

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Petition of citizens of Hawkins County, Tenn., asking the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill in the interest of the fraternal society and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WELLS: Protest of Rev. Herman C. Rowald and 382 communicants of his church, against a change in the preamble of the United States Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Washington: Resolution of Board of Trade of Olympia, opposing abolishing or transferring the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Geological Survey and Navy Department—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Massachusetts: Petition of H. E. Hillman and 31 others, of Holyoke, Mass., in favor of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 19, 1894.

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

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

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 1916) authorizing the Texarkana and Fort Smith Railway Company to bridge Little River, in the State of Arkansas; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

### PUBLIC LANDS IN OREGON AND WASHINGTON.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 3d instant, a report from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, submitting a list of all public lands located in odd sections in the States of Oregon and Washington; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

### COURT OF CLAIMS REPORT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of that court in the cause of John A. Fairfax vs. The United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

### URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I submit a conference report on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill. I will simply state that the House conferees receded from the disagreement of the House to all the amendments of the Senate, except the amendment striking out the provision for a census abstract. That is left in. The clause which was stricken out of the bill as it passed the House providing for an abstract of the census is restored, and with that exception all the Senate amendments are agreed to.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6556) "to provide for further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, and 16, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

#### "MINTS AND ASSAY OFFICES.

"For wages of workmen and adjusters, to be used in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, \$52,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For compensation and mileage of members of the House of Representatives and Delegates from Territories on account of fiscal years as follows:

"For 1893, \$3,334.

"For 1894, \$15,900."

To pay the clerk to the Speaker's table, for services rendered as clerk to the Committee on Rules during the first and second sessions of the Fifty-third Congress, \$500; and the Senate agree to the same.

F. M. COCKRELL,

EUGENE HALE,

Managers on the part of the Senate,

JOSEPH D. SAYERS,

J. G. CANNON,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was concurred in.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask a leave of absence, for ten days, for my colleague, Mr. McLAURIN.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the leave of absence is granted.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. ALLISON presented a memorial of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Northwood, Iowa, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the preamble of the Constitution of the United States recognizing the Deity: which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Johnson Division, No. 67, Order of Railway Conductors, of Waterloo, Iowa, praying for the adoption of certain amendments relating to ticket scalping, etc., to the interstate-commerce law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the petition of J. H. Merrill and sundry other citizens of Iowa, and the petition of E. P. Fogg and sundry other citizens of Epworth, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to suppress the lottery traffic; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of W. A. Granger and sundry other citizens of Nashua; of W. H. Bradley and sundry other citizens of Larchwood; of R. T. Gilbert and sundry other citizens of Viola Center; of F. H. Robbe and sundry other citizens of Charles City, and of Viola Lodge, No. 220, Legion of Honor, of Viola Center, all in the State of Iowa, praying that fraternal society and college journals be admitted to the mails as second-matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation to suppress the lottery traffic; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WASHBURN presented sundry memorials of citizens of St. Cloud and Alexandria, in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against an increase of the internal-revenue tax on cigars; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAFFERY presented a petition of sundry citizens of New Orleans, La., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the harbor of that city; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of Mrs. Luella A. Oteri, of New Orleans, La., owner of the steamer Joseph Oteri, jr., praying for the remission of a penalty imposed upon that vessel for a technical violation of the customs laws; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented sundry petitions of citizens of New Orleans, La., praying for the establishment of a bureau of public health within the Treasury Department of the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

He also presented the petition of Francois L. Bouillotte and others, children and heirs at law of Joseph Bouillotte, late of Rapides Parish, La., praying that their claims against the United States for stores and supplies taken for the United States Army, at Alexandria, La., during the civil war, be referred to the Court of Claims for adjudication; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PEPPER. I present a memorial of the executive board of Baker University, located at Baldwin, Kans. I can state its contents perhaps more briefly by reading the resolution which embraces the memorial:

That we, as the executive board of Baker University, protest against the passage of the bill now pending before Congress requiring colleges having military departments to furnish "quarters" for the officer in charge.

The memorialists therefore "urge the Congressmen and Senators from Kansas to use their utmost influence to prevent the bill from becoming a law." I ask that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and I wish simply to state that I not only agree with the suggestion in the memorial, but that I should be very much pleased to see the Government take off its military hand from all colleges and schools throughout the country as well as Baker University.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The memorial will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CAMERON presented a memorial of the Powelton Building Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of the clause in the Wilson tariff bill relating to building and loan associations; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Encampment No. 60, Union Veteran Legion, of Johnstown, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of House bill No. 5575, which proposes to take from the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers all or nearly all control, and place the same under the government of the War Department; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Scranton, Pa., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law, and remonstrating against the pas-

sage of the so-called Bailey bankruptcy bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petitions of Springer Morris and J. N. Conn, of Point Marion, Pa., praying for the passage of House bill No. 5248, providing for the inspection of immigrants by United States consuls; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1433) granting to the Hot Springs Water Company a site for a reservoir for cold water upon the permanent reservation at Hot Springs, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PASCO, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4328) for the relief of William B. Chapman, George W. Street, John W. Hoes, Emmet C. Tuthill, and Joseph H. Curtis, reported it without amendment and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 552) for the relief of Calvin Gunn, reported it without amendment and submitted a report thereon.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CAFFERY introduced a bill (S. 1924) to give the Court of Claims jurisdiction in the matter of the claim of the owners of the steamboat Bee; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1925) for the relief of D. R. Carroll and others; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BATE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1926) for the relief of John Tyler, jr.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PALMER introduced a bill (S. 1927) for the relief of Michael A. Dace; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

#### THE KIDWELL FLATS.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved*, That the Attorney-General is directed to furnish the Senate information as to the present status of the suit in regard to the Kidwell flats, in the District of Columbia, and why the suit is not pressed to a conclusion.

#### CLERKS IN TREASURY AND INTERIOR DEPARTMENTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], coming over from a previous day.

The SECRETARY. A resolution to direct the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Interior to transmit to the Senate in separate lists the names of all clerks and employes appointed, promoted, reduced, and dismissed since the 4th of March, 1893, etc.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to modify the resolution by striking out after the word "reduced" in line 4, the word "and," and by inserting after the word "dismissed," in the same line, "and who have resigned by request."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read as modified.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. GALLINGER on the 13th instant, as modified, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Interior be directed to transmit to the Senate in separate lists the names of all clerks and employes appointed, promoted, reduced, dismissed, and who have resigned by request since the 4th day of March, 1893, and the State to which each such clerk or employe is accredited; also that such of them as served in the Army or Navy of the United States at any time during the war of the rebellion shall be designated by some distinguishing mark in each list.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

#### HEARINGS ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEPPER], coming over from a previous day.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PEPPER on the 14th instant, as follows:

Whereas there exists in many places and on the part of large numbers of citizens, individually and in organized bodies, a disposition to visit the city of Washington for the purpose of personally presenting to Congress their views with respect to pending and prospective measures of legislation; and

Whereas many of such persons and bodies are reported to be now on their way hither, with others likely to follow, for the purposes aforesaid:

Therefore, to the end that these our petitioners shall have full and respectful hearing and that proceedings attending their communication with the Senate shall be orderly and not subjected to interruption by the transaction of other public business,

*Be it resolved*, That a select committee of nine members of the Senate be appointed by the Vice-President, to be known as the Committee on Communication, whose duty it shall be to receive all written or printed communica-

tions from citizens or bodies of citizens visiting the Capitol or intending to make such visit, for the purposes mentioned in the preamble hereto, and to receive all petitions, memorials, and remonstrances of such persons and bodies and hear them orally in relation to the matters and things about which they desire to communicate with the Senate. The committee shall report fully to the Senate from time to time as other committee reports.

The Sergeant-at-Arms will set aside a convenient room in the Capitol or other building belonging to the Government for the use of said committee and furnish the same with the necessary articles for the convenient dispatch of business—

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there was a motion made yesterday to refer the resolution to the Committee on Rules; and before action is taken upon it I wish to state to the Senate very briefly the object of the resolution, so that we may act not hastily, but advisedly.

There is, and has been, for perhaps two or three years, a growing disposition on the part of a great many people in the country, not confined to any particular section, but scattered all over the country, to present their views to Congress in person, changing the usual form of petition from written to oral language. That disposition is growing more general every day. The newspapers now inform us that in Boston, from other cities in Massachusetts; from New York City, and other places in the State of New York; from Philadelphia, Baltimore, Cincinnati, Chicago, Minneapolis, San Francisco, Los Angeles, St. Louis, and a number of other places, men are congregating in small bodies for the purpose of coming to Washington with the ultimate object of presenting their views in connection with their condition to Congress personally.

The object of this resolution is that the way may be made easier for proceedings of this kind to be conducted, so that whatever action this branch of Congress may think proper to take in relation to the visitors the way will have been prepared for future action. I am of opinion that if it goes out to the country that the Senate, which is regarded by many of the classes of people to whom I refer as the American House of Lords, and as an exclusive body, out of touch with the people—

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, it is impossible to hear a word on this side.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. PEPPER. If it goes out among the people through the newspaper press that the Senate of the United States is not that exclusive body it is charged with being, that it is not so far out of touch with the people as a great many persons believe it to be, that fact itself being shown by the appointment of a committee of the kind proposed in this resolution, will go far toward modifying and mollifying public sentiment in relation to existing conditions.

I therefore hope that if the Senate is disposed, after thinking over the matter seriously, to turn the resolution over to a committee, be it so, but with the understanding that it is being done respectfully to the people interested, and that the object is to make some kind of arrangement by which our visitors who want to speak personally and orally to this body may have a way of access through a committee specially appointed.

Mr. President, I think we are on the verge of trouble, and unless we are wise and manage our own course prudently we may have occasion in the near future to regret it. Last evening in the Star of this city I observed some language which I regretted very much to see in a newspaper, as if the police authorities of the city were preparing to arrest men as vagrants who come upon a peaceable mission to the capital of their country for the purpose of conferring in person with the chosen representatives of the people. This is an ugly feeling, Mr. President, and it ought not to exist here or elsewhere. We are always prepared with our police force, and with our military force, and with our civil force—

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

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. He says these persons are coming on a peaceful mission. From what circumstance comes the almost universal popular description of this movement as an army?

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Massachusetts can not be heard on this side. If he would address the Chair and talk a little louder, possibly we might know what he is saying.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. HOAR. I understand the Senator from Tennessee to be entirely out of order in speaking to the Senate from his chair, and also to be entirely out of order in fancying that he presides over the Senate when the Vice-President is present. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Tennessee admits he was out of order. No man can watch the Senator from Massachusetts as vigilantly as I do and by any possibility keep in order. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator devoted himself to his own proper function instead of watching any other Senator's faults, as he seems to do, he might be in order. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Kansas from what circumstance comes the universal description of this moving body as an army?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Massachusetts is older than I am in this world and I have no doubt quite as much devoted to theology and religious matters. He has doubtless ten thousand times heard the expression the Christian army, the army of salvation, the army of the Lord, the army of peace, and in some of the Sunday schools—

Mr. HOAR. When those armies make their fight with Satan they do not make it by personal conference with him.

Mr. PEPPER. Our Sunday schools are beginning to teach their pupils to be soldiers. They are employing military men to teach the Sunday-school scholars military discipline. In the city of Boston, with which the Senator has some acquaintance, he will find a school of that kind in operation now.

One of the most harmless, one of the most peaceful bodies in the world is a body known as the Salvation Army, that move up and down the streets with flags and banners flying, to the beating of drums and cymbals and the singing of songs; and yet their errand is one of peace.

The Senator will remember from reading the newspaper descriptions of this army of which he speaks that it is known as the army of peace. They have religious inscriptions upon their banners, and they carry portraits of the Prince of Peace, the Carpenter's Son, the Lowly Nazarene, the man who of all men best taught "Peace on earth and good will toward men."

Mr. President, these men who are coming to Washington are coming on a peaceful errand. They want to say to the Congress of the United States that they are out of employment, and they want something to do to earn an honest living; and they want to say it to us so that they will know we hear it with our ears, that we see them with our eyes, and that we take cognizance of what they say with our understanding. There could be nothing more peaceful, while it may be true that the object seems visionary and while every member of this body has discouraged it, and none perhaps more than I have done, yet we can not avoid this thing.

Mr. President, it is like the coming of a child into the world. Everything is ready, and the child must be born. Nature has provided all of these things in her own way. Here is a movement of the people that is coming naturally, logically. It reminds one of the moving bodies of men in France prior to the French Revolution. It reminds us of insurrections among the workmen in ancient times when they gathered about their leaders without any apparent object in view, and yet the world at that time was moved by what they were doing.

We may talk about these movements as visionary, as childish, and all that; nevertheless they are actually taking place, and I do not believe that it is beneath the dignity of this great body of American Senators to be ready when these people come to Washington and say to them, "Here is a committee of our body that we have already prepared to confer with you, to hear what you have to say, and report your message to us." There is something about this movement, Mr. President, that is pitiful; something that is earnest; something that deserves our attention; something that we can not if we would, and I do not believe that we would if we could, undertake to laugh down. It is upon us and we must take care of it. Let us treat it as statesmen—wisely; and as Christians—kindly.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I certainly hope the resolution of the Senator from Kansas will be adopted by the Senate, not because I think it advisable for Mr. Coxey's army or any other army to come to Washington for the purpose of presenting a petition to Congress in person, not because I think it is advisable for them to do this, but because I believe that as American citizens they have a right to do so if they see fit, and it would be unwise on the part of the Senate to deny them this right. Any American citizen has a right to come to Washington, I suppose—at least I have never heard it denied until within the last two or three days—any American citizen, it makes no difference where he may live, or what his occupation may be, or what his station in life may be, has a right to come here, and he has a right to walk under the Dome of this Capitol if he sees fit and be as secure as any other citizen in the land. So if Mr. Coxey and his followers see fit to come here for a peaceful purpose, as they are coming—whether that purpose be visionary or not is not for us to judge—they have a right to do so and look in upon the highest legislative body of the country of which they are citizens; and they have a right to occupy these galleries, which are sometimes occupied by persons who are almost chronic in occupying them to the exclusion of citizens of other sections of the land. They have a right to come and be heard by a committee of this body; they have a right to present their grievances in person; and no man has the moral or the legal right to deny them that privilege whether he be Senator or citizen.

Disclaiming, then, any purpose whatever of approving or advising Mr. Coxey's movement, I must say that, so far as I am concerned, I believe that he has a right to come here with his followers, and that he and they have a right to be treated with as much courtesy and kindness in doing so as the President of the United States, and any different reception of Mr. Coxey or his followers, or of any other American citizen, would be altogether un-American, and would not be sustained by the common judgment of the American people.

Let us look for a moment at the way public business is transacted here. I have been reading for two or three days in the newspapers of this city that some general, called Ordway—I do not know who he is, whether he is a regular army officer or a militia officer—is mobilizing the military force of the city for the purpose of receiving Coxey at the confines of the District, with the bayonets of soldiers and the clubs of policemen.

These men are coming here for a rightful purpose, as American citizens, whose persons, whose homes and whose rights are as sacred under the flag and the Constitution of this country as are those of any other man, woman, or child, and yet we witness the singular spectacle of the city being thrown into excitement about the movements of a harmless army of this character, entirely without arms. The Army is to be mobilized to receive them upon the point of the bayonet, if need be, and hired soldiers are to meet them at the confines of the District and check their entry or to shoot them into submission if they refuse, when they have violated no law.

Is that American? Is it right to deny to such men the privilege not only of entering the District of Columbia and the city of Washington, but to enter these galleries, if they see fit to enter them?

Go down to the depot of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad or the Pennsylvania Railroad at almost any time of the day and you will see great bodies of lobbyists coming to the city. I have seen them myself, fifteen, twenty, and twenty-five at a time, and sometimes more. They do not stop to take their baggage to the hotels, but they walk right into the corridors of this Capitol and seek these galleries, seek the lobbies of the Capitol, seek Senators and the committee rooms to lay their various schemes before members of Congress. Sir, many of them are met almost with hats off; they are met almost with outstretched arms and words of welcome, and yet they are doing the country more damage and more injury than all the Coxey armies, than all the forces that can be mobilized in this country by men like Mr. Coxey; and yet here is a threat upon the part of the Government—for I assume that this militia officer would not take the step he threatens to take without orders from some authority, from some one higher than himself—here is the threat we see in the newspapers, that honest workmen who are out of employment, every one of whom perhaps is as good as any Senator in this Chamber, every one of whom owes allegiance to this country and to its flag, are to be met with a military force because they come here to place their grievances before Congress in person; because they come here in a body, as lobbyists come here from day to day and week to week and month to month, they are to be met by a military force to deprive them of an undoubted and sacred right. A surprising spectacle in a country like this!

The conditions of the country are ripe to produce movements of this kind. These people have appealed to Congress from time to time by petitions and memorials without any attempt being made to redress their wrongs. They send their petitions to Congress, and they are received here simply because the Constitution makes it obligatory upon us to receive them: they are never read or published here so that the world can know what they contain; they are hurriedly read by title or a more brief statement is made of their reception, and they are speeded off into the dark closets and caverns around this Capitol, never to be resurrected or seen again. No attention whatever is paid to them.

The right of petition as it exists in this country, and as it is practiced in this body, is a farce, and the great common American people know it full well. So, seeing that they can not be heard otherwise, they come here to lay their grievances before Congress in a peaceful manner. Will we deny them that sacred right of American citizens? Will we deny them the privilege—no, not the privilege—but the right under the Constitution they have to do so? Will we not only deny them that right, but meet them at the confines of the city as felons are to be met and driven back? Are American citizens coming here for a lawful purpose to be met at the confines of the capital of their nation by a hired soldiery, by a police force, and kept out of the city and beaten into submission if they persist in coming?

What provokes any suspicion against this class of our people? Is it the clothes they wear? Is it because they are not clothed in purple and fine linen and arrayed like Solomon in all his glory? Is it in consequence of any threats they have made against Congress or any branch of the Government? Is it in consequence

of their being armed and threatening the peace of the city or the integrity of the nation? Sir, it can not be any of these, for they are peaceable, law abiding, honest, humble American citizens, and they come upon a mission of peace, and not of war.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator allow me one second?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. HARRIS. Representing in some measure, as I do, the people of the District of Columbia, I beg to know of the Senator from Nebraska what evidence he has that the officer in command of the District militia has ever made a threat or an intimation such as the Senator has indicated? I undertake to say he will find no authority for any such statement coming from any such officer.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I will say in answer to the Senator from Tennessee that I said the newspapers of this city were full of it. I ask the Senator from Tennessee if that is not correct?

Mr. HARRIS. I understood the Senator to deal with what he was pleased to characterize as a threat of the officer commanding the militia of the District of Columbia. I deny that any such threat has been made. The Senator need not ask me what has appeared or what may appear in a newspaper in its disposition to speculate upon every possible condition—in its disposition to hunt things sensational. I know not what the newspapers have said or what they will say upon this or any other subject, but the Senator is not justified in charging that a public official has uttered threats such as he has described upon mere newspaper declarations as to what possibly or probably may happen.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I am not responsible for what the Senator from Tennessee understands, nor did I make the statement which he now makes. I said that in the newspapers of this city it was claimed and it is not denied—and that is how I knew that there was an officer of this name—that Gen. Ordway is mobilizing the military force of this District for the purpose I have named.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the Senator mean to say that it is stated that that officer has threatened to do the things which the Senator describes?

Mr. ALLEN. It has been stated in the newspapers that this officer has mobilized or is mobilizing a force for the purpose of meeting these men with the bayonets of soldiers. What does that mean? Does not that mean war upon them and upon their rights? It is nonsense for us to say that nothing of that kind is contemplated when there is a unanimous consensus of opinion upon the subject, and it is not denied by the very officer himself, who must see the statements made in the newspapers from day to day. I know nothing of his purpose except as I get it through the newspapers of this city; and I say if he intends to meet these men with a military force, he violates every principle of this Government, and violates its statutes as well.

I heard it stated in this Chamber within a few days that the time has come when these Capitol grounds must be made sacred and nobody must be permitted to occupy them; that parades must not occupy the Capitol grounds. What is there, Mr. President, about the Capitol grounds which makes them so sacred that no American citizen dare walk across them without permission?

Mr. FAULKNER. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. FAULKNER. Is not the Senator aware of the fact that no processions of any character or description can parade the streets of the city of Washington, or of any other municipality of which I know, without permission from the city authorities, designating the route over which they are to pass and the object and purpose of the procession?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, if that be true, it is a shame and a disgrace to this nation that it should be so.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is so everywhere in every city of the United States.

Mr. ALLEN. It is not so everywhere in every city of the United States.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is true in every well-regulated city.

Mr. ALLEN. It is an absolute shame and disgrace to this nation that peaceable citizens dare not get together and march in the streets unless they get permission from some person, in charge of the municipality; and when the Senator from Missouri says it is so in every city of the United States, I say I know that it is not so in every city; that there are large cities in the United States where it is not required to get permission to have a parade of any kind. If that be the law of the city of Washington, and honest and loyal citizens dare not get together upon the streets and march with drums and fifes if they desire to do so, then it is high time for this Government to repeal such a law. There is no right in anyone to enforce a law of that kind unless there be an occasion for its enforcement by a violation of the peace or threatened injury to the people and to property.

Mr. President, it is almost of weekly occurrence—I have seen it myself, and seen it repeatedly—for military companies and parades of different kinds to march across the Capitol grounds, and yet I am told that it is in violation of the law for them to do so, and that even the District Commissioners have no power to permit processions to invade the Capitol grounds. I saw last week, as I have seen almost every week since I have been in this city, military companies and societies of different kinds with banners, with fifes and drums, and with brass bands marching across the Capitol grounds without the slightest molestation or injury. There is not a man in this Capitol building to-day who has not seen the same thing; and yet we are told when Coxey, this mysterious and harmless Mr. Coxey, who is coming down the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal with two or three hundred harmless men, reaches Washington, because he is not domiciled in Washington and of known high character, because he is not honored with a position in this end of the Capitol, or the other perhaps, because his fellow-citizens have never called upon him to represent them in any respect in Washington, that he and his followers are to be met by police officers and a military force and kept off the Capitol grounds. Why? Does he menace this Chamber or the Capitol? Not at all. He is harmless; his mission is harmless; the mission of those who follow him is harmless, and it is lawful, and in one sense laudable and respectable.

The Capitol grounds—the great campus upon which this building is situated—are very sacred, indeed, now, but when railroad lobbyists, tax lobbyists, bank lobbyists, and all the other lobbyists who infest this city and these Capitol grounds, come here everything is thrown open to them from cellar to dome; there is no restriction upon them; but when Mr. Coxey comes marching along with his army of the commonweal to petition Congress for the redress and relief of the masses of his race, he is to be met and not permitted to enter the Capitol grounds, to say nothing of this sacred Senate Chamber.

Another thing, Mr. President, I desire to mention while on my feet. It may be unpleasant for me, surrounded as I am at this time with the galleries full of people, to speak publicly about it, but a sense of duty requires me to do so. American citizens come from a great distance to this capital, many of them for the first and last time in their lives, to visit the White House, the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the other places where the public business of their country is transacted. I have seen these galleries so full of chronic attendants who seem to think they have proprietary interest in them that it was impossible for this class of tourists and American citizens to get a seat in one of them. The galleries are inhabited from day to day, from week to week, and from month to month by the same class of persons, so that American citizens from Maine to California and from Texas to Massachusetts are crowded out of them when they come here but once in a lifetime to look upon the Senate of the United States, and nothing is done, no effort is made to change this condition of affairs; but when this harmless man Mr. Coxey and his harmless and unarmed followers are coming here to lay their grievances before us we refuse to give them even a few moments' time of a few of the Senators in this Chamber, and are to forbid them entrance even on the Capitol grounds.

Mr. President, have we not time to give ear to them? Look in upon this Chamber if you will two hours from this time when the tariff discussion is going on, and probably there will not be six members of the body present to hear the speech which is being delivered; for hours it will go on in that way until 5 o'clock, and probably there are fifty or sixty Senators who could give these men from two to three hours to present their cause without any detriment whatever to their private affairs or to the public business of the nation. I hope the resolution will be adopted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] to refer the pending resolution to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is 1 o'clock, and I desire to be heard before the vote is taken.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

#### THE REVENUE BILL.

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

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator from Tennessee permit me to offer a resolution, at the request of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]? The resolution is simply to be read and referred.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, there is objection. I understood the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] to say that he



would not consent to the reception of any morning business during the time to be devoted to the consideration of the tariff bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BUTLER. I hope my friend from Missouri will not get into a frenzy about the little proposition I made. I did it very innocently, I can assure him. I do not want to violate any rule. It is simply a resolution which I was requested by the Senator from Alabama to submit for reference.

Mr. HARRIS. I bear testimony to the perfect innocence of the Senator from South Carolina; and take occasion once again to give notice that from the time the tariff bill is laid before the Senate until 5 o'clock I shall object to every interference with its consideration, I care not how small.

Mr. BUTLER. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Tennessee for the emphasis with which he has made that assertion.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], who is entitled to the floor upon the pending bill, is detained from the Chamber this morning by illness. The Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] is ready to go on, and I ask that he may be permitted to do so, the Senator from Pennsylvania retaining his right to the floor whenever he shall return.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from California will proceed.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, one of the most difficult problems of national legislation is to enact laws that shall be in harmony with the intelligent thought of the people from all portions of this vast Republic; from the northern line to the Gulf of Mexico; from the extreme west to the eastern boundary. A diversity of interests must ever characterize a country so vast in extent as ours, and this fact should imbue us with charity for the opinions of those who differ with us. We are each of us, to a greater or less extent, influenced by our environments and local interests. But aside from all these differences growing out of divergent localities, there is one point upon which all intelligent and patriotic Americans at least should be able to agree, and that is upon the necessity for an American policy upon all questions of citizenship, of taxation, and, as far as possible, of finance.

We should have no other political creed but love for our common country and her institutions. The stability of nations, of empires, of dynasties, is grounded in the selfishness of their adherents and supporters. So true is this, and so generally acknowledged, that it has become almost axiomatic that nations are strong in proportion as they are selfish. Under the present order of things the question that conserves the highest degree of welfare for us should be paramount in our affections, even though other nations would gladly have it otherwise. Protection of our homes, of our industries, and the elevation and dignity of labor should be the principal cardinal doctrine of every patriotic American citizen. The question of expense and revenue is a very simple one that comes home to each member of every community, and the same rule that applies to us as individuals must govern us collectively, whether organized into a municipality, a State, or a nation.

Is it not then a plain business proposition, divested of all specious pleading, that we have before us for consideration? It requires in round numbers, say, \$500,000,000 per annum to properly carry on this Government. That is, we must provide that much money for the expenses of the legislative, judicial, and executive departments of the Government. The support of the Army and Navy, diplomatic service, coast fortifications, river and harbor improvements, public buildings, light-house and life-saving service, pensions and hospitals, interest on public debt, scientific research, and other purposes, all intended for the benefit, advancement, and honor of this great Republic. This large sum of money must be obtained either by direct or indirect taxation. It must all come from our own people, and from those that do business with us from other countries, selling us the products that come from their soil or that which is manufactured by the skill or labor of foreign workmen.

Our people pay their taxes for the support of municipal, county, State, and National Government; and, in addition thereto, they must pay a special license for conducting the business in which they are engaged. Why, then, should we permit foreign nations to bring here, without paying for the privilege, their products and wares to compete with our industries, giving them equal if not better advantages than our own people. We have a land extending through many degrees of latitude and longitude that is capable of producing everything known to the vegetable kingdom, while our mines of mineral wealth are diversified and practically inexhaustible. We honor labor as the source of all wealth, and it is the labor of American manhood that has developed the resources of the country and is to-day its power and safety.

It has been the policy and plan, for the past thirty years, of

wise American statesmanship to raise about one-half of the expense of the Government by placing an import duty upon the products of other lands that come into this country for consumption or use of our people, and to so adjust these duties that they will best protect and foster American industries, and thereby dignify and protect American labor against the cheap, sordid, and contract labor of foreign lands. That this is the correct principle is evidenced from the fact that during this time our industrial interests have been stimulated and our people prosperous, contented, and happy.

The bill before us for consideration, designated a tariff for revenue, proposes to take from the import duties \$75,000,000, which is simply a license the producer pays for the privilege of entering into our home market with his merchandise on equal terms with one to the manor born, and imposes this additional burden upon our own people in the form of increased excise duty and an income tax upon the gain or profit made by their diligence, industry, and enterprise. When we consider this contemplated change, and remember the deep interest taken by England and other European powers in our late Presidential election, with what force does the prophetic words of Thomas Jefferson come home to us when he said:

The election of a President of America some years hence will be much more interesting to certain nations of Europe than ever the election of a King of Poland was.

When in periods of great financial crisis, due to or affected by the action of government, it becomes the duty of all officers of the government to inquire into any and all causes for the disturbance of the business affairs, to promote the prosperity of our people, to add to their comfort and strengthen their power, and to do all the things unbiased by personal or local interests and untrammelled by party affiliations.

After these investigations it becomes our duty to set forth the causes leading to our conclusions and state the remedies, if found. Actuated by an earnest desire for the general welfare of our entire country, and regarding the question of national finance as a purely business question, I hope to discuss it as a business man from a broad business basis.

The fact is conceded that a general depression in business prevails over our entire country, enterprise stagnant, labor unemployed, the revenues of Government lagging behind the expenditures, the debt increasing and national bankruptcy impending. This in a time of peace with the world, in a time of general health and a period of unusual agricultural and mineral productiveness, presents a condition that may well be denominated a crisis. This condition in the United States is attributed to changes and threatened changes of our revenue laws and the violent partisan agitation thereof.

There are many theories of methods for the acquisition of means for the support of government: as a single tax upon land; the issuing of mortgage bonds on land; a direct tax, consequent upon free foreign trade; internal revenue, or tax upon home products, manufactures, business transactions, inheritances, incomes, and prosperity; governmental ownership of railroads, canals, and inland water ways; in the transmission of telegraphic and telephonic messages; in the business of banking and exchanges connected with its postal system; and by levying a uniform duty on imports without any variation or discrimination whatever; our plan, the Republican plan, of levying duties with discriminations designed to protect American industries and products, to foster American manufacture, to develop American resources, to lighten the burdens of taxation of the busy and industrious classes; to exact as far as possible a toll from the foreign producer or manufacturer upon the goods and wares imported in competition with like goods and wares of home production or manufacture.

Such are some of the different methods proposed by theorists and parties in our country. Other countries have other methods of land rentals, mining royalties, business monopolies, and many devices for the acquisition of revenue. As business men we should discuss and enlighten ourselves on all the methods devised by theorists or statesmen, and, after thorough and impartial examination, adopt that which is most equitable and practicable, accomplishing the purpose in view of giving revenue and fostering our general welfare. While the many theories have their advocates, with books written, conventions held, and parties formed in their interests, there has but one been presented for our discussion at the present time, and this presents but a system of schedules for dispute.

We have been accustomed to hear much about a tariff for revenue without discrimination as the only constitutional tariff, and a tariff for revenue with discrimination, and upon these distinctions the American people divided into parties in the early part of this century. These were the tariffs for revenue and the tariff for protection. The first was the theories upon which was based the Democratic party and the latter the basis of the

Whig party, and maintained by the Republican party. Upon these many battles of the hustings and the forum have been fought, and over the failure of one and the triumph of the other has the country been agitated, its business depressed or promoted. These propositions were well defined in the platform of the two, yes, three or four, political parties in the last general campaign, and these were expected to be discussed in this Congress. But we have wandered far away from our course.

The Democratic party has fallen from its high estate, abandoned its principles utterly, and instead of making open and bold war upon its ancient doctrines and adopted platform, enters beneath the Republican platform, attacks the Republican tariff measure which it declared unconstitutional and a robbery, and to bring it down attempts to build on the same principles a weaker structure from the same materials. We are thus brought to this strange contest, with no great fundamental principle to investigate, but to contrast as a measure of policy the legitimate with the illegitimate, the complete with the incomplete, the strong and carefully completed structure with that made of the madly gathered and weakened fragments.

The questions we have before us are denominated the Wilson bill and the McKinley bill, or rather the amendments to and reconstruction of the latter. The McKinley tariff was a growth of thirty years' experience, modified after many years of careful study, and with some amendments, would be perfected in its general scope so that it would provide sufficient revenue with the least possible burdens, thereby giving the best encouragement to commerce and the greatest possible protection to home people and to home industries. With this evolution by years of the protection tariff system under the guidance of men of great business discernment, pure patriotism, extending its beneficence over every section, State, country, hamlet, and farm of the Union, holding firm that which is our own, by ourselves, and for ourselves, enhancing our prosperity and strengthening our strength, we ask that it be maintained as a whole and that which is experimental, protective in principle, yet confessedly ineffective in its protection, claiming to seek revenue, yet admitted to fall far short of obtaining requisite revenue be quickly and utterly rejected.

