we could restore silver as a part of the currency of this country, why would not that be the great fundamental principle underlying every currency reform that might be suggested?

Mr. Speaker, the whole matter lies in this: In the time that I have served in Congress on the Committee on Banking and Currency I can not state how many men we had before us with regard to this question, but probably two or three hundred of the very best and ablest we could select in the country. They gave us an opinion on the question, each one of them, and it is an astonishing fact that developed itself, and one that I repeat here now, and which my brother members on the committee will not hesitate to indorse, that outside of the banking interests we have never been able to have two men before our committee who agreed on any single proposition. That will not be contradicted by any member of the committee. And more startling, sir, in six years' experience on that committee I have not seen three members of the committee who agreed on any proposition.

Now, who is it you want? Where is the man? Why, you have

ample time to bring every one of them that you may wish to examine before the committee. But instead of that you propose to appropriate \$100,000 for a certain roving commission, when the honest duty of the member of Congress is to handle the question himself to the best of his ability.

Now, if you wish to deal with the conditions that exist, you have the power yourself, and should take the responsibility that properly belongs to you.

I do not desire to consume any more time. You gentlemen do not want this resolution passed; but it is your President that wants it passed, and you are afraid to make the issue with him. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I consumed?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed five minutes.

Mr. COX. That is the time that I intended to consume. I suppose somebody on the other side will follow.

The SPEAKER. The other side has consumed ten minutes.

Mr. COX. If gentlemen desire to speak now, we will not have any trouble about that.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. We desire to consume our time on this side. If the gentleman does not wish to proceed—

Mr. COX. Oh, well, I will yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ]. We will put two together, and you will find trouble enough to answer one.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we ought for a moment stop and ask ourselves why this resolution comes now, or rather these instructions, if you may so call them, of the President of the United States. In his statement to this body he used this language:

This subject should receive the attention of Congress at the special session. It ought not to be postponed until the regular session.

Your chief, the President, has found some good reasons, at this eleventh hour, to present these instructions. Is it possible that after he has seen what his side of this Congress has done on the sugar schedule he has lost confidence in the majority, both of the House and Senate, and has decided that all the legislation of the country should go to commissioners to be appointed by himself?

On page 492 of his volume of speeches and addresses President McKinley criticised Mr. Cleveland in these words:

When in office, and clothed with authority, he was unwilling that sugar, an article of prime necessity to every household, should come untaxed to the American people, when it was known that it was an annual burden upon them of some \$60,000,000.

I say, therefore, that the President, seeing the Republican members of these two bodies running riot with the sugar trust, and with almost everything else that they handle, declares that he has no confidence in the majority of this legislative body.

And there is other evidence that he has no confidence left in the majority party of either House or Senate. They were not permitted to deal with the question or intrusted with legislation with reference to Cuban affairs because of some good and sufficient reason in the judgment of the king. You were not permitted to legislate on the bankruptcy question because of some good and sufficient reason in the judgment of the king.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LENTZ. I had three minutes more yielded to me by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON]. I will use one or two of them, and leave the rest for the gentleman from Alabama.

You were not intrusted with legislation on the great question of pensions, although you have thousands and tens of thousands of invalid pensions pending and applications and petitions for general legislation on that subject. Has it come to this? The tariff bill was not a bill that resulted from any act of legislation. It was a star-chamber measure, framed over at the Arlington Hotel, and not at the Capitol of the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You were not trusted or permitted to legislate on the tariff; you could not be trusted to legislate on the Cuban question; you could not be intrusted by the President with the bankruptcy question or the question of pensions, and now it seems you can not be trusted to deal with the money question. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In the name of God, how soon shall we have a commission to select some good man for the Presidency for life, and his offspring to become the heirs to the throne, in this miserable trust-ridden country?

That is the issue that is made at this last hour. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the declaration of the President of the United States, that the 450 men in these two legislative bodies are not wise enough, although they come from the Congressional districts, and the 45 States of the Union, that they have neither brains nor character enough, in the majority side of these two great legislative bodies, to be intrusted with the most important measure before the people of the American Continent, aye, before the people of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

How much of the time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] did I use, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has one minute remaining. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX] had yielded to his colleague [Mr. RICHARDSON] three minutes, and that he yielded the time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ].

Mr. COX. I yielded three minutes to my colleague [Mr. RICHARDSON], and he yielded the time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ] has one minute left.

Mr. LENTZ. I yield that to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] is recognized for one minute.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I have two minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this country is controlled—

The SPEAKER. One moment. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] says he has two minutes. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX] yield to him one minute?

Mr. COX. Yes; but I was trying to get some gentleman on the other side to proceed first.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] has two minutes.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this country is controlled by men who live upon 4 acres of land. One-half of the wealth of our country, by the grace of Republican laws, is now owned by so few men that they could rest comfortably under the roof of this building.

Trusts and combinations of wealth have become the ruling power where there once reigned a spirit of liberty and equal rights. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, what a change has come upon us?

When a champion of the 70,000,000 freemen rises in this Hall to speak in their defense or to contend for their rights, it is resented by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], who rises in his seat and says that the defenders of the American people are trying to array the successful against the unsuccessful.

You all remember the tariff commission of 1882. It worked during all the summer of that year, and recommended a reduction of 20 per cent in tariff rates. You met here in December, 1882, and on March 3, 1883, you enacted a law disregarding all their recommendations, and you largely increased instead of reduced taxation.

You remember the Electoral Commission which by a vote of 8 to 7 reversed the expressed mandate of the American people. You now propose to submit this important question to eleven bankers. They will be men possessed of great wealth which they hold in money and bonds, and we all know that it will be to their interest to prevent any increase, and, if possible, to effect a reduction in the amount of money in our country. Their first effort will be to retire the \$346,000,000 greenbacks. The tendency of this will be to add to their wealth and power, but it will reduce prices and lessen the income of the producing masses.

Why was this resolution sent to this House after we had voted upon and passed a resolution to finally adjourn at 9 o'clock to-night? It will be near that hour before it can pass the House and reach the Senate, and every member of this body knows that the resolution will not be considered or even read to that body.

Why, Mr. Speaker, such trifling as this when there is distress among so many of the honest toilers of our land?

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand to-day's New York Journal, from which I read:

Died, aged 13 months. Cause, starvation. Father out of work for seventeen weeks.

Strikes all over our land. Strikes spreading and starvation and death among people who are out of work.

Where is the prosperity the people were promised?

Why these notices all over every city and hamlet in our land: To rent—to rent—for sale—for sale—marshals' sales—sheriffs' sales?

This is the picture in a land once so happy and prosperous. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHARLES W. STONE] desire to occupy time now?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the first declaration of the Republican party at St. Louis was for a protective tariff.

That promise has been fulfilled.

The second, but no less important, utterance was that "the Republican party is unreservedly for sound money," and it supplemented its statement of financial policy by the explicit promise to "favor all measures designed to maintain inviolable the obligations of the United States and all our money, whether coin or paper, at the present standard—the standard of the most enlightened nations of the earth."

Upon these two pledges the battle was fought and the victory won.

With either issue stricken from the platform, or evaded on the stump, we can now see that the result would have been at least uncertain.

To-day, bound by our sense of honor to our party associates, in fulfillment of the promises repeated again and again during the campaign to the men who abandoned their former party allegiance, we are called upon to take a first step in putting "our financial system upon an enduring basis, where it shall not be subject to easy attack or its stability open to doubt or dispute."

Who can question the wisdom of this course, or fairly claim that no action is needed now?

We have hardly rested from the hottest political fight which this country has ever seen, when the issue is again raised in every State where elections will be held this fall.

Through all these long months of tariff agitation, differing, as our opponents have on that subject, with united voice they have declared their purpose to continue the contest on the old lines and pledge anew their devotion to the "lost cause" of the independent free coinage of silver at 16 to 1.

The Republican party can not decline the challenge thus made and expect to hold the allegiance of its own members who believe this to be the most important issue of the day, nor can they lightly pass it by in the hope that those who came to us on this issue alone will forget the purpose of their coming in the awakening activities of industrial life which we believe will result from tariff legislation.

For our own sakes and theirs—yes, more than either, for the country's sake—we must meet this question squarely, and meet it now.

It will not answer for us to claim that with the operation of the tariff law just passed the dangers to which this nation has been exposed for the past four years will be removed, and that from this time onward the weakness in our financial system will be hidden or obscured by a renewed prosperity.

The dangers passed and disaster escaped should teach us now to be still more determined that such things shall not be possible in our future course.

The President of the United States, at the opening of this extra session of Congress, said, "Our financial system needs some revision," and when he said it he voiced the opinion of men of all parties. The question he asks us to decide now is not What shall be done, but shall anything be done?

It is not a question as to whether this bill points out the best and wisest course to pursue.

I am free to say that I do not think it does; but it is infinitely preferable to no action whatever, and, as a step in the right direction, I give it my hearty support.

I am not one of those who believe that a radical revolution of national finances and banking methods and systems is either necessary or desirable, but that as we have come step by step into present conditions, so step by step we should go back to the bed rock of sound money, with gold as the legal tender, silver as subsidiary coinage, a national-bank currency with the law modified and liberalized, but without endangering the safety of the note issues, with Government supervision without responsibility for redemption over all banking institutions which, under our laws, are allowed to issue notes to circulate as money among the people of this country.

But I recognize the fact that there is no question to-day about which more men differ, or on which all men differ more, than on this very one of currency and banking methods; and when the Executive of this nation declares his purpose, as he did in his inaugural—

If vested with such power, to appoint a commission of prominent, well-informed citizens of different parties who will command public confidence, both on account of their ability and special fitness for the work of revising our coinage and banking and currency laws and giving them that exhaustive, careful, and dispassionate examination that their importance demands—

I propose not only to give my vote for it, but my earnest cooperation in every way toward securing the best possible results.

While I am of the opinion that a joint commission of Presidential and Congressional appointment would be more successful in securing the enactment of its conclusions into law, I am at the same time forced by observation and experience to accept the conclusion that such a commission as proposed will be far more effective in educating the voters of the land not only upon the question at issue, but upon the all-important one of so casting their votes as to send to both branches of Congress such men as will render it possible to have any law enacted looking to improved conditions.

And, after all, Mr. Speaker, this is the task before us.

It is among the people that the work must be begun and carried on, for no reform of the currency or reorganization of the banking system is possible until a Congress reformed and reorganized in both branches is sent here under instructions from the people.

Let me illustrate.

I stand here to-day a Representative from a State in which a year ago both political parties declared for a single standard of value, and that standard gold, and from a district that not only through its Republican convention explicitly indorsed that declaration, but ratified it at the polls by 15,000 majority, after a full discussion of this specific issue in the fall campaign.

Can there be any possible doubt as to my vote upon the financial question here?

The responsibility resting upon me to represent the views of my constituents I believe is held to be equally sacred by the other members of both Houses, for I think that the Rocky Mountain statesmanship, which shapes its political views with each new location of a mining camp, or the Democratic free trader, who by his vote helps to raise the duty on articles in which he is personally interested, and then on principle votes against a completed Republican tariff bill, is exceedingly scarce in Congress.

And because I believe that this work of education must first be done outside of the Halls of Congress, and when done there, that the vote here will follow as a matter of course, I favor this proposition to select the commission anywhere in the world, and with unlimited authority for action, in accordance with the terms of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the 24th day of July, 1897, will be remembered in American history as the day upon which the Dingley tariff bill became a law, a bill which, I believe, will not only afford sufficient revenue for the nation's needs, but will at the same time help to maintain the American scale of wages and the American standard of living and protect and preserve the American home.

If now, upon this same day, the Republican party can inaugurate a policy which will guarantee to the American workmen the payment of those wages in the best money in the world, we may well congratulate ourselves upon the auspicious ending of this extra session. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this resolution because I am opposed to this Congress publicly abdicate the authority that was delegated to it by the people. I think it would be more in conformity with a free Government if, instead of acknowledging our incapacity publicly in this way in a bill passed by this House, admitting that we are unable to understand, to grapple with this great financial question, it would be better for us to resign our power back to our constituents who gave it to us.

