

Milwaukee, Wis., against certain amendment of the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HUNTER: Petition of members of Captain Hanway Post, No. 83, Grand Army of the Republic, of Bowling Green, Ky., for the passage of the private pension disability bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: Petition of the Prairie Du Sac Grange, No. 175, asking that there be no further extension of charters to national banks, etc.—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of W. D. Carleton, and 110 others, citizens of Dane County, Wisconsin, in favor of the schedule of duties agreed upon by the wool-growers and woolen manufacturers at Washington, January 14, 1888—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIDLAW: Petition of citizens of Chautauqua, N. Y., for the protection of wool-growers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCREARY: Petition of Joseph Ballou, of Lincoln County, and of Mary Hope, by Ann Rupley, heir, of Boyle County, Kentucky, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCORMICK: Petition of Rev. H. King and 32 others, citizens of the Sixteenth district of Pennsylvania, for prohibition in the District of Columbia—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: Petition of John A. Miller and others, for the passage of bills adjusting accounts of laborers under the eight-hour law, and giving workmen the benefit of said law—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. O'DONNELL: Petition of 15 members of the Norvell (Mich.) Farmers' Club, praying for an increase of the duty on wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Calhoun County (Michigan) Grange, No. 3, Patrons of Husbandry, for the creation of a department of agriculture, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHARLES O'NEILL: Resolutions of the Vessel-Owners' and Captains' Association, urging that if the duty on sugar is reduced there should be a proportionate reduction on molasses—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Pennsylvania Prison Society, on the subject of convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of A. T. Eggleston and 40 others, citizens of Sedgwick County, Kansas, for organizing the Territory of Oklahoma, etc.—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. RAYNER: Petition of certain citizens of Baltimore, Md., in reference to the claim of Wesley Hartlove, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICE: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., in opposition to the passage of the bill to protect free labor from the injurious effects of convict labor, as tending to impose upon the former, and the industries in which it is employed, greater burdens than those hitherto borne—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of Sarah H. Morton, widow, and heirs of Josiah S. Morton, of Rutherford County, and of Samuel Sherrill, of Lincoln County, Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Charles Hickerson, of Coffee County, Tennessee, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS: Papers in the claim of George W. Davis, of Sebastian County, Arkansas—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of George W. Davis, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SENEY: Of L. H. Reisinger, of Galion, Ohio.

By Mr. SPOONER: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Providence, R. I., for more ample accommodations for appraisement of goods at the port of New York—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Board of Trade of Providence, R. I., for the incorporation of the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. J. D. STEWART: Petition of Hannah Allen, of Clayton County, Georgia, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. E. B. TAYLOR: Petition of Mrs. Tamer Slater, mother of Lewis K. White, Company F, One hundred and fifteenth Ohio Volunteers, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN (by request): Papers in the claim of Julia R. Speakes, of Pierson Peoples, of William Cook, of James Horton, of Jackson M. Hoover, of Samuel R. Ihly, of Henry J. Harter, of Isham Peoples, and of Nathaniel W. Ellis, of South Carolina—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSHEND: Petition of the representatives of J. W. Edwards, of Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Illinois, for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition of James Groves, of Robertson County, Tennessee, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. S. V. WHITE: Petition of Rev. A. L. Stinard and 29 others, residents of the Third district of New York, for prohibition in the

District of Columbia—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. W. L. WILSON: Petition of Amos Morrison, of Bunker Hill, Berkeley County, West Virginia, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOST: Petition of Robert Campbell, late postmaster at Lexington, Rockbridge County, Virginia—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

The following petitions for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of \$25 levied on druggists were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. CLEMENTS: Of citizens of Floyd County, Georgia.

By Mr. S. T. HOPKINS: Of Washington Laycock, of Rondout, N. Y.

By Mr. JACKSON: Of physicians and druggists of Washington County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. LODGE: Of John Lanabee, of Melrose, Mass.

The following petitions for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, were received and severally referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of John G. Smith and 62 others, citizens of Kossuth, and of James A. Henderson, and 30 others, citizens of Green County, Iowa.

By Mr. LAIDLAW: Of citizens of Fredonia, N. Y.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by the means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. S. T. HOPKINS: Of citizens of North Hebron, N. Y.

Also, of citizens of Union Grove, N. Y.

By Mr. HOVEY: Of citizens of Salem, Ind.

By Mr. LAIDLAW: Of citizens of West Valley, of Whitesville, and of Sheridan, N. Y.

By Mr. REED: Of citizens of Leeds, Me.

By Mr. RYAN: Of citizens of Halifax, Kans.

The following petitions, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. BOOTHMAN: Of J. M. McEwan and 58 others, citizens and ex-soldiers of Holgate, Ohio.

By Mr. LAIDLAW: Of ex-soldiers of Chautauqua County, New York.

By Mr. RYAN: Of citizens of White City, Morris County, Kansas.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. GIFFORD: Of 118 citizens of Jerauld and Hutchinson Counties, Dakota.

Of Mr. GUENTHER: Of 37 citizens of Waukesha County, Wisconsin.

By Mr. HOUK: Of citizens of Blount County, Tennessee.

By Mr. LAIDLAW: Of 189 citizens of Chautauqua County, and of 87 citizens of Cattaraugus County, New York.

By Mr. SAYERS: Of 61 citizens of Comal, Gillespie, and Blanco Counties, Texas.

By Mr. STONE, of Missouri: Of 227 citizens of Cass and Cedar Counties, and of 92 citizens of St. Clair County, Missouri.

The following petition for an increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:

By Mr. ABBOTT: Of citizens of Cuba, Johnson County, Texas.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, May 8, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* announced his signature to the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

A bill (S. 1064) for the relief of L. J. Worden;

A bill (S. 1828) to provide for a light-house at Newport News, Middle Ground, Va.;

A bill (S. 2458) to amend an act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Potomac River at the foot of Pennsylvania avenue east;

A bill (S. 2506) for the establishment of a light-house, fog-signal, and day beacon in the vicinity of Goose Rocks, Fox Island Thoroughfare, Maine; and

A bill (S. 2614) to authorize the Batesville and Brinkley Railroad to build a bridge across the Black River in Arkansas.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented the petition of John Pope Hodnett, of the District of Columbia, praying compensation for service rendered by him as counsel of the workmen of the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented a petition of 100 citizens of Westfield, Kans., praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MITCHELL presented the petition of Charles Gaskins and others, heirs of David Gaskins, late a citizen of Virginia, praying to be allowed compensation for losses sustained by him in consequence of the occupation of his farm by the Union Army in 1862, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McPHERSON presented a petition of citizens of New York City, praying that the work of the eradication of pleuro-pneumonia be continued under the Bureau of Animal Industry as at present organized; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DAVIS presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against the proposed amendment to the interstate-commerce law prohibiting transportation of interstate commerce over Canadian railways in its transit between points of shipment and destination; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CHANDLER presented the petition of C. B. Palmer and 13 other citizens of Bremen, Me., praying that a pension be granted to Mary Johnston, widow of William Johnston, a soldier in the war of 1812; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CHANDLER. I present the petition of N. E. Bowers, president, and R. P. Coop, secretary, of the Nashua (N. H.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and S. J. Frazier, Worthy Patriarch of the Sons of Temperance, and other citizens of Nashua, N. H., praying for legislation against the running of Sunday mail trains; I also present a petition of the same parties, praying for legislation forbidding interstate commerce on Sunday by railroad trains; and a petition of the same parties, praying for legislation against military drills on Sunday. I move the reference of these petitions to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HISCOCK. I present the petition of John Pope Hodnett, of the District of Columbia, praying compensation for services rendered by him as counsel for the workmen of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SPOONER. That matter at the last Congress was before the Committee on Claims. The claimant asks, I think, some \$25,000 from the Government of the United States as compensation for services which he alleges he rendered as counsel for certain laboring men in this District. I think, perhaps, the petition ought to be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. I make that motion.

Mr. HISCOCK. I understand that there is a bill on the subject pending before the Committee on Claims.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. A previous petition on the subject was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and reported back by that committee with a request that it be discharged and that the petition be referred to the Committee on Claims, which was done by order of the Senate.

Mr. SPOONER. Very well.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the petition will be referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HISCOCK presented a petition of ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Ontario, Steuben, and Yates Counties, in the State of New York, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of farmers of Westchester County, New York, complaining of certain abuses now practiced under the authority of the Bureau of Animal Industry; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a mass meeting of the farmers of Westchester County, New York, held at Mount Kisco, April 16, 1888, it was unanimously

Resolved, That the sense of this meeting is that the action of the officials of the Bureau of Animal Industry, acting under the orders of the governor of the State of New York, in quarantining the cattle of Westchester County is highly injurious to the interest of the farmers, and that the manner of conducting the quarantine has been unjust, partial, and unfair.

Resolved, That it is the opinion of this meeting that the manner of the appointments made under the governor's orders of the inspectors of cattle throughout the country have been made with a view of promoting the interest of the politician without regard to the wishes or interest of the farmers.

Resolved, That we deem it unnecessary to quarantine any herds but those affected with pleuro-pneumonia, and that the restraining of the moving of healthy cattle from one place to another is not only inconvenient but oppressive, and that we demand immediate relief from the necessity of obtaining a permit to buy, sell, or move healthy cattle.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the governor of the State of New York and proper authorities at Washington, D. C., and we would respectfully ask the honorable Senate and House of Representatives to investigate the management of quarantined districts before making any further appropriation for the Bureau of Animal Industry.

JOSHUA B. WASHBURN, Chairman.
ARTHUR S. COME, Secretary.

Mr. BLAIR presented the petition of Hon. John J. Bell, Ex-Governor Charles H. Bell, and other citizens of Exeter, N. H., praying for the passage of a bill for the better protection of the Yellowstone National Park; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ALDRICH presented a petition of the Providence (R. I.) Board of Trade, praying for increased accommodations for the appraisement of goods at the port of New York; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HOAR. I present a memorial of the New England Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, composed of 250 ministers, representing 37,000 church members, who protest against the ratification of the treaty with China, lately pending, as it proposes to exclude all Chinese persons, except official representatives, merchants, teachers, and travelers. This body protests against any treaty which excludes Chinese ministers of the gospel from coming to this country, and which prevents Chinese delegates to their general conference from taking their places in that body as utterly un-American and un-Christian. I suppose, until we can appeal from the American people drunk to the American people sober, this question must be considered as settled. Under the rules I presume the memorial must lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The memorial will lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I am instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary to report an amendment to be proposed to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill when it shall be under consideration, concerning stenographers in the courts in Utah, when such courts are engaged in the trial of United States causes, as they may be called.

I move that the amendment be printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon, which were agreed to; and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 2583) for the relief of Mrs. Julia W. Jones, widow of Lieut. Rowland M. Jones;

A bill (S. 2645) granting arrears of pension to Alden W. Treworgy; and

A bill (S. 2431) for the relief of Nathan Burnham.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Robert Hammond, of Cambridge, Ohio, praying to be allowed compensation, etc., for injury sustained in the amputation of his leg, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the committee were discharged from the further consideration of the petition.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 6575) for the relief of James L. Alsip;

A bill (H. R. 417) granting a pension to David Strunk;

A bill (H. R. 7913) granting a pension to Nellie Palfrey Goodwin;

A bill (H. R. 6520) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Ward;

A bill (S. 2646) granting a pension to Danville A. Ricker;

A bill (S. 2459) granting a pension to Mary S. Maynard;

A bill (S. 2500) granting a pension to Gertrude K. Lyford;

A bill (S. 2451) placing the name of Elizabeth Domm on the pension-rolls; and

A bill (S. 2439) granting a pension to Charlotte T. Alderman.

Mr. BLODGETT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2705) granting a pension to Ellen Smith; and

A bill (S. 2728) to grant a pension to Indiana J. Nichols.

Mr. BLODGETT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon; which were agreed to, and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 2694) granting a pension to Rev. Henry N. Greninger;

A bill (S. 2706) granting an increase of pension to Deborah C. Sayles; and

A bill (S. 2703) granting a pension to Anna A. Tallman.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 5522) for the relief of Elijah Martin;

A bill (H. R. 955) granting a pension to Mary M. Sweet;

A bill (H. R. 2167) for the relief of George E. Oliphant; and

A bill (H. R. 7490) for the relief of Sidney W. Whitelock.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon, which were agreed to; and the bills were postponed indefinitely;

A bill (S. 2649) granting a pension to William Doan;

A bill (S. 2699) granting a pension to George W. Francis;

A bill (S. 2679) granting a pension to Luman N. Judd;

A bill (S. 2698) granting a pension to Martha Allen and the minor children of Robert Allen; and

A bill (S. 2687) granting a pension to Joseph Blanchard.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred

the petition of Isaac N. Herald, praying to be allowed a pension, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the committee were discharged from the further consideration of the petition.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2690) granting a pension to John Gallagher, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2721) granting a pension to Jackson Chapman; and

A bill (S. 1162) for the relief of Susan E. Alger.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of William S. Grow, praying to be allowed a pension, submitted a report thereon, accompanied by a bill (S. 2884) granting a pension to William S. Grow; which was read twice by its title.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the petition of Henry A. Hawley, of Delma Junction, Iowa, late hospital steward, United States Army, praying to be allowed a pension, submitted a report thereon accompanied by a bill (S. 2885) granting a pension to Henry A. Hawley; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 488) granting a pension to Elizabeth Burr;

A bill (H. R. 3922) to place the name of Casper Seibel on the pension-roll;

A bill (H. R. 3959) granting a pension to Dolly Blazer;

A bill (H. R. 6845) granting a pension to John Witham; and

A bill (H. R. 8266) for the relief of Mrs. Clarissa G. Green.

Mr. QUAY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5844) to increase the pension of William Clark, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1340) granting a pension to Elizabeth Sirwell, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon, which were agreed to; and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 1975) to increase the pension of the widow of the late Naval Constructor Edward Hartt;

A bill (S. 1047) to increase the pension of James A. Underwood; and

A bill (S. 2469) for the relief of Annie L. Langworthy.

Mr. PADDOCK. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2549) for the relief of Belle R. Clements, to report it adversely; but I was requested to ask that the bill be placed on the Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The bill will be placed on the Calendar, with the adverse report of the committee.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of citizens of New York and Illinois, praying that the name of Maria N. Abbey, a nurse during the war of the rebellion, be placed on the pension-roll, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the committee were discharged from the further consideration of the petition.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2604) granting a pension to Mrs. Loanda Sherman, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2647) regulating the practice in certain cases in the Post-Office Department, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MITCHELL subsequently said: A few moments ago I reported a bill from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads. Since submitting that report I am in receipt of a communication from the Postmaster-General, and I think it is due him and the Department that his communication should be incorporated in the report. I ask leave, therefore, to withdraw the report for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Leave will be granted the Senator to withdraw the report for the purpose suggested, if there be no objection. It is so ordered.

Mr. TURPIE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon; which were agreed to, and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 2709) for the relief of Hugh O'Neil; and

A bill (S. 2708) granting a pension to Albertia Shipman.

Mr. TURPIE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2657) granting an increase of pension to Emily J. Stannard;

A bill (S. 2710) granting a pension to the widow of John Shafer; and

A bill (S. 2595) to increase the pension of Seth F. Myers.

Mr. TURPIE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Joseph B. Sellers, praying to be allowed an in-

crease of pension, submitted a report thereon, accompanied by a bill (S. 2886) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Sellers; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MCPHERSON, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8464) for the relief of the Merchants' National Bank, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2481) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Kentucky River and its tributaries, by the Louisville, Cincinnati and Virginia Railway Company, reported it with amendments.

Mr. STANFORD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2789) for the erection of a public building at Reno, State of Nevada, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 785) to provide for an addition to the United States building at Jackson, Miss., reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 786) to provide a building for the use of the United States courts, post-office, custom-office, and internal-revenue office at Vicksburg, Miss., reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4467) for the erection of a public building at Bar Harbor, in Maine, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7265) for the erection of a public building at Hoboken, N. J., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2788) for the erection of a public building at Virginia City, State of Nevada, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2546) to appropriate \$12,000 for the completion of the public building at Peoria, Ill., and increasing the limit of the cost of said building, reported it without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BLODGETT introduced a bill (S. 2887) granting a pension to George H. Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MITCHELL introduced a bill (S. 2888) for the relief of Charles Gaskins and others, heirs of David Gaskins, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WALTHALL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2889) for the relief of Fannie Ricks Jones and Anne Ricks Willis, heirs of Benjamin S. Ricks, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ALDRICH introduced a bill (S. 2890) granting a pension to Fannie A. Kimball; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, introduced a bill (S. 2891) granting a pension to Mrs. N. H. Lambdin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2892) to authorize the Territory of Idaho to aid the construction of a wagon-road between Northern and Southern Idaho; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. PADDOCK introduced a bill (S. 2893) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to encourage the growth of timber on the western prairies;'" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

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

Mr. STEWART and Mr. STANFORD submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. HAWLEY, it was

Ordered, That leave is hereby granted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers in the case of Charles G. Merriman, of Connecticut.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. VOORHEES. Mr. President, if it will not interfere with the business of the Senate, I desire to make a statement personal to myself, which I conceive to be due to the Senate.

It is well known that I have been seriously indisposed and confined to my room almost exclusively for the last week. I visited the Senate Chamber yesterday with the purpose of making the statement then which I shall make now. The opportunity, however, did not present itself until I was suffering so much pain that I withdrew from the Capitol and went home.

Referring to a discussion in which I participated last week, I desire to say to the Senate, that, however severe the provocation which was

given, yet I made use of language at that time contrary to parliamentary rules and to the rules and usages of this body and to the decorum of the Senate. I regret having used such language, and tender a proper apology to the Senate of the United States for having done so. My high respect for the dignity of this body, of which I have been for many years now a member, as well as my self-respect, induces me to make this statement.

REVENUE SERVICE IN MARYLAND.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over under objection from a former day.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. MANDERSON, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate, at as early a date as is practicable, full information as to employes in the customs service at the port of Baltimore, in the offices of the collector, the naval officer, surveyor, and appraisers at said port; all of said information, as hereinafter detailed, to cover the time between March 4, 1885, and April 30, 1888.

1. Number, names, and official designations of employes removed or resigned upon request since March 4, 1885, with dates of removal or resignation, and giving cause of removal, when made for cause.
2. Number, names, and official designations of employes appointed since March 4, 1885, with dates of appointments.
3. Number and designation of offices and official positions coming within the classified service, created since March 4, 1885.
4. Number and designation of offices and official positions coming below or outside the classified service, created since March 4, 1885.
5. Number and designation of offices and official positions coming within the classified service, abolished or left vacant since March 4, 1885.
6. Number and designation of offices and official positions coming below or outside the classified service, abolished or left vacant since March 4, 1885.
7. Total number of employes, with names and official designation of each, in the customs service March 4, 1885.
8. Total number of employes, with name and official designation of each, in the customs service April 30, 1888.
9. Number, names, and official designations of heads of divisions in the customs service March 4, 1885.
10. Number, names, and official designations of heads of divisions in the customs service removed or resigned upon request since March 4, 1885, with dates of removal or resignation, and giving cause of removal when made for cause.
11. Number, names, and official designations of heads of divisions in the customs service appointed since March 4, 1885.
12. Number, names, and official designations of temporary employes (excepting day laborers) appointed since March 4, 1885, with the date of appointment and term of service of each.

Also, to furnish the Senate with full information as to employes in the internal-revenue service in Maryland in the office of the collector for the district of Maryland, all of the information as hereinafter detailed, to cover the time between March 4, 1885, and April 30, 1888.

1. Number, names, and official designations of employes removed or resigned upon request since March 4, 1885, with dates of removal or resignation, and giving cause of removal when made for cause.
2. Number, names, and official designation of employes appointed since March 4, 1885, with dates of appointment.
3. Total number of employes, with name and official designation of each, in the customs service March 4, 1885.
4. Total number of employes, with name and official designation of each, in the customs service April 30, 1888.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. GORMAN. I move to amend the seventh paragraph by adding at the end the words, "designating those who were appointed under the civil-service law and those who were appointed without examination."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend the seventh paragraph, by adding:

Designating those who were appointed under the civil-service law and those who were appointed without examination.

So as to read:

Seventh. Total number of employes, with names and official designations of each, in the customs service March 4, 1885, designating those who were appointed under the civil-service law and those who were appointed without examination.

Mr. GORMAN. I have no objection in the world to the Senate having all the information that is asked for in these resolutions, but unless the amendment that I have offered be adopted the information that will come will be necessarily misleading.

Mr. MANDERSON. If I may interrupt the Senator, I certainly have no objection to the interpolation of the words suggested by him in the resolution. I think it is a very proper amendment to the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is the Senator from Nebraska understood as accepting the modification?

Mr. MANDERSON. I have no objection to it if the Senate sees fit to interpolate it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BALTIMORE POST-OFFICE EMPLOYÉS.

Mr. MANDERSON. There is another resolution, coming over from a previous day, of a similar character.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. MANDERSON, as follows:

Resolved, That the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, directed to send

to the Senate, at as early a date as practicable, full information as to employes in the post-office at Baltimore, all of said information, as hereinafter detailed, to cover the time between March 4, 1885, and April 30, 1888.

1. Number, names, and official designations of employes removed or resigned upon request since March 4, 1885, with dates of removal or resignation, and giving cause of removal when made for cause.
2. Number, names, and official designations of employes appointed since March 4, 1885, with dates of appointments.
3. Number and designation of offices and official positions coming within the classified service created since March 4, 1885.
4. Number and designation of offices and official positions coming below or outside the classified service created since March 4, 1885.
5. Number and designation of offices and official positions coming within the classified service abolished or left vacant since March 4, 1885.
6. Number and designation of offices and official positions coming below or outside the classified service abolished or left vacant since March 4, 1885.
7. Total number of employes, with name and official designation of each, in the post-office March 4, 1885.
8. Total number of employes, with name and official designation of each, in the post-office April 30, 1888.
9. Number, names, and official designations of heads of divisions in the post-office March 4, 1885.
10. Number, names, and official designations of heads of divisions in the post-office removed or resigned upon request since March 4, 1885, with dates of removal or resignation, and giving cause of removal when made for cause.
11. Number, names, and official designations of heads of divisions in the post-office appointed since March 4, 1885.
12. Number, names, and official designations of temporary employes (excepting day laborers) appointed since March 4, 1885, with the date of appointment and term of service of each.

Mr. GORMAN. I offer the same amendment to paragraph 7, the same language precisely, to come in at the end of the paragraph.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the seventh paragraph the words:

Designating those who were appointed under the civil-service law and those who were appointed without examination.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be agreed to, if there be no objection; and the question recurs on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BALTIMORE AND POTOMAC RAILROAD.

Mr. BLAIR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1430, being the land-grant forfeiture bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further morning business that order is closed, and the Senator from New Hampshire moves—

Mr. FARWELL. I ask unanimous consent to take up Senate bill 2615. I think there will be no objection to it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further morning business, the Senator from New Hampshire is recognized to move the consideration of Senate bill 1430.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask the Senator from Illinois to wait until the land-forfeiture bill is taken up, and then it can be laid aside.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1430) to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes.

Mr. FARWELL. I now ask unanimous consent to take up Senate bill 2615 for consideration at this time.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the pending business be informally laid aside for the purpose of enabling him to move the consideration of the bill (S. 2615) to authorize the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to acquire and use real estate for railway purposes in the District of Columbia, which has been read at length as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. BLAIR. I have no objection, unless the bill shall lead to discussion.

Mr. FARWELL. It will lead to no discussion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would hold that the Senator from New Hampshire would have the right to ask for a vote upon his motion if there should be any objection. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2615) to authorize the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to acquire and use real estate for railway purposes in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FARWELL. The bill has been previously read as in Committee of the Whole.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understood that an amendment had been or was to be proposed to the bill.

Mr. FARWELL. I will offer certain amendments now.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill having been read at length it is open to amendment, and the Senator from Illinois proposes amendments which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 2, line 3, strike out the words "of Maryland and" and insert the words "and west of;" and in the same line change the word "avenues" to "avenue;" and after "avenue" insert "and south of Maryland avenue and west of Sixth street west;" so that the clause will read:

That the said company is also hereby authorized to acquire for railway pur-

poses such additional property as may be needed south and west of Virginia avenue and south of Maryland avenue and west of Sixth street west.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The next amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 2, line 5, after the word "it," insert "west of Sixth street west and south of Virginia avenue;" so as to read:

And to extend its tracks to its said properties, as well as those now owned by it west of Sixth street west and south of Virginia avenue.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The next amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of section 2 the following proviso:

Provided, That the power of condemnation shall not be exercised west of Delaware avenue, beyond the limit of two squares in depth at right angles from the main track of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad: *And provided further*, That no property used for church or school purposes shall be condemned under this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about this bill.

I am in favor of granting the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company reasonable facilities to acquire lands in this city for their purposes. I take it that this bill is a final settlement of the question of the removal of the railroad from the route granted to and now occupied by the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad. I suppose it is the end of any effort to remove the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad, and my own judgment, as a longsojourner here in this District, is that it is a wise settlement of that controversy. The Baltimore and Potomac Railroad have a right to their present location, and they should be encouraged to improve, to ornament, and to complete it, and this bill will enable them to take their cars from the streets and avenues of this city and to place them in grounds to be purchased by them and owned by them in severalty. So I consider that as settled.

What I wish to say is, that I think the Congress of the United States in neglecting to compel the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad to take their depot out of the unsightly place in which it is now situated, and running that railroad across some twenty different squares of the city of Washington and depreciating the value of property worth millions of dollars belonging to private citizens, preventing the improvement of a large section of the city, and one of the most beautiful sections of the city, a section equal in capacity and extent and beauty of location to the northwestern section of the city, is a hardship and injustice that ought to be put an end to. I wish now to announce my willingness to participate in requiring the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad to remove their tracks from their present location. I am told they are willing to remove them.

Mr. COCKRELL. Where should they be removed?

Mr. SHERMAN. Their depot should be removed, in my judgment, to an equally eligible and proper site alongside the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad depot. I would require them at once to remove five or six squares from their present location, say anywhere east of Seventh or Eighth street east, there to tunnel under one of the streets, to carry their road around and bring it in alongside of the Baltimore and Potomac south of Sixth street west. If Sixth street is to be thus devoted to railroad purposes, the Baltimore and Ohio should be given equal facilities with the Baltimore and Potomac. It is not possible to bring these two corporations together in a common depot, because they would quarrel with each other. I know that in Ohio we have several places where these roads are brought in contact, and they never could agree about anything. I would put them alongside of each other and give them equal facilities and equal privileges under sharp and equal competition, and require them to make equal improvements, bridges and embankments, so as to protect the park and make the crossing of the tracks easy and safe and reduce to a minimum the obstruction and disfigurement of the park.

I merely rose to express my desire that the Committee on the District of Columbia would at the present session, in conformity with the universal wish of the people of Washington without exception, report some bill that will relieve us from the nuisance which now lies in our sight. Here is the magnificent North Capitol street blocked up.

Mr. FARWELL. If the Senator will permit me, I will inform him that there is a subcommittee on that matter now which has it under consideration.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is all I desire; but while we are rendering additional facilities to one of these roads we ought to render equal accommodations to the other.

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator from Ohio understand that this bill commits the Senate irrevocably and perpetually to the policy of keeping the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad on Sixth street and the park?

Mr. FARWELL. Not at all.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not know what the Committee on the District of Columbia proposes; but the effect of the purchase of the prop-

erty contemplated by the bill, the facilities extended to the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad, together with the general desire on the part of the business men of the city of Washington, to leave the depot where it stands, will, in my judgment, during our lifetime at least, and probably forever, keep the location of the Baltimore and Potomac depot where it is. I do not say that the committee desires it, but I say that is the effect of it.

Mr. VANCE. I desire to offer an amendment to come in at the end of section 2—

Mr. HOAR. Does a single objection send this bill over?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPOONER in the chair). The Chair so understands.

Mr. HOAR. I object.

Mr. BLAIR. I call for the regular order.

Mr. VANCE. Can my amendment be read, sir, and printed, if the bill goes over?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It can be read, if there be no objection.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add to the proviso already adopted to section 2, the following:

Provided, That the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company shall be required to remove their track and depot from the public grounds which they now occupy and locate them upon the lands so acquired.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR] asks for the regular order.

JOHN C. GREEN.

Mr. HARRIS. I rose for the purpose of asking the indulgence of the Senator from New Hampshire for a single moment in order that I may ask the Senate to consider Order of Business 812, Senate bill 67, and if it leads to a minute's debate I will retire from the scene and not trespass upon the courtesy of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BLAIR. I can yield no further. If the Senator's bill does not require debate I shall not object.

Mr. HARRIS. If it leads to debate I shall not ask indulgence.

Mr. BLAIR. I give notice to the Senate that if another like request is made I shall object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Tennessee asks that the pending business be informally laid aside for the purpose of considering Senate bill 67.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 67) to perfect the military record of John C. Green, of Tennessee.

The Committee on Military Affairs reported an amendment, in line 12, before the words "of August," to strike out "first" and insert "twelfth day;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and required to enter on the rolls of Company I, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteers, the name of John C. Green, as duly mustered into the service of the United States on the 20th day of December, A. D. 1863, and to complete his military record as follows: Captured by the enemy, while in the line of duty, at Union City, Tenn., March 24, A. D. 1864; died at Andersonville, Ga., on the 12th day of August, A. D. 1864, while being detained by the enemy as a prisoner of war.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

FORFEITURE OF UNEARNED RAILROAD LANDS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1430) to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. PALMER] to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, in the very briefest way possible I wish to reply to a few observations made yesterday by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER]. The difference between the amendment of the Senator from Michigan and that of the Senator from Wisconsin I do not propose to discuss. I am opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, either with or without the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The Committee on Public Lands sought to forfeit all unearned lands, all lands opposite the uncompleted portions of the railways. That committee were of the opinion that they could not by legislative act settle the existing claims of the various claimants in the State of Michigan. They believed that any amendment of the character of this one would tend to defeat the forfeiture act. Therefore the committee said they would leave each of the parties there to seek his rights or his remedies before the Department or before the courts of the country, and so the bill stands to-day without this amendment.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin not only confirms cash entries of lands proposed to be forfeited by this bill, but thousands of acres of other lands that were entered for cash, which lands are in no way connected with this bill and are not included in the forfeiture. From the

remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin yesterday the Senate would infer that these lands were agricultural lands and were covered all over with homes and farms. The facts are that the great body of this land is not agricultural land. It is timber land; it is mineral land; it is land of very great value; and if the land was put up and sold to the highest bidder, as the law requires should be done, it would bring into the Treasury of the United States a vast amount of money.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office knew that these lands were not subject to sales at private entry. From 1865 to 1880, for fifteen years, he called the attention of the local officers at Marquette to the fact that these lands were not subject to private entry until they should be first offered at public sale, so as to give every man an opportunity to bid. They continued to sell them at private sale from time to time in the face of repeated orders from the Department here not to do so.

The committee that investigated the matter reported that these lands were purchased by less than thirty corporations. They purchased them at private entry, and the House report says that the register of the local land office so disobeyed the orders of his superior that the greater part of these applications were made out in his handwriting. The committee furthermore says that the people who entered these lands at \$1.25 an acre were the agents of corporations; and yet the Senator from Wisconsin I presume regards them as innocent purchasers, and he says that it would be dishonest on the part of the Government not to confirm these entries.

Mr. SPOONER. Do I understand the Senator to say that he presumes I am one of the innocent purchasers?

Mr. BERRY. No, sir. If the Senator so understood me he misunderstood me. I said nothing like it. I said that the Committee on Public Lands of the House had stated that the register of the land office was interested to-day in these lands, and I presumed that he was one of the innocent purchasers of whom the Senator from Wisconsin was speaking.

Now, Mr. President, these lands the law required should be sold to the highest bidder. They were entered by these companies at a dollar and a quarter an acre in the face of the law, and now they ask the Senate of the United States to come in and confirm to them an immense body of lands, some of which the Senator from Wisconsin said yesterday had sold at \$100 per acre. If a man down in the hills of Arkansas or upon the plains of Wisconsin twenty years ago purchased 40 acres of land from the Government, and built his home upon it, and for some cause his title proves to be invalid, he can only come to the Government of the United States and get back his dollar and a quarter an acre; but these parties who the Senator says paid into the Treasury a million dollars can go there to-day and get their million dollars back, because that is the law, and if their entries were invalid they have a right to have the money back. I beg the Senator to tell me why Congress should take a man's land in Arkansas and give him back only one dollar and a quarter an acre without interest, and why he says it is dishonest on the part of this Government to refuse to confirm to these syndicates and these corporations 400,000 acres of land, 800,000 acres including the even sections, but 400,000, as was said yesterday, included within the odd sections.

If these lands are worth from ten to twenty or thirty dollars an acre, as is asserted, and will bring it at public sale, the law requiring them to be sold at public sale, I ask why it is that certain favored individuals can go and purchase them at a dollar and a quarter an acre in the face of the law and not give every other person an opportunity to purchase, and then ask the Congress of the United States to confirm their titles?

These are the objections I have to it. I know no party connected with it. The information I have is from the testimony taken before the House committee contained in the majority and minority reports made by that committee. It is open to every Senator here to examine that testimony. I assert that no one can read that testimony from beginning to end without coming to the conclusion that this register acted in a fraudulent way when he allowed the entry of these lands. I can not perceive that it is dishonest for the Senate of the United States to refuse to ratify such proceedings. The ideas of the Senator from Wisconsin and mine differ if he thinks it is dishonest for any man to refuse to vote for the confirmation of these titles when this testimony, as a majority of a committee of one branch of Congress has said, shows that they were procured in that way. It seems to me that it is unjust.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH] a few days ago delivered a long speech here tending to show that the party to which he belonged had been in favor of forfeiting all the unearned lands and that the difficulty was that the other branch of the Congress, a majority of whom belonged to a different party, had been the obstructionists; yet he is willing to-day to allow an amendment to go on this bill that has but one tendency, and that is to defeat the forfeiture of these unearned grants, when all parties have professed again and again that they were in favor of their forfeiture.

If this amendment is not adopted, if the several parties, the cash entrymen, the canal men, and all the other claimants have equities, let the parties come to Congress in a separate bill; but do not seek to load down this bill, which is a forfeiture bill pure and simple, with a mat-

ter which will tend to defeat the forfeiture bill and to defeat all legislation whatever.

Mr. President, I have talked on these amendments more frequently than I intended, but I am earnestly in favor of forfeiting the unearned land grants. I am earnestly in favor of the bill passing both Houses of Congress at the earliest day possible to accomplish that result. I believe that if this amendment is placed on this bill the probabilities are that this Congress will do as the last one did—that is, that these forfeitures will not take place because of differences between the two Houses. Therefore I trust that neither the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin nor that of the Senator from Michigan will be adopted, but that both will be laid on the table, and that the bill as it comes from the committee will be passed by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I am in favor of the passage of this bill, for I am in favor of forfeiting every acre of unearned land granted to a State or to railway companies for the construction of railroads that there is in the United States; but this bill, general in its terms, operates throughout the United States, and it proposes to forfeit and throw open to settlement lands which have already been purchased from the United States. I think it is manifestly proper that in adopting general legislation of this character Congress should provide for the protection of those purchasers if they ought to be protected.

That they need protection no one denies. It is admitted that these Michigan entries are invalid for the reason that, notwithstanding the lands were held by the land officers to be open to entry, they had not been reoffered, as required by law. In the case put by the Senator from Arkansas as to the failure of title in his State, I should be willing to vote to confirm those titles if the purchases were in good faith. Anywhere in the United States, where a man has bought from the Government of the United States at the Government land office land, believing that it was open to entry, has paid his money, there being no fraud in the transaction, I would cheerfully vote to confirm his title, and I think nearly every Senator would cheerfully so vote.

The Senator from Arkansas can not successfully indict the integrity of all the owners of these lands by the means he adopts for that purpose. There are 1,200 of them as stated by Mr. PAYSON in his report. At least half the men interested to-day in these lands are men who have bought from the original entrymen, and hold under conveyance from them and their grantees. Certainly the Senator from Arkansas does not impute fraud to them. Some of these original entrymen, who I presume still hold the land which they bought, I happen to know, and they stand as well, and deservedly stand as well, in the community in which they live as the Senator from Arkansas can stand in the community in which he lives.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a moment for a question?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. PALMER. Will he tell me how those 1,200 owners are distributed?

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. PAYSON states that they are distributed in this way: that 384 live in Michigan, 89 in Wisconsin, 37 in Illinois, 20 in Pennsylvania, 20 in New York, 17 in Ohio, 7 in Massachusetts, and 126 are scattered.

Mr. PALMER. I meant as to their property, their holdings.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not know.

Mr. PALMER. They are mostly in two towns which are essentially out of this case. They are on the even sections, and the Department has decided in favor of the cash entries.

Mr. SPOONER. It is stated in this report that 400 of these people own tracts of land not exceeding 160 acres each, small tracts of land. Now we have their money; the Senator says let them come and take back their money with interest. I ask the Senate of the United States if that is any measure of protection or justice to these people. They have paid taxes on these lands for years; some of them have sold them in good faith and given warranty deeds of them. Others have made improvements upon them and it would be no fair adjudication of their claim simply to give them back the purchase-money which they paid into the Treasury.

I am utterly at a loss to understand how the Senator from Arkansas can reconcile his attitude as to this amendment with his attitude as to the bill itself which comes from his committee. I am only asking by this amendment that Congress shall protect the title of these men whom the Secretary of the Interior shall find to have purchased in good faith. Of course there is a defect in the title.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator allow me there?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. Does not the Senator know that so far as the provision in the amendment that the Secretary of the Interior shall confirm the title of those who he is satisfied entered in good faith is concerned, the decision would be on an *ex parte* hearing where the Government would not be represented and where these parties would only furnish evidence of good faith? So it would absolutely amount to a confirmation of that entire body of 800,000 acres of land. I care not how much fraud a register of the land office who disobeyed the orders of his superior and

in his own handwriting filled out applications to lands that he knew were not subject to private entry and then afterwards became the agent through whom these sales were made may have committed, evidence will no doubt be furnished to show good faith, especially where the Government is not represented on the other side.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not think the Senate of the United States will dispose of this question upon the assumption that the statements or suspicions presented by Mr. Henley in his report are to be taken as absolutely conclusive on the questions of fact. Mr. PAYSON and the gentlemen who joined with him in the minority report say there is no evidence of collusion or fraud in the transactions, that there is no evidence of fraudulent purpose on the part of the land officers, no evidence of fraudulent purpose on the part of the purchasers; and how the Senator can talk about the Government of the United States not being represented when the amendment provides that the very officer who must first be satisfied by satisfactory proof of the good faith of these parties is an officer of the United States, a Cabinet officer of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, I can not understand. The Secretary is at liberty under this amendment to inaugurate any investigation he chooses. The evidence must be made satisfactory to him. He may demand such measure of testimony as he sees fit to be taken in such manner as he may indicate. So it seems to me there is nothing whatever in that objection.

But, Mr. President, the Senator seems to me, as I said, to be inconsistent. He would not confirm, no matter in whatever good faith the purchaser may have entered the land, one of these entries. Now this bill provides for forfeiting land on the ground that the railway companies never have earned it, and that therefore the Government of the United States has under all decisions the right to resume it; and this very bill which the Senator supports, in its second section provides—

That in all cases where persons are in possession of any of the lands affected by any such grant and hereby resumed by and restored to the United States, under deed, written contract with, or license from, the State or corporation to which such grant was made, or its assignees, executed in good faith prior to January 1, 1886, they shall be entitled to purchase the same from the United States, etc.

How purchase "from the United States?" They are to be entitled to purchase by paying the regular price. The land is not to be offered. They are entitled under this bill to protect their purchases in good faith by paying into the Treasury of the United States \$1.25 or \$2.50 an acre.

Mr. BERRY. One moment. The bill provides that they shall be allowed to purchase by paying \$2.50 an acre. That has no reference whatever to lands entered at private entry. It applies to the railroad lands out West, and it does not confirm their title, but simply gives them a preference over others to purchase at the given price.

Mr. SPOONER. Exactly. Where they have not paid the Government, where the land is resumed on the ground that it belongs to the Government, the bill to which the Senator agrees protects the title obtained in good faith from the railway company. True, the company did not own the land, but this authorizes the purchaser from the railroad company as against every other man in the United States, any homestead settler under the laws of the United States, to go to the land office, and by paying \$2.50 an acre, take the land; now why protect the titles of men who have purchased in good faith from a railroad company which confessedly had no title, and yet refuse to protect the title of men who have purchased in good faith from the very Government itself? They authorize these men who have not paid the Government to go to the land office and pay the United States. In the cases which I am endeavoring to protect by this amendment the parties have already gone to the land office of the United States and entered the land and paid the money.

Then I should like to know—for this appears to be satisfactory to the Senator from Arkansas—how can the question of good faith in the case of a purchaser from a railway company be determined fairly to his satisfaction, and yet the Senator be able reasonably to say that the Secretary of the Interior can not fairly determine the question of good faith under the amendment which I offered.

I do not intend to take up the time of the Senate any further in discussing the proposition.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question. I desire to know why the amendment should be limited to the State of Michigan alone?

Mr. SPOONER. I limited it to the State of Michigan because these lands were all unearned in the State of Michigan, and I knew of no other instance in the country which would come within the purview of the provision. I thought it might be objected to if it were not so restricted. That is why I limited it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, is an amendment in order at this time?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill is not now subject to amendment, an amendment in the second degree being pending.

Mr. MITCHELL. I shall at the proper time, unless I change my mind or see some good reason why I should not do so, move to amend the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin by striking out, in line 4, the words "the State of Michigan" and inserting in lieu thereof "any State or Territory."

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the lands in controversy have been the subject-matter of discussion in the Interior Department for several years. I do not recollect the exact statements that have been made pro and con, and I have never read the report referred to by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] as made in the House of Representatives, but I am morally certain that it can not be alleged against any considerable portion of these cash entries that there was any corruption or any fraud. What may have been the conduct of some officials, whether they made an error or whether they acted willfully and knowingly for the purpose of securing this land to themselves, I think there has been practically no complaint that the entrymen themselves committed any fraud on the Government.

It was a question that baffled and annoyed the Department for some time as to the status of these entries, whether they were valid entries or whether they were not valid. As I understand now the proposition is simply to say to the men who bought in good faith, who were bona fide purchasers, supposing that under the law they had the right to take the land, that they shall be protected in their property. If any individual conveys property that he does not have a title to, under the pretense that he has, in equity and in law he is compelled to make it good. The United States had an absolute title to this land, and nobody denied it. It was within the power of the Government to make a good title; yet the officers who assumed to do it acted without the authority which might have been obtained from the legislative department; but supposing they had that authority they made the title. They have taken these people's money, and these holders for fifteen or eighteen years, and in some instances perhaps longer, have paid the State taxes, have held possession of the land, and have believed they were the owners of it.

About 1882 there was a contest raised as to the question whether this was valid or not, and it was generally understood that there was a technicality that might vitiate the title though the patents had issued. Thereupon in some instances settlers went upon these lands for the purpose of making homes, believing that they were bona fide entitled to do so, believing that they did not interfere with the real right of anybody. They made pre-emption and homestead claims on top of the lands which the Government had already issued a certificate for, and in many cases had issued a patent for.

I understand by the amendment accepted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], and offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. PALMER], that that class of bona fide settlers are protected.

In addition to this there is not any question but what a large number of people went on these lands for the purpose of getting them for speculation, and not for the purpose of making homes. They did what other people had attempted to do—get the lands for the timber that was on them. That class of men are not entitled to any protection at the hands of the Government or any consideration whatever.

I shall vote for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin as amended by the acceptance of the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, which protects every bona fide settler.

Now, then, the question is simply this: Shall we protect the men who supposed that they had a right to take these titles, as the Government said it had a right to make them; who paid their money and took their receipts, and subsequently took their patents and sold to other men, who had the same right to believe in the title, at an advance price—whether these bona fide owners and holders are to be deprived of their lands for the simple purpose of allowing somebody else to come in here and get them—because the moment they are open they will be occupied by some other persons? The Government will derive no great benefit from this transaction, even if it was right and proper, which I deny.

The lands may sell for \$25 or \$30 an acre, it is said. I do not know exactly where they are. That has nothing to do with the question, in my judgment. If the Government has lured its citizens into buying these lands, they believing that they were entitled to do so, it is an act of injustice on the part of the Government, because it has the technical right, to say because the land has advanced in price that it shall not now be held by those people who, trusting the authorities appointed by law to make the final conveyance, received it. Because they trusted them and took their title, are they now to be despoiled and destroyed of their rights on a mere technicality?

Mr. President, recently under a decision of the Interior Department with reference to land in the vicinity of Denver overruling decisions of the Interior Department made in two cases carefully adjudicated in 1873 and 1874, after the people had been in possession of the land, after they had had a patent from the Government in some instances for fifteen years, the Government of the United States proceeds to institute suit to set aside the patent on the theory that the lands adjudicated by the Government to a certain railroad company had never been the property of the railroad company. The land is worth in some cases a thousand dollars an acre; and who is to be benefited by that thousand dollars an acre? Is it the Government?

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. TELLER. Not now. The Senator may speak when I get through this illustration.

Is it the Government that is to be benefited? Not at all. The mo-

ment it is declared that these are void entries, that moment the land is open under the settlement law, and Mr. Jones and Mr. Smith and everybody else jump on to it, and the man who had cultivated it for fifteen years and who put fences on it and houses on it and had made it a garden, who has held it and paid taxes on it, is deprived of his property that some saloon-keeper who hung around the town and did nothing may go upon it and receive the benefit of the enhanced value by the labor of the former occupant.

What I mean to say is, that when the Government has by its decisions misled its citizens and justified them in buying land of the Government or of a railroad company, the Government, while it is not in law, is in morals and in decency estopped from despoiling its citizens in that way.

Now, I will hear the Senator from Arkansas if he wishes to ask me a question.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator stated that some of this land was now worth a thousand dollars an acre.

Mr. TELLER. Not this land that is in controversy. I spoke of the Denver land.

Mr. BERRY. I want to say to the Senator that a very large portion of this land is not agricultural land; it has no houses and no ditches and no farms upon it. It is mineral land; it is iron land of great value. The Senator says that the Government would not be benefited. The law requires this land to be offered to the highest bidder. If it is offered to the highest bidder to-day it will bring from \$25 to \$30 an acre, it is said. If there is any reason why these men who purchased in fraud of the law, in the face of the instructions of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, shall be given by this Government the difference between a dollar and a quarter an acre and that which the land will bring at public sale to the highest bidder—if there is any reason why we should donate and contribute this to these corporations and these syndicates that do not occupy the land, I shall be glad if the Senator from Colorado would tell me what that reason is.

Mr. TELLER. I take issue with the honorable Senator. There is not any law that requires the land now in controversy in Michigan to be put up and sold at auction. It is discretionary with the Department. They may withdraw it from the operation of the settlement law and put it up. The Senator knows that upon pretty nearly every one of these pieces of land there are now four sticks laid out in the shape of a basement of a house. He knows that there is a little something done upon it by some speculator, and it is not a question whether the Government of the United States is to get what the value of the land is, but it is a question whether somebody else who has not had anything to do with this land up to the present time shall step in and have the enhanced value produced, perhaps not by the labor that these men have put upon it in Michigan, but by the holding of it until circumstances have made it valuable, upon which they have paid taxes for fifteen or eighteen years, and some man who has no claim at all upon the Government, who has never been misled by the action of its officials, who never has paid a dollar in State tax or anything else, or paid for the land, is to come in and take it as a homesteader or pre-emptor if he sees fit.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator has just admitted that it was in the power of the Department to withdraw it from settlement and offer it to the highest bidder.

Mr. TELLER. So as to the men who bought the land in the vicinity of Denver, who bought it from a railroad company that had a patent to it, and after there had been two determinations in the Department that it was railroad land and not public land, it is in the power of the President of the United States to put up that land that has now enhanced in value, having passed through the hands of half a dozen owners, and sell it for a thousand dollars an acre; but it would be downright robbery if he should do it; and there has not been any President who has ever sat in the chair of Washington who would have thought of doing it. The people of the United States are not so poverty-stricken and so poor that they want the Government of the United States to engage in robbing the citizens. They are willing that the Government should do what any individual would be compelled to do by the decent and respectable people of the community in which he lived, and that is, to make good his contracts and not to resort to technicalities of law. I say that the Government of the United States can not afford to take from anybody the land it has conveyed to him when the purchaser believed that he was getting a title from the Government, there being no fraud on his part.

If there was a mistake, what is the rule of equity? That the man who made it must suffer for it, and not the man who acted in good faith. If it was ignorance on the part of the Government officers, then the Government should suffer. If it was fraud on the part of the Government officers, then the Government should suffer and not the citizen, unless the citizen participated in the fraud; and it is only proposed here to treat with the bona fide people, those who acted in good faith.

Now, Mr. President, it may be that you could save fifteen or twenty or thirty thousand dollars of money by these proceedings; it may be that by resuming control of the land I have spoken of that is covered with houses in the city of Denver the Government of the United States

can add to its overflowing Treasury; but does the Senator from Arkansas want that done? Does he believe that the constituents who stand behind him want it done? Does he believe the respectable people of this country want it done when it comes out of the pockets of some citizen of the United States who is himself without fault?

Mr. President, money of that kind would be a disgrace to us, and ought to bring misfortune to us as well as to be a disgrace. What we want to do is, if there has been an honest transaction on the part of the citizen with the Government, that that shall be maintained. No government in the world can afford to plead technicalities; no government can afford to say, "The law is against you; you did not know it; but in the mean time I sold you this land; I took your money; I put it in my treasury and have used it; but twenty years later I have discovered a technicality that will enable me to pay you back your money and sell the land to others at an enhanced price."

Mr. President, the very suggestion is abhorrent, it seems to me. If these people took in good faith, then the Government is bound to protect them and to make them a title if it can be made; and the only exception should be cases where there was fraud or collusion with those acting under the Government. Where the honest settler, the bona fide occupier, has gone upon the land and attempted to make title, he ought to be protected, because his interests are paramount to those of the capitalist who put his money in or of the party who has simply bought, because one or the other must be wrong. But where there is no question of occupation, where it was a fair transaction between the Government and the cash purchaser, there ought not to be any hesitation either in this case or in any other in dealing with the citizen; and that is why the committee provide in this bill that where a railroad company not having the title, not being possessed of the title to the land, attempted to sell the land and did sell it under the supposition that it belonged to the company, the citizen believing it as well as the railroad company, and then it turned out that the railroad company did not own it, the Government shall allow him, contrary to public policy now, to buy the land of the Government and not take it by pre-emption or homestead entry. It is because the Government allowed him to be misled by its conduct; and if the Government has directly misled him, then much stronger is the case that the Government should protect him.

Not only did the Government in these cases give the certificates, but years afterwards issued the patents. The Senator says that it was in violation of the instructions of the Commissioner of the General Land Office. Why did the Commissioner of the General Land Office subsequently, at a period varying from a few months to several years, issue patents for these lands? The truth was that the whole thing proceeded upon a misapprehension as to the law, and that is all there was of it—a misapprehension as to the law by the purchasers and a misapprehension of the law by the Department. Now, it is said that the Government should take advantage of this mistake of the law and deprive these people of what they supposed and had a right to suppose was their property for the last fifteen or twenty years.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado is horrified at the idea that this Government should attempt to take lands because of a mere technicality, and he says the trouble arose from a mistake of the Government. I read six letters—I think there are six—from the Commissioner of the General Land Office at Washington to the local officers at Marquette, telling them again and again, "These lands are not subject to private sale;" and in subsequent letters, "You have disobeyed the orders, and I again remind you that they are not subject to private entry." In the face of that the officers at Marquette went on and sold 800,000 acres of these lands, three-fourths of which were sold to twenty corporations and syndicates, and the same register of the land office is now in partnership with the parties who purchased; and yet the Senator from Colorado says that is a mere technicality, and it would be robbery on the part of the Government to claim the lands. That may be called a technicality in the courts in which he has practiced, but in those in which I have appeared that would be called fraud, and any man who would doubt that these corporations had full knowledge of the fact that the Commissioner of the General Land Office was instructing the local land officers not to sell these lands at private entry—I say the man who would doubt that knows little of the operations of the corporations of this country.

Mr. President, the whole history of land grants to corporations of every character and description has been that in every instance almost the corporation has failed to comply with the conditions contained in the grant. The history of it is that wherever they have secured an advantage by the decision of any court over any poor settler, they have with merciless hand driven him from his home; and yet when they have made a mistake, when they thought they could purchase in the face of the law, when they knew they were violating the law, when this land would have brought thousands upon thousands of dollars if put up at public sale, when these favored individuals were permitted in the face of the law to take it up at \$1.25 an acre and now come and make a pathetic appeal to Congress when they have possession of lands said to be worth to-day millions of dollars, the proposition that these men who paid \$1.25 an acre for 800,000 acres of land should receive back only the money paid, the Senator from Colorado thinks would be a

great hardship, and he seeks to make an appeal to the Senate and to its sympathy in behalf of these syndicates.

I assert that no man can read the testimony taken before the House committee, no man can read the majority report, without coming to the conclusion that in nine cases out of ten these parties had knowledge of the fraud, and they knew they were gambling, they knew they were speculating, and they have no hold upon this land but that they have secured by paying a dollar and a quarter an acre, lands of immense value, and that their hold is uncertain, and the Department having decided against them they come here now and seek to foist it upon a bill known to be popular, a land-forfeiture bill forfeiting lands granted to railroads. They know they can not get their claim through on its own merits, and their only hope is to tack it onto a bill that the whole country is in favor of, and then they hope by that means to confirm a title which was conceived in fraud and which was known to be a fraud at the time it was done; and these lands, as I said, were sold directly in face of the orders of the Interior Department. If it is right to confirm them under the circumstances, then I have said all that I wish.

I repeat that my information comes from the report made to the Congress of the United States. If it is a false report, the men who made it are responsible for it. It comes from testimony taken week by week of witnesses who have sworn to these facts.

I insist that this land-forfeiture bill, which we all protest that we want to pass, ought not to be clogged and loaded down with amendments which will have a tendency to defeat it, and then Senators go before the country and say the Senate of the United States passed the land-forfeiture bill, but the House of Representatives did not agree to it, when they are placing amendments on it which they know that no man who understands that testimony can conscientiously agree to.

Mr. TELLER. I do not know what may be the rule in the courts in which the Senator pleads in Arkansas, but I know what is the rule in the courts in which I have practiced, and that is that there is no fraud to be charged on a party who does not participate in it. It certainly is not so in the higher courts of the United States. No man is chargeable with a fraud who does not participate in it. The Senator does not charge that these cash entries participated in fraud.

Mr. BERRY. I assert directly that that report said that three-fourths of this immense body of land was purchased, and that the committee were driven to the conclusion that it was purchased in fraud, and the purchasers must have known it.

Mr. TELLER. That was the impression of the committee without evidence, and my recollection is that there is no evidence which would justify that statement. But if that was true as to a few, what is to be done with the others? No man is chargeable with fraud, I repeat, who himself has not participated in it; and if the Government of the United States puts in a land office a scoundrel, as it frequently does, and that man proceeds to ignore the instructions of his superior, as is frequently the case, and a citizen is misled in putting his money into a purchase of land, is it any answer when he says, "I demand that the Government treat me as an individual would be compelled to treat another individual in any forum of the land," to allege that the land officer committed a fraud without any connection with the party who made the purchase of the land? There is the failure of the Senator's argument. He insists that the settler is responsible for the misconduct of the land officer and the subsequent misconduct (if he is correct) of the Commissioner who proceeded to issue a patent and the President who signed it. Was the President guilty of a fraud? Was the Commissioner guilty of a fraud?

The Senator knows, if he knows anything at all, that this whole proceeding arose from a misunderstanding of the law. There is not any question about it. If there were two men who knew that it was void they went in and bought with their own money a body of land on the supposition that some day the title would be confirmed. They must have been far-seeing men, for it has been a question in the Interior Department until within a very short time whether these were legal and valid entries. It was contended that they were valid most positively by some officers, and it has been only recently that the question has been finally settled.

The Senator from Arkansas can not obscure this question by saying that the amendment is put on here for the purpose of defeating the bill. Why, Mr. President, when did the Senator from Arkansas become the special champion of the people in respect to public lands? I do not want on a bill of this kind to go into a political discussion, but I say that there is, or ought to be, nothing of politics in this case. If there is I am quite prepared to show that the Senator need not throw any stones from that side of the Chamber when it comes to a question of fealty to the settler on the public lands on the part of the administration that preceded the war or the present and those that intervened. If he wants to open up the present administration of public affairs in reference to lands, I shall be quite prepared to meet him on any reasonable bill and at any reasonable time, and if I do not show him that this administration has done more to unsettle titles and disarrange business in the West than the value of the millions of money that he claims have been or are likely to be worth to the Government if it was recovered, I shall give up. There is no politics in this bill.

The Senator can not claim that he is more in favor of the repeal of

the law that withholds these lands from settlement than I am. Years before I became charged with duty in another department of the Government, on this floor I advocated again and again a repeal of all the grants made to railroad companies that had not been complied with at that time. As an executive officer I submitted three separate reports to the President, in each of which I urged the legislative department of the Government to take immediate steps to free public land from the incubus of a supposed grant.

The Senator need not stand here, nor need any other Senator, and attempt to hurl at me the stigma that I am in the interest of wishing to give to railroad companies or anybody else the public lands, for upon that question I yield to nobody in this Chamber or elsewhere. Ten years ago in this Chamber I introduced a bill that if it had passed then would have saved the country from a great deal of scandal, from a great deal of trouble, and would have saved a great deal of land for settlers that they perhaps will never get. Not only did I put in bills as early as that to forfeit some of these grants, but a bill which would restrict settlement entirely to homestead settlers, more than ten years ago, and upon every occasion I have advocated the preservation of the public lands for the actual settlers. I did not learn that doctrine in a Democratic school, either, but I was brought up to believe not simply that honesty was the best policy, but that it was a duty; and I would no more by my legislative vote here rob a man of that which belonged to him than I would as a private citizen, and I would be ashamed of myself in the community in which I live if I sheltered myself from an engagement of mine under the statute of limitations or any technical plea. I believe in keeping and maintaining not only the spirit of honesty, but honesty itself. I say that the Government having given to these people a title which they believed to be good, it being now in the power of the Government to make good the title, it is absolute robbery, and would be a national disgrace if we did not make good the title to every man who acted in good faith, and that is the only class of men that we seek to protect by this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BERRY. I move to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas moves that the amendment to the amendment lie on the table.

Mr. BERRY called for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator from Arkansas withdraw his motion for a moment?

Mr. BERRY. I withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. PALMER. To my clouded intellect there seems to be a great deal of irrelevant talk. An outsider would hardly appreciate what we are talking about. I know that this discussion may take a very wide range upon the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin; but what is under discussion now? It is my second amendment to the Senator's amendment, and it reads thus:

Provided, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to confirm any private entry for land heretofore settled upon and now claimed under color of the homestead or pre-emption laws; but in all such cases the Commissioner of the General Land Office and Secretary of the Interior shall hear and determine the claims of the parties respectively, according to the provisions of existing law.

It is one of the difficulties of my situation, Mr. President, that I was not trained in the law; and again, if I have a legal conviction, or a legal idea, I have not that technical phraseology and those sententious phrases that convince the groundlings (in which I include myself) and people who are not well versed in the law. I can not see why by reserving this right to the settlers and the homesteaders we are doing any injury to the cash-entry men, save taking away from them what is not legally theirs, and then we leave them the resort to the courts. I believe in confirming all these cash entries where there is no conflict. I will not say that there is any fraud in the entries among the purchasers. It is very evident, though, that a great many purchases were made with the conviction that they were buying into a pool; in other words, a gamble; and here is one of the evidences that I submitted yesterday from one of the parties who purchased, and it will speak for itself. This was Mr. A. C. Brown, a very respectable man.

Q. Did you have any talk with other parties living there, on the subject of those lands being reserved from the market?

Question repeated.

A. Yes.

Q. With whom?

A. It was a subject of general conversation.

Q. State to the committee whether or not it was generally known there among men dealing in the lands that these lands were within what was termed a lapsed railroad grant?

A. I think it was at that time.

Q. Afterwards you say that in 1880 you did buy some of the lands?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. At the solicitation of young Mr. Selden?

A. Yes.

Q. You bought them knowing the situation, did you?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you expect to hold that land?

A. I was willing to take my chances of it.

. That is scandal, I have no doubt. I am not talking of the legality or the weight of this in a court. I am merely stating that these men, who all bought in good faith, are not idiots. There undoubtedly were some of them innocent purchasers; but most of them knew that they were buying into an uncertain thing, and they were willing to take the chances, just as Mr. Brown says. Now, I am willing to give my vote toward the confirmation of all lands where there is no conflict by bona fide settlers. But the settlers have fought this fight for the last eight years. They have got certain rulings in the Department, and they are suspicious of all these amendments. As I said in regard to the canal discussion, I fear—and here I merely repeat—the Greeks bearing gifts. I do not pretend to call my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] a Greek at all, but that is the way it phrases. If we can protect them by the most stringent amendment that we can adopt, I am in favor of doing it.

The Senator from Wisconsin said yesterday:

Now, when it is asked that Congress shall go beyond that—

That was my first amendment:

That nothing herein contained shall be construed to confirm any sales or entries of lands upon which there were bona fide pre-emption or homestead claims on the 1st day of January, 1888, arising or asserted under color of the laws of the United States.

The Senator said:

Now, when it is asked that Congress shall go beyond that, I beg leave to say to the Senator from Michigan, with all due respect to him, that the proposition is subject to the just suspicion that it is the purpose to ask Congress to legislate, not on broad principles which shall fairly take in and protect all who ought to be protected, but under some specious guise or disguise to legislate for particular cases, the merits of which the Senate does not understand.

That is what we are all the while suspecting on the other side.

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

Mr. PALMER. Any number.

Mr. BLAIR. I should like the Senator to explain the difference between the amendment first read, and which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] was willing to have incorporated in his amendment, and the amendment the Senator from Michigan is now moving.

Mr. PALMER. Please repeat the question, I ask the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BLAIR. The Senator moved this amendment, which was accepted by the Senator from Wisconsin:

That nothing herein contained shall be construed to confirm any sales or entries of lands upon which there were bona fide pre-emption or homestead claims on the 1st day of January, 1888, arising or asserted under color of the laws of the United States.

That was accepted by the Senator from Wisconsin. Now the Senator from Michigan moves this amendment:

Provided, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to confirm any private entry of lands heretofore settled upon and now claimed under color of the homestead or pre-emption laws, but in all such cases the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Secretary of the Interior shall hear and determine the claims of the parties respectively according to the provisions of existing law.

Now, I wish to ask the Senator whether there be any distinction or difference between those two amendments save this, that in the last he leaves out the words "in good faith" or "bona fide," and also that he extends the time from the 1st of January, 1888, down to the passage of the act? Is there any other difference?

Mr. PALMER. I should think there was a very great difference. If the Senator will commence on the third line of the last amendment, at the words "but in all such cases," he will see quite a difference.

Mr. BLAIR. That is in the fourth line of the printed amendment.

Mr. PALMER. Where the words occur—

But in all such cases—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, being the bill (S. 2083) to provide for the establishment of a Bureau of Animal Industry, and to facilitate the exportation of live-stock and their products, to extirpate contagious pleuro-pneumonia and other diseases among domestic animals, and for other purposes.

Mr. CULLOM. I rise to say a word in reference to the order of business.

Mr. BLAIR. Will the Senator permit me to ask unanimous consent—

Mr. CULLOM. What I desire to say by unanimous consent is this: There are three bills before the Senate which have been talked about from day to day for nearly a month. We get about so far on this bill and then stop and take up another. It seems to me that we are making very little progress, and while I am a friend to all three of the measures that have been before the Senate, I desire to suggest to those in charge of these several measures and to the Senate generally that by consent we proceed with the consideration of this bill until it is finished, and then by consent go on and finish the bill that comes next in order, so that these bills may be gotten out of the way.

We are making no progress. The bill before the Senate is debated over and over again from day to day; about the same speeches are made, and we get no vote, and it seems to me that it is trifling away very much time that is not necessary to be spent in the way we are doing. I only

suggest this in the interest of progress in disposing of the business of the Senate.

Mr. PALMER. I would say so far as I am concerned that I am perfectly willing to continue with this forfeiture bill until we arrive at a conclusion.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed with the consideration of Senate bill 1430 until it is disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pending the consideration of the unfinished business the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR] asks the unanimous consent of the Senate that it be informally laid aside in order that the forfeiture land-grant bill may be continued.

Mr. COKE. I shall be compelled to object, unless unanimous consent is given that the animal-industry bill shall be taken up promptly at 2 o'clock to-morrow and proceeded with until it is disposed of.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no doubt this bill will be finished to-day if we go on with it.

Mr. COKE. I am entitled to the floor now, and I prefer not to take the floor after this bill has been disposed of, perhaps at 4 or 5 o'clock; but if I can get unanimous consent to have the unfinished business taken up to-morrow at 2 o'clock, I shall not object to this bill being continued to-day.

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

Mr. CULLOM. I trust the request the Senator makes will be granted, and that we shall go on with the consideration of the forfeiture bill to-day and continue until it is completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Texas that unanimous consent be given that the unfinished business shall be taken up at 2 o'clock to-morrow and proceeded with? The Chair hears none.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire that the unfinished business be informally laid aside in order that the Senate may proceed with the forfeiture land-grant bill? The Chair hears none, and the bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. PALMER] to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

Mr. PALMER. Have I answered the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BLAIR. The Senator's answer was that there was a difference, but he did not point it out.

Mr. PALMER. This is the vital part of the second amendment:

But in all such cases the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Secretary of the Interior shall hear and determine the claims of the parties, respectively, according to the provisions of existing law.

I do not understand that that concludes any parties from appealing to the courts after they get through there if they are dissatisfied; but the point of it is that the homesteaders have fought their fight in the Department, and now they do not wish to have it all undone by the amendment, as it would be, of the Senator from Wisconsin. I, not being a lawyer, can not tell what the legal effect of that would be, but I know how lawyers can construe language. They do not want to be relegated to the commencement of that old fight, although I have no doubt that if they had money enough to keep it up they would succeed in the end. They want to have a chock put under the wheels, and not be put down to the foot of the hill again; they have got really to the top. That is the whole animus of my second amendment.

Mr. BLAIR. What is the reason that the words "bona fide," in the first amendment, or "in good faith" are omitted in the second? Why not insert in the third line of the second amendment after "claimed," the words "in good faith" or "bona fide claimed?" What objection could there be that the two amendments should be alike in that respect?

Mr. PALMER. How would the Senator introduce it?

Mr. BLAIR. Let the second amendment read in this wise:

That nothing herein contained shall be construed to confirm any private entry for land heretofore settled upon and now claimed in good faith under color of the homestead or pre-emption laws.

Mr. PALMER. I see no objection to that.

Mr. BLAIR. Then another point. The second amendment covers time down to the passage of the bill. The first amendment covers the time to the 1st of January last.

Mr. PALMER. I gave my reasons yesterday why I introduced the amendment with this change of phraseology which withdrew that element of limitation of time, and that was this: I received a telegram from Mr. Hopkins, who is a very respectable man, as follows:

BEAR LAKE, Mich., 6th.

TO THOMAS W. PALMER:

Don't exclude pre-emption and homesteads taken since January 1. Hundreds of homes have been made since.

GEO. W. HOPKINS.

Those men have gone on under the decisions of the Department. They have had greater reason for going on than any cash entryman ever had for supposing that the lands were in the market. They have had continuous decisions and rulings of the Department, and I say that they should not be limited as to time.

Mr. BLAIR. In other words, the Senator claims that there have

been men who have homestead and pre-emption claims arising in good faith since the 1st of last January.

Mr. PALMER. Certainly. That limitation was withdrawn, because I got a telegram yesterday morning stating that the homesteaders were going on encouraged by the decision of the Land Office in *Wakefield vs. Cutter*, which ruled that "the cash entries on odd sections were absolutely void." I think that was on the 6th of last January. When we talk of these cash entrymen being invited to purchase these lands, even conceding it to be so, they have not had the encouragement to purchase these lands that the homesteaders have had to go and settle upon them. They have had not only decisions of the courts, but rulings of the Land Office.

Another thing in regard to the cash entrymen. They do not deserve the consideration that they should have if they had shown due diligence; but fifteen years ago, in the case of *Eldred vs. Sexton*, it was decided that their titles were not valid, and yet they have not taken any steps before Congress to have them validated except in some such way as this. That is all there is to the case.

Does the Senator from New Hampshire wish to ask any more questions?

Mr. BLAIR. Would not the Senator's entire purpose be obtained if the words "first of January" in the first amendment should be substituted by the "first of May?" Would not that cover everything that he desires?

Mr. PALMER. That would suit me. Just append that to my substitute. Do you mean my second amendment, for which this is a substitute, or my first amendment?

Mr. BLAIR. I think the first amendment. There seem to be two points of difference between the two amendments. The words "good faith" are left out of the second, and the second brings the time down to the present date, while the first stops at last January. If you introduce the element of good faith in the second amendment you already have it in the first—

Mr. PALMER. I admit that.