In discussing the question of tariff or protection, of mutual assistance, national development, and national revenue, it may appear selfish to advocate the special interest or interests of a single State, but of California interests I will speak, as they affect the whole. One knowing California can not speak of her without enthusiasm; vast in area, grand in scenery, genial in climate; almost every mineral known to man, often beneath a soil of great fertility or in mountain rocks or desert plains; a State of such varied and unlimited natural resources that she could be inclosed in a Chinese wall of impenetrability and possess within herself all the necessities and luxuries of life, all the raw materials used in manufactures, the facilities of manufacture, the means of defense, the money of commerce, and all that goes to make a rich and powerful people. But California is an integral part of this fraternal Union, the western buttress of this mighty Government, sharing in all the hopes, glories, burdens and responsibilities of her sister States. So illimitable are her resources that she can claim preëminence in agriculture, horticulture, viticulture, and minerals. Of the latter, only the most experienced of scientists can rehearse the catalogue.

California is vast in area and illimitable in resources, and over all is the most genial and salubrious climate known in civilized lands. With an area of 158,360 square miles, equal to 101,350,400 acres, she has but 1,208,130 inhabitants, as shown by the last census. Excluding deserts and lofty mountain ridges, there is remaining an area larger than all Great Britain and Ireland, which, acre for acre, possesses resources equal if not superior, and can maintain as dense a population in much greater comfort and attain a greater wealth. This vast area we want developed. You want it developed. You want its products and we want your products. We want many millions of people where we now have so few. We want, however, American citizens in the true and patriotic interpretation of the name!

Besides the minerals, California in 1892 produced 39,157,000 bushels of wheat, 13,000,000 bushels of barley, 6,000,000 bushels of corn, 33,000,000 pounds of wool, 2,000,000 gallons of brandy, 20,000,000 gallons of wine, 22,000,000 pounds of beet sugar, and 35,142,969 pounds in 1893, the entire beet-sugar product of the United States being 44,953,264 pounds.

California exported, chiefly to the East, in 1892, 112,719,200 pounds of fresh deciduous fruit, 69,715,000 pounds of citrus fruit, 59,432,661 pounds of dried fruit, 53,336,960 pounds of raisins, 110,574,420 pounds of canned fruit, and 4,126,605 pounds of almonds and walnuts. The development of these industries which have afforded these exports has been aided by protection, which should be enlarged rather than diminished. As the production

of the semitropical fruits in our country has increased the price has declined and the consumption kept pace with the production. The fact is also established that our oranges, lemons, figs, raisins, currants, olives and olive oil, almonds, and walnuts are equal in quality to the best and superior in general to the like products imported.

But California contends at a disadvantage with the old and populous country of the Mediterranean, of cheap labor, low rates of interest, and cheap transportation. Over mountains and deserts the California products must be carried, but notwithstanding these hardships the East is supplied with fruit of better quality and lower rates than formerly, when the foreign market had the monopoly. Yet with this great product not one-fifth of the people of the United States enjoy the luxury of semitropical fruits and nuts. We ask that the prevailing duties on these be not disturbed, and that the bill under consideration be so amended that these industries may continue to develop and increase.

The home production of semitropical fruits appears to have largely increased their consumption. Formerly rare and costly luxuries, they are coming into more common use, and we may look forward to the time when they will become common but cheap luxuries to all classes of people. That this is a desideratum devoutly to be wished no one will deny, and it may be accomplished under just protection. The value of olive oil imported in 1881 was \$480,683 for 384,412 gallons, and in 1891, under an increased duty, was \$876,613 for 733,489 gallons.

In the meantime the production in California has largely increased, and is now marching on to a business of great magnitude, olive orchards being planted in every section of the State. Pickled olives were imported in 1891 to the value of \$320,163. This commodity is proposed to be placed on the free list. California given protection will supply the demand with a better article, and in time at less rates. The importation of dried prunes has averaged 60,000,000 pounds annually during the past seven years. California produced in 1886, 2,000,000 pounds, and in 1892, 25,000,000 pounds, the consumption steadily increasing as the good quality of the California product becomes known, at the same time lessening the price of the consumer.

There was imported into the United States in 1892, 23,250,809 pounds of raisins, and California in the same year sent to the Eastern markets 53,336,960 pounds. This fruit is still classed among the luxuries, used only by the more wealthy, but under the stimulus of home production is advancing to common use and becoming a necessity in the household. But not one-tenth of the amount is consumed that will be under the full development of American production. Let the encouragement of American production continue, and all the various sections of our country, the Atlantic coast, the great Valley of the Mississippi, the mining region of the Rocky Mountains, and the high plateaus will all be supplied abundantly with a better article and at cheaper rates than have ever before been known. American production of raisins, as of other delicate fruits, means prosperity to large American communities and adding an increased ratio to the aggregate American wealth, in this, that it saves to the people for circulation and mutual assistance what would otherwise go abroad not to return in any form, and that it gives to capital investments for its money, to bankers activity in their exchanges, employment to labor, freight for transportation, markets for manufactures and farm products, building up cities, communities, and States.

Bold and enterprising men have engaged in these productions, investing large sums of money and the toil of years until now tens of thousands of people and millions of dollars are represented. A vast amount of wealth has been added to the country, and comfort and luxuries given the people. To establish this and to advance it protection was necessary, and no free trader nor pessimist can show that it has worked any hardship in America. In fact, in this case, protection has proven an unexceptional blessing. The duty upon the importation of raisins and other semitropical fruits should be retained as established in the tariff of 1890. This also affords the opportunity to increase the revenue where the foreigner will pay for the privilege of competing in the market. The high prices we have paid for these delicacies have enriched the landowners of the Mediterranean countries at the cost of our stores of the precious metals.

These may be called some of the specialties of California and the list be greatly enlarged. Of these specialties, citrus fruits, figs, raisins, and nuts, we imported in 1891 to the value of \$15,062,208, and in 1892 to the value of \$11,237,285. This was so much money sent abroad that could have aided in passing over the period of hard times if it had been retained at home in exchange for home products of the same class. The encouragement of the cultivation of these fruits opens another source of business for our people. This is in the preservation of fruits for exportation. This also implies the encouragement of sugar production.

Statistics show that Great Britain consumes annually per capita 70½ pounds of sugar, while but 55 pounds are used in the United States. It is also known that the table consumption in the United States greatly exceeds per capita that in Great Britain. The excess in the latter country is used in the preservation of fruit and the making of the various commodities, as jams, jellies, and other articles of which fruit is the basis.

This indicates the enormous business now existing in England in this line, and what a great industry may be developed in our own country by the encouragement of the culture of fruit and sugar.

Of gold California has given \$1,300,000,000 to the world, revolutionizing commerce and constituting the chief factor in creating the golden era in which we live. California now produces \$12,250,000 of the precious metals annually, of which over \$11,000,000 is gold, the entire gold product of the Union being \$33,000,000. But large as is California's output of gold there are many other minerals of great importance to the country that are affected by the tariff. I will name a few of the industries affected.

Of these one is borax. The history of this mineral, its ancient rarity and value, the discovery of it in California and Nevada in peculiar forms, the heroic development of its production, the cheapening of its price, and the beneficence it has proven to the world constitute one of the most interesting chapters in mineralogy. The mineralogists of California, incited by the discovery of gold in great abundance, turned their attention to other useful minerals, the search for borax being one, and from traces observed in the analysis of water followed the clue until the object sought was found.

At the date of this discovery the common price of borax was 50 cents a pound, and its uses were limited. Tuscany, in Italy, was then the chief source of supply. Following this discovery borax was found in different forms in the deserts of Nevada and Eastern California. Following these, borax, in similar formations, was found in Asiatic Turkey and in other countries. But the Americans had led the way. In the search and exploitation of the borax fields our miners of the West have penetrated the most inhospitable deserts of the world, and through years of toil, hardships, and danger have shown an enterprise and courage worthy of the highest reward.

They have not made the desert to blossom as the rose, but they have redeemed its character to such an extent that they have paid the Government many thousands of dollars for the land, extracted from it many millions of dollars of value, cheapened a product to domestic, artisan, and scientific uses, made possible and developed new and important industries. In this they have made the barren deserts great and valuable factors in the progress, comfort, and commercial affairs of the world. Of these desert fields where borax is found the most famous is the historic Death Valley in Eastern California, a valley deep below the level of the sea although surrounded by the high plateau of the Great Basin and within view of the highest land in the United States.

The region belongs to and is characteristic of the eastern base of the Sierra Nevada mountains, a region of unique formation, abounding in useful minerals usually denominated salts, as well as silver, lead, and other metals. It is a region of excessive heat in summer, and in winter is reached only through the deep snows of surrounding mountains. Of the horrors of this inhospitable region it is unnecessary to tell, but brave men have penetrated it hundreds of miles from railroads, have developed stores of wealth, have established outposts of civilization, opening markets for agricultural and manufactured products, and, if these mining industries are not destroyed by un-American and hostile legislation there will be opened lines of railroad through the country, and another desert region will be eliminated from the map.

Destroy this industry, as the Wilson bill proposes, and these bright hopes of the future are obliterated, the business of invested capital bankrupted, thousands of men deprived of labor, country revenues cut off, and the people of the United States made to pay the foreign manufacturer and importer an exorbitant increase over the present price for an article now in common use. That this prediction of increased price has a basis we have but to look to the past. The English obtained control of the Turkish borax mines. While England never rejects ripened fruit ready to fall into her lap, she does not always wait for it to fall, but shakes the tree, and then if it will not fall reaches for it and pulls it down. So England got the concession of the Turkish and other borax mines, and having free entrance to the American market, proceeded to undersell and close out the American borax miner. When this was so nearly accomplished that English manufacturers had control of the market the price was put up to 15 cents per pound. Then came the tariff of 1882, and the year following the price fell to 10 cents per pound, the

fall in price being the full amount of the duty, and the American business revived. This is an example of the benefit of a protective tariff to our people and the producer.

Gen. Rosecrans, a distinguished and learned gentleman and a Democrat, in presenting this question to Congress in 1883, recommended duties on pure boracic acid, 10 cents per pound; on commercial boracic acid, 8 cents per pound, and on other forms of borax, 5 cents per pound. The bill now under consideration places borax on the free list, and to this treatment of a great industry I earnestly and decidedly object and protest. The world's production of borax is about 24,000 tons annually, the United States producing 7,000 tons; Italy, 3,000 tons; Turkey, 9,000 tons; Thibet, 2,000 tons; Chilo, Bolivia, and Peru, 3,000 tons.

This product has increased from a few thousand tons since the discovery in California and Nevada until the present time, when about 9,000 tons of borax is used annually in the United States. The uses to which it is put are various. One of the oldest was by the blacksmith in welding iron, and as a medicine and emollient sold by the druggists, but since it is so largely produced its uses have multiplied a hundredfold.

Now it is important in calico printing and dyeing, in painting, blacking, washing, enameling of porcelain, glazing in potteries, flux in smelting, an antiseptic and preserver of flesh, a substitute for soap, a disinfectant, and many other purposes, entering the ordinary household as a necessity. The working of the desert borax fields involves the labor of several hundred hardy men, with great teams of twelve to twenty animals each, maintaining stations, supplying refining works, giving transportation to railroads and consuming a large amount of the products of the farm, manufactories, and mechanical shops of the country. The economies of protected industries lay much stress upon opening markets in foreign countries for American products. I would ask if by purchasing the Turkish, Thibetan, and Bolivian borax the miners of those countries would consume as much of American products, patronize American blacksmiths, American wagonmakers, or American railroads as do the American borax miners.

Among other minerals found abundant in California are chromium, antimony, quicksilver, manganese, sulphur, salt, nitro, soda, potash, gypsum, onyx, alabaster, lime, marble, and others, and all varieties of these which enter largely in the arts, manufactures and domestic uses, and are commodities of great commercial importance. All these are proper subjects for tariff for revenue, and such tariff would afford incidental protection and therefore assist in the development of American resources and American industries. Chromium, chromic iron, or, as commonly called, chrome, is used in making coloring matter for silks, cotton, woollens, wall paper, carpets, tanning leather, and other purposes, and its uses are increasing. This mineral exists in all the mountain ranges of the Pacific coast from Puget Sound to the Mexican line, and was formerly mined with fair profit, some 4,000 or 5,000 tons being shipped annually to the Atlantic coast, but since the removal of import duties the business has nearly ceased. A duty of 25 per cent would both aid the revenue and revive the industry on the Pacific coast. Now chrome is imported from Australia, Scotland, and Turkey in exchange for gold. Develop this resource and stop another leak for our gold.

Antimony is used largely in a great variety of manufactures, and of this mineral we have sufficient for all our needs. All that can be said regarding chromium is applicable to antimony. With a duty upon its importation, attention would be given to the abundant stores of it in our own country, and soon the metal would be cheapened.

Of quicksilver California has already produced \$30,000,000, and large capital is invested in its mining and reduction. While there is still an abundance in the many mines of California the exceedingly rich deposits have been exhausted, and the industry may be entirely destroyed if the product of the foreign mines is permitted to enter into competition free of duty. All the foreign mines of quicksilver are or have been owned or controlled by the Rothschilds, and it would not be wise American policy to transfer so important a mining industry to that wealthy and monopolizing house. The foreign producers will sell their quicksilver for gold or for bonds, payable, principal and interest, in gold, and for nothing else.

Of the extent of the quicksilver deposits in California, or of the capital invested in mines and reduction works, there is no question nor speculation; nevertheless all this property and this vast resource and plant for home labor, home production, and home consumption of firm products and domestic manufactures may be destroyed by the unfettered competition of foreign capital based on foreign low rates of interest and cheap labor. Heretofore quicksilver has had a protection of 10 cents per pound duty, but now it is proposed to admit it free. Such a policy can

not be defended. No one can show a manufacture hampered or an industry of any class burdened by the high price of quicksilver under the present conditions, nor can any one promise that quicksilver will be cheaper when the American mines are closed by foreign competition. There would be no industries or manufactures retarded were the price of this mineral double what it now is. The gold and silver mines of the West have been the chief consumers of this valuable useful liquid metal, but an unfortunate policy has so borne upon these that quicksilver mining has received an almost fatal blow.

I hope that Congress will not give it the finishing stroke. This is an industry of but a single and distant State, for quicksilver is found in no other part of our country, excepting California, in sufficient quantities to pay for working. The Senators from New York or Alabama may not now realize that its life or death affects them. A manufacturer of New York may, temporarily, obtain quicksilver at a slightly reduced rate, but no consumer will ever see the reduction. The gain to the importer is infinitesimal at best, but the loss to California is serious. California is but a unit of the Republic, but of units the whole is made. The prosperity of the whole is in consequence of the prosperity of singles, and the infliction of injury upon one has a widespread and baleful influence upon all. Quicksilver is peculiar in many things, and particularly for the fact that it is produced in only four parts of the world. Its sources of production are Spain, Austria, Italy, and California.

The Almedan mine in Spain was discovered over two thousand years ago; the Idria in Austria, four hundred years ago, while the mines in Italy were discovered over a hundred years ago. The latter, however, play no very important part in the industry, as they produce but a small quantity comparatively. The cinnabar or sulphide of mercury, from which quicksilver is produced, was discovered in California in 1850. The discovery of gold there only a short time previous hastened the development of the industry. The price of quicksilver then was \$1.50 per pound. To-day it is less than one-third of that amount. Had it not been for the quicksilver industry in California there would have been no competition in prices and hardly any conjecture can be made as to what the ruling price would be, for, as I have stated, the quicksilver of the world outside of that of California is controlled by one corporation or firm. In 1878 there were thirty quicksilver mines in the State of California, while to-day there are not ten—prices have steadily declined; the mines could not be worked to any degree of profit. The United States is one of the largest consumers of the metal.

The production of quicksilver is already hampered with many difficulties, but this proposed action to place it on the free list consummates them all. The cost of production is nearly three times as large as that of the mines of Spain and Austria, for the reason that there is a better grade and a higher paid class of labor necessary. The price obtained to-day is barely sufficient to keep the mines running, and striking off the protection of 10 cents per pound simply gives the foreign producer the absolute market and the control of the price. It benefits the great financial house of the Rothschilds, but it throws out of employment and leaves idle our American workmen. It is a strange policy for us to adopt, to close down our own mines to oblige those who control the only other three sources of production, and they in Europe. It seems to me that it can not be defended and that it is as uncalled for as it is unjust.

The American consumer of quicksilver has not been injured and will not be by the existing law. The protective tariff has helped to keep the quicksilver mines of California running, and they, and they alone, have reduced and kept down the price to the consumer. A gentleman who is connected with the quicksilver production in California says of the case as follows:

The amount produced in this country is equal to its need at present. But little has been imported for a long series of years since the imposition of the duty, and during this past year none at all.

I beg to call your attention to the fact that were the mines of California to be closed down, as they must inevitably be unless some protection is afforded, that the whole power of making the price would lie with the Spanish and Austrian Governments, as represented by their agents, the Rothschilds, and we should be at their mercy. When this duty has been so slow as to cause a shut-down of the American mines, this has been the case heretofore. We are now protected by a duty of 10 cents per pound. This is little enough, and we ask in consideration of the capital involved, and the labor of 5,000 men employed at good wages, that it be kept at the present rate.

Let us for a moment consider the question of sugar; its importation; costs to our people; as a means of revenue, and the effects of its production at home. Let us look upon it from the Democratic standpoint of free trade and from the Republican standpoint of an assisted industry either by protection or bounty. The McKinley bill removed the tariff duty from raw sugar, but to foster its production as a domestic industry enacted that a bounty equivalent to the former protection be paid for a limited period to the home manufacturer. The bill as it came to the Senate takes no notice of sugar as a means of revenue, nor of-

fered protection or assistance. Originally it proposed a sliding scale of bounty, but that was stricken out. Common justice demands that a contract made by the Government with her citizens should be observed in perfect good faith, therefore the policy of the bounty should prevail until such time as that named in the act or the American sugar industry fully commands the market.

The American people now pay annually to foreign countries an excess of \$100,000,000 for sugar produced by servile and coolie labor or in countries where the production is assisted by government. The consumption in the United States is about 2,000,000 tons per annum, nearly all imported, on which was formerly paid between \$50,000,000 and \$60,000,000 revenue to the Government in addition to the amount paid the foreign producer, the shipper, the importer, and the trusts, who held the consumer at their mercy, a total cost of unrefined sugar to the people of over \$230,000,000, taking the average rate of sales at commercial centers.

For the product of sugar in the last year in this country there was paid on the bounty fund over \$9,000,000, the exact figures being \$9,375,130.88. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE] yesterday in discussing this question stated that \$15,000,000 had been paid. I find, however, that his figures are not in accord with those of the Secretary of the Treasury, as he reports but \$9,000,000. The question before us is, which is of more benefit to the people, the fostering of this industry or its destruction?

There can be no question that sugar by importation affords a most simple and feasible means of raising a large revenue. So do tea and coffee. So a great revenue could have been obtained from the sale of the public lands, the ownership of the salt and other mines, as do some countries, and as was formerly advocated in this. But with the progress of enlightenment, better democracy and greater liberality has obtained. Our mines are owned and worked by the people and their prosperity has resulted; our public lands have become the homes of independent farmers and populous and prosperous States have grown up. The tax upon tea and coffee was removed to lighten the burdens of the poor classes, and all rejoiced in the beneficent act.

Then came another step forward in the same direction and the tax was taken from sugar and all those classes of people who feel the burdens of the purchases of the comforts and necessities of life felt the relief and were made glad. In all these times and with all the apparent sacrifices of the Government, all wrung from it with terrible opposition, the revenues were maintained, the country prospered in accelerated ratio, and the people were benefited. Here we might contrast the simple or barbarous methods of levying duties with the discriminating or enlightened. Tea and coffee, the luxuries of the industrial classes, competed with nothing produced at home and were beneficently exempted from taxation.

Sugar, entering into a vast number of comestibles and commodities, and as much of a necessity to the poorer classes as tea and coffee, is an importation in competition with a domestic product in a small way, but may be entirely produced at home. To cheapen it to all classes, to aid in the preservation of our fruits, and to assist manufactures, the tax was removed. But one of our great States was largely devoted to its production and to leave it to the unbridled competition of the foreign product of cheap labor would have been a cruelty, a neglect most abhorrent to a fair and generous people, a shame to the Union of States. To leave it thus meant a destruction of its great industry, its relegation to bankruptcy. The Republican party has no such heart; the business welfare of our common country does not require it. A bounty was substituted for the duty which had been the protection.

But I need not defend Louisiana. She has able statesmen to take care of her interests. The interest is growing up in California to which I will soon refer. The payment of the bounty has become a question of controversy and opposition throughout the United States and by people of all parties and classes. The bounty on sugar is not the only one that has been granted by the Government nor denounced by the people. Have these resulted beneficially? Before the Republican party came into existence bounties were paid for public improvements. The great national pike of the time of Jackson was a national work for the benefit of a limited section of the States through which it passed, and no one ever begrudged the bounty by which it was constructed. The granting of public lands to aid in the construction of the Illinois Central Railroad, and the Michigan and Illinois Canal were bounties given by Democratic statesmen. All improvements to rivers and harbors are but bounties to localities, perhaps large or small, aggregating for the general good and national glory.

But they are made where localities were unable to protect themselves or make the improvements necessary for progress. The Western pioneers demanded that bounties in land and money

be given for the construction of railroads threading the wilderness and reaching the Pacific. They were granted, and if in some respects without wise restrictions, certainly for the general good, and resulting in the creation of great States and developing untold wealth where otherwise were desert wastes traversable only by severest toil, dire suffering, and constant warfare, occupied by wild animals and savage tribes. Will anyone at this day controvert the beneficence of the bounties which have resulted so grandly in the cause of civilization and our country's development? I am reminded by seeing my friend from Maine [Mr. FRYE] that when he and I were boys the Government paid a bounty to those who engaged in cod fishing and went out and remained so many weeks or months fishing. That was done, too, under a Democratic administration.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator from California might go one word further and say that the fishermen who received the bounty afterwards paid it all back by helping us to beat Great Britain in 1812.

Mr. PERKINS. It therefore proved a most excellent investment. It was seed cast upon the water that returned ten, aye a hundred fold, to benefit the people as a whole who had given this small bounty.

But more particularly will I refer to the development of the sugar industry in my own State. Under tariff protection and with the McKinley bounty, mills for the manufacture of sugar from beets have been established with the prospect of eminent success. There are now three beet-sugar mills of large capacity in California. There is soil and room for a hundred more. It would require a thousand such as the largest in existence to supply the present consumption in the United States, and with the increased consumption the increased population, wealth, and varied uses will give, not many years will pass before double the number will be required.

The consumption in 1860 was at the rate of 56 pounds per capita. In England the consumption was at the rate of 67 pounds per capita; in other countries less. As it becomes cheaper, as our people advance in prosperity and as our fruit interests develop the consumption will increase in a greater ratio. The product of the world exceeds 5,000,000 tons per annum. About 60 per cent of the whole is made from beets. This sugar is, chemically, the same as cane sugar, and no one from its appearance or use can distinguish a difference. The product of sugar from beets per acre in America is estimated at from 1½ to 2 tons, demanding 2,000,000 acres of favored land to supply the present home demand.

The farmer and the community surrounding the sugar mill, the men who perform the labor, those who furnish the supplies to the mill, and those who supply the operatives, the transportation people, and all far-reaching are benefited. A mill disburses from \$150,000 to \$500,000 annually in the community where it is located. This builds up many happy and comfortable homes. Every mill means a prosperous village with its families, churches, schools, shops, manufactures, and well-paid labor with money that would otherwise go to some foreign country, leaving the land unoccupied or engaged in the production of something of which we have already an oversupply. The mill, representing a half million investment, is but a small part of the value it has created in its surroundings. Multiply this by a thousand, the number of mills and communities necessary to supply the United States, and we have an inconceivable valuation as the result of the judicious encouragement of this industry.

In the discussion of this bill some opponents of protection have asserted that our country profits most when its imports exceed the value of its exports. I would ask if anyone can contend that if we send abroad \$100,000,000 for sugar we profit more than if the same were disbursed in Louisiana, California, Texas, Utah, Nebraska, and other States where sugar is or may be manufactured? To say that it would be more profitable is a palpable absurdity. One throws away, the other retains. To buy when we can produce is waste and ultimate exhaustion. A little bounty insures this production, a bounty which at present and for some years is but a few cents per capita of the people of the United States, wherein a duty as before the McKinley bill was enacted would be 88 cents per capita. But the 88 cents paid by each man, woman, and child is not all the exactions upon the people from a commodity like sugar imported. Trusts and combinations of monopoly are now formed which would be impossible if the people throughout the United States were engaged in the manufacture.

By free importation and the bounty repealed the sugar industry is destroyed. To destroy an industry that now bids so fair would be a national calamity, a crime against our people, a degradation of statesmanship.

I appeal to the Senate not to let this be done. This important industry has been built up in other countries by the wise states-

men in granting aid. The great Napoleon saw the necessity of the home production of sugar when the harbors of France were blockaded by English fleets and his merchantmen harassed by English cruisers, and he it was who inaugurated the production of beet sugar. Perhaps our strength will forbid a blockade, but with a war against a strong foreign power we would feel much more at ease if we made our own sugar. European travelers observe our neglect of the beet-sugar opportunity with astonishment. Prof. Anton Veith, director of the Agricultural College of Bohemia, publishing his observations of a tour in the United States some years ago, says:

The establishing of such an industry as the fabrication of sugar from beets exerts such a great influence upon a country that it deserves all the support of a great government.

During the past summer the German Government sent a number of experts to this country with the special object of examining American agriculture, and particularly the beet-sugar industry. Prof. Alexander Herzfeldt, one of these commissioners, said:

If the United States shall continue to protect the sugar industry so that the development that now seems assured by protection may not be disturbed, the American market will be lost to Germany and France. *New York Tribune.*

This bill proposes with no former notification whatever, to absolutely repeal the bounty clause of existing law. The law of 1890, the McKinley act, promised and agreed that "On and after July 1, 1891, and until July 1, 1905" there should be paid to our domestic producers of sugar from 1½ to 2 cents per pound depending on its quality.

I do not like the idea of repudiation in any form, and I can never consent by my vote, and without my protest, that this Government shall ever be a party to it. It is a repudiation of the contract pure and simple to pass this bill as it stands. Sugar sells to-day so cheap that no one can afford to adulterate it, for the adulteration will cost more than pure sugar. Consumers pay for it from 5 to 5½ cents, which is 2½ cents per pound cheaper than the price which prevailed before the bounty law was passed. It is clear to me that the repeal of this bounty, unless something is given in return, will not only kill our home industry, but will hand over the market to foreign sugar rivals.

The beet sugar manufacturers are held to-day for contracts made with farmers of beets, extending over this and next year, and this repeal will force them into bankruptcy by the heavy losses on their contracts. The McKinley act, especially that portion relating to the sugar bounty, was no ordinary tariff bill, subject to change from year to year, but an absolute, declared contract for a certain number of years, for fourteen years. Citizens of California had confidence in the promise, the contract of the Government, and invested millions in the beet industry and the establishment of mills to manufacture the sugar. It is as clear as the noonday sun that there is an inevitable loss if this bounty is repealed and nothing of an equivalent offered in its place.

Of sulphur and salt, Alameda County, my home, alone producing over 45,000 tons of salt per year, and ferro-manganese and many other minerals and their manufactures either on or to be put on the free list these arguments would be repeated. All these useful minerals abound in and make up the wealth of California and the great plateau of the West—a region of unbounded mineral resources, a region in the heart of our country supplying that which is demanded in the commerce and manufactures of all countries from the lowest barbarism to the highest civilization, which gives wealth to the producer, employment through countless industries, strength to the Government, and in turn affords a market to manufactures and products of every grade.

By a strange fatality of most unfortunate experimental financiering, of which our country was not the originator nor wholly responsible, this great and important region has been made to suffer the loss of one of its principal resources, and now it may ask that other resources may be protected, that all may not be destroyed. While frequently referring to the products of my own State as subjects worthy of protection and feasible for purposes of revenue, I do not propose to make of the tariff an entirely local question; though good Democratic authority has asserted and maintained it was and is. But the products of California are so varied and so important to the commerce, the manufactures, and the comfort of the other States of the Union that all are worthy of special mention and the care of the Government.

That the claim that by a skillful levying of duties the foreign producer or manufacturer is made to pay a part of our revenue is not a fantasy, a dream, or a delusion, it is but necessary to refer to the case presented by the Bermuda farmers, now become so well known in the Ways and Means investigation. Another brought to my attention, of a manufacturer in New York of dye-



stuffs, of which he exported large quantities to Germany. That country, seeing another opportunity for revenue and protection, imposed a specific duty upon the goods. Every particle of this duty was, and is to this day, paid by the New York manufacturer, as he could not add it to the price of his dyestuffs in the German market. This fact, however, is so evident in the business affairs of our own country that it is unnecessary to argue it to reasoning and observing people. Duties laid thus skillfully have that effect, affording the easiest paid revenue and at the same time protecting home industries, and such is the McKinley tariff bill, which ought, perhaps with some modifications, to remain the law of our land for a long time to come.

The production and manufacture of wool is one of the great industries of California as well as of the United States; California having produced more wool in 1893—26,804,414 pounds—than any other State in the United States, and being the third State in the matter of the number of sheep, having in 1893, 4,124,376 sheep, Ohio being the first with 4,318,725, and Texas second with 4,314,551 sheep. In fact, it is one of the great industries of the world and has through a long series of years in all the enlightened governments by the world been a subject of the most profound consideration of kings, statesmen, and the people. Spain protected its merino sheep by inhibiting their exportation under severe penalties. Australia encourages sheep-raising by grants of vast ranges at nominal rates, as do the South American States and other countries.

The policy of all has been that of protection and encouragement. Only in America has there arisen the strange and factional opposition to the industry. This fierce, unrelenting, and unreasoning opposition is one of the relics of the sectional disputes and interests of a past generation. Cotton against wool; the export of one and the free importation of the manufacture of the other, permeates with baleful influence the politics of the present day. Complaint is made that the farmer is called upon to bear the burdens of taxation with less assistance from Government than any other vocation. This complaint should be heard and the grounds for it removed as far as possible.

Agriculture has been honored through all history, and is the basis of all industries. From the farm comes the sustenance of all, and from the fields come the stalwart sons for the country's defense and for its development. America, with its broad area and fertile soil, depends more than any other country upon its farmers, and every fostering care within the power of government should be extended in their behalf. There is a life of toil, where monopolies are impossible and guilds are of no avail. Their burden of taxation is unavoidable, but theories threaten them with more, to the extinction of their independence. Truly has the poet said:

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,  
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.  
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade—  
A breath can make them, as a breath has made;  
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,  
When once destroy'd, can never be supplied.

Let our theory be to lighten the burdens where possible and to assist where the opportunity offers. In almost every turn of our legislation the opportunity offers. Let us improve it.

The record of the Republican party may be proudly cited in its legislation for the farmer; in its investigations and publications for the farmer's benefit; in the homestead and liberal land laws; in the establishing of a Department of Agriculture and of experimental stations; in its grants to agricultural colleges and universities; in its aid to lines of transportation; in its systems of internal improvements, and countless other ways.

Let us for a moment consider how we may farther extend that aid. Take the single industry of woolgrowing. The aggregate is made of singles. A tariff on wool is both protective and revenue. In 1892 the value of raw wool imported was \$17,697,067.50, on which a revenue was collected of \$7,799,085.63, under a tariff of 11, 12, and 15 cents per pound. By the present bill this revenue, so urgently required at the present time, of eight millions of dollars is thrown away or put on the onerous burden of internal revenue, income tax or issue of interest-bearing bonds, and the incidental protection that was given is obliterated.

The Agricultural Report of 1893 shows there are 47,273,553 sheep in the United States, in 47 States and Territories. Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Delaware, and South Carolina are the only States having each less than 100,000. Ohio, Texas, and California hold the largest number, each having over 4,000,000. Texas and California are of very large area, so their proportion of sheep to acreage is far below many of the other States and Territories. The production of wool in the United States in 1892 was 294,000,000 pounds, and the amount imported in the year ending June 30, 1893, was 172,435,838 pounds. The production and the importation have increased steadily for a series of years.

The wool production of the world is estimated at 2,456,773,600

pounds annually. The largest producers are Australia, Argentina, United States, and Russia, in the order mentioned. We are thus shown the countries with which we must compete. They are countries of vast areas of cheap grazing lands, against which the farmers of the United States should not be called upon to compete on equal terms, particularly when we require the revenue the incidental protection gives.

But we are told that the tariff imposes a grievous burden on the farmer in his purchases of clothing, and that the tariff has made it possible to force upon the people cloth of a poor quality. While this is known by all intelligent people to be untrue and is easily contradicted we may take some evidence given before the Ways and Means Committee. Mr. Latzko, the Australian commissioner to the World's Fair, testified that—

The American woolen goods had no superior in any part of the world; there is nothing manufactured from wool that can not be as well made in this country as anywhere else.

The difference between free raw material in London and protected raw material under the McKinley law for a fine dress suit is just 60 cents.

The difference in the cost of material for a workman's suit in this country and Great Britain is just 75 cents. All the other difference in the cost of the suit is the difference in the wages paid to laborers.