But it is entirely in line with the action of the majority in this House since we have assembled. We have seen the majority delegate to the Speaker the power that the people gave to them, making the Speaker the sole arbiter of legislation in this House. I am sorry that the time is so limited. I regret that I did not have ample warning of what was coming up, in order that I might have prepared an essay, like the gentleman who has preceded me. [Laughter.] But I want to offer just a few remarks in an offhand way, without any pretension to delivering an essay at all. I hope and trust that some good may come out of this measure. I hope that the commission to be appointed as the result of this measure, if we get one appointed by the President, will succeed in enlightening him and in discovering where he stands upon this financial question. When he was in Congress, he voted for the Bland Act for the free coinage of silver.

Mr. GAINES. And voted to pass it over the President's veto.

Mr. SIMPSON. He voted to pass it over the President's veto anyhow, and he also helped to frame a straddle platform in Ohio, so as to make the people think he stood for the free coinage of silver. Later on he allowed them to ram a gold-standard platform down his throat. I hope this commission will be able to enlighten him and to find out where he stands, so that this Administration may have some permanent abiding place on the financial question.

Who will this commission be that the President will appoint? Will they be men who have the general interests of the country at heart? They will not be, gentlemen, and you know it. They will be men selected from the marts of trade, from the banking institutions of the country, whose every interest is on the money changers' side; who have no interest except to increase the purchasing power of the dollar and increase the interest they receive. There is only one question on which they will agree when they come together, and it is the retirement of the greenbacks and the substitution of bank paper, and they will be the bankers who will issue the paper.

We will be asked to give up the old greenbacks, issued by the Government, in the interest of a lot of bankers who hope to control the volume of currency of this country and increase it or diminish it at will in order to enrich themselves. The men who will compose that commission will not be in the interest of those who produce the wealth of the country with which they purchase dollars and whose interest it is to have dollars cheap instead of dear, but the commission will be composed of men whose interest it is to have them dearer. So I say it is impossible to get a

nonpartisan commission. That is the objection; and I hope, Mr. Speaker, the resolution will not pass. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. COX. Does some one on the other side desire to speak?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. The gentleman will exhaust his time.

Mr. COX. I yield three minutes to my colleague [Mr. CARMACK].

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite likely that some such resolution as this would have been entirely proper if it had come at the right time and in the regular order. But before the President of the United States proposes to take the duties of this Congress out of its hands and have them delegated to a commission he should have first created another commission, to inquire into the mental condition of this House and determine whether or not it was competent to discharge the duties imposed on it by the Constitution and the law. I think it very likely that if such a commission had been appointed, its report would have proved some justification for the resolution now before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose, in the short time allotted to me, to enter into any discussion of the merits of this resolution; but I simply want to state what seems to me one vital objection. The gentleman from Iowa on my left [Mr. HENDERSON] declared in his remarks that it was not contemplated in this resolution that the commission should prepare a scheme for retiring the greenbacks and Treasury notes or for the destruction of our coined silver or to do anything at all in particular; that it was, in fact, left entirely free, untrammelled, and uninstructed. Now, one objection, I think, to this resolution is that it does not undertake to instruct the commission which is to be appointed by the President. The report of this commission in order to be effective must have some show of being enacted into law by Congress. Now, we remember, Mr. Speaker, some years ago the President of the United States appointed a tariff commission, or a commission to revise the tariff; and that commission made the mistake of supposing that the Republican party, then in power, really desired that we should have such a revision of the tariff as would make taxation just and equal.

They reported a scheme for a reduction of the tariff 20 per cent; and when the recommendations of that commission came into Congress, they were treated with contempt. They were spurned out of this House, and no trace of those recommendations have ever been found in any tariff bill enacted by the Republican party. Now, what I say is this: If this commission is to be appointed, this House should undertake to lay down certain lines, not with exactness or absolute precision, but certain general lines for the guidance and instruction of the commission, so that it can bring back a report that will stand some chance of being framed into law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARMACK. I have two minutes that were yielded to me by another gentleman.

Mr. COX. Two minutes that were assigned to another member have been yielded to my colleague.

Mr. CARMACK. To that end, Mr. Speaker, I have a suggestion in the form of an amendment which I desire to offer to this House, and especially to gentlemen on the other side. It is this:

The commission, in preparing a scheme of currency reform, shall proceed along the lines laid down in the financial plank of the Democratic platform adopted at Chicago in 1896.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

And they shall especially include the restoration of the system of bimetallism by the free, independent, and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the other side of the House will consent to have this added to the resolution now pending, I for one will vote for it. I will pledge them several votes on this side of the House. I think that they can have it by unanimous consent; and I desire to ask, Mr. Speaker, if at any stage of these proceedings it would be in order to offer this as an amendment to the resolution?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. CARMACK. Can not it be done, Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. The House can do almost anything by unanimous consent.

Mr. CARMACK. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent [laughter on the Republican side] that this amendment be added to the resolution now at the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to offer an amendment which he has read to the House. Is there objection?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. CARMACK. I asked unanimous consent for its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put it in that form. Is there objection to the adoption of the amendment suggested by the gentleman?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. It is whether or not it is in order to move to recommit the pending resolution to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report a substitute—another proposition—in its place?

The SPEAKER. It certainly is not in order at present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I did not hear the remark of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair states that it is not in order at present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Will it be in order at the conclusion of the debate?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not examined that question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Well, I give notice that I desire to move to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the substitute which I hold in my hand and which I would like to have read now for the information of the House.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. That is not in order at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER. Let us have it read.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That is what I want, and I propose at the proper time to move to recommit the joint resolution with instructions to report this substitute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not the floor now. He stated that he rose to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute be now read for the information of the House.

Several members objected.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman at the proper time will have a right to move to recommit. That is his right under the rule.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I suppose I will have that right if I can get recognition.

Mr. McMILLIN. You are entitled to recognition, and will get it of course.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I am not so sure about that [laughter], but I think I am entitled to it.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen will be in order. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!" on the Republican side.]

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if it would be in order to offer an amendment postponing the operation of this proposed legislation until we hear from the bimetallic commission that is now junketing through Europe, so that we may procure the consent of foreign nations to this legislation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX] has the floor.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHARLES W. STONE] if there is anyone on his side who desires to be heard?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Yes, sir. We prefer that the gentleman should exhaust his time, if he desires to do so. We have a right to close the debate.

Mr. COX. Very well; although I do not think it makes much difference who closes. I now yield three minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEWIS]. [Derisive applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, my appearance is applauded by my friends on my right, and surely when they applaud me I must be wrong [applause]; but nevertheless I express to them ungrudgingly my sincere appreciation of their testimonial of, I trust, unaffected friendship. [Laughter.]

Conscious as I am, Mr. Speaker, that a question of this sort is weakened rather than strengthened by fragmentary discourse, and as the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX] has given me permission to parcel out the time which he has allowed me, and being likewise conscious of the ability of the distinguished gentleman from Colorado to give to this House more edification and more information upon this question than I can possibly bring to bear, I willingly yield my time to the Hon. Mr. SHAFROTH. [Applause.]

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to say anything upon this subject until the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] announced his interpretation of what was intended by this joint resolution. He announced that the real meaning of it was the establishment of what he terms "sound money," with gold as the only primary money, with silver as subsidiary coin, and with paper money redeemable in gold. I concede, Mr. Speaker, that that is the true intent and meaning of this joint resolution.

I have no doubt that the purpose, the object, of the resolution is to fasten upon the people the single gold standard; but it seems to me, sir, that in attempting to do this you had better wait until your bimetallic commission which is now in Europe can have an opportunity to ascertain whether we can get the consent of one or two of the European nations to adopt a bimetallic system. Mr. Speaker, if the policy which is outlined in this joint resolution, as interpreted by the gentleman from Connecticut, is to be the policy of the Republican party, then they had better repeal the resolution or act which was passed establishing that commission.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the adoption of the joint resolution.

Mr. COX. Our time on this side is not exhausted, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago this country was in the midst of one of the greatest panics that it has ever endured. The people began a campaign of education. This is the people's Government. The people have a right to control all that is done through their representatives. Yet, notwithstanding that, if I believed this campaign of education would go on along the lines demanded, I would forego even that objection.

But, sir, I know, and every member on the floor of this House knows, that if this commission is appointed as proposed, it will simply be a companion piece by the side of the tariff bill that has just gone into force—enacted wholly in favor of the trusts; and this would be conducted in the interest of the gold standard and a contracted currency. Instead of the people—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. If gentlemen on the other side decline to speak further, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HANDY].

Mr. HANDY. Mr. Speaker, I can see very readily that our friends on the other side are anxious to vote. They are tired of this debate; but I wish to occupy the three minutes that have been given to me in a way that ought to be pleasant for them. I will use the time in extending gentle and sincere sympathy to gentlemen on the other side who have been so hard hit by their President. The message received this afternoon from the President is in effect a stern and severe condemnation of the whole course pursued by the Republican majority in this House during this whole session. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The President says in his message that currency reform is a very important matter; yet my friends across the aisle throughout the whole session have neglected it, as if it were of no importance.

The President says that he called attention to this subject in his inaugural address; yet for four months and a half you have neglected to heed that warning. The President in his message says that there was nothing more clearly settled at the last national election than the principles involved in the money question; yet you gentlemen have treated the last election as if it were altogether a tariff victory. The President says in his message read this afternoon that the country strongly favors this legislation; yet you gentlemen have acted as though the country favored high taxes and nothing else. The President says that this matter ought to be attended to before we adjourn, that it ought not to be postponed; yet the gentlemen on the other side propose in effect to postpone it, for they know perfectly well that this resolution can not be passed by both Houses of Congress. We are now within three hours of final adjournment. The summer is done, the harvest is ended, and the monetary commission is not saved.

As a result, you have the whole tenor of this message of the President condemning your whole course. Gentlemen, it is too bad! You are entitled to better treatment than that. You have been very submissive; you have been humble and meek; you have followed your leaders like good little boys. It is too bad that you have now to go home with the seal of condemnation set upon you in this formal manner by your great national leader—the President of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It moves me to a tender sympathy. I am a gentle-hearted man, and I pity you—truly I do. You have worked hard to please; you have been patient; you have submitted to all kinds of indignity in this House, and you go home bearing upon you the simple stamp, "You have failed to do your duty; you have not given to the country this monetary commission demanded by the President." Too bad, gentlemen, too bad! [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Now, so far as I am concerned, I am ready for the vote.

Mr. COX. What time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Two minutes.

Mr. COX. I yield those two minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am resolved to vote for the pending measure or something akin to it. I shall do so because the withholding of my vote from it might be understood to mean that I am not in sympathy with banking and currency legislation, which is not the case. But I do not wish my vote to be construed into an indorsement of this crude measure or of the

circumstances—particularly the time—of its being brought before the House for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to pass any measure of this character in this House—and everybody understands that this measure is in articulo mortis, and that if we pass it it will die before it reaches the Senate—if we are going to pass anything as an expression of our sympathy for banking and currency legislation, it should be made in details as nearly perfect as possible.

I am opposed to this measure because it vests entirely in the Chief Executive the selection of the commission. Inasmuch as Congress is to be the great factor in enacting the legislation which it is presumed will grow out of this investigation, it is the right of Congress to exercise some authority along with the President in making the selection of these commissioners. The Speaker of this House and the official head of the Senate of the United States should be vested with the power of selecting some of them. [Applause.]

Not only that, but in my humble opinion, if this commission is to be appointed for our information, members of the House and the Senate should not abdicate altogether the right to take part in the initiative, and the commission should in part consist of Representatives and Senators. The commission, too, ought to have upon it representatives from each of the great political parties. For the reason that these matters are not therein provided for, I think this is a crude measure. It ought to be amended in these particulars; and with that object in view—to the end, as I have said, that if it should pass it may be as perfect inherently as it can be made—I desire to move, in good faith, that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to amend the same by substituting the proposition which I now offer; and I ask unanimous consent that it may be read to its conclusion.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I rise to a point of order. No amendment is in order at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Is it in order to have the proposed amendment read in my time? I ask that that be done.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. If the gentleman has any time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I never had any evidence by the fall of the gavel that my time was out, and I supposed it had not expired.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Then I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I have no objection to the reading.

Mr. DOCKERY. There is no objection on this side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. It has been submitted to high Treasury officials and approved by them.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHARLES W. STONE] withdraw his point of order?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I do not. I simply assented to the amendment being read, although the gentleman has stated the purport of it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that his proposed amendment be read. Is their objection?

Mr. SHATTUC. I object.