Mr. BLAIR. Then they are just alike. Now, if you make the first amendment cover the time down to the 1st of May, then it is just like the second one; each is like the other; and the Senator from Wisconsin in agreeing to say "the 1st of May" instead of "the 1st of January," accepts all that you ask substantially.

Mr. PALMER. That will necessitate the limitation of the 1st of May.

Mr. BLAIR. "Or the passage of the act." There would seem to be great propriety in fixing the 1st of May.

Mr. PALMER. The occupants would prefer the 1st of May to 1st of January, and I am willing to do that.

Mr. BLAIR. There can be no sort of question that amid all this turmoil and hullabaloo in the Senate and all over the country about this bill, as the amendment names the 1st of May this year these folks up there have heard about it, and if you should cover all who have made entries there in good faith down to the 1st of May you would cover everybody that would probably be there.

Mr. PALMER. Then the Senator would suggest the 1st day of May instead of the 1st day of January?

Mr. BLAIR. Yes, and making that the date in the first amendment. The last part, "arising or asserted under color of the laws of the United States," must include everything that is in the second amendment.

Mr. PALMER. Now the Senator will amend the second as he suggests. What is his suggestion, "in good faith?" Was it the proposition of the Senator that I should withdraw the second amendment?

Mr. BLAIR. The Senator from Wisconsin has accepted the first amendment of the Senator from Michigan, and if he will assent to change the date in the first amendment from January to May, and the Senator from Michigan is willing that only those shall be protected who are claimants in good faith, then the acceptance of this one change in the matter of date, and the adoption of the first amendment would, it seems to me, cover everything that the Senator from Michigan desires, and everything that either party in the controversy desires.

Mr. PALMER. Either the Senator from New Hampshire is confused or I am. The first amendment is the one that substituted "the 1st day of May" for "the 1st day of January." That is the first amendment accepted by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. SPOONER. Now, the proposition of the Senator from New Hampshire, as I understand it, is to amend that amendment by striking out the word "January" and inserting in lieu of it the word "May," so that it shall provide that this confirmation shall not be operative to confirm any title that comes in conflict with a bona fide pre-emption made prior to the 1st day of May, 1888.

Mr. PALMER. That is my first amendment accepted by you.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. That is all right. My second amendment is further up, on page 3979 of the RECORD:

Provided, That nothing herein contained shall be construed, etc.

Does the Senator from New Hampshire want to amend that?

Mr. BLAIR. I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin, as has been stated several times, adopted that first amendment.

Mr. PALMER. And he accepts it as amended.

Mr. BLAIR. Commencing—

That nothing herein contained shall be construed to confirm any sales or entries of lands upon which there were bona fide pre-emption or homestead claims on the 1st day of January, 1888.

Now substitute for "January" "May."

Mr. PALMER. That was all finished, but that is not the amendment under discussion. That comes in by a side track. I insist on my amendment:

Provided, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to confirm any private entry for land heretofore settled upon and now claimed under color of the homestead or pre-emption laws; but in all such cases—

Here is the point of it—

the Commissioner of the General Land Office and Secretary of the Interior shall hear and determine the claims of the parties respectively, according to the provisions of existing law.

And my explanation is this: They do not want to have that fight to go over again. They have fought the good fight and I hope they have finished their course, but with that left out they will not feel so.

Mr. SPOONER. Now, while the Senator from Michigan talks a good deal about his not being a lawyer, I have very little sympathy for him in that respect, for I venture the assertion that he has presented no amendment to this bill that has not been drawn by a very good lawyer.

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

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. PALMER. The second amendment was neither instigated, suggested, nor reviewed by a lawyer—the one that I have substituted the last for. That was drawn by a horny-handed son of toil.

Mr. SPOONER. But how about this?

Mr. PALMER. It was drawn by a lawyer, I hope.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator says it was drawn by a lawyer. I do not think any lawyer reading it would hesitate to come to that conclusion.

I only wish to make one remark in regard to this amendment, and then I shall have no more to say on this subject.

The amendment which I have accepted was correctly stated by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR] as protecting adequately every bona fide settler or pre-emption claimant down to January 1, 1888. This amendment which is now offered, and which was drawn by some lawyer, leaves out the words "in good faith," and the effect of it is simply to exclude from this confirmation every claim on every tract of land upon which up to the time this act passes there shall be a squatter, whether he has squatted in good faith or in bad faith—

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?—

Mr. SPOONER. Through fraud or otherwise.

Mr. PALMER. To show him my good faith.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not question your good faith.

Mr. PALMER. I accept the amendments to insert "good faith" and the limitation of time.

Mr. SPOONER. That is, "January" is changed to "May."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The proposed modifications to the amendment will be first reported at the desk to avoid confusion. The Chair understood that some modifications had been agreed upon and accepted by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PALMER. To facilitate business, I will say, for the information of the Secretary, that in my first amendment the "first day of January, 1888," is changed, by common consent, to the "first day of May."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Let that be reported.

Mr. SPOONER. I beg the Senator's pardon. I agreed to accept that amendment if the second amendment which he now proposes was withdrawn.

Mr. PALMER. Then that can be considered undone.

Mr. DOLPH. I move to lay the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin on the table.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Oregon moves to lay upon the table the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PALMER. I should regret to have that done.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair must remind the Senator from Michigan that the motion is not debatable.

Mr. PALMER. I would merely say that if the motion should be adopted I should have to vote against the Spooner amendment.

Mr. BLAIR. Am I to understand that this is a motion to lay the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin on the table?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. To lay the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin on the table.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Chair please state the question again?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Oregon moves that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin be laid upon the table.

Mr. BLAIR. I should like to know what that amendment is.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be read by the Secretary, though that can be done only by unanimous consent, the motion not being debatable and the reading being in the nature of debate. The Chair hearing no objection, it will be read.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the proposed section 9, the amendment is to add:

Provided, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to confirm any private entry for land heretofore settled upon and now claimed under color of the homestead or pre-emption laws; but in all such cases the Commissioner of the General Land Office and Secretary of the Interior shall hear and determine the claims of the parties respectively, according to the provisions of existing law.

Mr. BLAIR. By unanimous consent I wish to say that that is not the amendment of the Senator from Michigan as I understand.

Mr. PALMER. The Senator from New Hampshire is mistaken. That is my amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Debate is not in order. The amendment just read is the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, as the Chair understands and is informed by the Secretary.

Mr. SAWYER. I understand that the first amendment that was offered by the Senator from Michigan to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin was accepted and is part of my colleague's amendment. Is it not?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair so understands.

Mr. PALMER. That is the status of the case.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon to lay on the table the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PALMER called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, I wish the Senators in charge of this disputed point would state exactly what the scheme of this bill is about these questions so that we may vote intelligently.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Is this a motion to lay on the table?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is a motion to lay on the table. The roll-call will proceed.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOAR (when the name of Mr. DAWES was called). My colleague [Mr. DAWES] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. HISCOCK (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. MANDERSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN], who is detained from the Chamber by sickness. I do not know how he would vote on this question.

Mr. BERRY (when Mr. VEST's name was called). The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY]. If the Senator from Missouri were here, he would vote "nay."

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES].

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. The Senator from Connecticut is away, sick.

Mr. PADDOCK. I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS]. I do not know how he would vote.

Mr. HAWLEY. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS], temporarily absent, requested me to announce his pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. SPOONER (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired generally with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WALTHALL]. I voted, not noticing that he was absent from the Chamber. I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. BERRY. My colleague [Mr. JONES, of Arkansas] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. HISCOCK]. If my colleague were here he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 15; as follows:

YEAS—21.

Aldrich,	Evarts,	Jones of Nevada,	Stewart,
Brown,	Frye,	McPherson,	Stockbridge,
Chace,	Gibson,	Mitchell,	Teller.
Chandler,	Hawley,	Payne,	
Cullom,	Hoar,	Sawyer,	
Dolph,	Ingalls,	Stanford,	
Berry,	Davis,	Palmer,	Turpie,
Blodgett,	Edmunds,	Pasco,	Vance,
Cockrell,	Hampton,	Pugh,	Wilson of Iowa.
Coke,	Morgan,	Reagan,	
Allison,	Daniel,	Hearst,	Ransom,
Bate,	Dawes,	Hiscock,	Riddleberger,
Beck,	Eustis,	Jones of Arkansas,	Sabin,
Blackburn,	Farwell,	Kenna,	Saulsbury,
Blair,	Faulkner,	Manderson,	Sherman,
Bowen,	George,	Morrill,	Spooner,
Butler,	Gorman,	Paddock,	Vest,
Call,	Gray,	Platt,	Voorhees,
Cameron,	Hale,	Plumb,	Walthall,
Colquitt,	Harris,	Quay,	Wilson of Md.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. A quorum not having voted, the Secretary will call the roll of the Senate.

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

Aldrich,	Dolph,	Hoar,	Sherman,
Bate,	Edmunds,	Ingalls,	Spooner,
Berry,	Evarts,	McPherson,	Stanford,
Blair,	Faulkner,	Manderson,	Stewart,
Blodgett,	Frye,	Mitchell,	Stockbridge,
Brown,	George,	Paddock,	Teller,
Chace,	Gorman,	Palmer,	Turpie,
Chandler,	Gray,	Pasco,	Vance,
Cockrell,	Hampton,	Payne,	Walthall,
Coke,	Harris,	Pugh,	Wilson of Iowa.
Cullom,	Hawley,	Reagan,	Wilson of Md.
Davis,	Hiscock,	Sawyer,	

Mr. EDMUNDS. I wish to say that my colleague [Mr. MORRILL] is absent on account of ill-health and may be for some days. I wish to make this announcement once for all as accounting for his not being present.

Mr. HAWLEY. My colleague [Mr. PLATT] is absent from the Chamber somewhat indisposed and compelled to take a few days for rest.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Forty-seven Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum, and the roll-call will proceed on the pending motion.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Is it in order to make a motion now to indefinitely postpone this bill?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is not.

Mr. EDMUNDS. My motive, if I may be allowed to say so, was simply to make a motion in order to ask my friend from Wisconsin to explain precisely the ground why this amendment ought not to be considered or adopted; but if it is not in order I will not press it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The roll-call will proceed on the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FAULKNER (when Mr. DANIEL's name was called). The Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. HOAR (when the name of Mr. DAWES was called). My colleague [Mr. DAWES] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WILSON]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

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

Mr. HARRIS (when his name was called). Upon this question, and indeed upon all questions, I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], who is necessarily absent from the Chamber.

Mr. PADDOCK (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS].

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland. I am paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES].

Mr. HAMPTON. My colleague [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON].

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. RANSOM].

Mr. CHACE (after having voted in the affirmative). If had escaped my mind at the time I voted that I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COLQUITT]. I therefore wish to withdraw my vote.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Rhode Island withdraws his vote.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN].

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 18; as follows:

YEAS—23.

Aldrich,	Evarts,	Ingalls,	Stanford,
Blair,	Frye,	McPherson,	Stewart,
Brown,	George,	Mitchell,	Stockbridge,
Chandler,	Gray,	Payne,	Teller,
Cullom,	Hawley,	Sawyer,	Walthall.
Dolph,	Hoar,	Spooner,	

NAYS—18.

Bate,	Coke,	Palmer,	Turpie,
Berry,	Davis,	Pasco,	Vance,
Blodgett,	Edmunds,	Pugh,	Wilson of Iowa.
Call,	Gorman,	Reagan,	
Cockrell,	Hampton,	Sherman,	

ABSENT—35.

Allison,	Dawes,	Jones of Arkansas,	Quay,
Beck,	Eustis,	Jones of Nevada,	Ransom,
Blackburn,	Farwell,	Kenna,	Riddleberger,
Bowen,	Faulkner,	Manderson,	Sabin,
Butler,	Gibson,	Morgan,	Saulsbury,
Cameron,	Hale,	Morrill,	Vest,
Chace,	Harris,	Paddock,	Voorhees,
Colquitt,	Hearst,	Platt,	Wilson of Md.
	Hiscock,	Plumb,	

So the amendment to the amendment was laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

Mr. BERRY. I move to lay the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin on the table.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Arkansas moves to lay the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin on the table.

Mr. BLAIR. Before that motion is put, I ask to have the amendment read as modified by agreement of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be read as modified.

Mr. BLAIR. There was a change in the date.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert the following as a new section:

SEC. 9. That in all cases when any of the lands forfeited by the first section of this act, or when any lands relinquished to, or for any cause resumed by, the United States from grants for railroad purposes, heretofore made to the State of Michigan, have heretofore been disposed of by the proper officers of the United States, by sales or entries, by cash warrants or scrip, under color of the public-land laws, and where the consideration received therefor is still retained by the Government, the right and title of all persons holding or claiming under such disposals shall be, and is hereby, confirmed: *Provided, however*, That where the original cash purchasers are the present owners this act shall be operative to confirm the title only of such said cash purchasers as the Secretary of the Interior shall be satisfied have purchased without fraud and in the belief that they were thereby obtaining valid title from the United States. That nothing herein contained shall be construed to confirm any sales or entries of lands upon which there were bona fide pre-emption or homestead claims on the 1st day of January, 1888, arising or asserted under color of the laws of the United States.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator from Arkansas will permit me, I wish to accept an amendment to that amendment, fixing the limitation at the 1st day of May instead of the 1st day of January, so that it will save the right of any bona fide homesteader or pre-emption claimant down to the 1st day of May instead of the 1st day of January.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent, the yeas and nays having been ordered, that the amendment may be modified as it will now be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to modify the amendment so as to make the last clause read:

That nothing herein contained shall be construed to confirm any sales or entries of lands upon which there were bona fide pre-emption or homestead claims on the 1st day of May, 1888, arising or asserted under color of the laws of the United States.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to this modification? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he has any objection to an amendment striking out—

Mr. BERRY. I decline to yield further. I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion to lay the amendment on the table.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Arkansas asks that upon taking the question on the motion to lay the amendment on the table the yeas and nays be entered on the Journal.

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

Mr. CHACE (when his name was called). I desire to announce that I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COLQUITT].

Mr. EVARTS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], whom I do not see in his seat, and therefore I can not vote.

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

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

Mr. BERRY (when the name of Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, was called). My colleague [Mr. JONES, of Arkansas] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. HISCOCK]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. FAULKNER (when Mr. KENNA's name was called). I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. KENNA] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SABIN].

Mr. PADDOCK (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS].

Mr. VANCE (when Mr. RANSOM's name was called). I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. RANSOM] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB].

Mr. BERRY (when Mr. VEST's name was called). The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] requested me to announce that he is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY].

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The pair of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] was announced.

Mr. FAULKNER. I am very willing to transfer my pair. I made a pair originally with the Senator from Pennsylvania, and did not know that a subsequent arrangement had been made; but as I am present, and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] are absent, I am very glad to transfer my pair to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. How does the Senator from West Virginia desire to be recorded on this vote?

Mr. FAULKNER. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES].

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. MANDERSON. I announce my pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN].

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 22; as follows:

YEAS—15.			
Bate,	Cockrell,	Palmer,	Turpie,
Berry,	Coke,	Pasco,	Vance,
Blodgett,	Gorman,	Pugh,	Wilson of Iowa.
Call,	Ingalls,	Reagan,	
NAYS—22.			
Blair,	Edmunds,	Mitchell,	Stewart,
Brown,	Faulkner,	Payne,	Stockbridge,
Chandler,	Frye,	Sawyer,	Teller,
Cullom,	George,	Sherman,	Walthall.
Davis,	Hawley,	Spooner,	
Dolph,	McPherson,	Stanford,	
ABSENT—39.			
Aldrich,	Dawes,	Hiscock,	Plumb,
Allison,	Eustis,	Hoar,	Quay,
Beck,	Evarts,	Jones of Arkansas,	Ransom,
Blackburn,	Farwell,	Jones of Nevada,	Riddleberger,
Bowen,	Gibson,	Kenna,	Sabin,
Butler,	Gray,	Manderson,	Saulsbury,
Cameron,	Hale,	Morgan,	Vest,
Chace,	Hampton,	Morrill,	Voorhees,
Colquitt,	Harris,	Paddock,	Wilson of Md.
Daniel,	Hearst,	Platt,	

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. No quorum having voted, the Secretary will call the roll of the Senate.

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

Aldrich,	Davis,	Hoar,	Sherman,
Bate,	Dolph,	Ingalls,	Stanford,
Berry,	Evarts,	McPherson,	Stewart,
Blair,	Faulkner,	Manderson,	Stockbridge,
Blodgett,	Frye,	Mitchell,	Teller,
Brown,	George,	Paddock,	Vance,
Call,	Gibson,	Palmer,	Walthall,
Chace,	Gorman,	Pasco,	Wilson of Iowa,
Chandler,	Hampton,	Payne,	Wilson of Md.
Cockrell,	Harris,	Reagan,	
Coke,	Hawley,	Pugh,	
Cullom,	Hiscock,	Sawyer,	

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Forty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum being present, the roll-call will proceed on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] to lay the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] on the table.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHACE (when Mr. ALDRICH's name was called). My colleague [Mr. ALDRICH] having been called away, I have transferred my pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COLQUITT] unto him.

Mr. EVARTS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], and therefore I can not vote.

Mr. FAULKNER (when his name was called). I desire to say that the reason for the vote I shall give, contrary to the vote that I gave previously upon this question, was based upon a reply I received to a question I propounded to the Senator from Arkansas—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would remind the Senator from West Virginia that debate is not in order pending a roll-call.

Mr. FAULKNER. I do not propose to debate the question. I vote "yea."

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

Mr. HISCOCK (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. PADDOCK (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS].

Mr. BERRY (when Mr. VEST's name was called). The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] requested me to announce that he is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY]. I will state that if present the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

The roll-call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 17, nays 22; as follows:

YEAS—17.			
Bate,	Coke,	Palmer,	Vance,
Berry,	Faulkner,	Pasco,	Wilson of Iowa.
Blodgett,	Gorman,	Pugh,	
Call,	Hampton,	Reagan,	
Cockrell,	Ingalls,	Turpie,	
NAYS—22.			
Allison,	Davis,	McPherson,	Stanford,
Blair,	Dolph,	Mitchell,	Stockbridge,
Brown,	Frye,	Payne,	Teller,
Chace,	George,	Sawyer,	Walthall.
Chandler,	Gibson,	Sherman,	
Cullom,	Hawley,	Spooner,	
ABSENT—37.			
Aldrich,	Eustis,	Jones of Nevada,	Riddleberger,
Beck,	Evarts,	Kenna,	Sabin,
Blackburn,	Farwell,	Manderson,	Saulsbury,
Bowen,	Gray,	Morgan,	Stewart,
Butler,	Hale,	Morrill,	Vest,
Cameron,	Harris,	Paddock,	Voorhees,
Chace,	Hearst,	Platt,	Wilson of Md.
Colquitt,	Hiscock,	Plumb,	
Daniel,	Hoar,	Quay,	
Edmunds,	Jones of Arkansas,	Ransom,	

So the Senate refused to lay the amendment on the table.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

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

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

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

Mr. MANDERSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN].

Mr. PADDOCK (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS].

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES].

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. CHACE. My colleague [Mr. ALDRICH] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COLQUITT].

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 16; as follows:

YEAS—25.

Blair,	George,	Mitchell,	Stewart,
Brown,	Gibson,	Palmer,	Stockbridge,
Chace,	Gray,	Payne,	Teller,
Chandler,	Hawley,	Sawyer,	Walthall.
Oullom,	Hoar,	Sherman,	
Dolph,	Ingalls,	Spooner,	
Frye,	McPherson,	Stanford,	

NAYS—16.

Bate,	Cockrell,	Hampton,	Saulsbury,
Berry,	Coke,	Pasco,	Turpie,
Blodgett,	Faulkner,	Pugh,	Vance,
Call,	Gorman,	Reagan,	Wilson of Iowa.

ABSENT—35.

Aldrich,	Davis,	Hiscock,	Plumb,
Allison,	Dawes,	Jones of Arkansas,	Quay,
Beek,	Edmunds,	Jones of Nevada,	Ransom,
Blackburn,	Eustis,	Kenna,	Riddleberger,
Bowen,	Everts,	Manderson,	Sabin,
Butler,	Farwell,	Morgan,	Vest,
Cameron,	Hale,	Morrill,	Voorhees,
Colquitt,	Harris,	Paddock,	Wilson of Md.
Daniel,	Hearst,	Platt,	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. I have an amendment to offer.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of section 1 the following additional proviso:

And provided further, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to except from forfeiture that portion of the grant made by "An act making a grant of alternate sections of the public lands to the State of Michigan to aid in the construction of certain railroads in said State, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1856, or acts amendatory thereof, conferred by the State of Michigan on the Marquette and Ontonagon Railroad Company, lying west of L'Anse, in said State.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. PALMER].

Mr. DOLPH. I am a member of the committee which reported this bill, but I do not understand the amendment. Before voting upon it I should like to hear some explanation of it.

Mr. PALMER. I will make the explanation, Mr. President, with the Senator's permission.

There was a grant at the same time with the carnival of grants in 1856 made to the Marquette, Houghton and Ontonagon road. That road has been completed. They have got their lands for the amount of road built up to L'Anse, at the foot of Keweenaw Bay on Lake Superior. There are 60 or 70 miles of that road, as marked out by the original grant, incomplete. There is no intention of completing it, but the Duluth, South Shore and Atlantic road have built within the indemnity limits, and they have built the road in such a way as to give rise to the suspicion that they intend to claim that they are the successors of the Marquette and Ontonagon road and their legatees in the matter of this grant.

The amendment is only to make assurance doubly sure. The road has not been built to accommodate the people that it was intended to accommodate, and it would have been built without the grant. This is to put a spike in this inclosure that will make that assurance sure.

Mr. DOLPH. I will ask the Senator, if he will permit me, if all these questions would not come up before the Departments and before the courts, and the rights of everybody be determined under this general bill which forfeits the lands in the case of all uncompleted roads?

Mr. PALMER. If the Senator will permit me, this amendment only declares that nothing in the bill shall be construed to exempt the forfeiture of the grant named.

Mr. DOLPH. Why should it? The bill is plain enough, in a single section forfeiting all these lands. Why should we interfere with all these grants? I move, if in order, to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. PALMER. I call for the reading of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be again read.

The Secretary read the amendment of Mr. PALMER.

Mr. PALMER. The propriety of this amendment may be shown by the fact that this road was about 40 miles or over south of Ontonagon. Still it runs within the indemnity limits and it is suspected by

a great many that that road, which has consolidated with the Marquette and Ontonagon road, will claim these lands. It seems to me that a declaration of this kind is very apt at this time and is essential and necessary, and therefore I hope the amendment will prevail.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question being put, there were on a division—ayes 12, noes 19; no quorum voting.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. No quorum having voted—

Mr. EDMUNDS. I ask the Chair to state the question again. There is evidently a quorum present.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. PALMER].

Mr. BERRY. The question is to lay it on the table—the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH].

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion of the Senator from Oregon to lay on the table was not heard at the desk.

Mr. BERRY. I understood that motion to have been made.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let the question be put again.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Will the Chair please state the question?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understands the pending question to be upon agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. DOLPH. I suppose that my motion is in order. I moved to lay the amendment on the table.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion to lay on the table is in order. No such motion was heard by the Chair or by the clerks at the desk. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH] moves that the amendment do lie on the table.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I wish to make some remarks, if I may be allowed to proceed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If the Senator from Delaware had risen before the Senator from Oregon made his motion the Chair would recognize him.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I wish simply to say, by consent of the Senator from Oregon—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Oregon withdraw the motion for that purpose?

Mr. DOLPH. I will consent. Before doing that I wish to say that we have been see-sawing here morning after morning upon this bill and upon amendments that never were before the Committee on Public Lands, and which are not understood, and I thought it was time to cut off debate. I withdraw the motion to lay on the table for the present.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I simply wanted to give my understanding of the amendment, and if I am wrong I should like to be corrected.

I understand that the amendment simply provides that nothing in this proposed act shall be construed to exempt from the forfeiture declared certain lands granted to the State of Michigan in aid of the construction of certain railroads in that State.

Mr. EDMUNDS. We can not hear the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Delaware will pause for a moment. Complaint is made that on account of confusion in the Chamber the Senator from Delaware can not be heard.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I said that I rose simply to give what I understand to be the object of this amendment so that if I am in error about it some person who may have been giving more attention to this bill than I have might correct my misapprehension.

I understand that the amendment is simply to declare that certain lands granted to the State of Michigan to aid in the construction of a certain railroad shall not be exempt from the operations of the forfeiture declared by the bill. I understand that the railroad for which the grant was made was never built, but I understand from the Senator from Michigan that another railroad somewhere within the limitations which the other road was to run is now being built, which was not the original grantee of these lands, and he apprehends they may come in and claim the benefit of the lands unless there is an affirmative declaration that the lands shall not be exempted from the forfeiture declared by the bill. If that is the object of the amendment, I am in favor of it. I am not satisfied that any other company should come in and obtain the benefit of the grant which would be forfeited by the bill.

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask the Senator from Delaware a question? I agree with what the Senator has said, but I ask him whether there is not some danger, by inserting this provision, of raising an implication on the other hand in favor of some other contrivance up there that does not come within this description by excepting this particular grant?

Mr. SAULSBURY. There might be, perhaps, some inference from the declaration that this grant was particularly excepted and others were not. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that I confess I feel very great reluctance in dealing with any of these questions. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin was apparently very fair upon its face and right in itself; yet I understand that while it may relieve certain bona fide persons, who may be injured unless it is passed, there are, possibly, some persons who have no equitable or legal

claim to lands who, under the operation of that amendment, may come in and get the benefit of it. I confess that I feel great reluctance in dealing with any of these questions.

The suggestion made by the Senator from Vermont has great force. An affirmative declaration that certain lands shall not be exempted from the operation of this proposed act may leave an implication that other lands which are not specified are not treated in the same way. However, I think the amendment, so far as I understand it, and so far as it applies to the particular lands to which it refers, is right, and I shall vote for it.

Mr. DOLPH. I suppose upon the theory of this amendment that I ought to move that nothing in this bill shall be construed to prevent the forfeiture of the grant to the Northern Pacific Railroad from Waulala to Portland, and so we ought to go all around through the States and Territories.

The bill as it came from the committee is a very plain one. It is very easily understood. It was proposed by the committee to forfeit all the land grants adjacent to uncompleted road, and to stop there, and then to provide for the rights of persons who have gone unadvisedly into the possession of lands under the railroad companies, and who have made improvements upon their lands.

We have been discussing this measure morning after morning during the entire morning hour. Amendments have been offered and discussed, and withdrawn and reoffered; amendments have been drawn by outside parties affecting particular interests which never have been considered by the Committee on Public Lands; and now we have an amendment offered upon the theory that some other railroad may claim some land which is covered by the bill, or that there is something in the bill that would exclude from its operation the forfeiture of some lands that are adjacent to uncompleted road.

If we can not rest satisfied with the plain declaration of the bill that the lands adjacent to uncompleted road or road not completed and in operation are hereby forfeited, we can not rest on anything.

The amendment relates to a matter that I never heard of before, and I know nothing about it. I never happened to see the amendment; I did not anticipate that it would be offered. If there is another company that has built the road and is entitled to the land I suppose that it would not be lands adjacent to an uncompleted road, and the Secretary of the Interior would say so, and the Supreme Court—

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

Mr. DOLPH. Not at this moment. The Supreme Court would say so, and that would be the end of it. Would they not? If they are not entitled to the lands, the same power would determine that.

The first section of the bill provides for a forfeiture of all lands adjacent to uncompleted road. If that is not sufficient, and if we must strengthen it by inserting provisions that nothing shall be construed to exempt land adjacent to uncompleted roads in various States and Territories, not to be behind I suppose the Senators from Oregon should offer such an amendment as that in regard to the Northern Pacific Railroad grant.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I think I shall vote against this amendment upon the ground that I suggested to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY]. The amendment appears to be perfectly correct on its face, and declares what appears to be in the bill, but I have observed in the course of rather a long experience here that every bill of this kind that we pass, amended and fixed up and so on, when it comes out in the Departments and in the Supreme Court of the United States does not appear to be the kind of a bill that we thought we were passing. I am very sorry for it, and therefore I shall vote against this amendment, unless I am better advised, upon the ground that it raises an implication, and I do not know how it will apply, although it does not appear to change the state of the law as it will be after the bill is passed.

While I am up I wish to say another thing about the bill and all bills of this kind, that more than six years ago a committee of this body, of which I had the honor to be a member, to whom was referred the subject of these forfeitures as legal subjects, reported a bill most carefully considered and drawn up by the then Senator from Ohio, Judge Thurman, which would have wound up, as the phrase is, and disposed of the whole of this question upon equitable and just principles, if we could at that time have persuaded the Senate that it was a good thing to do. Perhaps I have stated that too strongly, for I am not sure after this length of time but that it did pass the Senate. It certainly met with general approval here, but perhaps in the press of business it did not get acted upon.

But one thing we may be pretty sure of, and that is that under the present decisions, as they now stand, of the Supreme Court of the United States, which finally determine all these private rights, corporate and every other, as between the United States and the claimants, when Congress undertakes to say under the decisions of the Supreme Court as they have been, and are, and undoubtedly will be, that we are to forfeit grants on the sides of roads that have been completed before the passage of the law, in the general case of these lands—there may be exceptions—we are going beyond our constitutional power and are taking away from the grantees vested rights which they have attained, although beyond the period mentioned by Congress in the construction of the roads, and that can not be taken away.

So, in this bill, which brings these questions of the rights of homestead claimants and pre-emptors, scrip, and warrant people, and all that body of persons down to a time that will turn out in point of fact to be after the road has been built, we are inviting disaster upon the very citizens of the United States whom we wish to protect, because we are standing up on their side and saying that their titles shall be good when it will turn out that they will not be good. We are doing them an injury rather than a benefit by legislation of that character, and I am very sorry for it.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I do not know that there is a necessity for the amendment. I am not sure but that the bill itself sufficiently protects the lands that it proposes to declare forfeited against any claim which may be set up by the railroad, referred to by the Senator from Michigan, which is now being built within the limits of the land where the other road was to go. But the amendment has been offered, and what will be the effect of a negative vote? If we vote down the amendment, does not the implication arise that there was no intention to exclude that road which is now being constructed from the operation of this forfeiture? It seems to me that we are placed just in this position: If we vote down the amendment the railroad company may infer from that vote that they have a claim to the land.

It is simply to cast my vote right that I desire the information which I rose before to obtain. With my view of it, the amendment having been offered by the Senator from Michigan, I shall not feel justified in withholding my vote from an affirmative declaration that the bill shall operate to exclude that railroad from any of the benefits under the grant made to the State of Michigan.

Mr. PALMER. The object of the amendment was, as I said, to make assurance doubly sure in this case. Here is a road that is built from the terminus of a partially-completed road. It runs within the indemnity limits of the grant, but at the same time it does not go to the point prescribed in the original act, nor does it accommodate the people for whom the original road was to be built.

Any one by looking at this map [exhibiting] can see the propriety of the amendment. The Marquette, Houghton and Ontonagon road, as I understand it, has been consolidated with the Duluth, South Shore and Atlantic, and the first thing that we shall know will be that they will claim the lands opposite the completed portion of that road, although it was not the road contemplated by the original grant, nor does it accommodate the people whom the original road was intended to benefit.

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

Mr. PALMER. Certainly.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Does the Senator think that under the bill, as it stands, without this amendment, the people to whom he is referring will have any claim at all under the present state of the law or under this bill?

Mr. PALMER. Whether they do or not I will say to the Senator from Vermont that I think this declaration would make it so positive that they never would beleaguer the Departments for the land on the continuation of the road from L'Anse.

Mr. EDMUNDS. But I will ask the Senator if he is willing to give his opinion as to the effect of the bill, as it stands, without this amendment, upon the question that he has now invited the attention of the Senate to?

Mr. PALMER. I am not a sufficiently good lawyer to determine on that. I have been mistaken so many times on points of law that I should hate to give a deliberate opinion to an august body like this, but I think that the declaration in the amendment is such that it makes that beyond cavil or peradventure.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Extend it to all other roads and I would be with you.

Mr. PALMER. I was going to say that I do not know of a parallel case in the country to this. My colleague agrees with me (and we disagree in a friendly way on many things) that there is danger of the Duluth, South Shore and Atlantic road putting in a claim as a successor of the Marquette, Houghton and Ontonagon road for the lands between L'Anse and Ontonagon.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. PALMER].

The question being put, there were on a division—ayes 16, noes 13; not a quorum voting.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the Senate do now adjourn. It is obvious that we shall not do any business here this afternoon. We have had a dozen votes which were unavailing.

Mr. BLAIR. Before the Senator presses his motion, I ask him to withdraw it for a moment. We had this afternoon set aside on purpose, if possible, to complete the bill. It does seem to me that when we are only struggling with the inadvertence at least, if not the fault, of the Senate itself, in so many absences, the bill ought not to be thus victimized by running off home early in the afternoon. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will please withdraw his motion and let us attempt to complete the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HOAR. It is impossible to resist the siren voice of my honorable friend from New Hampshire. I withdraw the motion.

Mr. BLAIR. I wish it were still sweeter.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The absence of a quorum having been disclosed by the last vote—

Mr. EDMUNDS. I ask the Chair to count the Senate to save time, so as to see whether there is a quorum present.

Mr. HOAR. That is contrary to the rule.

Mr. BLAIR. Let us have the yeas and nays. I think a call will develop the presence of a quorum.

Mr. EDMUNDS. But I wish to say something when we get a quorum.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The result of the vote not having been announced, the Senator from New Hampshire asks for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BLAIR. I withdraw the request in order that the Senator from Vermont may proceed.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I wish to make this motion—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that the absence of a quorum having been disclosed debate is not in order.

Mr. EDMUNDS. There being no quorum, the Chair then is to order the roll to be called, unless, as I think—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That is the duty of the Chair under the rule.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I think that finding the absence of a quorum we might so far depart from the rule as to authorize the Chair to count the Senate to save time so as to see if a quorum is present; and I submit that request, if it is in order.

Mr. HOAR. I submit that there can be no departure from the rule, even by unanimous consent, when there is no quorum. The Senator from Vermont is out of order in his suggestion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts is obviously right under the rule technically.

Mr. HARRIS. Instead of a roll-call I ask consent that we take the vote on the pending amendment by yeas and nays.

Mr. EDMUNDS. No, the roll must be called first.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The roll-call will proceed.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I wish to make a motion before taking the question by yeas and nays.

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

Bate,	Edmunds,	Ingalls,	Spooner,
Berry,	Everts,	Manderson,	Stanford,
Blair,	Faulkner,	McPherson,	Stewart,
Blodgett,	Frye,	Mitchell,	Stockbridge,
Brown,	George,	Paddock,	Teller,
Call,	Gorman,	Palmer,	Turpie,
Chace,	Gray,	Payson,	Vance,
Chandler,	Hampton,	Payne,	Walthall,
Cockrell,	Harris,	Reagan,	Wilson of Iowa,
Coke,	Hawley,	Saulsbury,	Wilson of Md.
Cullom,	Hiseock,	Sawyer,	
Dolph,	Hoar,	Sherman,	

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Forty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum being present, the Senator from Vermont will proceed.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I wish now to move (and I do it under a sense of duty to the Senate and to the country and to the private persons who are concerned as settlers on these lands), to commit the bill again to the Committee on Public Lands, with instructions to report the same back again, amended as they may be advised, as soon as may be. In the course of amendments which have been adopted (the spirit of all of which so far as I understand I am for) I am very much afraid that we have been led into a statement of what is to be statute law that will not stand judicial investigation when these railways come to resist it; and if it does not, we are only misleading the people whom we are trying to help in getting them into lawsuits and difficulties that may bring distress upon them.

I wish, therefore, after all these discussions and all these amendments have been suggested, which present every possible phase of these controversies, that the committee may reframe the bill so as to keep it within the definite decisions of the Supreme Court, to protect every clear right of every citizen, or settler, or anybody else, and to wind up every unearned and unexecuted railway grant that has been made anywhere, and make an end of it. I think this can be much better and more safely done, after these discussions, by the committee than it can be done by the presentation of amendments in the Senate.

I hope, therefore, that the Senate will agree to recommit the bill in order to put it into a final shape that will meet the general views the Senate has expressed in its votes, so that it will stand as a clear protection of private rights which can not be properly assailed, and as a clear termination of all public grants to all these corporations that have not been earned, in such a way that we shall not be sorry in two or three or four years that we have been led into such legislation, as I am very much afraid the bill will be if it passes in its present shape of phraseology.

So I make the motion that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Public Lands with instructions to report the same amended as soon as may be.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question being on agreeing to

the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. PALMER], the Senator from Vermont moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BLAIR. I could have wished, as no doubt the committee would have desired, and the Senate, which has labored and struggled with this bill in debate now for nearly two weeks, that the suggestions of the honorable Senator who has just made the motion to recommit might have been available to the committee and to the Senate during the progress of the debate. I feel sure that if there be any difficulties of a legal character in the construction of the bill as it stands at this late day, and, as I had supposed, very near its conclusion, they would have been obviated and removed at a very early period if we had had the benefit of the Senator's criticism earlier upon this floor.

It does seem to me, with great respect to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and our admitted leader here in the Senate, a little too much for him to ask, after all that has been done, the committee having considered the bill a long time and having done the best it knew how to do, the bill having been reported to the Senate, and the Senate having taken charge of it for two weeks, and having modified it very largely, so that it is not now much the bill that the committee came here with, for which the committee is largely responsible—it does, I say, seem to me a stretch of forbearance that the Senator should come in here and move to recommit to the committee itself this measure, which is the work of the Senate far more largely than it is of the Committee on Public Lands.

I do not mean by this to intimate that the Committee on Public Lands has not considered most of the points which the Senate has discussed, and which the Senate has seen fit to incorporate in this measure, and that it did not come here after due deliberation with a general bill covering, as it thought, the great leading features that it was necessary to embody in legislation touching the forfeiture of these unearned land grants. The committee thought it had considered the subject fully, and when it came here, as I have stated, with a general bill, when beyond the control of the committee, in the exercise of rights which individual members of the Senate have here on this floor, the bill has come to what it is.

I assure you, Mr. President, that it is my belief that if the bill goes back to the committee it will commence its labors again with no prospect or probability of returning the bill to the Senate in any better condition than it was in the first place.

If the bill is to go again to any committee, I think it would be a fair suggestion that it should go to some other committee, for I do not believe that the Committee on Public Lands will be able to reproduce to the Senate anything which will be more encouraging as the subject-matter whereon to commence another month of debate than that with which we came here in the first place, and I do hope that the Senator from Vermont will not insist on his motion.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire misunderstands me if he supposes that I implied any reflection upon the Committee on Public Lands. I made the motion in the spirit that I should have made it if the bill had been reported from the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman. In its present condition the short time that I have been able to be in the Senate during these discussions I have heard it stated more than once by gentlemen whom I believe to be members of that committee, that the amendments proposed had not been brought to the attention of the committee at all. Some of them have been agreed to, I understand.

Therefore it is proper and necessary, for the Senator himself says that the Senate has changed the aspect of the bill as it was reported from the committee, that the committee, yielding to the views of the Senate cheerfully, as it may, should take the general expression of the sentiment of the Senate in regard to the general policy and scope of the bill, and put it into a shape of phraseology and enactment that will make peace instead of inviting disputes on every side out of its present aspects and phraseology, if such disputes should arise.

It is not, therefore, in any sense of criticism or complaint of the committee, but exactly the reverse, that I desire, as one member of the Senate, before I vote finally upon this bill, that the committee shall again consider it in all its new aspects and put it into a shape to meet what is the general view and wish of the Senate as expressed in the substance of these amendments, and put it in a condition where we shall not invite trouble, and disaster, and litigation upon all sides growing out of the imperfect phraseology that necessarily arises from amendments on a difficult subject like those that are offered in the Senate.

That is my motive, Mr. President, and nothing else.

Mr. DOLPH. I hope the motion will not prevail. It is true that several amendments have been added in the Senate. Some of them, however, were considered by the Committee on Public Lands and reported by that committee in the print of the 7th instant. The main amendment that had not been considered and reported favorably by the committee is section 8, the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL]. To-day the Senate has adopted, as in Committee of the Whole, the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], which I think is a very proper amendment, but it did not go far enough. I think there have been slight amendments to some of the other sections which did not come from the committee. Prob-

ably the principal one is the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. MITCHELL] granting the right of way over certain odd sections to the city of Portland for the purpose of laying pipes for conducting water, which is not a very serious matter.

This bill has been considered carefully by the Committee on Public Lands. That committee have had during several Congresses this question of land-grant forfeiture before them. In this bill an attempt is made to do precisely what the Senator from Vermont thinks should be done, and what I think we are all agreed upon doing, though some may desire to go further. It is attempted to forfeit the lands which are adjacent to uncompleted road.

It is not to be wondered at in a general bill which applies to all railroad grants that there should have been various amendments thought necessary by Senators, and that those amendments should have been pressed upon the consideration of the Senate. That would be the case again. If the bill should be re-referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and they should proceed to consider the matter and report a bill, that fact would not cut off amendments, and we should have this same discussion to go through with again, and we should have to pass upon the amendments pressed persistently again, as they have been during the discussion upon this bill by Senators from the several States.

I suppose we are now nearly at the close of this discussion. I know of but few other amendments to be offered. There does not seem to be any reason why we should not vote finally this afternoon upon the amendments and upon the bill, and pass it.

It ought not to be forgotten also that after the bill leaves the Senate it has to receive consideration in another branch of Congress, and finally, very likely, by a committee of conference, whose report will come up for consideration in both branches of Congress. So I think we shall be only losing ground and rendering it quite likely that no forfeiture of these land grants will be had at all at the present Congress, or at least at this session of Congress, if the bill in its present condition should go back to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. EDMUNDS. You can report it day after to-morrow.

Mr. DOLPH. The chairman of the committee is not present; we shall probably not have a meeting before Monday, and it would be a long time before it could be reported. Then it would take probably a long time to discuss it and dispose of it in the Senate, as we have been discussing it at the present time. I hope, therefore, the motion will not prevail.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I hope the motion to recommit will not be agreed to. This bill has caused the Senate a good deal of trouble and consumed a considerable portion of its time. There would be just as much difference of opinion in regard to the decisions of the Supreme Court and the constitutional authority that Congress has upon this subject after another report by the Committee on Public Lands as there is now.

There are some of us here, I for one, who do not think the Supreme Court has ever made any decision limiting the power of Congress to forfeit a railroad grant where the railroad company have not complied with the terms of the granting act. I do not believe it is competent for the Supreme Court to invade the constitutional prerogative of this body, either directly or indirectly, either by a decision of a case between parties where they have the power to make their opinion a finality, for that is judicial power, or by a direct decree that this body shall not exercise its constitutional powers.

It is true that judicial power authorizes a judge sitting as a court to make any decision, however absurd, however unreasonable, and to make it the law between the parties; but when that grows to be a public evil, and the public policy of the country is affected and set aside by either of the co-ordinate departments of the Government, then it would become a great public question for serious consideration as to what steps should be taken to effectuate the proper, the declared public policy of the country. But we shall not advance the progress of this bill by a reference of it again to the Committee on Public Lands.

This bill is a compromise on their part. They tried to avoid these questions and to forfeit that portion of the grant which is within the power of Congress without question or dispute. There have been various limitations and qualifications imposed upon this forfeiture; they may be right or they may be wrong; they may have been well considered; but surely the Senate is quite as competent as a whole to consider these questions as any portion of it. We have time, we have opportunity for discussion and consideration here as large, if not larger, than a committee has, and, so far as I am concerned, I prefer a bill settled in the progress of discussion and interchange of opinion in the open Senate rather than a bill formulated by one or two members of the body.

Now, especially in regard to these grants which are in the State of Florida, and with which I am perfectly conversant, the terms of any general forfeiture do require some qualification and some explanatory provisions in the bill which would limit them in respect to those cases that possess peculiar rights and equities so as to allow them to operate in the general protection of settlers and reserving the public domain not yet disposed of for homestead settlement; but this end might not be obtained without some qualifying provisions in the bill, and conse-

quently, so far as that State is concerned, I am prepared to say that the amendments to the bill made in the Senate are of great value, both to those persons who, whether corporations or individuals, possess rights properly acquired, and to those who have settled upon the lands and have a right to have their titles confirmed to them.

For these reasons I hope the bill will be proceeded with and that it will not be recommitted.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion to recommit the bill.

The question being put, a division was called for, and the ayes were 9—

Mr. EDMUNDS. I give it up in order to save any question about a quorum.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. No further count is demanded. The motion to recommit is not agreed to. The question recurs on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. PALMER].

The question being put, there were on a division—ayes 20, noes 11.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CULLOM. I should like to hear the amendment read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of section 1 it is proposed to add:

And provided further, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to except from forfeiture that portion of the grant made by "An act making a grant of alternate sections of the public lands to the State of Michigan to aid in the construction of certain railroads in said State, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1855, or acts amendatory thereof, conferred by the State of Michigan on the Marquette and Ontonagon Railroad Company, lying west of L'Anse, in said State.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHACE (when Mr. ALDRICH's name was called). My colleague [Mr. ALDRICH] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COLQUITT].

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

Mr. HISCOCK (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. MANDERSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN].

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. EVARTS. I am paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. PADDOCK. I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS].

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 16; as follows:

YEAS—24.			
Allison,	Cullom,	Palmer,	Spooher,
Bate,	Faulkner,	Pasco,	Stockbridge,
Berry,	Frye,	Pugh,	Turpie,
Blair,	George,	Reagan,	Vance,
Call,	Gray,	Saulsbury,	Walthall,
Coke,	Hampton,	Sherman,	Wilson of Iowa.
NAYS—16.			
Blodgett,	Cockrell,	Hoar,	Sawyer,
Brown,	Dolph,	McPherson,	Stanford,
Chace,	Edmunds,	Mitchell,	Stewart,
Chandler,	Hawley,	Payne,	Teller.
ABSENT—36.			
Aldrich,	Dawes,	Hiscock,	Platt,
Beck,	Eustis,	Ingalls,	Plumb,
Blackburn,	Evarts,	Jones of Arkansas,	Quay,
Bowen,	Farwell,	Jones of Nevada,	Ransom,
Butler,	Gibson,	Kenna,	Riddleberger,
Cameron,	Gorman,	Manderson,	Sabin,
Colquitt,	Hale,	Morgan,	Vest,
Daniel,	Harris,	Morrill,	Voorhaes,
Davis,	Hearst,	Padlock,	Wilson of Md.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to have some member of the committee explain just what is proposed by section 7 of the bill relating to grants to the State of Iowa.

Mr. BLAIR. That amendment was adopted when I was not present. I respectfully turn the matter over to somebody who understands it.

Mr. DOLPH. Recently the Secretary of the Interior has revoked the orders of withdrawal of indemnity lands where the orders were made without express direction of an act of Congress. Where those withdrawals were made by the act itself, or rather where the Secretary of the Interior was directed by the act of Congress to withdraw the indemnity lands from entry under the land laws for sale, he held that he did not have the authority to revoke the orders of withdrawal. This section simply repeals so much of certain acts as contain a provision requiring the Secretary of the Interior to make withdrawals of indemnity lands as affected that question, and it is proposed that Congress shall do by this section in regard to those roads precisely what the Secretary of the Interior has done in regard to others.

Mr. ALLISON. That explanation, I suppose, is all right as far as it goes, but I do not understand that the Senator states the effect of this legislation on the land grants in Iowa. As to lands which have been purchased, what is the effect of it?

Mr. DOLPH. I have undertaken to make that statement. I would

much have preferred myself that the bill should have directed the Secretary of the Interior to revoke these orders of withdrawal of lands within the indemnity limits, but the committee thought it better to repeal so much of the acts of Congress as directed the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw lands from sale which were within indemnity limits. The matter was discussed when the amendment was adopted in the Senate, and it was stated by the chairman of the committee, and I agree in that construction, that the only effect will be to now open up to settlement the lands which have not already been selected by railroad companies which are within the indemnity limits of these roads, and leave the companies, if they have not selected all the lands to which they are entitled, to arrange with the homestead and pre-emption settlers.

Mr. ALLISON. I could not quite understand why this amendment only applied to the States of Iowa and Minnesota if it is in accordance with a general principle.

Mr. DOLPH. Because there are only three cases of land grants in which it was provided in express terms that the Secretary of the Interior should withdraw the lands from settlement.

Mr. ALLISON. I make no objection to the amendment.

Mr. DOLPH. These are the acts mentioned in the section.

Mr. SHERMAN. The word "act" should be inserted in the first line of section 7, on page 7.

Mr. MANDERSON. I think it will be found that in the copy of the bill at the Secretary's desk that omission does not occur. The copy which the Senator has is the last printed bill, and there is a manifest omission of a word.

Mr. ALLISON. On page 7, section 7, line 4, of the bill, the section to which the Senator from Oregon called attention, I notice a quotation from the statutes declaring—

That section 5 of an act entitled "An act for a grant of lands to the State of Iowa in alternate sections, to aid in the construction of a railroad in said State," approved May 17, 1864.

On examination of the statute referred to I find that it was approved May 12, 1864, so that there is a wrong citation. I move to amend in that particular.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am told that the defect I pointed out is not in the original bill, but it is in the last print.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa will be read.

Mr. ALLISON. It is in line 4 of section 7, after the word "May," to strike out "17th" and insert "12th;" so as to read "May 12th, 1864."

The SECRETARY. In line 6—

Mr. ALLISON. In line 4.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The difficulty occurs from the fact that the Senator from Iowa reads from one print of the bill and the Secretary from another.

Mr. ALLISON. I see that that also is a misprint. The section seems to be in the handwriting of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB], and the date was intended to be "12th" instead of "17th." The print is "17th."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understands, then, that the Senator from Iowa does not move any amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I will not if the Secretary will make a distinct "two" instead of "seven," so as to make the date "May 12th" instead of "May 17th."

Mr. PALMER. I offer the following amendment, to come in at the end of section 4:

And any lands that may have been found to have been earned by the past construction of the Ontonagon and Brulé River Railroad in the State of Michigan shall, upon such determination, be certified and patented to said company by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. DOLPH. I move to lay that amendment on the table.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator withdraw that motion so that I can explain the object of the amendment?

Mr. DOLPH. For that purpose I withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. PALMER. I will state that I have no interest in this amendment save to give the people of Ontonagon and vicinity an outlet. The act which conferred the grant upon this road by the State of Michigan provided that they could get no land until the road was completed from Ontonagon to the Brulé River. They are cut off from the land grant by this bill. They are bankrupt as far as the road is concerned, and private parties will have to finish it. If they can get their land without the slow process of legislation through the Legislature of Michigan, they can go on, they think, and build down to the intersection of the Duluth, South Shore and Atlantic road, and thereby accommodate the people of the country and save something out of the wreck of the road. It is giving them nothing; it is only expediting the thing and giving them a credit that they otherwise can not get.

Mr. DOLPH. I renew my motion. I do not think the Senate wishes to confirm any grants.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is moved to lay on the table an amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. PALMER].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CALL. I offer the following amendment, to come in at the end of section 8:

Provided, That the title to the land described in the act entitled "An act granting lands to the States of Alabama and Florida to aid in the construction of certain lines of railway in said States," approved the 17th of May, 1856, which lies adjacent to the part of the lines of railroad built under and in pursuance of the act of the State of Florida entitled "An act to encourage a liberal system of internal improvements in the State of Florida," approved January 5, 1855, within the time limited in the granting act, and which were granted to any of the said companies by the Legislature of the State of Florida, and are held by purchase from said companies, made before the year 1866, are hereby confirmed to such purchasers: *Provided further*, That all the public lands within the State of Florida are hereby withdrawn from all entries except homestead entries until the pending legislation on the subject shall be disposed of, or until the present Congress shall terminate, and also except any sales of a quantity not more than 160 acres to one person, the head of a family; and the register and receiver shall have power to sell isolated tracts of land, whether offered or unoffered, when, in their discretion, it shall be thought best.

Mr. DOLPH. *resc.*

Mr. CALL. I hope the Senator from Oregon will not move to lay this amendment upon the table. I think I can give very good reasons for it.

The grant to the State of Florida is a peculiar one. There was never any disposition made by the Legislature of the State to any railroad company of any of the lands contained in the grant of 1856. Therefore, as a mere legal question, it might be that persons would have derived by purchase from the State or railroad title to lands adjacent to the completed portions of the road which were built within the time specified in the granting act, but for the defect that the Legislature never made any disposition of the land to any of the companies which built the roads.

The internal improvement act of 1855 of the State of Florida contains a section which says that the State of Florida will hereafter grant to such railroad companies as shall build any part of the lines designated in this act any lands which may be granted by the United States to the State of Florida in aid of them, without any other legislation on the part of the State, the roads being built with lands donated from the swamp and overflowed land grant and by cash subscriptions. Without any other legislation referring to the grant of May 17, 1856, there was built within the State of Florida a line of railroad by different companies from Jacksonville, on the route towards Pensacola, being one of the lines designated by the State to be built, but terminating at the town of Quincy, some 175 miles, more or less, from Escambia Bay or Pensacola. So in the other part of the State a line of road was built from Fernandina to Cedar Keys, stopping there. These two lines of road were built within the time designated by the granting act.

Supposing this legislation of the State would become effectuated by some further provision, these lands were sold along the completed portion of the road. The holders and occupiers of these lands for these many years are in this condition, without a title, without an actual disposition of the land by the Legislature, and after these roads had failed and the charters had been taken away from them and the whole system terminated, the Legislature passed an act confirming, so far as the State had any authority to do it, the title of the persons who had acquired these lands from the railroad companies so far as they were built within the time designated in the granting act. So I think there is no objection whatever to making that title good, which this bill does in other cases where there was a grant by the Legislature.

Now, in regard to this other provision which is added to the bill, and is the same as that which has just passed the Senate in regard to Mississippi, withdrawing the lands from sale until the legislation now pending, making a permanent withdrawal and opening them to homestead entry and settlement, shall be disposed of, the law in Florida has been so altered by an act of Congress passed some years ago in regard to public lands that they have been restored to cash entry. Now, in order to allow every one to have an opportunity of acquiring a home, this amendment provides that these lands shall be withdrawn from all entry except pre-emption and homestead entries or cash entries, in quantities not greater than 160 acres to each head of a family. I apprehend there will be no difficulty in regard to that, inasmuch as it is only intended, as the Mississippi act which passed the Senate was, to await the result of the general legislation on this subject now pending, which it is believed will be accomplished.

For these reasons, in order that this amendment which has been added to the bill in regard to the State of Florida, and which was necessary, may be so qualified that it will embrace the class of persons whose title is a just title, and, although not strictly legal, has all the substantial rights attaching to it, because it is derived from the actual completion of the road within the time designated by the original act, and because the Legislature of the State never made any disposition of this land to the railroad company, but has passed an act confirming the right, so far as the State had any authority to do so, of all those persons who acquired any right from the railroad companies up to the point of the completion of the roads within the time designated in the original act.

Mr. DOLPH. I move that the amendment lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Oregon moves to lay the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida on the table. The question being put, there were ayes 20.

Mr. CALL. I ask that the question be put again. I do not think it was understood.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Florida asks that the question be again submitted. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon that the amendment of the Senator from Florida lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to—ayes 20, noes not counted.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to have the amendment adopted as in Committee of the Whole on the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] reserved for a separate vote.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendments will be separately stated and voted upon.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask that all the amendments, with the exception of the one specified by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], be voted on in gross.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That there may be no mistake the reserved amendment will be read by the Secretary.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, inserted, as section 9, the following:

That in all cases when any of the lands forfeited by the first section of this act, or when any lands relinquished to, or for any cause resumed by, the United States from grants for railroad purposes, heretofore made to the State of Michigan, have heretofore been disposed of by the proper officers of the United States, by sales or entries, by cash warrants or scrip, under color of the public-land laws, and where the consideration received therefor is still retained by the Government, the right and title of all persons holding or claiming under such disposals shall be, and is hereby, confirmed: *Provided, however*, That where the original cash purchasers are the present owners this act shall be operative to confirm the title only of such said cash purchasers as the Secretary of the Interior shall be satisfied have purchased without fraud and in the belief that they were thereby obtaining valid title from the United States.

That nothing herein contained shall be construed to confirm any sales or entries of lands upon which there were bona fide pre-emption or homestead claims on the 1st day of May, 1888, arising or asserted under color of the laws of the United States.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection the amendments made in Committee of the Whole, other than the one just read, are concurred in in the Senate. The question recurs on concurring in the amendment just read.

Mr. HOAR. I move to amend that amendment by striking out in the sixth line the words "by sales or entries, by cash warrants or scrip," and by inserting in the seventh line, after the word "laws," the words "or under State selections or."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the sixth line of the amendment it is proposed to strike out the words "by sales or entries, by cash warrants or scrip," and in line 7, after the word "laws," to insert "or under State selections or;" so as to read:

SEC. 9. That in all cases when any of the lands forfeited by the first section of this act, or when any lands relinquished to, or for any cause resumed by, the United States from grants for railroad purposes, heretofore made to the State of Michigan, have heretofore been disposed of by the proper officers of the United States, under color of the public-land laws or under State selections or where the consideration received therefor is still retained by the Government, the right and title of all persons holding or claiming under such disposals shall be, and is hereby, confirmed: *Provided, however*, That where the original cash purchasers are the present owners this act shall be operative to confirm the title only of such cash purchasers as the Secretary of the Interior shall be satisfied have purchased without fraud and in the belief that they were thereby obtaining valid title from the United States.

Nothing herein contained shall be construed to confirm any sales or entries of lands upon which there were bona fide pre-emption or homestead claims on the 1st day of May, 1888, arising or asserted under color of the laws of the United States.

Mr. HOAR. That extends the principle of the amendment to all cases, and only to those cases, where there have been purchases under the authority of an officer of the United States, and where the Secretary of the Interior finds that the purchase has been made without fraud and in good faith and the Government has received and retains the consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts to the amendment.

Mr. BERRY. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether, if his amendment shall be adopted, it will have the effect of confirming the canal selections, the lands selected by the canal company, and if it is not in effect the same amendment he moved in Committee of the Whole and which was laid on the table upon a former day?

Mr. HOAR. It will have the effect to confirm the lands held by the canal company or persons claiming under them, if it shall turn out that that land was conveyed to the canal company by an officer of the United States; further, that the United States received the consideration and now holds it; and, further, that the title was obtained in good faith and without fraud; and I am at a loss to conceive how any man born with a capacity for the sense of justice, undertaking to act in a legislative capacity in the interest of the whole people, can refuse to confirm a title which depends upon such facts.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I am at a loss to conceive how any one born with a sense of justice and right can think that it is proper for a legislative body to undertake to confirm selections of lands, not only to the canal company but to cash purchasers, where the evidence taken shows, and a majority of the committee report, that the lands were

selected in fraud; that these persons were parties to the fraud; that the purchases were without consideration, and that these parties have already received many times the value of the canal constructed.

The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin says that it shall only apply to those lands which were selected without fraud. I assert again, as I asserted this morning, that the Secretary of the Interior will be the judge to determine this, but the evidence as to whether or not they were selected or purchased in good faith will be furnished only by the parties in interest, and it practically amounts to confirming to the canal company and to the cash purchasers an immense body of land. That is the reason why I do not agree to the proposition.

Mr. PALMER. I ask to hear the amendment read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be again read. The Secretary read the amendment of Mr. HOAR to the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PALMER. If that is what I think it is, I am astonished that the Senator should return to the attack again. This, I suppose, confirms the canal selections. It was a nefarious transaction—I will not say from beginning to end, because there may be some very respectable people in it collaterally—but the manipulations of the selections, the removal of an honest officer, the putting in of a pliant tool, the utter defiance of law, the misconstruction of law, the defiance of law in every respect—this is one of the cases where all those terms will apply. They have taken mineral lands when it was expressly declared that they should not take mineral lands. They were confined to the lands nearest the canal, and they left a hiatus of 100,000 acres, and there it is. It seems as if [pointing to a map of the upper peninsula] Providence had come to my relief. There [exhibiting] is the map displaying just the manipulation and maneuvering of that canal company. Here are concentric circles showing—

Mr. DOLPH. If the Senator from Michigan will permit me, I ask him if it is not true that the 15,000 acres in controversy here were part of the second grant, so that there is no question of the location of the land at issue at all?

Mr. PALMER. I do not think that is so material.

Mr. HOAR. What did you say it for?

Mr. PALMER. Because I wanted to pile Pelion upon Ossa. I was a little cumulative. Now the idea; after this has taken up two or three days of the time of the Senate, to throw and inject in the last day, in the afternoon, such a proposition, surprises me. If it was by any one else than the Senator from Massachusetts, or a Senator, I should feel as if I should characterize it in very strong terms. As it is now, I am confined to the assertion that that canal company should receive no favor, except at the hands of a court and in due process of law. Let them have what they can get, but do not let the United States Congress confirm a single acre which they have gotten surreptitiously.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan concedes away his whole case. Here is an amendment which provides for the confirmation only of lands which were sold and selected by the officers of the United States, which were received in good faith and without fraud, and for which the United States has received and now retains the consideration. And he says that describes the selections of the canal company. If it does, his other statements are absolutely contradicted. And upon what do those other statements rest? They rest upon a report of a committee which was drawn and written, as a member of the Senate, the Senator's colleague [Mr. STOCKBRIDGE] knows, by a person whose fraudulent conduct has been exposed here over and over again, the person who got people to go onto the lands which belonged to this canal company (the only flaw upon their title being that they were selected on lands of an unearned railroad grant which had not been declared forfeited under the old law), lands selected with the approbation of the Secretary of the Interior and under the opinion of the Attorney-General.

This man got a number of persons to go on the lands and make fraudulent entries, and make contracts with his firm to give them an interest and then to swear that those contracts never had been made; and here in this debate the affidavits of those two partners were presented, one of them swearing that the letters were written in which it was said they would hold these men by their perjury to do their further bidding, but that they were written by his partner and not by him, and denying that the contracts were actually made, and the partner coming in with his affidavit and saying that the contracts were made, and he left the firm so as not to induce men to commit perjury; and that is the man who has been furnishing material to the Senator from Michigan nearly all through this debate, as I am credibly informed, and it is upon his authority and the authority of a report made by a divided committee in the House of Representatives that this act of gross injustice is sought to be carried through, that report being written by the very senior partner of that fraudulent firm.

Mr. PALMER. Nothing could more clearly betray the poverty of the case.

Mr. HOAR. I thought I was giving way for a question?

Mr. PALMER. The intention was to ask who furnished the briefs for the Senator's remarks?

Mr. HOAR. The information for my remarks, Mr. President, was furnished to me first by Hon. Benjamin Dean, of Boston, late a member

of the House of Representatives, and counsel for this canal company, a gentleman of high character and standing, a Democratic member of the House of Representatives, known probably to half the Democratic side of the House. More recently the statements were furnished by a gentleman by the name of MacGowan, who is the counsel for Mr. Malvern and a body of citizens of wealth, property, and character. Mr. MacGowan was formerly a member of the House, a gentleman of high standing and character in his profession, and the present owners of this canal company's rights are among some of the best known and most respectable people in the State of Massachusetts. My colleague [Mr. ALLEN] of the other House came to my seat this afternoon to tell me about his neighbors in the city of Lowell. They took the rights of this canal company when it had failed. They raised a million dollars of hard cash and completed the canal, and proceeded to perform all the conditions.

When this matter was first voted down it was voted down on the statement of the Senator from Michigan and of members of the committee that they would simply forfeit the lands and would not enter upon the question of confirming any of them. There was some sense in that. They would leave that to the future. They put in an amendment which I agreed to, leaving that and saying this bill should not touch it. But now you have an amendment confirming all the other titles you can think of in regard to which there are technical defects. You have confirmed the titles in the State of the Senator from Mississippi, the homesteaders; you are confirming by the amendment of my honorable friend from Wisconsin the homesteaders and cash entrymen for whose interests he has an especial concern; and now you are going to leave out of this bill and forfeit the rights of these people who, as I said, have earned their rights and have performed all the conditions imposed on them by law.

The Senator talks about fraud, and when asked what he means by fraud he says they selected mineral lands when they had no right to select mineral lands. That has been answered over and over again. They selected lands in which there were afterwards discovered iron mines, and the opinions of two Attorneys-General have been read in this debate showing that iron mines are not mineral lands within the meaning of our land laws.

Then the Senator said, and he has undertaken to repeat it now within two minutes when the Senator from Oregon put him the question, that they went away from the neighborhood of their canal. The answer to that is that there was a second act of Congress. Finding that there were not lands sufficient to build the canal under the first grant, there was a second act of Congress, giving them an additional 200,000 acres and authorizing them to go anywhere within the upper peninsula of Michigan; and the 15,000 acres here in controversy were selected under that, and that was done after the opinion of the Attorney-General was taken that they might go there, and under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior.

Now, how idle to keep up this parrot cry of "fraud!" "fraud!" "fraud!" The answer to the whole thing is that this amendment so carefully prepared by the honorable Senator from Wisconsin remits all these questions to the decision of the future:

Shall be operative to confirm the title only of such said cash purchasers as the Secretary of the Interior shall be satisfied have purchased without fraud and in the belief that they were thereby obtaining valid title from the United States.

And the former part of the amendment limits it only to the cases of lands of which the proper officers of the United States made disposition.

It may be that the Senate sits to perform these high acts of legislation; in my own State we call the highest legislative body of that State "the general court;" and it was the understanding of our ancestors that men charged with legislative functions have also the duty, the obligation, and the responsibility in dealing with the great interests of citizens that come before them which rest upon judicial officers; and I say it is a burning shame, it degrades the character of the Senate itself when citizens come here over and over again with a claim like that I have stated and the Senate turns its back on account of these demagogic cries which are attempted to be made, and especially when the Senate turns its back on them when the concoctors of these frauds are sitting in the gallery inspiring the attack.

The Congress of the United States granted 200,000 acres of land to pay the men who should build this canal, so essential to the commerce of that stormy and dangerous coast on that lake, and it was built; and by a second act it was declared that this land might be selected, as I have said, anywhere in the upper peninsula of Michigan; and it was said also that the land should be selected by an officer appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, and the selections should be confirmed by the Secretary; and in every single instance the facts upon which these titles depend were submitted to the Attorney-General of the United States by the Secretary of the Interior, and they had the approbation of both those high officers; and the only flaw, the only possible defect that the ingenuity of man can conjure up in the title of this canal company is that an old railroad grant had been made, the railroad never having earned the lands, it being supposed, until the Supreme Court decided otherwise, it being held by the Attorney-General of the United States

and by the Land Office, that when the railroad company had forfeited its land by failing to complete its road those lands were open to selection by other grantees; and it turned out ten years afterwards that because this old sleeping railroad title was still there, never earned, giving no rightful property to the railroad company, therefore the selection of these lands were invalid.

Mr. GEORGE. May I be allowed to ask a question?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator wish to be understood as saying that the only reasonable objection to the validity of the grant to the canal company is that some of the lands are located upon lands which had been granted by an act of Congress to a railroad company and not earned by that railroad company?

Mr. HOAR. I do mean exactly that thing.

Mr. GEORGE. And that before the decision in *Schulenberg vs. Hariman* the land officers of the United States recognized the law to be that on the mere failure of the grantee, the railroad company, to comply with the conditions of the grant the grant was forfeited, and acting on that theory permitted the canal company to take up these lands? Is that the interpretation?

Mr. HOAR. I mean to say exactly that thing, and I mean to add to exactly that thing that the governor of Michigan, to which State this land had been granted for a railroad, made a release to the United States.

Mr. GEORGE. Has the canal company complied with all the conditions of the grant to it?

Mr. HOAR. The canal company complied with all the conditions, and the governor of Michigan so certified. Now, Mr. President, I undertake to say that there is not a member of this body who, having made a grant of land which had failed to his grantee by such a defect, would go home and look his neighbors in the face if he was not ready and eager to do everything that lay in him to confirm it; and is it true that this great, proud, strong, rich American people has a less keen sense of honor than that which dwells in the breast of the very humblest of its legislative servants?

Mr. GEORGE. Now I desire to ask the Senator from Massachusetts another question. Is the sole effect of the amendment which he has offered, and which is now pending before the Senate, to secure to this canal company the lands which I have referred to in the former colloquy I had with the Senator?

Mr. HOAR. That is the sole effect, and that is upon the condition expressed by the clear statement of the Senator from Wisconsin, that the Secretary of the Interior shall be satisfied that they "have heretofore been disposed of by the proper officers of the United States," and that the parties "have purchased without fraud and in the belief that they were thereby obtaining valid title from the United States."

Mr. PALMER. I think nothing shows the poverty of the case of the honorable Senator from Massachusetts as much as the fact that he has got a phantom that he fights, and that phantom is some lawyer who is stuffing me with information. He does not controvert the facts; at the same time he concedes that attorneys are filling him with information. As a matter of course we have to get our information from somewhere; but in addition to the information I get from attorneys I bring in reports of the House of Representatives, and I was about to have them read the other day and I handed them to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator indulge me?

Mr. PALMER. Always.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask in the presence of the Senate the honorable Secretary of the Interior of the last administration, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], if he does not know these facts that I have stated, if he does not know them on examination, thorough official examination, to be true?