The wool industry of this country ranks seventh largest of the agricultural interests, and amounts to \$66,000,000 annually. But take the tariff from wool, let that great interest die out, and the cloth for the workman's suit may cost 75 cents less and the country will have to send \$66,000,000 in gold or its equivalent abroad to pay for the wool. You will say this industry will not entirely die out. Probably not. Sheep for mutton will be grown, and then, as the wool will be of little value a high price will necessarily be charged for mutton, which will raise it to the class of luxuries, and the poor man who attempts to eat mutton will find his annual expenditures therefor a hundred times greater under free wool than under protected wool.

This I know will be the result in my State, where good mutton is the meat of those exercising economy. We know how anxious are Argentina and Australia that we should admit their wool and pelts free of duty. Then they assert they will drive the American producer from the market in all the products except the fresh meat, and this will come later under the cold-storage system. This plainly shows what we must avoid. To be forewarned is to be forearmed.

We are here to legislate for American good and not for the good of a foreign country, however friendly we may feel for that country. The questions arising in adjusting the tariff are national and for the nation are purely selfish. I can not close this branch of the subject without referring to the petitions which I have received and presented in this body. This special one claims to be signed by over 10,000 woolgrowers of California:

To the honorable members of the Fifty-third Congress of the United States:

Whereas, as a result of a general belief that the tariff on woolen goods will be reduced and wool put on the free list, the price of wool is now below the production; and

Whereas we believe that if wool is put on the free list, and the tariff on woolen goods materially reduced, the price of wool will be still lower; and Whereas we can not afford to raise wool in competition with free wool raised in countries like Australia, where the woolgrower rents land from the Government at a less rental than we pay in taxes on our land, and receives Government aid and encouragement; and

Whereas the lands of these United States are well suited to the raising of sheep, provided we can get a fair price for our wool and mutton; and

Whereas we believe that it is to the best interests of this country to prevent the slaughter of a large proportion of the sheep of this country, which will be the certain result of a further reduction in the price of wool;

We, the undersigned, farmers and woolgrowers, irrespective of party, do hereby petition and beg that your honorable body will make no change in the present tariff affecting the wool and woolen schedule now in force.

We are indeed confronted with the strange problem of an overcrowded people—a problem which the fathers of the Republic never dreamed would come so soon. To this may be added the marvelous devices of invention in the direction of labor-saving machinery. Men were never so cheap nor muscle so superfluous in the work of the world as now. The star of empire has moved westward until the tide of population has met the confines of the Pacific. We find unemployed men everywhere. Everywhere enforced idleness and suffering. It was not so in the early history of the Republic. It was not so before the attempt to depreciate the intrinsic value of one-half of our circulating medium. And, indeed, it was not so before the threatened blight of free trade fell upon the country.

Government by the people is only enduring where the best interests of the people are promoted. There can be no class distinctions or favoritisms in the collection or disbursing of revenue, and no system for raising revenue has ever equaled in unobjectionable simplicity that of our present tariff. Its greatest virtue consists in the fact that it is American. When we seek to foster other nations at the expense of our own, or so manage our own affairs as best to favor the industrial interests of other countries looking to a market among us, we are feeding a dry rot that means the ultimate decay of our institutions. It is not pleasant to take this view of the case, but it is the true view

nevertheless. We have not yet reached that halcyon time when the consideration of a common humanity is the basis principle of the upbuilding of nations. The millennium is a long way off yet. Our idle mines and factories, our multitudes of hungry and unemployed operatives, our depreciated currency, all voice this fact as never before in the history of this country.

The present Administration assumed the control of the country the 4th of March, 1893. During the seven months following, as shown by Bradstreet, the falling off in the business of the clearing house amounted to the vast sum of nearly \$1,000,000,000, and it has kept up at that fearful rate ever since. This stupendous deficit represents the country's value of trade. Twelve billions of dollars less money circulated in the ordinary channels of trade and commerce, in wages, in the manufacture of goods, in the employment of labor. And all this under the proposed free-trade policy, or, as they like to be called, tariff reformers, of the present Administration, in the brief period of twelve months. Indeed, the nation stands appalled before the peril that threatens. Cities swarming with the unemployed, mines and factories closed, an army of unemployed marching from the west and north toward Washington—no such general depression of the ordinary industries of the country finds a parallel in our history.

Carry out the policy of England concerning this country; make it contributory to her greatness regardless of the effect upon our people and industries, and what becomes of the magic attraction of our flag, what will there be left to inspire patriotism, or make this land the hope of the oppressed? Divest this country of its policy of protection and there will be nothing in its citizenship to call forth the admiration of mankind. Its labor must degenerate to a level with that of the Old World's, with which it will be brought in immediate competition. We shall have squandered our birthright to placate other nations by placing our standards of labor on a level with their own. We should blush for the American party (and all parties in this great country ought to be American) that has no higher conception of the nation's needs. This ought to be the richest country in the world; taxes should be the lowest. Labor on a higher standard and better paid, its products bring the greatest satisfaction. All of which it would be and do but for the Anglomaniac that has turned the heads of a large portion of our people, especially of one of our great political parties.

Every avenue to wealth and fame is open to the humblest boy in this land. Yonder little schoolhouse on the hill is the stepping stone to the highest niche in the temple of fame in this land. It is true American manhood that makes the man in this glorious land. I have traveled all over the world; I have been in every land, on every continent of this great globe; I have been in the frozen north, in the tropics, in the frozen south where the Southern Cross is seen like the Great Bear of the north pole; I have been in the islands of the Pacific, in the islands of the Indian Ocean; but nowhere on God's universe have I ever seen a land like this. I have, as the patriarch of old, approached the temple to pay homage to the Unknown, as I saw the Star Spangled Banner floating over the consul's house in the north of Europe or in Southern Africa felt as Moses did when he stood near the burning bush, that I stood upon sacred ground, and I involuntarily removed my hat from my head and thanked God that I was an American. Let our votes and our actions be in harmony and accord with this true American spirit of patriotism that should animate our hearts.

There is nothing genuine with some so-called Americans in their estimation that does not wear a foreign stamp. They furnish their homes with the products and works of foreign manufacture, they wear foreign-made clothing, eat foreign viands, drink foreign wine, and smoke foreign cigars. This is the class of people that I like to give the full benefit of a tariff intended to protect American industries. Any abridgment of our protective policy is a step in the direction of national decay, and so the intelligent thought of the people declare at the ballot box in the elections in Ohio, Massachusetts, Iowa, New Jersey, and Rhode Island. Year after year, much of the time of Congress is devoted to the assailing on the one hand and defending on the other this last vestige of American policy. But for the last quarter of a century the people have had no fears of the result, as they knew that the party that would be safely trusted in the matter held sway in one or the other branch of the National Legislature.

Take the history of our Government from the first and the policy of England towards us has been strangely varied. When we were weak she was strong and at the same time aggressively protective. This was prior to the adoption of the "free-trade policy of 1846, forced upon the country in response to the demands of the South, because of the predominating influence of the North, the result of free labor" over that portion of the country where chattel slavery prevailed. England did not then feel

assured that she could bear the competition of continental nations, and, as is well known to anyone familiar with our history, she manufactured for herself and for her network of colonies reaching around the globe. Into those colonies no other nation could carry anything. There was no scale of duty upon which other nations could enter the colonial ports. What the colonies needed outside of British product could be furnished to them only in British ships. This was, then, her idea of protection—the protection her great Premier Gladstone has declared to be immoral. But it was not protection, it was prohibition, absolute and remorseless. And it was continued even to the day when Mr. Gladstone entered upon his long and splendid career in Parliament.

The dignity of labor should ever be uppermost in the American mind, and the only way for us to dignify it is to bar out from competition the servile and cheap labor of those countries where a man's worth and social standing depend not upon his own merits, but upon some advantageous circumstance ceded to or stolen by some favorite ancestor. A protective tariff should be the last surrender of this Republic to kinglycraft. It is the guardian of our greatness, the bulwark of our manhood. Every attempt to fasten free trade upon this country has been followed by financial depression and disaster. This last attempt brings such hardship to our industrial interests as has never before blighted this fair land. If we are wise we ought to learn something in this school of experience. We should guard with jealous care this last feature that distinguishes us from the effete institutions of the Old World.

The American artisan and laborer have long held a distinguished place in this country. There is none above them; but how long will it be thus, without protection? Compare their surroundings with those of this class in other countries. Squallor and poverty on the one hand—plenty and often luxury on the other. So long as labor is not crowned king, as it is metaphorically with us, in countries depending on us for a market, we can never allow our laboring men the humiliation of competition.

We have by legislation wisely, in my opinion, excluded immigration of the pauper and contract laborer from Europe, and the servile Chinese laborer from Asia, but by the proposed legislation we are to permit the product of the Chinese factories in China, where labor is but 10 cents a day, to come into our country and sell in competition with the products of American workshops that are operated by American workmen. To do this is to shock the sensibilities of every patriotic citizen. Cheap wares are not the only things we need. The farmer needs a market for his product at good prices and he can have such a market only when the mechanic, the miner, the factory hands find ready employment at good wages. Rightly says the Inter-Ocean—

The Republican tariff made the home of American workmen a home of plenty. He lived and enjoyed the luxuries of the rich in the older lands. The Democratic policy in its very promise, and before its reality could be experienced, has brought distrust and want and suffering. It is that and nothing else. The talk about silver producing the hard times was simply a Democratic blind.

Free trade is only desirable of those things we can not produce or manufacture, and even then the necessities of our revenue may require a moderate tariff which our people will never begrudge. We are contending for one of the basic principles of the Republic without which our bond of union becomes a rope of sand. To the hundreds of thousands unemployed men in the different States of the Union it is that already, with the mere shadow of "free trade" hanging over us.

I am not arguing against the possible necessity for a revision of the tariff, but such a revision can never be entrusted to the Democratic party as now organized. The revision should be made, if at all, by those in sympathy with the protection of American labor and American industries, and then with a view to increasing and not diminishing the revenue. The measure of the necessity for a protective tariff may be wisely gauged by the number of unemployed men in the nation. By the status of manufacturing industries—by the demand for our agricultural products. These are the reasons of our needs for raising of the revenues necessary for the expenses of the Government. The amount required is about \$500,000,000 annually. To raise the largest part of this vast sum by any other method than that of a tax on imports would be the sublimest piece of folly ever imposed upon a nation.

Several bills have been introduced looking to the creation of a non-partisan commission for the purpose of thoroughly revising the tariff duties based upon the difference in the cost of American and foreign labor, thereby promoting and encouraging our own domestic industries, and at the same time elevating and advancing the dignity of American labor. In the establishment of two of our greatest industries, namely, the manufacture of Bessemer steel and plate glass, it was accomplished only after repeated failures and the expenditure of vast sums of money,

and then only by a most liberal encouragement on the part of the Government, without which success would have been impossible. In all American manufactures the higher wages of American mechanics is the chief factor in, as well as the pride and glory of our institutions. It is our glory that our artisans may live in competence, educate their families and surround themselves with comforts that belong only to the rich in the older countries.

It may not be amiss in this connection to present some of the opinions of the fathers on this momentous subject. When the Colonies obtained their political independence they naturally wished to establish their industrial independence also. That great Scotchman, Alexander Hamilton, first struck the keynote of the second struggle when, as Secretary of the Treasury, December 5, 1791, he said:

"This idea of an extensive domestic market for the surplus product of the soils of the first consequence. It is of all things that which most effectually conduces to a flourishing state of agriculture. To secure such a market there is no other expedient than to promote manufacturing establishments. It is the interest of a community, with a view to eventual and foreign economy, to encourage the growth of manufactures. In a national view, a temporary enhancement of price must always be well compensated by a prominent reduction of it.

American statesmen have followed in similar strains. Thus Washington's last annual address, December 7, 1796, says:

Congress have repeatedly and not without success, directed their attention to the encouragement of manufacturers. The objects of too much consequence not to secure a continuance of their efforts in every way which shall appear eligible.

President Madison, in his special message of May 23, 1809, says:

It will be worthy at the same time, of their just and provident care, to make such further alterations in the laws as will more especially protect and foster the several branches of manufacture which have been recently instituted as extended by the laudable exertion of our citizens.

Thomas Jefferson, in a letter to Benjamin Austin, of Boston, 1816, says:

To be independent for the comforts of life, we must fabricate them ourselves; we must place our manufacturers by the side of the agriculturists. Experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort.

President Monroe, in his first inaugural address, March 5, 1817, says:

Our manufactures will likewise require the systematic and fostering care of the Government. Possessing as we do all the raw materials, the fruit of our own soil and industry, we ought not to depend, in the degree we have done, on supplies on other countries. While we are thus dependent, these sudden events of war, unsought and unexpected, can not fail to plunge us into the most serious difficulties.

President Jackson, August, 26, 1824, says:

Heaven has smiled upon and gave us liberty and independence. The same Providence has blessed us with the means of national defence and national defense. If we omit or refuse to use the gifts which He has extended to us, we deserve not the continuance of His blessing. He has filled our mountains and plains with minerals and given us a climate and soil for the growing of hemp and wool. These being the great materials of our national defense, they ought to have extended to them adequate and fair protection. That our manufacturers and laborers may be placed in a fair competition with those of Europe, and that we may have within our country a supply of these leading articles so essential to war.

The cause of that disparity of conditions having been removed, there is no longer any good reason why the people of the South should not favor protection, a condition of things most essential to her prosperity. Most serious disturbances of our business affairs come of any interference with the tariff. The man who has erected his mills and his factories under protection of his products, with the withdrawal of that protection, is most seriously disturbed, if not ruined.

It seems to be more a determination on the part of the Administration to carry out an idea, erroneous as we may believe it to be, than any demand of the people or any especial need or emergency of the times. If we think the voice of the people can be stifled on these great questions affecting the policy of the nation, we mistake the nature of this Government. It needs no prophet to predict that the people have had quite enough of this partisan tampering with the tariff. You will see what they will say in the next elections, when the question comes home to them as it will. And the political party that would retain or obtain a lease of power in the future would do well to heed this voice, the source of all power in this nation.

The condition of affairs in this country is vastly different from what it was a quarter of a century or more ago. The discontented and unsettled classes, of which the number is steadily increasing, have no longer new and virgin territory to occupy when they become dissatisfied with the older communities. The time has come when in the order of things we must have a fixed national policy upon all questions affecting the stability of the Government.

We can endure less foolishness than formerly. The people can stand less nonsense in the shape of unwise laws than when there was less suffering and idleness among them. These freaks of legislation, if we may so call them, should be forced upon the

country only in time of great prosperity. Our free trade "or tariff for a deficiency" friends seem to be oblivious to this fact.

We oppose this bill because it works a serious diminution of our revenue on foreign imports, because the people do not want it, because it would cripple our industries, and because the present condition of the country is most unfavorable for any such innovation. We should beware at such times of any disturbing acts of legislation which tend to unsettle the quiet of the country. We should bear in mind that under the existing tariff which this bill proposes to disturb, there is an estimated deficiency made by the Secretary of the Treasury of \$78,000,000 for the current year. And in the revenue bill proposed by this new schedule, it is proposed to discard \$76,000,000 from the present tariff and impose a new form of internal and direct taxation upon our people to make up for this deficiency.

A proposition more unwise in these unsettled times could not well be devised; and strange it seems to me, that a party that one would naturally expect to see laying the foundation of future power—a party seeking to hold itself in sympathy and touch with the people—should in this reckless way throw away all chances to future promotion or ascendancy. With the motto of Dante, written above the entrance to his inferno, "Abandon hope all ye who enter here," it may well be said of all those misguided statesmen who have entered into this conspiracy against protection, abandon all hope for preferment of the people you unwise ones who seek to overthrow the main pillar of our institutions. If I did not prefer the prosperity of my country to that of party, I would withhold this warning cry and let them rush to certain disaster.

"A tariff for revenue only!" exclaim the champions of free trade. Exactly, say the people, but give us enough tariff for enough revenue, which means no reduction of the present rates, but on the other hand such advance upon many articles as may at least work an increase equal to the present deficiency. I want to emphasize the matter I have already referred to concerning an American policy in customs and finance. We have a territory as great as that of all Europe and a population which a few years hence will excel that of all English-speaking countries combined. And yet we have no policy of our own—no financial policy that is not made for us in the financial centers of the Old World. Our definition of money is vague, indefinite, and intensely English. With an immense territory and population we seem to be denied a distinctive policy of finance of our own. We must first ascertain what is wanted of us and then quietly and submissively yield up our own manhood to the keeping of others. This should never be submitted to by those who prefer the American Republic and her institutions as superior to those of any other lands.

The proposed new tariff bill especially affects the great fruit, wine, and nut industries of California, and will ruin them if it becomes a law in the proposed form. These industries are wonderful in view of the fact that it is in the memory of the man of middle age in this country when they were started. There is scarcely a city or town in the country where California fruits, nuts, and wine cannot be purchased. While the trade is enormous there has not been as much profit in it as is generally understood. There are many reasons for this, but the principal one is the difficulty and expense in securing the market for the goods and cost of transportation to the consumer. The fruits, nuts, and wine have had to fight every foot for the position they now occupy in the markets of the United States, for the foreign productions only yielded because they were forced to, and for the additional reason that the fruits, nuts, and wines of California have not only undersold them, but because, also, they—the home productions—have been of better quality.

If it is pardonable at any time to introduce in a speech of this character statistics and tables showing the growth and quantity of California's productions in this line, this would be a case; but I forbear, for I am thoroughly convinced that it needs no such array to show that they are appreciated and are in demand. Later on, however, when this bill is under consideration by paragraphs, I may offer the Senate some statistics on the question. These great industries grew because they were given protection by our laws, and though they may not be classed as infant industries, they are still comparatively new, and will for some years yet need a fair and legitimate protection in their competition with the Old World. A severe blow has been given them by this bill, and unless it is amended an irreparable damage will be done.

California sent out last year 2,500 carloads of 12 tons each of raisins, and this year will send out 3,700 carloads. Add to these the thousands of carloads of oranges, peaches, apricots, pears, figs, plums, prunes, etc., fresh, preserved, canned, and dried, and one can in a small degree realize the importance of the industry, and I hope realize the necessity of protec-

tion. California to-day has 12,000 acres of almonds, and is probably the only State in the Union interested as a grower. Her forests of walnut trees are also threatened by the reduction of the duty. Even worse than the reduction is the doing away with the specific duty and the change to the ad valorem, for there is hardly any calculating the injury the change will make. The duties levied by the present law are none too high, while those proposed by this bill if not changed will almost bring about an abandonment of the industry.

In regard to the wine industry, what can I add in opposition to the passage of this bill? It is a bill that is wrong in so many directions that it would take days to enumerate them. In no one, however, does it do more harm than it does to the wine-maker of California, or indeed to the wine-maker of other States, when it abolishes specific and establishes ad valorem duties. This feature was introduced at the very last moment, and without question through the efforts of importers of foreign wines, or possibly of the producers of European wines, more particularly of those of France. The bill reads that the duty on still wines in casks shall remain as it has been, viz, 50 cents per gallon, but that it shall not exceed 100 per cent ad valorem.

This, on the face, appears to be a very large protection, but when you consider that the production of wines in Europe, especially this year, has been very great—thus in France fully 1,300,000,000 gallons against an average crop of barely half of this, and Italy a crop of possibly six to eight hundred million—you will well understand that the price of such wines in Europe will be very low, and I have no doubt that the cheaper grades will not average above 10 cents per gallon there. This means, according to the wording of the bill, a duty of 10 cents per gallon upon such wines, a figure considerably lower than was ever asked on the part of importers here. Besides this, there are many parts of France and Germany where wines are artificially manufactured—thus in Cote, France, and in Hamburg, Germany—and as the basis of such wines is potato or grain spirits, which pay no tax, as they are intended for wines for export, and which spirits cost possibly 6 to 8 cents per gallon, one can well imagine how cheap they can produce so-called wines, particularly as the balance that they add is in the form of chemicals.

It must be understood that it is difficult to appraise the value of wines, for they can not be judged as other manufactured articles are, for the reason that even the best judges differ as to the value of goods, and as many of the goods are shipped by the producers, the latter can put an arbitrary value upon their wine, as they may possibly figure only cost of production and interest upon their investment. This would result in the shipment of altogether or to a great extent low-priced wines.

In this connection I have received a letter from Mr. John T. Doyle, president of the viticultural commission of California, himself a prominent leading Democrat, in which, discussing this bill, he says, and as he states the case better and stronger than I can, I quote from it:

The 50 cents per gallon is in no sense a protective duty. It was in force long before the McKinley bill was thought of, and I am not aware of any suggestion to change it in past years. The fact that the wine raised in this State does not average the producer 15 cents per gallon is conclusive evidence of the nonproductive character of the duty. Wine is ordinarily an article of luxury, and a most proper subject for a revenue duty. It is, also, an article so difficult to fix a true value on by any external test that any but a specific duty would be quite out of place. An ad valorem duty on wine is an absurdity. \* \* \*

But there is a stuff called wine, which is made for exportation in France and Italy in enormous quantities, which should not be admitted to importation here on any terms. It is often filthy and nauseous in its mode of manufacture, and is really unfit for human consumption. A duty of 50 cents excludes it, for under no circumstances could it sell for so much; but I doubt if 100 or even 200 per cent ad valorem would, for it can probably be invoiced at 5 cents per gallon, or even less. The best of it is made by taking pomace after it has yielded all its wine to the press, adding glucose and water, and allowing it to ferment again.

The pomace gives the color and something of the flavor of wine, the glucose yields the necessary alcohol, which, if need be, is supplemented by German potato whisky, the most noxious of all the alcohols known to chemistry, and which is now finding its way all over the South of Europe as an ingredient of counterfeit wines and liquors. The pomace is thus used over and over again. The invasion of the French vineyards by the phylloxera led to the introduction of this counterfeit wine industry some years ago to supply the export trade of the country and it has since attained an enormous proportion.

We do not ask for any protection on wine, a duty that will give such revenue as is fairly collectible from such a luxury is all we need. But the public has a right to expect the Democratic party not to open the door, for the first time, to the importation of vicious and poisonous beverages under the pretense of freedom of trade. Free trade should at least be confined to honest commodities.

There are besides those I have referred to many other interests of California affected injuriously by the various provisions of this bill. The reduction of duty upon lumber, rice, freestone, sandstone, onyx, lime, hops, beans, chicory, twine and cordage, burlaps, jute and bagging, and live stock will prostrate those industries as at present conducted. The struggling factories engaged in the manufacture of cotton, wool, rope, and

jute can only continue by a corresponding reduction of wages to their employes. The placing of machinery for vessels on the free list will, I am afraid, result in closing several of the ship-building machine shops on the Pacific coast. They have been built up by the patient industry, pluck, and enterprise of our California mechanics. That they can do work to favorably compare with any country in the world, I have but to mention the United States ships Charleston, San Francisco, Oregon, Olympia, Monterey, and other steamships built by our mechanics of California.

But they can not continue to pay the same wages and compete with workmen on the Clyde who will manufacture and send machinery there at a nominal freight in ships that come to load wheat, and must have ballast on their outward trip to California. But I find that I have already occupied more of the time and attention of the Senate than I should at this time. I shall, however, claim the privilege when the bill is under discussion by schedules and paragraphs to offer amendments and to point out, discuss, and show to the Senate how the people of the State I have the honor in part to represent on this floor, will be injured if the bill becomes a law without very radical improvement.

We should maintain the integrity of the Republic in its dearest rights and usages, and should aim to uphold a higher order of manhood among our laboring classes than belongs to any monarchy on the face of the globe. God pity this land when a man's title to true nobility shall not depend solely upon his personal worth and merit; where the measure of his greatness hangs upon the empty bauble of a title conferred upon some worthless ancestor. There can be no heraldy of merit founded upon superior skill or genius in the great world of use. And herein should ever consist our superiority over the nations of the earth. When we foolishly surrender this boon this great Republic will surely fade from the nations of the earth.

I am not one of those who feel that they are called upon at all times and in all cases to denounce trusts, combinations, coöperative, or corporative investments. Many combinations produce more beneficial results than otherwise, and are in the interests of the people. There are unlawful trusts, however, which do harm and which menace legitimate interests in every direction.

These should and can be regulated by law, State and national, and I stand ready to take my share of the responsibility in passing such laws, for I am convinced that such determined remedial agents are necessary. I would crush out the trusts and combinations which oppress as I would encourage and foster those which are organized for beneficial purposes.

I am a thorough believer in "profit-sharing" enterprises—coöperation and coöperative effort—for many good things can be done by this means which are not possible by private capital or private enterprise alone. Trusts when organized for the public good should have proper encouragement, but when they have reached the point where they, by aggregated capital and combination of interests, attempt to, or influence, legislation, either State or national, they should be removed and dispersed.

In explanation of a trust that has my unqualified indorsement, I instance the case of the raisin men of five counties in California, Fresno, Tulare, Madera, Kings, and Kern Counties, which have agreed that all raisins are to go into the hands of the organization to be sold, doing away entirely with middlemen. To perfect this plan, they propose to raise a capital of say \$250,000, representing the same number of shares at \$1 an acre, so that there would be no need of resorting to commission houses for advances. It is further proposed that each neighborhood or district shall have a coöperative packing-house in order to reduce the cost of preparing the goods for market. When a sale is made the proceeds are divided pro rata among all who have goods in the warehouse, so that no one could have any advantage over another. No one will be injured who does not join the association. Consequently such a trust as this becomes a public benefit.

The question of free or dutiable iron and coal, as affecting the interests of California, from a narrow point of view, may be debatable, but on a broad view of the subject we find we are in touch with the coördinate welfare of our sister States of the Union. We may ask if we can build up the highest prosperity of our own, or any one State, while we neglect the interests of others, or do we not profit most when others are prosperous? California produces but little iron or coal. These commodities are imported in large amounts, chiefly from foreign countries, and in foreign ships, iron from England, Sweden, and Russia, coal from Great Britain, Australia, and Vancouver Island.

California is the largest importer of coal of any State of the Union, the amount being about 1,000,000 tons annually, and paying over \$700,000 in duties to the National Treasury. Under this bill the duties are very largely reduced and the consumer expects them cheaper in our markets. But this expectation

will not be realized, as we generally find that an importer, as well as anyone else, will charge all he can get for an article whether he has paid duty on it or not, particularly when he, or a syndicate, has the power of a monopoly.

The production of coal on the Pacific coast, though small, kept this monopoly down, or nearly down, and by the power of competition, though limited, kept down the price to the consumer. But without the duty the American producers of coal could not maintain themselves. It is doubted that the reduced duty provided for in this bill will be sufficient to aid the American miners of coal to keep up their competition, though they will do so if they can, and the result may be that the trusts controlling the foreign coal will raise the price to consumers.

Mr. POWER. Will the Senator from California allow me?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. POWER. Where do you get your coal used for the shipping interests?

Mr. PERKINS. As I was about to state, large quantities of it are brought from England, large quantities from Australia, and large quantities from British Columbia, with our own domestic product in Washington, Oregon, and California.

Mr. POWER. How does the coal produced in Washington and Oregon answer for the shipping interests?

Mr. PERKINS. For steam purposes?

Mr. POWER. For steam purposes.

Mr. PERKINS. The coal of California and Oregon has not been as good steam coal as that of Washington and British Columbia. However, the coal of the State of Washington, and I speak advisedly, has veins that compare favorably with any other steam coal upon the coast, its principal competitor being that of British Columbia or Vancouver Island.

Mr. POWER. Is the coal from the State of Washington as good as that from Vancouver Island?

Mr. PERKINS. I think in some of the mines it is quite equal to that of British Columbia.

Mr. POWER. The Government made a contract for the Berling Sea fleet in the last few weeks for coal from the British country, taking that coal in place of our product. I was called upon to look after that so far as some friends are concerned, and that is the reason why I asked the question. Why was that done?

Mr. PERKINS. The Senator from Montana calls my attention to the fact. I presume it is done to carry out the foreign policy of this Administration perhaps.

Mr. POWER. So I thought at the time.

Mr. PERKINS. I am somewhat a consumer of coal, being obliged to purchase from 5,000 to 10,000 tons monthly, and from an actual test in our experiments we find that the coal of the mines in the State of Washington called the Franklin mine, for steam purposes, is equal in its efficiency to that of any coal upon the Pacific coast, notwithstanding the Government in asking for bids or proposals for furnishing coal did not mention this mine, but advertised only for foreign coal.

Mr. POWER. That is what I understand.

Mr. PERKINS. Not being in accord with the present Administration, I am unable to give my friend the information he desires.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from California permit me?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator from California mean to be understood as saying that the bid of the Department excluded American coal?

Mr. PERKINS. I will not say that it excluded it, but it was not considered, I understand.

Mr. DAVIS. Has attention been called to the character of the Washington coal?

Mr. PERKINS. The case can hardly be otherwise, as the mines of the Washington coal have been worked for thirty years or more, and it is used continually by the steamships operating on the Pacific coast. The company that I in part represent, engaged in operating steamships, consumes from 5,000 to 10,000 tons monthly; and I speak without reservation when I state that its effective use for steam purposes is equal to the coal of British Columbia or any other coal.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. In addition to that, if the Senator will allow me, the special attention of the Secretary of the Navy was called to the fact that the Washington mines had been omitted, by a communication signed by several Senators, myself among the number.

Mr. DAVIS. What response was made to that communication?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The response was to the effect that under all the circumstances, as far as they were advised, they thought the British coal the best.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator from California will further

allow me, I beg to call the attention of my distinguished friend from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] to the fact which has been stated by the Senator from Oregon, and to ask his influence with the Administration to see that domestic coals are properly treated hereafter.

Mr. FAULKNER. If the Senator from California will permit me, I am satisfied that the Administration which is now in power would certainly (if it was in accordance with an economic administration of the Department) much prefer the use of American coal to foreign coal, and I suppose it can only be by reason of misinformation in reference to the quality of the coal which could be furnished by those mines that they purchase at all the foreign coal to which the Senator from California has alluded.

Mr. PERKINS. I had not referred to this in my remarks; I tried not to be personal at all; and ordinarily I should defer to the judgment of the Senator from West Virginia; but I have some knowledge of coal, because the vessels which I am engaged in operating consume large quantities of coal and we know from actual test, not a theoretical experiment, but by burning 1,000 tons of coal from this mine and 1,000 tons of coal from the other mine, that the same speed of a vessel under similar circumstances is attained. That is the result.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I should like to ask a question right here. The Senator from California, as he states, and we all know, is a very large consumer of coal on the Pacific coast. That being so, of course one would naturally suppose that he would like to get the coal so used as cheaply as possible. Does the Senator think that by putting coal on the free list he in the course of a few years, if at all, would get his coal as cheaply as he does now?

Mr. PERKINS. I shall endeavor to demonstrate the fact, but my time is passing, and I wish to make a few remarks about the income tax. I shall have to file a special brief with my friend to show him that I am satisfied the consumer would not get his coal one cent less, judging the future by the past. Before our mines in Oregon, Washington, and California were developed (and we have a few of them in California) coal was always purchased from the ships to arrive, and the consumer was never benefited once thereby. But, parenthetically, speaking of the question of my friends from Montana and Oregon, it is true that our Government did not give our Oregonians and Washingtonians an opportunity of competing, yet I want to say a kind word for our friends in British Columbia. They are our neighbors, and they buy a great many goods from us in California. They are a very kind-hearted, hospitable people. They are an American people, who ought to be connected and allied with us by political bands.

To show how much more generous they are than our own Government, to one of the steamship companies that I can call to mind I think they have paid during the past twenty-five years a special mail subsidy for carrying the mails by steamer from San Francisco to Victoria, British Columbia, of from \$5,000 to \$10,000 a year, while our Government pays for carrying the mail about \$1.50 a mail, I think. That is the policy. Therefore I feel very kindly toward our friends, and if they would unite themselves with the United States I should not object to purchasing our coal there altogether.

But since the Senators from Montana and Oregon have called attention to the discrimination against American coal, I am sure my friend from West Virginia, having a judicial mind, will say at once that there is some mistake and that he himself will volunteer to remedy this wrong, and in the next bid the coal of Washington and Oregon will be invited to compete.

Mr. FAULKNER. If the Senator will permit me, I have no doubt that after the Secretary of the Navy has read the very elaborate and satisfactory argument of the Senator from California on this subject and knows his ability to talk from personal knowledge of the quality of the coal there will be no difficulty whatever. I understand that this coal was excluded on the report of the officers who had tested it.

Mr. PERKINS. Since the question has been brought up I want to say in justice to the Department that while the Washington coal is just as effective and is equal for steam purposes, yet it is not quite as clean, and the officers prefer a harder coal that does not throw any cinders on the deck or upon their suits of clothing made of foreign wool. I think I can make it clear even to my friend from West Virginia that there should be a duty upon coal; but I wish to say that I have an interest in one mine and that I am interested in the management of a company which has investments in several coal mines; and while those who know me would hardly charge that it would influence me in my vote, yet as there are some evil-minded people who sometimes misconstrue a person's action, when the question of the coal duty is up for consideration I shall, with the permission of the Senate, refuse to vote upon it.

