

Mr. STOCKDALE with Mr. CLARK.
 Mr. FISHER with Mr. LEHLBACH.
 Mr. BYNUM with Mr. STEELE.
 Mr. VANCE with Mr. RUSSELL, of Connecticut.
 Mr. GREENMAN with Mr. SHERMAN.
 Mr. RUSK with Mr. O'DONNELL.
 Mr. DAVIDSON, of Alabama, with Mr. PATTON.
 Mr. SNYDER with Mr. YOST.
 Mr. ERMENROUT with Mr. GROUT.
 Mr. FORD with Mr. GUENTHER.
 Mr. GLOVER with Mr. PUGSLEY.
 Mr. STEWART, of Texas, with Mr. DUNHAM.
 Mr. CLARDY with Mr. WADE.
 Mr. PERRY with Mr. SPOONER.
 Mr. O'FERRALL with Mr. MASON.
 Mr. BIGGS with Mr. MORROW.
 Mr. BELMONT with Mr. DAVENPORT.
 Mr. GRANGER with Mr. ROCKWELL.
 Mr. BLANCHARD with Mr. THOMAS, of Illinois.
 Mr. MONTGOMERY with Mr. HUNTER.
 Mr. MORSE with Mr. WHITING, of Massachusetts.
 Mr. TURNER, of Georgia, with Mr. REED.
 Mr. HOWARD with Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois.
 Mr. CUTCHEON with Mr. TARSNEY.
 Mr. DARLINGTON with Mr. MOORE.
 Mr. PIDCOCK with Mr. PHELPS.
 Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts, with Mr. COGSWELL.
 Mr. MORGAN with Mr. MILLIKEN.
 Mr. WHITING of Michigan, with Mr. HOUK.
 Mr. LAWLER with Mr. DE LANO.
 Mr. MCKINNEY with Mr. BOOTHMAN.
 The following were announced as being paired for this day:
 Mr. MILLS with Mr. PARKER.
 Mr. ROGERS with Mr. OSBORNE.
 Mr. BLISS with Mr. BROWER.
 Mr. BANKHEAD with Mr. KELLEY.
 Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, with Mr. WHITE, of New York.
 Mr. CRAIN with Mr. MORRILL.
 Mr. SHAW with Mr. ATKINSON.
 Mr. NORWOOD with Mr. HIESTAND.
 Mr. MCSHANE with Mr. HIRES.
 Mr. BACON with Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas.
 Mr. SPRINGER. I am paired with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], but am advised by his friends that he would vote "no" on this question, and so I will allow my vote to stand.
 Mr. STONE, of Missouri. I am paired with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIAMS]. If there is a quorum I withdraw my vote. Otherwise I desire that it shall stand, under the agreement. Has a quorum voted?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. No quorum has voted.
 Mr. SHAW. I notice that I am paired with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ATKINSON], and I withdraw my vote.
 The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.
 The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. No quorum has voted.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCook, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 6514) for an allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the Treasury Department, in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message further announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2726) granting an increase of pension to Margaret S. Heintzelman; asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and announced that Mr. DAVIS, Mr. TURPIE, and Mr. BLAIR had been appointed conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message further announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2913) granting a pension to Mary Sturgess.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BLAND. I move that the House do now adjourn.
 The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. T. J. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 11416) for the relief of Catherine McDevitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 11417) granting a pension to Mary Dippel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 11418) to restore to the pension-roll the name of John Horrigan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11419) granting a pension to Mary E. Converse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANDES: A bill (H. R. 11420) granting a pension to John Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11421) granting relief to Edward Wesner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCULLOGH: A bill (H. R. 11422) granting a pension to Daniel B. Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAIN: Petition of Mrs. Frances M. Brandon, of Laredo, Tex., for a pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FORNEY: Papers in the case of James A. Galbreath—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of A. J. Swezey and 75 others, citizens of Winnebago County, Illinois, urging the passage of House bill No. 10320, to prevent the sale of adulterated food, medicines and liquors—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of A. J. Swezey and 59 others, citizens of Winnebago County, Illinois, urging the passage of House bill No. 11027, to prevent the manufacture and sale of adulterated lard—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS: Resolutions of Girard Grange No. 6, of Kansas, for legislation prohibiting the adulteration of food articles—to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, September 12, 1888.

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

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

TRUSTS AND COMBINATIONS.

Mr. GEORGE. I desire to offer some amendments, which I regard as of some importance, to Senate bill 3445, the trust bill, which has been reported from the Committee on Finance by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN]. As my handwriting is a bit difficult to read, I ask leave to read them myself.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection.
 Mr. HOAR. It is impossible to hear the request of the Senator from Mississippi on this side.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Mississippi asks consent to read his own amendments, his handwriting not being very legible.