Mr. PALMER. There were so many that the Senator should specify which one.

Mr. HOAR. The whole statement of the case.

Mr. PALMER. He would hardly like to commit himself to all of the Senator's statements.

Mr. TELLER. I have not had occasion to examine this canal question for some time. It has been very thoroughly examined from time to time, and was while I was in charge of the duties of Secretary of the Interior. I think the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts is substantially correct. Those are the facts as I understand them and remember them.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator please recapitulate those facts concisely so that we shall know. There were so many facts stated.

Mr. TELLER. I will wait until the Senator gets through.

Mr. GEORGE. I desire to ask the Senator from Michigan a question.

Mr. PALMER. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. I desire to ask the Senator from Michigan whether he controverts the statements made by the Senator from Massachusetts, and if he does, to what extent does he differ with him on the facts?

Mr. PALMER. I can not say whether I can controvert them, but I will try. If I had the RECORD here to know exactly what the Senator said, I could talk more consecutively and more understandingly.

If he says that the only fault of the canal company was that they unintentionally took lands not thinking them to be mineral, and they afterwards turned out to be mineral, I shall not try to contradict him at all. I will merely read from the report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office. The best way is to be sustained by documents, and I am only sorry that I have not the current literature here to-day. I supposed the fight was off, and therefore I did not bring up four or five reports showing the nefarious character of this whole canal operation. I will say here, and I say it from—

Mr. GEORGE. "Nefarious," did the Senator say?

Mr. PALMER. N—nefarious. I will say that the canal never was completed within the specifications of the Department; that now those arms or piers which were to have afforded a harbor of refuge are not of such a character as to be anything but a damage to navigation, and we shall come before Congress and ask for \$350,000 to get this canal out of the hands of that company so that we may make it of practical benefit to navigation on the Lakes. I do not think they have rendered an equivalent.

Mr. GEORGE. Was the canal built according to the terms of the act under which the lands were granted?

Mr. PALMER. I think I can say not with positive certainty, and I will have the literature to fortify me to-morrow morning.

Mr. HOAR. I ask the honorable Senator if he, his colleague, has not stated that that canal was completed, and that he went through it himself on the largest steamers?

Mr. PALMER. I think I have heard him say that, and I have heard the Senator from Massachusetts say so a great many times. I do not say they intentionally misrepresent, but I know that such is not the fact. I will place my word against both.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator a question. In the first place does the Senator claim because the land proved to be iron land that it was without the grant?

Mr. PALMER. No, sir. I claim that it was without the grant because it was designated as mineral land, and I can show the reports sustaining that.

Mr. TELLER. I do not think the Senator can sustain that from the Department.

Mr. PALMER. I am merely taking the Department's reports.

Mr. TELLER. That iron land is mineral land within the meaning of the grant?

Mr. PALMER. It was never supposed to be iron land until long after.

Mr. TELLER. If it had been iron land it would not have been excepted from the grant.

Mr. PALMER. Some of the finest copper mines in the world were developed on the margin of this grant.

Mr. CHACE. Right here will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PALMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHACE. I want to ask the Senator from Michigan a question. I want to know distinctly whether he says that those copper mines are on this very property or not?

Mr. PALMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHACE. They are on this property?

Mr. PALMER. You mean the property that we are talking about?

Mr. CHACE. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. No; I think not.

Mr. CHACE. Then I ask the Senator if that bears on this question?

Mr. PALMER. Not at all.

Mr. GEORGE. Are the mineral lands involved in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. PALMER. There is a large quantity of iron lands, but I understand from the former Secretary of the Interior that iron lands are not considered as mineral lands. I am perfectly willing to be fair. I do not want to obscure this question by a lot of collateral issues, as seems to be the desire of the other side. But what I say is that the Senate should not want to do anything or ought not to do anything towards confirming lands gotten in violation of law, even although the particular lands I speak of may not have been so gotten, and where they rendered no equivalent I say that we ought not to confirm their title.

Mr. GEORGE. What is the specific violation of law through which these lands were gotten?

Mr. PALMER. These lands that I speak of now?

Mr. GEORGE. The lands referred to in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts. We are talking about them.

Mr. PALMER. I do not think that there is any particular violation of law about them.

Now, Mr. President, I hope that this amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts will not prevail. If you want to know anything more about the canal company—I dislike to use epithets; I do not want to hoist any red flag in the way of some agent who is pressing the canal claim in season and out of season—this canal company, not satisfied with having one or two lawyers, has had as many as seven ex-members of Congress who have had access to the floor. This canal company can take care of its own interests without coming here as a supplicant to ask us to confirm an irregular selection.

They know they were violating the law. They have had able counsel

all the time while they were going in upon this railroad reservation. To-morrow morning, if this shall be continued, I can give a little more history of the canal company.

I will say this now: That the canal has never been completed within the specifications; that, notwithstanding my colleague says that the largest vessels can be floated through it, I think I risk nothing in saying that he is mistaken, that he has not been through it within two or three years.

Mr. HOAR. The governor of Michigan has given his certificate.

Mr. PALMER. Which one?

Mr. HOAR. Governor Bagley.

Mr. PALMER. He has been dead several years.

Mr. HOAR. Now, my honorable friend will pardon me. I think this country is entitled to have each one of these facts understood. The Senator from Michigan says that this canal is not completed. My information is that it is completed. The Senator's colleague says that it is completed and he has been through it on the largest steamers. Now, I ask the Senator this question, whether the law did not make it the duty of the governor of his State to inspect the canal and certify whether it was complete, and whether he did not make that certificate—a governor of high character, Governor Bagley? The Senator answers and says he has been dead some years.

Mr. PALMER. I owe the Senator an apology. I thought he was asking in the present tense. He was speaking of the present condition of the canal, and I thought he was bringing to bear Governor Bagley's assertions on that point, and I was surprised when he said Governor Bagley. That was all. I did not mean to cover the thing with derision at all; but the canal has never been completed, notwithstanding the assertions of my very respected colleague, for whom I have the highest regard. I do not think he will reiterate, against my assertion, that the largest vessels can go through the canal.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. The Senator will excuse me. I asserted this, and I reassert it, that the Portage Lake Canal was built, according to the certificate of the governor of Michigan, in accordance with the act authorizing its construction. Governor Bagley, of Michigan (whose word was always good in Michigan, and the people of Michigan had the greatest confidence in him as a careful, conscientious man), took a competent person with him, visited the canal, inspected it, found it was completed in accordance with the act granting lands for its construction, and so certified. Now, I think I am right in saying that if he made a mistake and it was not exactly completed in accordance with the contract, that would be immaterial. It was not so; but if it had been, I think the certificate of the completion of the canal was conclusive upon that point.

That canal was built and completed and accepted, I will not say how many years ago, but twelve or fifteen, perhaps more, perhaps sixteen or seventeen years ago. The piers extending into the lake were built, like all the works, or nearly all the works on our Great Lakes, of wood. They were timber piers, such as were required by the contract. It may be possible, in fact I believe it is true, that those piers have gone somewhat to decay, that while those piers extended into Lake Superior to get sufficient depth of water, I think 13 feet, to comply with the requirements of the contract as certified to by the governor, in the course of years they have gone to decay, the sand has accumulated, as it does at the end of all piers constructed on the lakes, as any gentleman familiar with them knows, and from time to time it is necessary to change them. The fact that the canal is not in as good order now as it was and will not pass vessels drawing the same amount of water that it did when it was completed has no effect upon this question at this time. The canal was undoubtedly constructed in accordance with the contract; the certificate provided for was given by the governor, and as a matter of law is final.

I want to say further, while I am upon my feet—I did not propose to be drawn into this matter, and I dislike very much to differ with my honorable colleague on such a subject, and I am only led to do so when it seems to be absolutely necessary—I want to say that there never would have been any question as to the title to the lands which the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts seeks to confirm, the 15,000 acres, had it not been that those lands were within the limits of an old railroad grant, and I desire to say only two or three words on that point.

The grant within the limits of which these lands are situated was made to the State of Michigan in 1856. The act granting these lands required that the railroad should be built in ten years or the land should revert to the General Government. The ten years expired in 1866. The Land Department construed that granting act to mean just what it said on the face of it; that if the road was not built in ten years the lands should revert to the General Government. Thereupon after 1866 the Department restored the lands to market. They were open for canal selections, and these lands were selected. They were open to cash entries, and sales were made for cash. They were open to homestead and pre-emption, and such locations were made. That state of things existed until 1874. From 1866 to December 1874, when the Schulenberg vs. Harriman decision was made, the lands were open to sale to anybody who would pay for them, open to homestead entry, open to selections of the character made by the canal company; and it

was only after that Schulenberg decision that the lands were withdrawn from market. These selections were made within that time.

My idea is that upon the passage of this bill, when the Government asserts a right of forfeiture which has existed since 1866, and the Government comes into the possession of these lands again by virtue of that forfeiture, Senators should keep in mind that these canal selections were certified by the governor of the State of Michigan for the benefit of the canal. Now the fact is that the legal title under the Schulenberg decision to these lands is in the State of Michigan, and the General Government can not convey title.

The same holds good in regard to the cash entries you have heard so much about for the last week or ten days. The Government undertook to sell lands between 1866 and 1874 which its officers supposed they had a right to sell, because the road was not built within ten years. They sold those lands; they selected the 15,000 acres for the canal company. The Supreme Court in the Schulenberg decision of 1874 decided that the Government was not in possession of a legal title to those lands, but the title was in the State of Michigan. I am no lawyer, neither am I a "horny-handed son of toil," as my colleague is.

Mr. PALMER. I think I have the floor.

Several SENATORS (to Mr. PALMER). Do not interrupt him now.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I think the honest and honorable thing, and the thing which the Senate should do, is, if they pass this bill, thereby reinvesting the Government with the title to these lands, to make good what they attempted to do in years past. I think that view of the case should commend itself to every honest and honorable man. I did not mean to say anything about this matter, and I will not say more now. I was going to take up another branch of the subject, but I will not do it.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, my colleague has not met the point wherein he and I differed, and that was in regard to the capacity of the canal for floating the largest vessels on the Lakes. We might as well close—

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. They were obliged by their contract to give 13 feet of water. They gave more.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Secretary please read what I send to the desk?

The CHIEF CLERK. "House of Representatives, Report No. 684, Forty-eighth Congress, first session."

Mr. PALMER. It is the report of Mr. Henley, from the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives, in the Forty-eighth Congress.

Mr. TELLER. I think that report has been read here about half a dozen times.

Mr. PALMER. There have been statements in regard to the completion of the canal made which contradict. I do not myself like to contradict unless I have the authority for doing it.

Mr. TELLER. If there is any defect or any vice in this title it does not grow out of the fact that the canal was not completed. That is a new defect.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. TELLER. Let me finish. I want to make my statement so that everybody can understand what I mean.

If there is a defect in this title it is because at the time, as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. STOCKBRIDGE], who has just taken his seat, said, the title was in the State of Michigan and not in the General Government when the certification was made. Now, whether the canal was completed or not, is not a question for us. That has passed beyond the domain of discussion. We said that the governor of Michigan should determine that question. He having determined it, if he made a mistake, everybody understands in law that that is conclusive upon us. There is no evidence that he made any mistake. There never has been any respectable claim. I think, that he made any mistake. The whole defect, I repeat again, on which these people have been kept from receiving benefit from the land was because there was a misunderstanding in the Department at the time that the certification was made of the rights of the General Government with reference to lands included in that grant, of which there had been no re-entry by the Government, and up to the day of the Schulenberg vs. Harriman decision every act of the Government was in consonance with the act spoken of here.

The Government treated the land as its land and not as the land of the grantee mentioned in the act, whether it was the State or whether it was a company; and I say now whether or not the canal was built is not a question for discussion. The question simply is, whether the Government will now make good the title that it has given to these people or attempted to give them more than fifteen years ago, because the decision in the Harriman case was made in 1874 and the certification was before that. In 1872 I am told the certification was; I do not remember. That is all there is of it; and if we do not make the title good by an act, there is no other way they can get it. The executive department can not give it to them; it must be by legislative action.

As the Senator from Massachusetts has said, if anybody can show any reason why they should not have it, it must be because they did not complete the canal and because Mr. Bagley and they were guilty

of fraud. That would vitiate it, and that alone, and nobody in Michigan or anywhere else has ever suggested that Governor Bagley did not certify to that which in his judgment was right.

If he made a mistake, I can say for the legal profession that it is beyond controversy to-day, that when a matter of that kind is left to a tribunal and it has decided it without the right of appeal expressly being claimed or reserved, that decision is final and can not be inquired into by any power, much less can it be inquired into by the United States in a case of this kind.

Mr. PALMER rose.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator before he proceeds allow me to modify my amendment? I wish to add a few words. I desire, with the leave of the Senator—

Mr. PALMER. If it does not involve any further remarks.

Mr. HOAR. No, sir. Where I say "under State selections" I wish to narrow it strictly "under State selections confirmed by the Secretary of the Interior."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The modification of the amendment to the amendment will be stated.

Mr. GEORGE. Does that limit the amendment?

Mr. HOAR. It limits it only to the State selections which the Secretary of the Interior approved.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 7, after the word "laws," it is proposed to strike out the word "and" and to insert "or under State selections confirmed by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. PALMER. This is the most intangible, impalpable, illusory, misleading, nebulous fight that I ever was in. [Laughter.] Part of the time it is the equities, part of the time it is the equivalent, part of the time it is the law, but all the time on general principles "We want the land." [Laughter.] All I have to say is that from the very inception of the removal of the register at Marquette this thing has been open to very grave suspicion, and I contend that it can be shown very evidently, and so that it can not be controverted, that there was collusion at Marquette, and it is a well-known rule of law, I believe—so I have heard it stated in this Chamber—that no man or no corporation can take advantage of its own fraud. Now I would like to have the Secretary read that report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

Several SENATORS. What is it?

Mr. PALMER. It is the report I have indicated.

The SECRETARY. "House Report No. 684, Forty-eighth Congress, first session."

Mr. DOLPH. Is that subject to objection?

Mr. PALMER. No, sir; it is part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks it is not subject to objection. The Senator from Oregon can object to its being read by the Secretary, but the Senator from Michigan can read it himself.

Mr. DOLPH. I do object, because it has been read over and over again.

Mr. PALMER. Nothing will give me greater pleasure than to read it myself.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is not customary to object to the reading of papers by the Secretary.

Mr. DOLPH. I withdraw the objection at the suggestion of some Senators.

Mr. PALMER—

It will be observed—

The report goes on to say—

that under the two granting acts—

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator to give way for an adjournment.

Mr. PALMER. Presently—

these lands were required to be selected in the tiers of sections nearest the canal, of unappropriated land, not mineral, not covered by pre-emption or homestead claims; and 200,000 acres (those included in the grant of 1865), beyond all controversy, were limited to lands subject to private entry. The selections were in fact made contrary to almost every one of these provisions of law. They were not in the tiers nearest the canal; they were made without reference to subsisting pre-emption or homestead claims; they were made of lands not subject to private entry, and over 15,000 acres were upon lands within this railroad grant and withdrawn for its benefit.

It is well known that this canal company knew that they were entering these lands in contravention of the law. They had able lawyers backing them up all the time who were interested in the company.

It will also be observed that the company was required by the granting act to construct a breakwater, harbor, and ship-canal at least 13 feet in depth, and that by section 5 of the act of 1865, if the work was not "completed" within two years (afterwards extended to December 1, 1873), the lands thereby granted should "revert to the United States."

It is satisfactorily shown to your committee that no sufficient harbor or breakwater has ever been constructed, and that all that has ever been done by the company or its successors to earn this grant was to build a canal about 2 miles in length, connecting Portage Lake with Lake Superior, and at one end thereof build two piers some 600 feet in length, extending into the lake. Even this work was not reported as having been done until June 25, 1875, over eighteen months after the right of forfeiture had accrued under the extending acts. (Governor's certificate, appendix to Canal History, pages 73, 74.)

It still further appears, from the official records of the office of the Chief of Engineers, in the War Department, that the said canal had not up to 1879 been completed in the manner required by the act, particularly as to the depth of water required, actual soundings in that year by the Government engineers

showing an average of much less than 13 feet. Your committee has no information that any work has been done upon the canal since that date.

December 16, 1879, Maj. Henry M. Robert, of the Engineer Corps, United States Army, reported as follows upon this subject:

"I do not think the entrance to the canal can be said to be completed until the piers are extended to a depth of water equal to that which is considered necessary at the harbors constructed directly by the United States. If this were done a great deal of the difficulty experienced in entering the canal would disappear. It is not to be expected that a vessel can be easily steered in rough water when its keel almost touches the bottom. This lack of depth of water at the head of the canal is, in my judgment, the greatest difficulty at this point, and the remedy is for the canal company to complete the work, to aid which the United States donated 400,000 acres of land."

From all the foregoing your committee find that these selections were mainly, if not wholly, made contrary to the provisions of law; that the company, during the period allowed before forfeiture, had not performed the work required; that it has never constructed any sufficient harbor or breakwater; that the canal itself, as finally finished, was not "completed," and never has been completed as prescribed by the granting act; and that the company has no equities entitling it to favorable consideration. Your committee are accordingly of opinion that no act confirming these selections should be passed.

Now, Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

JOHN FRUCHIER.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Pending the motion to adjourn, the Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

In answer to the resolution of the Senate of April 12, directing the Secretary of State to transmit to the Senate a copy of the correspondence in his Department in regard to the case of John Fruchier, an American citizen who has been impressed into the military service of France, I transmit herewith a report in relation thereto from the Secretary of State, together with the accompanying papers, not considering their communication to be incompatible with the public interests.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,

Washington, May 8, 1888.

Mr. STEWART. The person to whom the message relates, who was impressed into the French army, has been released since the resolution was introduced. The correspondence it may be important to print or it may not. I presume the message will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so referred, without the order to print, if there be no objection.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask that the message and accompanying papers from the State Department, in relation to the imprisonment of this American citizen, may be printed. I do not think there will be any objection to it, and it is very desirable that they should be printed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The order to print will be made, if there be no objection.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. ALLISON, it was

Ordered, That leave be granted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers in the case of C. P. Eppert, no adverse report having been made thereon.

AMENDMENTS TO A BILL.

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

FORFEITURE OF UNEARNED RAILROAD LANDS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill (S. 1430) to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes, is before the Senate.

Mr. BLAIR. It is now evident that we are approaching a final vote upon the bill. As the Senator from Michigan [Mr. PALMER] has made a motion to adjourn, and desires an adjournment, wishing to be heard further, I understand, and not having his documents all here, I ask unanimous consent that the consideration of the bill may be resumed to-morrow morning immediately after the conclusion of morning business, and that the vote be taken upon the bill and amendments at half past 1 o'clock.

Mr. CALL. I suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire to ask the Senate to agree to take the final vote during the day, some time during the session to-morrow.

Mr. PADDOCK. Say 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the formal morning business to-morrow the Senate resume the consideration of Senate bill 1430, and that the vote thereon and upon the amendments be taken at half past 1 o'clock.

Mr. CALL. I object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Florida objects.

Mr. BLAIR. Then I ask unanimous consent that the consideration of the bill be resumed to-morrow morning, immediately at the conclusion of the morning business, and that it be continued until the bill is disposed of.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire is reminded that a previous order of the Senate requires the resumption of the pleuro-pneumonia bill at 2 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. BLAIR. I will modify my request. I ask unanimous consent that the consideration of the bill be resumed at the termination of the

formal morning business to-morrow, and I give notice that I shall ask the Senate to continue its consideration until the bill is disposed of.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that the consideration of Senate bill 1430 be resumed to-morrow morning at the close of the formal morning business. Is there objection?

Mr. EVARTS. I object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New York objects.

Mr. EVARTS. I object in the hope that we may go on and vote on the bill to-night.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. PALMER] has moved that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. PALMER. I withdraw my motion if there is any chance of concluding the bill.

Mr. BLAIR. I think there is.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion to adjourn is withdrawn.

Mr. COCKRELL. We can not finish the bill to-night; it is simply impossible. There is a long speech to be made on it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts moves to amend the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole as has been read by the Secretary. Is the Senate ready for the question?

Mr. CALL. I do not think the bill ought to be passed without a more mature consideration of the matter. I design to address some remarks myself upon the subject.

Mr. BLAIR. Does the Senator care to speak on the pending amendment?

Mr. CALL. I do, and I shall renew the motion to adjourn; I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Florida moves that the Senate do now adjourn.

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

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. On the motion to adjourn the Senator from Nevada asks that the yeas and nays may be entered on the Journal.

Mr. STEWART. At the request of several Senators I withdraw the demand.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The request for the yeas and nays is withdrawn. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Florida that the Senate adjourn.

The question being put, there were on a division—ayes 21, noes 21.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered; and being taken, resulted—yeas 21, nays 21; as follows:

YEAS—21.

Bate,	Cullom,	Jones of Arkansas,	Turpie,
Blodgett,	Davis,	Pasco,	Vance,
Brown,	Faulkner,	Payne,	Wilson of Iowa.
Call,	Gorman,	Reagan,	
Cockrell,	Gray,	Sabin,	
Coke,	Hawley,	Saulsbury,	

NAYS—21.

Berry,	George,	Palmer,	Teller,
Blair,	Hiscock,	Pugh,	Walthall,
Chace,	Hoar,	Sawyer,	Wilson of Md.
Chandler,	McPherson,	Spooner,	
Dolph,	Mitchell,	Stewart,	
Evarts,	Paddock,	Stockbridge,	

ABSENT—34.

Aldrich,	Dawes,	Hearst,	Quay,
Allison,	Edmunds,	Ingalls,	Ransom,
Beck,	Eustis,	Jones of Nevada,	Riddleberger,
Blackburn,	Farwell,	Kenna,	Sherman,
Bowen,	Frye,	Manderson,	Stanford,
Butler,	Gibson,	Morgan,	Vest,
Cameron,	Hale,	Morrill,	Voorhees.
Colquitt,	Hampton,	Platt,	
Daniel,	Harris,	Plumb,	

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

Mr. CHACE. My colleague [Mr. ALDRICH] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COLQUITT].

Mr. BLAIR. Now let us have a vote.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] to the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I was in favor of an adjournment because I think that the Senate ought to consider somewhat carefully before it passes an amendment of this character. The Interior Department, it is well known by a complaint arising from all over the United States, has disposed of an empire of public lands without the authority of Congress, precisely upon the grounds upon which this amendment is based.

Mr. COKE. If the Senator from Florida will yield for the purpose, I will move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Florida yield for that purpose?

Mr. CALL. I do.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Texas moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HOAR. I ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. A division is called for.

Mr. HOAR. May I have unanimous consent to make a statement? I voted against a motion to adjourn, but it was lost by a bare tie. I think it is hardly worth while to ask one-half of the Senate to stay here against its will. I therefore will move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts withdraws his request for a division, and—

Mr. BLAIR. The Senator—

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will allow me—

Mr. BLAIR. The Senator has disposed of the controversy on which we were going to help his amendment through. I ask unanimous consent that we resume the consideration of the bill to-morrow morning at the termination of the formal morning business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning business to-morrow morning the Senate resume the consideration of Senate bill 1430. Is there objection?

Mr. COKE. Unless it is understood that the bill gives way to the animal-industry bill at 2 o'clock, I object.

Mr. HOAR. That will be done.

Mr. CULLOM and Mr. SAWYER (to Mr. COKE). It can not interfere with you.

Mr. HOAR. I inquire of the Chair if the effect will not be as the Senator from Texas desires?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Before the adjournment of the Senate, the Chair will lay before the Senate as unfinished business the bill from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, known as the pleuropneumonia or animal-industry bill.

Mr. COKE. Then I make no objection, with that understanding.

Mr. BLAIR. It is the understanding that the Senator from Texas will have the floor at 2 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Then the agreement is that at the conclusion of the morning business to-morrow morning the Senate will resume the consideration of Senate bill 1430.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

Several SENATORS. Let us adjourn.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair first lays before the Senate the bill (S. 2083) to provide for the establishment of a Bureau of Animal Industry, and to facilitate the exportation of live-stock and their products, to extirpate contagious pleuro-pneumonia and other diseases among domestic animals, and for other purposes.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] moves that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 9, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, May 8, 1888.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

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

NEW YORK INDIAN LANDS IN KANSAS.

The SPEAKER. The question before the House at the adjournment yesterday was a motion to refer the President's message to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PERKINS. Will it be in order as a matter of privilege, if the message and bill go to the Committee on Indian Affairs, to move to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the bill and put it upon its passage?

The SPEAKER. It will be in order to move to bring it before the House for consideration. The matter does not lose its privilege at all by reason of its reference to a committee, and it is a matter of privilege to move to discharge the committee from its further consideration for the purpose of bringing it before the House, the same as in a case involving the right of a member to a seat on the floor. Is there further objection to the reference of the message?

Mr. PERKINS. I make no further objection.

The message and bill were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

NATIONAL ARMORY, SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Secretary of War of an appropriation for shafting, fixtures, etc., for the new milling shop, National Armory, Springfield, Mass.; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting plans and an amended estimate of an appro-

priation for the further development of the water-power pool at the Rock Island, Ill., arsenal; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

UINTAH INDIAN RESERVATION.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 7936) to restore to the public domain a part of the Uintah Indian reservation in the Territory of Utah, and for other purposes, with the amendments of the Senate thereto.

Mr. PEEL. Mr. Speaker, the amendments simply change the phraseology and do not alter the sense of the bill at all. I therefore ask unanimous consent that they be concurred in.

The SPEAKER. The amendments will be read.

The amendments were read, as follows:

Page 1, line 20, after the word "interior," insert "and upon his order."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "cash," strike out "entries."

Mr. PEEL. The Committee on Indian Affairs have formally passed on the amendments this morning, and I now move that they be concurred in.

The amendments of the Senate were concurred in.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. STONE, of Missouri, until Saturday of next week.

To Mr. COBB, until the 16th instant, on account of important business.

WILLIAM R. BLAKESLEE.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARLINGTON] had a matter pending before the House yesterday morning when the regular order was called. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] demanded the regular order, but the Chair is advised that he has since withdrawn his objection to the bill. The bill and report were read yesterday. The Clerk will again report the title of the bill.

The title of the bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 550) for the relief of William R. Blakeslee.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to remove the record of "dismissal from the service on account of incompetency," now standing against the name of William R. Blakeslee, late surgeon of the One hundred and fifteenth Pennsylvania Volunteers, and instead thereof show him as being honorably discharged.

The report (by Mr. FORD) is as follows:

William R. Blakeslee resides in Coatesville, Chester County, Pennsylvania. On the 2d of October, 1861, he appeared before the State board of surgeons at Harrisburg, Pa., to undergo an examination for the position of surgeon of one of the Pennsylvania regiments then about to be organized and sent into the field for the defense of the Union. This board was composed of Henry H. Smith, surgeon-general of Pennsylvania, and three other eminent medical gentlemen. Having been examined by said board, he was notified on the 8th of October following that he had been reported to Andrew G. Curtin, governor of Pennsylvania, by the State board of surgeons as worthy of the appointment of surgeon. After receiving his commission he was mustered in the United States service, on the 29th of October following, assigned first to the Thirty-first Pennsylvania Volunteers, and soon after to the One hundred and fifteenth Pennsylvania Volunteers, then forming in the city of Philadelphia.

He continued with his regiment nearly two years, participating in various battles in which the regiment was engaged, receiving the approval of the medical officers in the corps and division under whom he served.

It appears from the testimony that he was not a favorite of the colonel of the regiment, and that he was required to undergo an examination in December, 1862. On the 23d of January, 1863, he was dismissed from the service for incompetency.

He was afterwards mustered into the service of the militia regiments of Pennsylvania, organized to repel the invasion of that State by the Confederate army, in whose service he continued for eleven months, performing the duties of surgeon to the satisfaction of State Surgeon-General King, of Pennsylvania, Surgeons John Campbell and Jonathan Getteman, of the United States Army.

Henry H. Smith, M. D., formerly surgeon-general of Pennsylvania, says:

"This application for modification of a record and restoration to rank seems to me, from my knowledge of Dr. Blakeslee, only justice to a worthy officer."

William Pepper, provost professor of the theory and practice of medicine of the University of Pennsylvania, uses the following language, under date of March 28, 1887:

"Having known William R. Blakeslee, of Coatesville, for years, and being acquainted with his good professional standing and with his excellent personal and medical qualifications, it gives me pleasure to indorse the above petition."

Dr. Hayes Agnew, professor of surgery in the University of Pennsylvania, says:

"I fully indorse the above."

William White, surgeon of the Philadelphia Hospital, says:

"I warmly indorse the above."

The committee recommend the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DARLINGTON moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION IN BRUSSELS.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Calendar the joint resolution (S. R. 70) and to put it on its passage.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That said invitation is accepted, and that there be, and there hereby is, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to effect the purpose of this resolution, to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of State for the purpose of such representation at said exhibition.

Sec. 2. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of State to transmit to Congress a detailed statement of the expenditures which may have been incurred under the provisions of this resolution, together with any reports which may be made by the representatives of this country at said exhibition.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as that exposition is to be held next month I believe, I should like to hear a statement from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL] as to how the money is to be expended, and in what manner it is expected that the United States will be represented at the exhibition.

Mr. CHEADLE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I hope the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHEADLE] will withdraw his objection. This is not a private matter. It is a public matter, a matter of international courtesy, and this is the only opportunity we have to get it before the House. I ask the gentleman to remember that this Government is going to invite the whole world to participate in the celebration of the centennial of the discovery of America three or four years hence. This resolution is in the way of a return for the courtesies we have received from other nations, and I trust that the gentleman will withdraw his objection.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope my colleague [Mr. CHEADLE] will at least allow a statement as to how the money is to be expended.

Mr. BURROWS. Let us have the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

On Saturday last the gentleman from Nevada made a statement in regard to Mr. Hewitt in his speech which I asked him at the time to repeat, as I was not quite certain of his exact language.

This he declined to do, and thereupon I made a denial of the gentleman's words as I understood them to be.

My denial was contradicted and I have accordingly awaited the appearance of the gentleman's speech in the RECORD in order that I might ascertain the exact language used by him in regard to Mr. Hewitt.

I find it to be as follows:

Can they still cling to a party existing upon an empty but attractive sound, that points with pride to its prime minister, Thomas F. Bayard, and who holds out as a shining example of its confidence, patriotism, and liberality an ex-member of this House who basely apologized to the British minister at Washington for his contemptible duplicity in introducing a resolution of inquiry as to the legality of the trial of an American citizen condemned and executed by a British jury and a British court? I refer to Abram S. Hewitt, the Democratic mayor of the city of New York.

In vindication of my denial I ask that the Clerk may read the following telegram, received yesterday morning from Mr. Hewitt.

The Clerk was proceeding to read, when

Mr. BRUMM said: I do not object to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BRYCE] making any explanation as to anything that occurred on the floor of the House; but it strikes me that the reading of a telegraphic message from any person—

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to have the fact settled whether this involves a matter of privilege.

Mr. HOLMAN. It affects the veracity of a member.

Mr. BRYCE. My statement has been contradicted; and in proof of the statement, I now propose to have read—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York will suspend a moment. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS] makes the point of order that no question of privilege is involved here.

Mr. COX. Under the rule anything is a question of privilege which involves the reputation and character of a member.

The SPEAKER. As a Representative only.

Mr. COX. As a Representative only. My colleague [Mr. BRYCE] was challenged here as to his veracity in making a certain statement. It seems to me clear this case comes within the category of the rule.

Mr. BRYCE. I am not here, as I understand, in any position except in my Representative capacity, and any statement made by me must be made in that capacity.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that if the rule were carried to such an extent, a question of privilege would be presented whenever a member was accused on the floor of having made an erroneous statement as to a matter of fact. That would be an extension of the rule far beyond any construction which has heretofore been put upon it. Of course each case must stand upon its own circumstances, and it is sometimes very difficult to determine what is strictly a question of privilege within the terms of the rule. The Chair will cause the rule to be read.

Mr. COX. In order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. BRYCE] may be allowed to proceed. It seems to me but justice that this vindication of the chief magistrate of the city of New York should be placed on record. That is all there is of it. I am sure my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM] will not object.

Mr. BRUMM. I will not object.

The SPEAKER. This may be a very proper matter for a personal explanation; but the Chair does not think it comes within the rule as a question of privilege.

Mr. BRYCE. I ask unanimous consent to make a statement on this subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to make a brief personal explanation. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRYCE. I ask the Clerk to read the telegram which I have already sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEW YORK, May 6, 1888.

Hon. L. S. BRYCE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Have just seen the reports in newspapers. WOODBURN's statements as reported are simply untrue. BRUMM's statement is probably due to forgetfulness. He is entirely wrong. I never made any statement whatever in the House on the O'Donnell business, and never made any apology there or elsewhere. There was nothing to explain or apologize for. The story that I apologized to the British minister was a lie which I contradicted at once in the newspapers in which it appeared. No charge was ever made in the House, and hence I never had occasion there to deny it. The newspaper charge was utterly false, and was contradicted by Mr. West as well as myself. You were quite right to interpose a flat contradiction, and I thank you for it. Will write more fully.

ABRAM S. HEWITT.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan (during the reading). I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. My inquiry is whether this telegram can go into the RECORD. Some time ago I tried to get into the RECORD a telegram from the governor of the State of Michigan under very similar circumstances to the present, but I failed in my effort. If a telegram from the governor of Michigan is to be refused publication in the RECORD, I do not see why a telegram from the mayor of New York should receive greater consideration, because the State of Michigan far excels the city of New York. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The case to which the gentleman from Michigan refers arose during a call of the House. At a time when there was no question for debate before the House, the gentleman from Michigan rose in his place and desired to have read a telegram. A point of order was made, and the Chair ruled that the telegram could not be read. In the present case the gentleman from New York [Mr. BRYCE] proposes to have a telegram read as part of his remarks, which are being made under the leave of the House just given.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. I see and appreciate the difference. [Laughter.]

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the telegram.

Mr. BRYCE. I now ask the Clerk to read a letter which I have received this morning from Mr. Hewitt.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEW YORK, May 7, 1888.

MY DEAR BRYCE: A lie once started never ceases to circulate, and every time it reappears it comes up with new additions. *Infama crescit eundo*. I telegraphed you last night that you were perfectly right in interposing a flat contradiction to the statements of WOODBURN and BRUMM, as they were reported in the newspapers. I have not seen the RECORD, and therefore do not know the exact form in which the charges finally stand.

But the facts are as follows: On the second Monday of the first session of the Forty-eighth Congress I introduced a resolution requesting the President to apply to the British Government for a suspension of the sentence of death against O'Donnell, who was to be executed in the course of the week. This resolution required unanimous consent, and was shown to the Speaker and the leading members on both sides, in order that there might be no objection. It passed, and owing to my efforts was presented to the President on the same night, and the request to the British Government made within twenty-four hours. This action was taken in good faith, and my part in it was never criticised by anybody until some one started the story that I had gone to the British minister to apologize for my action. This, of course, was an unmitigated lie; but it was true that I did see the British minister two days after the passage of the resolution, not for the purpose of discussing it, but in the course of the interview I urged upon him the importance of granting the request in the interests of international comity. No reference was ever made to this matter on the floor of the House; but the story which was circulated was promptly denied by me, not only to reporters, but specifically by a note addressed to the editor of the Irish World, who had made inquiry of me on the subject. Subsequently, in January, Mr. BRUMM introduced a resolution into the House, which you will find on page 477, part 1, volume 15, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Forty-eighth Congress, namely:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs be instructed to make inquiry whether any foreign minister accredited to the Government of the United States has endeavored to mollify the effects of a unanimous resolution of this House by representations reflecting on the honor and integrity of its members.

This resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who towards the end of February following made the following report, which you will find on page 1431, volume 15, part 2, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred resolution No. —, to wit, resolution that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be instructed to make inquiry whether any foreign minister accredited to the Government of the United States has endeavored to mollify the effects of a unanimous resolution of this House, by representations reflecting on the honor and integrity of its members, beg leave respectfully to report that they have under the instructions of the resolution made inquiry and have obtained no information as to whether any foreign minister has endeavored to mollify the effects of a unanimous resolution of this House by representations reflecting on the honor and integrity of its members, and the committee ask to be excused from the further consideration of the resolution.

"Whereupon the committee were discharged from the further consideration of the subject."

Mr. BRUMM never offered any other resolution which could have any reference to the O'Donnell matter. My name was not used in connection with these resolutions, and I never made any statement upon the floor of the House upon

the subject. There was nothing to explain, either to the House or to anybody else, the allegation that I had in some way intervened with the British minister having been previously denied in the newspapers, where it was made. I am quite sure that when Mr. BRUMM recalls these facts he will withdraw the statements which he is represented to have made on the floor of the House, to the effect that I made an apology at any time, or anywhere, in reference to my connection with the O'Donnell business.

As to the main question, I inclose herewith, first, an interview which I had with a reporter of the Sun immediately after the occurrence; secondly, a letter which I addressed to the editor of the Irish World, narrating all the circumstances, and an editorial in which the editor exonerates me from the malicious charges which had been made; third, a letter from the British minister, in which he distinctly states that I not only made no apology to him, but that I urged favorable consideration for the resolution. I suppose that this statement disposes in full of the malicious slander of which I have been the victim, although I know it will continue to be repeated. If this letter and these documents can be inserted in the RECORD, there will at least be a complete and final official denial of the falsehood which has been many times repeated in the newspapers, but so far as I know has never before been uttered upon the floor of the House.

Yours, sincerely,

ABRAM S. HEWITT.

HON. LLOYD S. BRYCE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. BRYCE. I send to the desk to be read a letter from the British minister to Mr. Hewitt.

The Clerk read as follows:

MR. HEWITT AND THE BRITISH MINISTER.

BRITISH LEGATION, Washington, D. C., January 14, 1884.

DEAR MR. HEWITT: In reply to your note of yesterday asking me whether in the course of a social visit you were kind enough to pay me some days ago you said or did anything which could be construed as an apology for your action in moving the resolution in the O'Donnell case, I have only to say I did not regard what you said to me in the light of an apology for the resolution, but an explanation of the peculiar circumstances which prompted it on your part in the interest of the friendly relations which exist between the countries.

This impression was moreover strengthened by your allusion to the moderate language, in your opinion, of the resolution which you gave as a reason why you thought the request for delay in execution of the sentence should be granted, and by your saying that other resolutions less considerate in form had been proposed to you, and, as you were informed, would have been offered if you had not framed one so satisfactory to both sides of the House as not to meet with a single objection, which would have defeated it. I may add that I could not presume there was any evidence, from what you said, of any want of sincerity on your part in moving the resolution in question.

Believe me, yours, very truly,

L. SACKVILLE WEST.

Mr. BRYCE. I think, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. I ask the gentleman in this connection whether he has the words that the British minister actually used? The gentleman has not stated at all what was the exact language of the minister or what the conversation was, except on one side.

Mr. BRYCE. I think, Mr. Speaker, that these documents fully justify my position in denying that there was anything base or contemptible on the part of Mr. Hewitt in the matter referred to. In short, they show conclusively that Mr. Hewitt never apologized to the British minister or to this House, as asserted.

It is plainly the purpose of the gentleman from Nevada to excite against Mr. Hewitt the feelings of a warm-hearted and generous people with whose struggles for liberty I heartily sympathize, as I have often heard Mr. Hewitt say he does himself. Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I can only state that I did not seek this controversy. It was thrust upon me, and I could not do otherwise than try to vindicate a gentleman closely connected with me by marriage, and for whom I have besides the highest esteem. This vindication I have made, and I now leave the matter to the calm sense of this House, without regard to partisanship, and to the sober judgment of the American people, which is always right.

I ask unanimous consent that the extracts referred to in Mr. Hewitt's letter be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that certain inclosures in a letter which has been read be printed in connection with his speech. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The extracts referred to are as follows:

[From the New York Sun.]

MR. HEWITT AND MINISTER WEST—WHAT MR. HEWITT THOUGHT AND SAID IN REGARD TO THE O'DONNELL RESOLUTION.

When the dispatches from Washington which charged Congressman Hewitt with duplicity in the matter of the O'Donnell resolution were shown to him, yesterday he read them through with a smile. Then he said: "In regard to the statement that I called at once on the British minister and informed him that the resolution didn't mean anything and would amount to nothing, and in other terms belittled it, I have only to say that it is wholly untrue. It is true that after the passage of the resolution I called on Minister West, but my visit was simply a social one. He had called on me and I returned his call. My visit had nothing whatever to do with O'Donnell or the O'Donnell resolution."

"In the course of the conversation during your stay with Mr. West was any reference made to the O'Donnell resolution?"

"Yes; it was discussed by us. I took the position that an American citizen in a foreign country had been on trial for his life, and that as an American citizen he was entitled to a fair trial, and that it was the duty of the American Government to see that he had such a trial. Further, when an American citizen had been convicted of a crime and had been sentenced to die, and the time elapsing between the sentence and the execution was so short as to prohibit a proper examination of the record to ascertain if the trial had been fair, then it was the duty of the Government to ask for an extension of time."

"What did Mr. West say to that?"

"He said that O'Donnell had had a fair trial. I replied to him that that was precisely the point at issue, and the point on which our Government ought to be satisfied before the condemned man was executed."

"What led you to introduce the resolution?"

"Before the introduction of the resolution I had an interview with the Secre-

tary of State, in which I took precisely the same position that I took before Minister West, but I had some doubt whether the Secretary would act in the matter. So I introduced the resolution to make sure that something would be done. In doing this I made no reference to the fact that O'Donnell was of Irish birth. To me his nativity made no difference. He was an American citizen and entitled to his rights as such. If one of those rights was to be hanged for a crime, he ought at least to be hanged according to law."

"It is further charged, Mr. Hewitt, that you went over to the Republican side and begged Republican members, one of them a Philadelphian, to object to its consideration, and that the request was indignantly denied."

"That is also wholly untrue. When I had prepared the resolution I did hand it to prominent members on both sides of the House. It was a matter that required unanimous consent, and I passed it around in order that members might know what it was. This was done to avoid objection, instead of to invite it."

"It is asserted that you said to Minister West that you had introduced the resolution deliberately to forestall one of more belligerent purport, which you said would surely have been introduced and passed had you not thrown yourself into the breach."

"This is untrue, like the rest. I said I had drawn the resolution with great care, in order that it might be within diplomatic usage, and that it might not contain any matter that would give any one in the House cause to object to it. I have been criticised in some quarters because I introduced the resolution at all. Such criticism arises from a misunderstanding of international law. I hold that it is the duty of the Government to see that American citizens in foreign countries are protected in their rights, and that even when guilty of crime they are entitled to a fair trial, and that where time is necessary to ascertain the facts the Government should insist that the time be granted. I think Great Britain has made a mistake in denying this request for time to make an examination. The time will come when she will regret her action. I made no apology to Mr. West, nor was it necessary to make one. I have not seen him since, and I do not know whether he made any representations to his Government concerning my position or not. My position was that of Marcy, Webster, and Seward in reference to the rights of American citizens abroad. I shall be sorry when our Government takes any other position."

[Irish World, March 29, 1884.]

THE HEWITT-WEST AFFAIR—MR. HEWITT'S OWN EXPLANATION OF HIS INTERVIEW ABOUT O'DONNELL.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C., March 10, 1884.

Editor Irish World:

My attention has been called to an article in your paper of March 8th entitled "Mr. Hewitt and the O'Donnell resolution." I supposed that I had disposed of the calumny when I assured you, in reply to your note, that there was no truth in the allegation that I had gone to the British minister immediately after having introduced the resolution, and had in effect assured him that the British Government need not be influenced by the action in the O'Donnell case, as it was only a piece of buncombe.

I now repeat that all these allegations are absolutely untrue, and I am surprised that after my uniform and reiterated denials any doubt should exist upon the subject. It certainly has not escaped your observation that not a particle of affirmative proof has been produced in support of the charge against me, and that in calling upon me to make further explanations you require me to prove a negative, which is neither reasonable nor often possible, although in this case, fortunately, I am able to do it by a simple statement of the facts as they occurred.

Before the O'Donnell resolution was offered, on the morning of December 10, I decided to call upon the Secretary of State in reference to the case, not because any human being had asked me to intervene, but from a sense of duty which I could not resist. I had seen it stated that Mr. Justice Denman had made a charge to the jury in regard to the evidence which, I was told by the lawyers, would be good for a new trial in this country. I had learned to my surprise that there was no right of appeal in a criminal trial at Old Bailey except to the clemency of the Crown. It was also known to me that a question of jurisdiction had been made as to whether O'Donnell should be tried at Cape Town, where the ship first reported, or in London, to which she was at once ordered.

The question in my mind was not whether O'Donnell was guilty or innocent, but whether, if he were an American citizen, his legal rights had been respected. In my interview with the Secretary of State, after learning that the Department had already decided O'Donnell to be a citizen of the United States, I called the attention of the Secretary to the questions involved, and urged him to consult with the Attorney-General as to O'Donnell's rights, adding that the American people would hold the administration responsible for their assertion and protection. The Secretary kindly said that he would give prompt attention to the subject, and I left the Department.

Later in the day my colleague, Hon. William E. Robinson, asked me to read the draught of a resolution which related to the O'Donnell case and give an opinion as to the propriety of offering it and the prospect of its passage in the House. After examination I told him that I did not regard it as proper in form and did not think that it could get the unanimous consent required for its introduction. He then asked me to go with him to the lobby to see some gentlemen who were interested in the case. Complying, I found a number of persons, for whom Captain Condon appeared to be the spokesman. They submitted draughts of other resolutions, which I thought objectionable. I tried to prepare one as we stood in the lobby, but finding it impossible I went with Condon to a committee-room, where, after several attempts, I framed the resolution which was finally adopted by the House, and which Condon said would be entirely satisfactory. In order to get it passed it was necessary to have unanimous consent and the recognition of the Speaker. Hence it was shown to him, and to leading members on both sides, some of whom approved and others said they would interpose no objection, which it was my object to avoid, and not to create, as has been absurdly asserted.

The resolution thus offered and passed unanimously went to the Clerk's office to be engrossed. I urged the engrossing clerk to prompt completion, and afterwards went to the office of the Clerk of the House to insure its immediate delivery to the President. General Clark had, however, left his office, but one of his subordinates agreed to deliver a note to him, which I hastily prepared, and which has since been found and returned to me by General Clark, as follows:

"MY DEAR GENERAL: I think that the O'Donnell resolution ought to be delivered to the President to-night, or to-morrow morning at latest, as it may save O'Donnell's life if promptly attended to."

"Yours, in haste,

"ABRAM S. HEWITT.

"General CLARK."

The next morning he assured me that the resolution had been delivered to the President on the night before in accordance with my request.

I have no personal knowledge of the action of the President, but I have no reason to doubt that the request was duly forwarded to the British Government and pressed in the same good faith which characterized its introduction and passage by the House.

Meanwhile a young English friend had come to make me a visit. On Wednesday morning, two days after the passage of the resolution, and when it was

no longer in my mind, he asked me to make a call with him on the British minister. That this suggestion was purely accidental is evident from the following extract from a private letter which I have since received from my young friend:

"Some one has forwarded me extracts from the American papers, in which they seem to have made capital for political purposes out of the visit you were unfortunate enough to have accompanied me in to Mr. West when I was with you in Washington. As you never would have gone to see Mr. West at all that day if it had not been for one of the embassy coming in to call on me, they must have drawn very considerably on imagination to invent the story I read of your purposely visiting our representative to explain your resolution about O'Donnell."

The fact is that Mr. West had recently left his card at my rooms, and, as we missed seeing each other the year before, I felt it important to take an early opportunity to return his visit according to the custom usual among gentlemen. The O'Donnell resolution was not in my mind, and I had not the slightest intention of referring to it in any way, but it was spoken of in the course of conversation, and I improved the occasion of a purely social visit to urge upon Mr. West the propriety of the request, and the desirability of acceding to it gracefully in the interest of the friendly relations between the two governments. Not the slightest reference was made to its being made for political effect.

The other less considerate resolutions were referred to, as Mr. West says in his letter, which you have already published, merely as an additional reason why the request should be granted. I do not know that I would have been deterred if I had neglected the opportunity thus afforded me to enforce the request, but how I come to be censured for having urged the propriety of the President's appeal for delay, and the good effects of granting it, passes my comprehension. Certainly, if I had made the visit expressly for this purpose, it would have been proper and commendable. How it could be less so, because the visit was accidental, I fail to see.

I forbear to make any comment upon the motives of those who have circulated malicious stories to my prejudice, but I deem it right to say that you have been misled by erroneous reports (made in violation of the injunction of secrecy) of the occurrences in the room of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as you can readily ascertain from any member of the committee who was present on the occasion. Certainly I was not on the defensive, and no rebukes were addressed to me.

Finally, let me assure you that there is not the slightest foundation for any charge of bad faith against me; but that my motives, from first to last, were neither to gain nor lose popularity, but solely to perform my duty as a representative of the people by seeing that the rights of American citizens in foreign countries were duly guarded and protected. If my call on the British minister within two days after the passage of the resolution was an "unfortunate coincidence" I certainly turned it to good account by urging the granting of the request upon the representative of the British Government, in whose hands were "the issues of life and death" in O'Donnell's case.

Finally, let it always be remembered that moderation and courtesy afforded the only possible chance of securing a favorable response. I would have been guilty of gross folly if I had taken any other attitude in my intercourse with the British minister, with whom it is alike my duty and my privilege to preserve friendly relations.

Respectfully, yours,

A. S. HEWITT.

[An incident in a man's life, like a passage in a book, ought to be read in the light of the context. Mr. Hewitt's career has been clean and straightforward. His simple word respecting any question of fact that might be raised would have been sufficient for us. But Minister West's story of the "explanation not an apology," with a few delicate touches here and there, suggested to many minds that there was some sort of an touching alliance in the affair. It looked like a distinction without a difference. Doubtless the English minister, whatever disguise of friendship he puts on, would like to see Mr. Hewitt punished for his action in the O'Donnell case, and doubtless, also, he does not feel a particle of sincere regret at the embarrassment that has been given to Mr. Hewitt.

England is thoroughly perfidious in her dealings with other nations. Those that she selects as her emissaries are men who are cold-blooded as they are suave. An episode in the life of Ben. Franklin is here called to mind. Lord Hillsborough, a member of the British Government, had expressed himself in private concerning Franklin in very angry terms, calling him an intermeddler, "a factious, mischievous fellow," and the like.

But to Franklin's face my Lord Hillsborough acted quite differently. He affected to be very liberal, wished well to Ireland, was particularly in love with America, and was very kind and attentive to old Ben., who was his guest for a while. "He wished," writes Franklin, "that I would favor him with my sentiments. He seemed attentive to everything that might make my stay in his house agreeable to me, and put his eldest son, Lord Killwarling, into his phaeton with me to drive me a round of 40 miles that I might see the country, the seats, and manufactures, covering me with his own great-coat lest I should take cold. In short, he seemed extremely solicitous to impress me and the Americans through me with a good opinion of him (and, of course, ultimately with a good opinion of England through him). All which I could not but wonder at, knowing that he likes neither America nor me; and I thought it inexplicable but on the supposition that he apprehended an approaching storm. But I think all the plausible behavior I have described is meant only by patting and stroking the horse to make him more patient while the reins are drawn tighter and the spurs set deeper into his sides." These are the methods which men in England's interest always employ. Americans who "dearly love a lord" are caught in the snare. But Franklin's head was level as his heart was well disposed.

On a review of the whole affair seen in the light of Mr. Hewitt's long and unblemished course, we do not for a moment question that he acted in entire good faith with respect to the O'Donnell resolution; but he was unhappy in his subsequent policy, if the term may be used, which to some appeared a weakness, and which the Englishman's letter does not strengthen, but which Mr. Hewitt himself (and he certainly is the best exponent of his own intention) says was based solely on "moderation and courtesy" with a view to the "securing a favorable response." But here let the matter end. Generous remembrance of Mr. Hewitt's noble services in the past and a sense of justice in the present demand his vindication.—EDITOR IRISH WORLD.]

Mr. WOODBURN. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BLOUNT. Before this debate goes any further I would like to have some understanding as to when it is to terminate.

Mr. WOODBURN. I desire to make a few remarks in vindication of myself.

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not object to that; but I think there ought to be some limitation.

Mr. WOODBURN. I shall occupy not more than two or three minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have been three times a member of this august body, but I never have—

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS. If we are to have questions of order discussed here we want order preserved on the floor.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is well taken. Gentlemen will resume their seats, and public business will be suspended until order is restored on the floor.

Mr. WOODBURN. But I never have in my lifetime knowingly made a charge that I can not substantiate. I do not regard the denial of the British minister—or his letter—as a denial of the charge. In fact it is an admission that Mr. Hewitt did so say. It is no better authority than the gentleman's statement that he knows the facts to be otherwise because he is related by marriage to Abram S. Hewitt.

When I made this charge I was informed by a reputable gentleman in Washington, who was on the floor of the House when I did make it, that he was one of a committee of three representative Irishmen delegated by the Irish organizations of America to investigate the truth of this charge made against Mr. Hewitt; and that member of the committee stated to me, and said he could prove it, that the result of their investigation and deliberation was that Mr. Abram S. Hewitt was guilty. One of the committee is correspondent of the New York Irish World, and another is Mr. O'Meagher Condon; and taking their statements in addition to the current literature of the day, and with additional statements made by reputable members of the House, I made the charge, and do not take it back. I must have better authority than a letter over the signature of Mr. Abram S. Hewitt, the interested party, the defendant in the case, to warrant me in changing the assertion that I made.

Mr. BRUMM rose.

Mr. MILLS. I move to dispense with the morning hour.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM] desires to make a brief statement.

Mr. BRUMM. My friend from New York will bear me out in this statement, that after the controversy that occurred here a few days ago we had a conversation with each other, a friendly conversation; that we looked over the RECORD to see what had been said, and that I there and then agreed that the gentleman might either not publish anything in the RECORD with reference to it, or that he might strike out the word "apologize" and insert "explain," or fix it up in any way to satisfy himself consistently with the truth.

I stated that I had no disposition to hurt the feelings of anybody, and certainly no disposition to do injustice to Mr. Hewitt. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BRYCE] did fix up the RECORD. The record is not as it was. But I have no objection to make to the manner in which the gentleman saw fit to alter it from what actually was said. He fixed it up to suit himself, and I have no objection to make.

But, Mr. Speaker, when the charge is made that there was no explanation made by Mr. Hewitt, so much of that charge I still maintain is false, or at least not correct. The apology was made by Mr. Hewitt; and, according to my recollection, it was made on the floor of the House in a speech by Mr. Hewitt, and I shall take the trouble to examine the RECORD at leisure to see whether I am not correct in that recollection.

But, however it may be, whether made on the floor of the House or not, the explanation—and that is the mildest term I can use—was made by Mr. Hewitt before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I asked to go before that committee, but I never was summoned before it. At my request I was permitted to make a statement before that committee, and I asked the committee to summon Mr. Hewitt as a witness. I also requested that they summon the British minister to be investigated and questioned, but no action was taken by the committee.

Mr. BRYCE. Why did they not?

Mr. COX. They had no power.

Mr. BRUMM. Well, I am not questioning now why they did not. I am only stating the facts to the House. Let the country judge as to why they did not; but they did not, at all events. There was certainly no harm at least in requesting the British minister to appear before the committee and submit himself to a cross-examination, and also request Mr. Hewitt to come before them and submit himself to examination and cross-examination. Neither was done.

A day or so after I appeared before the committee I was told that the committee had permitted Mr. Hewitt to come before them and make a statement, not in my presence, not with notice to me, but with no notice to anybody that was interested on the other side in that resolution, and without being subjected to cross-examination, and a short time after the resolution that was read was brought into this House.

Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that was an explanation at least, if not an apology; if not, I do not know what you might call it. It was enough to convince the committee that they ought to accommodate Mr. Hewitt by going no further in the matter, for they did not make any investigation at all.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MILLS. I move to dispense with the morning hour for the call of committees.

The SPEAKER. That requires a two-thirds vote.

The motion was agreed to, two-thirds voting in favor thereof.

Mr. MILLS. I now ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen having reports to make from committees be permitted to present them at the Clerk's desk for reference to the appropriate Calendars.

There was no objection.

The following reports were filed by being handed in at the Clerk's desk:

JOHN CHASE.

Mr. FORD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 8177) to remove the charge of desertion from John Chase; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARCUS H. M'COY.

Mr. TIMOTHY J. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 884) for the relief of Marcus H. McCoy; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CATHERINE HAYS.

Mr. YODER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 5398) granting a pension to Catherine Hays; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM C. SPENCER.

Mr. YODER also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 2445) for the restoration of William C. Spencer to the Army; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

BERTRAND AND GAUDIN COZES.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 5537) for the relief of Bertrand and Gaudin Cozes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. HEMPHILL, the Committee on the District of Columbia was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9068) to amend sections 1195, 1196, 1197, 1198, 1199, and 1200 of the Revised Statutes of the District of Columbia; and the same was referred to the Committee on the Militia.

DISTRICT INDUSTRIAL HOME SCHOOL.

Mr. HEMPHILL also, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 7083) to regulate the powers and duties of the board of trustees of the Industrial Home School of the District of Columbia, in respect to infant wards and scholars, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. GEAR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back adversely bills of the following titles; which were severally laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 8258) for the relief of Caleb Aker; and

A bill (H. R. 7952) authorizing the Secretary of War to accept the resignation of Maj. D. H. David, of the Fourteenth Regiment of Kansas Cavalry Volunteers, and for other purposes.

HEIRS OF CHRISTOPHER COTT.

Mr. GEAR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 956) for the relief of the heirs of Christopher Cott; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

INCREASE OF PENSIONS TO HELPLESS SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. LYNCH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1000) to increase the pensions of certain soldiers and sailors who are utterly helpless from injuries received or diseases contracted while in the service of the United States; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO.

Mr. NEAL, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back with amendment the bill (S. 347) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Youngstown, Ohio; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, AKRON, OHIO.

Mr. NEAL also, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back with amendment the bill (S. 349) for the erec-

tion of a public building at Akron, Ohio; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ROBERT C. MURPHY.

Mr. TIMOTHY J. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1533) for the relief of Robert C. Murphy or his legal representatives; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

BONDS OF DISBURSING OFFICER.

Mr. CUTCHEON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8873) in relation to bonds of disbursing officers and to monthly payments of the Army; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARY DICKINSON.

Mr. LAIDLAW, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8778) for the relief of Mary Dickinson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOSEPH S. HEARST.

Mr. LAIRD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7243) to relieve Joseph S. Hearst from the charge of desertion; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

EUNICE TRIPLER.

Mr. LAIRD also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 2513) for the relief of Eunice Tripler, widow of Charles S. Tripler; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, informed the House that the Senate had passed a bill (S. 67) to perfect the military record of John C. Green, of Tennessee; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution (H. Res. 95) to enable the President of the United States to extend to certain inhabitants of Japan a suitable recognition of their humane treatment of the survivors of the crew of the American bark Cashmere.

TARIFF.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of bills raising revenue.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STOCKDALE] is entitled to the floor; he has thirteen minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. STOCKDALE withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is said that when Burke, Pitt, and Fox contended in debate in the British Parliament they were so supremely masters that no one else dared to speak when they had spoken. Yet as time went on it was found that some members, on occasions when great questions were being discussed, would rise to their feet and in apparent forgetfulness give expression to their feelings on the pending measure. On one of these occasions the member who had spoken was approached by a brother member of Parliament and asked how he dared to speak after Fox had spoken. His reply was, "Because, sir, I am as much interested in that subject as he."

So, Mr. Chairman, my excuse, if indeed an excuse be necessary, for addressing the committee on the bill now under discussion is that my constituents are as much interested in the Mills bill as the people in any of the districts represented on this floor by the managers of this debate.

The questions presented are not new. The best manner of raising a revenue to support the Government and what measures should be adopted to relieve the recently politically emancipated colonies from the equally grinding and humiliating commercial superiority which England held over her late dependencies were questions which the fathers of the Republic were early called upon to meet and solve. It is said that it was the boast of the younger Pitt, during the period of our political exist-

ence under the "Articles of Confederation," that the united colonies had not only been reconquered as commercial dependencies, but that they were a surer source of revenue to England than before they had gained their political independence.

The history of that period furnishes us an instructive lesson. With no regular and uniform system of import duties, and no power under the Articles of Confederation to compel the several States to pay their proportion of the sums found necessary to support the Government and float the large debt incurred in the war for independence, the condition of our forefathers was deplorable indeed. They, however, were equal to the occasion, and the first step to insure a permanency of that liberty for which they had so long contended was in the framing and adoption of our Constitution.

The question that then met them is the one which is now before us, namely: The best method of deriving a revenue. An examination of the debates at that time will show as wide a range of opinions and quite as vehement declamation as have been indulged in in the discussion of the present proposed tariff measure.

The first Congress which assembled under our Constitution declared in favor of the wisdom of the policy which the Republican party has ever contended for, in the enactment of a law which affirmed that—

It is necessary for the support of Government, for the discharge of debts of the United States, and for the encouragement and protection of manufactories, that duties be laid on imported goods, wares, and merchandise.

Hamilton, in his celebrated report to the House of Representatives in 1790, demonstrated with a logic that was irresistible that if we were to become a recognized power among the nations of the earth, the protection of home manufactories of all classes and kinds was the most direct and surest method. Time has demonstrated the wisdom of his words and his far-seeing statesmanship. The bitterest opponents of what we denominate our protective system are compelled to admit that our periods of greatest national prosperity have been under well regulated and adjusted protective tariff laws, while our periods of greatest financial depression and distress have followed the repeal and readjustment of those laws under the leadership of the believers in free trade and the declaimers for that glittering generality that the "world's market" furnishes a place where you can buy your needed articles of consumption the cheapest and sell your surplus products the dearest.

Henry Clay, the founder of our "American system," in discussing this great economic question, stated, in a public address, that the most disastrous period he had ever witnessed to our financial, commercial, and industrial interests had been during the seven years preceding the tariff of 1824—a period when the Millses, Carlises, and Breckinridges of that day had obtained control of our national affairs and ingrafted upon our statute laws their heresies of free trade—and that the period of greatest prosperity to all our commercial and industrial interests was during the seven years following that act of 1824.

The history of those times confirms the statement of that great friend of American industries, and had he lived to see the wondrous change wrought under the tariff laws of our country from 1860 to the present time well might he have accounted it among the most glorious monuments to his memory that during his long, useful, and brilliant public career he was ever the champion and friend of protected industries in this country.

Mr. Blaine, in his letter accepting the Republican nomination for the Presidency in 1884, brought before his countrymen in forceful language the results of this system in the following statement:

After 1860 the business of the country was encouraged and developed by a protective tariff. At the end of twenty years the total property of the United States, as returned by the census of 1880, amounted to the enormous aggregate of \$44,000,000,000. This great result was attained notwithstanding the fact that countless millions had in the interval been wasted in the progress of a bloody war. It thus appears that while our population between 1860 and 1880 increased 66 per cent, the aggregate property of the country increased 214 per cent., showing a largely enhanced wealth per capita among the people. Thirty thousand million of dollars had been added during these twenty years to the permanent wealth of the nation—\$1,500,000,000 per annum.

This marvelous showing of national prosperity has no parallel in the world's history. It is the wonder of all nations, and will forever remain a monument to the patriotism and statesmanship of the Republican party. It is at this wondrous prosperity and an overflowing National Treasury that the assaults of the Democratic party are being directed. The President's message clearly defined the issue upon which the coming campaign is to be fought, and his note of alarm is taken as the slogan of his party. Disguise it as his more discreet followers may, the fact can not be kept from the American people in the campaign of 1888, that the Democratic party is committed fully, unequivocally, and irrevocably to the doctrine of free trade.

The Republican party in the campaign of 1884 called the attention of the public to the platform of the Democratic party, adopted at their convention in Chicago, and claimed that a change of administration meant a change in these economic principles which govern our revenue system and industrial interests; but like the responses of the double-dealing oracle at Delphos the Chicago platform was interpreted by the Democratic speakers and leaders to meet the requirements and wishes of all classes, trades, and callings.

In our industrial centers it was interpreted to mean protection to wage-workers; while in the blue-grass regions of Kentucky it was in-

terpreted to mean trade as free as the air we breathe or the sunlight we absorb.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, your party came into power by practicing a system of false pretenses on the American people unequalled in the history of political parties. At the close of the late civil war the broken and disorganized fragments of the Democratic party were gathered together, tenderly nursed, and sought to be reorganized and united on abandoned issues of the Republican party in its march of progress and reform.

Learning nothing in each defeat, but gaining in audacity and power to dissimulate its real motives and present a seemingly patriotic exterior, while it harbored dark and murderous designs upon all the great manufacturing, agricultural, and material interests of our country, it nerved itself to a superhuman effort in 1884, and by various fraudulent and false charges against the party of the people, and the claim that an overflowing Treasury meant overtaxation and distress to the great laboring classes, it succeeded in being, after a quarter of a century, restored to national power.

As a matter of historical interest, Mr. Chairman, I call to your attention the position of the Democratic party in the State of New York. The Republican speakers, from one end to the other of that State, charged then, as is now demonstrated, that the success of the Democratic party meant the disturbance of the protective tariff laws of our country. That was denied, but by whom? Did you send your Speaker, Mr. CARLISLE, or the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of this House, Mr. MILLS, to the State of New York to expound the Democratic doctrine and explain your Chicago platform? Did Mr. HEMPILL, of South Carolina, and Mr. McMILLIN, of Tennessee, go to that State and talk to the manufacturers and the mechanics their views on free trade and protection, as they have expressed them on the pending bill during this debate?

No, sir! The managers of your party during that campaign knew that the imperial State of New York, with its diversified interests, could never be carried on the political and party principles of these men. Whom did they look to? When your columns were wavering and defeat seemed inevitable, you all turned, Mr. Chairman, to the brainiest and safest man in your party. You called for Mr. RANDALL, of Pennsylvania, to come to the State of New York, and in a series of speeches well advertised and largely attended, he explained to the voters of that State that the tariff system of this country should not be disturbed in case of the success of the Democratic party, and that the plank in the Chicago platform upon that subject meant only a wise and judicious adjustment of the inequalities which we all acknowledge, and which we all contend should be remedied. His well-known record upon this question, his integrity and worth, all united to give weight to his utterances. And it could be his proud boast that his efforts in the State of New York in behalf of his party made it possible for Grover Cleveland to occupy the President's chair.

How have his efforts been repaid by your party? And how have his pledges on its behalf been kept? If Dame Rumor can be relied upon, Mr. RANDALL is no longer a welcome visitor at the White House. His counsels are no longer potent with his party, and his influence in his own State has been attempted to be crippled and curtailed by raising up a rival who basks in the sunshine of Presidential favors and whose unlimited control of Federal patronage has been liberally used to humiliate and disgrace this friend of American protection who was the once honored leader of his party in this House.

I stated, Mr. Chairman, that the issue presented is the issue of free trade as against protection, and in support of that charge I appeal to the message of the President which was sent to the two Houses of Congress at the beginning of this session. The logical conclusions to be drawn from that message lead inevitably to a re-establishment of free trade in this country. It has been so received and so interpreted, not only by unprejudiced minds on this side of the Atlantic, but has been hailed with shouts of delight in free-trade England.

I will quote but a single paragraph from the Glasgow Herald:

"It is a condition which confronts us, not a theory." Precisely so. Words almost identical with these have been used and with enormous effect in this country by Adam Smith, by Richard Cobden, and by Sir Robert Peel. President Cleveland may say to others, therefore, and think what he chooses, but he has precipitated the inevitable struggle between free trade and protection in the United States, and that is tantamount to saying that he is on the side of free trade.

I could multiply like statements from English journals and English public speakers regarding the President's message almost without number, had I the time. But I take it to be unnecessary, for there is no Democrat on this floor bold enough or audacious enough to claim that the President's message has not been interpreted in England as favoring the free-trade doctrines as taught by Richard Cobden.

But I will not stop here, Mr. Chairman. The Speakership of this House is an office in honor, dignity, and influence second only to that of the Presidency. I hold in my hand a paper which gives a list of the names of the American members of the Cobden Club and the dates of becoming members. In running my eye over that list, I find that JOHN G. CARLISLE, of Covington, Ky., became an American member of the Cobden Club in 1883. I would not knowingly do Mr. Speaker CARLISLE a personal injury or misstate his political position. The

sources from which I have derived this information have seemed to be authentic and reliable. But, sir, before commenting upon it I will pause for a denial of this charge, if one can be truthfully made.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Yes; for a question.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I desire to ask the gentleman if Mr. CARLISLE was a member of that club before General Garfield was a member of it or not?

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. The gentleman knows that General Garfield repudiated his election to that club, while Hon. JOHN G. CARLISLE seems to be proud of it.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. When did General Garfield repudiate it?

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. I can not go into a controversy about that. I have made the charge and thrown down the gauntlet for the Democratic party to deny that the Speaker of this House is a member of the Cobden Club. If any man can truthfully deny it let him step forward. If not, let him hold his peace.