Mr. SWANSON. If gentlemen on the other side decline to occupy the whole of their time, I do not see why the gentleman from Indiana, if he desires, should not occupy a part of it in having his proposition read.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I do not desire any time for discussion. I asked time for debate and was denied it. I simply obtained the floor for the purpose of moving in good faith that the joint resolution be recommitted, in order that my proposition may be reported back as a substitute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHARLES W. STONE] has not declined to use his time.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I desire to say now, as a matter of fact, that when the gentleman came to me and asked time I simply said to him that I could give him only two or three minutes, and he said he did not want it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Will the gentleman be candid? I went to him and said that I should be forced to vote for the measure, but that I expected to express myself freely on the floor as a representative of the people. Before I said that, he was willing to give me plenty of time; after that he suddenly discovered that he could yield me only two or three minutes. Regarding this as a makeshift proposition, I desired an opportunity to so stigmatize it on the floor; but the gentleman from Pennsylvania very conveniently denied me the opportunity to do so. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] has before placed his word against other men's word on this floor, and with unfortunate results, in my judgment.

I assert now most positively that I never tendered to the gentleman from Indiana any time more than the two or three minutes

which I yielded to him. I told him that the time had been promised to other members—

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Let me ask the gentleman—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Then he should not abuse the privilege of the floor.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. And I am content to leave the matter just there. I think gentlemen sitting around heard both the request and the reply; but whether they did or not, this is a mere statement of the facts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The gentleman thinks it necessary to verify his statement. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I did not understand the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I stated that the gentleman seems to be inclined to verify his statements by testimony. Now, I am quite sure that the House will accept my statement. If it is to be a question of personal veracity, however, I will be very glad to make the issue with the gentleman.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I am not going to dignify the matter by further reference to it. I have stated the facts as they exist; there I will leave the matter.

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY].

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this resolution for three reasons. First, because the President of the United States has requested the creation of such a commission by Congress with a view to aiding the Executive and Congress in the right solution of this difficult monetary question.

I shall vote for the resolution, in the second place, and largely, for the reason that the business men of the country, the men who are little accustomed to engage in political disputes and who are little accustomed to appear before committees of Congress, have so largely asked that such a commission should be created. I think the judgment and the views of such men who carry on the great industrial and business operations of the country should not be lightly regarded in such a particular as this.

And I shall vote for the resolution, in the third place, because I think the information that will come from the investigation by such a commission of experts as is contemplated by the provisions of the joint resolution will be of immense value to us as members of the House, to Senators as members of the Senate, and to the President, as well as to the various departments of the Government.

I am not one of those who take the view that whenever Congress endeavors to obtain information outside of its own membership with reference to intricate and important matters of government, such as the monetary problems offer, it is a confession of ignorance of the question on our part. On the contrary, I am sure that the men who know most about the problems with which this resolution deals are the most earnest for any further information that can be obtained from every other possible source.

It is only those who have but a surface knowledge of the question who seem to draw the inference that to seek information from outside is a confession of ignorance. Neither is it an abandonment of our right to legislate when we commit to a commission the investigation of many of the details of the subject with which we are afterwards to deal.

There is no more intricate subject connected with governmental affairs than that of the currency. There is no subject on which we can obtain additional light with greater benefit to ourselves than that relating to the monetary system. Everything that can throw light on this question is of importance, and all that is sought to be obtained through the agency of the commission is new light and new information upon the question.

It is believed that a commission of experts can furnish us with useful information, which will be referred to the appropriate committees of the House, and to be considered as all other business is considered in the two Houses of Congress. When we have obtained such information, I am sure we shall all be better prepared at the next session of Congress to enter upon the consideration of these important problems.

I hope, therefore, that the resolution may be agreed to, and, while in some points of view I should have preferred such a mixed commission as that suggested by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], yet under all the circumstances, in view of the existing conditions, with the objections which I know lie in the minds of many members of the House and the Senate to mixed commissions, it seems to be on the whole wisest and best to seek in this manner from experts the information which may be added to the stock of information we now possess, coming as it will from the business men of the country. Hence I shall support the resolution, and hope it will pass.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have five minutes remaining.

I desire to say simply in relation to the organization of the proposed commission, that the matter has received very careful consideration, and in view of the fact that the President of the United States has taken on himself the responsibility for this proposition by recommending the creation of such a commission, and has re-enforced the recommendation by a special message, it seems proper to vest in him the power to appoint the commissioners.

It is a project for which he is largely responsible, and it seems to me perfectly proper that he should have the power to put in proper force the measure which he has fathered. As to representation from this body on the commission, I desire simply to say that the phraseology is that which was adopted in relation to the commission to consider the question of international bimetalism, and under that the President of the United States saw fit to select one member out of three from the Senate of the United States.

There is nothing in this resolution that prevents his selecting every man on that commission from the House of Representatives or from the Senate. It being, as I said, a measure which was proposed by the President, it is perfectly proper that he should have the broadest power under it, and as the gentleman from Connecticut has said, he may appoint this commission from anywhere in the world. Wherever he can get the best talent and the highest ability, let him go for his commissioners.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question, in view of something I have heard from the other side of this House. I have heard gentlemen on the other side of this House denouncing this proposition because it looks to that kind of legislation that would result in the redemption and retirement of the greenbacks that they are now so much in love with. Now, I want to ask the gentleman if he remembers a plank in the Democratic platform of 1876? If he will allow me, I will read it:

We denounce the improvidence which, in eleven years of peace, has taken from the people in Federal taxes thirteen times the whole amount of the legal-tender notes, and squandered four times their sum in useless expenditure, without accumulating any reserve for their redemption.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

That was the Democratic platform of twenty years ago, denouncing the Republican party because it had not taken such steps as would result in the speedy retirement of the greenbacks.

Mr. McMILLIN. There is not a word in that platform demanding their retirement, but on the contrary there was a statute in existence expressly prohibiting it.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Speaker, as I have said already, I do not conceive that the question of the retirement of the greenbacks or the question of any specific financial measure enters into the proper discussion of this measure. It is simply a question whether we shall create a commission which shall, when created, consider and investigate all these questions and make recommendations to us.

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like to ask the gentleman if he will permit a question.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I have but a short time remaining. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand that the free coinage of silver enters into the proper consideration of this subject at all. The terms of this resolution are restricted to the question of banking and the paper currency of the country.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, let us have order. We are dealing now with experts, and we know what they did in 1873 and 1874.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] makes the point that the House is not in order. Will gentlemen have the kindness to resume their seats?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I have but a moment, and I wish to use that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. OGDEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania had five minutes. How much of that time has been consumed?

The SPEAKER. That is hardly a point of order.

Mr. OGDEN. I rose to a parliamentary inquiry, not a point of order. How much time has the gentleman from Pennsylvania consumed? That is a timely question, and a pertinent one.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has two minutes remaining.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Speaker, in those two minutes I wish to say to my friends on the other side, who have undertaken to say that we are relegating our duties to some other commission and that we are specially competent to consider these questions, that I have listened to one, two, and three of those gentlemen making that argument who have risen here, and have not even known that the convention that asked for this proposition was not the hard-money convention of the Democratic party, but a nonpartisan convention from twenty-nine States,

presided over by Republicans, and a convention of that character and that standing that the President of the United States has seen fit to dignify it by referring to it in his message.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. They called themselves Democrats. We think they are Republicans.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. That demonstrates, and incontestably demonstrates, to gentlemen upon the other side the information that they would bring to the consideration of this question.

Now, let me remove a further apprehension of my Democratic friends as to the character and purpose of this commission, because they have heard something of a man named Hanna, and seem to fear that it has some relation to Ohio politics. I want to relieve their apprehension, and say that the gentleman of that name associated with this measure is no relative of the man they fear so much, and not even a resident of the same State.

I listened to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. ERMEN-TROUT], with his newborn zeal, stating his apprehensions that there was danger from a commission of this kind. I hold in my hand a speech made by him a few years ago in this House, in which he takes occasion to say:

I approve of the appointment of a tariff commission, because I believe that the public mind is in such a state at present that no legislation emanating from this Congress on this vexed subject without the instrumentality of a commission will be satisfactory.

This is simply a question as to the propriety of a commission, but I am not surprised at this change of opinion on his part.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to move to recommit the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not in order.

Mr. CARMACK. What is the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Whether or not it is the proper time to move to recommit?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that after the engrossment of the joint resolution would be the proper time for the gentleman's motion to recommit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I desire to make it at that time.

The question was taken on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 124, noes 86.

So the joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the pending measure to the Committee on Ways and Means, with instructions to report back in lieu thereof the resolution, the nature of which I have in part stated to the House, and which I would have had read in the presence of the House but for the objection of one member on the floor. I ask to have it read now.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill creating a "currency commission," and for other purposes.

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a "currency commission," consisting of three Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, three Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who shall be members of the three dominant political parties of the country, and three citizens of the United States, to be appointed by the President, is hereby authorized and created, whose duty it shall be to take into consideration and thoroughly examine and investigate the subjects of the bonded debt, the legal-tender currency, the coinage laws, the national banking system and circulation—including taxation thereof—and the financial condition of the United States generally, and shall collect, compile, and arrange for publication the history of all laws relating to these several subjects and also of the several banking methods or systems of the United States, of the several States, and of leading foreign countries, and make report thereon to Congress not later than January 5, 1898.

SEC. 2. A majority of the commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and all vacancies therein, resulting from the resignation or failure of any person appointed by either of said officers to serve as a member of the commission, shall be filled by the President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, or the President of the United States, as the case may be. The commission shall sit in Washington, but may hold special sessions in any part of the United States, either as a body or by subcommittee, or it may designate any of its members to prosecute, in any part of the United States, any inquiry on its behalf in respect to any subject stated in section 1 of this act.

SEC. 3. The members of the commission appointed by the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives shall receive no additional compensation for their services rendered as members of said commission, but shall be paid their actual traveling and other expenses necessarily incurred while in the discharge of their duties in connection with said commission, and the members of said commission appointed by the President shall from the date of their several appointments be respectively paid a compensation at the rate of \$5,000 per annum, together with their actual traveling and other expenses necessarily incurred in the discharge of their official duties under this act.

SEC. 4. The said commission shall organize by the election of a president; shall appoint a secretary and have authority to employ experts and such clerical and other assistants as it may deem necessary to carry out the pur-

pose of this act; shall prescribe their duties and fix their compensation. The commission may hire suitable offices for its use, and shall have authority to procure all necessary office supplies. The Public Printer is directed to cause any printing or binding to be done which may be required by the commission on the written order of the president or secretary.

SEC. 5. It shall be the duty of the commission, in its report to Congress, to submit drafts of such bills relating to the bonded debt, the legal-tender currency, the coinage laws, and the amendment or reorganization of the present national banking system of the United States as it may deem proper, which bills shall be accompanied by reports explaining in detail the purpose, scope, and effect of such bills and such action thereof.

SEC. 6. All of the expense of the commission, including the salaries of its members and employees, rent, office supplies, telegrams, etc., and for traveling expenses incurred by its members or by its employees in making any investigation duly ordered upon its official business, shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor, approved in writing by the president of the commission.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to recommit to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the substitute which has been reported to the House.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARMACK. I wish to know whether it would be in order to move to amend the instructions by substituting other instructions?

The SPEAKER. It would be in order to amend the instructions.

Mr. CARMACK. I move to amend by substituting the following—

Mr. CANNON. Is it in order if the previous question has been moved?

The SPEAKER. The previous question not having been moved, it is in order, if germane.

Mr. CANNON. It has not been reported.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. The previous question having been ordered by the rule to the final passage of the joint resolution, it seems to me that amendments are not in order.

The SPEAKER. Quite true; and yet this motion—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Has not the gentleman from Tennessee the floor?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee has the floor to make the proposition which he has made to the House. He has not the floor for any other purpose. The Chair desires to say in the matter of recommitment that while it may be a question upon the use of the word recommit, nevertheless it has been the custom where the previous question has been simply ordered to allow a motion to recommit, on the ground that the House, after ordering the bill to be engrossed, may be disposed to change it if not satisfied with it.

That applies to a case where there may have been a great many amendments, more especially. Nevertheless that is the rule in the House, and it seems to the Chair that under the rule the motion to recommit ought to be entertained.

Mr. CARMACK. I call for the reading of my amendment.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. The previous question having been ordered on the adoption of the resolution reported by the Committee on Rules to the final passage of the bill, is either amendment or debate in order, or is it necessary—

The SPEAKER. Debate is not in order; but at the same time it has been held that instructions may be amended—the previous question not having been asked for by the gentleman from Indiana, who presented the original proposition to recommit, or by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, or any other member of the House.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inquire to what extent the previous question on the bill to its final passage applies to these intermediate motions?