Mr. GEORGE. I will read them so that they will be understood.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. GEORGE. The amendments I propose to offer to the trust bill are to add the following as additional sections:

Sec. 4. That when any action or suit in law or equity shall be commenced or shall be pending in any court of the United States, it shall be lawful for any defendant therein to except to the jurisdiction of such court upon the ground that the cause of action or suit is for the enforcement of a right based on a contract for the sale, exchange, or transportation, or on any damage arising from any wrong committed in respect to any article of merchandise manufactured, transported, imported, or sold in violation of the provisions of the first section of this act, and if such ground of exception shall be proven to the satisfaction of the court, judgment of dismissal shall be entered with double costs to the defendant, and with such reasonable sum for the attorney's fees for the defense thereof as may be allowed by the court.

Sec. 5. That when the President of the United States shall be satisfied that any arrangement, trust, contract, agreement, or combination as described in the first section of this act has been formed and that in consequence thereof there has been a rise in the price of any article of merchandise, he shall have power and it is hereby made his duty to issue his proclamation suspending the collection of all customs duties or import taxes on similar articles when imported into the United States from any foreign country. Such suspension shall continue for ninety days after the President, upon being satisfied that such enhancement in price no longer exists, shall issue his proclamation withdrawing his former proclamation of suspension, and the President of the United States may from time to time, as may in his judgment be proper, reissue or withdraw any proclamation he may have issued.

Sec. 6. That when any article of merchandise shall have been raised in price by reason of the unlawful means described in the first section of this act such article when owned by any of the persons, companies, or corporations mentioned in the first section of this act or by any person, corporation, or company claiming or holding either directly or through any number of successive transferees under any of the first-named persons, companies, or corporations shall not be the lawful subjects of interstate or foreign commerce and such commerce or transportation is hereby prohibited. It shall be the duty of the President of the United States through the Interstate Commerce Commission and such other agencies as he may see proper to employ to make such investigations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. To that end every officer of the United States who may be employed in such investigation is hereby authorized to summon witnesses and to examine them under oath, and the said Interstate Commerce Commission shall make all such needful rules and regulations as may be deemed proper to carry out the provisions of this section, which rules and regulations shall, before they go into effect, be approved by the President of the United States. When such commerce and transportation as to any article of merchandise shall have become unlawful under the provisions of this act the aforesaid interdict on the same may be removed whenever the President of the United States shall so proclaim upon his being satisfied that the enhanced price as herein provided against shall no longer exist and that commerce in such article is free and not restrained or affected in any way by reason of the matters mentioned in the first section of this act.

Sec. 7. That whenever it shall appear to the President of the United States

that the manufacturers or producers of any article of merchandise or a majority of them in the United States shall not pay in regular weekly wages, in lawful money, to the workmen, artisans, and laborers, excluding superintendents and officials engaged in such manufacture or production, the full sum realized in sales by them in excess of the wholesale price in the city of New York of similar and competing articles manufactured or produced in any foreign country, such wholesale price being diminished by a reduction therefrom of the customs duties on said foreign articles, it shall be his duty to issue his proclamation suspending all duties on such similar articles when imported in excess of 30 per cent. ad valorem, and such suspension shall continue till otherwise ordered by Congress, but no act of Congress shall have the effect to allow the collection of the suspended duties on articles which shall have been imported during the time of such suspension under the proclamation of the President of the United States. He shall also have in respect to the matters of this section all the powers of investigation through officers of the United States provided for in section 6 of this act.

Sec. 8. Every violation of any proclamation issued by the President of the United States under provisions of this act, and every violation of any provision of sections 4, 5, 6, and 7, shall be punished in the same manner and to the same extent as provided for in section 3.

Mr. President, I desire to make some observations in explanation of the amendments which I have offered. The fourth section, being the first which I read, relates to suits in the United States courts. It is a somewhat difficult constitutional problem to determine how far the Congress of the United States may go in the exercise of any direct power to legislate as provided in section 1 of the bill for the suppression of these combinations and trusts. As I have read the authorities—and I can mention some of them—the Supreme Court of the United States seems to have reached finally a conclusion as to the point of time when articles of merchandise become subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and subject to the power of Congress as interstate and foreign commerce. I take it that point of time, as I deduce it from the various decisions of the Supreme Court, among which are *Veazie* against *Moor* in 14 Howard, and a very late decision in relation to some logs transported through the State of New Hampshire—I have forgotten the name of the case—is that point of time when the article commences to be transported. If that be true constitutional law, then any provision of law by Congress which undertakes to subject the article to the jurisdiction of Congress because it may become at some future time the subject of interstate and foreign commerce would be unconstitutional.

It is a difficult question, however. I do not mean to pronounce now any positive opinion upon that subject. But for fear that the offering we are now making to the people of the United States upon a subject of very grave importance to them, affecting very seriously their interests, may turn out after all not to be an efficient remedy for this evil, I have seen proper to offer the amendments which I have submitted to the Senate.

The first amendment is an outlawry of all these combinations and trusts so far as seeking remedies in the courts of the United States is concerned. It can not be objected that we can not do that, because if anything is settled in American constitutional law it is that the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States within the limits prescribed by the Constitution depends solely upon the action of Congress. Congress may give, Congress may deny any jurisdiction as to any person or as to any class of cases within these limits.