What a spectacle does this exhibit to the manufacturers, business men, and laborers in New York, who were deluded into voting the Democratic ticket in 1884, under the promises and pledges of such speakers as Mr. RANDALL. What a spectacle, Mr. Chairman, does it exhibit to our industrial interests wherever they may be found. The follower of Richard Cobden, and a firm believer in his free-trade principles, by a solid Democratic vote is made the Speaker of this House—is elected to a position, Mr. Chairman, where he has almost autocratic powers in shaping the legislation of our country. He, and he alone, has the power of naming the Committee on Ways and Means, the committee which has exclusive jurisdiction of the revenue bills of the House. In that committee, so prepared by this disciple of Richard Cobden, do you, Mr. Chairman, find among the Democratic members of that committee a single man who agrees with Mr. RANDALL on this question of protecting American industries? Not one. They are firm believers in the principles of political economy as expounded by Mr. Speaker CARLISLE.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the principles of the Cobden Club dominate the legislation of this House and stand sponsors for the bill now under consideration. The chairman of that committee in opening this debate gave expression to these sentiments with an abandon and freedom that is truly refreshing. And the praise that he has received from free-trade sources has been unstinted. I quote but a single paragraph from Henry George's paper—the Standard—under date of April 28:

POLITICS THAT MEAN SOMETHING.

Mr. MILLS's speech in opening the tariff debate, as printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, justifies the impression produced by the telegraphic reports. It is a manly, vigorous, and most effective free-trade speech, abounding with telling points that go to the very heart of protection. It ought to be largely circulated as a campaign document.

But, Mr. Chairman, to establish the charge I have made it is unnecessary to quote from free-trade journals, either at home or abroad. But a day or two ago one of the trusted leaders of your party delivered a speech upon this floor in support of this bill, and stated the principles of free trade with a precision and ability that would have done credit to Mr. Cobden himself. I refer to Mr. HEMPHILL, of South Carolina. In the course of his remarks, in speaking of the manufacturer asking for protection, he said:

But against what? Not against the "pauper labor," for they are not here, and not against the products of their toil, so long as these are not sold here, but the protection asked for is against allowing Americans to buy or exchange; i. e., against the natural right of any free man to make his purchases where his taste inclines him, or his judgment or interest dictates; so that it is not against the pauper labor of Europe, or of any other country, but it is against the right of the American people to buy where and what they please that this protection is demanded.

Mr. PERKINS. Then, I will ask the gentleman a question. Do you believe in the doctrine that we should be permitted to buy where we can buy cheapest?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. PERKINS. If we should be permitted to buy where we can buy cheapest, why should we not be permitted to hire where we can hire cheapest?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Exactly; I think that is right.

Here, Mr. Chairman, are the answers of a man who is too honest in his convictions in favor of absolute free trade to hesitate or dodge when the direful consequences of such a policy are so pointedly brought out. This doctrine, you will observe, it is found necessary to state in advocating the enactment into a law of this so-called Mills bill. Mr. HEMPHILL belongs to the dominant faction of the Democratic party. He is recognized as one of its leaders, and his counsels and those who are in political sympathy with him, as expressed in his speech, will control the administration of the Government so long as the Democratic party remains in power.

What does this doctrine that the manufacturers and the employers of this country "should be permitted to hire where they can hire cheapest" mean? It means, Mr. Chairman, that the owners and managers of the coal mines of Maryland and Illinois, and the coal and iron mines of Virginia and Alabama, Pennsylvania, and these other great States interested in these industries, can lock out their employes for any cause or pretense and fill their places with the contract labor of Europe. It means that the factories and furnaces in all of the great manufacturing

States can be supplied by starving operatives from Belgium, England, and other overcrowded countries of the Old World. It means that the scenes of squalor, of poverty, and distress found among the laboring poor of Europe, which make the heart sick to contemplate, shall be the future lot and portion of the great laboring classes of America. Ay, Mr. Chairman, it means more than that. It means that the importation of Chinese coolies, which to-day, like a great cancer upon the body-politic in the Pacific Coast States, threatens their lives, shall be renewed and be unrestricted. The very contemplation of such results shocks the sensibilities of every friend of labor. I pray God that in my time the economic principles which lead directly to such results will never find sway or control in America.

But, Mr. Chairman, the condition of our National Treasury is pointed to as an excuse for the passage of this iniquitous bill.

In the language of the President, a "condition confronts us," namely, an overflowing and ever-increasing surplus in the Treasury. This is taken as an excuse for the framing and passage of the Mills bill by this Congress. Before giving some of the reasons which constrain me to oppose this bill, I desire to say that if the President and his advisers would use a little of the common sense which characterizes the conduct of a Western farmer, no trouble would be found in disposing advantageously to the Government of this surplus. An Illinois farmer with a well-filled wallet and a good bank account besides, would not become frightened or dismayed at the idea that his annual income from his farm exceeded the actual necessities of conducting the same and supporting his family, and especially so if he owed any large sums to his creditors, and his farm needed new fences to properly protect it, and improvements in the way of barns and other buildings to care for the stock and farm implements which he had gathered about him. As a sensible man he would liquidate his outstanding indebtedness with his surplus money, so far as he would be enabled to do so. What remained would be used in repairing his fences and building new, that his farm might not be overrun by his neighbor's stock, and in the construction of barns and sheds, that the horses, cattle, and other stock might be protected from the storms of winter.

The Secretary of the Treasury estimates that to meet the obligations of the Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, will require \$326,000,530.

The yearly income of the Government from all sources aggregates \$383,000,000.

The sources of this income are as follows:

Import duties.....	\$228,000,000
Internal-revenue taxes.....	120,000,000
From sales of public lands.....	10,000,000
From national banks.....	2,000,000
From interest and sinking fund, Pacific Railroad.....	2,000,000
From customs fees, fines, penalties, etc.....	1,150,000
From fees consular, letters patent, and lands.....	3,500,000
From sales of public property.....	300,000
From profits on coinage, assay, etc.....	9,000,000
From deposits for surveying public lands.....	150,000
From revenues of District of Columbia.....	2,400,000
From miscellaneous sources.....	4,500,000

This aggregates \$56,470,000 as an income of the Government in excess of its expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, under the estimates, as I have already stated, of the Secretary of the Treasury. If the expenditures are less than those estimated, the surplus at the end of the fiscal year will of course be correspondingly increased. This surplus can not exceed the Secretary's estimate more than ten or fifteen million dollars. Our outstanding indebtedness, as shown by the Treasury reports, is \$1,706,833,377.17. Of this vast sum \$228,054,600 4/5 per cent. bonds mature in 1891. The law of March 3, 1881, empowered the Secretary of the Treasury to apply this surplus money in the Treasury, or so much thereof as he might consider proper, to the purchase or redemption of United States bonds. This law, Mr. Chairman, it seems, has been well understood by every person in this country, excepting, perhaps, the President and his Secretary of the Treasury, as authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to use any surplus in the Treasury to purchase or redeem United States bonds. One of the purposes for which that law was enacted was to keep the money in circulation among the people and avoid financial distress.

The present Administration has studiously ignored the provisions of this law, and has permitted millions upon millions to accumulate in the Treasury, and now use this as a pretext for attacking our industrial interests. The remedy proposed by the President is to attack our protective-tariff system in the inequitable, illogical, and purely sectional bill now under consideration. That great Democratic leader, Samuel J. Tilden, who has now gone to his long rest, in a letter full of patriotism, and inspired by the true spirit of statesmanship, in the early part of the present Administration, called the attention of the President and his countrymen to the defenseless condition of our seacoast cities, to the thousands of miles of our unprotected seaboard, and advised that liberal appropriations be made from the Treasury for coast and harbor defenses. Why, Mr. Chairman, does not this Administration set in circulation some of these hoarded millions in the Treasury by appropriating them to such noble and patriotic purposes? Why sit idly by and send up the impotent cry that a crisis is imminent in the financial affairs of our country from this surplus in the Treasury when

it could be used to restore our Navy, now the derision of the world, to its old-time glory? Why not use some of these surplus millions in harbor improvements and in improving the great water ways that run to the sea?

The answer is plain to all thinking men. The free-trade faction of the Democratic party has obtained supreme control of the Government. They long for the day when the principles of political economy as taught by Richard Cobden shall control, not only the trade and commerce of this country, but our manufacturing and industrial interests as well.

By the methods which I have here hastily sketched they have sought to bring about this "condition" which the President in his message tells us "confronts us," and now pretend that they are seeking to allay the same by the remedies proposed in the Mills bill. This bill is presented under the seductive title "to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue."

An examination of the bill, however, discloses a very different purpose. The framers of this bill fear the result of the exposure of their free-trade doctrine, and seek to cover their real purposes by pretending that they are not to interfere with the manufacturing and laboring interests of the country by an indiscriminate assault upon the tariff laws, but rather by a judicious and equitable revision of the same.

I said, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is sectional in character. I propose now to call the attention of the committee and the country to some of its provisions, in support of this charge. Wool is an agricultural product, and one in which the farmers of this country are extensively interested. In Vermont, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan it is an important branch of husbandry. More or less attention is paid to sheep-raising, either for wool or for mutton, in all the Northern, Western, and Northwestern States and Territories. More than one million persons are engaged in this industry. The capital invested, at a low estimate, on the very highest authority aggregates \$350,000,000. The number of sheep in this country aggregate 43,544,755, and the total clip of wool for the year 1887 was 269,000,000 pounds. The Democratic majority of the Committee on Ways and Means propose to "simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue" by putting this vast industry on the free-list, and in their report to the House accompanying this bill they give as one of their excuses for putting it on the free-list that it is a "raw material."

I deny this, Mr. Chairman. Wool is no more a raw material than woolen cloth is a raw material. It is the finished product of the farmer. It requires months of care, labor, and the expenditure of capital to produce it. And when it is washed and clipped it is presented by the farmer as his finished product to the manufacturer to go through another process before it reaches the consumer. The woolen cloth furnished by the manufacturer holds the same relation to the person who takes it from him to cut and make it into clothing that wool does to the manufacturer. Each is the finished product of the one producing it. This illustration is sufficient to demonstrate the falsity of the excuse given by the Ways and Means Committee for putting this product upon the free-list.

Another excuse given is to reduce the price of woolen goods. If the Democratic members of that committee are not seeking to strike down this great industry, but believe, as they pretend, that putting articles on the free-list will reduce the price to the consumer, why did they not in this bill put all woolen goods on the free-list along with it? To reply in the style of argument in which they so freely indulge, they deprive the farmers engaged in this industry of all benefits of our protective-tariff system and still make him pay tribute in the purchase of his woolen goods to the already overprotected woolen manufacturer. Gentlemen, to be consistent you should have the courage of your convictions and put all articles in which wool is used on the free-list along with it. This is the test from which you shrink. You are afraid that the people of this country will not sustain you in the coming campaign in this attempt to interfere with our protective system, and hence seek to cover these attacks upon it by the specious arguments set forth in your report accompanying this bill. That this vast industry will be injured by being placed on the free-list is apparent to the most casual observer.

Under the stimulating effect of the protective-tariff laws of 1867 our flocks increased from 28,477,951 sheep in 1870 to 50,626,620 in 1884, an increase in that short space of time of more than 77 per cent., while under the reduction of the revision of the tariff of 1883, this vast number has decreased to 43,544,755 sheep in 1888, a loss to the industry of 14 per cent. in the number of sheep in the short space of four years. With a protective tariff which will properly protect this industry the time is not far distant when the American farmer will furnish all the wool consumed in this country. To put it on the free-list means its destruction.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I can not refrain from quoting the following from a speech delivered recently by Hon. George L. Converse, of Ohio:

The production at home of wools and woolens in quantities sufficient to supply the wants of the American people is necessary for our defense in war, and our independence and comfort in time of peace. Successful military campaigns can not be carried on without woolen clothes for the soldiers. More soldiers die from exposure than are killed in battle. Neither of these great industries

once destroyed can be again restored within a short time. Their restoration would require many years, and the men who by legislation would knowingly destroy them here and remit them to the keeping of foreign nations can not be classed among the friends of the Union.

To illustrate the sectional character of this bill, I now call the attention of the committee and the country to the manner in which this Democratic majority of the Committee on Ways and Means have legislated on the subject of rice. This also is a farm product; and of the 110,131,373 pounds produced in the crop of 1879, as reported in the census of 1880, 100,635,513 pounds were produced by the Southern States of South Carolina, Georgia, and Louisiana, a Southern product, as you will see, and cultivated in Democratic States. During the three last years the amount of rice entered for consumption from foreign countries, and the duty paid thereon in the form of tax by consumers as our free-trade friends contend, is as follows:

Year.	Entered for consumption.	Duty.
	<i>Pounds.</i>	
1885.....	116,392,598	\$1,619,576
1886.....	92,596,341	1,184,257
1887.....	95,585,490	972,614

Rice is a food product consumed largely by the laboring classes of this country. Why not furnish cheap food as well as cheap clothing, if the argument of the majority of the committee is to prevail, and put rice on the free-list? But instead of that, Mr. Chairman, we find that the tariff on rice is increased rather than diminished, and the importers of that food product have called the attention of the public to the fact that the duties now proposed in the Mills bill are actually higher than those which prevailed during the war, from 1861 to 1864. It is claimed by those who are conversant with the process and expense of rice culture that it can be grown and sold at 3 cents per pound, cleaned, pay all the charges of production, and leave a good margin of profit to the planter. And at 3 cents per pound cleaned, 44 bushels to the acre nets the planter \$22 per acre. And at 80 bushels per acre, which it is claimed is not an unusual yield, a net profit to the planter of \$48 per acre.

And yet, Mr. Chairman, this is an industry which it is claimed should be protected by a high duty on imported rice. A less number of persons are interested in this country in rice production than in the production of wool. The capital invested is less and the product is one which is used in every home. No argument can be used for placing wool on the free-list which will not be as forceful in placing rice on the free-list. It is easier, however, in this so called revision of the tariff laws, to strike a blow at an industry cultivated in Republican States than to interfere with those which prosper in Democratic States.

Again, Mr. Chairman, why not place sugar on the free-list? Here is a product as universal in its consumption as tea or coffee. The quantity and value of sugar imported into the United States during the past five years, as shown by the official records of the Treasury Department, are as follows:

Year.	Pounds.	Value.
1883.....	2,133,956,284	\$91,519,476
1884.....	2,755,416,896	98,262,607
1885.....	2,717,884,653	72,519,514
1886.....	2,689,881,765	80,773,744
1887.....	3,136,443,240	78,411,224

The amount entered for immediate consumption, with the duty paid on the same, during this period was:

Year.	Pounds.	Value.
1883.....	2,049,668,786	\$44,665,047
1884.....	2,562,719,594	47,500,750
1885.....	2,748,646,118	50,885,916
1886.....	2,701,020,874	50,265,538
1887.....	2,999,450,481	56,507,496

Thus you see, Mr. Chairman, that the people of this country pay a tax annually on imported sugar of nearly \$60,000,000. If the object of this bill is to reduce the revenues and furnish cheap food for the people, how better can that object be subserved than by placing sugar on the free-list? The whole sugar-producing interest in this country, on the most accurate and reliable authority, does not exceed in value \$80,000,000. This interest is limited almost wholly to Louisiana. The sugar consumed by the rich and the poor during a period of less than eighteen months is taxed by import duties in an amount sufficient to pay for the entire capital invested in that interest in this country and leave many millions besides. And yet the friends of this Mills bill, for the alleged purpose of reducing the revenues of the country \$5,390,054.73 duties on imported wool, are willing to imperil this great wool industry with its aggregate capital, as I have already shown, of \$350,000,000. If wool or sugar must be placed on the free-list, which,

I ask, in the name of justice, will best subserve the interests of the people and at the same time contribute most to reduce this dangerous surplus in the Treasury? Nothing but the most partisan and sectional feeling could have prompted this bill which covers these two great farm products—the one protected and the other on the free-list.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I for one shall vote to put sugar on the free-list, and if my voice and my vote will have any influence in determining that question, the laboring people from my section of the country shall no longer pay a tribute to the planters of Louisiana in the way of an import duty on that product.

But, sir, when I say this I do not mean that I should place the sugar planter at the mercy of foreign competition. I believe that the production of sugar can in time be increased to meet the entire demands of the country and that it can be produced here sufficiently cheap to drive from the market the imported product. Until that time I would protect it by a bounty, as France and other countries have done in developing this wonderful industry. Many other products are placed on the free-list which come in direct competition with the products of the Canada farmer. This will undoubtedly prove eminently satisfactory to the Canada producer. He is protected by the laws of Canada from any competition with the American product, while his surplus products can be shipped to this country free of duty and put in competition with the products of the American farmer. Among those products are potatoes, beans, peas, fresh vegetables of all kinds, meats, game and poultry; plums, prunes, currants, dates, hemp, etc., and many other articles which I might name.

And still, Mr. Chairman, your party, which is committed to the support of this bill, has the audacity to pose as the friend of the farmer. During the debate almost every friend of the bill has denounced the manufacturer and claimed that what is paid on imported articles produced by him is robbed from the people by taxation. It is a charge easily made, but under a well adjusted revenue law incapable of proof. The tariff laws are, first and foremost, for raising a revenue to maintain the Government, and, secondary to this, to develop the varied and wonderful resources of this country and insure to the laborer a fair and just compensation for his services. That the system has worked well is apparent from the well-fed, well-clothed, and well-paid mechanics of this country.

I shall not stop to indulge in what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] characterized as a bewildering array of figures to establish this. Every intelligent man knows it. If there are individual exceptions, as claimed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL], they arise from exceptional causes not incident to the tariff laws, and, like all exceptions, prove the rule.

Our mechanics and laborers furnish a picture of contentment and prosperity that can not be duplicated among the laboring classes in any other country in the world. If anybody is interested in breaking down our tariff system it is the manufacturer. If he could have free trade in the hiring of his employes we would no longer find the intelligent and prosperous class of workmen who are an honor to our country. The starving hordes of Europe would be shipped here to supplant them. Here is an interview with Judge Caton, of Illinois, one of the large manufacturers in our State, published in the Chicago Tribune shortly after the President's message was given to the country:

INTERVIEW.

Have you read the President's message?
It has been read to me.

What do you think of it?

It is a remarkable document, in view of what a message is supposed to be. What will be the result of it?

The tariff question is now squarely brought before the country as a national, a political, and a Presidential issue. A notice has been served that the Treasury is sucking up the money which ought to be in circulation, and that the business and commercial prosperity of the country is at stake, and must be considered in preference to other questions.

You seem to be in favor of a reduction of the tariff?

I am at the present time.

Why?

Well, among other things, I am a manufacturer.

And as a manufacturer you believe that the tariff should be reduced?

I do; and for a reason which I think has not been advanced. The manufacturer is not making any money, and does not profit by the tariff. The skilled laborer gets the profit. Advance the tariff on the manufactured article, and the confederation of trades advances his wages often above the tariff advance.

You say you have had experience. In what direction?

As a glass manufacturer. I think we have in Ottawa the best glass-works in the country. We seem to be busy at all times. Up to date I have never received a dividend. On the contrary, in order to preserve our plant and the capital invested in it, I have advanced funds from time to time and the several works instead of paying me a profit are in debt to me perhaps a hundred thousand dollars or more. The high tariff imposed for our protection has all gone to the skilled laborer. The blower, lowest in the scale of usefulness, gets \$4 per day, and the best men \$8 per day. The blowers are like the iron puddlers at the blast-furnaces who get from \$8 to \$12 per day. I believe, if the tariff were abolished and our works shut down for a year, as they would have to be, the laborer would return to reason and allow our business to be conducted with some profit to the manufacturer. I am not alone in this view. I think you will find the sentiment growing among manufacturers that their invested money brings no return, but rather outlay, and that the only remedy is in the abolition of the tariff and a general suspension of manufacturing until the labor system shall be placed on a paying basis to capital.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, until the labor system of this country shall be like that of Belgium and free-trade England. This is the deliberate judgment of a man not only eminent in Illinois, but whose

fame is not confined to the limits of his own country. This great glass industry which he mentions as being located at Ottawa, Ill., has not escaped the tariff tinkers who prepared the Mills bill. A large reduction has been made in the tariff on all kinds of imported glass of the character produced at this manufactory. In view of the deliberate judgment of Judge Caton, as expressed in the interview which I have just had read, I ask you, is this not a blow at the laborers engaged in that industry? As he well states in the interview, he does not stand alone in this view favoring the removal of our tariff laws. It is a feeling that is finding favor with the great capitalists and manufacturers everywhere in the country. It is not patriotic, not calculated to subserve the best interests of the country in developing our great and varied interests and resources. It is purely selfish, and if successful, by the adoption of free-trade principles in this country, can have but one result, that of degrading the American mechanic to the level of the European operative.

My time is too limited to take this bill up in detail and show all of its inconsistencies, its partisan and its sectional character. I will be pardoned, however, for calling to the attention of the committee a little incident which occurred during the address of Mr. McMILLIN, of Tennessee, the other day in support of this bill, as illustrating its partisan character. It is important in the approaching campaign that the State of Virginia shall be continued in the list of States which furnish 153 solid electoral Democratic votes. In the earlier days of our Republic Virginia favored free trade because her labor was free. There was a consistency in the Virginia planter, who owned his laborers, demanding absolute free trade. But since the blighting curse of slavery has forever disappeared the people of that State have come to realize that Virginia can never recover her old time position in this Union of States without the development of all of the diversified interests which are found in such rich and abundant supplies within her borders. And learning wisdom from the example of such manufacturing States as Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, her citizens, instead of bending their energies to one product or industry in the State, like Moses of old, who smote the rock in Horeb and brought forth abundant supplies of water for the preservation of the children of Israel, have blasted the rocks in her mountains and brought forth rich iron ores in abundance; have mined the great coal fields which have slept for ages undisturbed, and have started on that new era which, if unimpaired by the substitution of free trade for our protective system of home industries, will restore Virginia to that exalted position she once held when she was known as the "Mother of Presidents."

The logic of this bill would place iron ore and coal upon the free-list; and had the same disregard for the great industries which flourish in Northern and Republican States, as I have already pointed out, been followed in the preparation of this bill those articles would have been placed there. And it is even claimed by many that such is the fact from the proper construction of the bill. The construction, however, was combated by Mr. McMILLIN in his speech the other day, but his argument did not seem to satisfy the Virginia Representative [Mr. O'FERRALL].

The following clipping, however, from the Washington Critic of April 26 indicates that an understanding has been reached between these two gentlemen, who are willing to destroy the wool industry and jeopardize an invested capital of \$350,000,000 by placing that farm product on the free-list.

Here it is:

THE IRON AND COAL TARIFF.

There was a little talk yesterday that the Ways and Means Committee would amend the tariff bill so as to include iron and coal on the free-list, but Mr. McMILLIN has assured Colonel O'FERRALL, of Virginia, that nothing of the kind is contemplated, and what is more, the phraseology of the tariff bill will be changed so that all doubts on the point of free iron and coal will be removed. This will be interesting news to the people of Southwestern Virginia.

Aside from the argument that the necessities of the situation require that the State of Virginia shall give its electoral vote to the Democratic party this fall, no argument can be urged in favor of a duty on those products that will not be equally effective in protecting all the vast and varied industries of this country, many of which are being jeopardized by advocating the passage of this bill, and will be utterly destroyed if it becomes a law.

I can not sympathize with those who denounce protection of home industries as a species of robbery. The argument in favor of protection rests upon the great principle of the advantage of diversified production. Every industry is stimulated and benefited under a well-regulated tariff law. It keeps the currency in circulation among our people instead of draining out country of it and sending it abroad to purchase products manufactured in foreign countries and thus avoids financial distress. It brings the consumer and producer together and saves the cost of transportation. Fifty men composing a community all engaged in agriculture would each only have one consumer for his products. Diversify their interests by placing them in groups of ten, and each group of producers would have his home market increased fivefold. If each engaged in a separate industry, each would have fifty consumers for his product, and they together would become a self-sustaining and independent community. Sound economic principles require that so far as may be practicable, every section and locality in our country shall have

diversified interests, numerous enough to be self-sustaining. Economically considered, it is the development of that political idea which has made the New England township the model political organization of the world, a little republic in itself. And as the great Frenchman, De Tocqueville said, while it exists the Republic will flourish.

So while this protective theory is maintained our country will go on in its marvelous accumulation of wealth and prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY], in his free-trade argument here the other day, in his attempt to establish what he characterizes as the iniquitous protective system, claimed that our tariff laws discriminate against the great West from which we both come, and took the States of Massachusetts and Illinois and contrasted their wealth per capita in 1860 and again in 1880, and drew what seemed to him a very pleasing picture to the detriment or disadvantage of the great State which I have the honor in part to represent on this floor. I had hoped that I should have the opportunity of perusing his remarks in the RECORD before making any answer to his unjust statements, but that privilege has been denied by his discreetly withholding the reporter's notes of his address.

Among his many claims was that the average per capita of wealth in Illinois in 1860 was \$227, and that in the twenty years intervening from 1860 to 1880 the State progressed so slowly in the development of wealth that her per capita of wealth was but \$255 in 1880, while the great manufacturing State of Massachusetts, with a per capita of wealth of \$631 in 1860, by the development of her manufacturing industries had increased her per capita of wealth in 1880 to \$888—an increased per capita in Illinois of \$28, and in Massachusetts of \$257. These figures, as I learn, are based upon the assessed valuation of the property of these two States at these two different periods. His conclusions are drawn from them without taking into consideration the fact that the assessed valuation of the property in Massachusetts is obtained upon an entirely different basis from that in Illinois. Of course his conclusion and argument drawn from such figures are utterly worthless. The total true valuation of the property in Massachusetts in 1860 was \$815,237,433, and her total true per capita wealth at that time was \$662. The total true valuation of the property in Illinois was \$571,860,282, and her per capita wealth was \$509. The total true valuation of the property in Massachusetts in 1880 was \$2,623,000,000, and her per capita wealth \$1,471. The total true valuation of the property in Illinois in 1880 was \$3,210,000,000, and her average per capita of wealth was \$1,043.

These figures indicate a very different showing for the great agricultural State of Illinois than the gentleman from Missouri sought to establish. And when you take into consideration the fact, Mr. Chairman, that during this period the percentage of increase of population was nearly double in Illinois to what it was in Massachusetts, instead of establishing that our tariff system is detrimental to the agricultural interests it proves just the reverse.

In 1860 Illinois had 143,310 farms only, while in 1880 they had increased to the number of 255,741, an increase in number of 77 per cent. in the twenty years. The value of farm lands in Illinois in 1860 aggregated \$408,944,033, while in 1880 the aggregate value of farm lands in the State was \$1,009,594,580, an increase to the farmers of that State in the value of their farms in the short period of twenty years of 146 per cent. What a magnificent showing for the farmers of Illinois!

And I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, the great cause of this increased wealth in our farm lands. It is because our citizens have not been content to have a foreign market for the products of their farms, but have sought to establish a home market by the encouragement of the investment of capital in manufactories within the limits of our State.

We believe in diversified interests, and that the nearer the produce consumer can be brought to the farm the better it is for the farmer. And as a result of that policy we have increased the number of manufacturing industries of our State under the tariff laws which have been in force since 1860, 240 per cent. And the capital invested in manufactories during the same period has increased 410 per cent. This is added to the permanent wealth of the State, while the number of persons who have been called to the State to work in our factories and furnaces and be fed by our farmers has increased 530 per cent.

Time will not permit me to dwell upon this great State. Her history for the last twenty years speaks for itself, and no better indorsement of the wisdom of the Republican party in insisting upon the protection of our home industries can be asked for than it affords.

The claim that is made that the Republicans are in favor of continuing war taxes is most happily met and refuted by Mr. MCKINLEY, in the following from the report of the minority of the Ways and Means Committee:

It is a striking fact that all of the reductions of taxation which have occurred since the conclusion of the war, with the exception of the trifling ones made by the acts of March 1, 1879, and of May 28, 1880, aggregating a little over \$5,000,000, were accomplished while the party now in the minority was in the majority and in control of legislation.

A brief summary of what has been done in this regard will be both suggestive and instructive.

By the act of July 14, 1870, the reduction of the revenue from customs duties was:

Free-list.....	\$2,403,000
Estimated reduction from dutiable list.....	23,651,748
Total.....	26,054,748

By the act of May 1, 1872, tea and coffee were placed upon the free-list, making a reduction of \$15,893,847.

By the act of June 6, 1872, tariff duties were further reduced, and the reduction by the—

Free-list.....	\$3,345,724
Estimated reduction from the dutiable list.....	11,933,191
Total.....	15,278,915

By the act of March 3, 1883, from tariff:

Free-list.....	\$1,365,999
Estimated reduction from dutiable list.....	19,489,800
Total.....	20,855,799

The foregoing estimates were made when the several bills were passed. Of internal taxes the following have been the reductions made by the party now in the minority since the conclusion of the war:

By the acts of July 13, 1866, and March 2, 1867.....	\$103,381,199
By the acts of March 31, 1868, and February 3, 1868.....	54,802,578
By the act of July 14, 1870.....	\$55,315,321
By the act of December 21, 1871.....	14,436,862
By the act of June 6, 1872.....	15,807,618
By the act of March 3, 1883.....	40,677,682
Total.....	284,421,260

This we present as the result of Republican legislation from July 13, 1866, down to and including March 3, 1883.

The Republican party was in control of the House of Representatives from the first-named date to March 4, 1875. During that period it will be observed that taxation was reduced and revenue diminished in the aggregate sum of \$284,421,260. On the 4th of March, 1875, the control of the House passed to the Democratic party and remained with it until the 4th day of March, 1881, a period of six years. During these years the internal revenue was reduced \$6,368,995. On the 4th day of March, 1881, the Republican party was re-invested with control of the House of Representatives, holding it for two years, during which time it reduced taxation and revenues from custom sources in the estimate a sum \$20,855,799, and upon internal revenue \$40,677,682, and a grand total of \$61,533,481.

Since the 4th day of March, 1883, the House of Representatives has been dominated by the present majority party, a period of five years, and no taxes have been reduced and no curtailment of the revenues has taken place, although warned of a threatened surplus not only by the present Administration, but by the preceding one of President Arthur. It will be observed that from 1866 to 1888, a period of twenty-two years, the control of the House has been equally divided between the two political parties, each having eleven years.

During the eleven years of Republican control the revenues were reduced (estimated).....	\$302,504,569
During the eleven years of Democratic control the revenues were reduced.....	6,368,993

Difference in favor of the present minority party in the House of..... 356,135,634

Whatever inequalities may exist in our present tariff laws the Republicans are willing and anxious to remedy. This bill increases instead of diminishes the inequalities of the law. With its title it "keeps the word of promise to the ear, but breaks it to the hope." If it becomes a law in its present form widespread disaster will follow in its wake.

I should, as I feel regarding this bill, be false to my own convictions and to the best interests of the good people who honor me by sending me here to represent them, if I failed to enter my solemn protest against this unholy attempt to overthrow the great industrial interests of America. [Applause.]

Before Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois, had concluded his remarks his hour expired.

Mr. GEAR. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for ten minutes.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. I do not desire to occupy more than five minutes longer.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I do not wish to be discourteous, but there are a number of gentlemen who will not be able to get even a half hour. I must object. The gentleman can print the remainder of his remarks as many gentlemen will be compelled to do.

Mr. DOCKERY. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will be allowed a few minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSUR. Mr. Chairman, I begin by calling attention to the constitutional provisions for taxation. There are three:

First. Article I, section 2:

Direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union according to their respective numbers.

Stating how the numbers shall be determined.

Second. Article I, section 8:

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.

Third. Article I, section 9:

No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid unless in proportion to the census or enumeration hereinbefore directed to be taken. No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State.

WEBSTER DEFINES—

Duties as: tax, toll, impost, or customs; excises; any sum of money required by government to be paid on the importation, exportation, or consumption of goods.

Excise as: an inland duty or impost operating as an indirect tax on

the consumer, originally paid only on certain articles of home industry and consumption, and afterward levied also on imported articles; also levied on licenses—the right to deal in certain commodities.

Imposts as: impost, that which is imposed or levied; a tax, tribute, or duty, laid by government on goods imported into a country; an impost on land or other real estate and on the stock of farmers is not called a duty, but a direct tax.

Taxes generally: to subject to pay a tax, or taxes; to impose or assess upon; to lay a burden upon; especially to exact money from, for the support of government.

It will thus be seen duties, excises, and imposts are but other names and designations for taxes used in the generic sense.

Tariff. Whence came the word?

Appleton's Cyclopædia, says:

Tarifa, a town of Spain, situated in the narrowest part of the strait of Gibraltar, was named in honor of "Tarif, Ibu Malik," a Berber chief, who founded it, and during Moorish dominion stopped all vessels passing by, and compelled them to pay duties at fixed rates; whence the word tariff in English and other languages.

It is thus seen from the original derivation of the word it meant "a forced tribute;" something exacted without adequate compensation being rendered. And unfortunately, in a high protective tariff, the original meaning still prevails and is enforced; for deny it who may, when a duty as impost is laid so high that the Government gets but little or no revenue from its imposition, and the manufacturer has its benefit, it ceases to be a tax and becomes a tribute. In these constitutional provisions to the plain unsophisticated mind there lurks no taint of special privileges, no pretense for unequal laws, but the belief that all laws made pursuant thereto shall be uniform, just, and even-handed.

I freely admit that a government must have revenues adequate to its necessities, so that it may maintain itself on the one hand with dignity and upon the other with justice to its subjects. And yet in all its revenues, come from what source they may, an eye must be kept to a decent economy in the administration of public affairs to the end the people's substance be not squandered, extravagance engendered, or corruption fostered to blight and wither the public weal.

In the way of raising and exacting taxes the ingenuity of man has never devised one borne so cheerfully, with so little complaint, as the indirect method known as the tariff. Under this system abuses, wrongs, inequalities, and gross impositions have been and are daily done and perpetrated that under any other system of taxation could not last beyond a session of the legislative power authorized to remedy these evils.

Why is it so? Because the tax being paid at the custom-house upon the entry of the goods into this country is at once added to their value, and from thenceforward is incorporated into and clings to them as a part of the original value, through all successive purchasers and owners, whether importer, jobbing, wholesale, or retail dealers, finally to be paid and borne by the party who purchases for his own use or consumption.

If the idea of paying taxes was continuously present to the consumer at the time he purchased; if by law a great schedule of taxes was required to be publicly exposed in all stores, as if a great sign were displayed thus—

Woolen shawls.....	tax, 88 per cent.
Soap.....	tax, 15 cents per pound
Blankets.....	tax, 80 per cent.
Camphor.....	tax, 5 cents per pound
Brussels carpets.....	tax, 59 per cent.
Croton-oil.....	tax, 50 cents per pound
Clothing, ready made.....	tax, 68 per cent.
Blacksmith hammers.....	tax, 2½ cents per pound
Flannels.....	tax, 78 per cent.

And so on, through the nearly four thousand articles upon the tariff list, it would not be long ere the voice of the people compelled their Congressional servants to reduce taxation to the lowest point commensurate with the necessities of an honest and economical administration of the Government.

But the indirect mode of collecting taxes by the tariff method insidiously puts all thought of taxation in the background and out of sight. A man's necessity for coffee compels him to buy it. His comfort exacts the purchase of a blanket. His ease and quiet a cigar; his vanity, a silk hat; his pride, a broadcloth coat; and while he thinks he is sating his necessity, comfort, or pride, he little reckes he is paying a tax of 1 cent, or \$1 to his government, and three or more dollars tribute to some giant manufacturing industry, not to say monopoly.

Hence it is, I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that this indirect or tariff mode of collecting taxes is the favorite one with all rulers in civilized countries; for by appealing in four thousand ways to all the passions that excite or sway mankind, whether of pride, vanity, comfort, or necessity, the admitted inequalities of our present and remaining war taxes have been perpetuated to the present hour.

A tariff is, and always will be, a necessity to raise taxes in this country. The independent habits of our people, their freedom in all the past from inquisitorial visits and demands of the tax-gatherer, as well as the demands of the Federal Constitution, all compel its perpetuation.

Oh for a year of direct Federal taxation to the end that rings might be broken, monopolies exposed and taught a lesson, economy once more introduced into the hearts and souls of every one interested in good government, and the people made to rely upon themselves and their own efforts, and not look to Government for a thousand things they, the people, ought to do for themselves, and for every tub to stand upon its own bottom.

Some in the country may ask, why can not we have direct taxation, so that we may know exactly what we get, for what we pay? I answer, we can, but only at such rates of inequality as to be more glaring and unjust than even the ills we complain of in the present tariff.

The Constitution, the paramount law of the land, imposes the reverse of that which is imposed by all State constitutions, namely, that a direct tax shall be based and levied in proportion to population, and not upon values or property.

To illustrate:

By the census of 1880, Florida had a population of 260,493, and an assessed valuation of \$30,938,319; Rhode Island a population of 276,531, and an assessed valuation of \$252,536,673. Here the population is nearly equal, yet the man in Rhode Island with \$8 in property to that of the man in Florida with \$1, pays the same amount when levied by the Federal Government.

Again. New Hampshire had a population of 346,991 and an assessed valuation of \$164,775,181, while Nebraska, with the larger population of 452,402, had an assessed valuation of only \$90,585,784. Hence the man in New Hampshire with over \$2 in value would pay no more than the man in Nebraska with less than \$1.

Such inequalities in taxation are not to be borne; and whatever causes may have impelled our forefathers to favor direct taxation based upon population, sure it is, that by an almost universal assent, we in State taxation base it upon property. Think of a Vanderbilt or a Gould being taxed no more per head for his family than my genial friend from New York City, whose Irish wit so often enlivens the dull tediousness of a committee meeting.

In time of great pressure we have resorted to excises, internal taxation, or revenue and income duties; but the general verdict of the country has been that these were extraordinary or war taxes; and not to be continued after the crisis had passed that called them into existence, or war debts and obligations had ceased; to exact their imposition.

My own judgment is, and I believe nearly or quite in accord with the practice of the country, at all times even down to the present; namely, customs duties must furnish all ordinary demands to run the Government in times of peace. Excises proper, internal revenues, income taxes, and direct taxation, may and should all be resorted to in time of the nation's peril. And if I could have my own way and judgment, I should keep and maintain at all times a sufficient internal-revenue tax to pay all pensions and the remainder of our war debt, together with its annual interest, holding them to be obligations arising from the necessities of war, and not chargeable upon the revenues of the Government as incidents of a time of peace. And while I would especially retain taxes upon whisky and tobacco, I would remove all restrictions and inquisitorial features and personal examinations of books and papers that have done so much to make the tobacco tax odious before the country, and permit its free sale to any person who desired to purchase.

For several years past this nation has been confronted with the singular problem not of "how to raise taxes," as all other nations are, but the unique one of "how to lower them," and in this we apparently have more difficulty than England, France, Russia, Austria, or Germany have to fill their depleted treasuries, and we quarrel among ourselves like Kilkenny cats on what ought to be a loving duty in the interest of a long-burdened, sadly-taxed people. All, even the most rabid of our Republican friends, admit the urgent necessity of a reduction of our surplus taxes, yet they all demand, as do some of our own friends, that it be at the expense of their wives' kindred to the remotest generation, and that they can all be sacrificed upon the altar of economy; but no sacrifice upon themselves or upon their kindred is to be tolerated or borne for one moment.

For one I do not believe the tariff a sacred law, nor do I believe as the necessities for large revenue on the part of the Government disappear that there should be any more hesitancy on our part to an intelligent application of ourselves for its reduction to the standard of a sufficient amount only, and no more, to run the Government upon a basis of common honesty and economy consistent with a decent dignity for a Government so great and imperial in all its resources than there should be to a revision of our penal code if there was an intelligent general demand for such revision.

Prior to the war no such idea prevailed, for from 1789 to 1857, a period of sixty-eight years, no less than thirty-two tariff laws were passed, the last being approved March 3, 1857, under which the rates of duty imposed were exclusively ad valorem, arranged by schedules and ranged from 4 to 30 per cent., averaging about 18 per cent. as against 47 per cent. at present. It was an honest tax; it told its levy plainly. No pitfalls were in it, under the guise of specific duties, as in the present tariff, where the specific rate is alike upon West of England broadcloth,

worn by a Vanderbilt, or upon cotton-warp reversible cloth worn by a weaver. The specific duty is alike on both, 35 cents per pound; on the broadcloth, weighing 20 ounces per yard, it is only a tax of 37.2 per pound, and with its ad valorem of 40 per cent. on its cost make together a tax of \$1.81,2, or 50.3 per cent. of the factory price, while in the weaver's covering, 35 cents per yard specific duty, and 30 per cent. ad valorem, make the enormous tax of 180.7 per cent. of the factory price.

Here the ad valorem tax is 5 per cent. lower in favor of the weaver over the Vanderbilt. The specific tax of 35 cents per yard is the same, yet the pitfall is dug for the poor man. His eyesight is blinded by the lower ad valorem, and not being an expert, he is deluded into silence. Away with the specific duty! Let us know openly what we pay; let the Government hide nothing, but boldly declare the rate of taxation in a manner to require no explanation nor an expert to calculate it. A high meed of honor should be given to the Mills bill because of its effort to bring this about. I believe this extract from the majority report to be superbly true:

The specific duty is the favorite of those who are to be benefited by high rates, who are protected by competition, and protected in combinations against the consumer of their products. There is a persistent pressure by manufacturers for the specific duty because it conceals from the people the amount of taxes they are compelled to pay to the manufacturer. The specific duty always discriminates in favor of the costly article and against the cheaper one, and therefore it imposes a heavier burden as it goes down from the highest-priced articles to the lowest. This discrimination is peculiarly oppressive in woolen and cotton goods, which are necessities of life to all classes of people.

If the tariff is so great a blessing, surely all home manufacturers who believe in it ought to be willing to admit and boldly advocate the rate per cent. of taxation imposed, and not seek to cover it up.

Among the beauties, if not the very chief glories, of a tariff for protection are the assertions that it creates diversified and new manufacturing industries and will establish them throughout the length and breadth of the land, build up happy families, and give to more wage-workers and laborers homes, buildings of their own; make them freeholders and land-owners; also to sit in the shade of their own vine and fig-tree, with no cruel or avaricious landlord lying in wait to turn them out upon the cold charity of a selfish world, whether it be in the heats of summer or the sleet and ice of winter—than a tariff for revenue will create and give. And I presume that the advocates of a protective tariff on the other side of this Chamber not only assert this, but honestly claim a belief, if not a conviction, of its entire truth.

I seriously doubt that the effect of a protective system is either, first, to increase the number of manufacturing establishments (but I do believe, on the contrary, it fosters, with its hot-house influences, all the great and established existing factories, and enables them to eat up and absorb new and small ones, and to prevent in point of fact the creation and the scattering of new, small, and infant establishments throughout the country).

Second. It does not tend to either increase the number of families nor to increase the number of their dwellings; but on the contrary its influence is exerted in a contrary manner, and tends both to lessen the ratio of families in the land and the dwellings needed for separate homes for families.

Observe these figures taken from the census:

In 1870 there were 252,148 manufacturing establishments, with a capital of \$2,118,208,269. In 1880 there were 253,852, with a capital of \$2,790,272,506, an increase in establishments of 1,704, but an increase of capital of the enormous sum of \$674,063,837, with an increase of employes of 678,599. If this is to continue for all time, and why should it not, when five men out of six contribute of their means to help the sixth man, when in the name of conscience and of justice will Missouri, and Kansas, and Iowa, and Nebraska, and the great agricultural States of the West get their share? An increase of 1,704 in ten years. Thirty-eight States, and ten years in a decade. This shows all around a little over four new establishments to a State per year. To satisfy Missouri, with her 3,000,000 people, the four should each be as large as Cramp & Son's establishment at Philadelphia, and that would not give Missouri the cramps either.

What has done this? Let me quote from the Census Compendium, page 926:

The fact that, in the face of a large increase in the number of hands employed in manufactures, of the amount of material consumed, and of the value of the products, the number of establishments shows hardly an appreciable gain from 1870 to 1880, notwithstanding an increase of 30 per cent. in population is amply accounted for by the well-known tendency to the concentration of labor and capital in large shops and factories. The establishments of 1870 showed 8 as the average number of hands, and \$8,400 as the average amount of capital; those of 1880 showed 10.7 as the average number of hands and \$10,992 as the average amount of capital.

What is the increase of hands? Six hundred and seventy-eight thousand five hundred and ninety-nine, and of this number we may fairly assert 277,795 were females and 241,338 were between ten and fifteen years of age.

The gainful lust of a high protective tariff, in its inordinate race for wealth, spares not the women and children; but as they can be more easily imposed upon and obtained often for a pittance when their labor will supply the place of a man, we find in the census reports this pitiful story (see page 1344, Compendium United States Census):

We see that if we compare the number of occupations returned in 1870, increased by the rate of increase which took place during the decade in the

population over ten years of age, with the number of occupations actually returned in 1880, we find a deficiency in the agricultural class to the extent of 42,241; an excess in the class rendering professional and personal services of 577,832; in that engaged in trade and transportation of 253,507, and in that engaged in manufactures or mechanical and mining industries of 311,238, making a net excess in all classes of occupations of 1,105,636.

If we ask how the relative excess of occupations in 1880 over 1870 is distributed according to sex, we shall find that of the total excess, namely, 1,105,636, as stated, nearly one-quarter is of females, the number of females reported as pursuing gainful occupations having increased from 1870 to 1880 in a higher ratio than the number of males. Thus:

Number of females in gainful occupations in 1870.....	1,836,238
Increased by the ratio of increase in the female population since 1870, namely, 29.03 per cent.....	2,369,362
Actual number returned in 1880.....	2,647,157
Relative excess.....	277,795

Of this excess about two-thirds appear in the last of the four classes indicated, showing the effect upon the employment of women produced by the extension of the factory system.

If we inquire how the same excess is distributed according to age, we shall find that a disproportionate share falls in the class between ten and fifteen years of age, showing a further effect of the extension of the factory system in the increased employment of young children. Thus:

Number of persons of both sexes between ten and fifteen years of age reported in 1870 as in gainful occupations.....	739,164
Increased by 18.65 per cent., the ratio of increase in the population of this age from 1870 to 1880.....	877,018
Actual number reported.....	1,118,356
Relative excess.....	241,338

In the cruel decade from 1870 to 1880 we find the lustful demands of avarice extorting the services of 277,755 women in excess of the increase in same ratio as males. And when the total excess of 405,635 is divided up into classes upon age limits, we find in the class of children from ten to fifteen their relative excess over what it should be is 241,338.

The curse of a servitude until recently unknown is upon the women and children working ten or more hours per day in heated apartments. They day by day become more feeble and less fitted for future duties and functions in the married life.

Last Christmas week I journeyed through New England. I had better opportunities, it being the holidays, than ordinary to see the factory hands. They were out in holiday attire, but their pale countenances and haggard looks bespoke them old before their time; yet of the thousands I saw but few were Americans. Whence came they? From Canada, from Italy, and from Germany. On every hand—in the cars, at the depot, by the wayside—I heard the foreign tongues spoken, and various gentlemen assured me that American girls and American children were almost unknown in the mills. And this is another chapter in the history of a protective tariff! Oh, avarice, not liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!

With all the burdens imposed upon our agricultural people, I thank Jehovah that the burden of selling and destroying their women and children for avarice has not yet fallen upon them, for it seems that they have saved from their little ones, or rather from the population over ten years of age, the number of 42,341 inside of their usual rate of increase as laborers.

Now let us look to its effects upon married life and to its housing; for be it known to you, a protective tariff is the universal great panacea, the one great solvent, that unfolds all the secrets in Nature's hidden *arcana*. It creates fortunes; it populates the wilderness, builds cities, tunnels mountains, and, I will add, builds monopolies, makes giant trusts, with anaconda folds, to embrace a whole country and sixty millions of people; also creates giant fortunes in a shorter era of time than ever before known in any country in any age or any era, and ought, of course, to make happy families also.

Aladdin's lamp pales its glory before the shining luster of a protective tariff, and the slave of that lamp stands ready to abdicate his mystic power because he can not serve the spirit of a protective tariff instead of his lamp.

In 1850 there were 3,598,240 families in this country who had 3,362,337 dwellings to live in; at that time only 235,903 families were apparently without separate homes for themselves. In 1860 there were 5,210,934 families, and they lived in 4,969,692 houses or dwellings. Thus 241,242 families were without separate homes in all the land. The families had increased 1,612,692 in numbers, and all of them had new homes but 5,339. Glory alleluiah! The millennium is at hand, and the protective tariff has done this surely. One million six hundred and twelve thousand six hundred and ninety-four new families in the past decade, and all but 5,339 possessed of new homes. All hail and glory to a protective tariff! But hold on! This period from 1850 to 1860 was the period of lowest tariffs this country ever knew or had.

From September 14, 1851, to March 3, 1857, it had enacted four tariff laws, the duties running lower and lower until the last only ranged from 4 to 30 per cent., averaging 18 per cent., instead of from 10 to 300 per cent. and averaging 48 per cent., as does our present tariff. What comfort in the land is expressed in the figures 1,612,694 new families in ten years, and all living in new houses except 5,339! Surely it must be a low or revenue tariff that did it. No discontent abroad in the land then! Tramps unknown; the word is not yet coined.

Now let us look at the decade from 1870 to 1880, a decade under the highest tariff this country has ever known; one claimed by its

friends to be a distinctly protective tariff. In 1870 there were 7,579,363 families living in 7,042,833 dwellings. During the decade from 1860 to 1870 the number of families without dwellings had increased to 536,510, an increase, not of 3 per cent., or 5,339 only, but an increase of 295,268 families without houses or dwellings, an increase of over 100 per cent.—yea, of 123 per cent.

But, observe, this is under a new era of a high protective tariff, imposed between 1860 and 1870. Yet what misery is involved in the figures 295,268 families unable to find a separate home or dwelling, either to buy, build, or rent to live in, as against 5,339 families in the decade from 1850 to 1860. But the opposition will say this is a consequence of the war period. Be patient and let us see what we will see.

We will now look to the decade from 1870 to 1880 for its story. In 1880, 9,945,916 families had 8,955,812 dwellings to live in or occupy. In this decade the families increased 2,366,553 in number, but the dwellings only increased 1,912,079, leaving a total of 990,108 families in the land without separate homes or dwellings.

Thus in this decade the 536,510 unhusbanded families of 1870 had become 990,108, an increase of 453,598 in ten years, an increase of almost 100 per cent. in the decade, as against 123 per cent. from 1860 to 1870, as against 3 per cent. from 1850 to 1860, of homeless and houseless families for Democratic times and a low tariff; as against 123 per cent. and nearly 100 per cent. for Republican rule and a protective tariff running through two decades.

Poor men of the land, choose ye which you like the best, and then, in November, 1888, do your duty at the polls like free men, who, knowing your power, dare assert it.

I now ask, who apparently got the "boodle" of the ten years from 1870 to 1880.

We see the manufacturers by their own reports, for they furnish the statistics that make the census reports, got an increase of capital of \$674,063,837 at the discontent and misery of 453,598 homeless and unsheltered families in the same period. But I am not quite done with families and their dwellings. Between 1850 and 1860 the increase of families was 44.8 per cent. in numbers, and the increase of their dwellings was 32.4 per cent. This was in low-tariff times. Comparing now between 1870 and 1880, in high-tariff times, the increase in number of families was 31.2 per cent., while the increase in their dwellings was only 27 per cent. This shows an advantage for the first decade of 13.6 per cent. in families, and 5.4 per cent. in dwellings.

In this last decade, in 1873, with the greatest panic, came a new order of beings theretofore unknown in this country. Tramps. Five hundred thousand strong; tramps, tramping over the country. Skilled laborer, mechanic, agriculturist, all felt the baneful effect of the panic. A new era is ushered in; and since then strikes, lockouts, tramps, discontent, degradation and misery have appeared in such numbers and so universally over and throughout the country, and even still abide with us, as the recent commotion on Western railroads and in the Reading coal regions attest, as to all alike indicate that if capital is satisfied labor is discontented and day by day becomes more so. And all this in spite of a protective tariff. Can I not say it is the legitimate fruits of an unequal and unjust system of tribute that robs the poor to make the rich richer?

AMERICAN SHIPPING.

The tariff has destroyed our shipping, our merchant marine. Let us see. The tonnage of vessels built in the United States on the entire seaboard in 1857 was 285,453 tons. Thirty years afterward, in 1887, it was 83,061 tons.

The record of 1857 under a low tariff has only been exceeded twice, to wit, in 1864 it was 291,306, and in 1865 it was 310,421 tons—the two last years of the war, and then only under the impetus of a great national demand created by the war.

The record of 1887 is the lowest of all the thirty years save that of 1886, when it was 64,458 tons.

But it may be said, why take only the entire seaboard; why not include the vessels built upon the Great Lakes and upon the Mississippi River and its tributaries, built to accommodate our great and growing internal and domestic commerce, where the construction of foreign vessels can not come into competition with our home-built vessels, and the story may be different?

Let us see. Total tonnage built in all the United States in—

	Tons.
1857	285,453
1887	83,061

The year 1857 was only exceeded in two years, to wit:

In 1864	291,306
In 1865	310,421

Again, the record of 1887 is the lowest of all the thirty intervening years except 1886, which was 95,453 tons.

These figures show the same story as the seaboard tonnage. Under the stimulus of war times and a war demand, 1864 and 1865 are the years, and the only years, showing a larger tonnage of vessels of all kinds than in 1857, and they show further that in 1886 the lowest building ebb was reached. But now under Democratic rule we are apparently entering upon a new era, the increase in 1887 upon seaboard

building being 25 per cent., and upon all vessels 60 per cent. May this new era spread on and on; under beneficent legislation and the fostering influence of Secretary Whitney may a new navy be built that shall be our pride and glory, to be manned by sailors who shall in zeal and devotion to country emulate the heroism of a Farragut in lashing himself to a mast, and to the world-wide renown of a dying Lawrence, shouting, as he is carried below decks to die, his last command: "Don't give up the ship."

The operation of a high tariff by increasing the price of all articles entering into the construction of vessels, coupled with the foolish policy that our citizens shall not buy abroad the vessels our carrying trade requires and register them in America as American ships, to be protected by American laws and the American flag, has practically destroyed our sea-going marine and made this nation contribute annually one hundred millions or more to the wealth of other nations.

I call attention to an article published in the Missouri Republican April 28, 1888:

FREE TRAVEL—BUT NO FREE TRADE.

On Monday last "eight big steam-ships started across the ocean from New York carrying nearly one thousand passengers," as we learn from the Eastern papers. These one thousand American tourists will pay out for passage money, going and returning, \$200 each, or \$200,000 in all, and every dollar of the money will go into the pockets of foreigners, for every one of the eight big steam-ships is a foreign vessel, most of them British. American tourists do not travel in American steamers for the very good reason that there are none. The moment an American traveler going to Europe or the West Indies or South America steps off the pier in New York or Boston harbor on the steam-ship that is to bear him to a foreign land he treads a British deck and pays his passage money to a British subject.

On the same day that these 1,000 tourists embarked for Europe, the incoming steam-ships landed at Castle Garden in New York harbor 3,500 immigrants. They paid for their passage \$30 each, or \$105,000, every dollar of which also went into foreign pockets, for the steam-ships that brought them were foreign-owned. Here was over \$300,000 paid out in one day in New York for passage money from and to New York. And it is going on every day in the year. The number of American tourists carried abroad and brought back home this year will be about 125,000, and their passage money to and fro, at \$200 each, will amount to \$25,000,000. In the same time 700,000 new immigrants, it is estimated, will be brought over, whose passage money at \$30 each will amount to \$21,000,000. Here is \$46,000,000 paid out in one year for passage money to foreign steam-ships, to say nothing of the \$60,000,000 more which the 125,000 tourists will expend in traveling and sight-seeing, and for clothing, jewelry, books, relics, pictures, curiosities, and bric-a-brac in Europe.

Why is not this \$46,000,000 paid to American steam-ships? The answer is there are no American steam-ships running abroad. Our tariff makes it impossible to build them as cheap as they can be built in foreign ship-yards of untaxed materials, and so the American lines of thirty years ago, under the Democratic régime, have been driven from the ocean. But why do we not impose a tariff on foreign travel, and encourage the building of American steamers? A tax of 50 per cent., or \$50 on every person who goes aboard or returns in the cabin of other than an American steamer, and of \$15 on every steerage passenger, would protect home ship-building and establish American lines to all parts of Europe.

Why is not this done? Because the wealthy manufacturing States are opposed to it. They do not believe in free trade, but they do believe in free travel. They say the American people shall not buy British, German, and French goods, but they themselves, all the while, are buying passage from British, German, and French steam-ship owners. The great army of American tourists is made up in the rich manufacturing States. The wealthy mill and factory owners of those States are large consumers of foreign travel. They like to go to the lands of pauper labor—"free-trade England," Germany, France, and Italy, learn foreign manners, and bring back trunks filled with cheap foreign clothing; and while they think foreign goods ought to be made dear by a high tariff, they want foreign travel kept cheap.

While on a visit to Groton, Mass., in the late holidays, I called upon Governor Boutwell at his home. In the course of a conversation I had with him he stated that in his opinion it was one of the crowning glories of Republican rule and statesmanship in this country that it had practically destroyed our shipping. Not understanding his reason for such belief, I asked him to please explain, when he stated that a high or protective tariff had done it by giving to American wage-workers on land higher wages than they could earn at sea; that they could be fed, clothed, and housed better on land than at sea, and their moral condition better cared for, and he thanked God it was so. I said, "Why not legislate so as to secure the greatest social and moral benefits for labor on sea as well as land?" To which, as I remember, no answer was made.

Direct taxes and internal revenues were the direct result of war necessities. They began in 1862 and practically disappeared from our revenues in 1873.

Internal revenues began in—

1863 with	\$37,640,787.95
1864 with	109,741,134.10
1865 with	209,464,215.25
1866 with	309,226,813.42

A princely sum, and then began to diminish, for—

In 1867 it was only	\$266,027,537.43
In 1868 it was only	191,057,589.41
In 1869 it was only	158,356,460.49

And all this reduction was on the imperial wealth of the country. Wealth demanded the reduction and wealth obtained it in the removal of the income tax, bank taxes, and decrease in internal-revenue taxes of \$228,000,000. And this decrease was made year by year at the dictation of capital. See the following estimates:

By act of 1866	\$65,000,000
By act of 1867	40,000,000
By act of 1868	25,000,000
By act of 1869	45,000,000
By act of 1870	55,000,000

All legislative sympathy and thought was for capital, none for labor, none for the farmer and his interests, and to this day the burdens exacted of them as war necessities and imposed by the war tariff still continue. This is well shown by the following article from the Washington Sentinel:

The minority report of the Ways and Means Committee, signed by WILLIAM D. KELLEY, THOMAS M. BROWSE, T. B. REED, WILLIAM MCKINLEY, Jr., and J. C. BURROWS, claims that the Republicans during eleven years of their control of the House of Representatives reduced the revenues \$362,000,000 in round numbers.

Assuming this claim to be true, which it is not in some respects, let us see how these so-called reductions were made, for whose special benefit, and for whose injury. The exposures are to be found in Mr. MILLS's speech. The Republicans began their "war measures" by raising the tariff rates from 18 to more than 40 per cent. average. They created the internal-revenue system.

Among the items of the latter was a tax on home manufactures, which in 1866 brought in a revenue of \$127,000,000. That was less than 5 per cent. on the value of the manufactured product of that year, which had an increased protection of 22 per cent. as against the former tariff.

There was also an income tax which produced \$72,000,000 in the year 1866. The official reports show that in a population of more than 35,000,000 at that time only 461,170 persons had incomes above the exemption, and they represented the enormous annual income of \$707,000,000. The remaining thirty-four and a half millions of "plain people," as Mr. Lincoln called them, had only sufficient resources from their different forms of labor for a decent and too often a very pinched support.

Now these two internal taxes operating directly on prosperous manufacturers, then enriched by exorbitant gains, and on a class with great incomes, yielded together \$200,000,000 every year to the Treasury, in round numbers. Had these taxes, falling on a wealthy class most able to bear them without the least strain, been continued for ten years, the public debt would have been extinguished.

Then there were the 3 per cent. taxes on railroad companies, insurance companies, and express companies, taxes on bank capital, deposits, and bank-checks to swell the aggregate of so-called "reduction of revenues" in the minority report.

All these taxes, which only touched wealth and great corporations, were abolished by Republican Congresses, while not a dime was removed from the burdens that bore hardest on the poor and afflicted, the workman whose shoulders were forced to carry the load. And in 1863, when the tariff was revised by a bill which originated in the Senate, contrary to the Constitution, the Republicans repealed the tax on playing-cards and put 20 per cent. tax on the Bible.

Day by day this session each member has received circulars and letters begging, ay, demanding that the duties upon their special manufacture be let alone, stating if any reduction be made they are driven to bankruptcy. Ay, under the spirit of avarice they boldly demand some part of the burden incident to their business shall by law be lifted from their shoulders and put upon their fellows, confessing themselves bankrupt if left to their own unaided effort, skill, industry, and perseverance. In the name of our American race, the most inventive, energetic, industrious, thrifty people the world has produced, I deny it. Take away the hot-house manure of a protective tariff and put the country and industries upon the basis of a tariff for revenue only; admit raw materials not produced in this country, for the benefit of our many languishing industries; lower the taxes on necessaries of life; equalize them in the interest of the farmer and laborer, and all our manufacturing industries will have a healthy growth, become more diversified in numbers, and be scattered more uniformly over the land. The people will then pass from under the shadow of unequal laws, now breeding a great discontent, leading to strikes, lockouts, riots, anarchists, and socialism.

Let us go back to the wisdom of Jefferson, stated in his first inaugural address:

Still one thing more, fellow-citizens, is necessary to make us a happy and prosperous people—a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities. * * *

Again:

Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political. * * * Economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid.

Observe, please, encouragement of agriculture is the principal; commerce is the handmaid. All manufacturing industries practically become the subjects of commerce; their products must be put into markets and sold. This is commerce, but the curse of the country is we have reversed this order. Commerce is the principal and agriculture the handmaid and servant, bearing the burdens of commerce as well as its own. Agriculture, holding in its ranks half the laborers of the land, finds all equality before the laws taken from it and special tributes given to commerce. Agriculture is burdened beyond its capacity. Besides paying tribute to commerce, it takes upon itself, having no surplus capital of its own at command, through its lands and farms, the furnishing of security by way of mortgages for the surplus millions of commerce. This is shown by the mortgaged and unhappy condition of all our Western agricultural States, until they stagger and groan like a whipped galley-slave under the burden.

It is estimated that the lands in the following States are mortgaged as follows:

Indiana.....	\$175,000,000	Iowa.....	\$120,000,000
Ohio.....	350,000,000	Nebraska.....	25,000,000
Michigan.....	125,000,000	Kansas.....	100,000,000
Wisconsin.....	100,000,000	Illinois.....	200,000,000
Missouri.....	100,000,000		
Minnesota.....	70,000,000	Total.....	1,365,000,000

I have said that I did not consider the tariff law sacred. I quote from the message sent to this Congress by the President:

By the last census it is made to appear that of the 17,302,099 of our population engaged in all kinds of industries, 7,670,493 are employed in agriculture, 4,074,238 in professional and personal services (2,934,876 of whom are domestic servants and laborers), while 1,810,256 are employed in trade and transportation, and 3,837,112 are classed as employed in manufacturing and mining.

For present purposes, however, the last number given should be considerably reduced. Without attempting to enumerate all, it will be considered that there should be deducted from those which it includes 375,143 carpenters and joiners, 285,401 milliners, dressmakers, and seamstresses, 172,726 blacksmiths, 133,756 tailors and tailresses, 102,473 masons, 76,241 butchers, 41,309 bakers, 22,083 plasterers, and 4,891 engaged in manufacturing agricultural implements, amounting in the aggregate to 1,214,023, leaving 2,623,089 persons employed in such manufacturing industries as are claimed to be benefited by a high tariff.

To these the appeal is made to save their employment and maintain their wages by resisting a change. There should be no disposition to answer such suggestions by the allegation that they are in a minority among those who labor, and therefore should forego an advantage, in the interest of low prices for the majority; their compensation, as it may be affected by the operation of tariff laws, should at all times be scrupulously kept in view; and yet with slight reflection they will not overlook the fact that they are consumers with the rest; that they, too, have their own wants and those of their families to supply from their earnings, and that the price of the necessaries of life, as well as the amount of their wages, will regulate the measure of their welfare and comfort.

I call attention to two points in this. First, that only 2,623,089 laborers in all the United States are protected, less than 18 per cent. To aid 18 men make a living 82 men must contribute to their prosperity without compensation. Second, the President says "there should be no disposition * * * to allege the protected are in the minority, among those who labor, and therefore should forego an advantage."

To accuse a man who is in favor of tariff reform, and a revenue tariff only, as a free-trader is common with our Republican friends. To-day in the attitude of parties on the issue of revenue reform it seems to stand with as much force as a term of obloquy, pity, and contempt as the words copperhead or traitor did during the war. To all such I can only say that I had rather be a free-trader in reality than a robber boddler who believes in maintaining unequal laws imposed upon the many for the benefit of a comparative few.

I am now, and long have been, astounded that the moral sense of New England does not rise against such unequal legislation; but, thank Providence, daylight is breaking, her moral conscience is aroused. [Laughter.]

Listen. The Missouri Republican, of May 2, 1888, has the following editorial:

The most ludicrous product of the tariff controversy is a labored editorial in a Boston high-tariff paper to show that protection is not stealing! William Lloyd Garrison, in a talk before the Young Men's Christian Association of Boston, had declared that a protective tariff is "anti-Christian," and F. W. Bird, a prominent citizen of Boston, had said: "If I can't get a living by paper-making without special favors from the Government, which legalizes stealing from my customers, I will do something else;" and thereupon the Boston Advertiser stumbles through a solemn argument to show that "the American manufacturer uses neither force nor fraud; therefore he does not steal." It is evident that the Massachusetts protectionists are growing ashamed of the twenty-five years' habit of forcing their customers to pay them \$1.50 for \$1 worth of goods when they find it necessary to show that it does not literally violate the decalogue.

As an abstract question of right, who is there who dares to say, with his hand upon his heart, looking to God, "I have not the right, the God-given, inalienable right, to buy what I may need or require wherever I can buy it most cheaply?" Not one. The taxing provisions of our Constitution and their limitations have all been cited in your hearing by me this day. They are the supreme law. In them is declared, "taxes shall be uniform throughout the United States." This word "uniform" is surely comprehensive enough to mean that Congress should deal out in the taxation laws even-handed justice to all its citizens. I admit that by a long series of laws, precedents of protection for protection's sake, and not for revenue, have been established, and it may be too firmly to be questioned as matter of law. Yet, nevertheless, the facts remain that there is no language in the Constitution to indicate authority for them, nor will the moral sense of a large portion of mankind ever fail to denounce the doctrine when it exceeds the demands of revenue. I am no free-trader; there can be none in this country. The provisions of the Constitution prescribe otherwise.

Revenues are and must continue to be raised by customs duties, and I am willing now to say on the record what I have often said on the stump, that within the limits of a tariff for revenue only, I am willing, yea, as an American citizen, prefer from patriotic motives, I trust, that the same should be so adjusted and placed, as to nurture, cherish, and "protect," if you will (I do not like the word "protect" just now very well), American industries, rather than that they should be so imposed as to be an incubus upon, and aid in tearing and dragging them down. I would have this, however, to be, in Democratic language, an incident, and not the purpose and object of the law. To this extent, and in this only would I go. Beyond this protection ceases its patriotic demands, and charity for the ones at home demands a cessation of tribute, as all taxation beyond the revenue limit surely is.

Millions for defense of government, if needs be, but not a cent for tribute beyond the revenue line, should be and will be our campaign

rallying cry. Again, who is there that dares say, as a question of morals, as a question of right, as a question of even-handed justice, that one citizen shall not stand before the law on the plane of equality with every other citizen; that his burdens shall be the same, no lighter nor heavier than any other man's, and that a tribute forced by law under any guise as a plea whatever against his assent, to aid in up-building the fortunes of another is tyranny, yea, confiscation under the forms of law?

What *quid pro quo* have the farmers, 7,670,493 strong? Almost one-half of the mighty army of laborers practically receive nothing. On the contrary, they are to-day mortgaged many hundred, ay, hundreds of millions of dollars to those who have in the past received the benefits of protection.

In the nine contiguous protected and manufacturing States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania is held nearly all the concentrated surplus wealth of the nation. The railroads of the State of Illinois are valued at \$638,500,000. The report of the railroad commissioners of that State show that 95 per cent. of this vast sum is owned in the manufacturing States. The same is very nearly true of Missouri, and, I believe, of Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Colorado, and the Western Territories.

The census of 1880 shows fifty-nine life-insurance companies in the country, with ledger assets of \$420,000,000. Of this number some thirty are in said nine States, but they have over \$375,000,000 of the assets.

Mr. WARNER. Will my colleague allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MANSUR. Yes, sir.

Mr. WARNER. Does the gentleman object to foreign capital being brought into our State?

Mr. MANSUR. I do not object to that. But I want to get some for ourselves. I do not want it all owned away from us.

Mr. WARNER. Do you not encourage foreign capital coming in to build our railroads?

Mr. MANSUR. I have been trying with you to get it.

Mr. WARNER. I knew it.