The SPEAKER. It applies to the extent of cutting off debate. Perhaps there is good reason for supposing that it ought to shut off an amendment, but that has never been the ruling or custom of the House.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Is it in order to ask the previous question on top of the previous question already ordered?

The SPEAKER. It is not in order to ask the previous question on ordering the previous question, but it is in order to ask the previous question on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] and the pending amendment.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask the previous question on that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. But, Mr. Speaker, before that request was made the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK] had offered his amendment to the motion to recommit, and that proposition was before the House. Now, can he be cut off in this way?

The SPEAKER. The amendment of the gentleman from

Tennessee has been submitted to the House. The Clerk will report the amendment. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The amendment offered by Mr. CARMACK was read, as follows:

The commission in preparing a scheme of currency reform shall proceed along the lines laid down in the financial plank of the Democratic platform adopted at Chicago in 1896, and it shall especially include the restoration of the system of bimetalism by the free, independent, and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against that amendment that it is too indefinite and not germane.

The SPEAKER. Not germane upon what grounds?

Mr. LACEY. It is too indefinite. It proposes that the commission shall proceed along the lines laid down in the financial plank of the Democratic platform. Who is to determine what the Democratic platform is? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that might be a point, though not perhaps a point of order. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to insist on the point of order against this amendment, not on the ground stated by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], but on the ground that the joint resolution under consideration by its express terms relates only to banking and national currency paper, and that a proposition to include an entirely different matter relating to the coinage of metallic currency is not germane to the purpose of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. There may be something in that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHARLES W. STONE] has said, it may be true that this amendment extends the scope of the original resolution, but—

The SPEAKER (interposing). The joint resolution says: "What changes, if any, are necessary and expedient in our present banking and currency laws." The Chair will hear the gentleman, if he desires to be heard upon the point. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. SWANSON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. [Renewed cries of "Vote!"]

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. The Chair will endeavor to take care of the rights of all parties if gentlemen will be in order.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution proposes to authorize this commission to "investigate and report what changes, if any, are necessary and expedient in our present banking and currency laws, and what further legislation, if any, is desirable relative to our national banking system and our Government paper currency of notes and certificates."

The SPEAKER (after examining the joint resolution). The Chair thinks he will have to overrule the point of order.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Then I call for the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK].

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. On ordering the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand that the yeas and nays were requested in time for the motion on the previous question.

Mr. COX. That was not in my mind, Mr. Speaker. I called for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the amendment of my colleague.

The SPEAKER. Precisely. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK], upon which the yeas and nays are demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 96, nays 130, answered "present" 4, not voting 123; as follows:

YEAS—96.

- | | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Adamson, | De Armond, | Lewis, Ga. | Robb, |
| Baird, | De Graffenreid, | Lewis, Wash. | Robertson, La. |
| Baker, Ill. | De Vries, | Little, | Robinson, Ind. |
| Ball, | Dinsmore, | Livingston, | Sayers, |
| Bankhead, | Dockery, | Lloyd, | Settle, |
| Barlow, | Ermentrout, | Love, | Shafroth, |
| Bartlett, | Fitzpatrick, | McCormick, | Smith, Ky. |
| Bodine, | Fleming, | McCulloch, | Stallings, |
| Brantley, | Fox, | McDowell, | Stark, |
| Brenner, Ohio | Gaines, | McMillin, | Stephens, Tex. |
| Broussard, | Griggs, | McRae, | Stokes, |
| Brucker, | Gunn, | Maddox, | Strait, |
| Brundidge, | Handy, | Martin, | Sulzer, |
| Burke, | Henry, Miss. | Meekison, | Swanson, |
| Campbell, | Henry, Tex. | Meyer, La. | Tate, |
| Carmack, | Hinrichsen, | Miers, Ind. | Terry, |
| Clardy, | Jett, | Moon, | Underwood, |
| Clark, Mo. | Jones, Wash. | Ogden, | Vandiver, |
| Clayton, | Kelley, | Osborne, | Vehslage, |
| Cochran, Mo. | King, | Pierce, Tenn. | Wheeler, Ala. |
| Cooney, | Kleberg, | Plowman, | Wheeler, Ky. |
| Cooper, Tex. | Lamb, | Rhea, Ky. | Williams, Miss. |
| Cowherd, | Lanham, | Richardson, | Young, Va. |
| Cox, | Lentz, | Ridgely, | Zenor. |

NAYS—130.

- | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|
| Alexander, | Davenport, | Jenkins, | Prince, |
| Baker, Md. | Davidson, Wis. | Johnson, Ind. | Pugh, |
| Bartholdt, | Davidson, Ky. | Johnson, N. Dak. | Ray, |
| Belden, | Dingley, | Joy, | Reeves, |
| Belford, | Dolliver, | Kirkpatrick, | Robbins, |
| Belknap, | Dorr, | Knox, | Roysse, |
| Bennett, | Dovener, | Lacey, | Russell, |
| Bingham, | Ellis, | Landis, | Shannon, |
| Bishop, | Evans, | Linney, | Shattuc, |
| Booze, | Faris, | Low, | Simpkins, |
| Broderick, | Fenton, | Lybrand, | Smith, Ill. |
| Bromwell, | Fletcher, | McCall, | Smith, S. W. |
| Brown, | Fowler, N. J. | McDonald, | Snover, |
| Brownlow, | Gardner, | McEwan, | Southard, |
| Brumm, | Gibson, | McIntire, | Southwick, |
| Burleigh, | Gillett, Mass. | Mahany, | Spalding, |
| Burton, | Graff, | Marsh, | Steele, |
| Butler, | Griffin, | Mercer, | Stevens, Minn. |
| Cannon, | Grosvenor, | Miller, | Stewart, N. J. |
| Capron, | Hager, | Minor, | Stewart, Wis. |
| Clark, Iowa | Hamilton, | Moody, | Stone, C. W. |
| Clarke, N. H. | Hawley, | Morris, | Todd, |
| Cochrane, N. Y. | Heatwole, | Mudd, | Van Voorhis, |
| Codding, | Hemenway, | Northway, | Walker, Va. |
| Connolly, | Henderson, | Olmsted, | Wanger, |
| Cooper, Wis. | Henry, Conn. | Otjen, | Warner, |
| Cousins, | Henry, Ind. | Overstreet, | Weaver, |
| Crump, | Hepburn, | Parker, N. J. | Weymouth, |
| Crumpacker, | Hill, | Payne, | White, N. C. |
| Curtis, Iowa | Hitt, | Pearce, Mo. | Wilson, N. Y. |
| Curtis, Kans. | Hopkins, | Pearson, | Yost. |
| Dalzell, | Howell, | Perkins, | |
| Danford, | Hull, | Pitney, | |

PRESENT—4.

- | | | | |
|----------|---------|------------|------------|
| Babcock, | Barney, | McClellan, | Young, Pa. |
|----------|---------|------------|------------|

NOT VOTING—123.

- | | | | |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|
| Acheson, | Davis, | Latimer, | Simpson, |
| Adams, | Dayton, | Lester, | Sims, |
| Allen, | Eddy, | Littauer, | Skinner, |
| Arnold, | Elliott, | Lorimer, | Slayden, |
| Bailey, | Epes, | Loud, | Smith, Wm. Alden |
| Barber, | Fischer, | Loudenslager, | Sparkman, |
| Barham, | Fitzgerald, | Lovering, | Sperry, |
| Barrett, | Foote, | McAleer, | Spurgue, |
| Barrows, | Foss, | McCleary, | Stone, W. A. |
| Beach, | Fowler, N. C. | Maguire, | Strode, Nebr. |
| Bell, | Gillet, N. Y. | Mahon, | Strowd, N. C. |
| Benner, Pa. | Greene, | Mann, | Sturtevant, |
| Benton, | Grout, | Marshall, | Sullivan, |
| Berry, | Grow, | Maxwell, | Sulloway, |
| Bland, | Harmer, | Mesick, | Sutherland, |
| Botkin, | Hartman, | Mills, | Talbert, |
| Boutelle, | Hay, | Mitchell, | Tawney, |
| Brewer, | Hicks, | Newlands, | Taylor, Ohio |
| Brewster, | Hilborn, | Norton, | Taylor, Ala. |
| Brosius, | Hooker, | Odell, | Tongue, |
| Bull, | Howard, Ala. | Otey, | Updegraff, |
| Castle, | Howard, Ga. | Packer, Pa. | Vincent, |
| Catchings, | Howe, | Peters, | Wadsworth, |
| Chickering, | Hunter, | Powers, | Walker, Mass. |
| Colson, | Hurley, | Quigg, | Ward, |
| Connell, | Jones, Va. | Rixey, | White, Ill. |
| Corliss, | Kerr, | Sauerhering, | Wilber, |
| Cranford, | Ketcham, | Shelden, | Williams, Pa. |
| Cummings, | Kitchin, | Sherman, | Wilson, S. C. |
| Davey, | Knowles, | Showalter, | Wright. |
| | Kulp, | Shuford, | |

So the amendment of Mr. CARMACK was rejected.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

- Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. BRADLEY.
- Mr. TAYLER of Ohio with Mr. PETERS.
- Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. MARSHALL.
- Mr. LOVERING with Mr. FITZGERALD.
- Mr. UPDEGRAFF with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.
- Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania with Mr. BENTON.
- Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. SIMPSON.

Mr. BURKE. My colleagues, Mr. SLAYDEN and Mr. CRANFORD, are both absent on leave. If here, they would vote "aye" on this proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I am requested to announce that if the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. KITCHIN, were present, he would vote in the affirmative on this question.

Mr. GRIGGS. I am paired generally with the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. SPERRY; but I have transferred that pair to my colleague, Mr. HOWARD, and have voted on this question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that many of these announcements are unnecessary, inasmuch as the pairs are published in the RECORD.

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

The question then recurred on the motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana to recommit with instructions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. There seems to be some misapprehension on this side of the Chamber as to the first section of my proposed substitute, and I ask unanimous consent that it be read for information.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I object.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I wish to know whether on the proposition of the gentleman from Indiana it is in order to have a division of the question—whether it can be

divided so that we can vote separately on recommitting without instructions?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, it was rejected; there being—ayes 6, noes 58.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. COX. On that question I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 126, nays 99, answered "present" 6, not voting 122; as follows:

YEAS—126.

Alexander,	Dingley,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Reeves,
Baker, Md.	Dolliver,	Joy,	Robbins,
Bartholdt,	Dorr,	Kirkpatrick,	Royse,
Belden,	Dovener,	Knox,	Russell,
Belford,	Ellis,	Lacey,	Shannon,
Belknap,	Evans,	Landis,	Shattuc,
Bennett,	Faris,	Low,	Simpkins,
Bingham,	Fenton,	Lybrand,	Smith, Ill.
Bishop,	Fletcher,	McCall,	Smith, S. W.
Booze,	Fowler, N. J.	McDonald,	Snover,
Bromwell,	Gardner,	McIntire,	Southard,
Brown,	Gibson,	Marsh,	Southwick,
Brownlow,	Gillett, Mass.	Mercer,	Spalding,
Brumm,	Graff,	Miller,	Steele,
Burleigh,	Griffin,	Mills,	Stevens, Minn.
Burton,	Grosvenor,	Minor,	Stewart, N. J.
Butler,	Hager,	Moody,	Stewart, Wis.
Cannon,	Hamilton,	Morris,	Stone, C. W.
Capron,	Heatwole,	Mudd,	Tawney,
Clark, Iowa,	Hemenway,	Northway,	Taylor, Ohio
Clarke, N. H.	Henderson,	Olmsted,	Updegraff,
Cochrane, N. Y.	Henry, Conn.	Otjen,	Van Voorhis,
Codding,	Henry, Ind.	Overstreet,	Walker, Va.
Connolly,	Hepburn,	Parker, N. J.	Wanger,
Cousins,	Hicks,	Payne,	Warner,
Crump,	Hilborn,	Pearce, Mo.	Weaver,
Curtis, Iowa,	Hitt,	Pearson,	Weymouth,
Curtis, Kans.	Hopkins,	Perkins,	White, N. C.
Danford,	Howell,	Pitney,	Wilson, N. Y.
Davenport,	Hull,	Prince,	Yost.
Davidson, Wis.	Jenkins,	Pugh,	
Davison, Ky.	Johnson, Ind.	Ray,	

NAYS—99.