The fifth section relates to a suspension of the collection of tariff duties. My attention was called to that as a remedy against these trusts by a remark which dropped from the eminent Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] several months ago. It is known that the facility for forming these trusts arises out of the fact that a high duty is imposed on the articles concerning which the trust is formed. The manufacturers instead of allowing the people of this country to have the benefit of that reduction of prices which comes from a fair, an honest, and a business-like competition between the producers of this country, the producers and manufacturers themselves, in order to evade and avoid that result, combine and fix the price just below the price at which importations can be made. A just and a fair and a complete remedy, and I think an efficient remedy, would be that suggested by the Senator from Ohio, to reduce the duties in cases of that sort.

I have provided in this amendment that when such proof is made to the President of such combination he shall issue his proclamation and the duty shall be suspended until the normal condition of affairs shall be resumed. There can be no doubt about the constitutionality of that provision, nor can there be any doubt about its efficiency.

So up to this point we have an outlawry from the courts of the United States of men who thus violate the laws of trade and thus abuse the privileges granted to them by the tariff laws of the United States. They themselves having declared themselves, or having become *hostes humani generis*, enemies of the people of the whole country, they have no right whilst they occupy that relation to demand from this same people protection for their rights under the laws which they have violated, and through the courts of the country, whose interests they conspire to destroy.

Section 6 prohibits interstate and foreign commerce in trust articles. I will state the difference between section 1 and this section. Whilst I fear section 1 might be declared unconstitutional, for the reasons which I have before stated, there can be no doubt that when the article becomes or begins to be a part of interstate or foreign commerce by being delivered to a common carrier to be transported from one State to another or from the United States to a foreign country, at that very

instant the jurisdiction of the United States commences, and that section is framed with the view of furnishing a remedy in that aspect of the case.

Section 7 is no less important than the others. It is true, it is not strictly germane to the other provisions of the bill. It does not relate to trusts, but it does relate to a very important class of our people who are mainly injured by these trusts, and I think for that reason might well be associated with the other provisions of the bill.

It is claimed—I am not going now into a discussion whether that claim is just or not—that high protective duties are the cause of high wages to workmen. It is claimed that these high protective duties should be laid for the purpose of enabling the workmen to be paid high wages. On the other side it is denied that such a result follows.

The object of the seventh section, therefore, is that this claim of protection on the ground that the tariff duty is expended by the manufacturers in increased wages to the laborers shall be made good, or, in other words, that where a majority of the manufacturers and producers of a particular article in the United States, having protection under the tariff law, decline to give their workmen and laborers who are engaged in this production and in this manufacture the benefit of the tariff thus levied in their name and for their alleged benefit, then this provision of the amendment requires the President not to take away entirely, but to reduce the protection to 30 per cent.

These, sir, are the provisions of the amendments, and I ask that they be printed in the RECORD and also printed in ordinary bill form. The bill has been reported from the Committee on Finance, I understand.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill is on the Calendar. The amendments will be printed.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I desire to make an observation or two in regard to the same matter to which the Senator from Mississippi has addressed himself.

We have heard of late in the Senate and from other very distinguished sources of information and suggestion a good deal about the matter of trusts. At the same time there has been a most singular absence of specification in regard to these trusts. I am not aware that in regard to any of the trusts which have attracted the attention of the country and have created the discontent that calls for a remedy, there has been anything said on the part of gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber or their political associates elsewhere.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN] addressed the Senate in an elaborate written speech a few days ago, and I hoped we should get some light as to what these trusts were, where they were, what their relation was to great political parties, what the likelihood was of their being not merely a danger to the public in the way of increasing prices but a political danger. But no light seems to come.

Now, I wish the Senator from Texas or the Senator from Mississippi would tell the Senate what information they have. Is there a Standard Oil Trust, for instance, in this country or not? Is the Standard Oil Company one of the trusts which the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Texas want to have suppressed? If there be such a trust, is it represented in the Cabinet at this moment? Is it represented in the Senate? Is it represented in the councils of any important political party in this country? These gentlemen certainly have not assumed the position of enlighteners of mankind on this interesting question without having investigated that matter and having got an opinion about it which would be exceedingly useful to us.

Is there a sugar trust in the country, and have its representatives been consulted in the framing of a great revenue tariff, and had their interests specially looked out for and considered by the representatives of a powerful political party in this country in the framing of the measure which is to tax or affect the article on which every laboring man in this country I think pays more than he does for his flour? What can the Senator from Texas tell us about that? What can the Senator from Mississippi tell us about that? St. Paul said, "When I fight" (or rather the real Greek word which he used is, "When I box"), "I strike not as one that beateth the air;" "I hit somebody," was the apostle's boast, in substance. I should like to have these gentlemen tell us if there is a sugar trust in this country, and if it is likely to have got such power not only over prices but over legislation that it takes a great political party in this country and compels it to frame a tariff in its interest and tax every American citizen, every American household on one of the great necessities of life in accordance with its dictation and its interest.