Mr. MANSUR. But we have been trying to get rid of a bad bargain. I will ask the gentleman, would you not rather have your own capital all owned in Kansas City than to have it come from abroad?

Mr. WARNER. As the gentleman speaks of Kansas City, I will say that that city has more prosperity than any other point in the State of Missouri, and one great reason is that we have invited the influx of foreign capital.

Mr. MANSUR. Have I not paid my tribute to the wonderful growth of that city?

Mr. GEAR. Will the gentleman from Missouri permit an inquiry?

Mr. MANSUR. Yes, sir.

Mr. GEAR. Could the people of Iowa have built their 8,000 miles of railroad or could the people of Missouri have built their 6,000 miles of railroad without foreign capital?

Mr. MANSUR. No, sir; they could not have done it; but I wish our State had got that capital under laws more equitable and more general in relation to a sense of justice.

Mr. GEAR. I will ask the gentleman further, what analogy is there between the tariff and the construction of railroads in those two States?

Mr. MANSUR. If there were only 1,740 factories established in the last ten years, while their capital has increased \$700,000,000, it is evident we did not get our share of that in the West.

Again, these nine States have in their savings-banks, deposits aggregating \$1,100,000,000, while in the other twenty-nine States there are less than thirty million deposits. Again, in the United States there were 73,114 holders of United States registered bonds. Of these 54,545 were in the nine States named. Again, the amount of registered United States bonds was \$645,000,000. Of this, the banks, insurance companies, trust companies, etc., held \$227,451,550, and these banks and other companies holding these bonds are practically owned in the said nine States, leaving 418,000,000 held by individuals, of which sum \$329,563,500 was owned in said nine States.

Again, these nine States are unlike the Western States in this: They own their own railroads (and ours too); they practically own the manufacturing establishments of the nation, also. The sea-going shipping, the telegraph stock, the telephone stock, the stock of the great factories for making arms, sewing-machines, and other rich corporations of the land.

Official figures in the Almanac for 1888, by the Librarian of Congress, show the actual assessed value of the real and personal property of all the States to be \$22,954,630,201, divided between the manufacturing and the other States as follows:

Nine manufacturing States	\$10,137,612,665
Twenty-nine other States	12,817,017,586

That is to say, the 15,000,000 people in the nine manufacturing States own nearly as much of the assessed value of all the States together as is owned by the 45,000,000 of people who live in the twenty-nine agricultural States.

And now they are at last about to own the "brains" of the nation, according to the New York Herald.

"TRUSTS," AND THE PEOPLE.

Thus, in these times we see the ablest lawyers, the ablest chemists, the greatest inventors, the most ingenious mechanics, the most competent business managers in the pay of great corporations, combinations, and trusts, doing obediently the unscrupulous will of the aggregated and selfish capital which employs them. Thus we see more and more even our public men the servants of trusts and corporations.

Thus we see growing in this country a great, unscrupulous, powerful plutocracy, banded together more and more closely, resisting by the help of its hired agents every attempt to reform abuses and to re-establish liberty, crushing out opposition, more and more greedily grasping power, and bribing the best intellect of the country into its service.—*New York Herald*.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, I have tried to show while the operation of a protective tariff does build up manufacturing into monopolies, does create great wealth, and will admit that all persons relatively, whether laborer or employer, who share in it, "as the fountain from which all blessings flow," live in better houses and possess more comforts and luxuries than those who live outside its charmed circle, yet to sum up I deny,

First. That its tendency is to create new industries, nor does it tend to scatter them abroad in the land.

Second. I deny that it tends to the growth of the number of families, the great bulwark of society, upon which all the moral prosperity and happiness of the nation depend.

Third. I deny that to the average laborer, including very many in protected industries as well as all those outside thereof, it operates to facilitate his securing a separate dwelling for his family, with all the moral and social benefits flowing from such condition of separate life.

Fourth. I deny that it is good for our merchant marine and shipping interest, but on the contrary has destroyed it.

Fifth. I deny that it is good, or tends to good, for the farmer and the agriculturist and those dependent upon him.

Sixth. I deny that the benefits, in the great aggregate, flowing from it are to be compared in extent with the gross wrongs, the burdens, and impositions it places upon labor in the aggregate.

Seventh. To meet its demands it robs the cradle, in taking small children into its employ by the thousands and thousands.

Eighth. It imposes too much work upon the females of the land, drafts too heavily on their numbers, saps their constitution, and unfits many of them to become happy and healthy mothers.

Ninth. It breeds indifference to human rights, and tends to educate men for selfish, avaricious motives, to argue, ask for, vote for, and maintain unequal laws of taxation with special privileges.

Tenth. The great wealth and corporations of the land are continually hiring and taking our strongest and most intellectual men into their employ, who, by their ability, are able to greatly aid in still further maintaining unjust laws, and perpetuating financial manacles upon labor and its interests.

This is the condition of affairs to-day in America, and it is still further aggravated by the condition of the finances, with \$150,000,000 locked up in the Treasury, with an annual surplus of \$100,000,000. A great, national cry has for years gone up in the land, "Reduce our taxes!" Both parties have heard this cry; both parties for twelve years past have stood pledged to come to the rescue of the people. The Republicans would not when they could, and the Democrats could not when the great majority of them would. For all these years the Republican party, as it does to-day, stands in the attitude of obstructing all measures of reduction of taxation.

Let us see what in 1884 each party authoritatively declared in their national platforms:

The Democratic party is pledged to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests.

Republican tariff plank:

We therefore demand the imposition of duties on foreign imports shall be made, not for "revenue only," but that, in raising the requisite revenues for the government, such duties shall be so levied as to afford security to our diversified industries and protection to the rights and wages of the laborer, to the end that active and intelligent labor, as well as capital, may have its just reward, and the laboring man his full share in the national prosperity.

ITS PLEDGE.

The Republican party pledges itself to correct the inequalities of the tariff and to reduce the surplus.

I charge and believe the Republicans were and are now hypocritical in their platform pledge, and will now, as they ever have done, almost unitedly oppose any measure of reduction that applies to custom duties.

I believe a few Democrats in the Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth Congresses, by their defection from the ranks of the revenue reformers and alliance with the Republican party, were able to defeat temporarily just and wise measures of reduction. On this point I cite from a speech delivered in the House by Mr. MCKINLEY as follows:

The Democratic majorities in the Forty-fourth, Forty-fifth, and Forty-sixth Congresses, although committed by party utterances and by platforms, as well as the pledges of leaders, to a reduction of duties to a revenue basis, were unable, with all their party machinery, and the free use of the party lash, to accomplish even a step in that direction.

Every proposition for a change was met with the almost solid opposition of this side of the House, which, with the assistance of a few Representatives on the other side from Pennsylvania and the New England States, was strong enough to insure, and did insure, the substantial defeat of every measure looking to a disturbance of the existing tariff rates.

Yet I believe further that the heart of the masses of the great body of the Democratic party beats in unison with its great head and leader, Grover Cleveland, and under his promptings, aided here and there by a patriotic Republican, will in the next ninety days achieve a glorious victory over the combined cohorts of the world, the flesh, and the devil, with their right bowers of monopolies and trusts thrown in. So mote it be! [Applause.]

And now in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, while I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, let me invite attention to these final thoughts. That they will provoke criticism of a fierce order I believe; and yet I believe them true and worthy of the consideration of thoughtful men.

To quote:

The power of taxation is the one most liable to abuse.

Given a purpose or object for which it may be lawfully used and the exercise of it is unlimited.

It is, therefore, the most pervading of all the powers of government, reaching directly or indirectly to all classes of people; the power to tax is the power to destroy, and a striking instance of this truth is seen in the fact that the existing tax of 10 per cent. imposed by the United States on the circulation of all other banks than the national banks drove out of existence every State bank of circulation within a year or two after its passage.

It can as readily be employed against one class of individuals and in favor of another, so as to ruin the one class and give unlimited wealth and prosperity to the other. To lay with one hand the power of the Government on the property of the citizen, and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes, is none the less robbery because it is done under the form of law and is called taxation. This is not legislation. It is a decree under legislative forms.

So said Judge Miller, speaking for the Supreme Court of the United States in *Loan Association vs. Topeka* (20 Wallace, 663), and so today say the great Democratic masses of the country. Your protective-tariff law as it now exists is here well described. It is robbery, not taxation. It is a legislative decree confiscating in extorted tributes the property of toiling millions for the benefit of protected manufacturers and monopolists, who now have special privileges to accumulate wealth which are not granted to the many. And this is done by forms of law. These protected manufacturers and monopolists are the bulls of the law and the land, engaged in upholding the laws that grant these favors. They are first cousins, if not twin brothers, in theory with the socialist and anarchist of the land. These last are the bears of the laws and the land, who do not desire the power of the laws destroyed, but wish them exercised in a different way and manner and for different purposes.

To illustrate: Giant fortunes, springing up like mushrooms the land over, must be at the expense of the multitude, with a corresponding deprivation and misery among the masses going on to counterpoise the accumulated wealth of the few. This breeds a sense of wrong; a belief widespread that the laws are unequal and imposed for the benefit of the few. The laws thus tending to create giant fortunes are brought into contempt and breed socialism and anarchism. The law of taxation must be perpetuated. There is no escape from it. It is like fire—a great benefactor or a great tyrant and monster, as it is properly harnessed and controlled on the one hand, or, on the other hand, set loose to become a destroying demon.

Take the 60,000,000 of people in this land, arrange them like this: Place them all in one line, put at one end all the monopolists and protective-tariff men who believe in the doctrine of enforced tributes to build up their fortunes; in the center all those who believe in taxation for revenue only, and at the other end put all the socialists and anarchists who believe in the power of the law, the same law, as the monopolists and protective-tariff men, but demand a reverse use of it, who declare if the law can be perverted and used to build up fortunes it can also be legally used to tear down and destroy fortunes and divide them up among the multitude, and for the same reasons given by the monopolist and protective-tariff man for his use of the law, to wit, That it is for the good of society, for the benefit of the multitude.

One class appeals to the law power to build up fortunes and act as bulls in maintaining the law as it is; the other class appeals to the law power to tear down and destroy wealth, and act as bears in the use of this power to destroy and divide fortunes and wealth. Do they not as believers in a perverted taxing power become fairly amenable to the charge of being kindred under the law? In the use of the law of taxation there is no safety outside of its exercise for public purposes of revenue only. All exercise beyond that limit is surely dangerous.

Twenty years ago neither socialism nor anarchism was known in this country. Now their adherents and believers are in numbers unknown; but still as discontent spreads, and unequal laws and taxation prevail and are maintained, their numbers increase, and the time may come (I sincerely hope not) when the late uprising in the streets of Chicago by the anarchists shall be as child's play to greater riots and uprisings on the part of thousands, determined at all hazard to get rid of unequal laws, unjust taxation, and special tributes.

Then the monopolists, quaking in terror in their palatial homes, will have no protection against the vengeance of the mob, except in the superior numbers of the great conservative classes, who by the millions stand on the line indicated by me between these two kindred yet widely separated theories and people, and demand the return, as they now do, of the country to equal laws for all, even-handed justice for all even if the heavens fall, with special privileges for none, and who by their mighty numbers and conservative determination will and shall prevail.

Then again shall come a period in the land when all men before the law shall be equal, all men shall again be brethren and shall lie down together, and a little one shall lead them. [Applause.]

ADDENDA.

I am permitted by the kindness of Hon. WILLIAM M. SPRINGER to use this table, prepared by him for an article in the *North American Review* in June, 1883, which shows relatively the amount of taxes and of tribute for year 1882, under the tariff law, wherein is shown that on twelve classes of enumerated articles the Government, while raising by import duties \$194,464,758, afford protection to home manufacturers on same twelve classes of articles, to enable them to exact on their products from their home customers a tribute of \$556,9 8,637, or nearly three times as much as the Government tax:

Statement showing the amount of incidental taxes annually imposed on the people of the United States in the increased cost of home products by reason of discriminating duties on imported articles of like character, together with the value of such home products, the amount of wages paid and number of hands employed, and the imports and duties received thereon for the year 1882.

Articles affected by the tariff.	Merchandise imported during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1882.			Value of home products, census year 1880.	Average number of hands employed. Boys under 16 and girls under 15 counted as one-half a hand.	Total amount in wages during the year.	Estimated rate of increase ad valorem.	Incidental taxes—being increased cost of home products by reason of the tariff.
	Values.	Duty received.	Average ad valorem rate.					
Chemical products.....	\$21,517,169	\$6,718,561	Per cent. 31.32	\$117,377,324	28,895	\$11,840,704	Per cent. 20	\$23,475,464
Earthenware and glassware.....	13,822,043	6,693,257	48.42	31,632,309	30,674	13,130,403	45	14,234,539
Metals—iron and steel and all metal manufactures.....	74,427,988	30,358,936	40.79	604,553,460	290,000	122,648,191	20	120,910,692
Wood and wooden wares.....	8,654,327	1,589,851	18.37	311,928,884	185,426	47,817,199	15	46,789,332
Sugar and molasses.....	94,540,269	49,210,573	52.05	(See note.)			40	4,846,714
Tobacco.....	8,216,132	6,000,961	73.03	118,665,366	81,809	25,041,257	25	29,665,341
Cotton and cotton goods.....	34,868,044	13,482,167	38.67	210,950,383	170,363	45,614,419	20	42,190,076
Hemp, jute, and flax goods.....	33,578,076	9,844,652	29.32	5,518,866	4,329	1,238,149	20	1,103,773
Wool and woolsens.....	47,679,502	29,254,234	61.36	267,182,914	145,341	47,351,628	40	106,873,165
Silk and silk goods.....	38,535,475	22,632,490	58.73	41,033,045	28,554	9,146,705	50	20,516,522
Books, paper, etc.....	4,923,620	1,406,787	28.57	65,960,405	25,274	9,895,995	20	13,192,081
Sundries.....	62,410,690	17,272,269	27.68	665,699,693	337,216	129,881,399	20	133,139,938
Total.....	433,173,335	194,464,758		2,440,502,649	1,327,881	463,606,049		556,938,637

NOTE.—Planters' product for 1880 was: Sugar, 196,759,200 pounds; molasses, 16,573,273 gallons. Number and wages of laborers not stated.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the greatest infirmity of the American Congress, and the greatest calamity of the American people, is the constant agitation and discussion of questions that ought to have been buried out of sight and forgotten fifty years ago. Free trade is an exotic that never should have been permitted to take root on

American soil. It was conceived in treason and born in treachery to human rights and human liberty. It made its first appearance as a political question amid the throes of nullification and secession in 1831, and became the sheet-anchor of American slavery from that time forward. John C. Calhoun and his followers, who had been the advo-

cates of protection before this, at once became the champions of free trade. The first blows which were struck by New England against American slavery were so diverted that they fell with increased force upon American protection. New England was not only the birth-place of abolitionism but she was the center and home of all our manufacturing industries. The South resolved to destroy protection in order to destroy New England and protect slavery.

If New England had never aimed her shot and shell at the institutions of slavery, the South never would have built her fortifications of State rights, secession, and free trade. And in order to perpetuate slavery and make it profitable to the slave-owners, it was thought necessary for the South to buy cheap clothing in Europe for themselves and their slaves, and cheap food in the North, where no industry was to have an existence except that of agriculture. The North was to furnish the South food and the South was to furnish Europe cotton, and under this arrangement the South was not only to be the masters of the slave, but they were to be our masters as well. This is simply the way in which free trade came into American politics. It had its origin in Southern hatred for New England abolitionism, and ought to have ceased when the barbarism of slavery ceased. Hence free trade is nothing more or less than a fragment of the rebellion, and is as dangerous to the business of the country in 1888 as secession was in 1861; and if successful it will be as hateful in the statutes of the country as it was in the Confederate constitution which the rebellion sought to vindicate. Free trade has no more right to supplant our protective system than the Confederate constitution has to supplant the Constitution of the United States.

The protection of American industries is not a mere policy, a mere business question; it is a question of patriotism, a question of loyalty to the American flag, to the American laborer, and to the American home. It is a choice between self-defense and self-development on the one hand, and self-annihilation and self-destruction on the other. Upon its success or defeat will depend whether our people shall be the skilled laborers, artisans, and mechanics of the world, or whether they shall be "hewers of wood and drawers of water." The protection of American labor, the building up of American industries, the protection of the American workshop, and the elevation of the American home is a national achievement, worthy the support of every American patriot. The protective system stands as a wall of fire between American laborers and the degraded, half-paid laborers of Europe.

THE SURPLUS HOBBY.

There has been in the United States Treasury, time and again since the war, as much surplus as there is now, and sometimes more, and yet this is the first time that any great ado has ever been made about it. Republican administrations simply paid it out, reduced the national debt and stopped the interest. President Cleveland could have done the same. He did pay out part of it, and refused to pay more on account of having some doubt about the validity of the law authorizing such payments. This law was passed as an amendment to an appropriation bill, and while this fact raised some doubts in his mind as to the propriety of such legislation, the law which increased his salary from \$25,000 to \$50,000 a year was passed in the same way, and I have never heard that he had any doubts about his right to draw the increase.

Mr. Chairman, this talk about the surplus deserves the contempt of all decent men. It is the merest sham, the hollowest pretext, the most contemptible subterfuge. This money was accumulated and held in the Treasury for a purpose. It is the result of a Democratic conspiracy to destroy our protective system. To this end the river and harbor bill of the last Congress was defeated, the dependent pension bill and a hundred other pension bills were vetoed. The appropriation bills of the last Congress were made \$10,000,000 less than the actual expenses of the Government, the Blair educational bill, which had passed the Senate almost unanimously and which would have passed the House by a two-thirds vote, was throttled, in order to pile up money in the Treasury. And the men who did this point to the surplus as a peril to the country, and possibly meet in midnight conclaves and laugh with ghoulish glee at the smoke and flame which their incendiary fires have created.

We all agree, Mr. Chairman, that the money ought not to be locked up in the Treasury; that it ought not to be withdrawn from the channels of trade; but we insist that there is no necessity for it being in the vaults of the Treasury; that it ought to have been applied to the payment of the national debt, and to the purposes of the General Government. Let us examine the extent of this surplus. The customs tax or tariff receipts last year amounted to \$217,000,000, the internal revenue amounted to \$118,000,000, and all other incomes to \$35,000,000, aggregating \$370,000,000. The Secretary of the Treasury estimates that the necessary expenses of the Government for the next year will amount to \$326,000,000 (using round numbers), leaving an actual annual surplus of \$44,000,000.

There is now in the Treasury a surplus of about \$60,000,000, and hence a year from now the surplus will amount to about \$100,000,000, unless the Treasury estimate is cut down by reduced appropriations. This is making no provision for the river and harbor bill which passed

this House yesterday, which carries about \$20,000,000; no provision for the dependent pension bill, for the Blair educational bill, nor for any other like appropriations. And yet President Cleveland, in order to alarm the country and foist upon the people his free-trade heresy, discarded the precedents of a century, ignored the obligations of the Constitution, and substituted a free-trade bulletin for a Presidential message. And the Ways and Means Committee, in order to carry out the decree of their master, did what no committee of Congress ever did before, excluded the Republican members of their own committee, the members of the House, the members of the Senate, the farmers, mechanics, manufacturers, miners, laborers, and business men, hundreds of whom came here to be heard, and some of them came thousands of miles, from any participation in the preparation of this bill. The Republican members, made a part of the committee by the Constitution and laws of the country, were not permitted the privilege of crossing a "t" or dotting an "i" in this remarkable bill, nor did the chairman have the courtesy to make to them a polite bow and say, "By your leave, gentlemen." This bill was framed by Southern men to subvert Southern interests, as I shall hereafter show.

NO SURPLUS IN FACT.

Mr. Chairman, I do not understand what the Ways and Means Committee mean when they propose to reduce the surplus \$75,000,000 or \$100,000,000.

The outstanding interest-bearing debt is \$1,200,000,000. The present so-called surplus is only 5 per cent. of this sum, and if every dollar of it is held for this purpose it will not be sufficient to pay the 4½ per cent. bonds when they become due; and yet the country is thrown into a state of alarm and the destruction of the industries of the country is threatened because of this pretended surplus in the Treasury. We need every dollar that is now in the Treasury and all that we can collect from existing laws, if we make proper use of it.

Our fortifications are falling into decay, our seaport cities are unprotected, our merchant marine should be rebuilt, the dark pall of illiteracy that now hangs over the Republic should be removed, the 28,000 Indian children that are now hiding in the mountains and caves of the West need compulsory industrial education, and last, but not least, there is in our midst a great army of men who laid the idol of their youth, the sunshine of their home, the joy of their hearts upon the altar of their country for whom this Government has made no provision whatever. And there are thousands of widows, who waited and watched and wept while their husbands wrecked their fortunes, their business prospects, and their health in following their country's flag wherever a battle was to be fought or a victory to be won, whose pension claims are daily rejected by the Government.

Dependent fathers and mothers whose brave sons sleep where no flowers are ever strewn, are daily falling into graves where no Government aid can ever reach them. That tall shaft that casts its shadow across this National Capital ought to remind us that George Washington left a still more enduring monument when he declared that every soldier who risked his life, the ruin of his fortune, and the happiness of his home in saving the life of his country, was entitled to ample provision for himself and his family through all the declining years of his life. This was Washington's kind of patriotism, and I pray that the day is not far distant when we shall have a man in the White House whose patriotism and sympathy for the soldiers of the country will be akin to that which moved the great heart of Washington.

The Democratic party is not in harmony in regard to the disposition of the surplus. In this House we are considering a bill that proposes to reduce the surplus; but in Indiana the late Democratic State convention, which nominated the chairman of the Invalid Pension Committee as its candidate for governor, has declared not only in favor of liberal legislation on the pension question, but in favor of a service-pension law. The platform reads as follows:

The Democratic party is the faithful friend of the soldiers, their widows and orphans, and in appreciation of the heroic and unselfish services of the Union soldiers and sailors, we declare in favor of liberal legislation in their behalf, including an enactment by Congress of a just and equitable service-pension law as a recognition of patriotism and a reward for honorable services rendered the Government.

I would like to inquire whether the other side of this House is in favor of a service pension, and if so whether all the surplus in the Treasury will not be needed for this purpose, and for the further purpose of equalizing bounties, paying arrears, paying prisoners of war, for paying the soldiers the difference between greenbacks and gold, and for such other liberal legislation as is contemplated in this Indiana Democratic platform? I would like to know how many on the other side of this House propose to stand by this newly fledged Democratic idea? I will answer. This platform is only meant to catch votes. Gabriel will blow his horn before the Democratic party will ever favor such legislation. It is the same scheme that was perpetrated in Ohio in 1883, when the Democratic party promised in its platform to restore the duty on wool. This pledge was a success in Ohio. The Democratic party carried the State, elected the governor, the Legislature, and a United States Senator, but the duty on wool was never restored. I think the soldiers of Indiana will scarcely be caught in so flimsy a net as a Democratic resolution.

This is not the first time, Mr. Chairman, that President Cleveland

waked the echoes of the nation's danger by sounding an alarm. On the 24th day of February, 1885, eight days before his inauguration, he wrote a letter, addressed to a member of the House of Representatives, calling upon Congress to repeal the silver-coinage law, which required \$2,000,000 of silver to be coined each month. He announced the startling fact that gold and silver were about to part company; that the time of this separation was perilously near; that gold was about to be displaced by the excessive coinage of silver.

He depicted financial ruin, the disappearance of gold as a circulating medium, and all the horrors of an unprecedented contraction, which he said would follow the use of the so-called silver dollar in case the coinage of silver was not immediately stopped. The law was not repealed, gold did not disappear, but has grown more plentiful from that time to this, and the fearful contraction he foresaw never came. His Democratic brethren paid no attention to that alarm, and some of them will pay no attention to this.

THE BALANCE OF TRADE.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the President a question. I would like to ask him this question: If the accumulation and retention of \$60,000,000 in the United States Treasury is a menace to trade and commerce, and liable at any moment to bring upon the country financial ruin, what effect would an annual drain of \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000 have upon the country if the balance of trade were that much against us, as it most certainly will be if this bill should become a law? Or, in other words, is a surplus of this amount locked up in the United States Treasury any more completely withdrawn from the pockets of the people than it would be locked up in the treasuries of Europe? Not a particle. If it was a good thing for the President to sound the alarm of the nation's danger when this surplus was sleeping quietly in the vaults of the Treasury, how much more important is it just now for him to arouse the nation and call the attention of the country to the fact that a bill is now under consideration in the American Congress that threatens to so increase our imports that \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000 a year will be permanently withdrawn from the United States. And should this bill pass, this annual drain of \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000 will go on from year to year until the nation is stranded, as it was before the war, when all of the gold that we had dug from the mines of California was carried across the seas to pay for foreign goods, and we were left without money and without credit.

Then there is another fact to be considered. The excess of our imports over our exports, which must necessarily be paid in gold, will destroy the equilibrium between gold and silver, enhance the value of gold, withdraw it from circulation, and cause a contraction of the currency of the country, which can only result in panic and distress. Here is a danger a hundred-fold more imminent and more to be dreaded than the existence of a surplus twice as large as the one now complained of. To send money out of the country to buy anything we can produce at home just as well as it can be produced abroad is a national calamity. It is just so much money thrown away. Money is more than wealth or property. It is the circulating medium of the country. It is the measure of values and means of exchange. Before we had a high protective tariff we were constantly buying more than we sold, and the consequence was that other countries were enriched at our expense.

Since we have had a high protective tariff the order has been reversed; we have sold more than we bought, and the consequence is that gold and silver have flowed into our country, and we now have more gold and silver than any other country in the world. And this money that we absorb from other countries increases our capital, and is invested and reinvested, first in one enterprise and then in another, and the wealth and prosperity of the country will increase as long as this influx of money continues.

If the balance of trade should be against us, as it would be under this bill, long enough to reduce our stock of gold in the United States \$200,000,000, the value of the property in the United States would shrink at least 25 to 50 per cent. This would be an inevitable result.

No one will dispute that the volume of our money is the measure of our values; and when a great shrinkage comes, as came in 1857 from this same cause, and in 1873, when we were passing from inflation to resumption, the destruction of values and the bankruptcy of individuals must follow. Gentlemen on the other side talk a great deal about mortgages, as though they indicated the near approach of poverty and bankruptcy. This is not true. In times of prosperity they are the best security in the country, and these loans are alike beneficial to the mortgagor and the mortgagee. But when our tariff duties are reduced, and our imports exceed our exports, and our money goes abroad for foreign goods, and our volume of money becomes too small to do the business of the country, then it is that a mortgage ruins a mortgagor, because the mortgaged property is so reduced in value by the inevitable shrinkage that always follows this condition of trade that it will only sell at one-half its former value. A farm worth \$10,000 when our exports exceed our imports may only sell for \$5,000 when the current of trade is turned against us. This is what tariff tinkering does for poor men and for men who are in debt. How many thousands of men have passed through this same experience? Hence it is that we pay too much for the whistle we buy abroad, no matter how low the price.

If any one has any doubt about the reduction of tariff duties increasing our imports, and carrying just this much more money out of the country, let him look at the past. Since the war we have placed on the free-list imports which had paid in duties to the Government \$23,000,000 annually, and we reduced the duties on other articles \$55,000,000, and to-day the revenue from duties on imports is greater than at the close of the war, for the simple reason that a reduction of duties increases imports, and consequently increases the revenue. This is a result that can not be avoided, and it is the rock upon which every free-trade ship has been wrecked. And this is just as true of a family as it is of a nation. If a family buys more than it sells it will come to bankruptcy as certainly as the sun shines, and it is only a matter of time when this will occur—and after all a nation is only a great big family. If there is a sincere desire to reduce the revenue there are but two ways to do it; one way is to increase the free-list and the other is to increase the tariff. I favor the latter method.

CONFISCATION MEASURE.

Mr. Chairman, the Mills bill ought to be styled a confiscation act. That is what it will accomplish. Manufacturing establishments that cost hundreds of millions of dollars will be worthless if this bill becomes a law. Establishments that gave employment to labor and added greatly to the wealth and prosperity of the country will no longer have any value. This is the reciprocity which the South returns for the magnanimity of the North at the close of the war. Confiscation then was regarded as barbarous and cruel; now it is statesmanship and wisdom. That confiscation applied to the South; this applies to the North. The men who led the armies of the rebellion are now in the councils of the nation, and, instead of appreciating the magnanimity that restored to them their property and their citizenship, they now conspire to confiscate the private property of the manufacturers of the country. The South hated New England because it gave birth to abolitionism. Does it hate the manufacturers of the North because they made the suppression of the rebellion possible?

But it will be discovered that the confiscation of property will not be confined to the North alone. I have a copy of a letter addressed to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee from the Crystal Plate Glass Works at St. Louis, Mo. The stockholders of this company declare that they invested their money in this business upon the faith they had that the Government would not reduce the existing tariff on plate-glass. Under this belief they have invested \$1,500,000 of capital, and at their works 30 miles below St. Louis, Crystal City has grown up, and is the home of their operatives. The stockholders, who are residents of Missouri, Ohio, Michigan, New York, and Connecticut, declare that if the reduction of the duty proposed in this bill is made they will be compelled to close their factory.

Although there are but four establishments in the United States manufacturing plate-glass, the price has been reduced one-half, and on some kinds fully two-thirds; and instead of a duty of \$1 per square foot increasing the price this much, as the President suggests, it has resulted in reducing the price of plate-glass fully \$1 per foot, and this has been the result in almost every instance where an American industry has been established.

These plate-glass factories which this bill is intended to destroy disburse in this country annually millions of dollars for labor and materials, every dollar of which remains in this country and goes to make a market alike for the farmer and the manufacturers, and prevents the importation of glass from abroad, which would carry many millions of dollars out of the country. What is this bill, then, but a measure of confiscation? The manufacturers of this country invested their money in these great enterprises, relying upon the integrity and good faith of the Government. Shall they be betrayed? Shall their property be destroyed?

ELEVATION OF THE MASSES.

Some gentlemen seem to think that the benefits of a protective tariff will cease when all countries adopt the same system. Great Britain is now almost the only free-trade country in the world, and yet she raises by a revenue tariff about \$100,000,000 a year. Instead of this being a reason why we should abandon our protective system, it is a reason why we should preserve it. A high protective tariff accompanied with wise and just laws is a method by which a government can elevate its citizens to a higher plane of civilization. The United States is doing this now, but we can not lift the whole world up. We make laws for our own country, but we can not make laws for other countries. Charity begins at home, and our first duty is to protect American labor increase its compensation as much as possible, protect the American market, patronize American manufactures, and keep at home American money.

Not only this, but a protective tariff is an element of national strength. The thrones and crowns of Europe are now facing the problem of taxation and debt as they never did before. The United States is the only government in the world that is reducing its national debt and its aggregate taxation. In ten years we reduced our aggregate taxation about 10 per cent. In the same period Europe increased her taxation over 25 per cent. In the same time France, Germany, Great Britain, and Russia increased their taxation an average of nearly 40 per cent.

In addition to increasing taxation, every country in Europe has been increasing its national debt, while under our protective system we are reducing our aggregate taxation, paying off our national debt, and have nothing to complain of but a surplus. But instead of guarding the welfare of the American Republic and watching the interests of the American people, we find this House engaged in an attempt to unfurl the British flag and open the American market to British free trade, and only about an hour ago it was charged on the floor of this House that Speaker CARLISLE is a member of the Cobden Club, and no Democrat dared deny it.

TIN-PLATES AND IRON ROOFING.

Mr. Chairman, if a duty of 2½ cents per pound were placed upon tin-plates, as was intended to be done by Congress a few years ago, sixty-six tin-plate works would be built in the United States and fifty thousand workmen would be at once employed in the manufacture of tin-plates in our own country. At present every tin pan, every tin bucket, and every tin kettle now used in the United States is made from tin-plates manufactured in Great Britain. If we were to have a war with England to settle the fishery dispute, or some other vexed question, we would have to go without tin buckets and tin pans until we could build our own works and manufacture our own tin-plates. Is it not a little humiliating that we must depend upon England for every sheet of tin-plate used in this country?

Since the first effort was made to protect this industry by adequate protection we have paid Great Britain \$225,000,000 for tin-plates alone, which gave \$180,000,000 of wages to English workmen. And we are to-day supporting in Great Britain, beneath the folds of the British flag, sixty-six tin-plate works and fifty thousand English workmen who devote their whole time in making tin-plates for American consumption. We import and consume the entire product of these sixty-six mills, which employ fifty thousand workmen. We purchase and import annually 70 per cent. of all the tin-plates made in England and Wales. Is this a wise policy? Is it right to send \$20,000,000 annually to England for tin-plates which we can make in this country as well as they can be made any place in the world, provided the American manufacturer is protected against the cheaper labor of Europe?

The ad valorem duty on pig-iron is 43 per cent., on scrap-iron is 53 per cent., on galvanized iron 60 per cent., and on common sheet-iron 75 per cent., while the duty on tin-plates, the highest grade of any of these articles, is only 22 per cent.; and now the Mills tariff bill proposes to place tin-plates on the free-list and disappoint the last hope of saving this great industry to American workmen.

From 1873 to 1878 we erected in Ohio and Pennsylvania, at great cost, several tin-plate works and made as good tin-plate as ever came from any country; but these mills were crushed by the English manufacturers, who reduced the price of tin-plates from \$14 to \$5 per box, and the fires had scarcely gone out of the crippled tin-plate works in Ohio and Pennsylvania until the English importer put up the price of tin-plates to his own liking. This, Mr. Chairman, is free trade in tin-plates. It admits the product of cheap European labor into our markets at a low price until it destroys competition, and then the foreigner has a monopoly of the markets and gets his own price, and the money which rightfully belongs to the American manufacturer and to the American laborer goes to the European aristocrats who live on the blood of the hungry whose toil they steal and the tears of the down-trodden whose homes they blight.

The destruction of this great industry which would give employment to fifty thousand of our own people and support to nearly half a million more is not all that is embraced in this proposition to place tin-plates upon the free-list. It is intended by this reduction of duty on tin-plates to destroy the manufacture of sheet-iron and sheet-steel. There is couched in the Mills bill a secret stab at the manufacturers of sheet-iron and sheet-steel which does not appear on the surface. These products are apparently protected, while tin-plates, which are sheet-iron and sheet-steel coated with a thin film of tin, are placed on the free-list. There are now about 150,000 tons of sheet-iron made in the United States, while there are annually imported 280,000 tons of sheet-iron in the shape of tin-plates and terne-plates, which are sheet-iron covered with tin or a mixture of tin and lead. About one-third of the sheet-iron made in the United States is used for roofing and siding purposes, for which tin-plates can be substituted. What good will it do the manufacturer of sheet-iron or sheet-steel to have the highest protection on these products when tin-plates and terne-plates, which are composed of from 95 to 98 per cent. iron or steel and from 2 to 5 per cent. tin and lead, come in free? It seems to be the policy of this bill to slay not only the first-born of every American industry, but to take the life of the inmates of homes where the lintels and door-posts have been marked with the insignia of protection.

In Russia sheet-iron is used almost exclusively for roofing. The government buildings are all covered with iron roofing, and they are so made and so put on that they constitute the best roof in use, in the opinion of the Russian people and the Russian Government. The use of sheet-iron for roofing in this country is yet in its infancy, and yet there are many millions of dollars invested in it, and it already consumes and creates a demand for about one-third of the sheet-iron made in the sheet-iron mills of the country, an amount equal to the entire production of fifteen sheet-iron mills; and as timber and slate shall be-

come more and more expensive this industry will demand a still greater product. But if tin-plates, which are 95 per cent. sheet-iron, are to come in free the effect will be not only to diminish the product of sheet-iron mills fully one-third, but it will destroy the sheet-iron and sheet-steel roofing business entirely.

This, Mr. Chairman, is what free tin-plates mean to the men engaged in iron and steel roofing, to the men engaged in the manufacture of sheet-iron and sheet-steel, and to the fifty thousand men who desire to make tin-plates on American soil and under the American flag. And the only reason why these industries are at the peril of foreign competition is that the foreign tin-plate workers are only paid about one-half the prices paid by the makers of tin-plates in this country. Is the aid of this great Government to be invoked to destroy these industries, or shall they have some sort of adequate protection?

FARMERS AND FARMING.

There is one branch of the tariff that I understand so thoroughly that it is not a matter of argument, but a matter of personal knowledge. I refer to the effect of a protective tariff upon a farming community. I was born on a farm in the Congressional district which I have the honor to represent, and I know by experience what farm life is and what the needs of the farmer are, and having lived all my life in this district, I have seen the difference between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff in its effect upon the farmers of my district. I have seen the hardships, the privations, the rigid economies, the poverty, the bankruptcy, and the distress which existed under a Democratic revenue tariff, and I have seen the marvelous growth and prosperity which was developed by our system of protection.

Under the revenue tariffs of the Democratic party the farmers sold their wheat at 37½ cents a bushel, their corn at 15 or 20 cents, their horses at \$50 or \$60 per head, their cows at \$10 or \$12, and their eggs at 4 cents a dozen. Turnips, potatoes, apples, peaches, and pears rotted in the field for want of a market, and I have seen the time when there was absolutely no market for anything. Laboring men worked for 37½ cents per day, except in harvest, when they got 50 cents, and there was no eight-hour law then; a day's work was measured by the sun. There was only one skilled mechanic recognized in that day, and he was the cradler who cradled the wheat and oats and rye, and he got a dollar per day; but the man who cut with the scythe or sickle or thrashed with the flail only got 50 cents and worked from sun to sun. The great struggle with the farmer at that time was to get money enough to pay his taxes. If he could do this he was content to get along the best he could in supplying his other wants. His store bill, if he had any, was paid in grain, or pork, or beef, or some other product of the farm, and the laborer was paid with an order to the store. And while everything that he sold was cheap everything he bought was dear. Cotton cloth, calico, salt, nails, iron, steel, edged tools, etc., were a great deal higher than now.

The farms were as good as any I have ever seen in any State of this Union, and yet the farmers at that time raised their own wool, spun their own yarn, wove their own cloth, and made their own clothing. More boys went barefooted than wore shoes, more men went without overcoats in mid-winter than went with them, more people walked to church than rode in carriages; there were then more flannel dresses than silk, more sun-bonnets than velvet, more bare floors than carpeted, more walls without paper and pictures than with them, and a hundred-fold more hard work than leisure. Under the protective system, which this bill seeks to destroy, our farming community has grown and prospered. The homes of the farmers and the homes of the laborers are full of comforts and luxuries. Farms have increased in value, good markets and good prices have come to the farmer's door, and he now gets more for his small fruits and vegetables than he then got for all the products of the farm and field.

The district I now represent earns more, buys more, and consumes more than half of the State of Ohio did under a revenue tariff, and I believe has more money. The day laborers have more money in their pockets, see more, handle more, and use more than the wealthiest farmers did then. This is what protection does for the farmer, and the half is not told. And yet these free-traders who learn their wisdom from the Cobden Club, or from the British free-trade press that so warmly greeted the President's message, tell us that protection is robbing the farmer. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee may talk in that way to the beardless stripling who knows no better, but he need not repeat that stale story to the gray-headed farmers of my district, whether they be Democrats or Republicans.

WOOL AND WOOLENS.

In the Forty-eighth Congress I made a speech on the tariff in which I said so much about wool, and so little about anything else, that my friends called my speech a "wool speech." At that time I was almost the only one that discussed the wool question at any length, but in this Congress no speech is considered complete without an elaborate discussion of this question. My constituents are largely engaged in wool-growing and are deeply interested in the protection of this industry. I have presented to this House memorials and resolutions from wool-growing associations, hundreds of petitions, signed by thousands of wool-growers and farmers, asking for the restoration of the duty of 1867, and for the modifications of the tariff laws agreed upon here in Washington,

in January last, by the wool-growers and the woolen manufacturers; and I have been careful to have the body of these petitions and memorials printed in the RECORD, and I will say in addition, that these petitions and memorials represent the universal demand of the wool-growers and farmers of my district without reference to party or politics.

Mr. Chairman, I do not hesitate to say that the wool-growers and many of the wool manufacturers would feel very little interest in this bill if they thought its defeat would not be followed by certain other legislation which they have been heretofore demanding. These industries are already prostrate, and are almost beyond the reach of further injury. There is not a single woolen mill in the country that uses Ohio wool, or any good American wool of any kind, that has made a dollar this last year, unless it be some mill that is making some novelty or specialty, and most of these mills have lost money. Since the reduction of the duty in 1883 the number of sheep in this country has been reduced from 51,000,000 to 44,000,000; the annual wool product from 320,000,000 pounds to 260,000,000, and this reduction has extended to every State in the Union.

In 1882, the year before the duty was reduced, the amount of wool imported was 64,000,000 pounds; last year it amounted to 114,000,000 pounds.

The importations of woolen yarns during the year ending June 30, 1883, before the reduction took effect, amounted in value to \$433,000; in 1886 they amounted to \$2,283,000. Importations of worsted goods in 1883 amounted to \$963,000; in 1886 to \$5,295,000. The duties on these two items alone from 1883 to 1886 increased the surplus \$6,568,000. The United States in 1860 only consumed 86,000,000 pounds of wool; in 1886 it consumed 400,000,000 pounds, a development largely attributable to the growth of the American wool industry, an industry which is as much an American industry as any other on the continent, and yet to-day it lies mangled and bleeding for want of necessary legislation. Mr. Washington Belt, in his little pamphlet on wool, states that the loss which wool-growers would incur if wool were placed on the free-list would be as follows:

Shrinkage in the value of—	
Lands.....	\$280,000,000
Labor.....	25,000,000
Flocks.....	25,000,000
Wools.....	25,000,000

Total loss to the wool industry..... 355,000,000

And all this loss is to be inflicted upon the wool-growers to keep \$6,000,000 out of the Treasury and to give manufacturers their raw material \$25,000,000 cheaper; and it is now a question whether the wool-growers shall lose \$355,000,000 or whether the manufacturers shall annually pay \$25,000,000 more for their wool. Suppose manufacturers could save this sum by buying cheaper wool, who would be benefited? The manufacturers themselves declare against such a proposition. The signatures of 360 of the leading New England and Eastern manufacturers lie before me protesting against free raw materials. And I propose to quote from two of the most reliable New England manufacturers in proof of the fact that the woolen manufacturers are not asking for free raw material, but are protesting against it.

I will read an extract from some remarks made by Mr. Joseph P. Truitt, one of the best informed and one of the most conscientious manufacturers in New England:

I am opposed to that provision of the Mills tariff bill which admits wool free of duty, for the reason that free wool would be of no lasting benefit to the American manufacturer. It is stated as one of the principal reasons why this policy should be adopted that the manufacturer would obtain his wool so much cheaper.

If it is true that the abolition of wool duties would result in the cheapening of that article to the extent of the duty now paid, there is abundant reason for opposing it, for every pound of wool and every yard of goods now in the hands of dealers, merchants, and manufacturers would decline in value to a corresponding extent; and, as every sheep in the land must share in the depreciation, the immediate loss would be so great as to be almost incalculable. Every mill in the country would be compelled to stop: thousands of operatives now happily employed would be thrown upon the streets, and millions of yards of goods would be placed in the auction rooms for sale at prices that could only entail a fearful loss to the manufacturers; and while in this weakened condition the tide of foreign importation would come rushing in like some vast tidal wave, stifling and burying out of sight the industries of America, and years might elapse before they again recovered from the evil effects of this ill-advised measure.

Free raw material is the pioneer of free goods, for we can not expect that the wool-grower will consent to a policy of protection which embraces everything he buys and excludes every article which he produces and wants to sell.

The success of woolen manufacturing in this country is founded upon sheep husbandry at home, and the wool-grower is just as much entitled to protection upon the wool in which he invests his capital and which he exerts his skill to produce as the manufacturer who asks for a tariff in order that he may put it into goods; and I conceive that it is not only fair and honest, but that the very success of our business depends upon the support we give to the wool-grower. To admit wool free of duty means nothing more or less than the destruction of sheep-raising for wool in America.

We have seen the clip of this country grow under a protective tariff from 160,000,000 pounds in 1866 to about 320,000,000 in 1883, and we have also seen it decline under a badly constructed tariff to 265,000,000 at the present time. If it decreased at such a rapid rate when only a slight reduction was made, at what a frightful speed will it disappear when all protection is removed. Already the sheep are being killed off: wools costing 30 cents to raise are being sold at from 22 to 26 cents; the wool-grower is alarmed, and shows that he feels his loss by retiring from the business.

Without going into figures to show how certainly the clip is shrinking I will state that I am opposed to free wool for the reason, above all others, that it would inevitably destroy wool-growing in America, thus leaving us entirely dependent upon foreign markets for our supply. This would be no benefit to us, for instead of obtaining our wool cheaper than we do now we would have

to pay more. At present we have our home clip to fall back on when we can not buy wool abroad, but then we would have but one market in which to buy and we would be compelled to compete with European buyers, who have many advantages over us. At present we only have to buy about 20,000,000 to 30,000,000 pounds of clothing and combing wool abroad, and then we would have to buy over 300,000,000 pounds, provided our mills were able to run at all. This does not include carpet wools.

If the price of wool in London is now 14 pence, it would unquestionably advance upon the appearance of American buyers for 300,000,000 pounds of wool. How much that advance would be no one can say, but it is generally believed it would be so great as to deprive us of all advantage that free wool might be supposed to bestow.

The only sheep that our farmers would probably be obliged to keep would be those known as mutton sheep, which grow medium and low-grade wools. Merino sheep would disappear entirely, so that all fine wools for delaines, fine worsted coatings, and knit-goods would have to be brought from abroad. So long as plenty of wool grows in Australia and South America this would be all right, but when some calamity happened reducing the clip, and wool consequently advanced, we would long for the wool clip of America which was so ruthlessly destroyed by this bill which is before us.

I believe, then, that all the promises of relief based upon free wool in this bill are a fraud and unreliable. It is not true that we would obtain our wool cheaper. It is true that we would lose our home wools. It would not give the citizen a suit of clothes one dollar cheaper, and it would reduce his wages more than by any means he could hope to gain. It would result in free-manufactured goods, for the farmer would never rest, if you made wool free, until he made goods free. I believe in the old motto, "United we stand, divided we fall." The wool-grower and manufacturer together can stand against all the assaults of politicians, and I am therefore in favor of protection from the lamb in the field to the clothes on our backs; and I desire now to enter my emphatic disapproval of free wool.

I desire also to read an extract from a statement made to the Boston Herald by Mr. James Phillips, a well-known and trustworthy manufacturer of Fitchburg, Mass. He says:

It has been clearly demonstrated by those who have studied the subject historically and statistically in all its details, that without protection the wool-growing industry of the United States will be destroyed; that under normal conditions a sufficiently high protective tariff will make the industry remunerative and prosperous; and that when under a protective tariff the prices of wool have been so low as to make wool-growing unremunerative, it has resulted not from the tariff, but from abnormal conditions, and but for the tariff the decline of the industry would have been much greater.

It is hardly possible to present the facts which point unmistakably to these conclusions in the present discussion, but in a general way it may be stated that precisely the same reason which makes it impossible for the woolen manufacturer in the United States to compete with woolen manufacturers in foreign countries, namely, the difference in cost of labor, enters into the problem of wool-growing. In other words, the cost of labor engaged in wool-growing in South America, in Australia, in Russia, and in other countries is much less than in the United States. Then, the cost of pasture in those countries is less than in our own, to say nothing of climatic differences which make it necessary for us to feed and care for our sheep during the cold winter months. All these facts have been brought out in an unmistakable way by the

WOOL-GROWERS OF THE COUNTRY.

They have made as good a case in favor of protection as can possibly be made by any other industry. There can be no doubt of this. If this is admitted, and even free-traders must admit it, then I claim that it is impossible for any man who considers himself a protectionist, let alone any manufacturer who asks for protection for his goods, to discount his own arguments by denying the statistical evidence presented by the wool-growers of the United States. The history of the development of wool-growing in the United States is the same as that of any other protected industry. Its growth began when a tariff was enacted that enabled the American producer to compete with his foreign rival; that encouraged him to go ahead and improve the breed and quality of his sheep and increase the weight of its fleece. Like the other industries, the wool industry reduced when the protective barrier was lowered, and increased and developed rapidly when the tariff of 1867 secured for the American wool-grower the American market, until, in 1883, our flocks, stimulated by the tariff, reached over 50,000,000 sheep, and the product of the wool, in pounds, was 308,000,000.

Then came the fatal reduction in 1883, together with the importation abuses in the form of "ring waste" and "noils," and from that time to the present the number of sheep has declined, the wool product has decreased, and our native product has been supplanted by the foreign. These are simple facts which must be faced, and the point I wish to emphasize is, that these facts can not be construed one way for wool-growers and another way for wool manufacturers. As we now stand our annual consumption of foreign wool aggregates about 100,000,000 pounds. Of this, however, probably 80,000,000 pounds are carpet wools, largely of a kind not raised here. Our own product, which under adequate protection should be about 300,000,000 pounds, with about 20,000,000 pounds of imported wools of similar quality, supplies what we need at the present time for home manufactures of clothing and for other purposes.

Practically, therefore, our home supply of wool is nearly equal to the home demand for clothing purposes, and with adequate protection will undoubtedly continue to be so, and soon fully supply this demand. The value of the wool product is about \$100,000,000 per annum, depending on the market prices. Wool is the sixth in order of value among the agricultural products, being exceeded only by corn, hay, wheat, cotton, and oats. Only one country in the world, Australia, excels us in the quantity of wool produced.

We who live in manufacturing States, which only produce 1,250,000 sheep, are apt to underestimate the importance and the ramifications of this great industry throughout the agricultural regions of the country. One hundred millions annually. What does that mean to the farmers of the United States? Well, suppose that by the passage of this free-trade bill this industry is seriously injured or destroyed, what will be the consequence to the farmer? Anything which impairs the prosperity of a country is damaging to the interests of that country, and

YOU CAN NOT INJURE A PART

of a country without the effects being felt in other parts, any more than you can develop and make prosperous a part of a country without that development and prosperity benefiting the country as a whole. The wool product, as I have shown, is one of the most important, and it furnishes to its producers the means for purchasing our manufactured articles.

Were this industry destroyed it would deprive them of the purchasing power, and the loss of this home market would depress the value of woolen products far in the excess of any advantage that would be gained by giving the manufacturer his wool at a lower price. The immediate effect of admitting wool free would undoubtedly be to depress its value, but as soon as this effect had been accomplished, and the wool industry of this country paralyzed or exterminated, the secondary effect would be a material advance in price, growing out of the absence of competition among American wool producers and the increase of the American demand for foreign wool. This effect would be felt for many years, and until the growth and production in barbarous countries had increased in proportion to the increase in the American demand. The final result would be that in place of an industry furnishing now \$100,000,000 annually to our people

In cash, with which to purchase commodities manufactured at home, the growth and development of the wool industry in barbarous countries all over the world would have been encouraged to such an extent that it would be almost impossible ever again to develop the industry in this country except by the re-enactment and permanent establishment of a high protective tariff.

Referring to the distribution of this industry, it is perhaps necessary to call attention to the fact that no one agricultural product is so widely and uniformly distributed as that of wool-growing. In 1886 New England produced about 1,250,000 sheep; the Middle States, 3,000,000 sheep; the Southern States, 11,000,000; the Western States, 15,000,000; the Pacific Coast, 10,000,000, and the Territories, 7,500,000; total, 47,750,000.

I have quoted at length from these two gentlemen for the reason that they are experienced manufacturers and have a personal knowledge of the wool industry.

Mr. Chairman, the reduction of the duty on wool and woollens in 1883, a measure I voted against, and a measure which is now deplored by all protectionists, is not the only cause of the prostration of these industries. The shameless interpretations and constructions of the Treasury Department have reduced the price of wool more than the reduction of the duty itself.

PHILADELPHIA, April 28, 1888.

DEAR SIR: We send you a sample received this day from Liverpool, marked No. 1, which is lap waste such as by the recent decision comes in at 10 cents per pound duty, instead of 30 cents. This wool is selling in England at 50 cents free on board, duty 10 cents per pound, while the wool from which it is made costs 1 1/2 pence, or 23 cents in the grease.

Very truly yours,

JUSTICE, BATEMAN & CO.

Hon. Jos. D. TAYLOR, Washington, D. C.

Here is another sample, called tops, which ought to be classified as a manufacture of wool, as it is thoroughly scoured and partly manufactured, and yet it is only charged a duty of 10 cents per pound, whereas scoured wool, under the law, pays 30 cents per pound, and there was as much of this brought in last year as the whole wool crop of Pennsylvania.

The importation of this lap waste and tops at 10 cents per pound has the same result as letting in fleece wool at 3 1/2 cents per pound, as it takes 3 pounds of unwashed wool to make 1 pound of this, and even more, as this is the very best of the wool.

Ninety per cent. of the wool of Ohio enters into tops, and if the tops are to be made abroad, as they will be if on the free-list, it will be a very much more serious blow to Ohio wool-growers than the friends of the Mills bill ever contemplated.

The cause of low prices and dull sales in the wool market is found partly in the crippled condition of woolen manufactories, partly in the discriminations against home productions, partly in the injustice of the law of 1883, which reduced the duty on woolen goods as well as on wool, partly in the use, by means of improved machinery, of carpet wools for clothing, but none of these, nor all of them put together are doing as much harm to the wool grower as the unfriendly and unjust rulings of the Treasury Department to which I have just called your attention.

Mr. Chairman, I have received a good many newspaper articles in relation to the magnanimity of the Texas people, which the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee professes to represent. It is said that Texas has more sheep than New York and New England both, and yet it is said that Texas is in favor of free wool.

MILLS ATTACKED AT HOME—THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION OF WESTERN TEXAS.

The spirited resolutions adopted by the Cattlemen's Association of Central Texas, at their convention at Waco, had better be kept from Hon. ROGER Q. MILLS at the present, unless the health of the statesman's nervous system has been pretty well re-established.

The preamble of the resolutions adopted by Mr. MILLS's constituents holds him responsible for a tariff measure which retains the duty on fencing wire while removing the duty from the flocks the fences inclose; which puts hides on the free-list, while retaining the duty on manufactured leather; which does not materially interfere with the duty on woolen goods, but wipes out the tariff on raw wool; and which, in short, would destroy the cattle and woolraisers' interests.

We deprecate the course of Mr. MILLS, and put ourselves on record in hearty condemnation of his conduct and his bill.

We consider his action in rendering protection to the powerful and pampered industries of the East and North, and withholding it from the struggling industries of his own constituency, undemocratic, unpatriotic, and unrepresentative.

We condemn the Providence speech of Mr. MILLS, wherein he guaranteed protection to the Rhode Island people and agreed to rob the Texas people.

Protection on raw wool is purely a protection to the producer, the farmer, as well as the sheep man, and should be maintained; and, finally,

If Mr. MILLS persists in and urges the proposed removal of the duty on wool and hides, it is the sense of this, a representative body of his constituency, that he abdicate his seat, and hereafter we will withhold our support at the ballot-box and elsewhere.

I have in my hand a circular of Justice, Bateman & Co. giving the present prices of wools and the prices at which the same wool will sell if placed on the free-list. I will only give the prices of four classes of unwashed and four classes of washed clothing wool.

Table with 3 columns: Classes, Average market price in Philadelphia, May, 1888, under tariff act of 1883, and Free wool prices for American fleeces on basis of scoured value of competing grades in London, May, 1888.

There is another cause for the depreciation of wool which I have discovered, and I do not think that the wool-growers have any appreciation of the extent of it. I refer to the use of carpet wools in the manufacture of clothing. Washed carpet wools which only pay 3 cents per pound duty can be used in the manufacture of many kinds of clothing, and clothing, too, that comes into competition with the products of woolen mills that use high-priced wool.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to a discrepancy in the Democratic party. In Ohio the Democratic press is in favor of the Mills bill because they say that it will increase the price of wool to place it on the free-list, and in proof of this they refer to the depressed prices of wool after the passage of the law of 1867, while the Ways and Means Committee and the President's message declare that the object of placing wool on the free-list is to enable the manufacturer to obtain cheap wool.

The answer to this is found in the fact that the prices of wool in London fix the prices of wool all over the world, including the United States. And when the prices of the world fell the prices of wool in the United States fell also, and the prices of wool in the United States would have fallen as low as the price in the markets of the world but for our tariff and the premium on gold.

When wool the same in quality as our XX Ohio washed wool will sell in London at 18 or 20 cents a pound, American money, it is impossible for American wool-growers to compete in the markets of the

world. The Argentine Republic and Australia, where a league of land can be bought for a few hundred dollars, where labor is worth only a few pennies a day, and where sheep live on pasture all the year through, have advantages that we have not, and unless the wool-growers of this country are adequately protected the waste lands which can only be used for feeding sheep will be worthless, the American flocks will be destroyed, a million men will be robbed of their employment, several millions of people will lose their means of support, and \$100,000,000 a year will be sent out of the country for wool.

MANUFACTURE OF STARCH.

There is another industry in which the farmers of this country are interested that this bill aims to destroy. I refer to the manufacture of starch, which furnishes to the farmer a market for his corn. The following figures can be depended upon as showing the importance and extent of this industry in the United States at the present time:

Number of corn-starch factories	24
Capital invested	\$10,000,000
Daily capacity, bushels of corn	40,000
Annual capacity, bushels of corn	12,480,000
Acres of land required to raise corn, at 25 bushels per acre	480,000
Farmers necessary to raise corn, 3 men per 100 acres	14,400
Annual capacity, pounds of starch	361,920,000
Value of starch produced annually	\$12,476,800
Laborers employed in factories	3,500
Amount of wages paid annually	\$1,638,500
Average rate of wages per day	\$1.50

The present duty on starch is 2 cents per pound, and this bill proposes to reduce the duty to 1 cent per pound, but does not propose to reduce the duty on corn, which is the starch-maker's raw material. Why should the duty on starch be reduced? There is no starch manufacturer in the United States to-day making 5 per cent. on his capital stock, and I know personally that many of them are losing money. The average sales of the manufacturers for the past year will not exceed 4 cents per pound, which is the average export price for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, and at this time is about the average cost of production. A bushel of corn will yield 28 pounds of starch, and when the corn costs 56 cents per bushel, the starch in the corn will cost 2 cents per pound. The labor and chemicals employed will cost 1½ cents per pound. Insurance, transportation, taxes, and a very small profit will consume the other five-eighths of a cent.

If the duty on starch is reduced as proposed it will utterly destroy this industry. Who is complaining of the price of starch? It was never so cheap before in the world. The only object of reducing the duty is to let in potato starch from Germany, where the average wages in starch factories is 60 cents a day, as against \$1.50 a day in this country. I hold in my hand a late German paper giving the present price of potato starch at Berlin and Hamburg, the two great centers of Europe for potato starch; and this selling quotation reduced to American money is \$1.94 per hundred pounds. Adding freight from Berlin to New York City, 12 cents per hundred, would make the cost of European potato starch laid down in New York or Boston \$2.06 per hundred, which is less than the cost of the corn at the present time, without taking into account the cost of manufacturing. Hence it is evident that this reduction of the duty on starch of 1 cent per pound will destroy this industry, increase imports, send our money abroad for starch, and greatly increase the surplus.

THE HOME MARKET.

The discussion of the tariff question resolves itself simply into this inquiry: Shall the alien or foreigner, to whom we are under no legal obligations, who neither fight our battles in time of war nor pay our taxes in time of peace, have access to our markets on the same terms as an American? This is what England wants; this is what the Cobden Club wants; this is what free-traders want.

As well might the Englishman ask to ride on our railways free of fare, or stay at our hotels free of charge. The privilege of selling in the American markets is a franchise of great value, and belongs as a matter of right only to Americans. There is no other such market beneath the circle of the sun. And why? Simply because our laboring people are better paid than the laboring people of any other country in the world. Go to any city or town or village and inquire why the people buy so much and the answer will be, because poor people are well paid. They will tell you that the market is not made good by the few rich men who live in it, but by the masses of poor people who labor for a living.

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means declared a great truth in his Texas speech when he stated that we consume more of the products of our own labor than the 200,000,000 people on the continent of Europe. That is true. There is no people in the world that buy as much, or eat as much, or wear as much, or live as well as Americans do, and what men earn is the measure of what they consume, and this is why the American market is the best in the world. The annual products of the farm are estimated at \$8,000,000,000 and the manufacturers at \$7,000,000,000—an aggregate of \$15,000,000,000, and all this is consumed in this country except about 6 per cent.

Why should we surrender to the world a market like this with a

prospect of getting others in return? We had better aim to occupy our own market as nearly as we can. There is now imported into this country \$45,000,000 worth of woolen goods which we should manufacture at home, and out of our own wool. There is imported into this country annually about \$300,000,000 of other articles that ought to be manufactured in this country. And if we could do this and keep this money at home, we would have very little need of a foreign market or of a foreign trade. But they tell us that this is narrow philanthropy; that broad statesmanship embraces the whole world, and not a little Republic like ours. But I remember that about two thousand years ago a free-trade scientist propounded this question, "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar or not?" The ringing answer has come down through the centuries, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Two thousand years later we will make the same response; we will be just to all nations and all lands; we will render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's and unto America the things that belong to America.

There is a way, Mr. Chairman, in which our export trade can be increased, and I would like to suggest it to the other side of this House. The way to build up an export trade is to build up a merchant marine, to place American ships on every sea, and to send American seamen into every port, until there will not be a harbor in the civilized world where our flag will not wave or where our wares will not be seen.

TRUSTS AND MONOPOLIES.

There is one thing, Mr. Chairman, that is not at all surprising, and that is that all the changes should be rung upon trusts, pools, combinations, monopolies, and strikes. This has been the stock in trade of the Democratic party so long that it has grown old and musty. The stench of it is offensive, and the sound of it disgusting. A trust may be a good thing or it may be a bad thing, depending altogether on its purpose, but neither trusts nor pools nor combinations nor strikes have been fostered by protection. They have afflicted free-trade England just as much as they have America. And experience has shown us that where a trust or combination is not destroyed by its own weight it is cured by competition, and if legislation is necessary to check any unjust combination I am ready to grant it.

But what has the tariff to do with trusts or strikes or monopolies? Did the tariff have anything to do with the whisky trust or the Standard Oil trust or with the cotton-seed oil trust? Not a particle. It certainly had nothing to do with the coffee trust, for coffee was on the free-list, and if the tariff has had anything to do with the sugar trust why does not this bill place sugar on the free-list, where it ought to be? The idea of a manufacturing establishment which every town and village in this broad land will welcome as a Godsend, with offers of land and money and exemption from taxes, being a monopoly when the business is open to every man alike, is too absurd for consideration. The man who has a patent-right has a monopoly of his invention for seventeen years. The man who has written a book has a monopoly of his copyright, but no manufacturing establishment is a monopoly. The business is open to all. The tendency of protection is right the other way.

The multiplicity of factories, their wide distribution over the country, and their close proximity and relationship to the consumer, make unreasonable combinations impossible; while articles manufactured abroad fall into the hands of a few importers who can very easily combine and fix their own prices, as they have done a thousand times already.

THE MYSTERY OF PROTECTION.

The argument against protection to which the demagogue usually resorts is ridicule. He wants to know how it is that protection will cheapen cloth and raise the price of wool? how it is that protection will cheapen hats and caps and raise the price of labor? I would say in reply that the object of a protective tariff is not for the purpose of cheapening anything. That is not its aim, though it often is the effect. The object of a protective tariff is to diversify labor, to equalize emoluments, to secure a just recognition of individual rights, and a fair distribution of accruing benefits. To accomplish this we must protect American labor. In doing this we bring the producer and the consumer together, get rid of middlemen, and save transportation. This gives to the farmer a market for his crops which are perishable, and saves the freights on those that are not. If we were to feed 3,000,000 operatives in Europe, they might pay there enormous prices for our agricultural products and yet the farmer here receive a mere pittance; but when we bring these manufacturers to our doors a lower price than they paid there will be a high price to the farmer here, and a benefit to both.

The cheapness of manufactured products comes largely from the use of machinery, the sharpness of competition, and the saving of transportation. And the wisdom of good wages to the laboring man and good prices to the farmer is found not only in the benefit to them, but in the benefit which accrues to the capitalist and to the country in the creation of a market which has no parallel in the world's history, for all classes become consumers and add to the common prosperity of rich and poor alike. It does not satisfy hunger to tell a man that bread is 4 cents a loaf if he has no 4 cents. It will not keep away the chill of winter to tell a family that blankets are \$3 a pair if they have no means

of getting the \$3. It is not a question whether we shall pay this price or that; but the question is, how shall we get the means with which to buy? How can we best provide for ourselves and our families? Under what system can we obtain the best home, the best food and raiment, and the most of this world's blessings? What plan has given the best results? Go to yonder immigrant, who is only one of a half-million who land on our shores every year, and ask him—look into the pale faces of his half-clad wife and children and ask them.

WHO PAYS THE DUTY?

The President in his message and the speakers on this floor declare that the consumer or purchaser of a dutiable article pays the amount of the duty in addition to the cost of production, no matter whether the article is imported or not; or, in other words, that the duty on the imported article raises the price of the American product of the same article an amount equal to the duty. If this is true, omitting freight, the price of the article here would always be obtained by adding the duty to the price in London or Liverpool. And the price in London or Liverpool would always be ascertained by subtracting the duty from the price here. This being admitted, let us test this theory. The price of a certain quality of cotton cloth is 8 cents a yard in London, and the duty is 5 cents a yard. These added together, according to the free-trade theory, would give us as the American price 13 cents a yard; but we find that we can buy the same quality of goods here as cheap as in London. Take the price here, 8 cents, subtract the duty, 5 cents, and it will give 3 cents as the price in London; but it can not be bought in London any less than 8 cents, the price here. Take corn-starch. The duty on it is 2 cents a pound. The wholesale price here is 4 cents a pound. Subtract the duty from the price here and it will give the price in London at 2 cents a pound; but corn-starch in London is 5 cents a pound. Take the London price of starch at 5 cents a pound and add 2 cents duty to it and this would make the price of corn-starch here 7 cents a pound, 3 cents too much.

The price of steel rails in this country is \$31.50 a ton. The duty is \$17 and the freight \$2.50, making \$19.50 tax on imported rails. This deducted from \$31.50, according to the free-trade theory of the President, leaves \$12 as the British price of steel rails; but instead of this the British price is \$20 instead of \$12.

The steel-rail industry owes its existence in this country to the high tariff of \$28 per ton, under which the price came down and down until steel rails were sold at \$27 per ton, \$1 less than the duty. Take still another illustration. The duty on cut nails is \$1.25 a keg and the American price is \$2 a keg of 100 pounds. If the President's theory is right these nails ought to be bought in Europe at 75 cents a keg, but they can not be bought any place in the world for such figures. Cut nails have been sold in this country at \$1.85 when the duty was \$1.50 a keg. Chloroform sells for 35 cents a pound while the duty is 50 cents a pound; and there are many articles that sell for less than the duty. At the time a heavy duty is placed upon an import the price may go up, but when its manufacture is once firmly established in this country it will just as certainly come down, and when an article is placed upon the free-list the price may for the time go down, but as soon as American competition ceases it will just as certainly go up.

Take wool for an example. If it should be placed on the free-list the price will immediately go down about 10 cents a pound; but when the American wool industry shall have been destroyed, when the American wool-growers shall have gone into bankruptcy, when the world's product of wool shall be lessened by the destruction of the American crop, the price of wool will be higher than it has been in many years. And although we would then restore the duty it would take a great many years to build up the wool industry again and we would be left for a great while at the mercy of the importers. Take one hundred articles in common use in your home, in your family, and in your business, and compare the present prices under a protective tariff with the prices of any revenue period in the past, and the prices of ninety-five of these articles will be 100 per cent. lower than they were then, and some of them will be 500 per cent. lower, and a great deal better, while wages are higher than they have been during this century. The foreign manufacturer and the importer are compelled to pay these duties after competition has once gained a foothold in this country. America is the dumping-ground for foreign manufacturers, and they send their surplus here and sell it at any price they can get.

I want to say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that there are other industries in my district, such as glass, potteries, etc., seriously affected by this bill, and I shall have something to say of them when we come to consider the bill under the five-minute rule, when amendments will be in order. I want now to protest against this bill as being intensely sectional, offensively partisan, and grossly inconsistent. Why is it that an iron hoop that goes around a bale of cotton is placed upon the free-list and an iron hoop that goes around a bale of hay is made to pay a duty? Why is it that the duty on sugar is retained at a high rate while wool is placed on the free-list? Why is it that the rice of the South is given a high rate of protection while the lumber of the North is placed on the free-list? Why are the rice and sugar and cotton plantations of the South protected, while farms and forests of the North are turned over to the tender mercies of free trade?

And I desire also, Mr. Chairman, to protest against that feature of this bill which substitutes ad valorem for specific duties, a change which can only invite undervaluation, perjury, and fraud, and ultimately bring the whole protective system into contempt and failure; and I am willing to base my objections to this change upon the reasons given in Secretary Manning's report. But more than all, Mr. Chairman, I protest against the passage of this bill because of its effect upon the industries and the labor of the country. The effects of this bill would not be confined to manufacturing. While we are here to-day discussing this question, the mason with his trowel, the carpenter with his hatchet, the painter with his brush, the miner with his pick, and the laborer with his shovel, are no longer able to get employment because the improvements of the country have been paralyzed by this bill. And behind these brawny laborers stand anxious wives, with wrenched hands and tearful eyes, anxiously inquiring whether their food and raiment are going to be parceled out between the laborers of America and the paupers of Europe. In this bill they see, as they see the stars in the heavens above, the coming destruction of American industries and the desolation of the American home.