Adamson,	De Armond,	Lewis, Wash.	Robb,
Baird,	De Graffenreid,	Linney,	Robertson, La.
Baker, Ill.	De Vries,	Little,	Robinson, Ind.
Ball,	Dinsmore,	Livingston,	Sayers,
Bankhead,	Dockery,	Lloyd,	Settle,
Barlow,	Ermentrout,	Love,	Shafroth,
Bartlett,	Fitzpatrick,	McCormick,	Smith, Ky.
Bodine,	Fleming,	McCulloch,	Stallings,
Brantley,	Fox,	McDowell,	Stark,
Brenner, Ohio	Gaines,	McMillin,	Stephens, Tex.
Broderick,	Griggs,	McRae,	Stokes,
Broussard,	Gunn,	Maddox,	Strait,
Brucker,	Handy,	Mahany,	Sulzer,
Brundidge,	Henry, Miss.	Martin,	Swanson,
Burke,	Henry, Tex.	Meeikison,	Tate,
Campbell,	Hill,	Meyer, La.	Terry,
Carmack,	Howard, Ala.	Miers, Ind.	Todd,
Clardy,	Jett,	Moon,	Underwood,
Clark, Mo.	Jones, Wash.	Ogden,	Vandiver,
Clayton,	Kelley,	Osborne,	Vehslage,
Cochran, Mo.	King,	Pierce, Tenn.	Wheeler, Ala.
Cooney,	Kleberg,	Plowman,	Wheeler, Ky.
Cooper, Tex.	Lamb,	Rhea,	Young, Va.
Cowherd,	Lanham,	Richardson,	Zenor.
Cox,	Lewis, Ga.	Ridgely,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

Babcock,	Cooper, Wis.	McClellan,	Young, Pa.
Barney,	Dalzell,		

NOT VOTING—122.

Acheson,	Davey,	Latimer,	Shuford,
Adams,	Davis,	Lentz,	Simpson,
Allen,	Dayton,	Lester,	Sims,
Arnold,	Eddy,	Littauer,	Skinner,
Bailey,	Elliott,	Lorimer,	Slayden,
Barber,	Epes,	Loud,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Barham,	Fischer,	Loudenslager,	Sparkman,
Barrett,	Fitzgerald,	Lovering,	Sperry,
Barrows,	Footo,	McAisler,	Sprague,
Beach,	Foss,	McCleary,	Stone, W. A.
Bell,	Fowler, N. C.	McEwan,	Strode, Nebr.
Benner, Pa.	Gillet, N. Y.	Maguire,	Strowd, N. C.
Benton,	Greene,	Mahon,	Sturdevant,
Berry,	Groat,	Mann,	Sullivan,
Eland,	Grow,	Marshall,	Sulloway,
Botkin,	Harmer,	Maxwell,	Sutherland,
Botelle,	Hartman,	Mesick,	Talbert,
Bradley,	Hawley,	Mitchell,	Taylor, Ala.
Brewer,	Hay,	Newlands,	Tongue,
Brewster,	Hinrichsen,	Norton,	Vincent,
Brosius,	Hooker,	Odell,	Wadsworth,
Bull,	Howard, Ga.	Otey,	Walker, Mass.
Castle,	Howe,	Packer, Pa.	Ward,
Catchings,	Hunter,	Peters,	White, Ill.
Chickering,	Hurley,	Powers,	Wilber,
Colson,	Jones, Va.	Quigg,	Williams, Miss.
Connell,	Kerr,	Rixey,	Williams, Pa.
Corliss,	Ketcham,	Sauerhering,	Wilson, S. C.
Crauford,	Kitchin,	Shelden,	Wright.
Crumppacker,	Knowles,	Sherman,	
Cummings,	Kulp,	Showalter,	

So the joint resolution was passed.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. POWERS with Mr. LENTZ.

On this vote:

Mr. DALZELL with Mr. BAILEY.

Mr. GRIGGS. I was paired with the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. SPERRY; but as my colleague, Mr. HOWARD, was absent, I have transferred the pair to him. My colleague, if present, would vote "no."

Mr. JETT. My colleague, Mr. HUNTER, is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, before passing from this subject, I wish to say that a number of members desired to take part in the debate on the currency resolution, but the time allowed for the discussion was too short. I ask, therefore, that by unanimous consent general leave may be given to print upon this resolution for a limited time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks that members be given consent to print remarks in the RECORD upon the resolution just adopted—

Mr. HENDERSON. Within five days.

The SPEAKER. Within five days. Is there objection?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I object.

COMMITTEE TO WAIT UPON THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask the adoption of the resolution I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two members from the House of Representatives be appointed to join a similar committee on the part of the Senate to wait on the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses of Congress are ready to adjourn, and respectfully inquire if he has any further communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed as the members of the committee on the part of the House Mr. GROSVENOR and Mr. McMILLIN.

PRINTING COPIES OF THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the concurrent resolution of the Senate providing for the printing of extra copies of the tariff bill which has become a law.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed for the use of Congress 50,000 copies of the tariff law of 1897, in pamphlet form with paper covers, to be apportioned as follows: 25,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 10,000 copies for the use of the Senate, and 15,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

Mr. DOCKERY. I desire to ask the gentleman from Maine whether or not any provision is made by the resolution to print a comparative statement of the effects of the bill?

Mr. DINGLEY. I would state to the gentleman from Missouri, in response to the question, that the Senate Committee on Finance have already entered upon the preparation, through their clerks and experts, of a comparative statement of the tariff bill which is now a law with the tariff bill just repealed, and that that statement will be printed by the Senate when it shall be completed. It was not thought advisable that the printing of the additional statements should be undertaken by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. McMILLIN. If the gentleman will permit me, I would suggest that this statement has been already completed by the Senate Finance Committee. I saw it this morning in its completed form, and we can as easily provide for the printing of it now as for the bill itself.

Mr. DINGLEY. The resolution which I have called up provides simply for the printing of the tariff law. It has been customary always to print these statements separately.

Mr. DOCKERY. I understand, then, that the Senate, when this is ordered to be printed, will make provision for the members of the House also?

Mr. HENDERSON. Let us dispose of this first, and then we can take up the other matter later on.

Mr. DINGLEY. It has been the custom, I will state, for one or the other of the two Houses to undertake to prepare the comparative statement. The Senate has usually done it, and when it is done, provision is made to accommodate the members of the House who desire to have these statements.

Mr. DOCKERY. Has the gentleman an assurance that the members of the House will be accommodated in that regard?

Mr. DINGLEY. I have. I have spoken to the members of the Finance Committee upon the subject.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand that 15,000 copies are provided in the resolution for the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and none for the Ways and Means Committee. Is that correct?

Mr. DINGLEY. That is correct. I understand the object is this: The clerk of the Senate Committee on Finance remains at the committee rooms during the summer time, and is ready to respond to any calls from members of the House or Senate or generally from any part of the country for copies of the bill to be distributed. The 15,000 copies are placed in the committee room in order to meet such calls that may be made upon him from these

various quarters for the bill. He can furnish them to applicants in any part of the country; and for that reason this number has been placed with the clerk of that committee.

Mr. STEELE. I call attention to the fact that with 357 members of the House and about 90 members of the Senate, when we are asked for copies of this bill we will necessarily refer them to the Senate Committee on Finance, who has as many copies at their disposal as the House.

Mr. DINGLEY. I notice that the division of copies was not quite what it usually is in such cases, and I called the attention of some of the members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate to the difference. I was informed that there would be no difficulty upon that point; that members of the House could obtain copies as they desired them in the manner suggested.

Mr. DOCKERY. I understand, then, that a sufficient number of copies of the comparative statement of the two bills will be ready for distribution to the members of the House on application?

Mr. DINGLEY. I have the assurance of members of the Finance Committee of the Senate that that will be done.

Mr. RICHARDSON. As I understood the reading of that resolution, it is a joint resolution.

Mr. DINGLEY. It is a concurrent resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I thought that it was read as a joint resolution, and that it ought to be a concurrent resolution.

Mr. DINGLEY. It is concurrent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will state that copies of the bill will be immediately printed and distributed proportionately, from the folding room, to Members and Delegates.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same.

A bill (H. R. 3950) to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act providing a civil government for Alaska," approved May 17, 1884, to create the office of surveyor-general for Alaska, and for other purposes; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 82) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives on the day following adjournment.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution (S. R. 64) providing for a compilation of all treaties now in force between the United States and any foreign government; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On July 15, 1897:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 76) granting permission for the erection of a temporary studio in the city of Washington, D. C., for use in the construction and completion of the statue of General Sherman.

On July 19, 1897:

An act (H. R. 13) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for prior years, and for other purposes; and

An act (H. R. 3486) to allow the distillery of the New England Distilling Company and the rectifying house of Mullins & Crigler, both situated in Covington, Ky., to be operated within 600 feet of each other.

On July 24, 1897:

An act (H. R. 3941) to authorize the President to suspend discriminating duties imposed on foreign vessels and commerce; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 79) requesting the President to make investigation into the "regie contract" system.

PRINTING OF THE BOOK OF TREATIES.

Mr. HITT. I should like, Mr. Speaker, to call up Senate joint resolution 64, which came in this afternoon, and which provides for printing 1,500 copies of the treaties of the United States with foreign governments. No edition later than 1887 has been published, and that is entirely exhausted. The Senate have already provided for the editing and preparing of this edition, and the work has been done. I ask to have the joint resolution read, and I ask consent for its consideration.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has stated that he wants a lot of copies of a treaty printed. I wish to ask what treaty?

Mr. HITT. All the treaties of the United States with foreign powers since the foundation of the Government.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. R. 64) providing for a compilation of all the treaties now in force between the United States and any foreign government.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That a competent person be employed, under the direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to make a compilation of all the treaties now in force between the United States and any foreign government. Said compilation shall contain the full text of the treaties now in force, together with a citation of any decision which may have been made in regard to said treaties by the Supreme Court of the United States or any court of Federal jurisdiction. The said work shall also contain a list, in chronological order, of all the treaties at any time made by the United States with other foreign countries, with a reference to the page and volume where the text of the same may be found, the whole to be carefully indexed.

Mr. HITT. The compilation and work spoken of in the beginning of the resolution has already been attended to, and the Senate pays for it out of the contingent fund of that body, so that there will be no expense incurred for that work. It is simply for the printing of a new edition of the treaties, the edition printed in 1887 having been for years exhausted, so that no gentleman can get a copy except by finding it in a bookstore, where it costs a very considerable price.

The work is ready for printing, and it will only take the indexing, which will require a few weeks. I have consulted the former chairman of the Committee on Printing [Mr. PERKINS] and the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] on this subject, and they agree with me as to the necessity for the printing of this work.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the resolution reported again for information.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the resolution.

The resolution was again read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HITT, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

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

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be authorized to close the present session by adjourning their respective Houses on Saturday, July 24, at 9 o'clock p. m.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, ETC.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the adoption of the two resolutions which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved. That the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to have printed and bound all documents for use of said committee that it may deem necessary in connection with subjects in relation to appropriations being considered or to be considered by the said committee during the Fifty-fifth Congress.

Resolved. That the Committee on Appropriations, or such of the subcommittees as they may designate, shall have leave to sit during the sessions of the House during the Fifty-fifth Congress and during the recess.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolutions?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the noise and confusion I could not hear, and I am sure that other gentlemen around me could not hear.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the point is well taken, and that gentlemen should resume their seats and cease conversation.

The Clerk will again report the resolution.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. CANNON. These are the usual resolutions, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the resolutions reported by the Clerk?

There was no objection.

The resolutions were agreed to.

PAYMENT OF SESSION EMPLOYEES FOR THE MONTH OF JULY.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, and ask for its present consideration:

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved. That the Clerk of the House be, and he hereby is, authorized to pay from the contingent fund of the House the session employees of the House for the full month of July without deduction for the remaining days of the month, payment to be made under the resolution of the House of July 23, 1897.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, the resolution that is referred to as that of July 23 provided that the employees should be paid on the day after adjournment. If they are so paid, without the passage of this resolution, the session employees will only be paid for the number of days in July that they shall have served at that time. Now, these employees will most of them be here for the greater part of next week, and it seems to me that it would be very unjust that they should be paid only for that portion of the time that we keep in session.