I do not believe it right for anyone to vote on any measure in



which he has a direct interest, if it is over so small; and yet to my satisfaction, and I think to the satisfaction of my friend from West Virginia, I can show that the duty should not be reduced from 75 cents to 40 cents a ton, and that after all the talk of "free coal" the people of the Pacific States would have "dear coal" as the results of their efforts. I am confident that the price will not be reduced, though the duty is, and the difference between existing duties and the reduced duties will go into the pockets of the foreign ship and mine owner. The trusts are powerful enough to do just as they did before when the duty was reduced to raise the price to make up the difference.

For the year 1892 the total output of the coal mines of the world was 539,000,000 tons. Of this the United States produced 179,000,000 tons, or nearly 33 per cent of the total. Of this product the United States exported from her Atlantic and lake ports—

Anthracite .....	Tons. 851,000
Bituminous .....	1,645,000

Total ..... 2,496,000

During the same year the United States imported—

Anthracite .....	Tons. 65,058
Bituminous .....	1,143,000

Total ..... 1,208,058

Leaving this general statement, and coming to the coal consumption of the State of California, the statistics show that she imported from all sources of supply during the years 1892 and 1893, viz:

	1892.	Per cent.	1893.	Per cent.
<b>FOREIGN.</b>				
British Columbia .....	Tons. 554,600	35	Tons. 688,527	40
Australia .....	314,280	20	202,017	13.5
Great Britain .....	238,560	15	170,078	11
Japan .....	4,230	.....	7,768	.5
Total, dutiable and nondutiable .....	1,106,660	70	968,380	65
<b>DOMESTIC.</b>				
Washington .....	388,320	24	429,685	22.5
California and Oregon .....	95,150	4	93,400	4.5
Pennsylvania and Maryland .....	35,720	2	18,960	1
Total .....	485,100	30	511,405	33
Total importation .....	1,593,860	100	1,479,785	100

It may with safety be assumed that the 65,058 tons anthracite reported as coming into the United States were delivered at California ports. Deducting this from California's total importations of foreign coal will leave a balance of 1,043,000 tons of dutiable bituminous coal brought to her ports, showing that only 100,000 tons foreign bituminous coal went into all other parts of the United States, and that of all the foreign coal imported during 1892, California received over 91 per cent.

It will thus be seen that California occupies a singular and unique position relative to the Government tax on fuel. This is because:

1. She has not within her borders any known deposits of coal suitable in quality for the general needs, and within reach of her centers of consumption.

2. She is the most populous of the sparsely settled Pacific coast States, and therefore offers the largest market west of the Rocky Mountains.

3. She is essentially an agricultural State, dependent upon distant markets for the sale of her products, and compelled largely to use ocean carriage for transportation. This fact attracts vessel tonnage, almost entirely foreign in nationality, and which coming from far distant points is chiefly laden with coal as inward cargoes.

If business policy, and not theories shall determine the right of government to protect by tariff those lines of business which need protection, shall get any consideration, that policy will be best which tends to encourage the development of resources to the profitable employment of capital and to the largest amount of work and rates of wages. What that amount of tariff, distinctly for protection, shall be, is the question for those who fix the rates, but unquestionably it should be no more and no less than is necessary to equalize the cost between the same grades of foreign and domestic material laid down at the seaboard ports.

Respecting coal, California's position is different from that of every other State of the Union. Leaving out of the question any discussion that she may have interests requiring the help of sister States towards shaping the governmental policy for their protection, it is a fact that with her the farming element is the most important. The farmer pays the outward freight on

his wheat because he gets for his product the difference between the foreign market rates and the freights by sailing ships. Therefore, whatever tends to increase the outward carrying tonnage, or what will lower the cost of wheat freights, is in the interest of the farmer.

Dismissing for a moment the reciprocal interests of California with her neighboring States, it is a fact that coal constitutes the largest volume of inbound freight; therefore, it is better for the farmer if the coal trade of the State shall be supplied from distant foreign ports, because—

1. The inward earnings enable the ships to carry the wheat outward at lower rates than would otherwise be possible.

2. Coal as cargo from distant foreign ports sends here an increased tonnage of wheat-carrying ships.

It therefore follows that the importation of coal from adjacent foreign ports is not in the interest of the farmer, because it is carried in British steamers and by other nonwheat-carrying vessels. The importation of coal from near foreign mines has two effects in California: It displaces the product of mines worked by American labor in adjoining States, and to the extent that it displaces the product of distant foreign mines, to just that extent does it lower the list of vessels that would otherwise be attracted to carry away California products.

It is entirely safe to say, and the statement will be borne out by unprejudiced experience, that the abolition of the present duty as proposed by the bill as it came here will shut the California market against the American coast mines, and lead to a further absorption of the coal tonnage by the mines of British Columbia. An examination of the statistics for the past six years will show that the supply of domestic coals imported has decreased over 30 per cent. During the same period that of the British Columbia mines has increased nearly 90 per cent, while that from distant foreign mines shows no material increase.

It may naturally be asked, why should this result follow, seeing that the abolition of the duty would apply equally to foreign coals from Great Britain and Australia, and why may not the American mines still maintain their foothold. The answer is:

1. British Columbia coal as compared with that from Washington is better for household use, and for steam purposes it equals the best and is superior to most of the local domestic products; hence, it is in greater demand in the California market.

2. British Columbia mines, having flat veins, are more cheaply worked than the pitching veins in Washington, and being nearer tide water their output can be shipped on board vessels at a lower cost than coals in Washington.

3. The product of British Columbia mines is largely carried in cheaply built and cheaply operated British steamers, and therefore the cost of freighting is less than from the American Puget Sound coal ports, that use American sailing ships and more costly steamers, and these causes have operated to diminish the California supply from Northern American coal fields, and the abolition of the present duty will finish the struggle.

With respect to distant foreign coals, the answer is: The miners of British Columbia coals sell their own product in the California markets. Controlling the amount and cost of their supplies, by the use largely of British steamers they are within four days of their mines, and are thus enabled to undertake contracts for large deliveries. The dealer in other foreign coals is distant sixty days from Australia, and one hundred and twenty to one hundred and fifty days from Great Britain. The uncertainty of the arrivals of sailing ships from such long voyages makes it inexpedient to undertake such large contracts, unless by the carriage of unwarrantably large stocks of coal. He does not know nor can he control costs, for while the free-on-board price of coal at foreign ports is practically constant, for long periods, the inward freight rates are constantly fluctuating.

These are the chief reasons why the British Columbia miner is in position to force the domestic coals out of this market, and why he has been able to prevent any marked increase in importation from abroad. At the same time, while it is not contended that there should be a discriminating tariff against British Columbia, it should be emphasized that this growing absorption of California coal trade by these mines deprives the farmer of wheat-carrying vessels, tending to increase his outward wheat freights, when he competes in European markets against the world's wheat. It has retarded the mineral development of the State of Washington, which is practically in infancy, and the destruction of the tariff will further dwarf promising coal-mining in Oregon.

Who will benefit by the reduction of the duty on coal? As the function of such laws is to do the greatest good to the masses, let us analyze the coal traffic of California, and ascertain whether the great public will reap any material advantage. The American coal-producer on the Atlantic seaboard protests against any reduction in duty, because the Nova Scotia mines will disturb his trade in the great consuming centers of New England.

The American miner on the Pacific coast contends for a chance to keep his present trade in California against mines in British Columbia, but the same kind of practical reason applicable in the East does not fit the peculiar conditions there. It can be said in prophecy that if the present duty be reduced the difference will go into the pockets of the British miner and shipowner. Theoretically it should all go to the California consumer. Practically it will not.

Iron ore of excellent quality is abundant, California alone having enough to supply the world indefinitely, but under existing conditions it is not available as a commercial factor. For our future development we are looking forward hopefully to the construction of the Nicaragua Canal to bring us in closer commercial relationship with our Southern brethren, with whom we are now working at terrible cross-purposes, hoping for the same material end. Does Alabama believe she can send her coal and iron to Italy or Turkey in exchange for figs, olives, currants, raisins, oranges, lemons, chromium, borax, or sulphur more advantageously than she could to California for the same products? All these commodities and many more are California products, in great abundance and in greater perfection than elsewhere known. Of one important thing our Eastern (including Southern) friends appear to be ignorant or indifferent and narrow: that we have all the Mediterranean countries on our Pacific coast, all Northern Europe in our Mississippi Valley, all Great Britain and her every natural resource many times repeated in our Atlantic States, all the precious mineral regions of the world in our great Western plateau, and all Scandinavia, Laplandia, and Samoldia in our Alaska. But partisanship and limited local or individual interests subordinate all to narrow dictation.

The Republicans ask for this development by mutual assistance, by a syndicate of States as business men form syndicates for successful operations. We of California pay without complaint as a contribution to the general good of the other States and in support of the Government \$8,000,000 of customs, of which three-quarters of a million is for coal and \$2,192,581 internal revenue direct, and several millions more indirectly being paid directly at the place of manufacture of whisky, tobacco, beer, and oleomargarine. It is estimated that California pays annually \$6,000,000 of the internal-revenue tax, when her just proportion would be less than \$2,000,000, the gross amount collected in the United States being \$160,296,130. Thus California pays into the Treasury over \$15,000,000 annually. These great and disproportionate payments, continued through a long series of years, entitle her to careful consideration and justify her request for protection and assistance in developing her natural resources for the mutual good, power, and glory of our common country.

There is received at the port of San Francisco from 18,000 to 22,000 long tons of pig iron annually, almost entirely from Great Britain. A little more than a year ago this trade was broken into by the arrival at that port of a shipment of 930 tons of pig iron from Birmingham, Ala. This proved of excellent quality, and more was immediately ordered. The agent, Mr. John Martin, at that time stated that the iron could be supplied at the furnaces as cheaply as at the furnaces in Scotland, but the freight rates were greatly in favor of the foreign product. That is, the rate per ton from Ensley or Birmingham via New York to San Francisco was \$13.15 per ton, while from Glasgow to San Francisco the rate was \$2.40 per ton. Adding to this the duty of \$6.92 per ton, makes a total of \$9.12 a ton, or a difference of \$4.03 in favor of the British and against the Alabama product. The price of pig iron ranges in San Francisco from \$23 to \$30 per ton, or did at the time these transactions occurred. But with the tariff as it is and the canal of Nicaragua completed, shipments via Mobile or New Orleans to Pacific ports would place the ironworks of Alabama and other Southern States on an equality with those of Great Britain.

Here we make these concessions for mutual assistance and development. A member of the other House is reported as saying he voted against sugar because his State was not interested in sugar. Many have opposed protection to iron because, as it was charged, only one State—Pennsylvania—was engaged in its production. Now several States are interested in it, and all should be. Iron and coal are the basis of British power and wealth, and wherever in our country, under protection, their production has been carried on, there have grown prosperous communities, wealthy and powerful States. Knowing the condition of the Southern States, so undeveloped were their great natural resources when they attempted to establish the Confederacy, that a strictly enforced blockade would have soon starved the people and rendered the government powerless and compelled submission without a Bull Run, a Gettysburg, or an Appomattox. These developments are and must be through protection and interstate commerce, and not through free trade and foreign commerce.

Of the income tax, I can but say that it appears in the bill be-

fore us one of the most insidious and deceitful ever expressed in a multitude of words.

It appears most fair that the individual who rides on Mr. Belamy's coach, which other individuals pull through the dust and mud of good and bad roads, should be made to pay his fare, or at least to pay more than those who do the pulling; and it is on this theory the income tax is advocated. Were this theory sound it would still be found impracticable to collect that fare with any equality or any degree of satisfaction or profit. At first glance it appears that the income tax is levied only against those who ride. This appearance makes the proposition popular with those who believe they do all the pulling for this coach made so famous in the "Looking Backward" story. A closer examination of these sections of the bill show that the pullers of that coach are taxed as well as those who ride.

There are but few thrifty persons who have not invested some surplus earnings or "laid aside for a rainy day" in some incorporated company or savings bank. Such people are of the most beneficial toilers of the world. They comprise millions of our people of small incomes. In all the great companies are many of these, and possibly many call for an income tax. They do not know that their savings are aggregated in the bank or other corporation, and made to pay the same tax as if the depositor's income were over the limit of four thousand. Many a poor man and woman will find their scanty dividends lessened by the income tax if this bill becomes a law.

There are 4,781,605 depositors in the savings banks of the United States, with \$1,712,769,026 on deposit, an average of \$358.20 to each person. Of these California has 175,672 depositors, with an average of \$386 of deposits, or in all \$126,781,530. This includes \$101,462,937 in the savings banks of San Francisco and \$25,318,593 deposited in the interior savings banks of the State. How much of this belongs to "plain people," "wage-earners," and the like, it is impossible to ascertain. We know that for a long time there were many capitalists there who found it easier and more profitable to deposit large sums in savings banks than to invest themselves, but during the troubles of last year their funds were not available, and since then they are doubtless withdrawing their patronage from savings banks. Many of these banks now decline to accept any large deposits, the general limit being \$10,000, while some are said to have a limit of \$1,000.

It stands to reason, therefore, that a very large percentage, or nearly all, of the depositors are people of moderate means, who, not being able to take care of their savings, give them into the custody of those whose business is to conduct these trusts. There are 120,642 depositors in San Francisco and 55,030 depositors in the interior banks, and while we can not get accurate statistics the nearest obtainable estimate is:

Depositors of less than \$1,000 .....	157,745
Depositors of over \$1,000 and less than \$2,000 .....	8,722
Depositors of between \$2,000 and \$5,000 .....	6,024
Depositors of over \$5,000 .....	3,181

The average of deposits in our four largest local savings banks in San Francisco is, viz:

German .....	\$1,046.97
Hibernia .....	606.04
Savings Union .....	1,246.12
Savings and Loan Society .....	1,144.32
The lowest average deposit in all the banks is .....	57.67
The highest average deposit in all the banks is .....	1,760.00

The savings banks in California are of two classes, mutual and stock corporations, while in the East savings banks are mainly mutual concerns, having no stock, and are managed by directors more or less upon a philanthropic basis wherein all depositors are members and there are no stockholders.

If the income tax were imposed, it would of course apply to mutual and incorporated savings banks as well as all other corporations and they would have to pay upon their income, which consists of the interest upon loans and investments. This income, less expenses and dividends to stockholders, is now used to pay interest to depositors which we will say is 5 per cent. Corporations are not so liberal as to allow this charge, the income tax, to apply entirely to stockholders; therefore it would be deducted from the 5 per cent paid depositors, and the man, who has accumulated \$1,000 and is now receiving, say, \$50 per annum as the earnings of his savings, would get \$50, less the income tax of 2 per cent. There are also in California, and I think throughout the United States, building and loan associations, mutual societies organized for the purpose of assisting the mechanic and wage-worker in building a home and paying for it in monthly installments.

Thousands of homes are by this plan builded each year, that fall like a benediction upon the American family. It is almost

cruel to impose an income tax upon these societies as this law proposes.

The larger depositor, if his wealth were all in the savings banks, from which he received say \$1,000 annually, would have paid the tax once through the bank and then would have to pay it again personally, and this would apply to anyone whose income was derived from corporate investments. The company would have to pay its tax and then the shareholder, who received dividends, would have to pay it again, *i. e.*, the same income or earning power would be taxed doubly in its distribution. This may be the desired object, but it is double taxation, and therefore not equitable.

The worst feature about the proposed measure appears to be the discouragement it would give to enterprise, and particularly to combined effort, in the form of corporate undertakings. These are the times when the greatest encouragement should be given to all who are willing to develop new resources, for so much has been done to discourage capital that disaster and misfortune appear everywhere. Is it not possible that under an income tax we would drive from us many whose wealth is now of great benefit, and should they invest their capital in other countries how could this Government collect income tax upon such investments?

A man's income is a personal affair and he will not willingly disclose it, but, if forced to, will be driven to dishonest methods in resenting what he regards as an injustice. One of the bank commissioners of California writes me:

I am told that the income tax works well in England, but I am not familiar with the system there and it may be possible that it is a blessing in disguise, but viewing it as a creation of the Democratic party, I am loath to appreciate it.

It is more or less in evidence that the rich do not pay their just share of taxes, but the proposed plan will place greater burdens upon those of moderate means, who can not escape, and the class sought to be taxed will evade the law in one way or another.

I am opposed to this income tax provided for in this bill for many reasons, but first and principally because it is un-American. I am also informed there is no income-tax law proper imposed by any republic of the world to-day. It is a recognized monarchical form of taxation and should have no place upon the statute books of this country, unless as a war measure. There is no demand for it except from a few theorists and free traders who seek to secure by it money with which to pay the expenses of the Government and create an army of taxgatherers. This money, in my opinion, is needed and needed badly, but it would be more American-like if we insisted on collecting it from the foreign materials and manufactures sent here rather than from our own people. It is inquisitorial and, judging the future by the past, it will do far more to manufacture perjury than to produce an income to aid in supporting the Government. Who can deny that it is a deception; that it does not promise things it can not perform? It is supposed to be leveled at the rich and the rich alone; at those whose incomes are four thousand and over per year, and it is on its face; but there are thousands of others who will be affected by it, for it will reach into the savings banks as I have shown and tax every depositor, rich or poor.

It will affect all injuriously. It proposes also to give certain designated persons the right to look into the private business of all business men and business enterprises; to expose every one's private books to the public gaze; to require the successful business man to expose the sources of his success to those who are not so fortunate, to force him to an unnatural competition. Henry Clews, well known as a banker and financier in New York, as well as to the business world everywhere, in a recent letter says:

I remember during the war period, when various tax laws of that character were in force as war measures, it was quite a usual thing for the collector of one of the districts named, who was a bold, unscrupulous, and money-making man, to forcibly seize the books of well-known firms and keep them in his custody at his own office for experts to examine at their convenience and, I have no doubt, in many instances even to copy parts thereof; at any rate, such was the general impression.

Hundreds of others give similar testimony. Setting aside for the present all other objections to the income-tax feature of this bill it is clear, even from the statement of the honorable chairman of the Finance Committee of this body, that it is not necessary, for the reason that the bill raises enough to meet the expenses of the Government without it. We certainly should not provide for such a great surplus of revenues as the income tax proposes to raise. We do not need it and it will turn out to be a plague to annoy and punish us. This is also the most inopportune time to try such legislation. The recent financial depression carried down many of the supposed strongest business firms and farmers of our country, and has kept them down; others who have credit have managed to keep their heads up in spite of unfavorable circumstances, and if allowed to do so will come out all right in the end.

But if they are forced to open their books and accounts to the public gaze—to the income-tax gatherers—it will be shown that

they exist in many cases on credit and the confidence of their friends and supporters; and the result can not but prove disastrous to them and others. We have had enough of palling down, and certainly there should be no excuse, no statute placed in our laws which would increase and encourage financial disaster, and which would wreck those that would otherwise sail along pleasantly until times improved, when they can manage on their own account. It is for them and those depending on them a great struggle, and if they are not required to "show their hands," as it were, they will weather the storm and sail along in pleasant waters. What we need is confidence, and it should not be destroyed by the operations of the income-tax gatherer. We have business troubles enough already staring us in the face without the law placing in their pathway one which would be even greater than all else combined.

But if this bill is to become a law there is no reason that a member of the Congress of the United States should have \$4,000 of his salary that is paid him by the people go free from taxation. There should be no exemption above that of say \$500 per annum, which is about the average wages of the laboring man of the country.

It has been charged by those who profess to believe that every step toward free trade is a step in the direction of national prosperity and happiness—it has been charged, I say, by these gentlemen that protection of American industries tends to build up a moneyed aristocracy at the expense of a less fortunate democracy. That is, that it tends to make the rich man richer and the poor man poorer.

I do not flatter myself that I shall be able to refute this charge with such power of eloquence and of logic that those who differ with me will at once subscribe themselves as converts to my opinion; but I must say that to me, as a business man, the facts seem to lie so distinctly in one direction, that I can not see how any other conclusion can be reached than this: that while protection has made many men rich it has made no man poor; that it has resulted and can only result in national wealth without inducing individual poverty; and that if great fortunes have been made, such fortune-making has been the logical sequence of this national prosperity, and not at the expense of the individual.

A protective tariff, as I understand it, is simply the impost of such duties as will allow the producer of this country to compete with the producer of other countries, either by keeping out entirely the products of competitive nations or by adding such amounts to their cost by a tax on entry as will enable our producer to market his goods at a fair and legitimate profit. I am aware that gentlemen of great intelligence and far more political acumen than I possess may hold this to be, if not a mistaken at least a debatable proposition; but such is my honest opinion, largely shared in, I believe, by those who are of my political faith. I know that there are gentlemen on the other side who claim that this protective tariff, while it may foster American industries, fosters them only to the benefit of the manufacturers' pocket and to the depletion of the purchasers' pocket. Now, if this were so, it would inevitably follow that the manufacturers of this country would constitute the great millionaire class. But such is not the fact.

The total assessed value of all properties of the United States in the census year, 1890, I am informed, was \$64,340,092,988, of which amount no less than \$39,544,544,333 represent real estate and the improvements thereon; a division of our wealth in which every property owner of the United States has his share, and whose magnificent figures are due to the vast extent of our territory, to the masterly activity of our people, to their incessant desire for better surroundings, and to the general increment of values. The next largest item is that of transportation agencies: the value of railroads, street cars, shipping, canals, telegraphs, and telephones being \$8,399,491,612. The magnitude of these figures, which are decidedly conservative, can hardly be said to be due to the discriminations of a protective tariff, because while the wonderful business of transportation must be undoubtedly ascribed to the movement and development of our products, we are told that the reduction of the tariff would result in an increased energy along all the lines of national and commercial affairs.

The estimated value of live stock on farms and ranges, of farm implements and machinery, is \$2,703,015,040, and whether the live stock and the mechanical accessories of agriculture would be of a higher valuation if the cattle ranges and machine shops of the world could send us their yield unchecked, and whether the farmers of the country would be better therefor, is a moot and precarious question.

Our mines and quarries, including the products on hand, are valued at \$1,581,964,793, and if these have been developed under a protective tariff, so much the better, and I fail to find clear or valid proof that anyone has been injured by this development.

The value of general merchandise, that is, tradesmen's stock, household and personal effects, grain in elevators, goods in bond, and all exempt State and national properties is \$7,893,708,821.

There remain to be noticed only the estimated value of the machinery and the product on hand of mills and factories, \$3,058,593,441, and the gold and silver coin and bullion, \$1,158,774,918; and it seems to me absurd to seriously advance or combat the proposition that the effect of a protective tariff has been to place either of these two amounts in the centralized control of a few rich men to the detriment of the many poor.

Let us look a little more particularly into this fascinating subject of accumulated riches. That we have a moneyed aristocracy can not be denied, but I find nothing in its composition to show that it has been built up by a protective tariff; nothing that would even indirectly point to that inference. New York to-day, I suppose, contains more rich men than any other city in the world, but its lists of plutocrats is singularly deficient in those millionaire manufacturers who, we are told, have sprung up in the hotbed culture of protection.

The rich men of the West have rolled up millions in railroads and mines, and those of the Central and Southern States chiefly through the manipulation or ownership of agricultural products and live stock. I might add the names of the many millionaire women, rich through shrewd investments, but refrain from introducing them in this discussion. It is a far more difficult task, I find, to start on a list of manufacturers who enjoy a parity of wealth with those I have referred to, and a still more difficult one to trace any connection between their wealth and the protective tariff. Some, it is true, have built up fortunes more or less vast in manufacturing, but it is equally true that they have made these fortunes under the protection of patents and not under the protection of tariff. And these patents upon new inventions have resulted in most every instance in reducing the price of the manufactured articles to the public.

I am aware that the great manufacturing States of the East contain hundreds and thousands of men who have reached opulence through the prosecution of protected industries, but their opulence is a comparative one and not that of the great rich ones of the nation who through real estate, railroads, trusts, and speculation in man's avidity for sudden gain really control the financial balance of the country. This general statement is borne out in an especially forcible way by the detailed facts collected some little time ago by a New York newspaper. A census was at that time taken of all the millionaires in the United States, and a schedule furnished of the source of their wealth.

An actual list of 4,017 persons reputed to be worth a million dollars or more was compiled—of whom, by the bye, no fewer than 1,103 lived in New York City—and the recapitulation of the sources of wealth displayed a very curious and instructive condition of things.

The condensed history of these 4,000 showed that 986 have made their fortunes in merchandising; 188 in mines and mining; 436 in railroads, shipping, and other transportation agencies; 803 in real estate, banking, and kindred occupations; 75 in agricultural pursuits; 93 in patented and proprietary articles; 58 in brokerage; 76 in local investments; 178 in such miscellaneous industries as contracts, hotel-keeping, etc.; 55 through indefinite sources; 65 in law practice, and 1 in that of medicine; 57 in printing and publishing; 357 in such indirectly protected industries as sugar-refining, tobacco-growing, malting, milling, etc.; and 619 in protected manufactures. Thus, from still another set of figures, the same unerring deductions are to be drawn, that a protective tariff is not the cause of the uneven distribution of wealth; that the accretion of great riches is due to the varied causes of temperament, inheritance, fortune, invention, shrewdness, and the rewards of commercial integrity; and that unless the accumulation of riches can be shown to be an evil, the list of millionaires can scarcely be classed as an exemplification of malign laws. There are yet other statistics at command which lift the proposition at issue far above the uncertain limits of hypothesis.

The \$3,058,593,441 which I quoted from the stock account of the wealth of the nation represent, it will be remembered, the estimated value of the manufacturers' plant and stock on hand June 30, 1890, while late census figures show that the value of the manufactured products of the United States for the year ending June 30, 1890, was \$9,370,107,624—truly a magnificent figure. Yes, but let us look for a moment at its components and distribution. In the first place, the cost of the material was no less than \$5,158,803,353, which leaves the net addition to the wealth of the country at \$4,211,230,271. Now, what does this sum represent? It represents the wages of the operative, the salary of the clerks, the premium to the artist, the payments on borrowed money, the interest on invested capital, contributions to government, local, State, and national; outlay for wear and tear, insurance, extension of plant, and, sometimes, profit.

The wage account is an interesting one. To 106,620 clerks there was paid \$117,574,355, while to all other employes, numbering 4,250,783, there was paid \$1,890,908,747, or a total of \$2,008,483,102. A simple sum in division will show us that the clerks received an average of a little over \$1,100 per annum, while the army of workmen and workwomen and workchildren received an average of nearly \$445 per annum. It seems to me that this one group of facts alone settles it that the people—the working people—are they who live and flourish under the benefits of protection. The people, indeed, for it should not be forgotten that the workers to whom the \$2,008,483,102 was paid in wages numbered 4,357,403, or one-fifteenth of the entire population of the United States. Nor do these figures take into note the foundries, the machine shops, the architects, contractors, carpenters, and builders, whose services and labors are required as the industry grows; nor the factors and middlemen, nor the hundred and one more or less indirect beneficiaries of the industry. And it is God's blessing that it is so; and it has been our country's blessing and pride that it is so; and we should be careful indeed how we approach the momentous matter of change, and how we warp or modify a condition that has been so productive of general benefit.

No man has a greater appreciation of the intricacies of the tariff than I, nor has any man a better appreciation than I of the exceeding presumption that would mark any attempt on my part to simplify these intricacies. But it sometimes happens that the tyro may single out one proposition which seem likely to escape attention in a general discussion and which may be plainly and pertinently answered by the rules of common sense and business experience. It is to such a proposition that I have ventured to address myself, and it is in such a manner that I have ventured to specially refer to this phase of the subject under discussion.

We rejoice in the general prosperity of the world—all the nations of the earth. We feel a fraternal interest in the people of our own continent who have struggled with us in establishing free governments. We seek by legislation to advance the interests of our own country. In this can we not follow in the path and emulate the deeds of that grand statesman my native State proudly claimed as her own, and who did more than any other to inculcate these doctrines of protection and reciprocity for the good of our land and for sealing the friendships of all our American republics? To him we owe so much and returned so little—he who, standing on the sea-beaten cliffs of Maine, where the morning sun first sheds its beams on our most eastern shore, gazed over the land he loved with every thought of fostering care; over the hills and factories of New England, the great metropolis with its radiating arms of commerce, the rugged masses of the Appalachian chain with their stores of mineral wealth, the long Atlantic coast indented with its many harbors, bays, and rivers; over the fair fields, forests, and orange groves of the Southland, the broad valley of the Mississippi from the great unsalted seas and the countless sparkling lakes of the north to the distant Gulf of Mexico, with all the teeming industries of farms, and mines, and manufactures, and trade of State with State; on over the empire of plains, the lofty Rocky Mountains, seamed with veins of glittering gold and silver; over the high plateaus and the snow-crowned ridge of the golden Sierra, with the genial and fruitful land at its base; on to the Pacific and the islands of the sea; on to the wild shores of Alaska—all his own great country, whose every locality he knew, whose every resource he fostered, whose every interest he guarded with a heart too large for sectionalism, a mind too pure for prejudice, let us, as he, take the broad views, be true and just to all, include all in our embrace, from Maine to California. *Dirigo and Eureka!*

EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE W. H. ENOCHS.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask that the resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives on the occasion of the death of my late colleague in that House, Gen. William H. Enoch, may now be laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolutions of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with sincere regret the announcement of the death of Hon. William H. Enoch, late a Representative from the State of Ohio.

*Resolved*, That the business of the House be suspended in order that the public services and private character of the deceased be thoroughly commemorated.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be directed to communicate these resolutions to the Senate, and send a duly attested copy to the widow of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That at the conclusion of these services the House, as a further mark of respect, do adjourn.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move the adoption of the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions submitted by the Senator from Ohio will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility, the announcement of the death of Hon. William H. Enoch, late a Representative from the State of Ohio.

*Resolved*, That the business of the Senate be now suspended, in order that fitting tribute be paid to his memory.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask for a vote on the adoption of the resolutions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the oft-recurring announcement in this Senate Chamber of the death of one of our associates must impress us with our uncertain tenure of human life, as well as of official honors. Death regards no party, age, section, or service. It comes to all, but gives no warning of time or place or circumstance. Vigorous manhood may be the first victim, while feebleness and old age are spared.

The death of my late colleague, Gen. W. H. Enoch, a member of the House of Representatives from Ohio, is a striking example of this law of life and death. After an active life of fifty-one years he had attained a position of honor and usefulness where he could hope to take a leading part in the House of Representatives and prove in that, the highest popular arena of American talent, his marked energy and ability. He was elected a member of the House in 1890 by an overwhelming majority and was re-elected almost without opposition in 1892. He had the affection and confidence of his constituents, and in natural course and by the conservative usage of his people would have been long retained as their Representative, but, unhappily, before entering upon his second term he died, sincerely mourned by his constituents, without distinction of party, and by the people of Ohio who had become familiar with his history.

Though thus untimely cut off, he had lived long enough to furnish a remarkable example of that feature of American life possible only under free institutions. He was a self-made man. He was the architect of his own fortunes. He was born on a farm in Ohio in 1842. His parents were poor. He was their chief dependence for the labor on the farm. He had the advantage of the common country schools of Ohio, and there acquired the habit of study, the love of books, and the ambition to acquire an advanced education. At the age of 18 he entered the college at Athens, Ohio, but before the first year was over, a few days after the firing upon Fort Sumter, he enlisted as a common soldier in a three months' Ohio regiment, the first feeble, and, in view of subsequent events, the ridiculous preparation for a great war. Then only 19 years of age, he proved his aptitude for military drill and discipline and duty. He demonstrated his courage in early conflicts in West Virginia. At the expiration of his term of enlistment, without returning to his home, he enlisted in a West Virginia regiment largely composed of Ohio soldiers, for a term of three years.

A narrative of his life and real adventures would be as interesting as a romance. I have heard his comrades speak of him as an ideal soldier, brave yet cautious, cheerful under the greatest fatigue, resolute and hopeful, and generally successful. It is needless to say that his qualities as a soldier soon gained him promotion. He became lieutenant in December, 1861, and by successive promotions he attained the command of his regiment, and often the actual command of a brigade. He was breveted brigadier-general at the close of the war for gallant and honorable service in the field. The only obstacle in his way was his youth, which on two occasions delayed his promotion. It was this test of soldierly qualities, this training of body and mind, this struggle for political convictions deeply imbedded in the hearts of both Union and Confederate soldiers that gave to our civil war its fierce energy and destructive results.

Still the war could not be avoided. It was an irrepressible conflict. And next to the preservation of the Union and the abolition of slavery, the chief beneficial result of the war was the respect which the soldiers, both Union and Confederate, had for each other. Typical soldiers like Gen. Enoch, enterprising, brave, and determined, could perceive and acknowledge like qualities in Confederate soldiers, and could regret that human wisdom could devise no method of settling their differences except by destructive war, involving the death or disability of 1,000,000 of men, and the loss of many billions of dollars of property.

When the honorable military career of Gen. Enoch closed he was but 23 years old and a brigadier-general by brevet. His college life was closed by the necessity of earning a livelihood. He commenced the study of the law, and graduated at the Cincinnati Law School in 1866. He soon after commenced the practice of law at Ironton, on the banks of the Ohio River, where he ever since resided. He served one term in the Legislature of Ohio,

but declining further service he devoted himself to his profession.