Is there a cotton-oil and cotton-seed trust in this country? Where is that found at work? Does the Senator from Mississippi know something about that? He is a cotton man. He and the Senator from Texas both come from cotton States. Give us a little detail so that we shall be ready for this legislation when it comes.

Is there a whisky trust in the country? Where is that at work in politics just now, and is that anything of a danger?

Is there an anthracite-coal trust? Where is that at work? Is there danger from that?

I listened to the Senator's amendment, in which he proposes to attack those trusts or supposed trusts which are connected with manufactures on which there is a protective duty. If one such trust be found in the country, I understand he is willing to put the enormous power

in the hands of the Executive of altering the tariff of this country (a power which the framers of the Constitution denied to the Senate even the right to propose, leaving it only to the Representatives of the people), so as to strike down every honest manufacturer throughout the country who is engaged in the same business.

Does it not occur to the Senator from Mississippi that it might be well to include some of these trusts that I have mentioned, some of which, notably the whisky trust, the cotton-seed and cotton-oil trust, the anthracite-coal trust, and the Standard Oil trust, are not protected by tariffs? Why does the Senator steer so carefully in his proposed legislation not to hit these great trusts which stand to the Democratic party at this moment, as a great portion of the people believe, in the relation of Treasury and of Executive control both?

I do not think that it will turn out, on reflection, to be a good plan to put in the hands of a Chief Executive Magistrate of this country (who notoriously owes his election to the aid of the grossest interest of such a trust that exists on the face of the earth, and who has it represented in his Cabinet) the power to strike at these things and to control them and to affect the revenues of the country and the tariff legislation by his unsupported will. It is a good deal like setting the cat to watch the cream, if I may use a homely metaphor.

There is another trust about which I should like to have a little information. There is a gentleman whose name I shall not call, for I do not want to have the suggestion made that I am violating any rule of courtesy or parliamentary law, who is understood to be the most powerful and trusted counselor in directing the campaign of the Democratic party in this country at this moment. When he walks from the White House down Pennsylvania avenue after he has spent an hour or two at the White House he is very apt to have a bill in his pocket on some important political matter, and the bill is very apt to get through somewhere by a unanimous vote of the same party, and it is very apt to be pressed through here until the mistake or blunder is found out.

I should like to know whether the gentleman to whom I have referred has any relation to any of these great trusts that affect the transporting interests, or the coal interests, or any other interests in this country—the trust which puts its tax upon the fire of every workingman in the winter, the trust which can increase the freight he pays for every article of necessity or comfort in the summer, or upon the fare he pays when he travels from place to place on business or recreation. The Senator from Texas knows all about this trust. Who is managing it? What party keeps it up? What party profits by it? I hope we shall get a few of the facts and details of this matter before the committee is ready to report.

Is there a fruit trust, and where is that?

I ask the Secretary of the Senate to read at the top of the ninety-fourth page from the Congressional Directory.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

TWENTY-SEVENTH DISTRICT.

[Counties.—Erie, Venango, and Warren.]

WILLIAM J. SCOTT, of Erie, was born in the city of Washington, D. C., July 2, 1828, his parents being residents of Virginia; he received a common school education; served as page in the House of Representatives from 1840 to 1846; settled in Erie, Pa., in 1848, and was employed as a clerk in the shipping business; engaged in 1850 in the coal and shipping business, owning and running several vessels on the lakes; subsequently became largely interested in the manufacture of iron and the mining of coal, as well as in the construction and operation of railroads, either as president or director of various lines, aggregating over 22,000 miles of completed road, the greatest number of miles of railroad, probably, which any one individual was ever an officer or director of; was a district delegate to the national Democratic convention held in the city of New York in 1868, and a delegate at large from the State of Pennsylvania to the Democratic national convention held in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1860, and also represented the State of Pennsylvania on the Democratic national committee from 1876 to 1884; was elected mayor of the city of Erie in 1866, and again in 1871; was elected to the Forty-ninth and re-elected to the Fiftieth Congress as a Democrat, receiving 14,787 votes against 13,574 votes for Mackey, Republican, and 2,140 votes for Andrews, Prohibitionist.

Mr. HOAR. Twenty-two thousand miles of railroad—just think of it—in the service of the Democratic party in this election, more than all the railroads in Great Britain and France put together, if I am correct in my memory. I understand that part of it is in Canada, and I do not wonder that the Canadian minister who negotiated the late treaty went home and told the Canadian Parliament that he was told by the Democratic Secretary of State that the House of Representatives and the great Democratic party in this country proposed to do exactly what Canada desired, according to the report of Sir Charles Tupper.