But I am glad of one thing, Mr. Chairman, and that is that we are not, in the approaching campaign, to have the usual Democratic straddle on the tariff question. The President has taken the party shackles into his own hands, and has fastened one end of the party chain to the foot of British free trade and has welded the other around the neck of the Democratic party. Wherever free trade leads the Democratic party will follow. The President's organ has announced that the Democratic protectionists will be taken from the head of the procession and sent to the rear to do hospital duty. Think of the men who have given to the Democratic party all the character it has had in twenty years bathing the foreheads, washing the feet, and paring the corns of the free-trade Democrats whom the President and the Speaker of this House have so recently made the leaders of the Democratic party!

Mr. Chairman, if Henry Clay could compare the seven years before the tariff of 1824 with the seven years that followed as a vindication of the wisdom of protection, the Republican party of to-day only needs to compare the twenty-four years that followed the tariff of 1861 with the twenty-four years preceding it. When this comparison is made the world listens, the thrones of Europe tremble, the downtrodden of every nation and kindred and tongue take courage. The sunshine and rain and dews of America have been fresher and sweeter than ever before. The hearts and hopes and homes of the poor have been lifted up. Bands of steel and bands of sympathy have bound sixty millions of people together as humanity was never interwoven before. The mountains of iron and coal and copper join hands with capital and toil and skill, and the sickly Republic which the Democrats deserted in 1861 is to-day the foremost nation in the world. America, in her gold, in her silver, in her agricultural products, in her manufactured products, in her railroads and telegraphs and telephones, in her colleges and schools and churches, in all that go to make a great nation and a great people, has outgrown all the empires and kingdoms and nations of the planet we inhabit.

The Republican party lifted the old starry flag from the mud into which the Democratic party had trodden it and placed it above all the flags of God's green earth. On sea and on land, at home and abroad, the Republic has won honor and respect. And when the world's great volume of national immortality is written, and when the political parties of the ages are assigned their places in the world's history, at the head of the column will stand the name and deeds and triumphs of the Republican party. [Applause.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States in his annual message has pronounced the present tariff laws "vicious, inequitable, and illogical."

This charge, made as it is by the Chief Magistrate of the country, against the laws which raise the revenues for the Government is a grave one, but it is undeniably true. The Committee of Ways and Means insert in their report upon the pending bill a table to show the true nature of duties under the tariff laws. A slight study of this table will clearly demonstrate the distinction between a specific and ad valorem duty, and why the manufacturer clamors for the one and despises the other. The ad valorem duty means a charge or tax on the article according to its value, and is not like the specific duty which fixes arbitrarily the tariff, regardless of the value of the article taxed. The specific duty makes the poorer people pay the same tax for a yard of cloth worth 45 cents that the rich man pays for a yard of broadcloth that costs \$3.66; but this fact the specific tariff conceals. Is it not fair to tax the article according to its value? A tax ad valorem, or according to value, on the yard of broadcloth above mentioned, which costs \$3.66, would, at 40 per cent., make \$1.44, while on the cloth which costs 45 cents per yard the tax would be 18 cents, and the duty would be fair to both. As it is, the tax is 180 per cent. on the cheap cloth the poor man buys, and is only 50 per cent. on the high-priced broadcloth.

I will use the table set out in the report of the committee, and to it ask special attention, for, as the committee well say, it is worthy of careful study:

Price per yard of Leeds (England) woolen and mixed goods, duties, etc.

Name.	Description.		Price at factory.	Duty.					Per cent. of price at factory.	Cost in New York, not including packing, carriage to port, ocean freight, and insurance.
	Width (inches).	Weight (ounces).		Rate.		Amount.				
				Per pound.	Ad valorem (per cent.)	Per pound.	Ad valorem.	Total.		
West of England broadcloth.....	60	17	\$3.60	\$0.35	40	\$0.372	\$1.440	\$1.812	50.3	\$5.412
Fine worsted trousering.....	28	11	1.62	.35	40	.241	.618	.889	54.9	2.209
Imitation sealskin (mohair and cotton).....	50	31	4.50	.35	40	.678	1.800	2.478	55.0	6.978
West of England beaver.....	58	25	3.36	.35	40	.547	1.344	1.891	56.3	5.251
West of England all-wool Moscow.....	58	29	3.60	.35	40	.624	1.440	2.074	57.6	5.674
Fine worsted coating.....	56	24	2.88	.35	40	.535	1.152	1.677	58.2	4.557
Fine worsted trousering.....	28	12	1.42	.35	40	.263	.568	.831	58.5	2.251
Indigo-blue Cheviot coating.....	58	28	2.40	.35	40	.612	.960	1.572	65.5	3.972
Low worsted coating (worsted face, woolen back, cotton warp).....	50	24	.82	.18	35	.270	.287	.557	68.0	1.377
Low worsted trousering (woolen back).....	28	11	.48	.24	35	.165	.168	.333	69.4	.813
Ottoman (worsted face, woolen back, cotton warp).....	50	27	.82	.18	35	.304	.287	.591	72.0	1.411
Matelasse (worsted face, woolen back, cotton warp).....	50	28	.84	.18	35	.315	.294	.609	72.5	1.449
Mantle cloth (worsted face, woolen back, cotton warp).....	50	24	.68	.18	35	.270	.238	.508	74.7	1.188
Wool, fancy suiting.....	54	25	.94	.35	35	.547	.329	.876	93.2	1.866
Cotton-warp cloth.....	50	15	.54	.35	35	.328	.189	.517	95.7	1.057
Fancy coating.....	54	23	.78	.35	35	.503	.273	.776	99.5	1.567
Fancy cheviot.....	54	25	.82	.35	35	.547	.287	.834	101.7	1.654
Wool, fancy suiting.....	54	22	.70	.35	35	.481	.245	.726	103.7	1.426
Diagonal cheviot.....	54	25	.76	.35	35	.547	.266	.813	107.0	1.573
Common blue cheviot coating.....	52	25	.72	.35	35	.547	.252	.799	111.0	1.519
Cotton-warp Moscow.....	52	35	.96	.35	35	.766	.336	1.102	114.8	2.062
Cotton-warp cloth.....	52	25	.64	.35	35	.547	.224	.771	120.5	1.411
Cotton-warp twilled Melton.....	50	16	.42	.35	35	.361	.147	.508	121.0	.928
Cotton-warp Moscow.....	52	30	.74	.35	35	.656	.259	.915	123.6	1.656
Cotton-warp cloth.....	50	13	.32	.35	35	.284	.112	.396	123.7	.716
Fancy overcoating (cotton warp).....	50	34	.82	.35	35	.744	.287	1.031	125.7	1.851
Cotton-warp reversible.....	50	31	.74	.35	35	.678	.239	.917	126.6	1.677
Fancy overcoating (cotton warp).....	50	32	.76	.35	35	.700	.266	.966	127.0	1.726
Cotton-warp coating.....	50	17	.40	.35	35	.372	.140	.512	128.0	.912
Imitation sealskin (calf hair mixed with wool, cotton warp).....	50	28	.56	.35	35	.612	.196	.808	144.3	1.368
Cotton-warp coating.....	50	23	.46	.35	35	.503	.161	.664	144.3	1.124
Cotton-warp Melton.....	50	13	.24	.35	35	.284	.084	.368	153.3	.688
Cotton-warp serge Melton.....	50	15	.26	.35	35	.339	.091	.430	165.4	.690
Reversible diagonal (cotton warp).....	50	25	.48	.35	35	.634	.168	.802	167.1	1.282
Reversible nap (cotton warp).....	50	25	.44	.35	35	.634	.154	.788	179.1	1.228
Cotton-warp reversible.....	50	30	.45	.35	35	.656	.157	.813	180.7	1.263

This table is well worthy of careful study. In examining the figures given in the column headed "Price at factory" and the column headed "Per cent. of price at factory," which the total duty amounts to, the startling inequalities in the rate of duty to be paid in this country becomes apparent. The highest-priced goods named in the table is West of England broadcloth, worth \$3.60 per yard in Leeds, the specific duty being 35 cents per pound and the ad valorem duty 40 per cent., making a total duty of 50.3 per cent. on the value at the factory. This is on a high grade of goods. In looking at the bottom of the table the last entry is for cotton-warp reversible cloth, made in imitation of a better kind. It is worth but 45 cents per yard at the factory. The specific duty is the same as on the West of England broadcloth, 35 cents per pound, the ad valorem duty is 35 per cent., but the specific duty and the ad valorem duty together make the rate on the price at the factory 180.7 per cent. That is to say, the cheaper the goods at the factory the greater is the proportional increment of duty. The column headed "Per cent. of price at factory," which shows the percentage that the duty is of the factory price, brings this out clearly.

The committee refer to the cotton goods schedule for further illustration of this idea, and call attention to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury on revision of tariff, February 16, 1886. They say:

It will be seen in his report by the tables sent to him by persons dealing in cotton goods imported into the United States from foreign countries, that cheap goods, costing 3.55 cents per yard pay 176 per cent. duty or tax, while those costing 8.12 cents per yard pay 77 per cent. duty; and goods that cost 4 cents per yard pay a duty of 94 per cent., while those that cost 2 cents per yard pay a duty of 208 per cent. These inequalities run throughout the whole system of specific duties. It is that feature that commends it to the manufacturer of the competing article. As these excessive rates are thought to be more hurtful in cotton and woolen goods than in the articles embraced in other schedules, the committee have substituted the ad valorem for the specific duties as to the articles in the woolen schedule, and in all except yarns in the cotton schedule.

I now quote these words from the platform of the Republican party of 1884:

The Republican party pledges itself to correct the inequalities of the tariff, and to reduce the surplus.

Then they admitted the inequalities and promised the people to correct them. This was four years ago. When and how, gentlemen, do you intend to redeem this pledge? It was solemnly given to the people of this country in 1884 in convention at Chicago when you were appealing for votes, and though only a few weeks will elapse before you are called upon to express yourselves upon this subject in a national platform, you have not kept the pledge already given. In view of your conduct and history for the past two Congresses since that solemn pledge was given to the people, how can you come before the country again and excuse yourselves for your failure? Have you even tried to keep it? Did you not, as one man, in the Forty-ninth Congress, on at least two occasions absolutely refuse to consider the question of correcting the irregularities of the tariff and the reduction of the surplus, which you had pledged yourselves to the people to do? Twice during that Congress the Democratic party said, let us take up the tariff question, revise it in a spirit of fairness to all interests, lower taxes, reduce the surplus, and relieve the people of the oppression upon them, but

you responded with a unanimous no. You said by your votes, this matter does not deserve consideration at the hands of Congress.

The Democratic party was endeavoring to keep the pledge it made at Chicago "to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all parties." This was right and proper. A party, as well as an individual, should faithfully keep and observe pledges. The highest sense of duty to the voters of the land demands this. Party platforms and pledges should mean something; and when a party in national convention in this country solemnly pledges itself to carry out any given policy on a great subject it should be held to a strict accountability.

In no other way can the intelligent voters of this land decide with which party they will affiliate. Shall it be said party platforms are only made to catch votes? Are our people to be educated to such a standard of political morals as this?

The Republicans have presented no bill to this House "for the purpose of reducing the surplus or correcting the irregularities of the tariff which they admit to exist." They content themselves simply by opposing the reasonable, fair, just, and conservative measure which is pending as the result of Democratic thought and action. It is not claimed that the pending bill is a perfect one. Upon the bill generally, or as a whole, the Committee of Ways and Means say:

The committee have determined to recommend a reduction of the revenues from both customs and internal taxes. They have given the whole subject a careful and painstaking examination, and in the revision of the schedules have endeavored to act with a spirit of fairness to all interests. They have carefully kept in view at all times the interests of the manufacturer, the laborer, the producer, and the consumer.

The bill herewith reported to the House is not offered as a perfect bill. Many articles are left subject to duty which might well be transferred to the free-list. Many articles are left subject to rates of duty which might well be lessened. In both respects the bill could be improved; but in its preparation the committee have not undertaken or felt authorized to construct a new and consistent system of tariff taxation. They have dealt with the existing system, seeking to free it of much of its injustice, to simplify its provisions, to diminish its complexity, and as far as practicable to lighten its pressure on the tax-payer and make it more contributory to our industrial prosperity and progress.

Furthermore, we have felt constrained to consult the opinions and give weight as far as possible to the views of our associates from different parts of the United States, always subordinate, however, to the paramount consideration of the welfare of the entire country. From the beginning of our Government tariff legislation has been based on the principles of mutual concession. The present bill does not depart from this precedent.

The Democratic party, in the effort to keep its pledge to the people, here and now attempts, as it has heretofore done, to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests. Let us hope that when the vote is taken no Democrat will prove recreant to that pledge. [Applause.]

If the bill is not perfect, let him come forward in the proper spirit, ask for concessions, and keep the faith with the people.

Too much time has already been spent, and is yet being consumed,

by gentlemen on this floor arguing the theory of protection and free trade. However interesting these arguments are—and much learning has been displayed by gentlemen in their advocacy of one or the other theory—it is not, I respectfully submit now, a question of either protection or free trade.

As the President so aptly expressed it in his annual message to Congress, "it is a condition which confronts us, not a theory." He wisely added, "the question of free trade is absolutely irrelevant," and so, I add, is the question of protection in so far, I mean, as this bill affects that question.

Gentlemen may discourse upon the beauties of protection, and they have done so; but that is not the question to which we must, as intelligent legislators, address ourselves. It is to the condition in which we find the country, and not so much what brought about this condition, that demands our immediate attention. We have an overflowing Treasury. The laws under which taxes are collected are putting into the Treasury vast sums in excess of the necessities of the Government. Various expedients have been resorted to by the President and the Secretary of the Treasury for some time past to keep down this rapidly accumulating surplus. Large sums have been expended by the Treasury Department in the purchase of Government bonds not yet due for this purpose.

In some instances a premium of more than 24 per cent. has been paid out for these bonds—that is, for a hundred dollars of such bonds more than \$124 has been paid. By such resorts as I have just mentioned the people have been relieved to some extent and immediate danger averted. The surplus, however, has continued to accumulate, so that by the 30th day of June, 1888, it is estimated that the surplus in the Treasury will amount to the enormous sum of \$150,000,000. This sum is to be locked up in the vaults of the Treasury for no purpose whatever. It can not be used for any demands of the Government. The people will have paid it. If the Government does not need it, it should be returned to them? [Applause.]

This condition is not to stop with the 30th of June, but on and on and on each succeeding month will see from ten to twelve millions of dollars added to this enormous and unneeded surplus.

Shall we legislate so as to stop this drain upon the people's pockets, this hoarding up of their money? Or shall we till overcome by disaster debate the theory of protection and free trade? If the situation is not relieved by legislation at once, or at least at a very early date, it requires no prophetic ken to foretell that financial convulsion and widespread disaster will follow. This bill is not free trade, nor does it break down the system of so-called protection; but it will bring some relief to the country, and for this reason it should pass. It is to my mind a silly cry made by gentlemen opposing this bill, that its passage will bring ruin upon the country. When did the country ever have so high a tariff before? Never until the late war was there any such rate of tariff taxation as was then enacted; yet the country grew and prospered everywhere up to that date. The rate of taxation is now, on the average, over 47 per cent. The passage of the pending bill only reduces it a small sum. After its passage the rate will be higher than under the highest tariff passed during the late war, and this bill is more protective than the highest protective measure ever enacted before the war. It will leave it higher than the rate recommended by the Republican Tariff Commission of 1883.

This was a commission organized to recommend to Congress what the rate of taxation should be. They were so-called experts. They made their investigation and recommendation to Congress. This was in 1883; and the present bill, if it passes, will leave the rate of taxation higher than those Republican experts said it should be. Yet "there is ruin to come to the country if the bill is enacted into a law."

Gentlemen need not make such foolish and extravagant assertions, and expect the people of this land to be thereby deceived. This bill will add no more to the free-list, with the one exception of wool, than was recommended by President Arthur and his Secretary of the Treasury, Folger.

Lest I be accused of doing President Arthur injustice, I will quote his exact words from an annual message to Congress. He said:

Without entering into minute detail, which under present circumstances is quite unnecessary, I recommend an enlargement of the free-list so as to include within it the numerous articles which yield inconsiderable revenue, a simplification of the complex and inconsistent schedule of duties upon certain manufactures, particularly those of cotton, iron, steel, and a substantial reduction of the duties upon those articles, and upon sugar, molasses, wool and woolen goods.

This is nearly all the pending bill does. The last Republican President recommended this; his Secretary of the Treasury went even further, and yet to do the very thing they recommended should be done will ruin the country if now done by Congress?

The idea of ruining a country by abolishing its needless and unnecessary taxes was never before heard of in the history of any people in the world. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, absolute free trade is not possible in this country now. To raise the enormous revenue required for the support of the Government a tariff is necessary, but Congress should be careful to raise no more revenue than just enough to support the Government. No mat-

ter how low the tariff is that raises this revenue some protection will thereby be afforded to our manufacturers. Just to what extent a tariff or revenue law shall be made protective is a question of vital interest to the people, and should be well understood by them. It is, as I shall show, susceptible to very great abuse.

It is gravely argued on this floor, and has been always asserted by the friends of protection, that protection raised the wages of labor. The time was when the rallying cry was "Protection to American industries," sometimes called infant industries, but now we only hear of protection to American labor. It is not meant by this that protection raises alone the wages of persons who are employed in special industries or manufactories protected by the tariff. To do this would be to admit that the benefits of protection are partial and not shared by all laborers, and protectionists will not do that. Can it be that laborers on a farm, or in an industry not protected by the tariff, are benefited by this so-called protection? Are their wages increased by it? What, let me ask, is the object of the protective tariff? It is to check the importations of foreign goods and thereby increase the price of American goods and articles that the manufacturer of such goods and articles in the United States may receive the larger profits.

How does the fact that the manufacturer gets more money for his goods insure the further result that his laborer gets larger wages? It is even denied that the manufacturer is thereby made the better able to pay larger wages; but are wages measured by the ability of the employer, or are they not rather measured by the demand for the labor and the supply at hand? Unless protection, by enabling the manufacturer to pay large wages, necessarily insures larger wages, and further, unless this protection to only some of the industries not only insures the larger wages to all labor, whether employed in protected industries or not, it must follow as inevitably as night the day that protection does not raise the wages of labor.

Who will insist that because a manufacturer or capitalist has the ability to pay more therefore he does pay higher wages than his fellow-manufacturer who has not so much ability to pay? This is absurd. A man who buys labor buys it like any other commodity, at the market price. This is true, even if the protected manufacturer has to send across the water to the old country and import his labor, and this imported labor, too, being the very labor which he is urging a high tariff in this country to protect the labor here against. If the object of his fatherly care is the protection of our people here who labor, why will he bring the people of the older countries and place them in competition with the laborers whom he pretends to regard so tenderly? The market price is fixed, not by the ability of the buyer, but by the demand and the supply. The richest banker or railroad magnate pays no more to his porter or blacksmith than a poor farmer does. He has the ability to pay more, but the market price is fixed, and he takes advantage of it.

A man in my town wishes to get built a block of store houses, a duplicate of a block already there which cost \$20,000. He is rich, for that country. He already has many bonds, a number of buildings, and is obtaining large rents. His income is handsome. When he lets out his contract to erect these buildings is he governed by his ability to pay? We will imagine the poor day laborer who bids on this job saying to him: "Sir, you are rich and able to pay; therefore I will charge you \$25,000 for this work." But the answer comes: "You built yonder block for \$20,000, and I want it simply duplicated." "Ah," says the poor laborer who is living under a protective tariff, whose labor is protected, and where it is claimed men pay wages in proportion to their ability to do so, "sir, you are able to pay more than your neighbor who owns yonder block. That is all he has. You are rich. You must pay in proportion to your ability." This would end the controversy.

The merchant who hires his clerks does not grade their wages by his ability to pay them, but by the demand for them, the supply, and their efficiency.

Since the close of the late unhappy war our people in the South have not had the time to devote in politics to the study of the inequalities of the tariff, or indeed of any economic question of government. It has been with us more a matter of life and living, how to take care of rights dearer to us than mere questions of political economy.

That time, happily, has passed away. We find ourselves under the old flag with our rights unimpaired, I mean our political rights, and while we have submitted uncomplainingly to the onerous burden of Federal taxation, our people are now beginning to inquire into this question. In the two canvasses I made for a seat on this floor, my Republican competitors took decided ground in favor of the present high protective tariff. In each case I argued as best I could against protection and in favor of a tariff which would raise only the revenue necessary for the economical support of the Government. This is my present position. What, let me ask, is the tariff, which is but another name for tax, laid for? Is it not only to raise the funds whereby the Government may be administered? What power has Congress to lay a tariff except for the purpose I have indicated. This question has been settled by the Supreme Court of the United States, and I beg leave here to quote from that august tribunal.

In the celebrated Topeka, Kans., case, Justice Miller of the Supreme Court said:

Of all the powers conferred on the Government by the Constitution, that of taxation is the most liable to abuse.

And further:

This power can as readily be employed against one class of individuals and in favor of another so as to ruin the one class, and give unlimited wealth and prosperity to the other—if there is no explicit limitation of the uses for which the power may be exercised. To lay, with one hand, the power of government on the property of the citizen, and with the other bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprise and build up private fortunes, is none the less robbery because it is done under the form of law and is called taxation. Beyond a cavil, there can be no lawful taxation which is not laid for public purposes.

Again, I quote from Judge Cooley, formerly judge of the supreme court of Michigan (see Cooley's Constitutional Limitations):

Constitutionally a tax can have no other basis than the raising of revenues for public purposes, and whatever governmental exaction has not this basis is tyrannical and unlawful. A tax on imports, therefore, the purpose of which is not to raise revenue, but to discourage and indirectly prohibit some particular import for the benefit of some home manufacturer, may well be questioned as being merely colorable, and, therefore, not warranted by constitutional principles.

This being true, whence comes the power to tax the people to build up monopolies and make rich certain special interests by subsidy?

I remember, sir, one argument I have heretofore had to meet, and I have heard it repeated on this floor, that all high protective duties or taxes are paid by the foreigners who manufacture goods and bring them here to market. How is this? Recently I read this statement:

In 1881 the duty on the best plate-glass was 112 per cent. Glass of this kind selling in Belgium for \$386,000 was imported here, and, at 112 per cent., duty or tariff was paid on it to the amount of \$437,000. It was then sold here in the United States for \$850,000. Now, who paid this duty? Did the Belgium manufacturer? If he did, then out of the \$386,000, which was all he got for his glass, he paid \$437,000 to our Government for the privilege of sending it here. In other words, he gave us his glass for nothing when he could have sold it at home for \$386,000, and he gave us \$51,000 more for leave to do so.

If this glass only sold for \$386,000 in Belgium, when it was brought here and sold to our consumers for \$850,000, of which \$437,000 went into the Treasury as taxes, I want to know if the consumers here did not pay this tax? But for the high tariff of 112 per cent. on the glass our consumers here would have been able to buy it at \$386,000, and the transportation added. There can be no answer to this argument. In many instances, however, the tariff is laid so high that it amounts to a total prohibition of the importation of the goods so taxed. Then what is the inevitable result? If the goods are not imported, you say of course the Treasury gets no tax or tariff. This is true; but while this is true, our people who have to buy these goods from American manufacturers, thus prohibited from importation by reason of high duty, pay the increased prices all the same. Not that it goes into the Treasury, for in this case it goes into the pockets of the American manufacturer in the shape of subsidy or increase in profits. Many of the cheapest of woolen goods are thus taxed so high they are not imported. The duty on them varies from 115 to 200 per cent., and they can not be brought here by foreign merchants and sold after paying this high rate of tariff duty. The American manufacturer, however, knowing this, charges from 75 to 150 per cent. more for these goods than the foreigner, and is secure against his competition.

Who pays this increased price to our manufacturers? Not the foreign importer, for we have seen he does not in this case import on account of the high duty, but it is all paid by the poor consumer in our country who is compelled to buy these cheap woolen goods. And even in cases where the foreigner imports his goods, if he pays duty upon them he is not at last the party who suffers most under this tariff for protection. The best statistics we have show that the proportion of American goods we use to foreign goods is about five to one; so that the tariff raises the price of goods to our people about five times where it places the tax once upon the foreigner who brings his goods here for sale. Therefore when \$1 is paid into the Treasury for tariff our people have paid \$5 to the American manufacturer in the shape of subsidy. As we raise every year about \$200,000,000 by the tariff, it follows that to do this the people pay five times this sum, or ten hundred millions in subsidy. Such a law for taxation is not right and can not be defended on any just or equitable principle; yet any propositions which look to any reduction of taxes or the giving of any relief to the people are met by the cry of "free trade," and that an assault is being made upon the great American system of protection.

From what I have said, sir, it must be apparent to all that protectionists in making the law to collect the revenue for the administration of the Government do not look to revenue as the result of such law. I quote from an editorial in a leading Republican protective organ, the Ohio State Journal, of recent date, the following:

The principle of protection does not primarily look to revenue at all. Duties amounting in the aggregate to a million dollars may easily mean a hundred millions in benefits to home producers.

This is frank and candid, and I doubt if any protectionist on this floor will make the same confession or attempt its defense. What is this? The law made to raise revenue so framed as to raise one million of revenue, and in doing so give as a subsidy, as a benefit, a gift, a bonus, one hundred millions to some other citizens. This is the logic, this the confession. Whence, I ask again, comes the authority to Congress to lay

any duty which does not look simply to raising revenue? Congress has no more authority under the Constitution to take money from me which it does not need for the Government, under the guise of a revenue law, with the view of aiding or benefiting some other citizen or class of citizens, than it has to take my horses, mules, sheep, or other property for a like purpose. [Applause.]

According to the logic of the argument I have quoted from the protection organ, Congress can levy a tax upon the people to raise \$101,000,000, of which one million will go into the Treasury as taxes and the remaining one hundred millions will go into the pockets of a benefited class. Such a proposition, I submit, is monstrous. Who contends that the tariff is not a tax? I have heard that there are some who make this contention. Hear the great Western lawyer and orator, Mr. Storrs, on this point. He said:

Finally, what is a tariff? It is a tax. It is nothing less and nothing but a tax. It is a tax which we do not pay to the Government; for where protection begins revenue ceases. The consumer is impoverished, the Government is not aided.

This is an honest statement. A protective tariff laid upon four thousand articles of daily consumption by our people means a tax laid upon these articles, not for revenue, not for any purpose of government; for, as quoted above, "where protection begins revenue ceases." What does this phrase "protection to labor" as used mean? Does it mean that you must find employment for your neighbor, else he will go unemployed? Why not he find employment for you? Is it meant that you must find employment for yourself and neighbor also, while he must not find employment for himself? In this free country of ours it is best for every man to learn to take care of himself. No man should be expected to take care of himself and you, too; much less be made to do so by a tax law, so called. I have heard it gravely argued here and elsewhere that the high protective tariff reduced the price of every merchantable commodity, and that all profits are raised by this system. If this be true it opens up a new way for us all to get rich, and it is to be recommended as a popular panacea for poverty. [Laughter and applause.] We need only keep on piling up taxes, increase the protection, make the tariff altogether prohibitory, place restrictions upon trade until profits are carried up 300 or 400 per cent., and when all trade has ceased everybody's profits will be increased.

This again is absurd. Take the article of quinine which a few years ago was sold under a high duty. Our people paid \$3.50 per ounce for it; the tariff was taken off, and did this "merchantable commodity" go higher as was predicted? On the other hand, it retails at 80 cents per ounce. When it was sold at \$3.50 per ounce who paid it? The consumers among our people. Who got the benefit of the protection on it? Only two or three manufacturers in the United States. Who gets the benefits now of the reduction to 80 cents per ounce? The question answers itself.

Let us pursue this a little further. To the manufacturer the protectionist says, we give you a protective tariff, that you may get higher prices for your goods; that is the avowed object of it. To the consumer of these goods—the farmer, the lawyer, the mechanic, the doctor—he says, we will give you a protective tariff, that you may get goods you buy of the manufacturer cheaper. And to the labor he says, we give you protective tariff that you may get higher wages from the manufacturer. And the people believe him in each case. Let us suppose the object of the protective tariff was to enable lawyers to charge larger fees for their legal services, and as a lawyer I was to say to my clients, you ought to favor this law, for while it enables me to charge you larger fees it also enables you to get my services more cheaply. Let the miller say to his customers, you should favor this law, because it enables me to take more toll from you and at the same time give you more meal. So with the physician. So with the mechanic who builds your house. This argument would not work at all in any of these cases, but just apply it to the manufacturer and it acts like a charm. It is a wonderful antidote. [Laughter and applause.]

It seems to be a kind of medicine which stimulates the patient, yet reduces his fever; acts as a powerful laxative, yet produces constipation; feeds the system, yet depletes the patient; a fat, and yet an anti-fat [laughter]; a wine that may be taken for the stomach's sake when it is sick, yet a powerful emetic; it is a narcotic, and yet an atropine; it brings smiling happiness and solid comforts to those who toil in the workshops, and yet it is prolific of strikes and lock-outs; it richly rewards labor, yet fills the land with paupers and tramps. There is nothing in all nature like it. It is a centripetal, yet a centrifugal force. It contracts and expands under the same influence and condition. Administered to a Democrat in perfect health, in full doses, he begins forthwith to preach the gospel of Republicanism. It does these things, and is all this and more; it gives the men who make the goods higher prices, and the men who buy them cheaper goods. Surely there is nothing else like it on earth, or in the waters under the earth. Heaven alone, and I speak it not sacrilegiously, can produce such another panacea, a compound which will produce exactly the opposite effect upon similar subjects under like conditions. [Applause.]

This theory of raising the price of goods for the men who sell and lowering them for the men who buy, reverses every rule given us in nature by nature's God. With His rule in nature, we know how to apply remedies; the doctor can write his prescriptions; the farmer can

sow his grain, and expect like to produce like; he can propagate his stock with intelligence; the mariner can guide his vessel; the astronomer can calculate the coming eclipse; and old Probabilities can himself guess at the weather, it may be wide of the mark, but this new gospel of protection reverses all laws, and bids farewell to all the rules where the principle is engrafted. Better stick to nature and nature's law. Say, if you wish, protection benefits the manufacturer for the time being, that is, it temporarily benefits him, and none will controvert it, and the contention ends. The logic, so called, of the protectionist is thus reduced to absurdity. But from this let us turn to the good sense and sound reasoning of the Committee of Ways and Means. In their report upon the pending bill they say:

Duties are imposed to raise revenue, and they should be so imposed as to obtain the revenue with as little burden as possible to the tax-payer and as little disturbance as possible to the business of the country. This is accomplished by imposing the duty on the finished goods alone, and in no tariff, from the first to the last, have woollens, cottons, silks, or linens been placed on the free-list. We say to the manufacturer we have put wool on the free-list to enable him to obtain foreign wools cheaper, make his goods cheaper, and send them into foreign markets and successfully compete with the foreign manufacturer. We say to the laborer in the factory we have put wool on the free-list so that it may be imported and he may be employed to make the goods that are now made by foreign labor and imported into the United States. We say to the consumer we have put wool on the free-list that he may have woollen goods cheaper. We say to the domestic wool-grower we have put wool on the free-list to enable the manufacturer to import foreign wool to mix with his and thus enlarge his market and quicken the demand for the consumption of home wool while it lightens the burden of the tax-payer.

So it is absurd to contend that every merchantable commodity is sold more cheaply to our people by reason of the system of protection, so called.

I have not intended to go very largely into detail in what I have to say on the pending bill. To answer, however, further the contention that this protective tariff lessens the cost of living and cheapens goods to our people, I will insert here a table which shows the rate of tax laid upon some of the necessaries of life which enter into daily consumption by every family in the land, I care not how rich or poor they may be:

TARIFF ON CLOTHES AND OTHER ARTICLES.		Per cent.
Men's suits of wool—on every dollar you invest in a suit the tariff takes.....	48	48
Woolen hosiery and undershirts.....	75	75
Cotton hosiery and undershirts.....	45	45
Woolen hats and caps.....	75	75
Your wife's silk dress, about.....	50	50
Gloves.....	60	60
Blankets.....	60	60
Alpaca dresses.....	63	63
Any other woollen dressing.....	70	70
Scissors.....	45	45
Brass pins.....	30	30
Hair-pins.....	45	45
Pen-knives.....	50	50
Needles.....	25	25
Steel pens.....	45	45
Paper.....	20	20
Razors.....	45	45
On your carpet, if made of druggets, for every dollar.....	74	74
Carpet, if made of tapestry.....	68	68
Furniture (ask G. R. dealers).....	35	35
Wall-paper.....	25	25
Window-curtains.....	45	45
Looking-glass.....	60	60
Ornaments.....	35	35

TARIFF ON KITCHENS.		Per cent.
On every dollar's worth of iron in your stove there is a tariff of.....	45	45
Pots and kettles.....	88	88
Copper and brass utensils.....	45	45
Crockery of the commonest kind.....	53	53
Glassware, cheapest kind.....	45	45
Table cutlery and spoons.....	45	45
Pickled and salt fish.....	25	25
Salt.....	36	36
Sugar.....	48	48
Rice.....	133	133
Oranges and other fruit.....	10	10

If your woollen suit cost you \$10, put it down that \$4.80 of that cost is protective-tariff tax, and so with each article named in the table. So the laboring man, the farmer, the lawyer, the preacher, the physician, the mechanic, everybody, every day, everywhere in our land is paying this tribute under the present tariff laws. It is an insidious tax. It is an indirect tax. People pay it and imagine it is a part of the value of the goods bought, when if the proper modifications of the present law were made many of these goods could be bought for about one-half what they now cost, and still the Government would get all the revenue needed. If a tax-collector of the United States stood at the store door and levied and collected the tax upon every article set forth in the preceding table at the rate therein set forth, there would be an immediate outcry, and the gentlemen now on this floor who are defending with their might the present rate of taxation would change their position on this question or they would be retired by the people to the shades of private life. While this is true, the very people who would rather fight than pay such a tax as I have mentioned to a tax-gatherer at the store door will uncomplainingly pay higher taxes when they are collected by the storekeeper in the shape of increased prices. I desire here to quote from the message of the President of the United States sent to us at the beginning of this Congress. The President said:

But our present tariff laws, the vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of

unnecessary taxation, ought to be at once revised and amended. These laws, as their primary and plain effect, raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties. Thus the amount of the duty measures the tax paid by those who purchase for use these imported articles. Many of these things, however, are raised or manufactured in our own country, and the duties now levied upon foreign goods and products are called protection to these home manufacturers, because they render it possible for those of our people who are manufacturers to make these taxed articles and sell them for a price equal to that demanded for the imported goods that have paid customs duty.

So it happens that while comparatively a few use the imported articles, millions of our people, who never use and never saw any of the foreign products, purchase and use things of the same kind made in this country, and pay therefor nearly or quite the same enhanced price which the duty adds to the imported articles. Those who buy imports pay the duty charged thereon into the public treasury, but the great majority of our citizens, who buy domestic articles of the same class, pay a sum at least approximately equal to this duty to the home manufacturer. This reference to the operation of our tariff laws is not made by way of instruction, but in order that we may be constantly reminded of the manner in which they impose a burden upon those who consume domestic products as well as those who consume imported articles, and thus create a tax upon all our people.

It is not proposed to entirely relieve the country of this taxation. It must be extensively continued as the source of the Government's income, and in a readjustment of our tariff the interests of American labor engaged in manufacture should be carefully considered, as well as the preservation of our manufacturers. It may be called protection, or any other name, but relief from the hardships and dangers of our present tariff laws should be devised with especial precaution against imperiling the existence of our manufacturing interests.

But this existence should not mean a condition which, without regard to the public welfare or a national exigency, must always insure the realization of immense profits instead of moderately profitable returns. As the volume and diversity of our national activities increase, new recruits are added to those who desire a continuation of the advantages which they conceive the present system of tariff taxation directly affords them. So stubbornly have all efforts to reform the present condition been resisted by those of our fellow-citizens thus engaged, that they can hardly complain of the suspicion, entertained to a certain extent, that there exists an organized combination all along the line to maintain their advantage.

The effect of the high protective tariff is to build up favored cities and sections at the expense of others less favored; to enrich one individual at the expense of another; to feed and foster monopolies and impoverish the agricultural districts. It is not diffusive in its blessings, if it blesses at all. Why, then, should we as law-makers enact such legislation? The end of government is the greatest good to the largest number; not special benefits and privileges to a class or section. Protection may make magnificent cities and stupendous fortunes for the few. It may make a section or even a country rich, and yet the masses be the poorer thereby. The advocates of protection should reflect upon the poetic truth in these lines:

Ye friends to truth, ye statesmen who survey
The rich man's joys increase, the poor's decay,
'Tis yours to judge how wide the limits stand
Between a splendid and happy land.

A studied effort has been made on this floor and elsewhere, and is still being made to show that the President is a free-trader, and is unfriendly to the workmen of this country. I will be pardoned therefore if I quote rather extensively from his message in this connection and upon this point. He says:

We are in the midst of centennial celebrations, and with becoming pride we rejoice in American skill and ingenuity, in American energy and enterprise, and in the wonderful natural advantages and resources developed by a century's national growth. Yet when an attempt is made to justify a scheme which permits a tax to be laid upon every consumer in the land for the benefit of our manufacturers, quite beyond a reasonable demand for governmental regard, it suits the purposes of advocacy to call our manufactures infant industries, still needing the highest and greatest degree of favor and fostering care that can be wrung from Federal legislation.

It is also said that the increase in the price of domestic manufactures resulting from the present tariff is necessary in order that higher wages may be paid to our workmen employed in manufactories, than are paid for what is called the pauper labor of Europe. All will acknowledge the force of an argument which involves the welfare and liberal compensation of our laboring people. Our labor is honorable in the eyes of every American citizen; and as it lies at the foundation of our development and progress, it is entitled, without affectation or hypocrisy, to the utmost regard. The standard of our laborers' life should not be measured by that of any other country less favored, and they are entitled to their full share of all our advantages.

By the last census it is made to appear that of the 17,392,099 of our population engaged in all kinds of industries 7,670,493 are employed in agriculture, 4,074,238 in professional and personal service (2,934,876 of whom are domestic servants and laborers), while 1,810,256 are employed in trade and transportation, and 3,837,112 are classed as employed in manufacturing and mining.

For present purposes, however, the last number given should be considerably reduced. Without attempting to enumerate all, it will be conceded that there should be deducted from those which it includes 375,143 carpenters and joiners, 255,401 milliners, dressmakers, and seamstresses, 172,726 blacksmiths, 133,759 tailors and tailoresses, 102,473 masons, 76,241 butchers, 41,309 bakers, 22,083 plasterers, and 4,891 engaged in manufacturing agricultural implements, amounting in the aggregate to 1,214,023, leaving 2,623,089 persons employed in such manufacturing industries as are claimed to be benefited by a high tariff.

To these the appeal is made to save their employment and maintain their wages by resisting a change. There should be no disposition to answer such suggestions by the allegation that they are in a minority among those who labor, and therefore should forego an advantage in the interest of low prices for the majority; their compensation, as it may be affected by the operation of tariff laws, should at all times be scrupulously kept in view; and yet with slight reflection they will not overlook the fact that they are consumers with the rest; that they, too, have their own wants and those of their families to supply from their earnings, and that the price of the necessaries of life as well as the amount of their wages will regulate the measure of their welfare and comfort.

But the reduction of taxation demanded should be so measured as not to necessitate or justify either the loss of employment by the workingman nor the lessening of his wages; and the profits still remaining to the manufacturer, after a necessary readjustment, should furnish no excuse for the sacrifice of the interests of his employes either in their opportunity to work or in the diminution of their compensation. Nor can the worker in manufactures fail to understand that while a high tariff is claimed to be necessary to allow the

payment of remunerative wages, it certainly results in a very large increase in the price of nearly all sorts of manufactures, which, in almost countless forms, he needs for the use of himself and his family. He receives at the desk of his employer his wages, and perhaps before he reaches his home is obliged, in a purchase for family use of an article which embraces his own labor, to return in the payment of the increase in price which the tariff permits the hard-earned compensation of many days of toil.

Again, he uses the following patriotic words:

The plain and simple duty which we owe to the people is to reduce taxation to the necessary expenses of an economical operation of the Government, and to restore to the business of the country the money which we hold in the Treasury through the perversion of governmental powers. These things can and should be done with safety to all our industries, without danger to the opportunity for remunerative labor which our workingmen need, and with benefit to them and all our people, by cheapening their means of subsistence and increasing the measure of their comforts.

Let us cease wrangling with the subject and immediately reduce taxation to the very lowest limit possible for the economical operation of the Government, and hereafter reductions should be made from year to year as it shall appear safe to do so.

We should not mistake that which makes a happy and contented people. It is not half a hundred millionaires, a full Treasury, rich banks, gilded palaces, mighty corporations, a few fabulous fortunes, and accumulated wealth, but it is a—

Bold peasantry, a country's pride,
Which when once destroyed can never be supplied.

Mr. Chairman, I prefer to see prosperity widespread, reaching out into every village, portion, and hamlet of our common country. I do not wish the times so altered that—

Trade's unfeeling train—
shall—

Usurp the land and dispossess the swain.
Along the lawn, where scattered hamlets rose,
Unwieldy wealth and cumbrous pomp repose.
Those gentle hours that plenty bade to bloom,
Those calm desires that asked but little room,
Those healthful sports that graced the peaceful scene,
Lived in each look and brightened all the green;
These, far departing, seek a kinder shore,
And rural mirth and manners are no more.

The war afforded excuses for, indeed may have of necessity produced, vicious legislation; but now that peace reigns we should return to that policy which blesses most widely the country—a policy which builds up all sections and cities and does not produce two classes, the one millionaires, and the other paupers. The country needs a governmental policy which develops the well-to-do, contented man who realizes most fully that—

His best companions are innocence and health,
And his best riches ignorance of wealth.

I shall not detain the House with much speaking on the provisions of the bill which touch internal-revenue taxation. The internal-revenue law is a war measure. The inquiry is made, if this be true why not repeal it now that the war is over? While the war is over, its results abide with us. Its taxes are necessary to meet the expenses it brought about. We are paying \$80,000,000 in pensions, and a very large amount of annual interest on the war debt, besides other expenses growing out of the war. If we had no such expenses upon us growing out of the war, I should say the internal-revenue tax might be repealed, though it is the easiest tax of all to pay. On this subject President Cleveland, in his annual message, says:

It must be conceded that none of the things subjected to internal-revenue taxation are, strictly speaking, necessities; there appears to be no just complaint of this taxation by the consumers of these articles, and there seems to be nothing so well able to bear the burden without hardship to any portion of the people.

Both parties are pledged to the continuance for the present of this tax. Senator SHERMAN, who has always been recognized as good authority for his party, has said, when speaking of the internal-revenue taxes:

These taxes ought to be left as a part of our permanent system of taxation as long as any other taxes, internal or external, more oppressive, remain on the statute-books.

No consumer complains of these taxes. They know that whisky and tobacco are luxuries, and no complaint is made by those who use the articles that they are taxed. Internal taxes are not taxes on food, clothing, wool, shelter, and other articles of necessity to the consumer. The consumer of articles taxed by the internal-revenue law consumes them not from necessity but from choice. It is a cheap tax to collect. For the fiscal year 1887 the receipts of the United States Treasury from all sources were \$371,403,277.66.

The sum realized from tariff duty was \$217,286,893.13, and the sum from internal-revenue taxes was \$118,823,391.22, this tax being upon distilled spirits, malt liquors, and tobacco. The latter tax goes directly into the Treasury, less a small per cent. (about 3 per cent.), which covers the cost of collection. It is a voluntary contribution to the Treasury by the consumers of the articles taxed. I would not be willing to see this tax entirely repealed. The people do not demand this as a measure of relief. There is complaint, and just complaint, at the method of enforcement of these internal-revenue laws. It is believed the pending bill gives relief in this direction. The bill will repeal the internal-revenue law which requires special taxes and privilege of taxes on retail liquor dealers. As well stated by the Committee of Ways and Means in their report, these taxes have been a fruitful

source of the petty prosecutions which have crowded the Federal courts in some portions of the country. The bill will repeal all restrictions on the sale of tobacco by the producer, and all taxes on tobacco except on cigars, cigarettes, cheroots, and all privilege taxes except those for manufacturing and selling cigars, cigarettes, and cheroots.

The whole amount of reduction in taxes under the bill as it now stands is \$78,176,054.22. The total of tariff reduction is \$53,720,447.22, and of internal-revenue reduction is \$24,455,607. The largest items of tariff reductions are on wool and woollens, \$12,330,581.20, and on sugar \$11,292,087.94. Having then, as I have shown, a large and growing surplus in the Treasury, which threatens the paralysis of all business and widespread disaster to the whole country, let us, as wise and patriotic lawmakers, address ourselves to the imminent, the overwhelming danger which confronts us. Let us deal with the condition, not the theory. Let us stop the flow of money from the pockets of the people, from the legitimate channels of trade and commerce, where it is so much needed and where it of right belongs, into the Federal Treasury where it is not needed at all. This can be done without peril to the protective system, and to do it by the passage of this measure will not be to commit any member to the theory or policy of free trade.

Speaking for myself, sir, I would be very far from favoring a policy which would break down the industries of my country. Gentlemen on the other side pay glorious tributes to the section of the country I have the honor, in part, to represent on this floor. They impute to us motives we have not and attribute results to our contemplated action which in my judgment can not follow. In the South we ask no special privileges not accorded to other sections and other States; all we want is to be let alone. Not by way of boasting, but as a matter of pride, I desire to submit some facts here which go to show the evidences of increasing prosperity in our section. These interesting facts I take from the Manufacturers' Record, of Baltimore, Md., recently published. I insert a table showing the assessed value of property in the Southern States in 1887 and 1880.

States.	1887.	1880.
Alabama.....	\$124,925,869	\$123,757,072
Arkansas.....	148,888,206	90,511,653
Florida.....	84,860,564	32,794,383
Georgia.....	341,504,921	251,424,651
Kentucky.....	482,491,690	350,563,971
Louisiana.....	211,925,741	177,096,459
Maryland.....	485,839,772	459,187,408
Mississippi.....	129,887,254	110,628,129
North Carolina.....	210,035,453	169,916,807
South Carolina.....	141,074,000	120,351,000
Tennessee.....	239,000,000	211,768,438
Texas.....	650,412,401	311,470,736
Virginia.....	339,342,723	324,955,980
West Virginia.....	177,341,263	146,991,740
Total.....	3,858,509,867	2,881,418,527

It is well known that assessments in the Southern States are far below the market value of property. This table shows an increase of \$977,000,000 in seven years. Take the following table, which shows the comparative value of live-stock in the South in 1879 and in 1888:

Live-stock.	Value.	
	1888.	1879.
Horses.....	\$191,659,208	\$127,502,759
Mules.....	113,908,770	65,059,675
Milch cows.....	68,187,682	47,630,990
Oxen, other cattle.....	130,741,481	87,019,959
Sheep.....	15,278,829	19,262,888
Hogs.....	53,919,580	44,935,943
Total.....	573,695,550	391,412,254
Increase.....	182,283,296	

That is a pretty healthy increase in the value of live-stock between 1879 and 1888.

I also insert the following to show the total value of the chief agricultural products of the South (omitting sugar, rice, fruits, and vegetables, etc., the value of which is not given in the United States Agricultural Department's reports) for 1887 and 1879:

	1887.	1879.
Cotton.....	\$310,000,000	\$227,893,000
Corn.....	259,813,530	187,958,752
Wheat.....	42,297,810	65,575,378
Oats.....	34,955,729	20,193,011
Potatoes, barley, hay, tobacco, etc.....	95,000,000	69,478,313
Total.....	742,066,460	571,098,454
Increase.....	170,968,006	

If to these figures we add the increase in fruits and vegetables (Florida alone having developed her great orange and trucking business mainly since 1879), sugar, etc., the total gain in the value of agricultural products of the South in 1887 over 1879 was upwards of \$200,000,000, while during the same time the increase in the value of live-stock was, as we have already shown, \$182,283,000.

One further extract from the same source and I end it. This Journal says:

Now while the South has made this wonderful gain in agriculture, what has been done in manufactures and railroads?

The construction of railroads is an exponent of a country's progress, and by it we may measure the growth made. What has been the railroad construction of the South since 1880? The following figures show:

Mileage.

States.	January 1, 1888.	June 1, 1880.
Alabama.....	2,801	1,780
Arkansas.....	2,361	822
Florida.....	2,132	529
Georgia.....	3,505	2,433
Kentucky.....	2,237	1,560
Louisiana.....	1,458	522
Maryland.....	1,268	931
Mississippi.....	2,169	1,119
North Carolina.....	2,371	1,440
South Carolina.....	1,906	1,393
Tennessee.....	2,252	1,816
Texas.....	8,289	2,697
Virginia.....	2,791	1,697
West Virginia.....	1,196	692
Total.....	36,736	19,431

Here is an increase in the South's railroad mileage since June 1, 1880, of 17,305 miles, or a gain of 89 per cent., while the rate of increase in all the rest of the country was but 69 per cent. Including the road constructed since January 1, the South now has over 37,000 miles of railroad. Let us sum up a few points to contrast the South of 1888 and the South of the census year 1879-'80 (June to June). Surely these figures tell a tale of progress never surpassed by any other country in the world, and yet the South is just barely getting under way in its development. Here are the figures:

	1888.	1880.
Assessed value of property.....	\$3,858,509,867	\$2,881,418,527
Railroad mileage.....	36,736	19,431
Yield of cotton..... bales.....	6,800,000	5,755,259
Grain, 1887..... bushels.....	626,305,000	431,074,630
Number of farm animals.....	44,830,972	28,754,243
Value of live-stock.....	\$573,695,550	\$391,412,254
Value of chief agricultural products, 1887.....	\$742,066,460	\$571,098,454
Coal mined, 1887..... tons.....	16,476,785	6,049,471
Pig-iron produced, 1887..... do.....	929,436	397,301
Number of cotton mills.....	294	179
Number of spindles.....	1,495,145	713,989
Number of looms.....	34,006	15,222
Value of cotton goods produced.....	\$43,000,000	\$21,000,000
Number of cotton-seed oil mills.....	*160	40
Capital invested in cotton-seed oil mills.....	*\$12,000,000	\$3,504,000
Phosphate manufactured..... tons.....	432,757	190,162

*About.

These facts and statistics show what we can do and are doing in the South, in spite of a protective tariff; and they further show that all the ways of our people are ways of peace.

We can and will work out our own destiny, if left to depend alone upon the natural blessings Heaven has so munificently bestowed upon us, coupled with our efforts, and we prefer not to depend upon the fatherly hand of the Federal Government to boom us. The God of nature has given our land and people more protection than any high tariff will yield us. The star of empire which hitherto has steadily taken its course to the Westward has turned to the South. With our cheap coal, cheap iron, cheap land, cheap living, unsurpassed climate and workmen, giving us a large per centum of advantage over all competitors, we are in the fight for prosperity, not for to-day or to-morrow, but for all future time. If we have a high tariff we will live and prosper. If the tariff is lowered we shall do the same. If it be taken off altogether, and we must enter the race in a field of fair trade or free trade, we will be found with quickened gait keeping step to the onward march, and, putting aside the load which doth so beset other peoples, sections, and communities, will deserve and reap the rich reward of a brave, industrious, and frugal people. All we ask is that you take the heavy hand of Federal taxation from us. With our unrivaled climate and soil, our inexhaustible mineral resources, our navigable streams, our railroads, the capital we have and that which will inevitably come because it is profitable, we can rebuild our waste places, restore our happy homes, and have smiling contentment resting like a sweet benediction upon our land. A future is surely opening up before us whose possibilities are boundless and whose ending no man is wise enough to predict. Such are our hopes, and such our expectations, in the glad fruition of which we will see extinguished the last vestiges of desolation produced by our late unhappy war, when our people can and will realize in perfect truth that they are citizens of the freest and best government the world ever saw. [Great applause.]

Mr. MCADOO. Mr. Chairman, I propose, as fully as the time will permit, to state my views and convictions as to the reduction and revision of the existing revenue laws. Whether they be right or wrong they are the result of my best reason and observation. They have been strengthened by the arguments intended to refute them and are not to be changed by interest or clamor, but are at all times open to facts and reason.

I speak as a Democrat proud of the history, principles, and traditions of this wonderful organization. My first vote was given for Democratic candidates upon a Democratic platform, and at a time when the political soldiers of fortune who are now assuming the rôle of allies and dictators were among the bitterest of our opponents and slanderers. I believe that I shall, if spared life, be found continuing to vote for and upholding Democratic principles and candidates when the whim of the hour has ceased to charm, when the fashions in political novelties change, and these gentlemen have temporary service under some new banner to which their selfish interests may attract them. They labor who wait.

I should not hesitate for myself to make any personal sacrifice to preserve intact and victorious the legions of Democracy, and if disaster were as inevitable as victory is assured, having shared an unwonted and undeserved share of the common glory from my young manhood up, I would have no compunctions to go down in the common ruin.

We are confronted with such a situation as is novel to most nations. We have a large surplus in the Treasury, variously stated and misstated, but too large for our good. We have in times of profound peace a system of internal taxation under which we collect some \$118,000,000 a year. At the same time we have our immense collection of import duties upon foreign wares and merchandise.

Of the evils of the surplus I join in all that has been and will be said. It takes the people's money from the channels of trade and business where it belongs. It robs labor of a share of its pittance that it may tempt fraud and waste to filch it from the public Treasury. It creates a rich government and makes the people poor; it dams the waters that turn the wheels of industry and trade; it corrupts the current of legislation, begetting jobs and dishonest laws; it paralyzes individual effort and tempts the people to lean on government instead of on themselves, thus threatening alike our liberties and our prosperity. How shall we rid ourselves of this burden?

I will not insult your sense of honesty by arguing for profligate expenditures, venturesome enterprises, and unnecessary appropriations, which arise only by contemplating the growing Treasury. Our legitimate expenses for government and the necessary public works, naval defense, and the like are, of course, proper, and will always merit and receive sufficient to maintain them.

From reduction of the revenue, then, must come our relief, as, even were it advisable, difficulties are in the way of an immediate and rapid payment of the public debt.

Our revenues as all know are from two sources, internal taxes upon articles grown and manufactured in our own country and duties levied at the borders upon articles grown, produced, or manufactured in foreign countries. From one or both of these must the reduction be made. If reduction of the surplus revenue is the sole object sought, then of course we should take it from that source of revenue that will most surely give the result. The mere reduction of the import duties on foreign goods may, and in all probability will, only serve to increase importations and thus increase instead of diminish the revenues from that source. Enlargement of the free-list and the reduction or abolition of the internal taxes will surely reduce your income.

If this is a question of mere surplus reduction, then, speaking for myself, and opposed as I am to collecting any revenue save through the custom-houses upon foreign goods, I should go immediately to the internal taxes—the taxes unsuited to our people and our institutions, and threatening, in their rigorous execution, the rights of the States as well as the liberty and freedom of a great people unused to government espionage in their business and homes. If tobacco and liquors must come under governmental control, let their taxation add to the bankrupt treasuries of our States and municipalities. Why should the Federal Government tax tobacco, one of our great staples, any more than tax wheat? Why not tax corn meal as well as corn in any other form?

Your taxation does not lessen their use; your control but helps the powerful rings and trusts which manipulate their production and sale. Because the whisky king grows rich and omnipotent on our weakness or our vices, is he any less obnoxious and dangerous to free government than the coal baron who thrives on our necessities?

So far I have been speaking of the situation as one demanding simply a reduction of our redundant revenues. It would, however, be merely fencing with words to refrain from admitting that the most active alarmists of surplus dangers have two objects in view. Mere reduction of the revenues they make secondary to reduction, or revision, or reform of the tariff—in the plenitude of terms you can easily make a choice. We are therefore confronted with propositions that embody reduction and revision of both sources of national income, and I shall therefore, in a general way, address myself to the tariff aspect of the case.

The resolutions of the recent convention of New Jersey Democrats

state well the principles that should govern in a revision of the revenue and tariff laws. It reads as follows:

It reads as its rule of political faith and practice, the resolutions of the last Democratic National Convention, promulgated by representatives from every section of the country, and affirmed by the people of the United States in the election of the Democratic candidates, as embodying all the doctrines and principles necessary for the proper conduct of national affairs demanded by the exigencies of the present time.

It urges upon representatives of the Democratic party in Congress the early fulfillment of the pledges and promises of those resolutions according to their letter and spirit, and more especially those wherein are demanded a reduction of the redundant revenues of the Government, and the revision of the tariff with due regard to the interests of the agricultural and manufacturing industries, and of labor and capital to be affected thereby.

This tariff so collected would have been limited in amount by the honest and necessary wants of the Government, or as the Democratic platform pertinently states, "the wants of the Government economically administered," and to be so levied and adjusted on foreign articles coming into competition with those made or produced here as to give to American labor the higher recompense it now obtains over that of other countries. Such a tariff is admirably suited to a country that has for empire nearly a continent, every variety of production, soil, and climate, battalions of skilled and intelligent artisans and workmen, millions of freehold farmers, and within whose own limits absolute free trade prevails as nowhere else on the earth.

For such a tariff, as against free trade of the Cobden school or the existing British tariff, I am here to witness. It is not only wise, but is constitutional and backed by unbroken precedent, and defended by such Democrats as Madison, Jefferson, and Jackson. In the field of theological controversy resource is had to the early fathers of the church as the correct interpreters of the sacred message, and across the field of contention pass the sacred shades of Jerome, Origen, Alexander, Augustine, and Clement. May I not, to correctly interpret the charter of our rights, the Constitution of our country, cite the evidences of the founders of our Government, the framers of the instrument?

Andrew Jackson was a grand, undeviating Democrat and a man of hard practical sense. In his second annual message to Congress, December 7, 1830, he said:

The power to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several States. The right to adjust those duties, with a view to the encouragement of domestic branches of industry, is so completely identical with that power that it is difficult to suppose the existence of the one without the other. The States have delegated their whole authority over imports to the General Government, without limitation or restriction, saving the very inconsiderable reservation relating to their inspection laws. This authority having thus entirely passed from the States, the right to exercise it for the purpose of protection does not exist in them; and consequently, if it be not possessed by the General Government, it must be extinct. Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of the right to foster their own industry and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by foreign nations. This surely can not be the case: this indispensable power, thus surrendered by the States, must be within the scope of the authority on the subject expressly delegated to Congress.

In this conclusion I am confirmed as well by the opinions of Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, who have each repeatedly recommended the exercise of this right under the Constitution, as by the uniform practice of Congress, the continued acquiescence of the States, and the general understanding of the people.

In opposition to later-day lights listen to James Madison, President and sound Democrat:

The States that are most advanced in population, and ripe for manufactures, ought to have their particular interests attended to in some degree. While these States retained the power of making regulations of trade they had the power to protect and cherish such institutions. By adopting the present Constitution they have thrown the exercise of this power into other hands. They must have done this with an expectation that those interests would not be neglected here.—*Gales and Seaton's Debates*, old series, vol. 1, page 116.

Hear this address signed "Jerseyman" in November, 1787, to the citizens of New Jersey on the new Constitution. Hear him, one of the people, appealing to the people with the open book in his hand, speaking in the language of the people—hear him on the clause which you are attempting to interpret:

The great advantages (American Museum, volume 2, page 437) which would be the result of the adoption of the proposed Constitution, are almost innumerable. I will mention a few among the many. In the first place, the proper regulation of our commerce would be insured—the imposts on all foreign merchandise imported into America would still effectually aid our continental treasury. This power has been heretofore held back by some States on narrow and mistaken principles. The amount of the duties since the peace would probably, by this time, have nearly paid our national debt. By the proper regulation of our commerce our own manufactures would be also much promoted and encouraged. Heavy duties would discourage the consumption of articles of foreign growth. This would induce us more to work up our raw materials, and prevent European manufacturers from dragging them from us in order to bestow upon them their own labor and a high price before they are returned into our hands.

I might fill up my hour with citations from men whose Democracy was never questioned.

The First Congress affirmed it in the memorable preamble to the first tariff law, which read:

Whereas it is necessary for the support of the Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures, that duties shall be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported—

SECTION 1. *Be it enacted, etc.*, That from and after the 1st day of August next ensuing the several duties hereinafter mentioned shall be laid on the following goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States from any foreign port or place, that is to say,

Then follows a schedule of articles with the respective amounts of duty imposed.

The tariff thus levied was indeed small, as has been said, but was really more protective than our existing tariff, because in that day of sails and months of voyaging to cross the Atlantic distance was of itself great protection.

For this declaration all hail to the wise and patriotic men of the First Congress. Their names may not be on the honor-roll of the Cobden Club or its Anglo-American allies, but they are imperishably engraven in the hearts of their countrymen. If they lived in our day Professor Wells and the free-trade Sanhedrim of Boston, New York, and Chicago would deride them, but posterity would cherish their names as wise men loving their country and their kind. [Applause.] We read with quickened pulse of how the English flag went down on Monmouth's field and Bunker Hill before the tempestuous sweep of our patriotic sires, but beats our heart as fast at this giant blow of the First Congress for American commercial freedom from enslavement to British trade and greed that feeds the beasts of prey with hecatombs of human victims on India's plains and Ireland's hills. [Applause.]

England has long since filled up the gaps in her decimated ranks made from Lexington to Yorktown, but she has never recovered from this staggering blow of the First Congress of the United States of America. [Applause.]

While I am happy to state that no proposition before the House makes a distinct issue between protection and free trade, I think it well to examine and meet some of the exuberant and hysterical statements of those who deride all tariffs. These gentlemen are probably elated by the proposition of the Ways and Means Committee to abolish the internal-revenue tax on tobacco. And right here let us remind the House and the country that we are going to vote on distinct propositions and not upon speeches and editorials in which free pinion is given to a fancy that loses itself in space. For myself, I do not propose by this horn-blowing around the walls of the tariff Jericho to be diverted from our pledged duty to reduce the surplus and revise the tariff in the interest of the whole people of our common country. To this end I shall facilitate by voice and vote all legitimate efforts in that direction.

We hear much in these days from free-traders about the brotherhood of man and universal peace, but I do not fail to notice that, lovable and much to be desired as are these things, the one is preached to us by evangelists of hate and the other by those most heavily armed. The autonomy, supremacy, and individuality of nations is as necessary to the welfare and civilization of the race as demonstrations for universal fraternity of peoples unequal in every respect. [Loud applause.]

The brotherhood of man—I glory in the sentiment, but I can not but reflect upon the words of the true French republican, who, passing in the death tumbrel on to the guillotine through the streets of Paris, chafed with the legend "the brotherhood of man," exclaimed:

Alas! my friends is not this the brotherhood of Cain?

The brotherhood of man and free trade and universal peace and the millennium will come on this earth when each of us and all of us has for himself, without attempting to reform our neighbors, evicted from our own heart the brotherhood of Cain, and enthroned therein the spirit of peace, justice, and truth.

Against the transparent fallacies of free trade now so persistently and insidiously urged upon our country by organized foreign influence and native selfishness I might warn my countrymen at great length did time permit. Nothing so exposes the unreliability of its conclusion as the falsehood of its promises. Mr. Henry George, the most ardent and unequivocal free-trader, in a book which he presented me with through the generosity of a gentleman resident in England, opens his first chapter on "Protection vs. Free Trade" as follows:

Near the window by which I write a great bull is tethered by a ring in his nose. Grazing round and round, he has wound his rope about the stake until now he stands a close prisoner, tantalized by rich grass he can not reach, unable even to toss his head to rid him of the flies that cluster on his shoulders. Now and again he struggles vainly, and then, after pitiful bellowing, relapses into silent misery.

Pausing to say that a bigger fool bull I never read of, I deny the accuracy of the figure as applied to the United States. The very opposite is the situation. Our bull has the greatest area of the very best pasturage in the world, through which, fat, sleek, and contented, switching occasionally with his flowing muscular tail the miserable little free-trade gnats off his powerful, towering shoulders [applause], he goes free and untethered, his only annoyance the lean and hungry nomadic kine of Europe and Asia, cadaverous as those of Pharaoh's dream that come mooing and bellowing and trying to overturn the bars that they may come in and get a mouthful of our rich, sappy, home-market grass. [Laughter and applause.]

In connection with this great subject we have ever dinned in our ears the teachings of the British school of political economists. I know of no greater evil from which we suffer than the adoption by American schools of these theories. England, a small island, with a teeming population, was obliged to live at the expense of other people; and from Adam Smith to John Stuart Mill and Richard Cobden there arose for her apologists of her doctrine of international commerce. To my mind this political economy, so called, is nothing more than a defense

of piracy, an attempt to make larceny respectable, a promulgation of the gospel of "freebootery" under the guise of cant and hypocrisy, and uttered with proverbial British assumption of superior wisdom and virtue.

Some of these writers have reduced all the relations of man to man to a savage and barbaric one, thus supplanting religion by a cold, unsympathetic chop logic materialism founded on selfishness and dirt. The divine injunction that says that he is worse than an infidel who does not provide for his own, and that we are to protect and succor the weak, they replace with cruel and un-Christian doctrines about the survival of the fittest. Their demands for free trade and cheap labor run parallel with the unholy teachings of Malthus that maternity is a crime and that infanticide is necessary to decrease population and beget prosperity. They reduce man to savagery here and to a nonentity hereafter, and all this in the name of Christianity and the Cobden Club. Their whole structure is a tower of Babel that must end in confusion and disaster. [Applause.]

We are told that free-trade England prospers more than protection Germany and France. I do not admit this in the light of her overcrowded poor-houses and emigrant ships hurrying their thousands to our tariff-protected shores; but supposing it to be true for the sake of argument, then in reply, coupled with her less expensive armies, she has thriven upon the loot of her conquests, upon the blood of her victims in India, Ireland, and the wretched debtors to her financial schemes in Turkey and Egypt. England would never have adopted a purely revenue tariff if Cobden and his kind had not believed that we and others would have been deceived into giving free port to English goods. Fortunately the world saw through their hypocrisy, and to-day the protective system is well-nigh universal. Adam Smith and Cobden have piped but we have not danced.

How this unnatural free-trade mother treated her dependent colonies and conquered countries the story is almost trite from its repetition. Says a recent writer:

The first attempt at manufacturing any species of cloth in the North American provinces produced a resolution on the part of the House of Commons (1710) that the erecting of manufactories in the colonies had a tendency to lessen their dependence on Great Britain. Soon afterward complaints were made to Parliament that the colonists were establishing manufactories for themselves, and the House of Commons ordered the Board of Trade to report on the subject, which was done at great length.

In 1732 the exportation of hats from province to province was prohibited, and the number of apprentices to be taken by hatters was limited. In 1750 the erection of any mill or other engine for splitting or rolling iron was prohibited; but pig-iron was allowed to be imported into England duty free, that it might be there manufactured and sent back again. At a later period Lord Chatham declared that he would not permit the colonists to make even a hobnail for themselves; and his views were then and subsequently carried into effect by the absolute prohibition, in 1765, of the export of artisans; in 1781 of woollen machinery; in 1782 of cotton machinery and artificers in cotton; in 1785 of iron and steel making machinery and workmen in those departments of trade; and in 1799 by the prohibition of the export of colliers, lest other countries should acquire the art of mining coal.

Thomas Jefferson, commenting on the parliamentary legislation repressive of colonial industry and intended to aggrandize Great Britain at the expense of her dependencies, expressed himself boldly and emphatically thus:

"That to heighten still the idea of parliamentary justice, and to show with what moderation they are likely to exercise power where themselves are to feel no part of its weight, we take leave to mention to his Majesty certain other acts of the British Parliament by which we were prohibited from manufacturing for our own use the articles we raise on our own lands with our own labor. By an act passed in the fifth year of the reign of his late Majesty King George II. an American subject is forbidden to make a hat for himself of the fur which he has taken, perhaps, on his own soil, an instance of despotism to which no parallel can be produced in the most arbitrary ages of British history.

By another act, passed in the twenty-third year of the same reign, the iron which we make we are forbidden to manufacture; and heavy as that article is, and necessary in every branch of husbandry, besides commission and insurance, we are to pay freight for it to Great Britain, and freight for it back again, for the purpose of supporting not men but machines in the island of Great Britain.

Under the black flag of her commercial supremacy the Indian victims, who fall annually under her famine-creating laws outnumber those, by far, who fell beneath the devastating sword of Hyder Ali, India's patriot defender. Her mock hosannah to free-trade can not drown the wail of the hunger-stricken Irish peasants on the bleak and wintry Connemah, where the wild surges of the North Atlantic break against the wilder hills, and mortal man makes superhuman struggles for a bare existence, only to see his wife and children yield the ghost to gaunt famine under the red folds of England's free-trade flag. But turn, ye preachers of her example, to a recent occurrence within the shadow of her Parliament House. Then you might have stood within the shadow of the open and welcome portals of the Cobden Club House and have seen before you, around the base of mighty Nelson's pillar, thousands of ragged, hungry, and, in part, homeless, desperate, and disinherited English artisans, mechanics, and laborers, clamoring for the opportunity to work. The outside free-traders who are presumed to be on good terms with her "most gracious majesty," should call his mother-in-law's attention to the Marquis of Lorne who some time ago in the North American Review defended protection in Canada.