In November, 1890, Gen. Enoch was elected a member of the Fifty-second Congress by a very large majority; and here, as on the battlefield and in his profession, he gained a high reputation for industry, good sense, and ability of a high order. The kindly words spoken of him in the House of Representatives on these resolutions, not only by his colleagues from Ohio but by many others, is the best evidence of the respect in which he was held by them after his brief service in that body. His successor said of him:

Gen. Enoch was a citizen loved by his neighbors, honored and respected by all; he was a philanthropist with a generous hand, and no unfortunate, however poor, ever left his door without having been comforted by his generosity. He was a soldier by instinct, a stranger to fear, a gallant leader whom men were always proud to follow, and whose time and talent in later years were devoted to the cause of his comrades; history shows that he was distinguished in all the lines of service in the Army—in fact, that he was one of the youngest, if not the youngest, commandants of a brigade in the volunteer service. He was a lawyer true to his profession, and exhibited an unflinching zeal for the success of his clients. He was a statesman of the practical type, with exalted ideas of the obligations which public trust imposes. He was a patriot who loved his country with a jealous love, and was willing, if need be, to lay down his own life in defense of the old flag and the principles which it represents.

I believe that this high eulogy is a truthful, sincere, and just tribute to the character of Gen. Enoch. He left behind him his wife and one child, the chief mourners, but his whole constituency, without distinction of party, share in their grief and have expressed in many ways their respect and affection for their late Representative.

Mr. BRICE. Mr. President, the grim reaper has been a busy harvester in the Ohio delegation since my service began in this body, and it is my sad duty to address my associates on the untimely death of one of the most honored and patriotic sons whom the State of Ohio has sent to the national capital.

On July 12, 1893, Hon. William H. Enoch, representing the Tenth District of Ohio, died suddenly at his home in Ironton. By his death there was taken from the public service a Representative whose whole career, both public and private, evinced the highest qualities of manhood and patriotism; one who walked fearlessly in the path of duty in peace and in war, and who has left behind him memories which will long be cherished, though he now sleeps beneath the sod. It was, perhaps, the most fitting end that a hero of his soldierly mold should die in the service of the country for which he had through so many years battled and bled.

Gen. Enoch was a native of Ohio, having been born in Noble County, March 29, 1842. Reared upon a farm, his field of opportunities was not widespread, but such advantages as he obtained he wrested mainly from adverse circumstances by his own courage and endurance. His parents were sturdy and honest, though not more prosperous than was usual with the Western farmer of that day. From them he inherited the qualities of sterling integrity which were maintained throughout his lifetime, a heritage more potent for honorable success than any that a wealthy ancestry could bestow.

The conditions that surrounded him during his boyhood days on the farm were natural and rational, doubtless contributing much to that evenness of character and sturdiness of purpose which in later years marked his demeanor in the tumults of battle as well as in the pursuits of peace.

His early education was had in the common schools; but with an inborn disposition to lift himself to loftier heights he became a teacher, and from his savings in this capacity secured the means to attend college. What might have been the outcome in this direction as the result of his studious habits and his faculty for application we can never know, for the call to arms of 1861 turned the current of his life into the seething channel of a bloody conflict. He was but nineteen years of age when he enlisted as a private, unconscious that the future had in store for him the epaulettes of a brigadier-general. But that was the sequel with which a deserving fate rounded out his army life. It was the pride of his friends, though he was personally modest concerning the subject, that in five years, including some of the hardest campaigning of the war, he had risen from a private through all the intermediate grades to the high rank and honorable distinction of brigadier-general. There hardly exists a prouder military record than is contained in the mere statement of that fact, and it is made more conspicuous when it is recalled that these honors came to him not by a succession of fortunate accidents or the operation of kindly favoritism, but were earned on grim and deadly fields of battle.

During the war he participated in ten important engagements, and a much larger number of minor battles and skirmishes. At the battle of Winchester, near the close of the war, he received a well-nigh fatal wound, a bullet from the enemy traversing one side of his skull, but fortunately not penetrating.



You must pardon me if I have dwelt somewhat at length upon the military achievements of this admirable soldier, but the glories of war are ever dazzling. In viewing them, however, the honorable career of Gen. Enochs as a citizen and a legislator has not been forgotten. Sheathing his sword when the turmoil of the great conflict had subsided, he prepared himself for the practice of law, which thereupon became his chosen profession. After he was admitted to the bar he became known as a practical, clear-headed lawyer, a reputation which he not only sustained but increased during the entire period of his long practice.

In 1869 the allurement of politics diverted him from the law for the time being, and he was elected to the State Legislature. The attractions of that body evidently did not fulfill all his expectations, for after one term of service he declined to again be a candidate for the position, and returned to his law office.

In 1890 Gen. Enochs was nominated and elected as a member of the House of Representatives from the district in which he resided, beginning his active duties when the Fifty-second Congress was organized. He devoted himself faithfully to the duties he had been called upon by his people to assume, looking after the material interests of his locality, and at the same time giving studious attention to the broader issues involved in national affairs. He was known to his associates as an earnest and thoughtful worker in the committees to which he was assigned, where his practical qualities were most valuable.

His services in the capacity of a member of the House of Representatives were pleasing to his constituents, and without dissent he was nominated and elected to the present Congress. It was not his fate nor the fortune of his country that he should serve out that trust. A short time before the assembling of the Fifty-third Congress the hand of death lifted him from earth; and at his desk, where on the meeting day would have been handshakings and reunions, were found the somber emblems of grief.

Mr. President, in paying tribute this afternoon to this dead soldier and statesman we are doing honor to manhood, integrity, and courage. To the student of events, I point out his proud record as it is written on the pages of the history of his country. It is more eloquent than words that I may speak; more lasting than praises launched upon the echoes of this Chamber.

Mr. SHERMAN. As a further mark of respect to the memory of my late colleague in the House of Representatives, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, April 20, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, April 19, 1894.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

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

### SENATE BILL REFERRED.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 1134) to create the southern judicial district of the State of Texas and to fix the times and places of holding courts in said district and in the eastern and western judicial districts of said State; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted:

To Mr. MORSE, for two weeks, on account of illness.

To Mr. BARTHOLOLT, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia, for this day, on account of sickness.

### BRIDGE OVER THE MONONGAHELA RIVER AT PITTSBURG.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6055) to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Monongahela River in the city of Pittsburgh.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] for the consideration of this bill?

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if this bill is in the usual form?

Mr. DALZELL. It is in the regular form of bridge bills, and has been approved by the War Department.

Mr. SAYERS. And reported from the committee?

Mr. DALZELL. Reported favorably from the committee. It contemplates a free bridge to be built by the city of Pittsburgh.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand this is to authorize the erection of a bridge across the Monongahela River at Pittsburg?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. There are cities on both sides?

Mr. DALZELL. Cities situated on both sides of the river.

Mr. KILGORE. Is the river already crossed by bridges?

Mr. DALZELL. The river is already crossed by three or four bridges, but they are all toll-bridges, and the purpose of this act is to authorize the construction by the city of a free bridge.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to.

Mr. DALZELL. I move to amend by inserting in the ninth line of the first page, after the word "the," the word "twenty-fifth," so that it will read:

In the Twenty-fifth ward.

The SPEAKER. Without objection that amendment will be considered as agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DALZELL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

### MARY LEVANS.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5925) granting a pension to Mary Levans.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire if this bill has been considered in the Committee of the Whole at a Friday night session?

Mr. MOSES. It has not been so considered, Mr. Speaker; but I will say to the gentleman from Texas that this bill is unanimously reported by the committee. This old lady is now about 100 years old, and is in the poorhouse. Her husband fought under Jackson, and yet that war of 1817 was not covered by any general pension law. In consideration of the fact that we can only consider one or two bills here on any Friday night, it will take a month or two to reach this bill.

Mr. KILGORE. There is a regular course for the transaction of this business, and I can not afford to stand here and consent that the regular order with reference to this kind of a bill be suspended. I must object. Business ought to go on in the regular order anyhow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects.

### PACIFIC RAILROADS.

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, which I have been authorized by the Committee on Pacific Railroads to report favorably to the House. It is a resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to furnish information concerning first-mortgage bonds issued by and under the acts of 1862 and 1864 to aid in the construction of railroad lines to the Pacific Ocean.

The resolution was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, requested to communicate to the House of Representatives any information he may have, or can ascertain, as to what provision (other than the sinking fund now maintained in the United States Treasury under the act of May 7, 1878) the railroad corporations to whom bonds were issued by the United States under the acts of 1862 and 1864, to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, have made or propose to make for the payment at maturity of the bonds issued by said corporations, respectively, which are a prior lien to the bonds issued by the United States under the acts aforesaid, and whether any of such bonds are held and owned by either of said companies.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of this resolution of inquiry. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Why should not that resolution go to the appropriate committee?

Mr. REILLY. It has; and we have reported it back for consideration.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Very well.

The resolution was agreed to.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

The committees were called, but no reports were made.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. BAILEY in the chair.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of general appropriation bills, and the Clerk will report the title of the first bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9108) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895.

The CHAIRMAN. Under order of the House, adopted yesterday, there remain forty minutes to be allotted to the minority and fifteen minutes to be allotted to the majority, of general debate.

Mr. HITT. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, during my absence from the House yesterday afternoon attending to public business in the rooms of the Committee on Appropriations, I notice that there were some statements made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY] and by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] relative to ex-Minister Stevens, a distinguished citizen of my own State, which I desire to notice. The gentleman from Kentucky was pleased to say in the course of his remarks:

When the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania was perhaps making his canvass in that State, the Hawaiian question was considered and discussed in the House of Representatives for five days, and during the heat of his canvass it may have escaped the attention of my distinguished friend. I shall simply dismiss that subject now by reading for his benefit the action of the House of Representatives when that question was under consideration.

Then the gentleman read the first resolution adopted by this House.

Resolved, first. That it is the sense of this House that the action of the United States minister in employing United States naval forces and illegally aiding in overthrowing the constitutional Government of the Hawaiian Islands \* \* \* was contrary to the traditions of our Republic.

Subsequently, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] was pleased to say:

The truth is that Mr. Stevens had landed the troops to effect a revolution.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it may be true that in the mind of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY] this resolution, adopted by the House by 99 majority, as he said, is *res adjudicata* as he said, so far as this House is concerned, but it is not so far as public opinion of this country is concerned. Neither will it go down in history when that history shall be correctly written.

I desire simply, Mr. Chairman, to call attention to the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs upon this subject, and to what they have to say with reference to Minister Stevens. It should be noted, too, that no testimony was taken by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House on the resolution which they reported, and the vote taken by this House was without any information so far as any evidence was concerned, except so far as was contained in Mr. Blount's report.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Is it not true that the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives had about a hundred affidavits and statements of citizens of the Hawaiian Islands, furnished by Mr. Blount in his report?

Mr. DINGLEY. I do not know what affidavits the gentleman may have had in this matter beyond those contained in Mr. Blount's report.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. We had the report of Mr. Blount.

Mr. DINGLEY. That was of an *ex parte* character, and presenting substantially but one side.

Mr. HITT. There was nothing before the Committee on Foreign Affairs except the Blount report.

Mr. DINGLEY. There was nothing before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Illinois states, except the Blount report.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. We had before our committee over a hundred affidavits, made by prominent persons of Honolulu.

Mr. DINGLEY. But they were *ex parte* affidavits taken by Mr. Blount, and presented only on one side.

What I desire to call the attention of the committee to on this

subject and what I desire to go into the RECORD is the fact that the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Senate made a thorough investigation and had before them gentlemen who were familiar with and had a personal knowledge of all that occurred at Honolulu in this case, and that the chairman of that committee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama, in his report, made the following statement with reference to this point:

Justice to these gentlemen [Mr. Stevens and Capt. Witte] requires that we should say that the troops from the Boston were not sent into Honolulu for any other purpose than that set forth fully and fairly in the following order from Capt. Witte to the officer in command of the detachment:

"UNITED STATES STEAMSHIP BOSTON (SECOND RATE).

"Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, January 16, 1893.

"SIR: You will take command of the battalion and land in Honolulu for the purpose of protecting our legation, consulate, and the lives and property of American citizens, and to assist in preserving public order.

"Great prudence must be exercised by both officers and men, and no action taken that is not fully warranted by the condition of affairs and by the conduct of those who may be inimical to the treaty rights of American citizens. You will inform me at the earliest practicable moment of any change in the situation.

"Very respectfully,

"G. C. WILTSE,

Captain, United States Navy,

Commanding United States Steamship Boston.

"Lieut. Commander W. T. SWINBURN, United States Navy.

"Executive Officer, United States Steamship Boston."

And Senator MORGAN goes on to say:

The committee, upon the evidence as it appears in their report (which they believe is a full, fair, and impartial statement of the facts attending the precedent to the land of the troops, agree that the purposes of Capt. Witte and of Minister Stevens were only those which were legitimate, viz, the preservation of law and order to the extent of preventing a disturbance of the public peace which might, in the absence of the troops, injuriously affect the rights of the American citizens resident in Honolulu.

Could there be any more complete refutation of the contention of the other side than that which I have quoted coming from the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate after having thoroughly investigated this whole subject and presented in the report written by the distinguished chairman of that committee, Senator MORGAN of Alabama, a distinguished Democrat?

Further, Senator MORGAN in his report, goes on to say:

It is not a just criticism upon the correspondence of Minister Stevens with his government that he earnestly advocated annexation. In this he was in line with Mr. May and nearly every one of his successors as Secretary of State, and with many of Mr. Stevens's predecessors as minister to Hawaii.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my purpose in calling attention to the investigation made by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and to the report submitted by the chairman of that committee, Senator MORGAN of Alabama, is simply to show that the action of the majority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, and the adoption of the resolution which they reported, by the House, under the partisan spur that was put upon it, without hearing a single witness, without any knowledge as to the real facts in the case, is contrary to the recorded facts as ascertained and determined by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and is not *res adjudicata* in the sense claimed by the gentleman from Kentucky, as the gentleman from Kentucky yesterday said it was. I desire further to say to the gentleman that the decision which the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate reached will be that which history will approve.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Is it not true that the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate was compelled to confine its examination to such witnesses as were in the United States, having only between fifteen and eighteen persons to examine; whereas Mr. Blount, being at Honolulu, had an opportunity of taking the testimony, and did take the testimony, of those in office, of those out of office, of merchants, of sugar planters, of laboring men, of every class of people?

Mr. DINGLEY. Does not the gentleman from Kentucky know that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate informed the Senate and the country that that committee had availed themselves of every source of information relative to this matter, and that he in his report, reaching the conclusions which I have read, states that the facts therein presented are unquestionably the truth in this case?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. And that committee had Mr. Blount's report before them when they reached this conclusion.

Mr. DINGLEY. Certainly, they had Mr. Blount's report before them, as the gentleman from New York suggests.

Now, without any attempt to impugn Mr. Blount's veracity, I desire to say that it is evident from the witnesses he examined that he went there with a certain view of the case impressed upon his mind, and that the testimony he took was all on one side, and selected because it was on one side.

Mr. SICKLES. And there was no opportunity to cross-examine witnesses there while the witnesses examined by the Senate committee were cross-examined.

Mr. DINGLEY. And, as the gentleman from New York [Mr.

SICKLES] well observes, the witnesses examined by Mr. Blount at Honolulu were not cross-examined.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. They were not sworn either—many of them.

Mr. DINGLEY. The witnesses examined at Honolulu were, many of them, not sworn, and none of them were cross-examined; while the witnesses produced before the Senate committee were cross-examined at length by the able Senator from Delaware, Mr. GRAY, as well as Mr. MORGAN.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. The gentleman is mistaken in saying that all the witnesses examined by Mr. Blount were not sworn.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. He does not say that. He says that some of them were not.

Mr. DINGLEY. Now, Mr. Chairman, I know ex-Minister Stevens very well. I have known him for more than thirty years, and a more honorable, high-minded, truthful man than he does not live. He is a gentleman who has had more experience in diplomatic matters than almost any other man in this country, three or four excepted. He is a prudent man; he is a wise man; he is a man of the greatest integrity of character, a man whose statements will be believed to the fullest extent by every citizen in our State who knows him. He testifies as to that which he saw personally, not that which he heard; whereas Mr. Blount had no personal knowledge respecting what occurred at Honolulu, but obtained all his information at second hand.

It is not a question of veracity as between ex-Minister Stevens and Mr. Blount; because, I repeat, Mr. Stevens testifies to that which he saw, to that which he observed from day to day, while Mr. Blount had no personal knowledge of the matters in controversy. And I have felt it my duty, Mr. Chairman, at this time, not having been present when the discussion was had in the House, having been confined to my room by illness, to present these convincing facts entirely sustaining Mr. Stevens. I repeat the statement that ex-Minister Stevens, who has testified as to that which he saw, has a character for veracity in the State of Maine which would cause his statement to be taken as absolute verity, and it is certainly a great pleasure to me that the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Senate, instead of endeavoring to conceal the facts in this matter, instead of endeavoring to prevent the facts from coming out, instead of undertaking to defend the unjustifiable and wicked policy of the Administration toward Hawaii, as was done here in the House, sought to investigate the entire case; and notwithstanding the members of that committee were of both political parties, a majority, led by the Senator from Alabama, concurred in a conclusion as to the facts in accord with the report of Mr. Stevens.

It is certainly a source of pride to me, knowing ex-Minister Stevens as well as I do—having the utmost confidence as I have in him—to find that the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Senate, after having investigated this matter and heard witnesses as to what were the actual facts—witnesses who saw what transpired—have been enabled (Senator Morgan, the distinguished Senator from Alabama, having written the report) to report that the statement of Minister Stevens of what took place in Honolulu is substantially correct. And that is already the verdict of the people and will be the verdict of history. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on our side?

The CHAIRMAN. The minority have twenty-five minutes remaining.

Mr. HITT. Unless some gentleman on the other side is ready to proceed now, I ask that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] may be recognized.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman, if no other gentleman desires to speak at this time, I have a word to say in response to a query raised yesterday by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER], which I did not hear when he raised it. The query was, "What motive could this Administration have for undertaking to restore an overthrown monarchy?" I do not know what their motive was; but if I were to assign one, it would be an overmastering spirit of envious jealousy of successful political rivals—an eagerness to undo everything that it was in their power to undo which had been done by a previous Administration. Thus this Administration comes in to reverse the glorious traditions of our whole history, and with an attempted denial of undisputed facts turns the influence of this Government against a liberty-loving people which had struggled with and overthrown a half-civilized despotism.

I do not care how the Hawaiian Republic came into being. It is enough that it came on the ruins of a despotism; and it has maintained its position from the hour its independence was asserted to this. A majority in this House, in order to justify the course which it has taken, has construed every doubtful or disputed fact in favor of despotism and a defunct monarchy.

I care not what the motive may have been, it is enough, as the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] has just shown and the committee of the Senate has shown—and on this part of the report of Mr. MORGAN the committee was unanimous—that Mr. Blount in making his report to the President acted on insufficient evidence. Yet, members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs read to us resolutions adopted by a majority of the House condemnatory of their own country in its dealings with other nations struggling for institutions like ours, and would have us hence infer that the question of the propriety of that action is conclusive.

Mr. Chairman, I do not forget that the blackest chapter in American history was written in the blood of the pioneer settlers of Kansas, with the aid and coöperation of the Administration of James Buchanan, who found in the party zeal of the majority of this House and of the other at that time vindication and support. The chapter of next darkest hue in our history is being written by this Administration in the injustice and wrong heaped upon the liberty-loving people of the Hawaiian Islands in their struggle against a half-civilized despotism from which they have escaped. In the days of the struggle for freedom in Kansas, the greatest outrage perpetrated in our history, partisan zeal led a majority then on this floor and on the floor of the Senate to do and uphold it. The last outrage by an Administration of our Government upon the liberty and the rights of freemen, finds in the partisan zeal of the majority now a defense and apology. It is but history repeating itself. [Applause on the Republican side.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HATCH having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 5276) to authorize Commander F. W. Dickens, of the United States Navy, to accept the decoration of the cross of naval merit of the third class from the King of Spain.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 5978) to authorize the construction of a steel bridge over the St. Louis River, between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6556) "to provide for further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes."

The message further announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 1860) to authorize Prof. Asaph Hall, of the United States Navy, to accept a gold medal from the Academy of Science of France; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 74) for the proper enrollment of Thomas R. Proctor in the Navy of the United States.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee again resumed its session, Mr. BAILEY in the chair.

Mr. HITT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS]; formerly minister to Brazil.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit for the consideration of this House a brief statement which I think will illustrate the difference between the policy of the Republican party in foreign affairs and that of the present Administration.

On the 15th day of November the monarchy in Brazil existed in full force, and as far as human foresight could see there was no disposition to disturb the then existing form of government. But within twenty-four hours the spirit of liberty which our forefathers brought with them when they landed on Plymouth Rock, and which had made its progress southward with the steadiness and firmness of the rock on which they landed, asserted itself in Brazil, where existed the last vestige of monarchical government on the continents of North and South America.

The spirit had grown to such an extent that it was bound to assert itself when occasion arose, even against such a good monarch as the late Dom Pedro II of Brazil. In twenty-four hours a *de facto* government had been established, with every department of the Government in full swing; and the foreign representatives at the late court of Brazil were cut off from their home governments by cable, and had presented to them the great American question, "Now, what are you going to do about it?"

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who had the honor at that time to represent his country at the court of Brazil was a Republican,

and of the same political faith as the distinguished gentleman who represented his country in Hawaii. There was no doubt in his mind of the sympathy of the great statesman, who was a real Republican, who then occupied the chair of state, and that he would be heart and soul in favor of the foundation of a new republic. And going to the Provisional Government which had been established, the American representative demanded that communication be opened at once with his home Government. It was granted, and his dispatch went off and was received by the Secretary of State.

What did the great Secretary of State at that time, James G. Blaine, do? In three days he replied, "You will maintain diplomatic relations with the Provisional Government." And the mother of Republics in the north had the great privilege of being the first Government on the face of the earth to recognize the new republic in the south. [Applause on the Republican side.] What is the history of the Democratic party in a similar case? When on the adjacent islands, the continent already being free, imitating the example of Brazil and wishing to wipe out even from the adjacent land the effects of government of monarchy, the people appealed to the Republican Administration, the same principle of liberty prevailed and the same cordial reception was given by the Republican Administration; and to-day Honolulu would be republican in form and owe its existence to the United States were it not that, unfortunately, in the interim the political power of this country was changed, and we had that party come into power that seems to love and be imbued with the doctrines of Great Britain in free trade, monarchy, and every other doctrine that can be found in the text books of England; and the sympathy when it was asked was refused, and the treaty withdrawn from the Senate, to the everlasting shame of the mother of Republics on the American continent, and the new republic in the islands on the sea received no sympathy; and to-day she stands knocking at our door, still asking to be recognized. That appeal is still unheeded, as it was in the beginning of the struggling republic; it has been refused.

Such, Mr. Chairman, is the difference between the foreign policy of the liberty-loving Republicans and the Democrats, who seem to have sympathy with monarchies, both in their forms of government and in their treatment of its own laws. I have stated these facts, and had no desire to again participate in this discussion; but when I knew that this contract existed it seemed to me that it should go forth to the people and the country, that they may know which party to support in the foreign policy of this Government in the days that are to come. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COOMBS. They know that already.

Mr. HITE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Kentucky desires to proceed now—

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. If the gentleman has exhausted all the time they desire to exhaust on that side we will go on.

Mr. HITE. We will not consume more time, as I understand the gentleman from Kentucky does not intend to occupy further time on that side.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. How much time is remaining on the other side?

The CHAIRMAN. Sixteen minutes.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Does the gentleman from Illinois decline to occupy further time?

Mr. HITE. Unless the gentleman from Kentucky says something to which we desire to reply, we have no desire to occupy further time.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. But I have the right to conclude that debate, and have fifteen minutes. If the gentleman wishes to go on on that side he must go on now, or under the rule I will seek the floor to close the debate.

Mr. HITE. The gentleman has that right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the Chair is ready to recognize any gentleman of the minority to consume the time remaining to that side. If no gentleman on that side desires recognition the gentleman from Kentucky will be recognized to close the debate.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. But, Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will pardon me, I do not know by what rule the Chair may deprive the minority of its time, if it wishes to occupy it. As I understand it, the Chair says the minority must take its time now, and if it does not take the time the gentleman from Kentucky will be recognized to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Illinois will reflect a moment, he will recall the fact that on yesterday afternoon, by unanimous agreement in the House, it was determined that general debate would close in one hour and fifteen minutes, one hour of which time should be allotted to the minority and fifteen minutes to the majority.

The minority, in pursuance of that agreement, have consumed

something like forty-four minutes. The majority have consumed no time at all. The Chair announces his readiness to recognize any gentleman of the minority to consume the remainder of the minority's time. If no gentleman on that side desires to be recognized, the gentleman from Kentucky having reported this bill is entitled to close the debate.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I have no objection to the Chair recognizing the gentleman from Kentucky, but I understood the Chair to recognize him upon terms, namely, that the fifteen minutes of the minority be forfeited.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Illinois will permit the Chair, the Chair will suggest that there are sixteen minutes remaining to the minority; and that the Chair is ready to recognize gentlemen of the minority for that time. But if there is no gentleman who desires to occupy it, then the Chair will recognize the right of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY], who has charge of the bill, to close the debate.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Does the Chair hold that the minority, having time twice as extended as the majority, shall be forced to consume all their time before the majority say a word?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes that the gentleman having the bill in charge, under the rule, undoubtedly has the right to conclude the debate. The Chair thinks the rule is explicit on that subject.

Mr. REED. Will the Chair permit me to state what has been the custom of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. REED. The custom of the House has always been that if the minority do not choose to take their time, the majority may then conclude without further debate, but if they go on with their debate, the time that is allotted to the other side may be taken. The only method of forcing the minority to take the whole time is the coercion which results from a vote. I think the Chair, upon examination, will find that that has been the invariable custom.

For example, under the fifteen-minute rule, after the motion for the previous question, fifteen minutes being allowed on either side, there is no regulation as to how that time shall be taken. If the minority say they prefer to reserve their time, and the other side do not desire to speak, why, then, they go to a vote. On the other hand, if the minority take part of their time and the other side insist upon their going on and finishing it up, why I suppose they must do it, unless they go to a vote; but the minority can not be deprived of its time under the custom of the House. I think that has been the custom of the House always in similar cases. It is, however, usual for the affirmative to close.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word. I have endeavored during this debate to be as courteous and fair as I knew how to be. Yesterday gentlemen on the other side consumed more than half the time, and in the afternoon, when I asked that the debate might be limited, in order to be perfectly fair I agreed to take fifteen minutes on this side and to give them an hour. Now they are contending for the violation of a rule that has always existed. I am entitled to close this debate, as the Chair has intimated, and they have this morning occupied about forty minutes. I shall only occupy fifteen minutes, and I am surprised that gentlemen on the other side should contend for any change in the rules and precedents, or any change in the time.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have been here a good while, and I do not think I have ever seen such a rule observed as the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] has referred to. Invariably, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman in charge of the bill has the right, under the custom of the House, to open the debate, and he has the right to conclude it. Now, when it was agreed last evening that an hour should be granted to the minority, and only fifteen minutes reserved to this side of the House, the Chair has intimated very properly that the gentleman on the other side should consume their time. If there had been an equal division of time it would have been very proper, and I think has constantly been the custom of the House, to alternate between the members on one side and the other; but a large proportion of the time granted for general debate has been accorded to the other side of the House, and only a few minutes reserved to the chairman of the committee on this side, and I think the uniform rule of the House in all cases is to allow the gentleman having a measure in charge to close the debate.

Mr. REED. What the gentleman says, and the rule, which see the Chair has before him, refers to the closing of debate in the normal way, without agreement. But always when there has been an agreement, I think the custom is as I have stated. Whether anybody ought to insist is purely a question of courtesy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the force of what the gentleman from Maine states, as to when the previous question is ordered; but the Chair thinks that this matter is controlled by a different rule. The Chair thinks in this instance that the unanimous agreement of the House to close debate with an hour on one side and fifteen minutes on another still preserves the rule of the House under which the gentleman reporting the measure is entitled to close debate, the only difference being that instead of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs having an hour in which to close debate, he would only have fifteen minutes, in accordance with the unanimous agreement. The Clerk will read the rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

3. The member reporting the measure under consideration from a committee may open and close, where general debate has been had thereon; and if it shall extend beyond one day, he shall be entitled to one hour to close, notwithstanding he may have used an hour in opening.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that under the rule the effect of that agreement is to limit the gentleman from Kentucky to fifteen minutes instead of one hour, but does not impair his right to close debate.

Mr. HITT. If the Chair will permit me, I will state that my object in making the point was, it might operate as a hardship for one side to be compelled to make their whole debate before the other side began and before there had been any statement of the side of the gentleman, but I did not claim, and do not claim, that we should have the right to close debate.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I had expected to speak upon this measure under the five-minute rule, but as there seems to be a little time undisposed of, I give notice to the House that at the proper time I will offer the following amendment: On page 2, line 16, strike out the words "Hawaiian Islands," and on line 18 strike out the words "seven thousand five hundred dollars;" the object of this amendment being to strike out of the appropriation entirely the allowance of the minister to the Sandwich Islands. The reason for this proposition, Mr. Chairman, is simply this: This House was compelled, under a rule brought in by the Committee on Rules, at the dictation and request of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to discuss the whole Sandwich Island question at a time when President Dole had made a statement of his case and had presented it to Minister Willis, and Mr. Willis had withheld it until the sailing of the next ship; and we discussed the matter while this evidence was supposed to be upon the high seas between Hawaii and California.

It was an unheard-of and a remarkable proceeding for the House to take up a question involving great interests to the people of this Union, affecting the rights of the Government of the Sandwich Islands, and discuss it while the evidence upon the side of the defendant Government was *en route*, to be laid before Congress. Not only that, sir, but a committee in the Senate was, at the very time we had the hearing here, engaged in discussing the question and taking testimony; and after this House had acted thus, with its eyes closed against the evidence refusing to hear the evidence, whilst we were thus acting prematurely, the Senate were going on quietly and in a methodical way taking testimony. That testimony was subsequently laid before the nation, and to-day we may meet this question in the light of that evidence, and in the light of President Dole's statement.

In view of this additional testimony we ought to say that when we sent a minister to the Provisional Government of the Sandwich Islands, and that minister so far forgot his duty to the Government to which he was accredited as to advise it to resign and turn over its affairs to a government that the people had already condemned and turned out, that the least that this House can do is to say that the power which commands the purse strings of the nation shall cut off all allowance for a minister who seems to forget that he is an American citizen. I think we ought to indorse the earnest words of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] when he said, in his report:

When a crown falls in any kingdom of the western hemisphere it is pulverized, and when a scepter departs it departs forever.

This is the only way in which we can review the action then taken by the House. There is only one way that Minister Willis can be reached, and that is by striking out this appropriation. It is best for the House and the best interests of the country to strike out the appropriation, cut off the supplies of that minister, and call him home.

The CHAIRMAN. The minority still have twelve minutes remaining. The Chair is ready to recognize any gentleman on that side who desires to address the committee.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire particularly to discuss the items in the pending bill, and am perfectly content to leave the general matter of the reference made here to a distinguished citizen of the district which I have the honor to represent, the Hon. John Wanamaker, as it was presented by

my colleague [Mr. ADAMS] on yesterday. But there is one thing in the statement made by the honorable chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs which I do desire to correct. He stated that previous to his appointment as Postmaster-General Mr. Wanamaker was politically unknown. Mr. Wanamaker may not have had a national reputation as a leading Republican, but he did have a State reputation, and was as widely known as an active participant in political affairs as either the honorable gentleman who has recently been appointed Senator from the State of Georgia, or the junior Senator from the State of New Jersey, or many other gentlemen who have been chosen to Cabinet and other high positions in this nation, at the time of their selection.

As far back as 1852 the Republicans of Pennsylvania turned with practical unanimity to Mr. Wanamaker, and desired that he should become the candidate of the Republican party of Pennsylvania for the honorable position of Representative-at-Large in the Congress of the United States, and it was only the disinclination of Mr. Wanamaker to accede to their request which prevented him from being the unanimous choice of the Republican State convention of Pennsylvania at that time. He has been widely known as an active participant in every national contest for the last twenty years, has been upon prominent committees of advisers in reference to the conduct of political campaigns, and in the State of Pennsylvania he has been as widely known and as highly respected as a leading and active Republican as he was nationally known as a business man of exceptional ability and of undoubted and unquestioned integrity.

The CHAIRMAN. The minority have still nine minutes remaining. The Chair will recognize the gentleman on that side who desires to be heard. [A pause.] If no gentleman of the minority desires to address the committee, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY].