Mr. President, I do not profess to be an expert in this matter. I am one of the plain, simple people who pay the taxes. But the Senator from Texas is the great lover of the people; he spends his time and grows thin and spare when he thinks of the wrongs of the people at the hands of these trusts, metaphorically I mean, not actually. He will tell us all about these questions that I have asked, and when he has got through telling us I am going to ask him a few more, if he will be good enough to answer these first. I want to know the facts about these five or six great trusts, which are sufficient in their power to overthrow any government in Europe, if they existed in those nations, that should set itself against them, the coal, the sugar, the whisky, the cotton, the fruit, the railroad transportation of this country, controlled by these giant chieftains, manipulated in the interest of the Democratic party and the present Administration, represented in Cab-

inet and Senate, the chairman of their national committee one of the same sort. I do not wonder that gentlemen are working up the attention of the American people to this gigantic danger. I said they would overthrow any country in Europe, and it is only a country whose destinies are in the hands of 15,000,000 of freemen, each with his free and equal vote, that will be able to defend itself against them and put them down.

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. President, I introduced a bill some time ago which had for its object to define trusts and provide for punishing those connected with them. On the same day the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] introduced another bill on the same subject and having the same object in view.

It did not occur to me that the introduction of a bill was the time to explain its provisions, its meaning, and all the facts which inspired its introduction, as the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts seems to have supposed was the case. I supposed when a bill on this subject was reported and was before the Senate for consideration would be the time at which to discuss it.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Texas pardon me? I judge from what he said just now that he assumes I began this debate.

Mr. REAGAN. Oh, I was not talking about who began it.

Mr. HOAR. It was begun by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. REAGAN. I am not talking about that. I supposed that the time for the discussion of this question would be when a bill comes up for consideration in the Senate. I made no objection if a Senator chooses to make some explanatory remarks in introducing a bill; I know that is customary; but it is not customary to go into an elaborate discussion if the question before it is up for consideration and before the time when Senators have had an opportunity to consider the subject.

The Senator from Massachusetts is anxious that I should give an explanation about these trusts, of what constituted and by whom managed; and he seems to have a special distress on account of the management of trusts by Democratic politicians. I am sorry that a question which affects the interests of the great body of the American people can not be treated as a question affecting the interests of the people and deserving of a remedy without attempting to make a party issue out of it. I do not undertake to say whether Democrats or Republicans are connected with these trusts, nor do I care. My purpose is to get a law that will punish either Democrat or Republican who engages in this business.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator pardon me for a question?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. REAGAN. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. Did the Senator not make his own speech on this subject the other day as an attack on Mr. Blaine?

Mr. REAGAN. The Senator made an allusion of that kind before. I made no such speech nor any speech having that object in view at all. I made a speech upon the injurious effects of our tariff legislation on the industrial and labor interests of the country. That was the object of the speech; and the only reference I made to trusts at all was to refer to an expression made by a distinguished American citizen the day before excusing and defending trusts, and if I would follow the example set me by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts I would say a Republican politician had defended and excused trusts in a measure. I simply referred to that to dissent from what had been said. I made no pretense to discuss the question of trusts whatever. I did not have that object in view, and it only occurred to me at the very time the discussion was going on.

All I desire to say now is to protest that I have not been called upon nor have I undertaken to discuss the question of trusts, and I do not intend to do so until a bill comes up for consideration, when if it is found convenient and I think I can do anything to enlighten the subject I shall be disposed to do so.

The Senator from Massachusetts quoted from St. Paul about the impropriety of fighting in the air and about the propriety of striking somebody when he fought. Whom did he strike in these trusts? Has he told the Senate whether he would favor them or oppose them? There has been a good deal of talk with a view of giving a partisan trend to this subject, and when that question comes up for consideration, if the Senator chooses to take that line he will get enough of it. I assure him now that he will get enough of it if he undertakes to make a partisan issue of it.

My purpose is, and it is the only purpose I have in view, to arrest if possible the great evils that afflict this country. The Senator does not overstate them when he states they are sufficient to overturn any government in Europe, and if they are not arrested they will overturn this Government as inevitably as the night follows the day. It is for the purpose of trying to arrest them that I propose to act, not as a Democrat, not to affect Republicans, not to affect Democrats, but to affect any man who violates the laws of trade and the rights of the American people, I do not care to what party he belongs.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Debate proceeds by unanimous consent. Is there objection?

Mr. HOAR. I desire permission to say a few words.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts will proceed.

Mr. HOAR. I asked the Senator from Texas if he would be good enough to answer some five or six questions?

Mr. REAGAN. I say to the Senator now that I do not care to be catechised. I am not entering upon a debate of this question, and I shall not participate in a debate of it until it comes up in proper order.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator made an elaborate speech on this subject.

Mr. REAGAN. I tell the Senator now that I never made a speech on the subject. I only made an incidental reference to the subject.