Mr. HENDERSON. This has usually been done, has it not?

Mr. DALZELL. I can not say as to that. The only member of the Committee on Accounts here [Mr. BARTLETT] has approved of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess until half past 8 o'clock; and I desire to say that the Senate has agreed to the House resolution for final adjournment at 9 o'clock and has taken a recess until 2 minutes to 9. Having completed our business, I move that the House now take the recess.

The SPEAKER. Before putting that question to the House, the Chair desires to say that he intends, if nothing happens, at that time to announce the appointment of committees; and inasmuch as the arrangement with regard to clerks is such that it makes a complication which would require, under the present rules, a meeting of the committee, the Chair hopes that the consent of the House may be given to the appointment of committee clerks by the chairmen, subject to the approval of the committees at the beginning of the next session. If there be no objection—

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, just a moment. There are some officers in addition to the clerks of committees, and I desire this extended to these officers.

The SPEAKER. This is the mere question of appointment. Under the rules the appointment is made by the chairman, subject to the approval of the committee. As it is impossible to get the committee together, it results that the chairman is deprived of the use of a clerk as a member and sometimes does not have a clerk as chairman of a committee.

Mr. SAYERS. For instance, Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Committee has not only a clerk but an assistant clerk, and also a messenger.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to hear.

Mr. SAYERS. My object is to include those.

The SPEAKER. That does not in any way affect the members' clerks. That is what the Chair is trying to provide for. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If some gentleman of the House of Representatives should be appointed as chairman of a committee, will that deprive him of his private secretary, simply because he is the chairman of a committee?

The SPEAKER. It has that effect. To remedy that some gentlemen have requested me to make this statement to the House. It is to that extent a modification of the rules of the House.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If a gentleman is chairman of committee, he would have no secretary?

The SPEAKER. He would have no secretary, and in some cases he would not have the advantage of the services of the clerk of a committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. He would be practically without a secretary.

The SPEAKER. This request has no relation to the clerks of members.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. With that explanation, I have no objection at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRUMM. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make an inquiry. The regular clerks to the regular committees are annual clerks, as I understand it. The clerks of committees that were appointed in the last Congress will, then, hold over until the regular meeting in December, as I understand.

The SPEAKER. No; he would until the clerk to the committee was appointed by the chairman. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LACEY. Is it held that the appointment of a new committee would create a vacancy?

The SPEAKER. Certainly; it would create a vacancy upon the appointment of the successor.

Mr. LACEY. But where there is no successor and no such clerk has been appointed, the clerk would hold over until his successor was appointed.

The SPEAKER. He would not if the chairman has the authority to appoint. He has now, under the consent given by the House.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Then I understand that the chairman of a committee is to have but one clerk or secretary?

The SPEAKER. It does not affect him in that respect at all.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move that the House take a recess until half past 8 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 8 o'clock p. m.) the House was declared in recess until half past 8 p. m.

AFTER THE RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House reassembled at 8.30 o'clock p. m.

The SPEAKER. In the resolution presented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], which was adopted by the House, by accident "July 23" was inserted as the date instead of July 22, the legislative day. If there be no objection, the date will be changed to suit the time.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

HOUSE COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the appointment of the following committees:

Elections No. 1.—Messrs. Robert W. Taylor, Ohio; Lemuel W. Royce, Indiana; Romulus Z. Linney, North Carolina; James R. Mann, Illinois; Edward L. Hamilton, Michigan; Samuel A. Davenport, Pennsylvania; Charles L. Bartlett, Georgia; Andrew F. Fox, Mississippi, and Evan E. Settle, Kentucky.

Elections No. 2.—Messrs. Henry U. Johnson, Indiana; Frank G. Clarke, New Hampshire; Walter L. Weaver, Ohio; Marlin E. Olmsted, Pennsylvania; George M. Davison, Kentucky; Joseph M. Belford, New York; James G. Maguire, California; James M. Robinson, Indiana, and John Wesley Gaines, Tennessee.

Elections No. 3.—Messrs. James A. Walker, Virginia; James H. Coddington, Pennsylvania; William S. Mesick, Michigan; William S. Kirkpatrick, Pennsylvania; E. D. Crumpacker, Indiana; Aaron V. S. Cochrane, New York; Robert W. Miers, Indiana; Robert E. Burke, Texas, and Stephen Brundidge, jr., Arkansas.

Ways and Means.—Messrs. Nelson Dingley, jr., Maine; Sereno E. Payne, New York; John Dalzell, Pennsylvania; Albert J. Hopkins, Illinois; Charles H. Grosvenor, Ohio; Charles A. Russell, Connecticut; Jonathan P. Dolliver, Iowa; George W. Steele, Indiana; Martin N. Johnson, North Dakota; Walter Evans, Kentucky; James A. Tawney, Minnesota; Joseph W. Bailey, Texas; Benton McMillin, Tennessee; Joseph Wheeler, Alabama; Samuel M. Robertson, Louisiana; Claude A. Swanson, Virginia, and George B. McClellan, New York.

Appropriations.—Messrs. Joseph G. Cannon, Illinois; Henry H. Bingham, Pennsylvania; William W. Grout, Vermont; Stephen A. Northway, Ohio; William A. Stone, Pennsylvania; Mahlon Pitney, New Jersey; James A. Hemenway, Indiana; James J. Belden, New York; Samuel S. Barney, Wisconsin; William H. Moody, Massachusetts; Samuel J. Pugh, Kentucky; Joseph D. Sayers, Texas; Alexander M. Dockery, Missouri; Leonidas F. Livingston, Georgia; Thomas C. McRae, Arkansas; John M. Allen, Mississippi, and John C. Bell, Colorado.

Judiciary.—Messrs. David B. Henderson, Iowa; George W. Ray, New York; Case Broderick, Kansas; Thomas Updegraff, Iowa; James A. Connolly, Illinois; Samuel W. McCall, Massachusetts; John J. Jenkins, Wisconsin; Richard Wayne Parker, New Jersey; Jesse R. Overstreet, Indiana; Warren Miller, West Virginia; De Alva S. Alexander, New York; William L. Terry, Arkansas; David A. De Armond, Missouri; Samuel W. T. Lanham, Texas; William Elliott, South Carolina; Oscar W. Underwood, Alabama, and David H. Smith, Kentucky.

Banking and Currency.—Messrs. Joseph H. Walker, Massachusetts; Marriott Brosius, Pennsylvania; Henry U. Johnson, Indiana; Henry C. Van Voorhis, Ohio; James T. McCleary, Minnesota; Charles N. Fowler, New Jersey; George Spalding, Michigan; Ebenezer J. Hill, Connecticut; George N. Southwick, New York; George W. Prince, Illinois; John M. Mitchell, New York; Adin B. Capron, Rhode Island; Nicholas N. Cox, Tennessee; Francis G. Newlands, Nevada; Jesse F. Stallings, Alabama; Daniel Ermentrout, Pennsylvania, and John W. Maddox, Georgia.

Coinage, Weights, and Measures.—Messrs. Charles W. Stone, Pennsylvania; James H. Southard, Ohio; Edward S. Minor, Wisconsin; Ebenezer J. Hill, Connecticut; Thomas Updegraff, Iowa; Jacob Yost, Virginia; William C. Lovering, Massachusetts; Lucius N. Littauer, New York; Daniel W. Mills, Illinois; William W. McIntire, Maryland; Richard P. Bland, Missouri; Sam Bronson Cooper, Texas; Charles S. Hartman, Montana; Rice A. Pierce, Tennessee; Samuel Maxwell, Nebraska; Edwin R. Ridgely, Kansas; Charles F. Cochran, Missouri, and H. B. Fergusson, New Mexico.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce.—Messrs. William P. Hepburn, Iowa; Loren Fletcher, Minnesota; James S. Sherman, New York; Irving P. Wanger, Pennsylvania; Charles F. Joy, Missouri; John B. Corliss, Michigan; Charles G. Bennett, New York; James F. Stewart, New Jersey; John Simpkins, Massachusetts; John A. Barham, California; R. B. Hawley, Texas; James R. Mann, Illinois; William McAleer, Pennsylvania; Robert C. Davey, Louisiana; William H. Hinrichsen, Illinois; William C. Adamson, Georgia, and Robert W. Davis, Florida.

Rivers and Harbors.—Messrs. Warren B. Hooker, New York; Henry A. Cooper, Wisconsin; Theodore E. Burton, Ohio; William E. Barrett, Massachusetts; Walter Reeves, Illinois; B. B. Dovenor, West Virginia; Roswell P. Bishop, Michigan; Ernest F. Acheson, Pennsylvania; Page Morris, Minnesota; Thomas C. Catchings, Mississippi; Rufus E. Lester, Georgia; J. H. Bankhead, Alabama; Philip D. McCulloch, Arkansas; Albert S. Berry, Kentucky; Stephen M. Sparkman, Florida, and Thomas H. Ball, Texas.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries.—Messrs. Sereno E. Payne, New York; George D. Perkins, Iowa; Albert J. Hopkins, Illinois; John Simpkins, Massachusetts; Philip B. Low, New York; James B. Young, Pennsylvania; Archibald Lybrand, Ohio; William S. Booze, Maryland; John F. Fitzgerald, Massachusetts; W. Jasper Talbert, South Carolina; Henry D. Clayton, Alabama; S. T. Baird, Louisiana, and Levin Irving Handy, Delaware.

Agriculture.—Messrs. James W. Wadsworth, New York; Vespasian Warner, Illinois; E. Stevens Henry, Connecticut; Edward Sauerhering, Wisconsin; William B. Baker, Maryland; David B. Wilber, New York; Horace G. Snover, Michigan; William Lorimer, Illinois; Thomas H. Tongue, Oregon; William Connell, Pennsylvania; George H. White, North Carolina; John S. Williams, Mississippi; John D. Clardy, Kentucky; Jerry Simpson, Kansas; Alonzo C. Shuford, North Carolina; J. William Stokes, South Carolina; John Lamb, Virginia, and T. Y. Callahan, Oklahoma.

Foreign Affairs.—Messrs. Robert R. Hitt, Illinois; Robert Adams, jr., Pennsylvania; Lemuel E. Quigg, New York; Robert G. Cousins, Iowa; William Alden Smith, Michigan; Joel P. Heatwole, Minnesota; Richmond Pearson, North Carolina; Frederick H. Gillett, Massachusetts; Charles L. Henry, Indiana; Hugh A. Dinsmore, Arkansas; Francis G. Newlands, Nevada; Champ Clark, Missouri; John S. Williams, Mississippi; Albert S. Berry, Kentucky, and William M. Howard, Georgia.

Military Affairs.—Messrs. John A. T. Hull, Iowa; Benjamin F. Marsh, Illinois; Michael Griffin, Wisconsin; John H. Ketcham, New York; Lucien J. Fenton, Ohio; Rowland B. Mahany, New York; Hugh R. Belknap, Illinois; John McDonald, Maryland; Walter P. Brownlow, Tennessee; William Sulzer, New York; Charles H. Martin, North Carolina; Nicholas N. Cox, Tennessee; John J. Lentz, Ohio; James Hay, Virginia; Thomas M. Jett, Illinois, and Marcus A. Smith, Arizona.

Naval Affairs.—Messrs. Charles A. Boutelle, Maine; Samuel G. Hilborn, California; Melville Bull, Rhode Island; Francis H. Wilson, New York; George E. Foss, Illinois; Alston G. Dayton, West Virginia; James H. Southard, Ohio; H. C. Loudenslager, New Jersey; R. B. Hawley, Texas; Thomas S. Butler, Pennsylvania; Amos J. Cummings, New York; Adolph Meyer, Louisiana; Farish Carter Tate, Georgia; T. S. Plowman, Alabama, and Robert N. Bodine, Missouri.

Post-Office and Post-Roads.—Messrs. Eugene F. Loud, California; John H. Ketcham, New York; George W. Smith, Illinois; John J. Gardner, New Jersey; N. D. Sperry, Connecticut; William Lorimer, Illinois; Jacob H. Bromwell, Ohio; Wallace T. Foote, jr., New York; Henry H. Bingham, Pennsylvania; Samuel M. Clark, Iowa; Jesse B. Strode, Nebraska; Claude A. Swanson, Virginia; Henry W. Ogden, Louisiana; Daniel Ermentrout, Pennsylvania; John A. Moon, Tennessee; William Love, Mississippi; James M. Griggs, Georgia, and H. B. Fergusson, New Mexico.