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask whether the debate upon the other side has been closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stated that the minority still had some time remaining, and that the Chair was ready to recognize any gentleman on that side who desired to address the committee, but no one responding, the Chair then said that if no member of the minority desired to be heard he would recognize the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. How much time have we left on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. Nine minutes.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I take the floor and yield the time to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I beg pardon; I am not asking for any of the gentleman's time. I simply desire to know whether debate on that side is concluded.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the Chair, I will occupy a minute in putting on record here a single sentence from the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in relation to the Hawaiian Islands. It will be found on page 17 of the majority report, written by Senator MORGAN of Alabama, the chairman of the committee, and is as follows:

When a crown falls in any kingdom 'n the western hemisphere it is pulverized, and when a scepter departs it departs forever; and American opinion can not sustain any American ruler in the attempt to restore them, no matter how virtuous and sincere the reasons may be that seem to justify him.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, am I recognized to close the debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised that the gentlemen on the other side have been so nervous both yesterday and this morning. The last Administration brought about such a complication of our foreign affairs that the friends of that Administration find it necessary to do all they can to extricate it from its embarrassing position. My distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS], who I believe was the last minister to Brazil under a Republican Administration, referred this morning to the case of Brazil.

Evidently the gentleman had not examined carefully the history of the proceedings in this House when he endeavored to use that case to illustrate the splendid foreign policy of the last Republican Administration. That Administration halted and hesitated about recognizing the Republic of Brazil, and did not recognize it until I had the honor to introduce a resolution here calling upon the President to inform the House why the Republic of Brazil had not been recognized. Then, when the Democratic party held up to the world the failure of this Republic to recognize Brazil as a republic, the Republican Administration tardily made the recognition.

But, since the gentleman has chosen to go into the foreign policy of the last Administration, I will endeavor to give him



information which he does not seem to possess. It was said here yesterday that an effort had been made to put back a dusky Queen on the throne of the Hawaiian Islands. Let me refresh the recollection of the distinguished gentleman who made that statement. Mr. Harrison's Administration was rendered conspicuous by the fact that within the first four months of his Presidency he appointed commissioners to meet at Berlin commissioners from Germany and Great Britain, by whom a tripartite alliance was agreed upon for the purpose of putting back upon the throne of Samoa a savage king called Malietoa.

Mr. McMILLIN. While my friend is on that question, he will bear in mind also (if he will permit the interruption) that this Government was forced to pay a part of the expenses of that kingly government.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I am coming to that. Not only did the last Republican Administration indorse the action of Mr. Phelps and his associates who met the commissioners of Germany and Great Britain at Berlin and united with them in putting a savage King on the throne of Samoa, but Mr. Phelps was rewarded for his services by being made minister to Germany. Under that agreement we are paying to-day a part of the salary of the chief justice of Samoa, who has more power than the King of Samoa. And we did help for a while to pay the expenses of maintaining the King on the throne. And that same treaty contains tariff regulations for Samoa.

Therefore, when gentlemen are rolling under their tongues as a sweet morsel the statement, which I deny, that there has been an effort on the part of this Government to put the Queen back by force on the throne of Hawaii, they should remember what was done in Samoa.

But while I am on the foreign policy of the last Administration, let me give you another chapter. There was a little trouble down in Chile, and this great Government, representing 65,000,000 of people, acting through the President of the United States, Mr. Harrison, sent to this House what was almost equivalent to a declaration of war against Chile after the chief executive of Chile had sent an apology.

Mr. HITT. But not after it was received.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. It was a humiliating spectacle that the President of the United States should send to this House and to the Senate a war message when a dispatch had already been received—and the date will show it—I had a copy of it at the time—which showed that that Government in Chile had agreed to make any reparation and any apology which might be deemed necessary for the incident which had occurred in Chile.

But I have only a little time and must hurry on. My friend, the new member from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS], could certainly have not referred to the foreign policy of the last Administration if he had been in the United States at the time and had an opportunity to study it. But he was absent as minister to Brazil. Let me give him another chapter.

I now refer to the Bering Sea policy of the last Administration. When Russia controlled Alaska and the waters of Behring Sea, and Canadian sealing vessels went into those waters, the Czar of Russia sent his warships there and said, "The seals at Pribilof Islands belong to Russia, and if you interfere with them I will sink your vessels."

After our Government acquired Alaska by paying \$6,000,000 to Russia we received \$300,000 per annum for our sealing interests at Pribilof Islands, and later we received \$150,000 per annum. But when Canadian sealing vessels interfered with our industry, what was the vigorous policy determined upon by the Republican Administration? They said, "We would like to arbitrate this question." And the award was against us. Our distinguished commissioners, Justice Harlan and Senator MORGAN, did the best they could; but when they went before that court of arbitration, composed of two gentlemen from Great Britain, one from France, one from Norway and Sweden, and one from Italy, they found they could not get what they desired.

The result was, a decision was rendered by the court of arbitration which greatly injured, if it does not destroy, our sealing interests, because on the fifth point submitted to the court of arbitration it was held that we had only the right of protection and the right of property in seals within the 3-mile limit. That is another illustration of the foreign policy of the last Administration.

Now let me call attention to the last point to which I desire to refer—the Hawaiian policy of the last Administration, which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW] has been compelled to make three speeches on this floor to elucidate, and which is still very much befogged.

Mr. Harrison, as President of the United States, sent to the Senate for confirmation a treaty which he had negotiated, within thirty days after that "peaceable revolution" at Honolulu; and in that treaty he recommended that this country pay three million and a quarter of dollars out of our Treasury into the treas-

ury of Hawaii; that we pay to the Queen an annuity of \$20,000, and that we give to the Princess the sum of \$150,000. If that Queen had no rights—if she was lawfully deposed—if, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania claimed yesterday, she was not a lawful Queen and the people who loved a republic had rightfully taken charge of the Government, then why did the President of the United States, Mr. Harrison, recommend that we pay three million and a quarter of dollars for the Hawaiian Islands, together with an annuity of \$20,000 to the Queen and a donation of \$150,000 to the Princess? I have already on this floor discussed this question at length. I have not time to go into it now, further than to say that I believe—and I think I showed this in an argument which I made on this floor a few weeks ago—that Minister Stevens in his conduct at Honolulu violated international law, violated his instructions, violated all the precedents of the past, and violated the Constitution, and that this House properly condemned him.

Mr. MILLIKEN. The gentleman is mistaken, I think, in his statement. The country does not believe it, and he can not make the country believe it.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I did not yield to the gentleman from Maine, but will answer his statement.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Of course, I knew the gentleman would be always courteous.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. The gentleman has the honor of representing the district in which Mr. Stevens reside, and it is very natural and proper that the gentleman should stand up and defend one of his constituents. But the Representatives of the people of the United States, by 99 majority on this floor, have put the seal of condemnation on the action of Mr. Stevens at Honolulu.

Mr. MILLIKEN. The gentleman will let me suggest that that does not represent the people of the United States—

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I do not yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky declines to be interrupted.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I listened on yesterday with surprise, and I may say with amusement, to the political speeches that were made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], as well as by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR]. It is strange how easily men who have suffered political defeat can become elated. There have been a few elections held in cities in the United States [derisive laughter on the Republican side], and the elation and enthusiasm, as well as the glorification of the Republicans on the other side of the House over the result, is without a parallel in political history.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. There was an election in the State of Pennsylvania, for instance.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. But all I ask you is to wait until the regular elections are held in November [renewed laughter on the Republican side]—wait until the Democratic party is heard from in the various States of this Union, and after the elections in November next you will find that the Democracy is again triumphant and Democrats will again have a majority in this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In this day of Republican exultation—I wish I had time to picture the enthusiasm and arrogance of Republicans when they took possession of every branch of the Government in 1893 and their defeat and overthrow in 1892—

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time allotted for debate by order of the House has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky be permitted to continue his prophecy of the future of the Democratic party.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky (continuing). I say, Mr. Chairman, in this day of exultation on the other side, I would like to be permitted to remind Republican Representatives of their Waterloo in 1892, and of their condemnation by the people—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the gentleman from Kentucky that the time for general debate has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Let his time be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not in order for the Committee of the Whole to extend the time.

Mr. MCCREARY. I should have been glad, Mr. Chairman, to have been permitted to gratify the gentleman in his desire, but as the time has expired I ask now that the bill be read by sections. [Cries of "Regular order."]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I rise to ask unanimous consent that the time of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs may

be extended a little longer to enable him to tell us what the foreign policy of the present Administration is in regard to Hawaii. [Cries of "Regular order!" ]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Maine that it is not in order to extend the time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Can not it be done by unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not in order to ask unanimous consent of the Committee of the Whole to extend the time after it has been limited by the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Is there not some method known to parliamentary law—

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. This is the regular order.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. I ask that the bill be read by paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is proceeding with the regular order. The gentleman from Indiana rises to a parliamentary inquiry, which he has a right to do under the rules of the House. The gentleman from Indiana will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I wish to ask if there is not some device known to parliamentary law to enable the gentleman from Kentucky to have an opportunity to predict more fully the future success of the Democratic party?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. The gentleman from Kentucky can manage his own affairs, and does not desire the assistance of either the gentleman from Maine or the gentleman from Indiana.

I ask that the bill be read by sections.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill by paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to Belgium, Denmark, Hawaiian Islands, Netherlands, and Venezuela, at \$7,500 each, \$37,500.

Mr. LACEY. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 16, strike out the words "Hawaiian Islands," and in line 17 of said page strike out "seven thousand five hundred."

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I make the point of order on the amendment that it changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Iowa on the point of order.

Mr. LACEY. If it does change existing law it retrenches expenditures, and is therefore in order. But it does not change existing law. It simply reduces the appropriation. It leaves the minister there, and pays him what he is worth. There is no question about the right of the House to reduce salaries or withdraw appropriations for salaries altogether as amendments to appropriation bills.

Mr. SPRINGER. This is simply a failure to appropriate for this purpose. That, I believe, is the only effect of it?

The CHAIRMAN. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SPRINGER. Well, the House may do that. We are not obliged to appropriate for the office if Congress does not see fit to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. No; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. COOMBS. I should like to have that amendment reported again.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. COOMBS. The gentleman's amendment in its present form is defective. I suggest that he perfect the text of it.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman only wishes to reduce the amount \$7,500, and not to strike out "seven thousand five hundred."

Mr. HITT. The Clerk can make the change by subtracting seven thousand five hundred from the footing.

Mr. LACEY. The word "thousand" will have to be inserted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will correct the amendment as suggested, and will then read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 16, strike out "Hawaiian Islands," and in line 18 strike out "seven," and "five hundred," so that it will read:

"Envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to Belgium, Denmark, Netherlands, and Venezuela, at \$7,500 each, \$30,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests that the words "seven thousand five hundred dollars each" should be allowed to stand.

Mr. LACEY. That was not in my motion to strike out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] is recognized to speak upon the amendment.

Mr. LACEY. Only a word, Mr. Chairman, by way of explanation. The Hawaiian question has been very thoroughly discussed in the general debate, and that debate would be meaningless unless this House or committee took some action upon it; and this is the only action by which the voice of the House itself can be heard. I believe, sir, that nine out of ten—yes, ninety-nine out of a hundred of all the people of the United States are thoroughly ashamed of the policy that has been inaugurated in the Sandwich Islands, and that to withdraw the salary of the minister, who has voiced that policy and who has attempted to carry it out by the destruction of the Republic in those islands, is the most effective manner in which the House can express itself. That being the case, I submit the amendment without further discussion.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. The act authorizing the appointment of a minister to the Hawaiian Islands was passed in 1874. We have therefore had a minister in the Hawaiian Islands for twenty years. I believe that the importance of that country, and the fact that all the leading nations of the world have ministers there, make it necessary and proper that we should keep a minister there.

The dispatches that we have received from the Hawaiian Islands indicate that peace now reigns supreme there, that the present minister is kindly received, that there is no animosity whatever between the Government of Hawaii and the present minister.

It is known to many members of this House that the present minister, Mr. Willis, is an able man, a fair man, a just man, and I have no doubt that he has discharged his duty, under most trying and difficult circumstances, as well as any minister could have discharged the duties required of him. I do not believe that at this time it would be good policy for our Government to either withdraw the minister to the Hawaiian Islands or repeal the law which authorizes the appointment and payment of a minister to the Hawaiian Islands, and when we are seeking to have the most amicable relations with the people of these islands and when we have announced that we desire that they shall pursue their own line of policy and manage their own domestic affairs, I do not believe that a majority of this House would be in favor of repealing the law which authorizes a minister to represent the United States in the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if the people of the country could be convinced and feel satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the attitude of the American Government toward the Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands is what the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] seems to fondly hope, I have no doubt that they would oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY]; but the trouble about the whole question is, we are taught by experience that a man or a political party or a country that does a dishonorable and dishonest thing once, deliberately and of premeditated malice, is very likely to do it again, and the trouble in this case is that there is presented in the record one of the most conspicuous acts of diplomatic atrocity, hypocrisy, and treachery ever recorded upon the pages of the diplomatic history of this country or any other country.

A revolution had been complete, a government *de facto* had been established. No matter how, no matter by what means. It is idle, it is puerile, it is childish to discuss that question. It had been established, and we had no more right to attempt to overturn it than we have to go back and overturn the revolution of the French people by which the third Napoleon was driven from power and the Republic established.

That is probably because this Government sympathized in the revolution. This Government, through its minister, was not opposed to the change of government there. When this condition of things was known to all the world, and when it was eminently proper for Mr. Cleveland's Administration to withdraw the treaty, if he saw fit to do so, it was a question clearly within the province of the President to seek to send a paramount minister, who, while under terms of respect, of recognition, of endorsement to the head of that Provisional Government, wishing it well, the record shows that the assault of Abner upon his fated victim was not more deliberately premeditated and prepared than was the assault by the American Administration upon the Provisional Government of those islands. It was dastardly; it was illegal; it put a blot upon the pages of American statesmanship such as no time can obliterate; and there is a doubt in the mind of Americans, and a doubt in the minds of the people of Hawaii as to what is the real attitude of the American Government to those islands to-day. That is the difficulty; and that is the reason why, possibly, the withdrawal of this minister, amiable as he is, honest as I know him to be, upright as no doubt he is, acting under these instructions, he is liable again to be driven to some overt act of treachery.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that the attitude of the Republican party upon this bill so far is most remarkable, and presents a very extraordinary spectacle. Not satisfied with their efforts upon every opportunity to assail the present Administration upon the record it has made it seizes the opportunity afforded by consideration of appropriations to maintain an important branch of the service to indulge in further denunciation with reference to the Hawaiian Islands. We have seen dignified statesmen upon the other side of the Chamber, upon the consideration of this bill, depart widely from the propositions contained in it, and avail themselves of this opportunity to continue their assaults. In the confusion of their frenzy they turn and rend themselves like a blind snake in the dog days, merely to show still further their venom against the Administration.

Here is a government recognized by the civilized governments of the world, with legations established there, and maintaining a legation here: a government at peace with us, and upon friendly and amicable terms, one whose trade is of the highest importance to us; and these gentlemen propose, actuated, as it appears to me, by small and unworthy spite against the President of the United States, to withhold the compensation of the minister who is accredited to that country, and who they testify themselves is a man worthy in all respects to represent this great Government.

I have been surprised, sir, having sat upon the committee and subcommittee which prepared this bill, with the course of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT], who first addressed the committee upon the pending bill. In the committee everything went beautifully and smoothly, and there seemed to have been the best understanding.

Now he has taken the floor of the House and made a long and eloquent speech, for he is always eloquent and I esteem him most highly, and gives us once again the wails of his party on the late trouble in Hawaii. They continue to assert and it was announced this morning, that the people vindicate ex-Minister Stevens and disapprove wholly of the Administration. If the people believe that they are right, why this constant and repeated reiteration upon the part of the Republicans of the House in denunciation of us and in justification of themselves?

If they feel so confident that they are right and justice supports them, why is it that they can not withhold their criticism, but must continue to parade before the country not only criticism, but vituperation, and resort to all the epithets that language affords to denounce the Administration and the gentleman selected by the Administration to represent us in that country? Mr. Chairman, the just are not wont to protest their justness, the innocent their innocence: too much protestation is evidence of conscious weakness.

So full of artless jealousy is guilt,  
It spills itself in fearing to be spilt.

Now, it is well known to the gentleman who proposes this amendment, and those who stand with him, that the amendment will not be adopted by the House; and he has no expectation that it will. He has no hope, I am constrained to believe, no desire, that it will, because I believe the gentleman from Iowa wants to maintain relations with the Government of the Hawaiian Islands, I believe he would not have us strike out this appropriation and suffer this amendment to pass. His only object is to bring up in the House constantly the denunciations of his party, which are wholly unjustifiable; and I believe the country sustains me in believing that the action of ex-Minister Stevens in landing the United States forces was for the purpose not of protecting American interests, but to carry out a scheme and conspiracy which he had entered into to overthrow an existing government in behalf of adventurers.

Several members addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just taken his seat has stated what the Democratic party on this floor believe, or profess to believe. It is, that Minister Stevens, with one hundred and sixty-two marines, including a brass band, overthrew the Hawaiian monarchy and established the Provisional Government. I regret that any attack should be made upon Minister Willis. Everybody concedes that Mr. Willis is a gentleman, and an able man. I object to any attack being made upon him by Republicans, because he is a standing witness to the high character, the executive ability, the strength of character, and the patriotism of John L. Stevens. Minister Stevens, according to our friends on the other side, established a Provisional Government in Hawaii with one hundred and sixty-two United States naval soldiers, including a brass band. He established this Provisional Government so firmly and so successfully that Minister Willis, with the United States Navy under his control, with Grover Cleveland at his back, has been

utterly unable to overthrow it. [Laughter.] Stevens has been gone for almost a year, and yet that Government, the work of his hands, as our friends on the other side claim, continues to exist and prosper. [Laughter.] Therefore, I say, Mr. Chairman, that Minister Willis is not only a standing witness to the high character and ability of Minister Stevens, but a standing witness to the strength, the stability, and the permanency of the Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands. [Laughter.] Let him stay there and draw his salary.

Mr. MILLIKEN. The gentleman from Kentucky inquires why these repeated defenses of the Republican party are heard upon this floor. It is simply because the policy of the Republican party as carried out by the last Administration and by the very worthy and eminent minister who then represented this country at the Hawaiian Islands has been repeatedly attacked here. Our Democratic friends can not seem to forget their own unfortunate mistakes, and when other people would willingly let them be buried with the dead, they try to dig up the old rotten carcasses, and if possible breathe into them some semblance of respectability. I have been amused at their persistency. They remind me of the old lady who called her husband "Scissors." He concluded he would stop that thing, and finally he chuckled her down into a well. She still kept saying "Scissors," and when at last he held her under the water so that she could not say "Scissors" any more, she held up her two fingers and worked them like the two blades of a pair of scissors. [Laughter.]

Now, after the Hawaiian policy of the present Administration has been condemned by the most distinguished Democrat in the Senate, after it has been condemned by the majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations of a Democratic Senate, after it has been almost universally condemned by the press and the people of this country, our friends still seem to feel as if they can rick it up and galvanize it into a little respectability. As I said yesterday, it shows a sublimer faith in the power to do something impossible than I have ever seen manifested before. So far as Minister Stevens is concerned, he was sustained by the Administration that sent him to Hawaii when President Harrison sent to the Senate for ratification the treaty framed between this country and the Hawaiian Islands.

He was sustained by our Administration, and he has since been sustained overwhelmingly by the verdict of the people and the press of this country; and I pity the stupidity of the man, whether he be Democrat or Republican, who has not felt in the air the patriotic rebuke given by the people of the United States to the present Administration for its attempt to restore a rotten monarchy in Hawaii. The gentleman says that the Administration did not try to do that. Why, sir, the President in the message which he sent to this House and which was read from that desk, stated that he had done it. But, says my friend from Kentucky, the President did not use force. Why did he not use force? It was because he discovered before he got very far into the business that the people of this country would not allow him to use force, in violation of the Constitution of the United States, to restore a rotten monarchy in place of the enlightened and civilized government that had been set up in those islands where the American people have been so large factors in bringing about the degree of civilization that exists there to day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted.

Mr. HITT. I move to strike out the preceding word. Ordinarily, Mr. Chairman, a motion to withdraw a minister from a country would express a diminution of regard, and if this were an ordinary case, I could not assent to it. But our minister to the Hawaiian Islands has occupied a position which the world has well understood as intrinsically and essentially hostile to the existence of the Government of those islands. The President of that Government has so solemnly declared, and we have had that declaration communicated to this House.

The minister who represents us there has long since lost all usefulness in maintaining or increasing friendly relations. He was at one time an object of dread, and he has been an object of distrust all the time. It is true that is a small country. It is one of the slender powers of the world, and under ordinary circumstances it would require the special reason of its position, so adjacent to our Republic and so important to our future, as containing the position which is the Gibraltar of the Pacific, to justify our keeping a minister there at all. We have a consul-general who can attend to the current business that arises. The withdrawal of this minister would not, I am sure, be permanent, for the strength of public opinion in this country, whatever may be the force of party organizations or the head of a party to resist for a time, is always irresistible in the end.

The strong sentiment of the American people will constrain

the Administration in time to change its policy of hostility or duplicity toward Hawaii; and such an expression as this from the House of Representatives would be received as an expression of disapprobation of its course by the people of our country, as it has excited aversion in the people of the Hawaiian Islands and that Government, though it is friendly to our country, with so much more than an ordinary friendship, that all they crave is to be merged in our existence and be a part of us.

Mr. PICKLER. As I understand the gentleman from Illinois, he contends that the attitude of the present Administration has been hostile and is still hostile to the Provisional Government of Hawaii.

Mr. HITT. It is so regarded by that Government; and there is no need of continuing a minister there unless he can be useful to us.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. I was not surprised that some gentlemen on the other side should take an extremely partisan view of this question; but I was surprised that my distinguished colleague [Mr. HITT], who was formerly chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and who has had long experience in the foreign service of this Government as a member of our diplomatic corps—I was surprised that he should have stated to this committee and to the country that we should "rebuken" our present minister by refusing him his salary, the result of such withdrawal of compensation being necessarily the withdrawal of the minister.

Mr. HITT. I did not say that we should rebuke the minister, but that we should rebuke the Administration for its policy, which that minister has carried out, I must say, in a manner which is very honorable to him personally, in his faithful but painful and reluctant labors in carrying out instructions which no one approves.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then the gentleman has made this more a partisan matter than I supposed he intended. He wants to "rebuken this Administration" by withholding the compensation of the minister to the Hawaiian Islands! I had supposed that in preference to all other places in this service the gentlemen on the other side of the House would desire a diplomatic representative in the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. BOUTELLE. What for? Why should we have a minister there?

Mr. SPRINGER. For the same reason that we have a minister at other places.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Is he there to tear down a government or to set one up?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not yield to the gentleman for an interruption, unless he asks for information; and I can not give him any information on this subject—

Mr. BOUTELLE. I do not think you could.

Mr. SPRINGER. He is so thoroughly advised already.

The object of this amendment, then, is to "rebuken this Administration"—for doing what? For refusing to sanction what the previous Administration had done in regard to Hawaii, for withdrawing a treaty which provided a pension for this deposed Queen at \$50,000 a year, and a gratuity of \$150,000 to the heir apparent? The late Administration agreed upon a treaty of that kind, which in effect concedes that the Queen was unjustly deposed, that her Government had been taken away, her prerogatives despoiled. After accomplishing her overthrow, that Administration wanted to make reparation to her by paying money out of our Treasury, as I have indicated. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] suggests to me, which is true, that the indebtedness of the Hawaiian Islands, amounting to \$3,250,000, was, by the terms of the proposed treaty, assumed by the United States.

All this was proposed and advocated by the last Administration. And because Mr. Cleveland has withdrawn that treaty, refused to recognize that contract which Mr. Harrison made and the Republican party approved, the gentleman from Illinois proposes now to "rebuken the Administration." I think the present Administration deserves the thanks of the country for refusing to ratify that agreement, and for withdrawing it from the Senate.

Mr. BOUTELLE. This Administration will never get the thanks of the country.

Mr. SPRINGER. This Administration is not asking the thanks of gentlemen on the other side of the House, and especially not of the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BOUTELLE undertook to make a remark, but was rapped to order by

The CHAIRMAN, who said: The gentleman from Maine must not interrupt the gentleman from Illinois without his consent.

Mr. SPRINGER. So far as the foreign policy of this Administration is concerned, it needs no defense at my hands. The gentleman now at the head of our foreign affairs as Secretary of

State is one of the most eminent statesmen of the country. And what seems to disturb the gentlemen on the other side is the fact that he was so recently a member of their own party. But everybody will concede that Secretary Gresham is both able and honest, and that he has been faithful and fearless in the vindication of the dignity and honor of this country.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me for a question?

Mr. SPRINGER. No; I can not yield. The gentleman does not want information.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Well, I would not get any information probably—

The CHAIRMAN (rapping for order). The gentleman from Illinois can not be interrupted without his consent.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I asked the gentleman from Illinois to yield for a question—

The CHAIRMAN. And he declined to yield.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. And then he added that I did not want any information; and I replied that I would probably receive no information from the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN (who had been endeavoring to silence Mr. WILSON by the use of the gavel). The gentleman from Washington must be in order.

Mr. SPRINGER. I dislike very much to have a scene of this kind occur in the Committee of the Whole of this House. I am afraid the gentleman from Washington has lost his temper.

Mr. WILSON of Washington again attempted to make himself heard.

The CHAIRMAN (after rapping loudly for order). The gentleman from Washington knows the rules, and must on reflection realize that he is not observing them.

Mr. SPRINGER. I hope the gentleman from Washington—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] has expired.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I move to amend by striking out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending amendment, without objection, will be considered as withdrawn.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does the Chair think that so much of the time as was occupied by the gentleman from Washington should be taken out of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. The time was kept by the Speaker's clerk, by whom the Chair was advised that the time of the gentleman from Illinois had expired.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I regret, of course, that I could not have yielded instantly to the command or request of the very able gentleman who now occupies the chair in this committee, but when I asked the gentleman from Illinois, then occupying the floor, a man who has represented his district for a long time, an old member on this floor, if he would yield to me for a question, he declined and very properly declined to be interrupted. But when he went further than that and declared that I did not want to interrupt him for information, then I had a right, sir, as a member on this floor to reply to a retort that he made which was in itself out of order.

The gentleman from Illinois said that I did not wish any information upon the subject he was discussing. Perhaps that is true as far as he is concerned, for I would not probably have obtained any information from the gentleman from Illinois. But he was speaking in regard to the foreign policy of this Administration, and I desired to ask the gentleman only, inasmuch as he had spoken upon that foreign policy, why it was that this Administration had gone into British Columbia and had there inaugurated a foreign policy of letting contracts to coal American war vessels to residents of British Columbia instead of awarding them to the people of the United States? Just across the line, on the Straits of Fuca, is to be found as fine coal as any produced in British Columbia; and yet this Administration, sailing the American war steamer Yorktown—think of it, with all the old-time honor of that name—the American man-of-war Yorktown is coaling across the line in British Columbia, and this Administration has given to those people a contract for \$100,000 worth of coal.

Now, my people are in distress, as are the people all over the country. Our people, the people of my country, want work and they want to develop their own coal mines. They want the Government of the United States to give the contract to the laboring people of the United States. And I rose, therefore, to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he had any information in regard to that subject or why a contract of this character had been entered into with a foreign country?

Mr. Chairman, I should have known that the gentleman did not have any information on the subject, because he has but little information upon any subject in which this country is interested. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, I did not desire to take any part whatever in the wrangling which may have been produced during the discussion of this question; but I think a word of justice may appropriately be said for a very distinguished and faithful public servant in connection with this discussion, and I will say it.

I believe I will not make too much of a claim for myself when I say that the members of this House who know me know full well that I am not slow to engage in the advocacy of any wise economy that looks to the prevention of improper and improvident expenditures, and to the saving of all that can be saved of that which comes from the sweat and the toil of the people who pay the taxes.

But this is a proposition to abolish the salary of an important officer of the Government. It is true I have never had that confidence in the necessity for an excessive or a very large number of foreign ministers that other gentlemen seem to have had. I have believed that some provision made for the improvement of the consular service abroad would probably meet most of the demands of the public service in that direction. But we have the system as it is.

The Government of the United States is represented at the Hawaiian Islands to-day by Hon. Albert S. Willis, a gentleman who is not unknown to the members of this House nor to the country. He was for ten years the representative of the district now so ably represented by the gentleman who sits in front of me [Mr. CARUTH], and I think that those who knew him will say that for disinterested patriotism, for distinguished ability, for untiring assiduity in the discharge of every public duty, no district could have a more faithful representative than he. He was educated, painstaking, and able. His ability as a legislator here commended him to the attention of the President for the appointment to one of the most delicate and troublesome of our complicated missions; and I suppose that it will be conceded by all that no man could have more carefully, studiously, and faithfully discharged the important and delicate duties imposed upon him than did Mr. Willis. He went to the island at its most trying period. Few men could have discharged the trying duty with the coolness and ability he has displayed.

I do not know of any place where there has been more call for painstaking care and judicious action than in connection with that mission, and I know of no man in the whole range of my public service who has met the requirements of the place with greater ability and with purer patriotism than has this representative. I felt that this much was due to one who has served his country long and well, and I do not believe that at a time when our relations with those islands are so complicated, peculiar, and strained, it is proper to abolish our diplomatic relations with the islands. Nor do I believe that any American ought to want a man of his ability to serve his country without compensation. I therefore oppose the amendment. And I have not felt at liberty to sit and hear one attacked whose patriotism I know to be of the purest, who loves his country above self, and whose every effort in life has been to serve it faithfully, without saying thus much that is due him when so much more could be said and would be said if time permitted.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted. Without objection it will be considered as withdrawn.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I renew the formal amendment.

It seems to me that if this appropriation is withheld, we should place the withholding of it upon the true ground, namely, that so far as the Government of Hawaii is concerned, that government does not have the necessary confidence in the present American minister, and that he would not be useful and the Administration will not recall him. I did not arise to repeat what has been better said than I myself can say it, but I did arise for the purpose, upon the whole, of expressing my dissent to the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY]. It seems to me I would not be willing to abolish this place, and I doubt the wisdom of withholding the appropriation.

Then again the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] and other gentlemen, seem to place it largely upon personal grounds.

Mr. McMILLIN. I want to correct the gentleman. I did not place it upon personal grounds. I look to my country first, I hope, and then to other considerations. That is Democratic.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, yes! my friend is always Democratic, according to his statement. He seeks to defend Mr. Willis, and to commend him, and so on. Well, now, I know Mr. Willis. I recollect him very well, and I always found him a most excellent gentleman. Yet I must say that I was surprised that he, coming from the chivalrous State of Kentucky, should remain in the service of the United States and carry out his instructions. I know that most people from that State, where the

average citizen would defend his honor with his life if necessary, if anybody should accuse him of double dealing—I say I know that most citizens of that State from which the gentleman in charge of the bill [Mr. MCCREARY] hails, would not have accepted that service.

That chivalrous Representative [Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky] himself would have resigned his place, or he would take personal vengeance upon anybody who would dare intimate that he would double-deal for himself or at the command of anybody else. Now, Minister Willis, whom I esteem highly, did go as our representative to Hawaii. He did receive his instructions. He did make air war with the government that was in existence and in the night time he conspired with a subject of that government to overthrow it.

Mr. LACEY. Why keep him there?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. The gentleman from Iowa says why keep him? He carried out his instructions. Perhaps the right that loyalty to the Administration and the desire to hold the place required him to do it. Now, I am inclined to think that I would make this appropriation, and I want to say that I would go further than that. I would vote a deficiency of three or four thousand dollars to Minister Willis, whom we all know so well, for the wear and tear on his conscience and the sacrifice of his Kentucky chivalry. [Laughter.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. I should like to have the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER]. In the first place, I deny that the proposition to pay the deposed Queen \$20,000 a year was any admission or confession upon the part of this Government that she had been wrongfully deposed or that she had any existing rights at the time of the making of the treaty. I say that neither the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] nor the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky] nor any other gentleman on this floor, can show by law or by precedent, or by any international adjudication of the question, that he is right in the declaration which he has made on that point. It was simply a proposition in the nature of a gratuity, for the purpose of peace and harmony, to get rid of the idea in the minds of her former subjects, if there was any such, that she had been harshly and unjustly treated by the United States. It has been done so often in the history of other countries that it is idle for any man on the floor of this House, at this late day, to urge that as an argument.

Now, there is a single other proposition to which I wish especially to invite the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER]. It is very easy to say that an American official is a great statesman. The word statesman is a sort of generic term that is used when there is no other word available. It is like the lawyers wrestling with the word "quasi-corporation." You generally find a lawyer who can not give any other definition of some sort of an organization that is not quite a corporation, calling it "quasi-corporation." And when you can not call a man a great man because of any specific thing he has done, why, you just call him a great statesman, and then you are out of the woods.

Now, I have not introduced this subject into this debate. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] introduced the subject and referred to the Secretary of State as a great statesman. That is an allegation on his part that upon demand and notice, requires a bill of particulars and specifications. The mere declaration is not sufficient. The common counts will not answer in that case. Now, will the gentleman append to his very eloquent remarks a bill of particulars, based upon the literal and proper use of the words? What has the Secretary of State done, and when did he do it? He has held office ever since the war, without a break, always before this at the hands of the Republican party, after his great and valuable services in the Army. He began after that, I believe, as a State agent of the State of Indiana in regard to the pay of soldiers. From that day to this, in one capacity or another, all the way down to the present time, he has held office, always at the hands of the Republican party, until his present office.