Mr. HOAR. Here is the speech of the Senator which I have in my hand, from which I shall read, if he will pardon me. Let us see. The Senator from Texas rose the other day in a state of considerable, I will not say excitement, but zeal, righteous indignation, to comment on a declaration made by an eminent citizen of the United States now in private life, formerly a candidate of the Republican party for the Presidency, in regard to trusts. The Senator gave us an elaborate discourse on that subject, as I understood, and I heard him. I was therefore moved when the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] made his remarks on this subject to ask the Senator from Texas, who might be getting ready to act on this legislation, the facts as he knew them in his opinion on five or six questions.

If he could not have been blind to contemporary history in this country. He could not have made that speech without having thought all about and known all about, as far as he could, the questions to which I asked an answer. I wanted to know what he could tell us about the Standard Oil trust, and where its representatives were, what they were doing with the Democratic party to-day, the sugar trust, the cotton-oil and cotton-seed trust, the whisky trust, and this great railroad control; and the Senator, instead of answering that question, says that he is not going to be catechised, and he deplors that in regard to this great and melancholy evil, which causes him so much grief, anybody should undertake to introduce a partisan consideration of it, and talk about parties.

Here is an extract from that Senator's speech, "Speech of Hon. JOHN H. REAGAN, of Texas, August 16, 1888," made when no human being had alluded to the subject before, as far as I know. This is a copy of the speech which I suppose I received by his courtesy, which is always abounding, for, as we all know, he is one of the most courteous men alive. I received it from some one so that I might read it. This gentleman, who thinks it is dreadful that there should be any partisanship or mention of party in this great sober consideration, in the time of this Democratic funeral which is going on in this country, to be talking about party!

Can there be a doubt as to which side of this question the majority of the intelligent and patriotic voters of this country will adopt?

There is much reason to congratulate the country on the professed reforms of political principles which the Democracy has compelled the Republican party to adopt as a last means of saving that party from further defeat.

That is, I suppose the Senator means, with these six great trusts, which cover everything as with a great blanket in this country.

Mr. REAGAN. The Senator will allow me—

Mr. HOAR. As soon as I have finished the extract.

We declare our opposition to all combinations of capital organized in trusts or otherwise to control arbitrarily the condition of trade among our citizens. They did not know—

The Senator goes on—

What Mr. Blaine would say on that.

Then he quotes the Republican platform further, and goes on—

That beats audacity itself, and I do not know what name to call it.

And these six great trust-owners, all Democratic, have compelled the Republican party to insert in its platform a declaration of opposition to trusts. I should think they might very well. As I said before, they constitute its treasury, they constitute its support, they constitute its executive management and control. The Democratic party is like a great artichoke. You cut off the outer peel, and there is another one just like it, and so you peel and peel and peel, and it is trust, trust, trust, trust, trust from outer shell to inner core, and I do not wonder that it has compelled the Republican party to express its objection to it. Then the Senator goes on—

The votes and speeches of Republican Senators and Representatives in Congress—

Remember, this was not in debate, this was the introduction of the subject, when the Senate laid aside its business to enable the Senator from Texas to go on with a set speech—

from the time that party came into power until the present, and the action of the Executive Departments at all times when under the control of that party, will show to any one who will take the trouble to investigate them that the foregoing declarations of principle are in direct conflict with the recorded action of that party for many years past, and that they may now be regarded as a sort of death-bed confession of past political sins.

In view of the conflict between the recorded action of the Republican party and the foregoing declarations, we may congratulate the country on the success of the Democratic party in educating Republicans up to the point of making such declarations of principle. If they are only hypocritically made in the effort to be successful in the approaching election, still such action is a tribute to the virtue and soundness of Democratic principles.

There is nothing partisan in that, as my friend on my left [Mr. ALLISON] observes.

The Hon. James G. Blaine, who has just returned from luxuriating in the splendid castle of Mr. Carnegie in Scotland—

Nothing partisan in that—

the prize extorted from American labor by a protective tariff, has taken upon himself the task of showing how little President Cleveland knows about tariffs, and trusts, and statesmanship generally.

He goes on:

And now, Mr. Blaine, who is the guiding spirit of the Republican party in the pending campaign, true to his past record, and a true representative of his party and of its past history, has taken on himself, in his speech in Portland, Me., of yesterday, to ridicule Mr. Cleveland's reference to the evils and dangers of trusts. And in his rôle of defender of protection, of corporations, of aggregations of capital of all kinds, he poses as the apologist and defender of trusts.

When I asked the Senator about these great and notorious facts of our current history relating to the very subject he was talking about, he turns around with a pious exhortation to banish politics from the consideration of this important question!

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts commenced reading to show that I had in that speech introduced the subject of trusts first, and he read that paragraph. If he had read the entire speech, he would have known that it applied to the whole field of discussion of class legislation. I had reviewed, as I understood it, to some extent, the history of class legislation as carried on by the Republican party on various subjects. It was to that I referred in asking the question as to which side the intelligent voters of the United States would act with, and I was not dealing specially with the subject of trusts. I objected to the partisan turn the Senator wanted to give to this subject in advance of the discussion of the question. I have no objection, if he sees proper to go into it when the question comes up, to see what party in this country is responsible for this class legislation, and I promise the Senator if he provokes that, I will show facts from the record running through years to sustain the declaration which I have made there.