Public Lands.—Messrs. John F. Lacey, Iowa; William R. Ellis, Oregon; Samuel S. Barney, Wisconsin; Monroe H. Kulp, Pennsylvania; Frederick C. Stevens, Minnesota; Carlos D. Sheldon, Michigan; Daniel W. Mills, Illinois; Frank M. Eddy, Minnesota; John F. Shafroth, Colorado; Rudolph Kleberg, Texas; James Hamilton Lewis, Washington; James R. Campbell, Illinois; Marion De Vries, California; David Meekison, Ohio, and Marcus A. Smith, Arizona.

Indian Affairs.—Messrs. James S. Sherman, New York; Charles Curtis, Kansas; Israel F. Fischer, New York; Frank M. Eddy, Minnesota; Alexander Stewart, Minnesota; John F. Lacey, Iowa; Horace G. Snover, Michigan; Charles B. Landis, Indiana; Samuel J. Barrows, Massachusetts; Horace B. Packer, Pennsylvania; Charles E. Pearce, Missouri; John S. Little, Arkansas; William A. Jones, Virginia; Elijah B. Lewis, Georgia; John H. Stephens, Texas; William T. Zenor, Indiana; M. E. Benton, Missouri, and Marcus A. Smith, Arizona.

Territories.—Messrs. William S. Knox, Massachusetts; Philip B. Low, New York; Case Broderick, Kansas; Loren Fletcher, Minnesota; Michael Griffin, Wisconsin; Wallace T. Foote, jr., New York; J. A. Hemenway, Indiana; William S. Mesick, Michigan; William McAleer, Pennsylvania; Andrew J. Hunter, Illinois; John A. Moon, Tennessee; John W. Cranford, Texas; James M. Griggs, Georgia; Marcus A. Smith, Arizona, and H. B. Fergusson, New Mexico.

Railways and Canals.—Messrs. Charles A. Chickering, New York; Hugh R. Belknap, Illinois; Sidney E. Mudd, Maryland; James H. Davidson, Wisconsin; Morgan B. Williams, Pennsylvania; William B. Shattuc, Ohio; Joseph B. Showalter, Pennsylvania; Seth W. Brown, Ohio; Peter J. Otey, Virginia; Thomas J. Strait, South Carolina; William D. Vincent, Kansas; George W. Taylor, Alabama, and R. C. De Graffenreid, Texas.

Manufactures.—Messrs. George W. Faris, Indiana; Rosseau O. Crump, Michigan; Alexander Stewart, Wisconsin; Monroe H. Kulp, Pennsylvania; Clifton B. Beach, Ohio; Lucius N. Littauer, New York; James R. Howe, New York; Willard D. Vandiver, Missouri; Andrew J. Hunter, Illinois; William D. Vincent, Kansas, and George A. Marshall, Ohio.

Mines and Mining.—Charles H. Grosvenor, Ohio; Rosseau O.

Crump, Michigan; Frank M. Eddy, Minnesota; William L. Ward, New York; William Connell, Pennsylvania; Morgan B. Williams, Pennsylvania; Carlos D. Sheldon, Michigan; Charles S. Hartman, Montana; Farish Carter Tate, Georgia; James Gunn, Idaho; Freeman Knowles, South Dakota; Albert M. Todd, Michigan, and T. Y. Callahan, Oklahoma.

Public Buildings and Grounds.—Messrs. David H. Mercer, Nebraska; Josiah D. Hicks, Pennsylvania; Samuel G. Hilborn, California; Charles W. Gillet, New York; George E. White, Illinois; Richard Bartholdt, Missouri; Edwin C. Burleigh, Maine; George W. Weymouth, Massachusetts; Benjamin F. Howell, New Jersey; Charles P. Dorr, West Virginia; John H. Bankhead, Alabama; Harry Skinner, North Carolina; John S. Little, Arkansas; Robert Broussard, Louisiana, and William G. Brantley, Georgia.

Pacific Railroads.—Messrs. H. Henry Powers, Vermont; William P. Hepburn, Iowa; Ashley B. Wright, Massachusetts; William C. Arnold, Pennsylvania; George W. Faris, Indiana; William S. Kirkpatrick, Pennsylvania; Denis M. Hurley, New York; Frank G. Clarke, New Hampshire; William B. Shattuc, Ohio; James G. Maguire, California; E. W. Carmack, Tennessee; William H. Fleming, Georgia; James L. Slayden, Texas; Will V. Sullivan, Mississippi, and James A. Cooney, Missouri.

Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.—Messrs. Richard Bartholdt, Missouri; Henry A. Cooper, Wisconsin; George M. Curtis, Iowa; Lemuel W. Royse, Indiana; Robert Adams, jr., Pennsylvania; Denis M. Hurley, New York; Theodore E. Burton, Ohio; Page Morris, Minnesota; John M. Allen, Mississippi; Willis Brewer, Alabama; Robert Broussard, Louisiana; William M. Howard, Georgia, and N. B. McCormick, Kansas.

Education.—Messrs. Galusha A. Grow, Pennsylvania; William E. Barrett, Massachusetts; Samuel M. Clark, Iowa; Charles L. Henry, Indiana; Alexander Stewart, Wisconsin; William S. Booze, Maryland; George N. Southwick, New York; John E. Fowler, North Carolina; David A. De Armond, Missouri; Henry W. Ogden, Louisiana; Alonzo C. Shuford, North Carolina; Willard D. Vandiver, Missouri, and John A. McDowell, Ohio.

Labor.—Messrs. John J. Gardner, New Jersey; Joseph H. Walker, Massachusetts; James T. McCleary, Minnesota; William Lorimer, Illinois; Joseph B. Showalter, Pennsylvania; Aaron V. S. Cochran, New York; Isaac A. Barber, Maryland; W. Jasper Talbert, South Carolina; William F. Strowd, North Carolina; John S. Rhea, Kentucky; William A. Young, Virginia; Ferdinand Brucker, Michigan, and Thetus W. Sims, Tennessee.

Militia.—Messrs. Benjamin F. Marsh, Illinois; Case Broderick, Kansas; George Spalding, Michigan; Lucien J. Fenton, Ohio; Warren Miller, West Virginia; Edwin C. Burleigh, Maine; Edward E. Robbins, Pennsylvania; Samuel J. Barrows, Massachusetts; Rudolph Kleberg, Texas; John H. G. Vehslage, New York; John E. Fowler, North Carolina; William L. Stark, Nebraska, and Charles K. Wheeler, Kentucky.

Patents.—Messrs. Josiah D. Hicks, Pennsylvania; Edward Sauerhering, Wisconsin; Winfield S. Kerr, Ohio; John M. Mitchell, New York; Walter Reeves, Illinois; William C. Lovering, Massachusetts; James H. Davidson, Wisconsin; William L. Ward, New York; William Sulzer, New York; Champ Clark, Missouri; Thomas Y. Fitzpatrick, Kentucky; James R. Campbell, Illinois, and John H. Stephens, Texas.

Invalid Pensions.—Messrs. George W. Ray, New York; Cyrus A. Sulloway, New Hampshire; Winfield S. Kerr, Ohio; Vespasian Warner, Illinois; H. C. Brewster, New York; Henry R. Gibson, Tennessee; John C. Sturtevant, Pennsylvania; E. Stevens Henry, Connecticut; Isaac A. Barber, Maryland; Samuel W. Smith, Michigan; George B. McClellan, New York; Robert W. Miers, Indiana; Jeremiah D. Botkin, Kansas; James A. Norton, Ohio, and Curtis H. Castle, California.

Pensions.—Messrs. Henry C. Loudenslager, New Jersey; David G. Colson, Kentucky; James R. Howe, New York; Jesse B. Strode, Nebraska; Jacob H. Bromwell, Ohio; George W. Weymouth, Massachusetts; Carlos D. Sheldon, Michigan; Frederick C. Stevens, Minnesota; Jesse F. Stallings, Alabama; Thetus W. Sims, Tennessee; R. C. De Graffenreid, Texas; Thomas Y. Fitzpatrick, Kentucky, and Freeman Knowles, South Dakota.

Claims.—Messrs. Charles N. Brumm, Pennsylvania; Joseph V. Graff, Illinois; Edward S. Minor, Wisconsin; David G. Colson, Kentucky; Thomas McEwan, jr., New Jersey; Jacob Yost, Virginia; Charles E. Pearce, Missouri; Seth W. Brown, Ohio; John C. Sturtevant, Pennsylvania; John E. Osborne, Wyoming; John D. Clardy, Kentucky; Edward A. Robb, Missouri; John F. Rixey, Virginia; Will V. Sullivan, Mississippi, and E. W. Carmack, Tennessee.

War Claims.—Messrs. Thaddeus M. Mahon, Pennsylvania; Henry R. Gibson, Tennessee; Theobald Otjen, Wisconsin; William S. Mesick, Michigan; Jesse R. Overstreet, Indiana; Richard Wayne Parker, New Jersey; Walter L. Weaver, Ohio; George M. Davison, Kentucky; John F. Fitzgerald, Massachusetts; Sam Bronson Cooper, Texas; Patrick Henry, Mississippi; Thomas J. Bradley, New York, and John L. Brenner, Ohio.

Private Land Claims.—Messrs. George W. Smith, Illinois; Richard Bartholdt, Missouri; Roswell P. Bishop, Michigan; Alva L. Hager, Iowa; Charles W. Stone, Pennsylvania; Aaron V. S. Cochran, New York; William W. McIntire, Maryland; Robert W. Taylor, Ohio; William A. Jones, Virginia; P. D. McCulloch, Arkansas; R. D. Sutherland, Nebraska; William W. Kitchin, North Carolina; John W. Cranford, Texas, and T. Y. Callahan, Oklahoma.

District of Columbia.—Messrs. Joseph W. Babcock, Wisconsin; Alfred C. Harmer, Pennsylvania; George M. Curtis, Iowa; Richard C. Shannon, New York; Benjamin B. Odell, jr., New York; Sidney E. Mudd, Maryland; George E. White, Illinois; John J. Jenkins, Wisconsin; Charles F. Sprague, Massachusetts; James D. Richardson, Tennessee; Adolph Meyer, Louisiana; Asbury C. Latimer, South Carolina; William H. King, Utah; Mason S. Peters, Kansas, and William S. Cowherd, Missouri.

Revision of the Laws.—Messrs. Vespasian Warner, Illinois; Henry R. Gibson, Tennessee; Alston G. Dayton, West Virginia; Romulus Z. Linney, North Carolina; Thomas McEwan, jr., New Jersey; Thebold Otjen, Wisconsin; Joseph M. Belford, New York; Archibald Lybrand, Ohio; John W. Maddox, Georgia; Sidney P. Epes, Virginia; James T. Lloyd, Missouri; George J. Benner, Pennsylvania, and William C. Jones, Washington.

Reform in the Civil Service.—Messrs. Marriott Brosius, Pennsylvania; James A. Tawney, Minnesota; Richmond Pearson, North Carolina; Mahlon Pitney, New Jersey; S. A. Northway, Ohio; Charles F. Sprague, Massachusetts; De Alva S. Alexander, New York; Charles B. Landis, Indiana; Alexander M. Dockery, Missouri; Samuel M. Robertson, Louisiana; Samuel Maxwell, Nebraska; C. A. Barlow, California, and Rice A. Pierce, Tennessee.

Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.—Messrs. John B. Corliss, Michigan; William C. Arnold, Pennsylvania; Clifton B. Beach, Ohio; John M. Mitchell, New York; Adin B. Capron, Rhode Island; James H. Coddling, Pennsylvania; H. Henry Powers, Vermont; Samuel W. Smith, Michigan; Milford W. Howard, Alabama; Jehu Baker, Illinois; C. A. Barlow, California; George J. Benner, Pennsylvania, and George W. Taylor, Alabama.

Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.—Messrs. H. C. Brewster, New York; William R. Ellis, Oregon; Samuel J. Pugh, Kentucky; Martin N. Johnson, North Dakota; Samuel J. Barrows, Massachusetts; H. C. Van Voorhis, Ohio; John E. Osborne, Wyoming; T. S. Plowman, Alabama; Jeremiah D. Botkin, Kansas; Albert M. Todd, Michigan, and William W. Kitchin, North Carolina.