These Campbells were always the shrewdest and most far-sighted of the Scottish clans. If free trade is a national blessing and a universal panacea for every ill, how is it that the colonizing Englishman invariably turns protectionist as soon as he gets out of sight of Land's End? Why is he not a free-trader in Canada? Why is that Englishmen have, and I am sorry to say it, gotten possession of probably 30,000,000 acres of

land in this tariff-ridden and "blarsted" country? Why are all the people of the earth so blind? Why is it that England spends millions on her army and navy for no other purpose than to steal and possess great patches of the globe, and make compulsory customers of their inhabitants? If India were free, how long would the ryots of Hindostan work for 8 cents a day and open their ports to England? How long, under national freedom, would the wretched fellahs of Egypt be enslaved to her money power?

She makes foreign markets at the point of the bayonet, and holds them open with her guns. And the day our statute-book is desecrated with a free-trade enactment bonfires of rejoicing will light the darkness of the night on British hills from John O'Groats to the chalky cliffs of Dover, and its author will be received with open arms by the now distracted English nobility and manufacturers. But, aside from England, can our workmen compete with the landless, ambitionless, hopeless, and degraded laborers of Europe? I have said that free commercial intercourse can not exist between countries socially, politically, and physically different without bringing all to a common level. Can we compete with these people? Can we make them in our own market our commercial equals? Here is an official picture from the records of the workers in a part of Europe:

WASHINGTON, January 9, 1886.

Consul Dithmar, at Breslau, Germany, has made a report to the Department of State relative to agricultural labor. He states that the laborer usually lives upon the estate and is employed upon it the year round. The working hours are in summer from 6 a. m. to 7 p. m., and in winter from sunrise to sunset. He is given free lodging and free fuel, and it is customary also to allow his family the use of 100 square rods of land for raising vegetables. As direct wages he receives per annum \$19 to \$23.80 in cash and 24 bushels of rye, 3 bushels of peas, and 1½ bushels of wheat.

THE LABORER'S WIFE

is bound to work in the field whenever required, and receives for a day's work in summer 12 to 14 cents, and in winter 10 to 12 cents. Of tea, meat, tobacco, and schnapps the farm laborer gets but little. If he smokes a pipe it is but seldom, and his tobacco is unmanufactured leaf. In harvest time he is treated to schnapps to encourage him in his work. The government tax is no longer paid by farm laborers, but the commercial-income tax amounts to 50 or 75 cents a year. A writer on economic subjects figures that a laborer's family, consisting of himself, wife, and five children under twelve years of age, can subsist on \$1.00 a week, or

SEVENTY-FIVE DOLLARS A YEAR.

Consul Dithmar also gives a tabular statement of the wages paid to miners and mine laborers, showing that they receive daily 52½ cents (which is paid to foremen, engineers, and carpenters), to 18½ and 15 cents paid to women and minors. The average cost of the subsistence of a miner's family, including rent, clothing, and taxes, amounts to \$122.80 per annum. The rents paid by the miners range from 36 cents to \$1.19 per month.

The rate of wages paid to agricultural labor depends upon the locality where such labor is employed, being considerably higher in the level than in the mountain districts. In the former the wages of a man and wife aggregate \$194.25 per annum, while in the mountainous districts a man and his wife, assisted by a child, earns but \$184.92. In the district of Wolfenbuttel the laborers receive a cash wage of 35 cents per day, summer and winter; working time, 5 to 11 a. m. and 1 to 6 p. m. Women are paid 19 cents for the same time. A man will earn from 5½ to 7½ cents per diem mowing, and a woman from 29 to 35 cents for gathering behind the scythe. Men and women both earn from 35 to 47 cents hoeing, and from 47 to 59 cents gathering beets. In this latter work children are also employed to cut off the leaves, and a child from seven to twelve years old will earn in a period of three or four weeks 24 cents daily.

Why is England so anxious for free trade in America? I will tell you. Some time ago the home secretary for Great Britain sent out to all her manufacturers some questions, asking what in their opinion was the cause of the existing depression, and in nearly every instance, among other reasons given, was, "the American tariff system."

Is free trade a cardinal principle of the Democratic party? is a question to which there can be but one answer. While it is true that the Democratic party, being a strict guardian of the Constitution, has never advocated protection for the sake of protection, yet I might spend my hour reading Democratic authority for the incidentally protective features of the tariff.

If this claim is ever made there is certainly nothing in the whole history of the organization to sustain it. This historic and venerable party, the most vital and enduring organized defense of human rights and constitutional liberty yet devised by man, is coequal with the Government itself. To its storm and battle beaten but unsundered battlement, like the tenacious and evergreen ivy, cling the traditions of our past, and in the shelter of its stout walls flourish our hopes for the future. Its magnificent, enduring, and well-poised superstructure rests upon no narrow foundations of ill-developed theories or crumbling ledge of self or sectional issues. Protected from undue foreign influence or interference, it aims to develop the individuality of the citizen, preserve the autonomy and freedom of the community and the State, and watch zealously against the use of paternal government or centralized despotism. It came into being at the instance of the fathers to sentinel the temple they had reared. It is true that, like Augustine said of the early Christian church, with "unity in essentials, liberty in non-essentials, and toleration in all things," many men of many minds have worshiped at its altars, but with some few brilliant but erratic exceptions, its teachers in the study, its professors in the forum, and its great leaders in the field, from Jefferson the prophet to Jackson the partisan and soldier, all have upheld the doctrine of incidental protection to American labor against foreign wiles or open aggression.

It is an inspiring duty to battle steadfastly and at any amount of

personal sacrifice against allowing this great organization to be prostituted to the aims of fanatical theorists or designing men for selfish and unpatriotic purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I am nerved to the contest; my heart expands to meet the issue. It is no crime to differ with men within my party on the questions of the hour. Better men and nobler souls have faced these fires in graver crises of our history. I am unworthy of the presence of these august shades. Stephen A. Douglas and Silas Wright have passed away, but their memory is green in the hearts of millions of freemen and true Democrats.

This great constitutional party has resumed the control of the Government it helped to form and preserve, and has, in my opinion, with wise direction entered upon a series of splendid victories that will benefit the whole people by giving them wise, honest, conservative, economic, constitutional home-rule government. The difference between it and its opponents will always remain, to its credit, plain and distinct, and that without regard to passing and ephemeral distractions. The Democratic party, having revised the tariff, will find its life-work but begun. Jefferson did not found a great party to split hairs with Adam Smith.

TARIFF REVISION.

I believe in revising the tariff law because it has need of revision in the interest of all the people, because we are pledged to such a course as a party, and because I think the preservation of the protective principle can only be served by denouncing and destroying the selfish schemes of those who have prostituted these laws for inordinate gain, to the injury of the people. The shield of tariff protection must not unduly cover those who have abused its principles.

The greedy schemers who imperil the safety of the whole structure must be unearthed and driven forth. Protection to honest labor is not a mask for dishonest monopolists. The incongruities and inequalities of the laws should be remedied. Administrative reform is a crying necessity. Duties too high and above a labor line should be reduced. Exotics must face the open air. Greed must stay its hand. [Applause.] But raise or lower, the dead-line must always be the difference in wages between this and other countries.

The protective effects of the tariff are intended for labor. A great and admitted difference in wages does exist between this and other countries. This fact cannot be, and is not, denied. I could take up many pages with tables, but I am merciful. Undue reduction of the tariff must lower the cost of the product to meet European competition. Home cost is in many articles over 80 per cent. wages, hence wages will first be reduced. Low tariffs in the United States—low wages. Fine spun theories are advanced against this statement, but they can not convince.

They say the cost of the unit of production has decreased and wages have increased; that one man on a machine can make many more cotton shirts than one man by hand, and get more wages for his time and skill. Granted. This will apply to all countries—Europe as well as America; but wages have in no wise advanced in Europe as they have in America for the same skill, with the same appliances, working the same time.

A great thread mill has just moved its whole establishment from Leeds, England, to a town in my Congressional district, but they pay here, using the same machine and in some instances the same skill, over two times more wages than they did in England. The cost of the unit of production has increased here because wages are higher; labor costs more. That tells the whole story. Cut down wages and I grant you the tariff is not needed. Increase the tariff beyond this wage difference, and you are robbing the consumer in the name of the artisan. Adjust it to the wage difference and you benefit all concerned. Well paid laborer is the best customer, client, or patient of the consumer.

It is a mere abuse of that father of his, the arithmetic, to say that labor bears a small proportion to the value of almost any selected article. A finished product represents almost entirely human labor and skill. The product of two guileless Texan Democratic sheep represents the raw material that, made into clothes, will annually well clothe a man. All the rest is labor and skill. Thousands of our fellow-citizens are engaged in making these clothes. We hear a great deal about sheep, whisky, and dear clothes.

This style of argument is supposed to be crushing. It takes its place among a collection of antique fables about the "poor man's blanket" and the "rich man's diamond," and means, when you come to analyze it, just as much as the cachinnation of the laughing jackasses of the Australian forests. [Laughter.] Editors who know less about the tariff than they do about the dodo, keep this as standing matter in their columns, and young debating clubs, dropping the conventional subject of controversy as to whether it is more conducive to virtue to live in the country than in the city, give forth oracular utterances to political parties as to this subject.

Now, let us see. You tax whisky and collect it with an armed battalion of officers and spies, and as a result you enrich its monopolistic manufacturers and do not, in my opinion, increase nor decrease, by what the late Artemus Ward would call "a grown man's dose," the consumption of the entire liquor output. You only lower the quality. You collect tariff duty on clothes, and thus give employment to hun-

dreds of thousands of American men and women, beget home competition, and compel the foreigner to lower his price.

The very last public utterance of that great Englishman, Matthew Arnold, in the Nineteenth Century Magazine, in the course of a scathing review of our country and her people, April number, page 484, was to this effect:

Luxuries are, as I have said, very dear—above all, European luxuries; but a workingman's clothing is nearly as cheap as in England, and plain food is on the whole cheaper.

Mr. Arnold did not like us but he was candid. How amusing in the light of this statement—and it goes to the point—by this eminent Englishman is the cry of dear clothing. Dear clothing! Cheap whisky! Indeed!

It is said that wages have increased in England under free trade as in America under protection. If free trade is best, should they not increase more? If they have increased as much, why do English laborers and artisans flock to protection countries and colonies? And this emigration I admit will ultimately become a factor in the case. Now, in all this I want it understood that I am not claiming that the sun shines, the grass grows, and the water runs, and universal prosperity reigns, and everybody is prosperous and happy and contented because of protection, any more than I believe that poverty and original sin, headaches, corns, Congressional dead-locks, and farm mortgages will disappear under free trade or a strictly revenue tariff.

I join with the extremists of neither school. I know how selfish and false are the cries that surround this question. But I assert my belief that a judiciously levied tariff for revenue, with incidental protection to American labor, has done and will yet do much for our people and our country. It will diversify industry, make us independent of other countries, and to the great and rising Southern States, under non-sectional Democratic government, prove the source of manifold blessings. I do not believe the tariff question will settle the tremendous contest between labor and capital.

Labor is making an organized effort for its just share of the joint production, and that will go on regardless of tariffs or no tariffs. Of course, under free trade the employer would have the world open to him for a place for manufacture, and confronted with fair demands in America would move to a cheaper labor market. The contest might, indeed, then cease here, because there would be nothing left to contend about.

Radical changes in the tariff must always therefore fall first on labor. Capital can take care of itself. I am not concerned for it. It is noticeable in the United States that the leading free-trade advocates are men of wealth and settled income or those interested with them. As soon as a man becomes wealthy he looks for cheap labor. "The world's mine oyster," he says to himself. "If I can not make money manufacturing in America I can sell foreign-made goods, or invest in foreign manufactories, or speculate on the necessities of my countrymen."

It seems a cruel thing to say, but it is true, that there are men in this country to-day who for remorseless greed for their own profit would import to supplant their own race and kind in our labor market with the barbaric hordes of semi-civilized Asia. In what I have said about wages in America and other countries, I have gone into no statistics or offered, as I might, official statements, because the case is practically admitted.

It is a patent fact that in all branches of industry in America wages are higher than in Europe. Carpenters, masons, doctors, lawyers, and other callings not directly protected by tariff laws get the full benefit of these increased payments, and hence have higher remuneration than in competing countries. Raising the wages of a large portion of the labor and skill of the country raises all. For instance, the farm laborer will not work for proportionately less than the mill hand. Much is said about some local causes making differences in the rates of wages paid in different States of the Union. This may be so, but the differences are minor, and even where they reach the lowest they are still much higher than anywhere outside our own country, and the standard is very even and general, all things considered, throughout the United States.

THE TARIFF CONSIDERED SOLELY AS A TAX.

It has been alleged that the price of the imported article is in all cases increased the full amount of the duty levied. That is, if an article costs \$1 in Europe and you pay 50 cents on it as duty at the New York custom-house, the consumer pays the 50 cents as tax over and above the value of the article. In other words, that its usual and ordinary price is increased 50 cents. I will not rest my denial of this sweeping assertion on anything that I might say myself, but will cite the great English free-trade writer, J. R. McCullough, in his work on Taxation, London, 1845, page 154. He says:

It is not, however, by any means, a necessary consequence that the prices of articles on which a duty has been laid will be raised proportionally to its amount, or, indeed, that they will be raised at all, and in the latter case the distribution of capital will not be affected.

Provided the duty be not oppressive, its influence in stimulating those engaged in the production of the taxed articles to new efforts of industry and economy may enable them to sell the commodities at their old price, or at one but little higher. And supposing it were otherwise, and that prices were raised proportionally to the tax, the effect would be confined to the home market, inasmuch as the granting of an equivalent drawback, or the remitting of the duties on the articles when exported, hinders the foreign market from being affected by the tax.

This plainly says that the European producer meets the 50 cents tariff tax by reducing his price that amount or more at home; and so the American consumer does not pay it, but the foreigner pays it directly into our Treasury and we gain the whole. This is demonstrated as to many articles in our market. When European pottery had no American rivals, and our tariff was very low, pottery was about twice as dear as it is to-day under the existing tariff with home potteries. Behind the tariff bar grew up our home industry; and the foreigner was compelled to lower his prices. It is the same with glass. One factory making a certain kind of glass here in the United States was burned down. This destroyed competition in this market against foreign goods of that kind. The price of the foreign article immediately advanced. It is a well-known fact that the export price of foreign goods is often lower than their home selling price.

When the tariff is wisely and honestly adjusted a healthy competition, both foreign and domestic, ensues. If you do away with home manufactures who will insure us against the foreign trust and combination? The modern trust is, in my eyes, just as far from being either honest or just as the ancient pirate or highwayman, and they should be sternly repressed; but I am not willing to admit that the protective features of the tariff are solely and wholly responsible for these latter-day developments. It is noticeable that the towering trust giants, oil, whisky, etc., do not defend nor are they affected by the tariff. We need not burn down the house to get a few rats out of the cellar; other remedies are at hand.

It seems to me the climax of brazen effrontery for these monstrous conspiracies against the welfare of the people to inveigh as they do against organized labor. It was the foul confederacy of soulless capital that compelled labor to organize in self-defense, and at its door should be laid the excesses, if any, that may ensue. Harmony between labor and capital will be restored when faith comes again to a forsaken earth and the golden rule again reigns.

CHEAP MARKETS.

How much we hear about cheap markets and the purchasing power of the dollar. Now, the purchasing power of the dollar is all important if you have the dollar. Of what use is the cheap market to the man who can not get his dollar? Suppose you close his workshops and send him out into the world, where will the workman get his dollar to go into your cheap markets? Suppose you reduce his dollar one-half, how will that raise the price of your wheat? India and Russia compete with us in breadstuffs in the British market, and will so continue until more diversified industry gets a foothold in those countries. Advancing civilization in Russia and freedom for India are to be desired. When India is free from British rule she will eat her own wheat, and the horrible annual famines amid plenty will cease. But as it is now the best market for Texan and Kentucky farmers is up in New York and New Jersey.

Close the industries now prevailing there and our great industrial army—their best customers—will, I suppose, join them in purely agricultural pursuits, and all enter competition in foreign markets against Russian serfs, Egyptian fellahs, and Indian ryots. The tariff will not trouble us then. We will all lie down in peace and kick our heels in the daisies, or join in chasing a lonely coyote for a winter overcoat in his skin. Our people thoroughly understand this. In no country are the workmen so intelligent and well organized. They have, besides, the quick, acute, sharp sense that is characteristic of those reared in our dry, stimulating air.

These people are not represented in the parlor conventions of free-traders, where cheap-labor millionaires, importers, selfish politicians, and speculative philosophers elbow each other in a singular jumble. These workmen have no affiliation with gentlemen of infinite leisure, unbounded wealth, and great admiration for all things foreign. No; they are rugged, whole-souled, unwavering Americans in principle and practice.

THE FOREIGN MARKET.

Universal depression in agriculture prevails. In Great Britain agricultural distress is terrible. In France the whole nation is troubled by seeing the very foundation of that country—the small landholder—suffering unwonted hardship. It is so throughout all Europe. Agricultural depression is felt here to some degree, but in no country in the world to-day so little as in the United States. The British, French, and German farmers would gladly exchange places with ours. In fact they do come here in multitudes every hour. Even as I speak they are crowding the steam-ship wharves in my Congressional district. Now this depression has given room for much talk of the foreign market.

We must, forsooth, get a great foreign market by act of Congress. I would like to have this wonderful foreign market more clearly defined. Is it in Europe? Europe is doing her own manufacturing and striving hard to raise her own bread for her own artisans. Scarcity in England. For myself I have great hopes of extending our market in the South Americas. English ports are now open to us, but unless we reduce wages we can not beard the lion in his den. She is our great and sleepless rival. But soon, very soon, we will take from her the commercial primacy of the world. Her own writers see this coming and are sounding alarms to their countrymen. A well-regulated American tariff will surely sap away her commercial supremacy and

make us master in the newer countries where trade is yet to be won. This young Republic of unlimited possibilities and with its intelligent labor will eventually dominate trade and commerce in all American countries.

Let us proceed carefully and on true reciprocal grounds to extend our American market. When our people bend all their energies to it, when shipbuilding becomes as popular as railroad building, when our merchants and manufacturers train for it, then our laws will shape it, and our foreign market will be established. When the pressure for a foreign market becomes very great we can safely trust the genius, industry, and pluck of our people to find one. In the mean time let us remember that the home market first and last is our sheet-anchor.

In the mean time do not let us delude ourselves with vague talk about foreign markets that do not exist or are passing away. Let me read some extracts from a recent paper by Kropotkin in the London Nineteenth Century, April number. The writer has a wide reputation. He writes to prove that the home market is now the only market left for nearly all countries. He insists that each nation is rapidly approaching the point when it will raise its own bread, make its clothes, and build its own machines, and live within itself. The article is entitled "Our Industrial System." Hear this keen-eyed observer of universal events:

Each nation her own agriculturist and manufacturer; each individual working in the field and in some industrial art; each individual combining scientific knowledge with the knowledge of a handicraft—such is, we affirm, the present tendency of civilized nations. The following pages are intended to prove the first of these three assertions.

Gaze on this picture of the world's progress and see the changing conditions of nations and men.

Let us turn seventy years back. France lies bleeding at the end of the Napoleonic wars. Her young industry, which had begun to grow by the end of the last century, is crushed down. Germany, Italy, are powerless on the industrial field. The armies of the great Republic have struck a mortal blow to serfdom on the continent; but the return of reaction tries to revive the decaying institution, and serfdom means no industry worth speaking of. The terrible wars between France and this country, which wars are often explained by merely political causes, had a much deeper meaning—an economical meaning. They were wars for the supremacy on the world-market, wars against French commerce and industry; and Britain won the battle. She became supreme on the seas. Bordeaux was no more a rival to London, and the French industries seemed to be killed in the bud. And, favored by the powerful impulse given to natural sciences and technology by the great area of inventions; finding no serious competitors in Europe, Britain began to develop her manufactures. To produce on a large scale in immense quantities became the watchword. The necessary human forces were at hand in the peasantry, partly driven by force from the land, partly attracted to the cities by high wages. The necessary machinery was created, and the British production of manufactured goods went on at a gigantic pace. In the course of less than seventy years—from 1810 to 1878—the output of coal grew from ten to one hundred and thirty-three millions of tons; the imports of raw materials rose from thirty to three hundred and eighty millions of tons; and the exports of manufactured ware from forty-six to two hundred million pounds. The tonnage of the commercial fleet was nearly trebled. Fifteen thousand miles of railways were built.

It is useless to repeat at what a cost the above results were achieved. The terrible revelations of the parliamentary commissions of 1840-'42 as to the atrocious condition of the manufacturing classes; the tales of "cleared estates" and those of Indian "mutiny" are still fresh in the memory. They will remain standing monuments for showing by what means the great industry was implanted in this country. But the accumulation of wealth in the hands of the privileged classes was going on at a speed never dreamed of before. The incredible riches which now astonish the foreigner in the private houses of this country were accumulated during that period; the exceedingly expensive standard of life which makes a person considered rich on the continent appear as only of modest means in this country, was introduced during that time. The taxed property alone doubled during the last thirty years of the above period, while during the same years (810 to 1878) no less than £1,112,000,000 was invested by English capitalists either in foreign industries or in foreign loans.

But the monopoly of industrial production could not remain with this country forever. Neither industrial knowledge nor enterprise could be kept forever as a privilege of these islands. Necessarily, fatally, they began to cross the channel and spread over the continent. The great revolution had created in France a numerous class of peasant proprietors who enjoyed nearly half a century of a comparative well-being, or, at least, of a guaranteed labor. The ranks of the town proletariat—a necessary condition now for growing industries—were therefore increasing slowly. But the middle-class revolution of 1789-1793 had already made a distinction between the peasant householders and the village *prolétaires*, and, by favoring the former to the detriment of the latter, it compelled the laborers who had no household nor land to abandon their villages, and thus to form the first nucleus of working classes given up to the mercy of manufacturers. Moreover, the peasant-proprietors themselves, after having enjoyed a period of undeniable prosperity, began in their turn to feel the pressure of bad times, and were compelled to look for employment in manufactures. Wars and revolution had checked the growth of industry; but it began to grow again during the second half of our century; it developed, it improved; and now, notwithstanding the loss of Alsace, France is no longer the tributary to England for manufactured produce which she was thirty years ago. To-day her exports of manufactured ware are valued a nearly one-half of those of Great Britain, and two-thirds of them are textile goods.

Germany follows the same lines. During the last twenty-five years, and especially since the last war, her industry has undergone a thorough reorganization. Her machinery has been thoroughly improved, and her new-born manufactures are supplied with a machinery which mostly represents the last word of technical progress.

A superior technical and scientific education; and in her army of learned chemists, physicists, and engineers, who find no employment with the state, industry has a most powerfully intelligent aid. As a whole, Germany offers now the spectacle of a nation in a period of *Aufschwung*, with all the forces of a new start in every domain of life. Thirty years ago she was a customer to England. Now she is already a terrible competitor in the markets of the south and east, and at the present speedy rate of growth of her industries, her competition will be soon yet more terrible than it is.

The wave of industrial production, after having had its origin in the northwest of Europe, spreads towards the east and southeast, always covering a wider circle. And, in proportion as it advances east, and penetrates into younger countries, it implants there all the improvements due to a century of mechanical and chemical inventions; it borrows from science all the help it can give to industry; and it

finds populations eager to grasp the last results of modern knowledge. The new manufactures of Germany begin where Manchester arrived after a century of experiments and gropings; and Russia begins where Manchester and Saxony have now reached. Russia, in her turn, tries to emancipate herself from her dependency upon Western Europe, and rapidly begins to manufacture all those goods she formerly used to import, either from Britain or from Germany. Protective duties may sometimes help the birth of new industries, and sometimes check the improvement of those which already exist; but the decentralization of manufactures goes on with or without protective duties—I should even say, notwithstanding the protective duties. Austria, Hungary, and Italy follow the same lines; they develop their home industries; and even Spain is going to join the family of manufacturing nations. Nay, even India, even Brazil and Mexico, supported by English and German capital and knowledge, begin to start home industries on their respective soils. Finally, a terrible competitor to all European manufacturing countries has grown up of late in the United States. In proportion as their immense territory is more and more appropriated by the few, and free land of any value becomes as difficult to get as it is in Europe, manufacturers must grow in the States; and they are growing at such a speed—an American speed—that in a very few years the new neutral markets will be invaded by American goods. The monopoly of the first-comers on the industrial field has ceased to exist. And it will exist no more, whatever may be the spasmodic efforts made to return to a state of things already belonging to the domain of history. New ways, new issues, must be searched: the past has lived, and it will live no more.

Before going further, let me illustrate the march of industries towards the east by a few figures. And, to begin with, let me take the example of Russia. Not because I know it better, or that our industrial statistics, although slow to appear, are fuller than those of Austria or of Italy, but because Russia is the latest comer on the industrial field. Thirty years ago she was considered as the ideal of an agricultural nation, doomed by nature itself to supply other nations with food, and to draw her manufactured goods from the west. So it was, indeed, thirty years ago; but it is so no more. Elisée Reclus has given, in his *Géographie Universelle*, a curve intended to show the growth of Russian industries since 1859, and this modest curve is worth whole pages, as it tells at once to the eye the sudden increase of Russian manufactures a few years after the emancipation of serfs. In 1861—the year of the emancipation—Russia, together with Poland, had only 14,060 manufactories, which produced every year the value of two hundred and ninety-six millions of rubles (about £36,000,000). Twenty years later the number of establishments rose to 35,160, and their yearly production became nearly four times the above—i. e., thirteen hundred and five millions (about £131,600,000); and in 1884, although the census left the smaller manufactories out of account, the aggregate production reached already fifteen hundred and fifty-six millions—i. e., £155,000,000. The most noteworthy feature of Russian industry is, that while the number of workmen employed in the manufactories has not even doubled since 1861 (it has remained almost stationary since 1879), the production per workman has more than doubled; it has trebled in the leading industries. The average was less than £70 per annum in 1861; it reaches now £163. The increase of production is thus chiefly due to the improvement of machinery, especially since 1870. If we take, however, separate branches, and especially the textile industries and the machinery works, the progress appears still more striking.

"If we consider only the years which preceded 1879—when the import duties were increased by nearly 30 per cent., and a protective policy was definitely adopted—we still find the following progress in the cotton industries: The number of workmen employed increases only by 25 per cent.; but the production increases by 300 per cent.; the yearly production per workman employed grows from £45 to £117. The unanimous opinion of the experts at the exhibition of 1882 was, that a considerable improvement had been realized of late in the Russian cotton manufactures; and [everybody can confirm the accuracy of the statement by the cheapness and the good taste of the cottons now manufactured in Russia. The same is true, although to a smaller extent, with regard to the woollens industries, and fully with regard to the silks (compare Stieda's monographs in the *Russische Revue*). As to the machinery works, it would not be fair to make any comparison between 1884 and 1861, or even 1870; the whole has grown up during the last ten years; and Professor Kirpicheff points out that the progress realized can be best judged by the high perfection attained in the building of the most perfect types of big steam-engines, locomotives, and in the manufacture of water-pipes, notwithstanding the competition of Glasgow. Russia needs no longer to import any part of her railway plant, thanks to the progress made under the leadership of English and partly German engineers. As to the home-made agricultural machinery, both the *Times* correspondent and Russian reports agree in recognizing that it successfully competes even with American machinery, although the latter is much cheaper and more appropriate to the Russian prairies than the English."

A country which manufactures chiefly for export, and therefore lives chiefly on the profits derived from her foreign trade, stands very much in the same position as Switzerland, which lives to a great extent on the profits derived from the foreigners who visit her lakes and glaciers. A good "season" means an influx of from £1,600,000 to £2,000,000 of money imported by the tourists, and a bad "season" has the effects of a bad crop in an agricultural country; a general impoverishment follows. So it is also with a country which manufactures for export. If the season is bad and the exported goods can not be sold abroad for twice their value at home, the country which lives chiefly on these bargains suffers. Low profits for the innkeepers of the Alps mean narrowed circumstances in large parts of Switzerland. Low profits for the Lancashire and Birmingham manufacturers mean narrowed circumstances in this country. The cause is the same in both cases.

For many decades past we have not seen such a cheapness of wheat and manufactured goods as we see now, and yet we are suffering from a crisis. People say its cause is overproduction. But overproduction is a word utterly devoid of sense if it does not mean that those who are in need of all kinds of produce have not the means for buying them with their low salaries. Nobody would dare to affirm that there is too much furniture in the crippled cottages, too many bedsteads and bed-clothes in the workmen's dwellings, too many lamps burning in the huts, and too much cloth on the shoulders not only of those who used to sleep in Trafalgar Square between two newspapers, but even in those households where a silk hat makes a part of the Sunday dress. And nobody will dare to affirm that there is too much food in the homes of those agricultural laborers who earn 10s. a week, and pay for their meat 9d. a pound, or of those who earn from 5d. to 6d. a day in the clothing trade or in the small industries which swarm in the outskirts of all great cities. Overproduction means merely and simply a want of purchasing power amidst the workers. With their wages they can not buy the goods they have produced themselves, because the prices of those goods, however low, include the profits of the employers and the middlemen.

The same want of purchasing powers of the workers is felt everywhere on the continent. But it is obvious that it must be felt more in this country, which has been accustomed to pump bargains out of her foreign customers and now sees her exterior trade decline. The exports of manufactured goods from this country have declined by one hundred and sixty-one millions in the three years ending 1880 when compared with the year 1872, said Mr. Gladstone at Leeds. Even those who will not admit that there is a notable decline in the exports, willingly admit that the prices are so low in comparison with those of 1873 that in order to reach the same money value England ought to export four pieces of cotton cloth instead of three and eight or ten tons of metal instead of six. "The aggregate of our foreign trade in the year 1883, if valued at the prices of ten years previously,

would have amounted to £861,000,000, instead of £667,000,000," we are told by the commission on trade depression.

The home markets are overstocked; the foreign markets are escaping; and in the neutral markets Britain is being undersold. Such is the conclusion which every observer must arrive at if he examines the development of manufactures all over the world. Great hopes are laid now in Australia; but Australia, with her ever-growing numbers of unemployed, will soon do what Canada does. She will manufacture; and the last colonial exhibition, by showing to the "colonists" what they are able to do, and how they must do, will only have accelerated the day when each colony *farà da sé* in her turn. Canada already imposes protective duties on British goods. New demands for a further increase of duties are continually being pressed on the Canadian government. As to the much-spoken-of markets on the Congo, and Mr. Stanley's calculations and promises of a trade amounting to £20,000,000 a year if the Lancashire people supply the Africans with loin-clothes, such promises belong to the same category of fancies as the famous nightcaps of the Chinese which were to enrich this country. The Chinese prefer their own home-made nightcaps; and, as to the Congo people, four countries at least are already competing for supplying them with their poor dress—Britain, Germany, the United States, and, last but not least, India.

There was a time when this country had almost the monopoly of the trade in manufactured ware. But now, if only the six chief manufacturing countries of Europe and the United States be taken into account, Britain, although still keeping the first rank, commands less than one-half of the aggregate exports of manufactured goods. Two-thirds of them are textiles and more than one-third are cottons. But while thirty years ago, Britain took the lead in the cotton industries, about 1880 she had only a little more than one-half the spindles at work in Europe, the United States, and India (40,000,000 out of 72,000,000), and a little more than one-half of the looms (550,000 out of 972,000). She was steadily losing ground, while the others were winning. And the fact is quite natural; it might have been foreseen. There is no reason why Britain should always be the great cotton manufactory of the world when raw cotton has to be imported. It was quite natural that France, Germany, Italy, Russia, India, and even Mexico and Brazil, should spin their own yarns and weave their own cotton-stuffs. But the appearance of the cotton industry in a country, or, in fact, of any textile industry, unavoidably becomes the starting-point for the growth of a series of other industries. Chemical and mechanical works, metallurgy and mining, feel at once the impetus given by a new want. The whole of the home industries, as also technical education altogether, must improve in order to satisfy it as soon as it has been felt.

What has happened with regard to cottons is going on also with regard to other industries. Britain and Belgium have no longer the monopoly of the woolen manufacture. The immense factories at Verriers are silent; the Belgian weavers are misery-stricken, while Germany yearly increases her production of woollens and exports nine times more woollens than Belgium. Austria has her own woollens and exports them; Riga, Lodz, and Moscow supply Russia with finest woolen cloths, and the growth of the woolen industry in each of the last-named countries calls into existence hundreds of connected trades.

For many years France has had the monopoly of the silk trade. Silkworms being reared in Southern France, it was quite natural that Lyons should grow into a center for the manufacture of silks. Spinning, domestic weaving, and dyeing works developed to a great extent. But eventually the industry took such a development that home supplies of raw silk became insufficient, and raw silk was imported from Italy, Spain, and South Austria, Asia Minor, the Caucasus, and Japan, to the amount of from 9,000,000 to 11,000,000 pounds in 1875 and 1876, while France disposed only of 800,000 pounds of her own silk. Thousands of peasant boys and girls were attracted by high wages to Lyons and the neighboring district; the industry was prosperous. However, by and by new centers of silk trade grew up at Basel and in the peasant houses around Zurich. French emigrants imported the trade, and it developed, especially after the civil war of 1871. The Caucasian administration invited French workmen and women from Lyons and Marseilles to teach the Georgians and the Russians the best means of rearing the silk worm and the whole of the silk trade, and Stavropol became a new center for silk-weaving. Austria and the United States did the same; and what are now the results? During the years 1872 to 1881 Switzerland more than doubled the produce of her silk industry; Italy and Germany increased it by one-third; and the Lyons region, which formerly manufactured to the value of 454,000,000 francs a year, shows now a return of only 378,000,000. The exports of Lyons silks, which reached an average of 425,000,000 francs in 1855-'59, and 460,000,000 in 1870-'74, have fallen down to 233,000,000. And it is reckoned by French specialists that at present no less than one-third of the silk-stuffs used in France are imported from Zurich, Crefeld, and Barmen. Nay, even Italy, which had 2,000,000 spindles and 30,000 looms in 1880 (as against 14,000 in 1879), sends her silks to France (3,300,000 francs in 1881), and competes with Lyons. The French manufacturers may cry as loudly as they like for protection, or resort to the production of cheaper goods of lower quality; they may sell 3,250,000 kilograms of silk-stuffs at the same price as they sold 2,500,000 in 1855-'59. They will never regain the position they occupied before. Italy, Switzerland, Germany, the United States, and Russia have their own silk manufactures and will import from Lyons only the highest qualities of stuffs; as to the lower sorts a foulard has become a common attire with the St. Petersburg housemaids, because the North Caucasian domestic trades supply them at a price which would starve the Lyons weavers. And they do starve. The misery at Lyons was so great in 1881 that the poorly-fed soldiers of the Lyons garrison shared their food with the weavers and spared their coppers in order to alleviate the misery. But neither charities nor public works at the fortifications will help. The trade has irremediably gone away; it has been decentralized; and Lyons will never become again the center for silk trade it was thirty years ago.

Like examples could be produced by the score. Greenock no longer supplies Russia with sugar, because Russia has plenty of her own at the same price as it sells at in England. The watch trade is no more a specialty of Switzerland, and I saw skilled *gillocheurs* earning a miserable existence by carding wool and the like. India extracts from her ninety collieries two-thirds of her annual consumption of coal. The chemical trade which grew up on the banks of the Clyde and Tyne, owing to the special advantages offered for the import of Spanish pyrites, and the agglomeration of such a variety of industries along the two estuaries, is now in decay. Spain, with the help of English capital, is beginning to utilize her own pyrites for herself. Germany extracted them to the amount of 158,410 tons in 1882, and manufactured no less than 358,150 tons of sulphuric acid, and 115,000 tons of soda, as against 42,500 in 1877—nay, she already complains about over-production, and indeed the prices have fallen from 23 marks to 14 and 12 marks the hundred kilograms.

But enough. I have before me so many figures, all telling the same tale, that examples could be multiplied at will. It is time to conclude, and, for every unprejudiced mind, the conclusion is self-evident. Industries of all kinds are decentralized and scattered all over the globe, and everywhere a variety, an integrated variety, of trades grows, instead of specialization. Such are the prominent features of the times we live in. Each nation becomes in its turn a manufacturing nation; and the time is not far off when each nation of Europe, as well as the United States, and even the most backward nations of Asia and America, will themselves manufacture nearly everything they are in need of. Wars and several accidental causes may check for some time the scattering of industries; they will not stop it; it is unavoidable. For each new-comer the first steps only are difficult. But, as soon as any industry has taken firm root, it calls into existence hundreds of other trades; and as soon as the first steps have been made, and the first obstacles have been overcome, the growth of industries goes on at an accelerated rate.

The fact is so well felt, if not understood, that the race for colonies has become the distinctive feature of the last twenty years. Each nation will have her own colonies. But colonies will not help. There is not a second India in the world, and the old conditions will be repeated no more. Nay, some of the British colonies already threaten to become serious competitors with their mother country; others, like Australia, will not fall to follow the same lines. As to the yet neutral markets, China and Japan will never be serious customers to Europe—they can produce cheaper at home; and when they begin to feel a need for goods of European patterns, they will produce them themselves. Woe to Europe if, the day that the steam-engine invades China, she is still relying on foreign customers. As to the African half-savages, their misery is no foundation for the well being of a civilized nation.

Progress is in another direction. It is in producing for home use. The customers for the Lancashire cottons and the Sheffield cutlery, the Lyons silks, and the Hungarian flour-mills are not in India nor in Africa. They are amidst the home producers. No use to send floating shops to New Guinea with German or British millinery when there are plenty would-be customers for British millinery in these very islands, and for German ware in Germany. And instead of worrying our brains by schemes for getting customers abroad, it would be better to try to answer the following plain questions: Why the British worker, whose industrial capacities are so highly praised in political speeches; why the Scotch crofter and the Irish peasant, whose obstinate labors in creating new productive soil out of peat-bogs are so much spoken of now, are no customers to the Lancashire weavers, the Sheffield cutlers, and the Northumbrian and Welsh pitmen? Why the Lyons weavers not only do not wear silk, but have no food in their *mansardes*? Why the Russian peasants sell their corn, and for four, six, and sometimes eight months every year are compelled to mix bark and auroch-grass to a handfull of flour for baking their bread?

The Russian fabric inspectors' reports, the reports of the Plauen Handelskammer, and the Italian inquiries are full of the same revelations as the reports of the Parliamentary commissions of 1840 to 1842, or the modern revelations with regard to the "sweating system" at Whitechapel and Glasgow, and London pauperism. The capital and labor problem is thus universalized; but, at the same time, it is also simplified. To return to a state of affairs where corn is grown and manufactured goods are fabricated for the use of those very people who grow and produce them—such will be, no doubt, the problem to be solved during the next coming years of European history. Each region will become its own producer and its own consumer of manufactured goods. But that unavoidably implies that, at the same time, it will be its own producer and consumer of agricultural produce; and that is precisely what I shall discuss next.

P. KROPOTKIN.

Let me add to the picture drawn by this eminent student of economic facts by pointing to Ireland as the result of suppression by law of this diversified industry.

Mr. Chairman, it is possible that external circumstances may have influenced my opinion on this great question. I was born in a land that had that much lauded boon, commercial freedom. My infant eyes first saw the light of heaven under the sunshine and shadow of an Irish sky. In my better moods I hope I preserve the reflection. The haunts of poverty were more than filled; her custom-houses were almost tenantless.

I saw a brave, chivalrous, and generous people, with keen, acute intellects, bright and industrious, invaded by constantly recurring famines, driven to exile or death. In that "island of sorrows," that Niobe of nations, her magnificent natural harbors floated little or no commerce, and with idle hands and ingenious minds, under free-trade laws the smoke of the factory cast no shadows on the landscape. All this under free-trade laws. There the name of Peel was execrated, and the great Cobden had no place in her Pantheon.

RAW MATERIALS.

Much has been said about free raw materials. There is nothing made ready for use but has had some labor bestowed upon it; hence raw material, so called, represents more or less human labor. There are, however, natural products upon which little labor has been bestowed, but which are prime necessities of life or enter largely into the manufacture of other articles, and these should be as cheap as the labor engaged in making them ready for use can stand. Give abundant raw material to our factories and you will increase their number and output and make a market for our raw products, and thus increase them. Natural products which are not found, or which can not be readily raised in our own country, and which are of prime necessity to our industries may well be admitted free of duty so that we may have our full share of the world's product of such articles.

But the freeing of a natural product from duty should not be followed by a more than proportionate reduction of the tariff on the manufactured article. In some manufactured articles the raw material—full cost—is not over 1 per cent.

Speaking only for myself and on my own responsibility, as a guaranty of the good faith of my desire for full and fair revision of the tariff list in such a way as to secure benefit to the whole people and real reduction of the revenues, I append what I consider a fair and just basis for the passage of a bill:

ADDITIONS TO FREE-LIST.

Wools of class 2, or carpet wools, unscoured.
(All other wools 25 per centum ad valorem.)
Hair of the alpaca, goat, and other like animals.
Coal, bituminous, and shale, and coal slack or culm.
Salt.
Jute, jute butts, manila, sisal grass, and all other vegetable fibers, except flax and hemp.
Legs, and timber, hewn, squared, or sided; hubs for wheels, posts, lasts, oar blocks, etc., and staves in the rough.
Baryta, sulphate of, or barytes, unmanufactured.
Beeswax.
Borax, crude, and borate of lime.
Bristles, unmanufactured.
Currants, Zante, or other.
Coal-tar, and products and preparations of, not dyes or colors.
Egg yolks, unmanufactured.

Feathers of all kinds, not dressed, colored, or manufactured.
Grease and oils, for soap-making, dressing leather, etc.
Glycerine, crude or unrefined.
Human hair, raw or uncleaned, and not drawn.
Meats, game and poultry, dressed, but not otherwise prepared.
Mineral waters, of all kinds, not otherwise provided for.
Potash, crude, carbonate of, caustic or hydrate of, nitrate of, or saltpeter, crude, sulphate of, and chlorate of.
Soda, sulphate of, or salt cake, and Glauber salt.
Turpentine, and tar or pitch of wood.
Bulbs and bulbous roots, and various seeds.
Tallow.
Sponges.
Freestone, granite, and other building or monumental stone (except marble), in the rough.
Clays or earths, unwrought or unmanufactured.
Opium, crude, containing 9 per cent. or over of morphia.

SCHEDULE K.—WOOL, WOOLENS, ETC.

All wools of the sheep shall be divided for the purpose of fixing the duties to be charged thereon, into the two following classes:

CLASS 1. That is to say, merino, mestiza, metz, or metis wools or other wools of merino blood, immediate or remote; Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, Down clothing or combing wools, or other like wools of English blood, and usually known by the terms herein used; Canada long wools, and wools of like character with any of the preceding, including such as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Buenos Ayres, New Zealand, Australia, Cape of Good Hope, Russia, Great Britain, Canada, and elsewhere; and also including all wools not hereinafter described or designated in class 2.

CLASS 2. That is to say, Donkoi, native South American, Cordova, Valparaiso, native Smyrna, and including all such wools of like character as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Turkey, Greece, Egypt, Syria, and elsewhere.

Wools of the first class, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Wools of the second class, if scoured, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

Wools on the skin, the same rates as other wools, the quantity to be ascertained under such rules as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

Wools advanced from the second state by carding or combing, and ring waste, top waste, yarn waste, thread waste, garnetted waste, and all other similar products of wool, not herein otherwise specially provided for, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Woolen rags, shoddy, mungo, flocks, and waste or refuse wool, not herein otherwise provided for, 3 cents per pound and 10 per cent. ad valorem.

Woolen or worsted cloths and shawls, and other manufactures of every description, made wholly or in part of wool or the hair of the goat or other animals, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, valued at not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 12 cents per pound and 15 per cent. ad valorem; valued at above 40 cents per pound and not exceeding 60 cents per pound, 18 cents per pound and 25 per cent. ad valorem; valued at above 60 cents per pound and not exceeding 80 cents per pound, 24 cents per pound and 30 per cent. ad valorem; valued at above 80 cents per pound, 30 cents per pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem.

Flannels, blankets, hats, balmorals, yarns, and knit hosiery and underwear, composed wholly or in part of wool or the hair of the goat or other animals, valued at not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 12 cents per pound and 15 per cent. ad valorem; valued at above 40 cents per pound and not exceeding 60 cents per pound, 18 cents per pound and 20 per cent. ad valorem; valued at above 60 cents per pound and not exceeding 80 cents per pound, 24 cents per pound and 25 per cent. ad valorem; valued at above 80 cents per pound, 30 cents per pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem.

Women's and children's dress-goods, Italian cloths, lastings, bunting, and similar goods, composed wholly or in part of wool or hair of the goat or other animals, valued at not exceeding 16 cents per square yard, 5 cents per square yard and 20 per cent. ad valorem; valued at above 16 cents and not above 25 cents per square yard, 7 cents per square yard and 25 per cent. ad valorem; valued above 25 cents per square yard, 10 cents per square yard and 30 per cent. ad valorem: *Provided*, That all goods of the character enumerated in this paragraph weighing over 4 ounces per square yard shall pay a duty of 30 cents per pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem.

Clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing-apparel of every description, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, composed wholly or in part of wool or the hair of the goat or other animals, made up or manufactured wholly or in part by the tailor, seamstress, or manufacturer, 40 cents per pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem.

Elastic or non-elastic webbings, gorings, suspenders, braces, beltings, bindings, braids, galloons, fringes, gimps, cords, and tassels, trimmings, headnets, buttons, or barrel buttons, or buttons of other forms for tassels or ornaments, made wholly or in part of wool or of the hair of the goat or other animals, 30 cents per pound and 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Aubusson, Axminster, Moquette and chenille carpets, and carpets woven whole for rooms, 50 cents per square yard and 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Saxony, Wilton, and Tournay velvet carpets, 40 cents per square yard and 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Brussels carpets, 20 cents per square yard and 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Patent velvet and tapestry velvet carpets, printed on the warp or otherwise, 20 cents per square yard and 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Tapestry Brussels carpets, printed on the warp or otherwise, 15 cents per square yard and 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Treble ingrain, three-ply, and worsted chain Venetian carpets, 15 cents per square yard and 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Yarn Venetian and two-ply ingrain carpets, 9 cents per square yard and 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Druggets and bockings, printed, colored, or otherwise, 6 cents per square yard and 20 per cent. ad valorem.

The duty on mats, rugs, screens, covers, hassocks, bedsides, and other portions of carpets or carpetings, shall be the same as is herein imposed on carpets or carpeting of like character or description; and the duty on all other mats, rugs, screens, hassocks, and carpets and carpetings, of whatever material composed (except silk), not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, shall be 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Endless belts or felts for paper or printing machines, 15 cents per pound and 20 per cent. ad valorem.

This, of course, is not a full bill or complete revision, but is the basis of such a measure. The tobacco tax should be repealed. If this is done only in part it were better, in my opinion, to reduce the whole internal revenue by a cut of two-thirds or one-half. As to what I think of this tax, I have already stated. There is a difficulty about defining tin-plate so as to preserve our sheet-iron industry. If free, they should be confined to such plates as are used for domestic or canning purposes. This list can be amply defended. Carpet wools are nearly all foreign. Anthracite coal is already free. Salt employs but little labor and is a

great human necessity. The exporters now have it free—why not the farmers and the people? On the proper occasion I will have more to say on this subject.

Mr. Chairman, it is well, in conclusion, for those who deride all tariffs and glorify free trade to remember that the logic of the situation is with Mr. Henry George, that clever writer, who rightfully argues that with the abolition of custom-houses the single land tax comes within the domain of practical politics. While giving no sanction to the radical features of his teachings concerning the law, I am in perfect accord with him when he contends that tariff agitation is but a ripple on the surface, an air-bubble on the stream of deep and powerful currents that now give direction to the great ocean of human thought.

Mr. Chairman, I claim to be an honest revenue reformer. I would carefully revise the present tariff, reduce the revenue, and abolish the surplus, for which revision both political parties have declared, and for practical and honest effort so to do both will have to account to a watchful and intelligent people. I am aware that the business of the country suffer greatly from the continuance of an agitation largely fostered for political advantage. I am willing to make all reasonable concessions to settle this disturbing question; but, sir, I am proud to say that I would scorn to sacrifice the labor and industries of the Republic to noisy declaration which mingles self-eulogy with threats against its opponents.

To this House has been committed a fearful responsibility to unburden the overlaid Treasury, to reduce the revenues, and at the same time neither disturb nor injure the material welfare of the people. It is a task that calls for wisdom and prudence and high and unselfish aims. It is not a mere game to be played on the checker-board of infinitesimal politics, but an honorable and open contest on the higher plateau of supreme patriotism. As President Cleveland said in his last annual message, "The question thus imperatively presented for solution should be approached in a spirit higher than partisanship, and considered in the light of that regard for patriotic duty which should characterize the action of those intrusted with the weal of a confiding people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The time for quibble and dispute has passed, the time for action is imminent. Let us individually and collectively act wisely and well in the formulation and passage of a conservative and efficient measure, and the memory of the Fiftieth Congress will long survive in the annals of a grateful people, who, in the language of the motto of my State emblazoned in this Hall, are in the full enjoyment of "Liberty and Prosperity." [Great applause.]

During the delivery of the foregoing speech the following proceedings took place:

Mr. BLAND. Does not the gentleman attribute the difficulties of Ireland to the tyrannical rule of England keeping her in political commotion so that she could not have the benefit of free trade, free agriculture, or free anything?

Mr. MCADOO. I will say this, that at the time of the passage of the free-trade laws in England the soul and life had been ground out of Ireland by penal laws and barbarous restricting acts, so that they were immaterial to her. They only aggravated her sufferings. That is England's policy. Having sucked the life-blood out of her victim, she then offers her the empty boon, if boon it be, of free trade. It is rank cant and hypocrisy for British authors to talk of Ireland being unable to get the benefits of Cobden's agitation.

Mr. BLAND. When it is too late.

[Mr. MORROW addressed the committee in remarks which will be published hereafter.]

Before he had concluded,

The CHAIRMAN said: Under the order of the House, the committee must rise at this time.

Mr. MORROW. It is understood that I retain my right to the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be entitled to the remainder of his time when this subject is resumed to-morrow morning.

The committee rose; and Mr. McMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the tariff bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

And then, under the order of the House (the hour of half past 5 o'clock having arrived), the House took a recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m., and was called to order by Mr. McMILLIN as Speaker *pro tempore*, who directed the Clerk to read the following:

SPEAKER'S ROOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 8, 1888.

Hon. BENTON McMILLIN, of Tennessee, is designated to preside as Speaker *pro tempore* at the session of the House of Representatives this evening.

Hon. JOHN B. CLARK,
Clerk House Representatives.

Mr. BYNUM. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of revenue bills.

The motion was agreed so.

TARIFF.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union (Mr. SPRINGER in the chair) and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. STONE, of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I begin with the enunciation made by the President of an old economic truth, that the cost of any article subject to a tariff tax or duty is increased to the consumer by the amount of the duty. The tax paid by the importer is added to the cost of the article in his hands, and the man who buys the article for use repays the tax to the importer. There is, for example, both a specific and ad valorem tax on woolen hats. The ad valorem tax is 40 per cent., while the specific tax varies from 10 cents to 35 cents per pound. An importer who pays \$1 for a hat in England, ships it to the United States, and at the port of entry pays to the collector of customs 60 cents as a tariff tax on that hat, and adds the tax to the cost of the hat, and so the man who buys the hat for use pays the tax. If instead of buying an imported hat the consumer should buy a hat of similar quality of domestic manufacture he would be compelled to pay the same price. The two hats compete in the same market and bring the same price.

If the tax on the imported hat had been 30 cents instead of 60 cents, the hat would have cost the importer 30 cents less, and he could have sold it to the consumer for that amount less. And if the imported hat decreases in price, the domestic hat must do likewise in order to compete. On the other hand, if the tax on the imported hat should be increased from 60 cents to 90 cents, it would cost the importer 30 cents more (without taking into consideration any account for interest on the larger investment), and the consumer would have to pay 30 cents more. And whenever the imported hat advances in price by reason of the higher tax, the price of the domestic hat will likewise increase in order to reap the benefit of a larger profit.

The difference is simple. If the hat is imported, the consumer, through the importer, pays the tax to the Government; if it is a domestic hat he pays an amount equal to the tax to the manufacturer. If this be true, as it surely is, it would seem to follow as a logical and inevitable conclusion that if the tax should be reduced or removed on a given article, the conditions remaining otherwise the same, the cost of that article ought to be reduced in an equal ratio to the consumer. Now, as nearly everything we use in this country—the cradle in which our babes are crooned to sleep; the lumber, nails, glass, and all materials out of which the houses sheltering us are constructed; the blankets upon our beds; every article of furniture, whether useful or ornamental, in our houses, including the Bible on the center stand; the clothing we wear; the salt and sugar on our tables; the implements of our industries; the coffins in which we bury our dead; the marble slab we raise to their memory; in short, as everything from the cradle to the grave is burdened with this species of taxation, it would seem, also, to follow that it would advance the interests of the consumers, who comprise the bulk of our population, as contradistinguished from manufacturers and dealers, to reduce taxation, thereby reducing the cost of living.

I believe these postulates, like the great truths of the Declaration, are self-evident. It seems so to me. However, there are those who profess to believe and do maintain with great vigor that low taxation does not ultimately result in cheaper prices to the consumer, but quite the contrary. In support of that notion they point to the fact that most articles of commercial and domestic use in this country were higher before we adopted the protective theory than since, and insist that all staple articles have steadily declined under the tariff and as a result of the tariff. To illustrate: The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNE] said in his speech a few days ago:

In the Saginaw Valley to-day a barrel of good salt, the barrel included, can be bought for 53 cents. Salt was never cheaper than now. I can buy this day at my Indiana home salt for less than it cost to carry it from the wholesale dealer to that place on the day it was first made subject to a protective duty.

Again he said:

The currency price for a ton of steel rails in 1867 was \$166; to-day it commands but \$31.50.

On the day previous the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] gave this illustration, among many others. He said:

Previous to 1884 there was not a pound of soda-ash manufactured in the United States. We consume annually 175,000 tons in the manufacture of glass and other American products. Previous to 1884 we imported every pound of it, at an average cost of \$48 a ton. A duty of \$5 was imposed and the Salvay Process Company was organized at Syracuse, the only one on this hemisphere, at a cost of \$1,500,000, with a capacity of 50,000 tons annually. It commenced manufacturing soda-ash in January, 1884. How has it affected the price of this commodity? Was the duty of \$5 added to the \$48, so as to advance the cost to \$53 a ton? On the contrary, it fell in the American market as low as \$28 a ton in three years, a saving to the people annually of \$20 a ton on the entire consumption, or \$3,500,000.

These examples, quoted at random from these two distinguished advocates of protective taxation, are sufficient to illustrate their contention that the cost of an article to the consumer is not increased by the amount of the tax, but that the cost is greatly diminished as a result of the tax. Without stopping to discuss other causes not related to the tariff, which at least have contributed to a depression in the price of

salt, and to a reduction of the price of steel rails from \$166 in 1867 to \$106.75 in 1870, when the duty of \$28 per ton was imposed, and to a lower price since, I desire to meet the main question at once, and treat it candidly and fairly. It may stand admitted that prices, taken as a whole, have declined during the last twenty years, and during the supremacy of the protective policy; but it does not follow that the fall in prices is altogether, or largely, due to the fact of protection, nor that it is necessary to continue high taxation in order to maintain low prices; nor does it contravene that law in economics, as fixed as the law of gravitation, that the price of an article upon which a tariff tax has been imposed is increased by the sum of the tax.

I will take the soda-ash example furnished with so much detail by the gentleman from Michigan, without investigating the sources of his information or the accuracy of his statements, with which to illustrate my argument. When I say, or when the President said, that the price to the consumer is increased by the amount of the tax, I am, as he was, literally correct. By the statement it is not meant that any particular price at any particular time must be maintained and the increase be predicated on that; but, generally, that the current price, whatever it may be, any time, is increased by the sum of the tax. If the market price of soda-ash was \$48 per ton at the time the \$5 tax was imposed, and there had been no reduction in the current price, brought about by any cause, then the \$5 would have been added to the \$48, and the price to the consumer would have been \$53. If \$48 had been the lowest price at which the English manufacturer could have sold soda-ash on our markets, he could not then have paid the \$5 tax without advancing the price. The cost to the consumer, therefore, would have been inevitably increased, at least as to so much of the consumption as the home manufacturer could not supply; and he could supply only 50,000 tons out of 175,000 tons, according to the gentleman's own statement.

It may be said that there would not have been necessarily any advance in the price of the domestic product. But I think I am safe in saying if 125,000 tons had been imported and sold at \$53, the Salvoy Process Company would not have gone on selling its annual output of 50,000 tons at \$48 in the same market. But the price did not remain at \$48, at which it was selling before the tariff was imposed. Why? Because the manufacturers, foreign and domestic, can afford to sell it for less, and competition in the same markets has forced the price down.

It is selling now at \$28. The Syracuse concern is selling 50,000 tons, and 125,000 are being imported. On each of those 125,000 tons a tax of \$5 is paid by the importer to the collector of customs, and goes into the Treasury of the United States. Is not that added to the price by the importer? If you subtract the \$5 from the \$28 the remaining \$23 will be the net sum received by the importer. The \$5 simply reimburses him on account of the tax paid by him in the first instance.

But the Syracuse manufacturer sells his 50,000 tons at \$28 without having paid any tax, and hence he gets the benefit of it. If I should to-day buy 50,000 tons of imported soda-ash I would pay \$250,000 in the way of taxes to the Government; and if I should at the same time buy 50,000 tons from the Syracuse concern I would pay into its private coffers an equal amount in the nature of a tax. If I buy the imported article I pay the tax to the Government; if I buy the domestic article I pay the tax to a private manufacturing corporation. I am not now discussing whether this is the wiser or better thing to do. I will come to that later on. I am now simply stating a fact and illustrating the truth of an economic principle—that the cost of any article is enhanced by the amount of the duty imposed upon it.

The decline in price was not the result of the tariff. That is to say, the mere fact that a tariff tax is imposed does not in and of itself occasion a fall in prices, but the contrary. It may be answered that if there had been no tax imposed there would have been no reduction in price. That may or may not be. As long as England had a monopoly of our soda-ash trade high prices prevailed, as they do always where a monopoly exists. Overproduction, financial disasters, and perhaps other accidental causes, may conspire to impair prices. But, generally speaking, exorbitant prices are reduced or prevented, and a healthful commerce is preserved by the leveling power of competition. If any establishment, or any combination of establishments, has an absolute monopoly of our market, prices are sure to be exorbitant. But if capable competition comes in and struggles for the mastery, prices will be forced down to a legitimate basis by the inevitable laws of trade. I repeat, prices have been reduced, not by reason of a tariff *per se*, but by reason of commercial competition. Now, whether competition is stimulated by the tariff, or whether there would be any competition at all, except for the tariff, is another question, to which I will address myself at the proper place in the course of my argument.

So far my purpose has been to develop and emphasize the one fact that the cost of any article in general use subject to a duty is enhanced thereby, and that taxation increases the expense of living. The average of the tariff duties now in force is over 47 per cent. The man, therefore, who spends \$500 a year for the support of his family, and for machinery and implements to be used in his business, pays, approximately, 47 per cent. of the original cost, or \$160, in the way of taxes. In other words, except for the duty paid by the importer, he could have sold the goods for less—for as much less as the tax amounted

to; and if the tax paid on the goods purchased by the consumer at a cost of \$500 amounts to \$160, then the price at which the consumer could otherwise have purchased was increased by the sum of the tax. I say if there had been no tax on the goods the importer could have decreased the price to the consumer to an amount equal to the tax.

It may be answered that he could, but he would not. Of course I can not tell about that. It may be taken for granted that he would not reduce the price if he could pocket the tax himself in the way of increased profits. But if the tax was removed, and competition and all the conditions of trade remained the same, a reduction in price equal to the reduction in tax would certainly follow. Another thing is very sure: If imported goods are being now sold at the lowest prices compatible with reasonable profits, a reduction on that class of goods is impossible while the tax remains. And it may be safely assumed that goods of domestic manufacture will not be reduced in price as long as the prevailing price on the imported and competing product is maintained.

If, then, we are collecting from the people more taxes than the Government needs, thereby taking money from the pockets of labor and incurring all the evils flowing from an enormous idle surplus in the public Treasury, and if the necessaries of life and the cost of living are increased by that taxation for which there is no public or governmental need, we certainly ought not to hesitate to reduce taxation, unless thereby we incur the risk of results pregnant with other and greater evils and dangers than those incident to a State of redundant taxation. Would we run that risk by a reduction of the tariff tax? Would we run that risk by passing the Mills bill, which proposes to reduce the average tax from 47 to 40 per cent.? The protectionists say we would. They say that any substantial reduction of the tariff, or any material interference with existing conditions, would stop the wheels of progress in this country, and that one of two things would happen. First, that all our great manufacturing industries would be prostrated and destroyed, entailing widespread and irreparable disaster and ruin because of their inability, by reason of cheaper labor abroad, to compete on equal terms with foreign establishments; or, secondly, to avoid that result it would compel such a reduction in the wages paid for labor in this country as to impoverish and pauperize millions of brave and honest men who live by their daily earnings. As a consequence of these evil prognostications we are assured, with an air of authority, that competition would be destroyed and that Europe, or, more properly speaking, free-trade England, would soon plant the black standard of monopoly on the ruins of our now prosperous industries, and that salt would treble in price, and that soda-ash would go back to \$48, and steel rails to \$166 per ton, and that prices of all kinds would advance in like measure.

If these alarming prophecies are anything more than grim phantoms, invoked by selfish and ravenous fancy, with which to affright the souls of adversaries that greed may continue to thrive unmolested on the sweat of honest men; if there is a reasonable or logical probability that they are founded in fact, then it would be the part of wisdom to make haste slowly in this direction. Hamlet said we had—

rather bear those ills we have
Than fly to others that we know not of.

I, at least, had rather bear the ills we have, however burdensome, than to attempt a new departure, if by so doing I incur the certainty of worse ones. I had rather bear the ills we have than the greater ones so darkly portrayed by the prophets of protection. That is but to play the stupid part of common prudence. But are these doleful prognostications worthy of belief? Ought they to excite any real, intelligent apprehension? Are they candid or honest or sensible? Are they justified by any known economic truths or principles? Is the threat of danger real?

What is the proposition? That our manufacturing industries can not compete with those of England without protection. Why? Let me put it differently. Why can not our people compete with the English people, not only for our home trade, but for the commerce of the world? It can not be, or ought not to be, in the cost of raw materials. American manufacturers ought to be able to buy raw materials as cheaply as the English manufacturer under the same commercial conditions. What is there produced in England that is not produced in this country in greater abundance? What comes from the farms, or the forests, or the mines of England that are not derived in larger quantities from our farms, and forests, and mines? What raw material is produced at the home of the English manufacturer, or any European manufacturer, that is not produced at the home of the American manufacturer? Certainly none of any great importance. On the contrary, we produce much in this country that is not produced in England or in Europe.

For instance, we are the great cotton-producing nation of the world. Our manufacturers of cotton fabrics have the raw material grown at their very doors, while England must send across the Atlantic to buy from us. So far as the home market for the purchase of raw material is concerned, the English manufacturer has no advantage in quality or quantity over the American. And if both are compelled to go abroad to buy, can not the American go into the same markets and buy as cheaply as his English competitor? Of course, under existing laws,

the Englishman could lay his material down at his factory cheaper than the American, for, although they may have purchased in the same market at the same price, the American would have to pay a large tariff duty on his material when he landed at his home port, thereby greatly increasing the cost of his raw material over the cost of similar material to his English competitor. As a rule (to which, of course, there are some exceptions) the English manufacturer procures his raw material cheaper now than the American; but that is due almost solely to our high-tariff laws. If they were put upon equal terms and given equal opportunities there would then be no reason for any difference in that respect.

Our alleged inability, therefore, to contend against English competition can not be fairly or justly predicated on the higher cost of raw material to the American manufacturer, since whatever difference exists in that regard is the result of the very tariff laws which he insists on retaining and continuing—a difference which would disappear with a proper modification of the laws from which it springs.

I repeat, why is it that the American people can not compete with the English people upon equal terms? Not because of any inferiority in the character or capacity of our artisans. It has been our boast that the American workmen and operatives are the most intelligent, expert, and skillful in the world. It can not be because our manufacturing establishments are inferior to those of England or any country.

They are no longer puling infants in need of guardians or wet-nurses, but they stand erect, rich, athletic, powerful in all the conscious strength of fresh maturity—superior in wealth and productive capacity to any rivals in the world. We hold the first rank as a manufacturing people, our products in 1880 having exceeded even those of Great Britain by \$650,000,000.

It can not be because our home market is in any possible respect inferior to that of England. Our population is vastly greater, our people are equally as intelligent, and the home demand to be supplied by the products of the shop and factory is larger here than there. This is the growing country of the world. Our population and wealth are increasing with marvelous rapidity and home consumption and home demand are multiplying in an equal ratio. Our inability to compete can not be attributed to anything of that sort.

Why, Mr. Chairman, reflect what a marvelous country we have and what extraordinary advantages we enjoy! Combine Great Britain and Ireland, France, Germany, Austria, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Switzerland, Denmark, and Greece, and they would equal but one-third of our territory west of the Hudson River. I wish in this connection to read some extracts from a recent work, entitled "Our Country; its Possible Future and its Present Crisis," by Josiah Strong, D. D., general secretary of the Evangelical Alliance for the United States, and carefully revised by Professor Austin Phelps, D. D. He says:

We are told that east of the Rocky Mountains we have a river-flow of more than 40,000 miles, counting no stream less than 100 miles in length; while Europe in a larger space has but 17,000 miles. It is estimated that the Mississippi, with its affluents, affords 35,000 miles of navigation. A steam-boat may pass up the Mississippi and Missouri 3,900 miles from the Gulf—"as far as from New York to Constantinople." Thus a vast system of natural canals carries our seaboard into the very heart of the continent. Excluding Alaska, which is capable of producing great wealth, the area of the United States, according to the census of 1880, is 2,970,000 square miles. According to the smallest estimate I have ever seen, and doubtless too small, we have 1,500,000 square miles of arable land.

China proper, which according to her last census, supports a population of 360,000,000, has an area of 1,348,870 square miles, or considerably less than one-half of ours, not including Alaska. The Chinese could hardly be called a manufacturing people; and when their last census was taken (1812,) their foreign commerce was inconsiderable. That vast population, therefore, drew its support from the soil. The mountains of China occupy an area of more than 300,000 square miles, and some of her plains are barren. It would seem, then, that our arable lands, taking the lowest estimate, are in excess of those of China, by some hundreds of thousands of square miles. The fact, therefore, that Chinese agriculture, with its rude implements, feeds hundreds of millions ought, certainly, to be suggestive to Americans.

The crops of 1879, after feeding our 50,000,000 inhabitants, furnished more than 238,000,000 bushels of grain for export. The corn, wheat, oats, barley, rye, buckwheat, and potatoes—that is, the food crops—were that year produced on 105,097,750 acres, or 164,215 square miles. But that is less than one-ninth of the smallest estimate of our arable lands. If, therefore, it were all brought under the plow it would feed 450,000,000 and afford 2,554,000,000 bushels of grain for export. But this is not all. So excellent an authority as Mr. Edward Atkinson says that where we now support 50,000,000, "100,000,000 could be sustained without increasing the area of a single farm, or adding one to the number, by merely bringing our product up to an average standard of reasonably good agriculture; and then there might remain for export twice the quantity we now send abroad to feed the hungry in foreign lands. If this be true (and it will hardly be questioned by any one widely acquainted with our wasteful American farming), 1,500,000 square miles of cultivated land—less than one-half of our entire area this side of Alaska—are capable of feeding a population of 900,000,000, and of producing an excess of 5,100,000,000 bushels of grain for exportation; or, if the crops were all consumed at home, it would feed a population one-eighth larger, namely, 1,012,000,000. This corresponds very nearly with results obtained by an entirely different process from data afforded by the best scientific authority (Encyclopedia Britannica, volume I, page 717). It need not, therefore, make a severe draught on credulity to say that our agricultural resources, if fully developed, would sustain a thousand million souls.

But we have wonderful wealth under the soil as well as in it. From 1870 to 1880 we produced \$732,000,000 of the precious metals. The United States now raises one-half the gold and silver of the world's supply. Iron ore is to-day mined in twenty-three of our States. A number of them could singly supply the world's demand. Our coal measures are simply inexhaustible. English coal pits, already deep, are being deepened, so that the cost of coal-mining in Great Britain is constantly increasing, while we have coal enough near the surface to supply us for centuries. When storing away the fuel for the ages God knew the place and work to do which he had appointed us, and gave us twenty

times as much of this concrete power as to all the peoples of Europe. Our mineral products (of all kinds) are of equal richness and variety. The remarkable increase from 1870 to 1880 places us at the head of nations. Our mining industries exceed those of Great Britain 3 per cent., and are greater than those of all continental Europe, Asia, Africa, South America, Mexico, and the British colonies collectively, and as yet we have hardly begun to develop these resources.