The Senator speaks of the Democratic funeral. Perhaps he had better wait until the funeral procession starts to know whose funeral it is.

Mr. HOAR. It started from Oregon and Vermont and Maine.

Mr. REAGAN. I do not think anybody has been surprised at the result in Vermont and in Maine and very little surprised at the result in Oregon. I might turn to the State of Arkansas, that has had an election recently, and ask if the Senator feels discouraged at the result in Arkansas; but I do not. I do not care to occupy the time of the Senate now in such references. I simply desire to protest that the Senator has misconceived the object of the speech I made, and that I have not attempted the discussion of the special subject of trusts. The object of that speech in a great measure was to show the evil effects of our tariff legislation and of class legislation generally, and I made it a point to arraign as best I could the Republican party for being responsible for that; and whenever it becomes necessary I will attempt to make good what I said.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I have a feeling of kindly sympathy with the honorable Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]. The "Standard Oil Company" seems to trouble his mind and will probably trouble it during all his life, unless he can be relieved in some proper way of responsibility for it. Even at this day it seems that that company is represented as being guilty of all sorts of unlawful and improper things. Such allegations, without proof to sustain them, I regard as unworthy of an honorable man or an honorable Senator. Now, a brief statement perhaps will relieve the Senator's mind. I have no doubt he delights in uttering before the Senate an insinuation that that company has a representative in this body, and he never will be happy until that impression is removed from his mind.

To begin with, let me say that there is nothing whatever to sustain the insinuation which the honorable Senator conveys. I make the declaration now for the first time, and it will be the last time I shall ever take notice of it.

The Standard Oil Company is a very remarkable and wonderful institution. It has accomplished within the last twenty years as a commercial enterprise what no other company or association of modern times has accomplished; but, Mr. President, I never had a dollar's interest in that company; I never owned a dollar of its stock; I never rendered it any service, and that company never rendered me any service. On the contrary, when a candidate for the other House in 1871, no institution, no association, no combination in my district did more to bring about my defeat and went to so large an expense in money to accomplish it as the Standard Oil Company. I never was in their works but once, and then, in company with the late General Devereaux, as an escort to a gentleman, a distinguished stranger from Russia. So much for myself.

As a matter of fact nine-tenths of the stockholders of the Standard Oil Company are now, and always have been, Republicans. Within my knowledge there are but two Democrats who have ever been stockholders in that company. Not only are the majority Republicans, but they are very liberal in their philanthropic contributions to charities and benevolent works, and I venture the assertion that two gentlemen in that company have donated more money for philanthropic and for benevolent purposes than all the Republican members of the Senate put together.

So, then, if there is any politics in that organization, they are Republican politics. There never has been a national election in which those two gentlemen to whom I refer have not contributed very liberally; at the same time they have contributed liberally to the Prohibition or the "anti-saloon" organization which my honorable friend, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR], so ably represents.

I do not know that I need go any further in that matter. If the Standard Oil Company has done anything wrong, it is a corporation under the laws of Ohio, without any exclusive privileges and opportunities; if it has done anything immoral, oppressive, or unjust, I am as free as any other citizen of that State to demand that it shall be held accountable.

As to that corporation being represented in the Cabinet, I hardly know what to say. It is a mere insinuation, unmanly and untruthful, and such as only could be expected from the lower class of stumpers, and I think it not deserving of further notice here.

Now, one word further. I do not know one of these trusts to-day that is under the controlling management of Democrats. One reason is the Democrats generally have not had money enough to engage in these trusts, and I might say with reference to Colonel SCOTT, whom I have known many years and have been associated with him in various enterprises, that he, a very intelligent and enterprising gentleman, has had connection with numerous companies. The two principal lines of railroad in which he has been interested as a stockholder and director are the "Canada Pacific" and the New York Central lines of roads, and he has had an associate in the latter, Mr. Depew. As to the Canada Pacific, I suppose I need not name a distinguished gentleman who has been associated with him in the directory of that company. He is a gentleman of the highest respectability, and is the Republican candidate for the Vice-Presidency of the United States.

Insinuations that Colonel SCOTT "traveled down from the White House to the House of Representatives with a draughted bill," etc., I utterly discredit. I have inquired in my own way without success to find a single particle of evidence to sustain it. Such charges might do on the stump or in a political harangue, but I submit that it is unworthy a distinguished and leading Senator on this floor to make public such insinuations against honorable men. As to that I forbear further comment.

This bill I have not considered. It has been referred to the Committee on Finance. No doubt it will receive due consideration, and I think there should be no political differences in the effort to guard against the abuses and influences of these trusts. I hope each side, if there be sides, will vie with the other in endeavoring to provide some efficient protection against the evils of trusts.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. If I understood him correctly—he spoke in a low tone of voice—I understood him to say that the Standard Oil Company had exerted itself against his election?