Irrigation of Arid Lands.—Messrs. William R. Ellis, Oregon; Benjamin F. Howell, New Jersey; Warren B. Hooker, New York; Thomas H. Tongue, Oregon; John A. Barham, California; John J. Jenkins, Wisconsin; Charles B. Landis, Indiana; John F. Shafroth, Colorado; R. D. Sutherland, Nebraska; John E. Osborne, Wyoming, and John E. Kelley, South Dakota.

Immigration and Naturalization.—Messrs. Lorenzo Danford, Ohio; Charles N. Fowler, New Jersey; Rowland B. Mahany, New York; Samuel W. McCall, Massachusetts; Martin N. Johnson, North Dakota; Edward E. Robbins, Pennsylvania; Joseph V. Graff, Illinois; Stanyarne Wilson, South Carolina; Peter J. Otey, Virginia; Sidney P. Epes, Virginia, and William L. Greene, Nebraska.

Ventilation and Acoustics.—Messrs. Joel P. Heatwole, Minnesota; George W. Prince, Illinois; Richard C. Shannon, New York; Edward L. Hamilton, Michigan; Harry Skinner, North Carolina; Thomas J. Strait, South Carolina, and David H. Smith, Kentucky.

Expenditures in the State Department.—Messrs. Lemuel E. Quigg, New York; Robert R. Hitt, Illinois; William Alden Smith, Michigan; Horace B. Packer, Pennsylvania; Rufus E. Lester, Georgia; John E. Kelley, South Dakota, and William C. Jones, Virginia.

Expenditures in the Treasury Department.—Messrs. Robert G. Cousins, Iowa; James W. Wadsworth, New York; William A. Stone, Pennsylvania; E. D. Crumpacker, Indiana; William L. Terry, Arkansas; John Lamb, Virginia, and James L. Slayden, Texas.

Expenditures in the War Department.—Messrs. William W. Groat, Vermont; Charles A. Russell, Connecticut; Walter P. Brownlow, Tennessee; James R. Young, Pennsylvania; Joseph Wheeler, Alabama; John S. Rhea, Kentucky, and William L. Stark, Nebraska.

Expenditures in the Navy Department.—Messrs. James F. Stewart, New Jersey; Frederick H. Gillett, Massachusetts; James A. Connolly, Illinois; Charles G. Bennett, New York; Stanyarne Wilson, South Carolina; William M. Howard, Georgia, and John L. Brenner, Ohio.

Expenditures in the Post-Office Department.—Messrs. Irving P. Wanger, Pennsylvania; Michael Griffin, Wisconsin; Joseph V. Graff, Illinois; N. D. Sperry, Connecticut; Milford W. Howard, Alabama; Levin I. Handy, Delaware, and N. B. McCormick, Kansas.

Expenditures in the Interior Department.—Messrs. Charles Curtis, Kansas; Frank G. Clarke, New Hampshire; Isaac A. Barber,

Maryland; Seth W. Brown, Ohio; Jehu Baker, Illinois; H. D. Clayton, Alabama, and Patrick Henry, Mississippi.

Expenditures in the Department of Justice.—Messrs. Cyrus A. Sulloway, New Hampshire; William H. Moody, Massachusetts; Israel F. Fischer, New York; Joseph B. Showalter, Pennsylvania; Thomas C. Catchings, Mississippi; Thomas J. Bradley, New York, and William A. Young, Virginia.

Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.—Messrs. Charles W. Gillet, New York; George Edmund Foss, Illinois; Loren Fletcher, Minnesota; Walter Evans, Kentucky; William F. Strowd, North Carolina; John H. G. Vehslage, New York, and Ferdinand Brucker, Michigan.

Expenditures on Public Buildings.—Messrs. David G. Colson, Kentucky; Thomas Updegraff, Iowa; William S. Knox, Massachusetts; John McDonald, Maryland; Richard P. Bland, Missouri; W. Jasper Talbert, South Carolina, and J. William Stokes, South Carolina.

Accounts.—Messrs. Benjamin B. Odell, jr., New York; Melville Bull, Rhode Island; Charles F. Joy, Missouri; Eugene F. Loud, California; Marlin E. Olmsted, Pennsylvania; Charles F. Sprague, Massachusetts; Charles L. Bartlett, Georgia, Hugh A. Dinsmore, Arkansas, and Robert C. Davey, Louisiana.

JOINT COMMITTEES.

Library.—Messrs. Alfred C. Harmer, Pennsylvania; Lemuel E. Quigg, New York, and Amos J. Cummings, New York.

Printing.—Messrs. George D. Perkins, Iowa; Charles A. Chickering, New York, and James D. Richardson, Tennessee.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its secretaries, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, July 24, 1897.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed, to join a similar committee appointed by the House of Representatives, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses, having completed the business of the present session, are ready to adjourn, unless he may have some further communication to make.

The message also announced that in compliance with the foregoing resolution the Vice-President had appointed Mr. ALLISON and Mr. TURPIE.

NOTIFICATION OF THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, the committee appointed on the part of the House to notify the President of the United States that the House was ready to adjourn joined the Senate committee and have discharged the duty imposed upon them. The President directed the committee to inform the House that he had no further communication to make to the Congress, except to extend his congratulations upon the conclusion of its arduous labors, which embraced the most important legislation of many years, and to express his hope that its work would prove of lasting benefit to all the people of our common country. He also desired the committee to assure the House that he wished for all the members health and happiness during their vacation and a safe return to the duties which will await them here next December. [Applause.]

MONETARY COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER. The message of the President in relation to a monetary commission will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The hour of 9 o'clock having arrived, in accordance with the joint resolution of the House and the Senate, and by the authority thereof, I announce that this House is adjourned without day.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 4029) giving apothecaries of the United States Navy and naval hospitals the title of naval pharmacists and rank and pay of warrant officers—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4030) directing the Secretary of the Navy to consider and report on the subject of a statue of the late Admiral David D. Porter—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4031) creating a currency commission, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHANY: A bill (H. R. 4032) to provide an American register for the foreign-built vessel *British Lion*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LENTZ: A bill (H. R. 4033) to restore the wages of printers and bookbinders in the Government Printing Office—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE (by request): A bill (H. R. 4056) for the raising of revenue and the creating of a tariff commission, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE VRIES: A bill (H. R. 4057) to grant a pension to all soldiers of the United States who served in the war between the United States and Mexico in the years 1846 to 1848, inclusive, and in the Union Army in the rebellion of 1861 to 1865, inclusive, in the United States—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 4058) to amend an act entitled "An act to organize the Hospital Corps of the Army of the United States, to define its duty, and fix its pay," approved March 1, 1887—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4059) providing for the appointment of pharmacists in the United States Marine-Hospital Service, and fixing their pay and allowance—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McRAE: A resolution (House Res. No. 82) for the consideration of Senate bill No. 3, to approve a compromise and settlement between the United States and the State of Arkansas—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: A resolution (House Res. No. 83) for the consideration of House joint resolution No. 81, authorizing the appointment of a monetary commission and providing for its expenses—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HULL: A joint resolution (H. Res. 87) authorizing transfer of \$50,000 of the unexpended balance of appropriation "Pay, etc., of the Army, 1896," to "Pay, etc., of the Army, 1897," to meet deficiencies in last-named appropriation—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: A memorial of the Pennsylvania legislature, in favor of a sufficient appropriation to provide for a creditable representation by the United States at the Paris Exposition in 1900—to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 4034) granting a pension to John C. Tension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4035) granting a pension to Martha E. Kenon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4036) for the relief of the estate of R. C. Bumpass, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BAKER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4037) granting a pension to Mary F. Burton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4038) granting a pension to Silas A. Elkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 4039) to correct the military record of Gabriel P. Bartley, of Portsmouth, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 4040) for the relief of James R. Edwards, of Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 4041) removing the charge of desertion from the record of W. H. Sherwood, Company F, Thirtieth Ohio Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 4042) to authorize the Light-House Board to pay to Chamblin, Delaney & Scott the sum of \$2,125—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 4043) for the relief of James E. Southard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4044) for the relief of Elizabeth Pursel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4045) granting a pension to John E. Kirkham—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4046) for the purpose of correcting the military record of James M. Blankenship, alias Charles M. Smith, Company K, Third Kentucky Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4047) granting a pension to Isaac N. Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4048) granting a pension to Randolph F. Williamson, of Darlington, Montgomery County, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4049) for the relief of Robert H. Pyke—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4050) for the relief of Capt. Robert E. Bryant—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4051) granting a pension to John D. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4052) to correct the military record of Micajah Powell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOVE: A bill (H. R. 4053) for the relief of Elizabeth Mackin and Edward Dooley, heirs of Joseph and Mary Dooley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OGDEN: A bill (H. R. 4054) for the relief of the trustees of the Mansfield Baptist Church, of Mansfield, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VEHSLEGE: A bill (H. R. 4055) for the relief of Hannah Dean Tillman—to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. HENDERSON (by request): Petition of the League of Republican State Clubs of the District of Columbia, signed by the committee, consisting of William L. Branhall, president and chairman, Marion T. Anderson, B. F. Crenshaw, William E. Rogers, A. M. Clapp, J. M. Craig, C. M. Forrest, Milton C. Foss, and Edward W. Whittaker, asking that the civil-service order issued May 6, 1896, be revoked, and that the civil-service law be restored to the condition it was prior to the issuance of said order—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. HULL: Paper to accompany House bill No. 87—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McINTIRE: Sundry petitions of numerous citizens of Baltimore, Md., asking for a more rigid restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OGDEN: Petition of the trustees of Mansfield Baptist Church, of Mansfield, La., for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TODD: Memorials of various labor organizations in the State of Michigan, viz, Oil Dealers' Protective Union, No. 6573; International Broom Makers' Union; Coopers' Local Union, No. 63; Railway Teamsters' Protective Union, No. 5872; Bridge and Structural Iron Workers' Union, No. 6583; Machinery Molders' Union, No. 244; Tobacco Workers' Union, No. 9; Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, No. 43; Motormen and Conductors' Convention; Shoemakers' Union, No. 30, Electrical Workers' Union, No. 30; Typographical Union, No. 18, all of the city of Detroit; and Grocers' Clerks' Union; Bakers' Union No. 57; Iron Molders' Union, No. 213, of the city of Grand Rapids; Iron Molders' Union, No. 242, of Jackson; Longshoremen's Union, No. 25; Central Trades Union, of Bay City; Longshoremen's Union, No. 14, of Tawas City; Brotherhood of Holders On and Heaters, No. 6776, of Wyandotte; Cigar Makers' Union, No. 393, of Cadillac; Cigar Makers' Union, No. 310, of Manistee; Typographical Union, No. 184, of Ann Arbor; Cigar Makers' Union of Saginaw, protesting against the passage of House bill No. 30 and Senate bill No. 1575, intended to abolish the present system of ticket brokerage—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of E. O. Grosvenor and 72 other citizens of Jonesville, Mich., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 30, abolishing railway ticket brokerage—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the nineteenth encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic of Michigan, in favor of the passage of the bill for the relief of soldiers who suffered in rebel prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the nineteenth annual encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic of Michigan, asking for the passage of a bill establishing a national cemetery at Vicksburg, Miss.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the nineteenth encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic of Michigan, protesting against the late order of the President to consolidate the pension agency of Detroit with that at Indianapolis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Laura A. Silburn and 203 others, urging the passage of a bill to regulate the sale of cigarettes, protecting a State or Territory desiring to prohibit their sale—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the faculty, trustees, and students of Hillsdale College, and various churches, Young Men's Christian Associations, and other organizations, of Hillsdale, Mich., and vicinity, in favor of the passage of a law raising the age of protection to 18 years in the District of Columbia and Territories—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the session of the Presbyterian Church at Hillsdale, Mich., and 55 other churches, colleges, and beneficial associations, favoring the passage of a law forbidding the use of mails to papers publishing deaths by suicide, and pictures and descriptions of prize fights—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Presbyterian Church at Hillsdale, Mich., the mayor of Hillsdale, and various societies, urging the passage of a bill to prevent the nullification of State antigambling laws, and prohibiting interstate gambling by telegraph—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the First Baptist Church and numerous citizens of Hillsdale, Mich., for the passage of a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of obscene matter—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Presbyterian and Baptist churches, Hillsdale College, and various societies, favoring the enactment of a Sabbath law for the national capital—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