I am not here criticising his rulings and judgment upon the bench of the court in which he presided. The record of the Supreme Court of the United States is possibly one of the items that the gentleman may want to append, and I would commend to him a very careful consideration of those important documents before he again launches that general suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. GROSVENOR. I want to finish the point I am making, and I ask for two minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSVENOR. He was Secretary of the Treasury at one time. I call the attention of the gentleman to that record. It is neither hot nor cold. It is not disparaging or undisparaging; but there is nothing in it that justifies the gentleman's declara-



tion. He was Postmaster-General for a short time, but the routine of that office was not disturbed; and there is nothing in it to either injure or magnify the administration. Now, will the gentleman point out what he has done as Secretary of State in reference to Hawaii that commends his administration? I have already characterized whatever connection he may have had with the Hawaiian business. Now, will the gentleman point out something else that he is proud of? What is it; will he attach some specific fact in support of his declaration that we ought to accept all that he does without any investigation, because he is a "great statesman"? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SPRINGER. I move to strike out the last word.

The gentleman from Ohio has taken exception to my remark that the present Secretary of State was a "great statesman," and desired me to offer something specific to prove it. He was appointed a district judge of the United States by a Republican President. But I will go back a little further. Before that he served his country honorably and with some distinction in the late war, and received an honorable wound in battle, notwithstanding some persons have charged that he did not perform actual service.

Mr. GROSVENOR. One word there. The gentleman will not construe anything I said as disparaging his military record.

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not. After serving his country during the war he was appointed a district judge of the United States by a Republican President. He was transferred from that position by a Republican President and made Postmaster-General. He was afterwards transferred from that position and made Secretary of the Treasury in the Cabinet of a Republican President. He was appointed as a circuit judge of the United States by a Republican President. He was afterwards, while circuit judge, endorsed by the Republican party of the State of Illinois as their candidate for President, and received the vote of that great State in the Chicago convention for the office of President of the United States. He stood as high in the councils of the Republican party as any other gentleman; and the very fact that the Republican party of the State of Illinois selected him as its choice for President of the United States is a certificate of statesmanship as great as any gentleman on that side of the House ought to ask me to give.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That is a very handsome indorsement of republicanism. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman says that that is a very handsome indorsement of republicanism. It is an indorsement of the man by the Republican party; and I believe if he had adhered to the policies of that party he would have been now their favorite candidate for President of the United States at the next election. [Cries of "Oh" on the Republican side.] His fault simply consists in the fact that he has withdrawn from their organization.

Mr. MORGAN. What evidence have you that he does not now adhere to the policies of the Republican party? [Great laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. My distinguished friend from Missouri thinks that he has not given any evidence that he is now a Democrat. [Laughter.] Perhaps some gentlemen upon this side of the House indulge that opinion; but I for one rejoiced when I heard of his appointment as Secretary of State, and I have seen nothing in his acts that has caused me to change my opinion in regard to his appointment. I believe it was a very able and fortunate one, and that the country indorses his administration. I also believe that the great mass of the Democratic party is satisfied with the manner in which he has discharged the duties of the office. In the estimation of gentlemen upon the other side of the House he ceased to be a statesman when he ceased to be a Republican.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MERCER. I think the Chair ought to suppress the applause on the Democratic side. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this pending amendment is exhausted. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be regarded as withdrawn, and the question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY].

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I had addressed the Chair.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Chair had recognized me, but I will yield to the gentleman with great pleasure.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. You are always very polite. This House understands that. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. And I hope the gentleman will facilitate what I have to say afterwards by throwing a little luminosity on what he regards as the present policy of the Administration with reference to Hawaii.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. If the gentleman is as good a student of public affairs as he should be he understands the policy of this Administration as well as of the last. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have debated this amendment for some time and I would like to have an agreement as to the closing of the debate.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Do I understand that the gentleman from Kentucky is going to avail himself of my courtesy in yielding to him to try to cut me off from making a few observations? [Laughter.]

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Not at all. I would not deprive the committee of the pleasure of hearing the gentleman. [Laughter.] But this amendment has been debated for some time, and as I think the members of the committee are ready to vote upon it, I desire to come to some agreement to close the debate. I therefore ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment be closed in ten minutes.

Mr. HITT. There are two gentlemen on this side who desire to speak for five minutes each.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Then I ask unanimous consent that debate may be closed in fifteen minutes.

Mr. LOUD. If I may be recognized for a part of that time I shall not object.

Mr. LACEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the pending amendment be closed in twenty minutes. That gives ten minutes to each side.

The question was taken on the motion of Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky, and the Chairman declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. LACEY. I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 81, noes 2.

Mr. LACEY. No quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of no quorum being made, the Chair will appoint to act as tellers the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. LACEY, and the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. MCCREARY.

The tellers took their places; but, pending the count,

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky said: Mr. Chairman, we have come to an agreement. I withdraw my motion, and I ask unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and the pending amendment close in thirty minutes, giving fifteen minutes to each side.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I have not had the advantage of that information from the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs which would have facilitated and perhaps illuminated the few remarks that I desire to make. It is perfectly evident from what has been said here already on both sides, that there is no general desire to sever or interrupt our amicable relations with the present Government of the Hawaiian Islands. There is a very strong feeling in this House, as in the country, that we ought to have different relations from those of the recent past, and ought to be differently represented now in the Hawaiian Islands. I do not think that the best or the proper solution of this question would be a vote to abolish the Hawaiian mission. I desire that we shall be represented by a friendly minister of the United States in Hawaii until we annex that beautiful country, which will be accomplished in the near future as certainly as the tides of the Pacific ebb and flow. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I think it would be the suggestion of patriotism and of regard for the best interests of our country and of the world, for this House now, after we have had time for all partisan ebullitions to subside, for false policies to be abandoned, and for more than a second thought—I think, I say, we ought now to be able to deal with the Hawaiian question with regard to other and more weighty considerations than that of sustaining what has been acknowledged by the most lenient opinion in both political parties to be the most gigantic diplomatic blunder in our history. [Applause.] Gentlemen talk about Republican assaults upon the Democratic policy in Hawaii! Why, sir, the ink is hardly dry upon a speech made in another place by one of the most distinguished Democrats in the United States, a gentleman whose support as a candidate for President was very much more widely recognized than that of the Secretary of State to whom the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] has just alluded; and that Democratic leader whose frank utterance is now reverberating from one end of the country to another, and giving old-fashioned Democrats the only thrill of spasmodic enthusiasm they have experienced for more than a year, had this to say about the famous or rather infamous Administration foreign policy in Hawaii:

Our foreign policy, especially that relating to Hawaii, it must be admitted, has not met the expectations of the people. A sense of humiliation prevailed when the project for the restoration of a deposed monarchy was unfolded by the Administration, and gratification ensued when its abandonment or failure was reluctantly announced, influenced largely by an aroused

public sentiment. That unfortunate contemplated policy was a blunder, and a blunder is sometimes worse than a crime.

Does anyone dispute the party orthodoxy of that arraignment?

Why, Mr. Chairman, there is not a city, or town, or hamlet, or crossroads in the United States that has not given evidence of that "aroused public sentiment." It has been manifested everywhere except on the Democratic side of this Democratic House of Representatives and in that "cave of the winds," the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I want to ask the chairman—and he may answer when I have finished—what has been done with the proposition which I introduced here nearly two months ago to solve this identical difficulty?

Mr. M. CREARY of Kentucky. It was voted down.

Mr. BOUTELLE. When and where?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. In the House of Representatives.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Why, Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend, for whom I have great regard, seems to have taken so long a nap over these Hawaiian matters that he has not even yet wakened up to know that I introduced a resolution here almost two months ago for the recall of the present minister at Hawaii; and it has been slumbering in his committee—

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I thought the gentleman referred to the resolution which he introduced in regard to the Hawaiian Islands, and which was voted down in this House.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I referred to the resolution which I introduced, as I have said, February 26, two months ago, and which was published on page of 2424 the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—a resolution which it seems to me provides fittingly for a response to the overwhelming desire of the people of this country—not simply a Republican demand, but one that has found as emphatic expression in the columns of that great and influential organ of Democracy the New York Sun, and that other great organ of another wing of the Democracy the New York World, which have day after day reiterated the demand that Minister Willis should be recalled, in the interest of decorous and dignified relations with the Hawaiian Government.

This resolution which I introduced covers the ground, I think, better than any speech I could make, and I will read it.

The CHAIRMAN. The five minutes of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] have expired.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. HITT. I ask that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] be permitted to occupy the time allotted to our side.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. The time of the gentleman from Maine is to come out of the fifteen minutes allowed to that side under the agreement?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair. The Chair hears no objection to the gentleman from Maine being permitted to proceed.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Chairman, on the 26th day of February last—I want to remind the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this matter; I want to jog his memory—this resolution was introduced and referred to that committee:

Whereas the Government of the United States would not tolerate the presence at its capital of any foreign diplomatic representative who had engaged in any movement or performed any act in derogation of its authority or calculated to disturb or destroy its administration—

And I want to say right here that if there is a solitary sentence or sentiment embodied in these resolutions to which the gentleman from Kentucky, the distinguished chairman of the committee, or any gentleman on the other side of the House, takes any exception, as a proper expression of American doctrine, I want him to call my attention to it as I proceed—

and

Whereas the Government of the United States has repeatedly refused to entertain foreign diplomatic representatives who have even in the slightest degree seemed to be interfering in our domestic affairs or acting in a manner prejudicial to the dignity and interests of this Government; and

Whereas it has been the time-honored principle and policy of the United States to extend to all other governments, whether humble or great, the same honorable dealing and good faith that we demand for ourselves as a nation; and

Whereas no civilized government can be expected to regard with favor a diplomatic representative of another nation who has engaged in secret conference with its enemies and who has openly and formally demanded of said government that it surrender its authority to said enemies; and

Whereas the extraordinary and most praiseworthy forbearance of the Government of the Hawaiian Islands, in relation to the active and aggressive efforts of the present United States minister to secure its overthrow, strongly attests the desire of that Government to preserve the most amicable relations with the people of the United States in the face of continued and unparalleled provocation; and

Whereas the people of the United States have peculiar interests in the good government of the Hawaiian Islands, and have for more than half a century asserted the priority of American influence therein, based on the ties of kinship with those who have built up there a Christian civilization, and upon our important commercial and geographical relations with those islands; Therefore

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House that the most sacred obligations

of good faith, the highest mutual interests of the United States and the friendly government of Hawaii, the plainest dictates of international comity, and the imperative duty of avoiding further risk of complexity in the incitement of disorder and possible bloodshed in Hawaii require that the present United States minister to the Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands be immediately recalled and superseded by the appointment of another minister who will be unhampered by the lamentable incidents of the recent past, and who will be able and willing to represent—

And here I quoted in the resolution the language of Mr. Willis's credentials from President Cleveland to President Dole—

the "sincere desire" of the people of the United States "to cultivate to the fullest extent the friendship which has so long subsisted between us," and to "constantly endeavor to advance the interest and prosperity of both Governments."

Now, sir, I ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs what action has been taken in regard to that resolution? Has your committee [addressing Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky] authorized the reporting back of that resolution? Have you taken affirmative action upon it?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I will give the gentleman answer when he gets through.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I would like to know now whether there has been any action taken.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. There has been no report.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I ask the gentleman whether those resolutions have ever been brought to the attention of his committee?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be notified when I am within five minutes of the expiration of my time.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will give me sufficient time, I will answer him fully.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Chairman, if the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not prepared to answer "yes" or "no" as to whether his committee has acted upon or considered at all a resolution of this urgent character which has been pending before the committee for nearly two months, I am perfectly willing to let him answer in his own time, and be as deliberate about it as his committee has been in dealing with the subject.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. The degree of feeling which the gentleman manifests is unworthy of the situation and of himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] has now about four and a half minutes remaining.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I will reserve that time.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE], who has just taken his seat, has manifested a good deal of excitement in regard to Hawaiian matters before to-day in this House. [Laughter.] I always listen to him with interest, and am glad to give him information when he seeks it. It is true that the gentleman from Maine introduced the resolutions which he has just read, and they were referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Immediately after they were delivered to the Committee on Foreign Affairs they were referred by me to a subcommittee, but the gentleman from Maine, with all of his industry, with all of his usual excitement and zeal, has not, as I am informed, appeared before the subcommittee to give any reason why they should report favorably upon the resolutions he presented.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Why, Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with his long service here, must know—

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I decline to be interrupted. The gentleman can answer in his own time.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I have only four minutes time remaining. The gentleman has abundant time, and I am in hopes that he will give us some light—

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I decline to be interrupted.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman did not appear before the subcommittee. So it is his own fault if his resolutions were not promptly acted upon. If he has anything to submit to the subcommittee in favor of his resolution, to show that we should recall Minister Willis from the Hawaiian Islands, he should come before the subcommittee and make it known. They have been waiting patiently to hear from the distinguished gentleman. The subcommittee had no information that justified them in reporting the resolution in favor of Mr. Willis's recall; and they suppose, I presume, from the indifference the gentleman from Maine has shown with regard to his own resolutions, that he had ceased to take an interest in them.

If the gentlemen on the other side of the House who are in favor of annexation, as many of them have stated, are sincere, why should we break off the relations that now exist between the United States and Hawaii? The minister from Hawaii has been at Washington for years. No, the authorities of Hawaii have never withdrawn their minister from the United States, but seem to desire to maintain amicable relations with us. They seem to desire to keep their minister here, and I believe with

the same spirit of friendship and good feeling that the people of the United States desire to keep our minister there.

There is no reason therefore, Mr. Chairman, for recalling our minister or for repealing the law authorizing him to be paid \$7,000 per annum, which would be equivalent to withdrawing him. This movement on the part of the Republicans here indicates their desire to get up more excitement on this question. They have been beaten in the House of Representatives. "See the galled jade wince." These gentlemen are very apt to exhibit temper when they have not argument on their side. If these gentlemen are so well satisfied that the public sentiment of the country indorses their position as they have proclaimed, why are they not willing to trust to that public sentiment? Why is it that on all occasions we have Hawaiian matters brought up here for debate? It is simply because gentlemen on the other side of the House know that their cause is a weak one; they know that it can not be maintained, and they are trying on every occasion to bolster it up.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask how much time I have occupied?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed five minutes.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER].

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I hope after the exhibition we have had here on the motion of the honorable gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], that we shall vote now and that the vote will conform with the opinions expressed with so much emphasis by the honorable gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and his colleagues on that side of the House, who say they are opposed to the motion of the gentleman from Iowa. I also understood my honorable friend from New York [Mr. VAN VOORHIS], a member of the committee, to be opposed to the amendment; and to cap the climax of the opposition of the Republican side we find the honorable gentleman from Maine himself [Mr. BOUTELLE], who has just read his resolution, opposing the Lacey amendment. Why can not we vote on it at once?

But it seems to me that the motion is a most singular one coming from the minority, who say that we have now a republican form of government in Hawaii, and yet want to withdraw the accredited minister from this Government, or withhold his salary, which is equivalent. But I never understood my honorable friend from Illinois [Mr. HITT], who is at the head of the minority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to be opposed to the proposition or to be in favor of suspending our relations with Hawaii in the manner proposed here by withdrawing our minister at Honolulu, or to be in favor of withdrawing his salary.

It is the first time that the notion has been conveyed anywhere that such was his wish, if he favors the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY]. Why, sir, we have a minister from the Hawaiian Islands here in this country, accredited and received here. We have our minister there; and if the honorable gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] wanted to perfect his amendment, it seems to me he ought to have included in it the two propositions, that while we withdraw our minister by taking away his support, we should request the Hawaiian Islands to withdraw their minister. Why should we keep up a one-sided relation with this country, in the way which he proposes, by simply striking out the appropriation?

I take it for granted, Mr. Chairman, that there was no serious supposition that this amendment would receive even the support of his colleagues on the other side; and I hope we shall have a vote on it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Chairman, it seems hardly necessary to make any reply to the more or less skillful evasions of my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky]. It is a somewhat remarkable proclamation to this House, however, for the chairman of one of its principal committees to inform a member who introduced a resolution of great public importance and had it referred to that committee nearly two months ago, that the introducer of the resolution is responsible for the nonaction of the committee.

The gentleman wants to know why I have not come before the subcommittee. I never learned that a subcommittee had been appointed. I was never informed that any action whatever had been taken or contemplated, and I am informed now that if a subcommittee was appointed to consider that resolution, that subcommittee has never even been called together to consider it. And yet the gentleman arises to arraign me for laches in failing to go before a committee of which nobody ever heard, except the gentleman himself and possibly the members of that subcommittee, a committee which has never held any meetings and never intimated to me at any time, in any way, that I could have a hearing anywhere. The gentleman from Kentucky certainly has no idea, he never entertained the impression for a

moment, that if I had been notified in any way that I would be heard in behalf of the resolution, there would have been any failure upon my part to appear; and if I had appeared, I think there would have been no difficulty in presenting adequate arguments in favor of the resolution.

I have kept a somewhat close observance of the expressions of public sentiment upon this subject, Mr. Chairman, and with remarkably few exceptions, I know hardly a representative organ of the great parties in this country that has not repeatedly insisted that Mr. Willis should be recalled, not only in the interest of justice to Hawaii, not only in the interest of and in behalf of the dignity of the people of the United States, but in justice to himself, to relieve him from the melancholy situation in which the Administration had placed him, a situation which his own friends in his own party now recognize and confess to have been one of the deepest humiliation and embarrassment.

Of the gentlemen who have spoken to-day, not one, so far as I have noticed, has failed to make a plea for Mr. Willis, on account of the peculiarly "embarrassing" and "complicated" position in which he has been placed. If that is so, why not relieve him? Why compel him to sit down, in the face of the Provisional Government of Hawaii, to a daily dish of unpalatable crow? Why compel him to do all the swallowing of this miserable policy of hypocrisy and stultification? Why not compel the author of the policy, in the White House, why not compel the Secretary of State, to carry their proper load of the odium? Why do you not yourselves, gentlemen of the majority, who voted for that truckling and evasive resolution a few months ago—why do not some of you assume a part of this humiliation, and not make Mr. Willis a pack horse for the whole lamentable and disgusting load? I wish to ask to what Government is Mr. Willis supposed by the Administration, and by the Democratic majority, and by the Foreign Affairs Committee, to be accredited to day? I ask the chairman of the committee.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. To the *de facto* government.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Ah! That is a revelation! I thank you for that. This is the first time we have got that far. Here is an acknowledgment at last, from the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that the Government of Hawaii recognized by John L. Stevens on the 17th of January, 1893, in accordance with international obligation and his duty to his country, is the *de facto* government of Hawaii that he declared it to be. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I think that ought to be far enough for me to press the distinguished chairman to-day, as to the past, and I will leave him to elucidate further what the future policy of this Administration is to be in regard to the Hawaiian Islands.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Does not the gentleman know all ministers are accredited to the *de facto* governments of the countries to which they go?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I will say to the gentleman in reply to what he puts as an inquiry, that I supposed that Mr. Willis was secretly but officially accredited by President Cleveland and Mr. Gresham to "Her Majesty the Queen!" If I can read the English language he was told to sing a deceitful song of duplicity in the ears of the Provisional Government, but he was "confidentially" instructed to wind up by restoring and recognizing "Her Majesty the Queen!" [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] two minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] knows to what government our minister was accredited. There never has been any dispute about that. From the time Mr. Willis left this country until this time there has been no dispute as to that. The fact, however, still remains unanswered by the gentlemen on the other side of the House that the late Administration favored a treaty of annexation, which required the Government of the United States to pay this deposed Queen \$20,000 a year out of the Treasury of the United States, and \$150,000 of gratuity to the deposed heir apparent.

Now, if the Government of the United States was to be required to pay this money, for what purpose and on what account was it to be paid? It was to be paid by reason of the fact that the Government of the United States was responsible for the overthrow of the monarchy in that country, and that it was required to pay this amount in order to indemnify the Queen for the deposition brought about by our own minister and by our own forces. If the pension and bounty were not for that purpose their payment would have been the greatest fraud that ever was attempted to be perpetrated upon our Government. In consenting to impose that payment upon us, the late Administration confessed its responsibility for the overthrow of the Government and offered these sums as a just indemnity. The last Administration was responsible for the overthrow of the Queen, and offered to pay her on that account out of the Treas-

ury of the United States \$20,000 a year as long as she should live, and offered the heir to the throne \$150,000 in one payment. If this was not for an indemnity for the wrong done by our Government, it was an attempt at fraud upon our people, and in either case, deserves unqualified condemnation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to Switzerland and Portugal at \$6,500 each, \$13,000.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking a question. I see that—

The CHAIRMAN. What line?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. In line 6, page 3. I see that this provides a salary of \$7,500 for our minister at Portugal. This seems to be an increase of \$1,500. I believe the salary as fixed by the Revised Statutes is \$6,000. I do not know what great complication may have arisen between us and the Government of Portugal, and whether there is any proposition of annexing or overthrowing that Government. What I want to know is why the increase in the salary of our representative at Lisbon has been made. I do not even know the gentleman, or whether it is on account of his great ability or necessity, or because the United States of America has a great surplus it wants to get rid of. I am satisfied, however, that for some good reason this appropriation is proposed to be made different from what has been made before, because if there was not a good reason the gentleman from Kentucky would not make the proposition. I reserve the remainder of my time, and would be glad to hear the reason therefor.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. The Revised Statutes of the United States, and the act fixing the salaries of diplomatic and consular officers, allows \$7,500 to the ministers to Portugal and Switzerland.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Is there a provision in the Revised Statutes fixing that?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. What section?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Section 1675.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. What is the date of its enactment?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Eighteen hundred and seventy-four.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Eighteen hundred and seventy-four. Well, have there not been reductions since that time?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. There have been in appropriation bills, but the general law fixes the salary at \$7,500.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. As I understand, if the gentleman will allow me, in the earlier and economical and better days of the Democratic party, in the last twenty years, when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] was at the helm, the law was changed by a provision upon an appropriation bill cutting this salary down to \$6,000, and that it has been that way ever since 1875, and that upon this cut, being like unto some seventy or eighty other cuts throughout the whole United States service, the Democracy went to the country and won a great victory. Now, I just wanted to know what is the condition that justifies this increase? I do not seem to get any answer. I fear it is wicked extravagance.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I coincide with the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, and desire to hear that explanation myself. To secure that I make the point of order upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. STOCKDALE. That it increases expenditures on an appropriation bill. But I will withdraw the point of order, and move to reduce it to \$5,000.

Mr. DINSMORE. The gentleman has asked for an explanation. I can state with reference to the salary of the minister to Portugal that he was formerly minister resident and consul-general, and as such received consular fees. The post, however, was raised to that of envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, and in consideration of that and of the loss of his fees as consul-general we thought it was proper to increase the salary to \$6,500, because the absolute necessities of the post require more than \$5,000.

Mr. DINGLEY. But did he receive double compensation, in violation of the statute which prohibits that?

Mr. DINSMORE. The statute, as I understand it, does not prohibit that. Where a man is minister resident and consul-general he is entitled to receive the consular fees.

Mr. DINGLEY. The unofficial consular fees.

Mr. DINSMORE. Yes; the unofficial consular fees; and in that way the compensation of this post was increased.

Mr. REED. I am so glad that habit of not giving an explanation is not spreading to the floor. [Laughter.]

Mr. DINSMORE. I hope the gentleman will not insist upon the point of order on this provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order being withdrawn—

Mr. DINGLEY. Let the point of order still remain, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STOCKDALE] to say that he withdrew the point of order.

Mr. DINGLEY. I wish to reserve the point of order until I hear some further explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

Mr. DINGLEY. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, that I desire to make any point upon this appropriation. I do not know that it is a change of existing law, but I would like to hear some further statement of fact. If it is a change of the existing law, I desire to make the point of order.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. The Revised Statutes of the United States authorize a salary of \$7,500 for the minister to Switzerland and the minister to Portugal each. It is true that for some years past in the appropriation bills that amount has not been appropriated, but it is known to this House that the mission to Switzerland and the mission to Portugal have grown materially in importance of late years, and if we send a minister to Switzerland, and I think we should, and if we send a minister to Portugal, it is believed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs that those ministers ought to receive each a salary of not less than \$6,500.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. What was the amount appropriated in the last appropriation bill?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Five thousand dollars.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Then I hope the point of order will be sustained.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. But the statute authorizes a salary of \$7,500, and it has been already stated by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] that the rank of the mission has been raised to that of envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] reserved the point of order, but the Chair understands the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] now to make the point.

Mr. DINGLEY. I withdraw the point so far as I am concerned. Let the question come on the merits of the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] makes the point of order. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Kentucky on the point. Or does the gentleman from Ohio himself desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. It has always been held, Mr. Chairman, that where a salary has been reduced in an appropriation bill and the amount has been accepted as payment of the salary in full and has been fixed as the amount of the salary in the appropriation bill, that is the existing law; and if this salary was fixed at \$5,000 in the last appropriation bill, that is the existing law at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear from the gentleman on this point. It has been claimed that the appropriation bill is the existing law only for the fiscal year to which it applies.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Well, I think that would make it the existing law at this time.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] has the floor.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from Ohio to this point. In the Revised Statutes of the United States there is provision for \$7,500 as the salaries of our minister to Portugal and our minister to Switzerland.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. When was the salary reduced, and what were the terms of the law under which it was reduced?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I call the attention of the Chair to subdivision 2 of Rule XXI, which provides that—

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except, etc.

Now, the existing law is the statute to which I have referred, contained in the Revised Statutes of the United States. It is true that Congress has appropriated \$5,000 from time to time as the salary of this office, but the existing law, which is found in the Revised Statutes of the United States, provides for \$7,000, and this appropriation does not increase or exceed that amount, being only \$5,500.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn; and the gentleman from Illinois, as the Chair understands, withdraws the pro forma amendment.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, before we pass from this question, now that it is before us on the merits, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Kentucky, who has charge of this bill, whether \$6,500 as compensation of the minister to Portugal, is really an increase over and above the amount given in previous years?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I stated that this is an increase over the appropriation of last year.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is it an increase of the compensation? It has been stated that this minister has received some unofficial fees which have really made his compensation \$6,500 or more.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] can explain that matter.

Mr. DINSMORE. That is my information. I understand that a number of consular agents have divided their fees with this minister so that his compensation has really amounted to about that sum.

Mr. DINGLEY. You have not any definite official information on the subject?

Mr. DINSMORE. I can not state the exact amount; but I have ascertained that his compensation has amounted to about that sum.

Mr. DINGLEY. Are we to understand that we are proposing to increase the compensation of the minister to Portugal to the extent of \$1,500 on this appropriation bill? Is that the situation?

Mr. DINSMORE. Not the compensation—the salary. He does not now receive any fees; formerly he did.

Mr. DINGLEY. How does it happen that he obtained fees before which have now been cut off?

Mr. DINSMORE. He was minister resident and consul-general; and as consul-general there was a division of fees between him and consular agents under him. Now that he is elevated to the rank of envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, he gets no consular fees whatever.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I have in my hand an appropriation bill passed in 1892, which refers to this officer as minister resident and consul-general in Portugal.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I move to amend by striking out, in line 5, the words "and Portugal" and inserting after the word "dollars," in line 6, the words "and minister resident and consul-general to Portugal, \$5,000."

I hold in my hand a Senate document bearing date January 23, 1893, giving official and unofficial fees of consuls, consul-general, etc. I find that the official fees at Lisbon amounted, according to this report, to \$1,470.50. Of those official fees the consul or consul-general never received one dollar, because under a law passed many years ago those fees go into the Treasury. I find that the unofficial fees at the same place amounted to \$82.65. So that I am satisfied—I say it with all respect—that the information which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] has obtained from the State Department must be erroneous. The amount which this man is deprived of by being denied participation in the consular fees is \$82.65.

Now, I am willing to put this provision back into its former shape, so that this officer shall be minister resident and consul-general, as he was last year and as he has been ever since he was "economized" into that position twenty years ago, under the lead of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN]. But I am not willing to increase this salary \$1,500. I have no objection to paying an increased salary if gentlemen think the office is worth it; but I want the matter put on the true ground. If the gentleman from Kentucky in charge of this bill is satisfied from his great knowledge of the public service that the dignity and well-being of the United States require an increase of the salary of our minister to Portugal by the addition of \$1,500, let him rise in his place and say so. Let it be understood that such is the reason. If that reason be stated I will not oppose the proposition. But if this increase is to be proposed without any good reason—merely because the gentleman's party is in power and we are out—I wish to know it.

In other words, I do not want the salaries increased under a misapprehension, and I would like to have some explanation made of it.

Mr. DINSMORE. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. DINSMORE. I think the gentleman from Illinois is under a misapprehension. He states the amount of unofficial fees received as a part of the salary of this official. As I understand it, and my information is, he not only received that amount from these unofficial fees, but as a consul-general was entitled to a division of the fees of the consular agents under him, which fees aggregated approximately \$1,500 in Portugal.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. What does the gentleman from Illinois say to that?

Mr. HITT. He could not under the law get more than \$1,000 anywhere in the world.

Mr. DINSMORE. My information was that it amounted to about \$1,500, including the unofficial fees to which the gentleman from Illinois has referred. I may be mistaken as to the amount. I should regret to make a misstatement.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. That disposes of that subject.

Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] says that he could not under any provision of law get more than \$1,000.

Mr. HITT. By agencies, I mean.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. And at Lisbon, as shown by this statement, the unofficial fees were only \$32.65. Now, I am willing, if you believe this ought to be done, that you should do it; but I want you to have the courage to march right up to it and do it in a proper way.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs carefully examined the question of the salaries of the various ministers to other countries, and concluded to put into the bill an increase of last year's salaries for the ministers to Switzerland and Portugal. The general law already authorizes \$7,500 each for these. The committee, however, was unwilling to raise the salaries to that sum, but as certain fees had been taken away from the minister to Portugal, after the Committee on Foreign Affairs carefully investigated the importance of the missions to these countries, we unanimously agreed to fix the salary of the ministers at Switzerland and Portugal at \$6,500 each.

As far back as 1874 the salaries in these countries were fixed at \$7,500. If we have ministers abroad, we must at least furnish them with money sufficient to pay the necessary and ordinary expenses; and the committee, after a thorough consideration, did increase the salaries of the ministers to these countries \$1,500 each. These are the only increases over last year's appropriation for ministers that we have recommended in the pending bill.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It seems to be settled that this is an increase of salary of \$1,500 in each of these cases to these officials.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. That is, the ministers to Switzerland and Portugal.

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes. Now, I do not object so much to the increase, but I do object to excuses being given for the purpose of concealing the increase. Let it be stated openly that it is an increase.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I so stated.

Mr. BURROWS. In both cases, Switzerland and Portugal.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I desire to modify my amendment, and am willing then that a vote shall be taken. I withdraw the former amendment, and now move to strike out the words "six thousand five hundred," in line 5, on page 3, and insert the words "five thousand;" and, in line 6, strike out "thirteen" and insert "ten."

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

**SALARIES OF DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICERS WHILE RECEIVING INSTRUCTIONS AND MAKING TRANSITS.**

To pay the salaries of ministers, consuls, and other officers of the United States for the periods actually and necessarily occupied in receiving instructions, and in making transits to and from their posts, and while awaiting recognition and authority to act, in pursuance of the provisions of section 1745 of the Revised Statutes, so much as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, is hereby appropriated.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Kentucky what his estimate is as to the expenditure that would be made under this indefinite appropriation. This is to pay the salaries of ministers, consuls, and other officials of the diplomatic service while making their way leisurely to their posts of duty. What amount is covered by the item?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. This provision to which the gentleman from Illinois refers is the same provision that has been adopted in appropriation bills for many years past.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. That was not the question. It is, what is your estimate as to the amount which will be expended under this indefinite appropriation for the coming fiscal year?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. There is no estimate fur-



nished in the Book of Estimates, but I will obtain the information he desires in a few moments. It is in the Fifth Auditor's report.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Then the gentleman can not say whether it will be \$3,000,000 or a million and a half dollars?

I want to ask the gentleman what was expended this year for this purpose?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. There is a statute—section 1740 of the Revised Statutes—which authorizes this appropriation.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Well, I know that thoroughly; but does the gentleman know how much has been expended of this permanent appropriation this year?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I can say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] that this does not increase the amount that will go to pay our minister. It is to pay the salaries of ministers, consuls, and other officers of the United States for the periods actually and necessarily occupied in receiving instructions, and in making transits to and from their posts, and while awaiting recognition and authority to act, in pursuance of the provisions of section 1740 of the Revised Statutes. So much as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, is hereby appropriated.

It is known, I suppose, by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that almost all ministers and consuls who are appointed have to wait awhile, usually, I believe, not exceeding thirty days, to receive their instructions.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Yes, I understand; and therefore, as the gentleman can not state what the amount is, I move to strike out, commencing with the word "so," in line 2, down to the end of line 4, and insert the words "one hundred thousand dollars."

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. If the gentleman will allow me, I will suggest to him that it does not cost that much. I have before me the last annual report of the Fifth Auditor. Last year the amount paid for salaries of diplomatic officers while receiving instructions under the section I have referred to was \$52,572, and the salaries paid to consuls while receiving instructions and in transit was \$23,000; so that it will not be more than \$30,000, probably.