Mr. PAYNE. When I was a candidate for the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator refer to the time when he was a candidate for the Senate?

Mr. PAYNE. I will include that, if I did not include it before. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts, if he will allow me, as I suppose I am relieving his mind from a great deal of useless anxiety, that not one dollar or one cent directly or indirectly was contributed to my election to this body by the Standard Oil Company.

Mr. HOAR. Who were the stockholders? The Senator manifested a great knowledge of the stockholders. He said there were two Democrats among them.

Mr. PAYNE. One of them was my own son and the other Colonel Thompson. Those are the only Democrats that were ever stockholders in that company as far as my knowledge extends.

Mr. HOAR. They are very influential in the Democratic councils. I should like to ask the Senator another question, and that is, if it is not true that the Standard Oil Company has been able to get very large advantages in the way of railroad transportation over any other manufacturers of similar articles?

Mr. PAYNE. I will answer as far as I know. I know that at one time, in Saratoga, one of the managers of the oil company met in conference the representatives of the New York Central and the Pennsylvania Railroads and discussed the question of freights, but I know nothing of the results of the interview.

Mr. HOAR. That was not my question. My question was whether in the transportation of their manufactured products they had not had large advantages by transportation by rail over other manufacturers?

Mr. PAYNE. I know they have had very extensive dealings, and I know at one time they constructed, in order to conduct their shipping business, over a thousand cars. I know from general report—that at another time they constructed several hundred if not several thousand miles of pipe, in order to make themselves independent of the railroads. I only know these things from report.

Mr. HOAR. We get some very remarkable admissions from the Senator from Ohio, which I think will interest the country. One is of a very remarkable and considerable knowledge on his part of the private affairs of this company. He says he has not any personal interest. Another is, that two of its most important managers are persons who

were among the most influential and important managers of his election to the Senate, according to the evidence which has been laid before the Senate. Third, a confession on his own part that that company did take an earnest and active part in politics. He says it was taken in opposition to his election to the other House. I think if that company had taken an active part in politics on one side, it would have been very likely to have its vast weight felt on the other.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know that I understand the Senator very distinctly. I did not admit that any one member of the Standard Oil Company had contributed to my election to this body, nor do I know that any member of that company ever contributed a dollar to my election. The Senator must have been laboring in his Copiah, Miss., imagination on these matters to discolor and distort the facts. I know he has been troubled in that way for a long time. He certainly has had experience enough and is sensible enough to rise above the low demagogic motives that may control others.

I know something of this company, to be sure, because it is in my own town; it originated there, and I know the members of it. For many years before they left Ohio they were my neighbors, and I know from public reports and from what I have seen that we have had no two gentlemen in the State of Ohio who have been as liberal as they have, and it is to their credit, and their success is due to their wonderful sagacity as managers of this corporation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2726) granting an increase of pension to Margaret S. Heintzelman, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CHIPMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1959) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue to the governor of the Territory of Montana military stores for the use of the regularly enlisted, organized, and uniformed active militia; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*:

A bill (H. R. 7708) to increase the pension of Annie Gibson Yates;
A bill (H. R. 10234) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes;
A bill (H. R. 10856) for pension for Eliza N. Aiken; and
A bill (H. R. 10998) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

DEATH OF JOSEPH HOFFMAN, WASHINGTON COUNTY, TEXAS.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, is it in order to introduce a resolution at this time?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Resolutions are in order.

Mr. SPOONER. I desire to offer a resolution, but before sending it to the desk I ask the consent of the Senate to make a brief explanation of the purposes of the resolution and the motives which lead to its introduction.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator has that right under the rules.

Mr. SPOONER. As a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections it became my duty under the order of the Senate and the direction of the committee to investigate during the last session of Congress, in conjunction with other members of the committee, some alleged election outrages in Washington County, Texas. It was to me an exceedingly disagreeable duty. If there is a partisanship in the United States which gloats over the existence of outrage and cruelty and bloodshed as to elections in any part of the country as a source of political capital I have no sympathy with it; but I believe in the rights of citizenship; that men who under the Constitution of the United States have a right to vote should be maintained in that right whether they live in the North or in the South, whether they are white men or are blackmen—the black man just as much as the white man—and whether they vote the Democratic ticket or the Republican ticket. I therefore went about the work as an important duty. I do not intend to say a word at this time—for I should not regard it as proper—of the testimony taken by the committee in its effect or as to conclusions upon it. That will come later. There came before that committee one day as a witness, brought here by subpoena, a man by the name of Joseph Hoffman, a clear-eyed, clear-faced, brainy, brave man, if one could judge of the characteristics of the man from his appearance, and his testimony was careful and cautious, but outright and unequivocal. He was not a negro; he was a white man, a German, a Republican, living in Washington County, Texas. In all the testimony there was no whisper against his character. He had been elected, I think, nine times the assessor of that county, and at the election which we were investigating, when what was called the "People's ticket," by methods