Let us glance at our manufactures, present and prospective. Our first great advantage is found in our superabounding coal. The second lies in the fact that we have our raw material at hand. England must go at least 3,000 miles for every cotton ball she spins; we raise our own. We produce also the wool, the woods, the hides, the metals of every sort—all that is required for nearly every variety of manufacture. The remaining advantage which crowns our opportunity is the quality of our labor, American operatives being, as a class, the most ingenious and intelligent in the world. Inventiveness has come to be a national trait. The Mechanical World, of London, says that the United States has the best machinery and tools in the world; and Mr. Lourdelot, who was recently sent over here by the French minister of commerce, says that the superiority of tools used here, and the attention to details too often neglected in Europe, are elements of danger to European industries.

Herbert Spencer testified that "beyond question, in respect of mechanical appliances, the Americans are ahead of all nations." The fact of superior tools would alone give us no small advantage, but the possession of the best machinery implies much more; namely, that we have also the best mechanics in the world. In close competition any one of the three advantages enumerated ought to insure ultimate supremacy. Already our products in 1880 exceeded those of Great Britain by \$650,000,000. * * * And it is interesting to note not only our position, but our rate of progress. While the manufactures of France, from 1870 to 1880, increased \$230,000,000, those of Germany \$430,000,000, and those of Great Britain \$580,000,000, those of the United States increased \$1,030,000,000. Moreover, the marked advantages which we now enjoy are to be enhanced. While England's coal is growing dearer, ours will be growing cheaper. The development of our vast resources will greatly increase, and hence cheapen raw materials.

The superior ingenuity and intelligence of our mechanics and operatives will continue to give us better machinery, while our rapidly-increasing population will cheapen labor. Even now, with cheap labor against us, we can lay down our steels in Sheffield, our lower grades of cotton in Manchester, our electroplate in Birmingham, and our watches in Geneva, and undersell European manufacturers on their own doorsteps.

Again the same author says:

The wealth of the United States is phenomenal. In 1880 it was valued at \$13,642,000,000; more than enough to buy the Russian and Turkish empires, the Kingdoms of Sweden and Norway, Denmark and Italy, together with Australia, South Africa, and all South America—lands, mines, cities, palaces, factories, ships, flocks, herds, jewels, moneys, thrones, scepters, diadems, and all—the entire possessions of 177,000,000 people. Great Britain is, by far, the richest nation of the Old World, and our wealth exceeds hers by \$76,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, right in the midst of all this wealth and opportunity our manufacturers sit clamoring for a wall around them to protect them from the aggressions of weaker powers. Oh, Shame, where is thy blush! Oh, Self-abasement, where is thy sting!

Again, Mr. Chairman, I ask, why can not our American people compete with the English people upon equal terms? Driven by the pitiless logic of incontestable facts from every other reply with which they have been wont to fortify themselves the protectionists retreat to their final, and what has heretofore been considered their most formidable, stronghold, that is, the question of labor-wages. Here they take their stand and shout back their answer. They say: "It is true we have the advantage of cheaper fuel, and could have of cheaper raw material; we have the advantage of better machinery, of better mechanics and operatives; but labor costs so much more here than in England that open competition is impossible."

That is the reply, the one sole reply, which the protectionists make to my question. In that last ditch, heretofore a bulwark of safety, they take their stand, and shout back in chorus "How can we pay 40 or 50 per cent. more for labor here than England and compete in the same markets upon equal terms? How can we cross swords with England upon equal terms without reducing the price of our labor to an equality with the price of English labor?" That is the answer they make. This is the rock upon which they build their defense. These are the questions they put, and put them with such an air of foreboding evil as to alarm the workingman of the country. Here, Mr. Chairman, the issue is joined, and we should meet it face to face, fairly, frankly, and candidly.

There are some collateral, though important, views of this question which might be considered in this connection. For instance, less than 10 per cent. of our industrial population are engaged in industries which practically, or at least directly, receive any of the supposed benefits of the protective tariff. And, in any view of the question, it may be well doubted whether it is fair or just or wise to tax over 90 per cent. of our laboring people for the benefit of less than 10 per cent. It may be well doubted whether it is fair or just or wise to tax the farmer 47 per cent. on everything he buys in order that the wages of some other man, not a whit more deserving, may be increased; and it is poor consolation to the farmer whose house is mortgaged and whose wheat goes a-begging for a market at 50 cents per bushel, to be assured by that other man that he is indirectly benefited by the tariff affording him a better (?) home market than he would otherwise have.

But I do not propose to go into those phases of the question. I want to meet the issue point blank. I asked, Why can not we compete on equal terms with England? and I am answered, Because labor costs us more. Now, is that true? Does labor cost the American manufacturer more than it costs his English competitor? Unfortunately the statistics by which this question could be definitely settled are very incomplete and unsatisfactory. It is greatly to be hoped that the bill which recently passed the House to afford our accomplished Commissioner of

Labor ample opportunities to extend his investigations at home and abroad and gather necessary data for the settlement of this question beyond dispute may become a law. As it now is, I say, the data is incomplete and unsatisfactory. Still, many material facts have been ascertained, and they justify me in saying that there is no truth in the claim of the American manufacturer that he pays more for labor than his English competitor.

There are two ways of stating the proposition. The protectionist's way of stating it is, that the American workman receives higher wages and gets more money during a week or a month or a year than the English workman. But my way of stating it is, that the American manufacturer does not pay more for his labor than the English manufacturer. I hope to make the distinction clear as I advance. I am not now inquiring whether the American or English workman is the better off. I am not now inquiring which receives the most money in a month or a year, nor as to the purchasing power of their wages in their respective countries. Those things belong to other phases of the question. The point I now make is that the cost of labor to the American manufacturer is less than to the English manufacturer, or, in other words, the labor cost to the American manufacturer on the products of his factories is less than the labor cost to the English manufacturer on similar products.

Every completed article which a manufacturer sends out from his shops or mills has cost him a certain sum. He paid so much for the raw material out of which the completed fabric was made. He has money invested in the machinery used in making the article, upon which he calculates interest, and for the wear and tear of his plant; and he pays so much for the labor employed in the work of construction. All these and other items of expense enter into the cost of production. A certain part of the cost of production is charged to labor. Now, is that labor cost on the manufactured products of America greater or less than the labor cost on similar products in England? That is the question. The American protectionist says he can not hold out against English competition, because wages are higher here than there.

But that is an evasion. It does not meet the real point at issue. I agree that ordinarily the American operative will earn more in a week or a month than the English operative in the same industry. I will admit that daily wages are higher here than there. The most reliable authorities agree that the average wages in America are about 50 per cent. higher than the average in England; that is, where an English operative would earn \$8 in a week the American operative would earn \$12. But how does that concern the manufacturer who employs this labor if, notwithstanding these larger earnings, he gets his fabrics made, completed, and ready for market at a less labor cost on the product itself than his English competitor? Naturally it may be asked how it is possible for the American manufacturer to obtain his goods at a less labor cost than his English competitor when the operative he employs to do the work receives \$12 for a week's work—that is, from Monday morning to Saturday night—while the English operative receives but \$8. Evidently to reach that result the American operative must work more hours during the week or turn out more or better work in the same period of time.

In point of fact he does all those things. He works more hours in the week, and does more work and better work in the same length of time. There is the key to this whole contention. First, I say, if the American operative earns more money in a week or a year than the English operative, he also works more hours; and secondly, he does more work, by reason of superior skill and ingenuity, in the same length of time.

In 1882, Mr. Carroll D. Wright, then chief of the Massachusetts bureau of labor statistics, made some comparisons between wages received by certain classes of wage-earners in Great Britain and in Massachusetts, and also as to the cost of living. Here is one case put by Mr. Wright. I quote from him:

Each family is supposed to consist of a four-loom cotton weaver, with wife and three children, two of the children working in the mill. In neither case is the wife supposed to work. The English weaver is a Lancashire operative, working fifty-six hours per week, and his two working children are half-timers. The Massachusetts weaver works sixty hours per week, and his two working children are employed thirty-two weeks in the year.

The Massachusetts weaver earns per week.....	\$5.64
Two children in weave-room each average per week.....	4.66
Total income per week of the family.....	
The Lancashire weaver earns per week.....	5.28
Two children in weave-room, half-timers, each per week.....	1.68
Total income per week of the family.....	
Excess of weekly income in Massachusetts.....	3.34

He also gives a comparison between cotton spinners in England and Massachusetts, from which it appears that the Massachusetts spinner and his two children earn per week \$13.79, and the English spinner and his two children earn \$9.72, or a difference of \$4.07 per week in favor of the Massachusetts spinner. But it will be observed that the Massachusetts weaver and spinner each worked sixty hours, while the English weaver and spinner each worked only fifty-six hours, which is a difference of four hours per week in favor of the English operative.

Four hours per week is equal to two hundred and eight hours per year, and two hundred and eight hours are equal to twenty-six working days of eight hours each, or a full month. The comparative difference in the time worked by the children is still more striking. The children are called half-timers; that is, work half the time. In England they worked two weeks over the half year, or twenty-eight weeks; but in Massachusetts the time they worked amounted to thirty-two weeks, or an excess over the English children of four weeks in a half year.

And so it runs through the whole list. The aggregate annual earnings of the American operatives are much larger than of the English operatives—the average being, as I have stated, about 50 per cent. larger; but the American operative invariably works longer in order to make a larger aggregate of earnings. I do not mean to say that American operatives do not absolutely receive more for the same length of time than English operatives, for they do receive more. For instance, in the case of a Massachusetts cotton spinner, given by Mr. Wright, he received \$10.09 for sixty hours' work, or about 17 cents per hour; while the English spinner received \$7.80 for 56 hours' work, or a little less than 14 cents per hour; and the difference in many lines of industry is still more marked. However, the difference in time does in part explain the difference in earnings. That is all I mean to say upon that point, and that much I do mean to say and insist upon.

Now, as to the second proposition. I affirm that the American operative, by reason of superior intelligence and skill, and by reason of the superior machinery he uses, does more work in the same length of time than the English operative. Man's productive capacity, on account of the improved machinery he uses, has multiplied to an almost incomprehensible extent. In a Report on the Factory System of the United States, issued in 1884, as a sort of appendix to the census, I find some interesting comparisons between what a man could do in the old days and now. For instance, a single average hand-loom weaver could weave from 42 to 48 yards of cotton shirting per week; while now the six power-looms which a single weaver in a factory can attend will produce 1,500 yards. On a hand-wheel a spinner could turn off 8 ounces of No. 10 cloth-yarn in ten hours, or 3 pounds per week, the mule spinner about 3,000 pounds in the same length of time. In the same connection it is stated that the machinery of 1884 had a productive power of at least 20 per cent. over the same class of machinery in use ten years before. This shows with what marvelous facility and rapidity our machinery is improved.

Now, this ought to be clear: that the price of labor may increase and at the same time the labor cost of the product decrease. If the hand-loom weaver who turned off 48 yards per week received \$3 for his work, the 48 yards cost more for labor than the 1,500 yards turned off by machinery attended by a single weaver who received five times as much for his week's work. In this same census appendix of 1884 I find this statement: "The ratio of cost per pound for labor of common cotton cloth for the years 1828 and 1880 was as 6.77 to 3.31; wages being as 2.62 to 4.84."

In other words, while the labor cost of production decreased over 100 per cent. in fifty-two years, the wages of labor increased nearly 100 per cent.

Another thing ought to be clear, since it is the same thing differently stated: If the American manufacturer pays 50 per cent. more for labor than his English competitor, but at the same time gets 50 per cent. larger returns from that labor, then the labor cost of his production does not exceed that of his competitor. Now, what are the facts? In this connection I beg to quote somewhat extensively from the recent able speech of Mr. MILLS, who has utilized the available statistics upon this point, and has stated the case stronger than I would be able to do. He said:

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to a statement found in the report of the United States Census. This is the report in reference to the wages in the manufacturing industries of the country, and I call special attention to a report of an ax-manufacturing establishment in Connecticut on page 153. This gentleman who makes the report compares the operations of his house from his books in 1840 with 1880. In steel fitting, in ax making, each operative turned out 600 pieces per day in 1840. In 1880 each operative turned out 1,250 pieces per day. Each operative received in 1840 24 cents per hundred pieces, and received in 1880 20 cents per hundred pieces. He earned in 1840 \$1.44 a day, and in 1880, though he received less for each piece, he earned \$2.50 per day.

Now, was the increase of the daily wages of these operatives due to the tariff? Let the manufacturer answer. He says: "The following table shows the results of labor-saving machinery, together with the increase in the efficiency of labor in the manufacture of axes, from 1840 to 1880." When I saw these tables, proving the principle so clearly presented and so strongly enforced by Mr. Atkinson, I went to our very able and efficient chief of labor, Hon. Carroll D. Wright, and asked him to have a table like this in the census report prepared, and to send an intelligent agent into some of the oldest houses in the country and get a statement from their books and send it to me, that I might see if there was a different result in other establishments. I now give you the testimony of those houses to add to the others.

There are here seven establishments. The first one is in Massachusetts. A comparison is instituted between 1849 and 1884, and the industry is cotton print cloth. Each operative made in 1849 in this factory 44 yards per day; in 1884 he made 98.2 yards, an increase of productive power of 120 per cent. What wages did he get? The average daily earnings of the laborer in 1849 were 65 cents, and in 1884 \$1. His wages increased 50 per cent. The labor cost of the product decreased 32 per cent.

In that same establishment in 1849 the wages of weavers were 65 cents a day, and each man turned out 113 yards of cloth. In 1884 the wages had risen to \$1.06, and each weaver turned out 273 yards of cloth.

In the second house, also in Massachusetts, manufacturing printed cloths, each laborer in 1850 produced 42 yards; in 1884 he produced 102 yards, an increase of 142 per cent. His earnings were 65 cents a day in 1850 and \$1.05 in 1884. The increase in wages was 61 per cent. The decrease in the labor cost of the article was 33 per cent.

The third house, manufacturing sheeting, in Massachusetts, showed that each laborer in 1852 produced 41 yards, and in 1886 73 yards of cloth. His productive efficiency increased 77 per cent. His wages increased 49 per cent. The labor cost of the cloth decreased 15 per cent.

In the fourth house, in New Hampshire, manufacturing print cloth, each laborer in 1852 produced 42.5 yards, and in 1886 103 yards. The increase in productive capacity was 142 per cent. The increase in wages was 56.7 per cent., and the labor cost per yard decreased 35 per cent.

Without going all through these figures the facts as to each one of these houses show in every instance that the productive efficiency of the laborer had increased, and that corresponding with that the wages had increased and the cost of the product had decreased.

Now, then, the tariff had nothing to do with any of these results. During this time we had high tariffs and low tariffs, but whether high tariff or low tariff, or no tariff, the productive efficiency continued to increase, the multiplication of production by the power of machinery continued to increase, and wages rose with it, and the cost of the product sunk. So that the tariff conferred no benefit on the laborer; none whatever.

But now let us see what effect a reduction of the duties will have by letting in the goods of England and other foreign countries into our markets to compete with our people and to endanger the laborers of our country, as it is charged it will do. I say the same proposition for which I have been contending is demonstrated again when we compare the laborer of this country with the laborer of England. We produce cheaper than in England because a high rate of wages means low cost of product, and a higher rate of wages means lower cost of product, and the highest rate of wages means lowest cost of product.

Mr. Wright, Chief of the Labor Bureau, instituted a most painstaking examination into the rates of labor in England and Massachusetts a few years ago, and showed the rates of labor higher in this country than in England; 12 per cent. higher in cotton manufacture; 25 per cent. in the manufacture of woolens; 26 per cent. in iron and steel; 123 per cent. in boots and shoes. That would seem to indicate, according to the philosophy which has been taught in this country by protectionists for many years, that we are on the road to ruin because our rate of labor is higher than in England and other countries. But the reverse of that proposition is true, and the fact that the rate of wages is higher here than in England shows that England is distanced in the great industrial contest into which she has entered.

Now let me give you an instance here in boots and shoes. If we pay so much higher wages in producing boots and shoes, if the proposition we hear on the other side be true, we can not enter into any contest with Great Britain when we pay 123 per cent. higher wages than she does. Yet we import no boots and shoes at 30 per cent. duty from England. We make the cheapest boots and shoes and the finest made in the world. In that England can not contest with us; and the fact that the rate of wages is so much higher here than in England shows that she is far behind in the race.

Let us see. Here is a gentleman writing in Harper's Magazine in 1885, a very able article entitled "A pair of shoes." He takes the history of the hide from the cow and follows it through all its mutations into the finest products of manufacture.

Mr. Howard Newhall is the writer. He says: "American ladies' shoes wholesaling at \$1.50 per pair, cost for labor of making 25 cents. English ladies' shoes wholesaling at \$1.50 per pair, cost for labor of making 34 cents. American men's shoes wholesaling at \$2.60 per pair, cost for labor of making 33 cents. English men's shoes wholesaling at \$2.60 per pair, cost for labor of making 50 cents. In the report of the Massachusetts bureau of statistics for 1884 the general average weekly wage in Massachusetts is given as 128.9 per cent. higher than in Great Britain. The general average weekly wage in Massachusetts is given as \$11.63 per week, and in Great Britain \$5.08."

Now, what is the solution of all this? What does it mean? In Massachusetts wages are 128.9 per cent. higher than they are in Great Britain, but the labor cost of a pair of ladies' shoes in Massachusetts is less than the labor cost of a like pair of shoes in Great Britain. The cost is 25 cents in Massachusetts against 34 cents in England. The labor cost of men's shoes in Massachusetts is 33 cents per pair; the labor cost of men's shoes in England is 50 cents. If our people are to be injured by the importation of English shoes into this country the English shoe must be produced at a lower cost than the American shoe; otherwise it can not take the market.

It is not the rates of wages in England and America respectively, \$5.08 against \$11.63, that we have to consider, but it is the labor cost of the pair of shoes. Now, the man holds the market who can sell his goods cheapest, and the man can sell cheapest who gets his goods at the lowest cost, and that is the man in Massachusetts. What, then, does this difference of wages mean, \$11.63 per week in Massachusetts against \$5.08 in England? It simply means increased productive efficiency; it means that the productive efficiency of the American workman engaged in this industry is greater than that of the British workman by 128.9 per cent.

A few years ago, in 1879, our English friends across the water took alarm about the growth and development of our cotton industry in the United States, and they sent an expert—a gentleman thoroughly conversant with the cotton business of England—to the United States to make a thorough and searching investigation into the whole business of cotton manufacture in this country, and to report to them whether their industry was imperiled by that of the United States. That gentleman went to New England, the seat of the cotton industry in this country. He made a thorough and searching investigation, and in every instance he showed that we could produce cotton goods at a lower labor cost than they could be produced at any point in Great Britain. I have here the tabular statement that he gave to his people when he returned.

The following are the rates of wages for weaving and spinning cloths in some of the principal districts of England and America, as shown by his report:

A piece 28 inches, 56 reeds, 14 picks (?), 60 by 56.58 yards, costs at Ashton-under-Lyne, in England, 24.68 cents to weave; in Rhode Island it costs 16.82 cents. At Blackburn, in England, it costs 25.4 cents; at Providence, R. I., it costs 17.26 cents; at Stockport, England, 25.4 cents; at Fall River, 19.96 cents; at Hyde, England, 25.28 cents; at Lowell, 19.96 cents. In every instance the labor cost of the production of the cotton goods is lower here than in England. Now let us turn to the summary. At Fall River the wages in a pound of print cloth, about 7 yards, is 6.97 cents; at Lowell it is 6.82 cents; in Rhode Island it is 6.422; in Pennsylvania, 6.44; in England, 6.96 cents. In every place in the United States, in Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, the labor cost of producing a pound of print cloth was lower than at any point in England.

I hope my distinguished friend from Texas will pardon me for reading so much of his speech. The point I want to make is so well elaborated by him that when I begin to read it I hardly know when to stop.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if it be true that the labor cost of our manufactured products is less than the labor cost of similar products in Eng-

land, notwithstanding higher wages here, why would a reduction in tariff taxation necessitate a reduction in wages? If English wages should continue the same, the labor cost of English manufactures would continue the same; and if American wages continued the same, the labor cost of American manufactures would continue the same. A reduction in the tariff would not affect the efficiency or productive capacity of our labor. We could go on paying the same wages and getting the same results. We could go on paying higher wages and getting our products at a less labor cost. There would be no absolutely necessary or probable reduction in anything, except in the cost of raw materials, and in the enormous profits which the protective tax enables the home manufacturer to squeeze out of the home consumer. That is the whole of it; that is the end of the chapter. If the protectionist can not make his labor argument good, if it is without foundation in fact, then he has no solid ground under his feet.

Mr. Chairman, how does the matter now stand? What are the relative advantages and disadvantages of the American and English manufacturers? Let us see. The American has cheaper fuel, better mechanics, better machinery, a better home market, and gets the products of his factories completed and prepared for market at a less labor cost. The Englishman has but one advantage, he gets cheaper raw material. But that advantage he has over us by reason of these very protective tariff laws. Modify your laws so as to equalize us in that respect, and every advantage would be upon our side.

Mr. Chairman, again, and for the last time, I ask, why can not we compete with England upon equal terms? Why not reduce taxation since, confessedly, the Government does not need the money, and thereby avert the manifold evils of a redundant Treasury, leave the surplus in the pockets of the people who earned it and who need it, and, at the same time, cheapen the cost of consumption and lessen the expense of living? Sir, I marvel why it is that all the world stands in awe of free-trade England. We build a wall around our land, professedly to protect us against the cheaper labor of England; while France and Germany build a similar wall to protect them from the dearer labor of England. England seems to be a sort of commercial monster—the Old Man of the Sea—in whose presence all the world trembles. Her European neighbors have thrown protective tariffs in her pathway; notwithstanding, it is everywhere admitted the English artisan and mechanic are the best paid of any in all the great commercial countries of Europe.

But why is it that the brave, enterprising, matchless people of this great Republic should tremble with servile fear and whine in the presence or shrink dwarfish before the haughty glance of England? The gentleman from Michigan unblushingly compares us to Holland and England to the mighty sea. He says we had as well say to the Hollander, "Why not take down the dikes, the sea has not come in for a hundred years," as to say to the American people, "Why not take off your tariff, England has not mastered you for thirty years?" He says the Hollander would reply, "The sea has not come in because of the dikes," and he answers that England has not come in because of the tariff.

It is pitiful that we have sunk to such depths of pusillanimity. Why should we, who are greater in all things, be afraid of England? Who has taught us this lesson in cowardice? The American manufacturers, who rob the American consumers under the false pretense of protecting labor, and cover us with this humiliation that thrift may follow shame.

Mr. Chairman, I am rejoiced that this agitation before the people has assumed a form so positive and aggressive. The eyes of the people are opening to the truth. The farmers are beginning to learn that they are paying enormous taxes not required for any public purpose, and bearing burdens that do not even inure to the benefit of that labor on whose account it is said to be imposed, but goes to swell the princely fortunes of manufacturers.

The laborers in the protected industries are also beginning to learn that the tariff is not the anchor of their hope, that it is not an unstinted blessing. A well-founded suspicion is beginning to creep in upon them that may be, after all the pretensions put forth from year to year by the protectionists with an ever-increasing grandiloquence of flourish, the tariff may be an unmitigated evil in cunning disguise. They are beginning to learn that wages do not depend upon the tariff, but upon other causes in no sense connected with the tariff—causes I hope to find an opportunity to discuss before the close of this session.

The tariff regulates wages! Why, sir, if that were true wages in the same industries ought to be relatively the same in all the States of the Union; but, as was shown the other day by the eloquent gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], who gave a large number of illustrations drawn from official sources, wages in exactly the same industries vary in adjoining States from 10 to 60 per cent. There is another significant fact that while the tendency of the tariff has been upward the tendency of wages has been downward. Since the war the tariff has advanced from 40 to over 47 per cent., but wages have not increased, although the tariff was raised ostensibly for the benefit of labor. On the contrary, I repeat, the wages of labor have depreciated. This fact will be made manifest by the most casual examination of the twentieth volume of the Tenth Census, where the wages paid the different

classes of employes during each year from 1870 to 1880 are given. For instance, I find that a certain rolling-mill establishment in Pennsylvania, given at page 223, has furnished the following table:

Classes of employes.	Unit of payment.	Dates.								
		1880.	1879.	1878.	1877.	1876.	1875.	1874.	1873.	1872.
FORGE DEPARTMENT.										
Pig-stocker	Day..	\$1.27	\$1.21	\$1.21	\$1.21	\$1.30	\$1.60	\$1.80	\$2.00	\$2.25
Puddler	Turn.	4.15	3.65	3.49	3.49	3.40	3.69	4.49	5.09	5.43
Roller	do	4.90	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.50	4.00	6.00	7.22
BAR AND GUIDE DEPARTMENT.										
Piler	Day..	.50	.50	.50	.50	.50	.60	.60	.75	.75
Shearer	do	1.45	1.43	1.43	1.43	1.55	1.55	1.67	1.80	2.00
Heater	Turn.	5.12	5.12	5.12	5.12	5.12	6.40	6.00	7.06	8.83
Guide-roller	do	6.35	6.35	6.35	6.35	6.35	6.35	7.05	8.80	11.00
HOOP DEPARTMENT.										
Roller	Day..	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.25	5.83	7.28	9.10
SHEET DEPARTMENT.										
Roller	Day..	5.89	7.20	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.90	9.90	9.90
Rougher	do	2.52	2.52	2.52	2.52	2.52	2.72	3.16	3.20	3.75
Shearer	do	3.43	4.28	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	5.27	5.86	5.86
GENERAL DEPARTMENT.										
Roll-turner	Day..	5.40	8.25	8.25	8.25	8.90	12.50	10.25	7.35	7.35
Engineer	do	2.02	2.37	2.37	2.37	2.37	2.37	2.37	2.50	2.85
Fireman	do	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Blacksmith	do	2.45	2.45	2.45	2.45	2.45	2.75	3.30	3.30	3.75
Carpenter	do	2.12	1.75	1.75	1.83	1.83	2.55	2.63	2.50	2.75
Watchman	do	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.50	1.75	2.05	2.25	2.25
Teamster	do	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.50	1.50	1.60	1.75	2.00
Laborer	do	.60	.60	.60	.60	.70	.75	.75	.75	1.10

This table might be repeated *ad infinitum* in regard to almost every class of manufactures. I give it as a fair sample of the whole. Compare the wages therein given between the years 1872 and 1880, and it will be found that there is a large decrease, no matter whether the wages are for the day or for the turn. You may run all through these census tables and you will find that it makes no difference whether the wages are given for the day, week, month, year, ton, piece, or job, the same prevailing rule of decrease obtains.

There is another thing that labor must learn. If it be true that the tariff, taken as a whole, increases the cost of raw material, then labor must bear the burden of that additional cost. Let me illustrate. A manufacturer in England and a manufacturer in Massachusetts are competitors in the same business. Let us suppose that fuel cost them the same, that they have the same amount invested in their plants, and that the labor cost of their productions are the same; but let us also suppose that raw material cost the Massachusetts manufacturer 50 per cent. or 100 per cent. more than the English manufacturer. Now, the Massachusetts manufacturer can not take his more costly product to South America, or elsewhere, and compete with the English manufacturer in the same market. To do that he must in some way reduce the cost of production to him. But he can not reduce the cost of fuel, because he does not control that; he buys that from the operator in coal-mines. He can not reduce the amount he has invested, nor the wear and tear of his machinery. There is but one other thing to do. He must reduce the price of labor so as to make good the difference in the higher cost of material. Again: Here is an article manufactured in Massachusetts. The raw material out of which it was made cost the manufacturer \$2. He also paid \$2 for the labor he employed in its construction. The combined cost to the manufacturer for labor and material was \$4. Suppose the tariff on the material to be 100 per cent., then half the cost of material was paid in the way of taxes. Take the tax off, and the material could be laid down at the factory for \$1 instead of \$2. Let the same labor be employed at the same price in converting the material into the manufactured article, and it would cost completed \$3 instead of \$4. The extra dollar could be given to labor without increasing the total cost of production; or it could be divided between the laborer and consumer, thus increasing the wages of labor and reducing the cost of consumption; or, in this way, the Massachusetts manufacturer could meet the English manufacturer in foreign markets as an equal competitor without requiring labor to surrender any of its earnings.

There is another important lesson the laborers are beginning to learn, that the tariff increases the cost of living to them as well as to other people, and that if they earn more money in a week it costs them more to live. I have before me some illustrations furnished by Mr. Carroll

D. Wright. I will take the example of the cotton-spinner, which I used some time ago, to illustrate the difference in wages received in England and Massachusetts. Mr. Wright also made a careful, though partial, estimate of the cost of living in the two countries. Here is his estimate:

Each family is supposed to consume the following, the same being the weekly subsistence of an English operative's family of the size under consideration, presented in the Progress of Manchester by D. Chadwick, of the British Association, revised by Dr. Watts, and quoted by Leone Levi in Work and Pay (London, 1877), page 129. The English prices are based upon rates current in Lancashire from the report of Consul Shaw, before alluded to, December, 1881, and from other official sources. The Massachusetts prices are average rates current in said State January 1, 1882.

	Retail cost at Blackburn, England.	Retail cost in Massachusetts.
Prices and quantities consumed per week.		
Bread, 8 four-pound loaves.....	\$1.20	\$1.28
Corn-meal, 1 peck.....	.22	.22
Flour, 6 pounds.....	.28	.27
Fresh meat, 5 pounds.....	.95	.80
Bacon, 2 pounds.....	.36	.40
Potatoes, 40 pounds.....	.40	.84
Milk, 7 quarts.....	.42	.42
Vegetables.....	.12	.12
Coffee, Java, 1 pound.....	.16	.16
Tea, 1/2 pound.....	.12 1/2	.15
Sugar, 3 pounds.....	.24	.30
Rice, 2 pounds.....	.08	.20
Butter, 1 pound.....	.30	.35
Molasses, 1 quart.....	.12	.16
Soap, 1 1/2 pounds.....	.10	.10
Coal.....	.36	.62 1/2
Oil.....	.12	.10
Rent, five rooms.....	1.20	1.50
Total, per week.....	6.73 1/2	7.99 1/2

That is to say, it would cost the family in Blackburn to live, not including sundries and clothing, \$6.73 1/2; while the family in Massachusetts, consuming the same things and the same quantities, would expend \$7.99 1/2; extra expense in Massachusetts per week, \$1.26. I have previously shown the excess of weekly income in Massachusetts to be \$1.07; net excess after deducting \$1.26, the extra weekly expenditure of the family in Massachusetts, \$2.81. The family of the Blackburn spinner would have for sundries and clothing, after providing for the items specified in previous table, \$2.98 1/2, while the Massachusetts family would have for the same purpose, \$5.79 1/2. I believe this statement to be as fair and as just as it is possible to make it.

That is to say, at the end of a week, after paying rents and grocery-bills, the English operative would have \$2.98 1/2, and the Massachusetts operative \$5.79 1/2, with which to buy clothing and pay other expenses. The difference would be \$2.81 per week, or \$146.12 per year. That is a considerable item to the workingman. But then we know that all the medium and better grades of clothing are much higher here than in England. I have talked with many gentlemen who have had suits made in London for \$25 that would cost them \$45 here. Here are some comparative prices of goods marked "medium high," in Massachusetts and Great Britain:

Articles.	Massachusetts.	Great Britain.
Muslins:		
Swiss.....yard..	\$0.50	\$0.42
Dress goods:		
French all wool beiges.....do....	1.00	.25
French all wool serges.....do....	1.25	.41
Fast pile velveteen.....do....	1.38	.91
Mourning goods:		
Crapes.....do....	3.38	1.74
Black French cashmeres.....do....	2.13	.85
Black French merinoes.....do....	1.38	.85
Alpacas.....do....	.75	.49
Ladies' underwear:		
Night dresses.....each..	4.00	3.71
Chemises.....do....	2.38	2.34
Drawers.....do....	1.46	1.34
White skirts.....do....	2.50	1.58
Men's merino underwear:		
Shirts and drawers.....do....	3.50	1.82
Gloves:		
Gentlemen's.....pair..	1.62	.85
Ladies'.....do....	1.89	1.08

Of course the difference in prices will vary according to the quality of the goods. The very cheapest qualities are frequently lower here than in England; but "medium," "medium high," and "high" are invariably much more expensive here than there.

In the fifteenth annual report of the Massachusetts bureau of labor statistics the total family expenses in Massachusetts are estimated to be 48.41 per cent. greater than in Great Britain. So that when we come to look at all the phases of this question, the workmen of America have no such advantages as need to excite them into a state of ecstasy. Somebody is growing rich, and is still growing richer, out of the tariff; but it is not the industrial classes. Sir, I have heard a great deal said

about the prosperous and happy condition of our workmen under the protective tariff. Capital, I grant, has been prosperous; but has labor? A manufacturing enterprise is a joint undertaking, a sort of partnership between employer and employé. The employer puts in his capital, the employé his labor. How have the profits of the enterprise been divided?

Has labor or capital received the benefit of the tariff? Turn to page 15 of the second volume of the Census for 1880, and you will find this statement: "Number of manufacturing establishments, 251,104; capital invested, \$2,775,412,345; number of hands employed, 2,718,805; total amount of wages paid, \$941,325,925; value of all materials used, \$3,381,701,277; value of the manufactured products, \$5,341,838,890."

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us analyze this a little. The total value of the manufactured product was \$5,341,838,890. The raw material cost \$3,381,701,277. Subtract the raw material from the value of the manufactured product, and it will leave \$1,960,137,613 to be divided between labor and capital. How was it divided? Labor got \$941,325,925, and capital got \$1,018,811,688, or \$77,485,763 more than labor.

If you will divide the \$941,325,925 among the 2,718,805 employés (which embraces all hands, men, women, and children) you will find that it will average \$346.25. That is what labor received. But the \$2,775,412,345 invested by the employers of that labor received \$1,018,811,688, which is nearly 37 per cent. on the investment. What other legitimate investments in this country reap any such magnificent returns? And yet all this is done in the name of labor! What does the farmer think of it, whose land is depreciating in value, and whose investment, labor hard as he may with brawn and brain, will not pay him 6 per cent.?

What do the laborers in the shops think of it, whose names are used to bolster up this robbery? What do the operatives of Massachusetts and the artisans of Illinois think of it, who are compelled to take their children from the school-room and their wives from their homes to aid in earning a bare subsistence? If you will turn to the tables given on page 464 of the fifteenth annual report of the Massachusetts bureau of statistics, made in 1884, you will find that the average expenses of workingmen's families in that State were \$754.42, while the earnings of workmen who were heads of families averaged \$558.68, or nearly \$200 less than their expenses. To make up the deficit the workman is compelled to take his wife from home and his children from school to aid in earning a meager support. Accordingly we find that at that time there were engaged in the manufactures and mechanical industries of that State 28,714 children under sixteen years of age, and that nearly 33 per cent. of the support of the workingman's family fell on the mother and children.

The census of 1880 discloses the fact that at that date there were 1,118,356 children, fifteen years of age and under, employed in various occupations in the United States. In a recent report of the Illinois commissioners of labor statistics they say that their table of wages and cost of living are representative only of intelligent workingmen who make the most of their advantages, and do not reach—

the confines of that world of helpless ignorance and destitution in which multitudes in all large cities continually live, and whose only statistics are those of epidemics, pauperism, and crime.

Nevertheless, they go on to say, an examination of these tables will demonstrate that one-half of these intelligent workingmen of Illinois—are not even able to earn enough for their daily bread, and have to depend upon the labor of women and children to eke out their miserable existence.

Similar statistics exhibit similar conditions in other States. I was recently appointed by the Speaker as one of a committee sent up into the coal-mines of Pennsylvania to investigate the labor troubles there. Tens of thousands of men were out of employment because they could not get living wages. The coal barons have amassed enormous fortunes, some estimated as high as \$50,000,000, while the fifty thousand men whose labor created those fortunes were pinched with hunger and shivering with cold. The general superintendent of one of the largest mining corporations operating there, employing ten thousand men, said under oath to the committee that the strike was about ended; that the men would be compelled to return to work in a short time. When asked what would compel them, he naively responded, "Their necessities."

Mr. Chairman, I hope to find an opportunity to tell the House and the country something about what I saw in Pennsylvania before this Congress adjourns, and to make some suggestions for the relief of those wretched and destitute people. The venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] is perpetually and eternally harping about negro slavery in the South twenty-five years ago. Sir, that is ancient history. He had as well declaim against the butchery of the Roman amphitheater or the pompous brutality of the Roman conquerors in dragging their prisoners through the streets of their capital; he had as well inveigh against the coarse barbarity of the feudal system, or any other antiquated event. It does no good, and comes with ill grace from a man whose own State tolerates the most degrading and hopeless slavery known in this country.

Why, sir, to hear these advocates of protection one is almost persuaded that our laboring people are as prosperous and as happy as mortals need to be. But when I turn from their glowing pictures to the

unadorned facts gathered by the patient industry of the statistician, and go personally from the farm to the mine, and from the mine to the shop, instead of finding light hearts and happy smiles, I find the lips drawn tight as if to suppress the storm whose coming is masked by the frown upon the brow; and instead of hearing the joyous song of prosperous content I hear the complaining voice of discontent and deep-breathed mutterings that menace the public peace.

Sir, while capital invested in manufactures is earning 37 per cent. under the tariff, labor is sinking lower and lower in want, wretchedness, degradation, and squalor. We have prospered, they say, under the tariff. Yes, in the aggregate we have grown dangerously rich. We are the youngest nation and the richest in the world. But our wealth has not been a blessing. Our whole economic system is wrong. We run wild over the amazing and bewildering figures which are given us as representing our national growth in the aggregate, without stopping to reflect that under the operation of our economic policies this new created wealth, instead of being scattered and disseminated among the millions who created it, is being concentrated in comparatively a few hands, thus building up thousands of the largest private fortunes ever known to the history of the world.

There is no lack of wealth, but there is a woful lack of just distribution. I saw a recent well-authenticated statement that in the city of New York there are thirty men whose aggregate annual income is estimated at \$150,000,000. That is to say, of the wealth created in this Republic each year, thirty men in one city absorb \$150,000,000. Now, there is a law of that State applicable to the city of New York, which requires that a man must be worth \$250 in real or personal property before he is eligible to serve as a juror in that city. A recent report of the jury commissioner reveals the startling fact that there are seventy thousand voters in the city of New York ineligible for jury duty under the property qualification to which I have referred. If these voters are heads of families, then there are seventy thousand families averaging, say, five members, with less than \$250 each, and that in a city where thirty other voters are receiving an annual income from the productive industries of the country of \$150,000,000. One thousand dollars will support an ordinary family with tolerable comfort for a year. We have already seen that that is nearly twice the average earnings of workmen who are the heads of families in Massachusetts. One hundred and fifty million dollars would supply \$1,000 to each of one hundred and fifty thousand families of five persons, and thus comfortably support seven hundred and fifty thousand people. Any industrial system which creates such conditions and makes such results as these possible, is radically and fatally defective.

Mr. Chairman, I fear I have already extended my observations beyond all reasonable limit, and certainly far beyond what I at first intended. I started out to show—

1. That the cost of any article upon which a tariff tax is levied is increased thereby to the consumer.
2. That under the present law we are annually collecting millions from the people which the Government does not need, thereby congesting the circulating medium in the Federal Treasury, bringing disorder into our whole commercial system, and inciting the public authorities to schemes of extravagance and corruption.
3. That the American manufacturers have no just reason to fear competition from the manufacturers of any other nation on earth.
4. That the tariff does not advance wages to our workmen, but on the contrary imposes burdens for which it affords no compensating advantage.
5. That the protective tariff, as the chief factor of a vicious economic system, results in concentrating the wealth of the nation in comparatively a few hands, thereby creating a merciless moneyed aristocracy with enormous and dangerous powers, while the masses of the people, poor and discontented, are compelled to wage a hard battle for shelter, food, and clothing, and to earn enough to pay their tribute to the privileged lords of the factory.

I believe, sir, I have accomplished my purpose, and now, with one additional observation, I will have concluded my contribution to this discussion.

Mr. Chairman, defeated on every fair field of argument, the protectionist invariably begs the question. He asserts, what everybody admits, that, taken as a whole, the Republic has prospered in a remarkable degree during the last twenty years and during the dominance of the protective policy—that is to say, the aggregate increase of wealth has been phenomenal. He points to the fact that in 1860 our total wealth was valued at \$16,159,616,068, while in 1880 it had increased to \$43,642,000,000. With great grandiloquence of assertion he claims all this as the natural and legitimate fruit of protection, and congratulates the country that while we were eighty years, up to 1860, accumulating \$16,159,616,068, we added to that in twenty years, from 1860 to 1880, \$27,482,383,932, making the total of \$43,642,000,000, and thereupon he warns the country against new experiments. It is a sort of *ad captandum* argument, which is not true in its deductions, and would mean nothing if it was.

To say we would not have grown enormously in wealth in the same period under a purely revenue tariff would be foolish. No sensible man would say that. To say our growth would have been more or less

under the one system or the other would be to say something which would rest entirely in mere assertion. The truth is, the per cent. of our increase was larger from 1850 to 1860 than during any other decade of our history. An examination of the census tables shows that the increase from 1850 to 1860 was 126 per cent.; from 1860 to 1870, 93 per cent.; from 1870 to 1880, 45 per cent. The aggregate increase from 1850 to 1860 was less, but the per cent. was greater.

This growth is not confined to the protected industries. Since 1860 our population has nearly doubled, although the per cent. of increase was no greater than from 1850 to 1860. The eyes of all mankind have been turned upon our country. Its wonderful natural advantages have become known. We have a free people and a stable government—a country blessed with individual liberty and immense opportunity. Millions have come to us from the crowded populations of the old world and brought with them their wealth and willing hands. Great cities have sprung up as if by magic. The spirit of enterprise has gone out in search of wealth, and mines of all kinds and of inestimable value have been discovered and developed in all sections of the country. Railroads and telegraph lines have been built in every neighborhood. Machinery has increased the productive capacity of agriculture, and the industry of agriculture itself has increased in volume, multiplying the number of farms and extending their area almost beyond conception.

New States have been born in the midst of barbarous solitudes and grown to great commonwealths since 1860. New industries, demanded by the necessities and exigencies of our social, commercial, and industrial conditions, have been founded and have added their contributions to the general wealth. Sir, we have grown with magical rapidity, and we will continue to grow for many years to come. According to recent figures there is in France a population of 180.88 to the square mile; in Germany 216.62; in England and Wales, 423.67; in Belgium, 481.71; in the United States, excluding Alaska, 16.88. Dr. Strong estimates that if our population were as dense as that of France we would have, this side of Alaska, 527,000,000; if as dense as Germany, 643,000,000; if as dense as that of England and Wales, 1,173,000,000; if as dense as that of Belgium, 1,430,000,000. We could put the 50,000,000 inhabitants we had according to the census of 1880 all in Texas and the population would not be as dense as that now in Germany. Put them in Dakota and the population would not be as dense as that of England and Wales. Place them in New Mexico and the density of population would not be as great as that of Belgium.

It is also calculated that those 50,000,000 might all be comfortably sustained in Texas. After allowing, say, 50,000 square miles for "desert," Texas could have produced all our food crops in 1879—grown, as we have seen, on 164,214 square miles of land—could have raised the world's supply of cotton, 12,000,000 bales, at 1 bale to the acre, on 19,000 square miles, and then have had remaining for a cattle range a territory larger than the State of New York. With such a startling array of known facts, and with such bewildering possibilities, who can say what we might have achieved except for the obstructing incubus of a protective tariff! Of one thing I do feel assured: that whether we had gathered more or less in the aggregate, our increase in wealth, whatever it may have been, would have been more universally distributed among the people except for the protective tariff and its associate economic evils, and the result would have been a greater diversification of prosperity and a larger number of happy homes.

Many plausible arguments can be urged in support of the notion that protection has really retarded our growth. But, however that may be, certain it is that no considerable proportion of it can be justly attributed to protection. The United States has not been the only prosperous nation during these same eventful years. Free-trade England, and all the world, for that matter, have kept step to the same music of industrial progress. Mr. Gladstone, the great English statesman, recently made this astounding declaration: That in the first fifty years of this century as much was added to the wealth of the world as was added to it in the whole of the Christian era preceding, covering eighteen centuries full of great events; and that an equal amount was produced in the twenty years from 1850 to 1870. He estimates that the manufacturing power of the world is doubled by reason of the increased productive capacity of machinery in every period of seven years. In Ralph Waldo Emerson's work entitled *English Traits* I find this statement:

The power of machinery in Great Britain, in mills, has been computed to be equal to 600,000,000 of men, one man being able, by the aid of steam, to do the work which required 250 men to accomplish fifty years ago.

That is to say, the machinery of Great Britain alone has a productive capacity equal to that of the entire adult population of all the earth.

An English work by Dr. P. Gaskell, entitled "*Artizans and Machinery*," discussing the advance of physico-mechanical science in Great Britain, says:

Machines have been invented which enable one man to produce as much yarn as 250, or 300 even, could have produced seventy years ago—which enables one man and one boy to print as many goods as a hundred men and a hundred boys could have printed formerly. The 150,000 in the spinning mills produce as much as could have been produced by 40,000,000 with the one-thread wheel.

According to the same basis of calculation the machinery of Mas-

sachusetts alone has a productive capacity equal to 100,000,000 of men, or twice as many men as we had of total population in 1880.

The ratio of consumption has kept pace with the increased power of production. Dr. Gaskell in his work says:

When this new career (adaptation of mechanism) commenced, about the year 1770, the annual consumption of cotton in English manufactures was under 4,000,000 of pounds weight, and that of the whole of Christendom was probably not more than 10,000,000. Last year the consumption in Great Britain and Ireland was about 270,000,000 pounds.

Mr. Chairman, the most casual examination into the line of thought which I have here suggested will expose the utter fallacy of the pretension that the marvelous expansion and development of our resources, and the consequent accumulation of wealth, are the result of a protective tariff; or that the same results would not have occurred if there had been no tariff. The pretense is too transparent. It is the poorest species of begging. It is utterly ridiculous.

We are upon the verge of the most important political contest of the century. The privileged classes will employ every possible artifice to mislead, and will strain every nerve to the utmost tension to wrest victory from the common people that they may continue to thrive at public expense and exact tribute from the hard hand of honest toil. What the result may be no man can tell.

The pending bill is a moderate measure. If it should pass the tax remaining would average 40 per cent. Violent or radical changes should not be suddenly made. For twenty-five years the business of the country has been adjusted on the basis of protection. The Democratic party does not propose any radical disturbance of existing conditions. There is no reason for any uneasiness. We simply propose to assert the right of the people who pay the taxes to levy them, and then gradually to make such modifications of the tariff as will be just to all interests and reduce the volume of taxation to the needs of the Government.

Against this reasonable demand the Republican party makes war in the interest of the manufacturer. The President, speaking for the taxpayers, has challenged the forces of monopoly and privilege to battle upon this issue. His message was the bravest bugle blast that has been blown for many years. It rang out like the inspiring call of a great chieftain when liberty is in peril. Already there is terrific thundering in the index. A month hence the storm will break and rage with increasing fury until truth and right shall triumph in November or be beaten down by the victorious arms of an aristocracy made omnipotent by the power of money.

Mr. CHIPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to deliver a lecture on political economy.

Nor, sir, will I glorify the potency of free trade or of high protection.

The man who makes an idol of either the one or the other falls into a mistake, as all men do who wander after strange gods.

There is only one true faith, and that is the happiness of the American people.

If the highest of tariffs will make them happier, I am for the highest tariffs. If the broadest free trade will make them happier, I am for the broadest free trade. I will vote for either one or the other, according to the exigency of the hour, when the hour comes. But this is not the hour of free trade. No man proposes free trade. No party will vote for it, no party desires it.

In my judgment the bill now under consideration is not a free-trade bill. I do not say it is the best bill which could be drawn. I do not pledge myself in advance to vote for it. I shall have some amendments to offer to it. I shall watch the stages of its perfection with proper interest and with proper conscientiousness. I admit that I shall watch them in a friendly spirit, because I believe the bill is an honest endeavor to meet a public necessity.

Sir, we are not here to legislate in the interest of fortunes, but in the interest of men. If annihilation of every millionaire in the land would save a workingman one drop of sweat or add one comfort to the farmer's hearth, I would vote for that annihilation. If their continued existence would make better wages, better homes, better citizens, I would vote against the annihilation.

Millionaires are the luxuries of society. We must not gorge the body-politic with them. A very few of them are enough. What a man produces should not be greater than the man himself; yet the precise danger in our modern civilization is that lands and machines, bonds and stocks, bank-bills and coin, instead of being servants, are the masters.

Now, sir, this is an occasion when the point is sharply raised, what shall we do for the labor of the country?

The great fortunes are in no danger. Even your wicked fortunes are safe. Your Goulds still scourge the world. Your anthracite miners still transmute their sweat-soaked grime into diamond drops for their masters. Every toiler in the workshop, every laborer on the street, in the sewers, on the railways, every son of honest toil who fights against poverty, is underpaid. The farmers North and South, with their wheat and their cotton, still supply the surplus in our foreign trade, and wait with a patience almost divine for the day when they shall cease to "hew wood and draw water" for the enrichment of men already too rich for the peace of their souls and the good of their country. Strike

follows after strike, lockout after lockout, boycott after boycott, black-list after black-list. Sir, we have been in a sort of civil war; a battle between labor and capital; a war which may lull for a time, but its fires are only banked.

I do not exaggerate. I do not even draw the picture of social discontent in its naked proportions. I accuse no one of being the author of it. I only say it is here—a living, portentous fact. It bursts forth in riot. It evolves the shameful spectacle of military force arrayed against our own flesh and blood. It blossoms in the fruit of the gallows at Chicago. It cries aloud in the wreck and riot of Pittsburgh. It moans with covered head by the cold hearths of the anthracite miners.

It is all-pervading—a menace to peace, an apostle of anarchism, communism, and irreligion.

Sir, the labor of the country feels that it is in a death struggle. The laboring men know that they are losing caste socially, and they have organized for business and political protection.

Are they fools? Are they mere agitators? Is all the wisdom of the world in the heads of men who know the tricks of the stock market, or who have the uncanny gift of outwitting every man with whom they deal, the very gift of the devil?

The laboring people are sore pressed and the devil's dance of extravagance and fashion we see around us here daily; of imported airs, of "rings and things," of footmen and liveries, and of all of aristocracy which is mean, and of rank which is ridiculous, is filling their hearts with honest rage.

If fine paternal words could assuage their discontent we would soon have peace and slavery; but who are to speak those words? The rich men lately from the spade and pick, they and their women, do not appear to the poor folks as gods and goddesses. They throng every capital of Europe to be sneered at and plundered. They swarm in our own land like the rack-renters of Ireland. They enter these halls and their servants are ready to do their bidding.

I am not inveighing against wealth. I respect the enterprise and thrift which raise men to comfort. It may be that colossal fortunes are economic necessities, evils to be endured for the sake of some greater good, evils which may be curbed by wise legislation inimical to their perpetuity, or by the profligacy or inanity of heirs, who can neither make nor hold. That which a man hath honestly earned, let him honestly keep and honestly use, but let him earn, keep, and use it by his own force, his own goodness, and not by special legislation, by the highway robbery of the stock-exchange, by the grinding of the face of labor, by high tariffs for transportation on farmers' products, by trusts, combines, and forestalling, and by unearned profits.

I know, sir, there are too many millionaires in the land and too few men of modest competency. I know that the Chinaman, with his abomination, cheapens labor on the Pacific coast; that non-resident Canadian aliens swarm on our northern frontier and eat the bread of a country they will not defend in war; that the stripes of the convict, the social beast of prey, have become the passport to competition with honest labor. I know that corporations govern some States, are insolent in all States, and that nearly every industry, save that of the laborer and the farmer, assumes the form of corporate charters, the form which knows no comfort save dollars and cents; no sentiment save unconscionable interest.

I know that there is no longer the wheelwright, the blacksmith, and the cobbler on the four corners. I know that machinery is taking the place of handicraft; that cities, the ulcers of civilization, are increasing in size and number throughout the land; I know that we are breeding, by forced processes, a dangerous class, and that to-day, at the end of our first century, we are face to face with every problem which other nations have inherited as part of their decay.

I ask gentlemen on both sides of the House, how long can this last?

Remember, our workmen are voting men. They are rulers in the land. The property of every Cæsus depends upon their intelligence. You can not strip them of the franchise and rule them with a standing army. That would be the end of free government, the outcome of a tempest, which would wither fortune and life, confiscate property, crush corporations, throttle all opposition, and spend itself in a slavery which would engulf all men in despotism.

Gentlemen who sneer at this mistake the age. It has been the misfortune, sometimes the vice, of rulers that they could not see. The profligacy, the poverty, the oppression which preceded the French Revolution only called forth from Sybarites the utterance that "it would last their time."

But the condition of affairs in this country would not last the time of any of us if the working people had not hope from the ballot.

Well, sir, have I exaggerated the condition of affairs? No man whose heart and eyes are open will say that I have. How are you to meet it? With long tables which an unlearned man can not calculate, proving that high tariff or free trade is the panacea?

You can not by sums in arithmetic make a man believe he is comfortable when he is starving. You may scatter these tables broadcast, but they will be ointment for no sore.

The voice of labor will still shout forth its complaint—still clamor its needs, still thunder that mathematics do not answer its demand.

Something is wrong in this land of ours. The laboring men tell us so. They ought to know their own necessity.

Whether, sir, high tariff or free trade will be the corrective, is a problem, varying with the factors which enter it. It changes its aspects with the seasons. What may be beneficial in the spring may be hurtful in the fall. England founded her greatness in protection. She has maintained it by free trade. On every question, save one, she has been practical, wise, and that is her treatment of Ireland. For years she protected her industries by invidious restrictions on the industries of Ireland; but with Ireland free, with the United States mistress of the sea, when our factories shall run full time, she may again erect a wall around her coast.

Sir, the conditions under which our present system of tariff grew up do not exist to-day. The South was then our customer; she is now our rival. She will demand a share of whatever prosperity may be derived from the system. How can you say no to her? Her industries will be largely like ours, and compared to ours they will be "infant industries." The emancipation of the slaves added millions to the ranks of labor. They must be cared for, protected, employed. The mass of them will join the ranks of discontent unless constant employment at decent wages is afforded them. Their very number forces them to be an important element in the labor question.

What are we to do with all these working people, white and black? They can not live on tariff speeches. They can not be independent, useful citizens if they do not earn a decent living.

Sir, we are not legislating for to-day. We are discounting the future. The centuries of a nation's history are only one life; our pride, our reason, our patriotism, the solicitude which flows from man even to his remote descendants, bid us to be wise and unselfish. I will receive no measure from any committee on faith. I am glad, very glad, that in the great freedom of the Democratic party no such faith is a partisan test.

What is proposed here is not free trade. It is reduction of taxation, but, sir, protection still remains. The free-list is enlarged, but duties enough are left on most other articles to protect them. If those duties are not high enough, if the free-list is too great or too small, we will ascertain it when we come to amend the bill.

The great benefit claimed from a high tariff is that it enhances wages. Have we not had such a tariff? Does it not exist now? Why is labor discontented; why is its chief complaint low wages? According to the protection theory our workmen should be the happiest in the world, yet, sir, I observe that the best that can be said for them is that they are better paid than laborers in Europe—better paid than "pauper labor."

I observe, too, on all sides of this House, that the law of supply and demand is applied as ruthlessly to these beings with souls as to dumb brutes—as if the great necessity of men is not their manhood, as if that is not always a factor in the question of their earnings; but, sir, under this law of supply and demand, the voice of their manhood cries to us, "Supply and demand does not satisfy our needs; your supply and demand is bottomed on some false basis. It is not a supply and demand which gives us and our children the comforts of life. It is the sort of supply and demand which will do for people who go without meat or are content to live on black bread, or rats." If they are right, if this is so, what kind of a supply and demand have we? Do our mills run every working day in the year? Do our people produce all that they can produce—make all the money which full time represents?

What is the trouble? Is our tariff too high or too low? Frankly, it would seem to a common mind that we have had protection enough to bring about an industrial millennium, but I hardly think any millennium will be characterized by people crying for higher wages. Is it not barely possible that the day of high protection is gone and that the infant, grown to manhood, can walk alone?

But, sir, the bill of the committee does not break down protection. It essays to meet an abnormal condition of the national Treasury. We have too much money there; more than we need; more than is wholesome; so much that men are racking their brains what to spend it for. Will any one pretend that this is a desirable condition of affairs? Both the great political parties have said it is not desirable; both have pledged themselves to revenue reduction as the means of stopping this accretion of barren money in the Federal vaults.

And, sir, there is no other way of doing it. Taxes must be cut off in some direction. I know that this is a difficult thing to do. So many interests are involved that it is hard to say where to begin, where to end. Some gentlemen demand the repeal of internal taxation. Yet large classes who pay that tax object. Our people on the northern frontier want free lumber and building stone, free bituminous coal, free rice, free ship-building materials. The druggists wish the retail liquor-dealers' tax taken off. I speak now for the people of my own district. Some of them say that the bill lowers the duty on glass, on rails, and other articles too much; that it destroys the linseed-oil industry. It is plain that there is a great difference of opinion. The fine-cut tobacco men in my district deem the repeal of the tax on their production injurious; yet gentlemen from Kentucky think it right.

Our South Carolina friends wish to keep the duty on rice, but the brewers of the Northwest wish it taken off. I suppose my New Eng-

land friends object to free building-stone; but the workingmen of my district demand it; and the dairymen instruct me to vote for free salt, yet there is great opposition to free salt. The great need, then, is to so reduce taxation that no industry shall be destroyed and no State or section be forced to bear too much of the burden of reduction.

Now, sir, what are we to do? We have no minority bill before us. The gentlemen on the other side from Minnesota and Pennsylvania have not come to an agreement. They leave us in the dark.

But, sir, the country demands action; both political parties have promised action, and the Democratic majority of the committee are trying to fulfill the promise their party made to the country. If they have made mistakes, let us correct them. I have no doubt that many a political sun will sink before this matter is determined; but what of that? There are old and young on this floor, but what are their lives compared to the life of the nation? I know how strong the zeal of party is, but I hope that every man here yearns to do his duty patriotically. I am not one of those who have no patience with their opponents. I would burn with shame if I believed that any gentleman is not conscientious. We love our common mother; her dignity, her strength, her prosperity, are the sacred objects of our endeavor. High, high, among the nations, beneficent, great, free, she stands, and our eyes kindle and hearts throb when we gaze on her serene majesty. Whatever the result of this day's doing we will be her true sons so long as our lives last, and so may our children and their children's children arise and call us blessed. [Applause.]

[Mr. MARTIN withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, as no other gentleman present seems to wish to speak this evening, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. McMILLIN having resumed the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration a bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of revenue, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9891) for the benefit of Adam Cullip—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GAY: A bill (H. R. 9892) for the relief of the estate of O. L. Blanchard—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: A bill (H. R. 9893) providing for the payment of certain employes in the War Department for extra services—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROMEIS: A bill (H. R. 9894) granting a pension to Myron Teacharet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 9895) for the relief of Augustin Holland—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9896) for the relief of A. R. Lang—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WALKER: A bill (H. R. 9897) for the relief of Lindsay Murdock—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WADE: A bill (H. R. 9898) for the relief of John H. Miller—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9899) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret G. Reid—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9900) granting an increase of pension to Joshua H. Graves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9901) for the relief of James S. Johnson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9902) for the relief of Sarah L. Eversol—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 9903) for the relief of Mrs. Parthena Chaney—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PEEL: A bill (H. R. 9904) for the relief of Peter McCormick—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. T. J. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 9905) granting a pension to Marcus Davis—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAYNER: A bill (H. R. 9906) for the relief of the heirs of Wesley Hartlove—to the Committee on War Claims.

Change in the reference of a bill improperly referred was made in the following case, namely:

A bill (H. R. 3557) for the relief of C. C. Roberts—from the Committee on Military Affairs to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JEHU BAKER: Memorial of the Pennsylvania Prison Society, on convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BLAND: Petition of Mrs. Parthena Chaney, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURNETT: Petition for improved railway mail service in New England—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BYNUM: Petition of O. R. Meenan and 84 others, citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., and of George H. Thomas Post Women's Relief Corps, for the establishment of a soldiers' home at Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. T. J. CAMPBELL: Petition of Marcus Davis for a pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIN: Protest of citizens of Galveston, Tex., against the employment of the contract system on public works at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CROUSE: Protest of the Paris white and whiting manufacturers of the United States against any reduction of duties on their goods—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance from the producers and manufacturers of salt against placing the same on the free-list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINLEY: Petition of Robert V. Vaughn, of Green County, Kentucky, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GAY: Petition of the Board of Underwriters of New Orleans, La., for an international marine conference—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIFFORD: Petition of the Grand Army of the Republic of Dakota, for an appropriation of \$25,000 to be added to any amount that may be appropriated by the Legislature of Dakota towards establishing and maintaining a soldiers' home in Dakota—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAIDLAW: Petition of 90 citizens of the Thirty-fourth district of New York for prohibition in the District of Columbia—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. LEE (by request): Petition of the Washington Night Lodging Association for an appropriation of \$2,500—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CHARLES O'NEILL: Petition of citizens of the Second and Sixth districts of Pennsylvania for prohibition in the District of Columbia—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. PEEL: Petition of Peter McCormick for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of Charles R. Holmes, administrator of Joseph Watkins, of Rutherford County, Tennessee, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. E. RUSSELL: Petition of J. W. Hastings and others, citizens of Warren, Mass., for the abolition of the internal-revenue taxes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of A. J. Underwood, of W. J. Thompson, of Thomas Good, son and heir of William Good; of Margaret M. Ogden, administratrix of James Gaston, and of F. M. Hurn, of Alabama, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

The following petitions for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of \$25 levied on druggists were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. BREWER: Of druggists of the Sixth district of Michigan.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: Of R. T. Portwood, of Sunny Side, Miss.

By Mr. SEYMOUR: Of G. B. Kirkwood, of Negaunee; of H. C. Vilas, of Stoneburgh, and of Joseph Stafford and others, of Newbury, Mich.

The following petitions for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, were received and severally referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. DINGLEY: Of C. A. Packard and others, of Bath, Me.

By Mr. MORSE: Of citizens of Cambridge, Mass.

By Mr. SAWYER: Of 33 citizens of New York.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by the means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. JACKSON: Of George C. Stoolfier and 100 others, citizens of Washington County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. LAIDLAW: Of citizens of Fredonia, N. Y.

By Mr. ROMEIS: Of citizens of Millersville, and of Catawba Island, Ohio.

By Mr. SAWYER: Of citizens of Ridgeway, and of Carlton, N. Y.

By Mr. WARNER: Of citizens of Herndon, Mo.

The following petitions, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. A. R. ANDERSON: Of P. M. Phillipps and 93 others, members of Grand Army of the Republic Post of Allenton, Iowa.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of 16 ex-soldiers of Howard County, Iowa.

By Mr. GIFFORD: Of Geo. L. Harris and 33 others, ex-soldiers, of Lawrence County, Dakota.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. BIGGS: Of 187 citizens of San Joaquin County, California.

By Mr. MCKINNEY: Of 110 citizens of Rockingham, Merrimack, and Stafford Counties, New Hampshire.

By Mr. SAWYER: Of 157 citizens of Genesee County, New York.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, May 9, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

THE JOURNAL.

The Secretary read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. QUAY. I move to correct the Journal in as far as it relates to the report from the Committee on Pensions made by me on the bill to pension Elizabeth Sirwell.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will read the Journal entry as it stands.

The Secretary read as follows:

Mr. QUAY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1340) granting a pension to Elizabeth Sirwell, reported adversely thereon. Ordered, That it be postponed indefinitely.

Mr. QUAY. The Journal states that I reported the bill adversely. The fact was that by direction of the Committee on Pensions I reported the bill with a recommendation that the committee be discharged from its further consideration, the applicant for the pension having died some days ago. There was not an adverse report, and there was no question as to the merit of the application. I move that the Journal be corrected accordingly.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection the Journal will be amended as suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania; and if there be no further motion to correct or amend the Journal it will stand approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a petition adopted by the Twenty-second Annual Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Wisconsin, praying for certain legislation on the subject of pensions; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the repeal of that portion of the internal-revenue law which classes druggists as liquor dealers, and for the reduction of the tax on spirits; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Castile, Greene County, Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of the Pennsylvania Prison Society, remonstrating against the passage of the bill to protect free labor from the products of convict labor; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BATE. I present a petition of citizens and voters of Stewart, Houston County, Tennessee, praying that the work of the eradication of pleuro-pneumonia be continued under the Bureau of Animal Industry as at present organized; that the law establishing the bureau be strengthened without changing the plan of work now in operation; that the Bureau of Animal Industry be allowed to remain in the Department of Agriculture, with a chief who shall be a competent veterinary surgeon, and who shall report to the Commissioner of Agriculture; and that no board or commission shall be given any authority or control over that bureau or the work which it is now performing. I move that the petition lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FAULKNER. I present the following memorials remonstrating against changing the Bureau of Animal Industry as at present constituted, and favoring a pure-food bill and the repeal of the tobacco tax:

Memorials of—

E. J. Drago and 16 citizens of Berrien County, Michigan.

C. T. Gregg and 55 citizens of Manistee County, Michigan.

James Wells and 18 citizens of Huron County, Michigan.

Hugh Fuller and 39 citizens of St. Clair County, Michigan.

John J. Murdock and 29 citizens of Huron County, Michigan.

William Mead and 34 citizens of Montana Territory.

W. A. Hall and 14 citizens of Idaho Territory.

R. Davey and 22 citizens of Ingham County, Michigan.

Thomas T. Arnold and 18 citizens of King George County, Virginia.

I move that the memorials lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FAULKNER presented the petition of R. Davey and 25 citizens of Ingham County, Michigan; the petition of H. Baldwin and 48 citizens of Washtenaw County, Michigan; and the petition of W. D. Brooks and 18 citizens of Franklin County, Virginia, praying Congress to adopt police regulations to prevent the manufacture and sale of adulterated articles and the use of misleading brands of food, medicines, and liquors, for exportation from the country or from one State to another; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HISCOCK presented a petition of members of the United Labor League of America, praying that the bill for the relief of John Pope Hodnett be passed; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented a petition of ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Ingham County, Michigan, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SAWYER presented a petition of W. H. Dean and 46 other citizens of Center, Rock County, Wisconsin, praying that the Bureau of Animal Industry remain as at present constituted under the Department of Agriculture, for the passage of a pure-food bill, and the repeal of the tobacco tax; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, presented the memorial of Edward Shipley and 28 other citizens of Carroll County, Maryland, remonstrating against the passage of the bill to establish a Bureau of Animal Industry, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. REAGAN. I present a petition of citizens of Mason County, in the State of Texas, praying that the work of the eradication of pleuro-pneumonia be continued under the Bureau of Animal Industry as at present organized; that the law establishing that bureau be strengthened without changing the plan of work now in operation; that the Bureau of Animal Industry shall be allowed to remain in the Department of Agriculture, with a chief who shall be a competent veterinary surgeon, and who shall report to the Commissioner of Agriculture, and that no board or commission shall be given any authority or control over that bureau or the work which it is now performing.

I present a similar petition of citizens of Houston County, a similar petition of citizens of Johnson County, a similar petition of citizens of San Saba County, a similar petition of citizens of Fayette County, a similar petition of citizens of Angeline County, a similar petition of citizens of Erath County, a similar petition of citizens of Comanche County, and a similar petition of citizens of Grimes County, all in the State of Texas. I move that these petitions lie on the table, the bill on the subject being now under consideration.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RANSOM. I present a petition of citizens of Farmville, Pitt County, North Carolina, similar to those presented by the Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN], and move that it lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GIBSON presented a memorial of citizens of the parish of Vermillion, State of Louisiana, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Palmer bill, signed by J. D. Morgan, R. P. Fleming, R. Pickett, sr., P. H. Ramsey, A. Ramsey, W. C. Ramsey, James B. Ramsey, and others; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BLAIR. I present the memorial of Louis Schmid & Sons, of Washington, D. C., remonstrating against competition between the productions of the Reform School here in this District and their own manufactures, that of "all kinds of paper boxes," which they explain; they state that their business is being wholly ruined. As it is a matter in the District, I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLAIR presented a petition of citizens of Arizona Territory, praying for the passage of a bill to authorize citizens of the United States to return their stray cattle from the Republic of Mexico into the United States without the payment of duties; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. QUAY. I present a memorial of the Pennsylvania Prison Society, remonstrating against the passage of the bill confining the sale of wares manufactured by convict labor to the States in which they are produced. I do not sympathize with the purpose of this petition, but present it by request. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of physicians and druggists, citizens of Cannonsburgh, Pa., praying for the repeal of the law classing druggists as liquor dealers, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MITCHELL presented a petition of Multnomah Typographical Union No. 58, of Portland, Oregon, praying for the passage of the so-called Chace bill, providing for an international copyright; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Deadwood, Dak., and a petition of citizens of Spearfish, Dak., praying Congress to make provision for the payment of Indian depredation claims reported favorably by the Department of the Interior; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented a petition of Martin Wing and other citizens of