Mr. HITT. That amount is unusually large, Mr. Chairman, because during the last year a large part of the force, both diplomatic and consular, has been changed, and the men have been sent and kept waiting.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. It will not be so large this year.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. How much does the gentleman think it will cost?

Mr. HITT. I think the service has been so thoroughly cleaned out by Mr. Quincy in the consular department, and by the President and Secretary of State in the diplomatic branch, that there will be only a fraction of the \$70,000 needed for any changes in the coming year.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Will \$50,000 be enough?

Mr. HITT. Fifty thousand dollars will probably be more than ample.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I move to make it \$40,000; striking out the lines indicated, and inserting \$40,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Clerk report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 2, after the word "statute" strike out the following language: "So much as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, is hereby appropriated," and insert in lieu thereof the words "forty thousand dollars."

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph of the bill provides for the payment of salaries of diplomatic and consular officers while receiving instructions and in transit. It does not apply to anything else. The expenses have necessarily been heavier during the past year because of many changes in our diplomatic and consular service. It has been the law so long that I know of no reason why the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] should be agreed to. The whole amount paid out last year was only about \$80,000. I do not believe it will be that much, or near that, next year, but I do not think it will be safe or proper for this House to adopt an amendment fixing the sum at \$40,000.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Make it \$60,000, then.

Mr. HITT. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY] is right. The sum which he has named covers the expenditure for that purpose during the year that ended last June. A very large expenditure, because of the change of Administration, came after the 1st of July; so that it is probable that if we had the returns for the year following they would be very much larger.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will modify my amendment by making it \$80,000.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman from Illinois allow me a question?

Mr. HITT. Yes.

Mr. SAYERS. When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] had this bill in charge during the Fifty-first Congress did he make this item a definite or indefinite appropriation?

Mr. HITT. It was in the same words in which it is set forth in this bill.

Mr. SAYERS. An indefinite appropriation?

Mr. HITT. Yes.

Mr. SAYERS. Now, why does the gentleman from Illinois insist that it should be a definite appropriation at this time?

Mr. HITT. My colleague, I suppose, voices the sentiment of the House—

Mr. SAYERS. I ask the gentleman from Illinois that question. Does the gentleman favor it?

Mr. HITT. My colleague is, I think, voicing the sentiment of the House—

Mr. SAYERS. I ask the gentleman from Illinois if he favors changing from a definite to an indefinite appropriation?

Mr. HITT. Well, if you want my opinion personally, I would say that I think it is wise to specify wherever you can, as I have seen the gentleman from Texas do in appropriation bills; but I do know also that the law is so framed now, and the authority of the Department is so strictly limited, that there can not be any fraud. Yet it would be a satisfaction to have it made definite.

Mr. SAYERS. Why did not the gentlemen do that, then, in the Fifty-first Congress?

Mr. HITT. We did not care to make the innovation, because we were not then so vigilantly watchful or such professors of frugality as the gentlemen on the other side have since taught us to be. [Laughter.]

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the clause in the bill is drawn in accordance with the statute. I have here section 1740 of the general law, which I will have read if anyone desires to hear it. If not, I will ask for a vote.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend by striking out "so much as may be necessary" and inserting "sixty thousand dollars, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I accept that amendment.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that amendment, and I ask to have the statute read.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say at this time that I do not apprehend any mismanagement or any misappropriation of this fund. It is not a large fund—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). The gentleman from Mississippi will please suspend for a moment. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY] makes the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, and, in support of his point of order sends to the Clerk's desk the statute to be read.

Mr. STOCKDALE. My recollection is that the gentleman did not make the point of order until I was recognized and speaking, and then it was too late.

The CHAIRMAN. He was entitled to make it immediately on the presentation of the amendment. Indeed, strictly under the rule, that was the only time he could make it. The Clerk will report the statute.

Mr. STOCKDALE. The gentleman asked to have the amendment again reported. If he did not hear it the first time that was not my fault.

The CHAIRMAN. He asked to have the amendment read again, and the Clerk again reported it, but the gentleman from Kentucky made the point of order against the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi, and in support of the point of order sent the statute to the Clerk's desk to be read. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the statute, as follows:

Sec. 1740. No ambassador, envoy extraordinary, minister plenipotentiary, minister resident, commissioner, chargé d'affaires, secretary of legation, assistant secretary of legation, interpreter to any legation or consulate, or consul general, consul, or commercial agent, mentioned in Schedules B and C, shall be entitled to compensation for his services, except from the time when he reaches his post and enters upon his official duties to the time when he ceases to hold such office, and for such time as is actually and necessarily occupied in receiving his instructions, not to exceed 30 days, and in making the direct transit between the place of his residence when appointed, and his post of duty, at the commencement and termination of the period of his official service, for which he shall in all cases be allowed and paid, except as hereinafter mentioned. And no person shall be deemed to hold any such office after his successor is appointed and actually enters upon the duties of his office at his post of duty, nor after his official residence at such post has terminated, if not so relieved. But no such allowance or payment shall be made to any consul-general, consul, or commercial agent, not embraced in Schedules B and C, or to any vice-consul, vice-commercial agent,

deputy consul, or consular agent, for the time so occupied in receiving instructions, or in such transit as aforesaid; nor shall any such officer as is referred to in this section be allowed compensation for the time so occupied in such transit, at the termination of the period of his official service, if he has resigned or been recalled therefrom for any malfeasance in his office.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi changes existing law; and I make the point of order that it is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Mississippi upon the point of order.

Mr. STOCKDALE. As I understand the point of order, Mr. Chairman, it simply means that, when a statute authorizes an indefinite appropriation, the House is without power to make it different. I want to know if that is the position of the gentleman from Kentucky?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky will please give his attention to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. STOCKDALE. As I understand the gist of the point of order is, that because this statute, 1740 of the Revised Statutes, authorizes an indefinite appropriation, the House is without power to make it different. Is that right?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. My point of order is that it changes existing law.

Mr. DINGLEY. It does not change existing law.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Even if it did, it would be as easy to make a declaration before the House that you have no right to detract from the Scripture, and apply it to this proposition with the same force. And it seems to me there is no authority by the statute to make an appropriation for these incidental expenses of a greater amount than may be necessary. You must first ascertain how much is necessary. Will the gentleman from Kentucky or from anywhere else maintain that the statute turns the Treasury loose to any officer that may want to expend the money?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to decide the point of order. The Chair overrules the point of order. Now, the Chair is ready to hear the gentleman from Mississippi on his amendment.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Then I have very little to say, Mr. Chairman. And I only want to emphasize the fact, as I was saying before, that while I would not authorize the expenditure beyond what is necessary in this item, I believe that this system of legislation, that system of appropriation, has worked injury to the Treasury of the United States. I say there is no reason, no matter what the course and practice may have been before, or by antecedent Congresses, and in my judgment there is no excuse for the Congress of the United States, which is charged with the appropriation of the money of the United States, in authorizing any officer, however great or small, to expend such a sum as he may please in any part of the discharge of his duty. I believe further, without having time enough to go into the facts, that these ministers and consuls abroad have been paid and supported at times when they were preparing to go away, when they ought to have been at home, or ought to have been paying their own expenses. Therefore I am in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois with this amendment, which would make it so that we could know what we were paying.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will accept the gentleman's amendment making it \$6,000.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that the gentleman from Mississippi has been arguing this amendment under a misapprehension of the facts. The statement which he made at the conclusion of his remarks, and I had not the honor and good fortune to hear all that he said upon the subject, indicates an opinion in his mind that the Government of the United States pays some specific sum, stated by him, as the cost of transit of the minister to his post; and he further said that he is also paid money when he is here at home. Now, the law does not provide that a minister or a consul going abroad receive any specific sum whatever, but he is allowed what is called a "transit allowance," which is nothing more nor less than the amount of his salary from the time he starts until he reaches his post. That is all there is in it. He is paid his salary according to the rate allowed to him.

Mr. HITT. But he is paid that salary at the same time his predecessor is paid a corresponding salary, so that it makes a double salary taken out of the Treasury.

Mr. DINSMORE. I understand that the salary is paid where one is coming in and the other is going out.

Mr. HITT. They overlap.

Mr. DINSMORE. Nevertheless, such has been the policy heretofore pursued. This Government provides no allowance whatever for outfit, as is done in other countries; but it does allow the minister going abroad his salary from the time he leaves his home until he returns to it; and the regulations

specify the number of days he is allowed to travel in going out and coming back, and he can not draw pay for a greater time. The amount given depends entirely upon the post he is accredited to and the distance which must be traveled. Now, then, he is allowed no more under the law than I have stated; and nobody knows better than the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, who has served so long as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that the ministers in the foreign service are not paid exorbitant salaries.

In a great many instances the salaries are insufficient to pay the expenses of these officers; as was the case, for instance, with the salary which was increased by the committee and which has already been passed upon by the Committee of the Whole to-day. In that case the minister paid out for living expenses the whole amount of his salary, \$5,000. He wrote to me (and I know him to be a reliable gentleman) that his living expenses for himself and family at a hotel were \$100 a month, consuming practically the whole of his salary. He is a man of limited means, and could not set up an establishment for himself. Thus, in many cases the salary is insufficient to pay the expenses of these officers. In proposing this allowance for the expenses of the minister while en route to his post of duty, we are doing nothing more than has been considered fair in the past, and nothing more than has always been done hitherto by our Government, which has been more economical than foreign governments, which, besides these traveling expenses, have allowed an outfit.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is exhausted.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I move to amend by striking out the last word. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] misapprehends the position that I took. I was not saying that these expenses should not be allowed, but that I wanted to know how much they are.

Mr. DINSMORE. You do know that, under the law.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Yes; after the thing is done.

Mr. DINSMORE. You know before.

Mr. STOCKDALE. No, that is just what I want to know now; and this bill does not inform me.

Mr. DINSMORE. The law provides what the salary shall be, and it can not be any more or any less.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I understand what salary the law provides. But if we appropriate money for the expenses of these ministers while they are nursing themselves to get ready to start to their posts of official duty, we want to know how much it is going to cost. We do not want anybody to dip into the Treasury without let or hindrance if we are going to be a party of economy and reform.

Gentlemen say we are to make this allowance because it has been done heretofore. In the name of Heaven, are we never to do anything that has not been done heretofore? Must we go on forever in the old beaten track and spend money in certain directions because our ancestors expended it in that way? If we are to have no "reform," what would become of the Republican party? The only thing that keeps them alive is their claim to be a party of "reform." And as reference has been made to Mr. Gresham I will say that they reformed him so thoroughly that he had to leave their party and seek a better one.

It is said that one of our ministers was obliged to spend \$400 in order to keep his family at a hotel. Well, I can find gentlemen of this House who are paying \$400 in order to board with their families at a hotel; and it might be argued that we must give all members such a salary as will enable them to live at hotels as expensively as the rich members of the House do. Sir, there is no argument in that. We are not a Government of show, and tinsel and display. The greatest epoch in the history of this country in respect to matters of that kind was the day when James Buchanan shuffled off the court dress of England and walked down the aisle in the dress of a plain American citizen. We do not want to send our ministers abroad to display gewgaws upon their persons and to spend large sums of money at elegant hotels. If they live respectably that is enough.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is exhausted. The question is upon the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] as modified upon the suggestion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STOCKDALE].

The question being taken, there were—ayes 59, noes 63.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. No quorum has voted. I think we had better have tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois calls for tellers.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. No, sir; I make the point of no quorum, which will necessitate our having tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky and Mr. CANNON of Illinois were appointed.

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Illi-

nois [Mr. CANNON] make the point that there is no quorum present?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman made the point that no quorum had voted.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 64, noes 102.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I withdraw the point of no quorum. So the amendment as modified was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Secretaries of legations to China, Japan, and Mexico, at \$2,625 each, \$7,875.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to inquire the reason for this increase of the salary of the secretary of legation at Mexico.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. The mission to Mexico is now and has been for several years past a first-class mission; but the salary of the secretary of legation has not been changed. It remains at \$1,800, the amount fixed when the mission was second class. It was believed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs that this salary should be placed on a par with that paid to other secretaries of legation where the amount drawn by the minister is \$17,500. This was done not only that the salary might be uniform with the salaries of other secretaries of similar grades, but because the actual duties of the office entitle the secretary of legation to this small increase.

The duties of this official in Mexico have increased and are very exacting, and the volume of work is as great if not greater than anywhere else. The Department several times has asked this increase. It asked it when the present bill was being prepared by the committee, and after careful consideration the committee believed, as the mission to Mexico was made a first-class mission, that the secretary should be allowed the same salary as secretaries receive at Paris, London, Berlin, and St. Petersburg.

Mr. COOMBS. And I will add as a further reason, with the permission of the Chair, that the expense of living in Mexico has been much increased within the last few years.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Now let us see about the soundness of the reasons suggested for this increase. It is true that four years ago, when the Hon. Thomas Ryan, who had seen fourteen to sixteen years' service in this House, was appointed minister to Mexico, it was made a first-class mission, and the salary was increased from \$12,000 to \$17,500 in gold. It has been retained at that figure ever since.

The increase was made a little bit from a personal standpoint, I think, because Mr. Ryan was one of the best equipped men in the Government for that service; but it was made also from another standpoint, namely, that our relations with Mexico were growing more and more important every year, and we were just on the eve of that legislation which was, under the leadership of Mr. Blaine, to establish reciprocity on this continent. We had already commenced to arrange for the Pan-American Congress, and, reaching out from the standpoint of strengthening our influence on this continent, Congress thought it well to increase the salary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Well, I should like to have a few minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman will be permitted to proceed for five minutes longer.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. The reasons having passed by for the increase of the salary, and the place being filled now by a mere politician, and the Democracy being in power, and they have already got the ax sharpened to cut reciprocity up by the roots—

Mr. TRACEY. Dig it up.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Yes; as the gentleman from New York says, dig it up by the roots. And the reason having ceased for the increase of the salary, I would cheerfully vote to decrease it and put it back to where it was—\$12,000.

But, instead of doing that, and when there is no reason for making the other changes suggested, why, we find the committee increasing the salary of the secretary of legation from \$1,800 to \$2,600 a year. It remained at \$1,800 for the last four years. Now, the reason being gone and the Democracy also in power, for the sake of paying this salary out of a bankrupt Treasury, borrowing money at 5 per cent to pay the daily expenses of the Government, instead of reducing the salary of the minister from \$17,500 to what it was, we find this bill proposing an increase of that of the secretary of legation to the amount named here. I tell you that you are not going to do it unless you vote to do it, and if you want to do it you have got to let the country understand it.

I am for paying salaries, and fair salaries, where they are

needed and where the man is serving the Government; but when you go back upon every principle that would enable our people, either commercially or industrially to dominate this continent, now or in the future, I am not willing, by my consent at least, to see these salaries increased, when those who draw them can not do any service of value to the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will assume the pro forma amendment to be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I will now make the formal amendment. I have made the informal one, and talked about ten minutes. I will make a formal amendment now to strike out in line 11 the words "and Mexico."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that this paragraph has already been passed over.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I did not so understand it. I was discussing it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was discussing a motion to strike out the last word, being the word "dollars," in lines 14 and 15.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I think that paragraph all goes together. And I have this marked on my bill here for the purpose of making the motion.

Mr. HITT. I would remind the Chairman that the gentleman from Illinois was endeavoring to get the attention of the Chair, but the Clerk was reading at great rapidity.

Mr. MOSES. But the gentleman from Illinois had sat down to congratulate himself about his speech, and forgot all about the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that when its attention was called to the gentleman from Illinois, who was seeking recognition, the Chair asked the Clerk how far he had proceeded with the reading of the bill, and was informed that he had reached page 4, lines 14 and 15. The Chair so stated to the gentleman from Illinois. The gentleman from Illinois offered a pro forma amendment, and proceeded to discuss the salary of the secretary of legation at Mexico; and the Chair understood, and the committee will understand, that great latitude is indulged in Committee of the Whole in the discussion of such matters. The Chair therefore made no suggestion about it.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Well, now, if the Chair holds that I am too late, by one word, to make this motion, namely, because line 14 has been read, and the paragraph that precedes it closes with line 13, if I am to be ruled out on that point, then I want to ask unanimous consent to make this motion to strike out the words "and Mexico," which will leave the salary at \$1,800, what the law provides, and what it has always been.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] asks unanimous consent—

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I must object to that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. In the name of economy and reform, I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. BURROWS. I hope the gentleman will not do that, and I will suggest to the Chairman that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] said that upon this question, if the majority desired to raise this salary, it could not be done except by a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recalls that.

Mr. BURROWS. He intended to offer the amendment, and this is purely an oversight.

Mr. COOMBS. I hope the gentleman from Kentucky will not object to any show of economy on the part of the Republicans, because it is so rare.

Mr. BURROWS. That will be the shortest way out of it.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Does the gentleman state that he moves to strike out the words "and Mexico"?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I intended to make the motion. I offered a pro forma amendment for the purpose of eliciting some information and a reply from the gentleman from Kentucky, and then I intended, when the pro forma amendment was disposed of, to move to strike out the word "and Mexico;" in other words, to test the sense of the committee as to whether that increase of salary, from \$1,800 to \$2,600, should be allowed.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. And now you are a king a vote on that amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I have no objection, if you will vote on it immediately.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to recur to the paragraph relating to secretaries of legation—China, Japan, and Mexico—and move to strike out the words "and Mexico." As many as favor that motion will signify it by saying aye.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 38, noes 72.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. No quorum.

The Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky and Mr. CANNON of Illinois.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 37, noes 116.

The CHAIRMAN. No quorum has voted. The point of no quorum having been made, the Chair directs the Clerk to read the rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clause 2, Rule XXIII. Whenever a Committee of the Whole House finds itself without a quorum, the Chair shall cause the roll to be called, and thereupon the committee shall rise, and the Chairman shall report the names of the absentees to the House, which shall be entered on the Journal; but if on such call a quorum shall appear, the committee shall thereupon resume its sitting without further order of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. In accordance with this rule the Chair directs the Clerk to call the roll.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I would submit to the gentleman from Kentucky that he ask unanimous consent to dispense with the calling of the roll.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in order.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I supposed we could do anything by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following members failed to answer to their names:

Abbott,	Cousins,	Hudson,	Robinson, Pa.
Adams, Ky.	Cover,	Hull,	Rusk,
Adams, Pa.	Crawford,	Johnson, Ohio	Russell, Conn.
Alderson,	Crabbs,	Kribbs,	Schermerhorn,
Aldrich,	Curtis, N. Y.	Lisle,	Seranton,
Alexander,	Daniels,	Livingston,	Settle,
Allen,	Davey,	Lockwood,	Shaw,
Apsley,	DeForest,	Loudenslager,	Shell,
Arno D.	Denson,	Marshall,	Sherman,
Avery,	Doolittle,	McAleer,	Soley,
Babcock,	Draper,	McCall,	Stimpson,
Baker, N. H.	Dunphy,	McDannold,	Smith,
Baldwin,	Ellis, Ky.	McEttrick,	Snodgrass,
Bartholdt,	English, N. J.	McKeighan,	Somers,
Belden,	Everett,	McNagney,	Sperry,
Bell, Colo.	Felder,	Meklejohn,	Stallings,
Beltzhoover,	Funston,	Merced,	Stockdale,
Bingham,	Gear,	Meyer,	Storer,
Black Ill.	Geissenhainer,	Moon,	Strong,
Blair,	Gillet, N. Y.	Morse,	Swanson,
Bower, N. C.	Gillet, Mass.	Murray,	Tarsney,
Bowers, Cal.	Goldzier,	Mutcher,	Tawney,
Brattain,	Goodnight,	Newlands,	Terry,
Breckinridge, Ky	Graham,	Northway,	Thomas,
Brieker,	Grosvenor,	Oates,	Turner, Va.
Brockshire,	Grow,	Orlwaite,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Brown,	Haines,	Paine,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Burnes,	Hall, Minn.	Payne,	Wadsworth,
Bynum,	Hall, Mo.	Paynter,	Washington,
Campbell,	Hammond,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Wells,
Canon, Cal.	Hare,	Phillips,	Wheeler, Ill.
Caphart,	Harter,	Pigott,	Whie,
Chickering,	Hartman,	Powers,	Wilson, W. Va.
Childs,	Helner,	Price,	Wise,
Cockran,	Henderson, Iowa	Quigg,	Woodard,
Compton,	Henderson, N. C.	Randall,	Woomer,
Con-	Holman,	Ray,	Wright, Mass.
Cooper, Ind.	Holker, N. Y.	Rayner,	Wright, Pa.
Cooper, Wis.	Hopkins, Ill.	Reyburn,	
Cornish,	Hopkins, Pa.	Ritchie,	

The roll having been called, the Speaker resumed the chair. Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, finding itself without a quorum, as Chairman of the committee, in accordance with the rule, I caused the roll to be called, upon which roll call 194 members responded to their names. I report herewith the names of the absentees.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reports that, the Committee finding itself without a quorum, he caused the roll to be called and he now reports the names of the absentees to the House. The names of the absentees will be entered upon the Journal. One hundred and ninety-four gentlemen having answered to their names, the committee will resume its session.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. Tellers will resume their places.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I would suggest to the gentleman from Kentucky that he ask unanimous consent that this clause be passed by, until he completes the bill, and that at the completion of the bill we turn back and dispose of the pending amendment.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to passing by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, and let it be acted upon when we get through with the bill. Then, let the Clerk read on.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection that order will be made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Secretary of legation and consul-general to Honolulu, \$1,000.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BAILEY, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6103, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GEISSENHAINER, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. HUDSON, for this day, on account of sickness.

To Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York, one week, on account of sickness.

To Mr. COMPTON, this day, on account of sickness.

To Mr. GROSVENOR, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. CORNISH, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

#### FURTHER URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the further urgent deficiency bill.

The report of the committee of conference was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6556) to provide for further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, and 16, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same, with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

#### "MINTS AND ASSAY OFFICES.

"For wages of workmen and adjusters, to be used in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, \$52,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

"In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For compensation and mileage of Members of the House of Representatives and Delegates from Territories on account of fiscal years, as follows:

"For 1893, \$3,331.

"For 1894, \$15,900.

"To pay the clerk to the Speaker's table for services rendered as clerk to the Committee on Rules during the first and second sessions of the Fifty-third Congress, \$500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

JOSEPH D. SAYERS,

J. G. CANNON,

Managers on the part of the House.

F. M. COCKRELL,

EUGENE HALE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

#### The statement of the House conferees was read as follows:

The managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6556) to provide for further urgent deficiencies for the fiscal year 1894, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action recommended on each of the said amendments in the accompanying conference report, namely:

On amendment numbered 1, appropriates \$52,500 for wages of workmen and adjusters at the mints, to be used in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, instead of \$16,000, as proposed by the Senate for the Mint at Philadelphia.

On amendment numbered 2, restores the provision proposed by the House authorizing the printing, on or before August 1 next, of 100,000 copies of a Census Abstract.

On amendments numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, for expenses of United States courts for 1894, as follows:

For fees of witnesses, \$300,000;

For fees of United States attorneys, \$101,000;

For special compensation of United States attorneys, \$10,000;

For regular assistants to United States attorneys, \$31,000;

For special assistants to United States attorneys, \$40,340;

For fees of clerks, \$116,000;

For fees of commissioners, \$187,200;

For rent of court rooms, \$42,000.

On amendments numbered 10, 11, and 12, appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, for certain expenses of that body, in the aggregate \$21,000.

On amendment numbered 13, appropriates \$1,200 for compiling the Congressional Directory for the second session of the Fifty-third Congress.

On amendment numbered 14, appropriates \$18,234 for compensation and mileage of members of the House of Representatives on account of the fiscal years 1893 and 1894, and \$500 to pay the clerk to the Speaker's table for services rendered to the Committee on Rules.

On amendment numbered 15, provides for a laborer in the law library of the Library of Congress at \$30 per month, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment numbered 16, amends, as proposed by the Senate, the act of January 27, 1894, relating to contracts for supplies in the Departments at Washington.

The bill, as agreed upon, appropriates \$1,854,304.66.

JOSEPH D. SAYERS,

J. G. CANNON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps proper in connection with this report for me to call the attention of the House to one appropriation to which the conferees on the part of the House have agreed, and that is to the item for the rent of court-houses and for court rooms for the United States courts—\$42,000. Of the appropriation of \$42,000, over \$5,000 is intended to pay the rent during the remainder of the present fiscal year of three floors in a building in the city of Chicago which is now being used by the circuit and district courts. There is a question, and a very serious one, as to the necessity of this rental contract, regarding which there was some important and pointed testimony before the conference committee; but inasmuch as the contract has been made, and it is believed by competent authority, and as according to the terms of the contract the Government will be responsible for the rent of these floors until the 31st day of May, 1895, the conference committee thought that it would not be wise to delay the passage of this bill by the consideration of the question of the propriety of the rental contract at the present time.

It calls for an annual expenditure of about \$26,000. We have the assurance, however, from members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, that an opportunity will be afforded, when the sundry civil bill returns to the House, for the consideration of the contract. It was not believed by the conferees of the House that it would be within the power of Congress to repeal the contract before the 31st day of May, 1895; so that the House will have abundant time to inquire into and take action upon it, either when the sundry civil bill returns to the House at the present session or during the next session of this Congress.

With this explanation, if no other information be desired by any member of the House, I will ask for the adoption of the report.

The report of the committee of conference was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SAYERS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

And accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

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

By Mr. RICHARDS, from the Committee on Claims, the bill (S. 1055) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the cases of Edward N. Fish and others for supplies furnished the Indian service. (Report No. 729.)

Also, the bill (H. R. 2842) to reimburse George C. Tanner, late consul, etc., the sum of \$200, paid by him for rent of rooms. (Report No. 730.)

Also, the bill (H. R. 1323) for the relief of Olivia and Ida Walter, children and heirs of Thomas U. Walter, deceased. (Report No. 732.)

#### ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. RICHARDS, from the Committee on Claims, reported adversely the following bills; which, with the accompanying reports, were ordered to be printed and laid on the table:

A bill (H. R. 1521) for the relief of R. W. Scott. (Report No. 731.)

A bill (H. R. 775) authorizing the appointment of a commissioner and the settlement of the claims of certain citizens of Kansas. (Report No. 734.)

A bill (H. R. 1519) for the relief of Thomas Chambers. (Report No. 733.)

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 6750) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Yellowstone River, in the county of Dawson and State of Montana—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6751) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Yuma Indians in California for the cession of their surplus lands, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 6752) granting the use of certain real estate to the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., for a public park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON (by request): A bill (H. R. 6753) to amend the acts admitting certain States to representation in Congress, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 6754) to amend section 15 of an act approving, with amendments, the funding act of Arizona, approved June 25, 1880—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 6755) to regulate Canal street, etc., in the city of Washington—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A resolution directing the Secretary of the Treasury to re-examine and certify claim of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 6756) to regulate the sale of goods marked "sterling" or "sterling silver" or "coin" or "coin silver"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota: A resolution to authorize the investigation of the conduct of Judge Sanborn, of the eighth judicial circuit, in ordering certain citizens of Minnesota and North Dakota to appear before him at St. Paul April 27, 1894, in connection with the Great Northern Railway strike now pending—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

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

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 6757) to remove the charge of desertion of John Dewitt, of 55 West Ninth street, Cincinnati, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6758) to increase the pension of L. P. Alford—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORMAN: A bill (H. R. 6759) granting a pension to Eliza Ann Harrington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 6760) for the relief of B. P. Dowell—to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKAIG: A bill (H. R. 6761) for the relief of Edgar H. Bates for the loss of his minor son, Millard P. Bates, who was killed on or about September 3, 1872—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 6762) to pension William H. Fry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6676) for the relief of Peter Puckett; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of pastor and trustees of Martini Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the passage of proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States acknowledging therein the supreme authority and just government of Almighty God—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of James H. McDonald, M. D., and 291 others, of Chicago, in favor of the passage of the Manderson Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By BOWERS of California: Petition of 85 persons of Salinas, Cal., for amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Remonstrance of citizens of St. Charles County, Mo., against a certain constitutional amendment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALZELL: Memorial to Congress submitted by the wool buyers and wool dealers of Ohio and Pennsylvania, against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS: Protests of citizens of Wyoming, Idaho, and Utah, against the passage of House bill 5035, granting right of way and public lands in the Yellowstone Park to a railroad corporation—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts: Petition of Walter B. Miller and 43 other residents of Brookfield, Mass., in behalf of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GORMAN: Petition of the Retail Clerks' Union of



Detroit, favoring the governmental ownership and control of telegraphs—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, protest of the Evangelical Lutheran St. John's Church of Michigan, against the proposed God-in-the-Constitution amendment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARE: Petition of Edward Orton and others, professors in Ohio State University, for retention of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in the control of the Treasury Department—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois: Protest of A. Wagner, chairman; A. Mueller, secretary, and others of the Evangelical Lutheran school committee of Illinois, against the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IZLAR: Memorial of the City Council of Charleston, S. C., urging that the recommendation of the United States Light-House Board for an appropriation of \$155,000, for the purchase of a site for a supply depot to be constructed at or near one of the dock piers at Charleston, S. C., and for the erection thereon of suitable buildings, be carried but without delay—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Cephas A. Christian—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Indiana: Protest of Rev. E. H. Scheips, Conrad Stark, and others, of St. John's Lutheran Church, of Peru, Ind.; of Rev. C. F. W. Hugs and others, of St. John's Lutheran Church, of Bingen, Ind., and of Rev. S. Hassold, of Huntington, Ind., against the proposed religious amendment of the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCLEARY of Minnesota: Protest of President Cyrus Northrop and Prof. W. W. Tolwell, C. W. Hall, and N. H. Winchell, of the University of Minnesota, against the bill to abolish the Coast Survey—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McLAURIN: Resolutions adopted by the city council of Charleston, S. C., urging the speedy appropriation of \$155,000, as recommended by the United States Light-House Board, for the purchase of a site for a supply depot to be constructed at or near one of the dock piers at Charleston, S. C., and for the erection thereon of suitable buildings, be carried out without delay—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McNAGNY: Protest of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Redeemer, Fort Wayne, Ind., and of St. Paul Evangelical Lutheran Church, Gar Creek, Ind., against the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: Protest from the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Martinsburg, Dixon County, Nebr., and 112 communicants, against the proposed amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERCER: Three petitions remonstrating against the proposed change in the preamble of the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS: Protest from the Evangelical Lutheran Church at Spirit Lake, Iowa, against a proposed amendment of the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLER: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the District of Columbia, representing 1,000 members, favoring the passage of Senate bill 1841, providing for the seating of women employes in shops and stores of the District—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the exemption of loan and building associations from income tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Michigan: Resolution of the Barbers' Union, Detroit, Mich., in favor of Government control of a telegraph system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SCRANTON: Memorial of Ohio and Pennsylvania wool-dealers against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Diamond Lodge, No. 26, Shield of Honor, and petition of C. W. Lamoreaux and others, of Carbondale, Pa., in favor of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHAW: Protest of J. F. Boerger, pastor, A. Gerke and R. H. Zempke, trustees of Evangelical Lutheran Trinity Church, of Fall Creek, Eau Claire County, Wis., against the so-called God-in-the-Constitution amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona: Protest of the board of supervisors of Yavapai County, Arizona, against the passage of bill granting 1,000,000 acres of desert lands to certain States and Territories—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Petition of the Trunk Maker's Union, of Detroit, Mich., in favor of governmental ownership and control of the telegraph systems—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TRACEY: Petition of citizens of Albany, N. Y., against the proposed change of the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: Petition of S. W. Hill, of Osage, Iowa, against a tax on the income of building and loan associations—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEADOCK: Petition of Detroit cigar manufacturers against change in revenue laws relating to cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: Papers to accompany bill for the claim of William A. Walker, of Colbert County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of Henry Davis, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, April 20, 1894.

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

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

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 21, 1883, a report of the Third Auditor of the Treasury and accompanying papers in regard to any and all matters not heretofore reported relative to the Indian war claims of the State of California, etc.; which was read.

Mr. WHITE. The communication is in response to a resolution submitted by me and adopted by the Senate last December. I suggest that, in so far as the communication relates to the sum claimed, the report of the Treasury Department, and the statement of the State of California, that it be printed without the exhibits, and that with the exhibits the communication and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I make that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 14th instant, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims in Indian depredation cases; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 17th instant, a list of all persons in office April 10, 1894, in the Department of Justice, employed by the Government in the defense of Indian depredation cases, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, and ordered to be printed.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6356) to provide for further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the International Union of Journeymen Horseshoers, of Denver, Colo., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty with China; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BUTLER presented petition of the city council of Charleston, S. C., praying that an appropriation of \$155,000 be made for the purchase of a site for a depot for the Light-House Service, to be constructed at or near one of the dock piers at Charleston, S. C., and also for the erection of suitable buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of Franklin Lodge, No. 16, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Moline, Ill., praying that fraternal society and college journals be admitted to the mails as second-class matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. VEST presented a memorial of the president and professors of the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., remonstrating against the transfer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Navy and Geological Survey; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.