

heard on the subject, I move the previous question on the adoption of the substitute.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question now is on the adoption of the substitute.

The substitute was adopted, and the original resolution was laid on the table.

Mr. RICHARDSON moved to reconsider the vote by which the substitute was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

TAX ON OLEOMARGARINE.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the table the resolution introduced by me some time since and refer it to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. What is the resolution?

Mr. LAWLER. It is a resolution taking the tax off oleomargarine. Several members objected.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I understand that all my colleague desires is to have the resolution taken from the table and referred to the appropriate committee.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the reference of the resolution indicated by the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. LAWLER. If the House will allow me a word of explanation, I think there will be no objection. I introduced this resolution, which proposes not to interfere with the oleomargarine law, nor with the license fee of the wholesale or the retail dealer, but only to take off the 2 cents tax, which affects the consumer. I merely ask the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Ways and Means for its consideration; that is all. I introduced the resolution before the committees were appointed, and it was laid on the table until they should be appointed. Ever since the appointment of the committees I have been trying to get it up, and all I ask now is that it shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MORGAN. I object.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let it go to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. PAYSON. I will ask my colleague [Mr. LAWLER] whether he is willing that it should go to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. LAWLER. I would rather have it laid on the table than sent to that committee.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN TRUSTS.

Mr. BACON. I ask unanimous consent to take from the House Calendar a resolution reported by the Committee on Manufactures as a substitute for a resolution of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] referred to that committee (House Miscellaneous Document No. 69).

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The resolution reported by the committee will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it is alleged that certain individuals and corporations in the United States engaged in manufacturing, mining, or dealing in some of the necessities of life have combined for the purpose of controlling or curtailing the production or supply of the same, and thereby increasing their price to the people of the country, which combinations are known as associations, trusts, pools, and like names, but are not incorporated under the laws of any State; and

Whereas such combinations not only injuriously affect commerce between the States, but impair the revenues of the United States as derived from its duties on imports: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures be, and the same is hereby, directed to inquire into the names, and number, and extent of such alleged combinations, under whatever name known, their methods of combination or doing business, their effect upon the prices of any of the necessities of life to the people of the country, upon its internal or foreign commerce, and its revenues from import duties, together with any and all other matters relating to the same which may call for or suggest legislation by Congress, and report the same to the House with such recommendations as the said committee may agree upon. And for these purposes the Committee on Manufactures is authorized to sit during the sessions of the House, to employ a stenographer, to administer oaths, examine witnesses, compel the attendance of persons and the production of papers. And the expense of such investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, when this proposition was originally reported I objected to its immediate consideration for the reason that I did not think its language comprehensive enough to include an inquiry as to all "trusts" and "pools" which it might be desirable to investigate. These combinations are not peculiar to the United States. We have jurisdiction of inquiry only within the limits of the Union. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON], with whom I have conferred on this subject, has consented, as I have understood him, to amend this resolution so that the inquiry may embrace the "Standard Oil Company," the "Whisky Trust," and every organization in the nature of a "trust" or "pool," whether its operations relate to the necessities of life or merely to the comfort of citizens in other particulars. [Laughter.]

This is a wide field, and if the Federal power can regulate these organizations, perhaps it might be useful to exercise the power of control. Not knowing, myself, how far our power in this regard may extend, I shall be glad to have a committee of this House appointed with the view of ascertaining whether we can adopt measures for the benefit of the people which the resolution presupposes to be desirable.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, this substitute was prepared by the Com-

mittee on Manufactures after conference with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] who introduced the original resolution, our intention being to put it in such form and language as would enable a committee of this House to examine into and lay before the House the facts with regard to such combinations as are referred to in the preamble. We believe it does now embrace all such combinations. It certainly was so intended. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL], however, whose experience of course entitles his views to deference, believes that a change of language will make the proposition more certainly comprehensive. Understanding it to have been the purpose of the committee to embrace every such trust or combination which, owing to the fact that it is not incorporated, is not within the reach, perhaps, of the laws of any State, I see no objection to introducing into the resolution certain language which the gentleman has suggested. These alterations, as it seems to me, will not affect the purport of the resolution; but I desire to make the proposition conform to the gentleman's views, as I understand he is anxious to have all these subjects investigated.

I will state the changes which the gentleman has proposed. After the words "necessaries of life" in the preamble, the gentleman proposes to insert the words "and other products for sale;" so as to make the preamble read:

Whereas it is alleged that certain individuals and corporations in the United States engaged in manufacturing, mining, or dealing in some of the necessities of life and other products for sale have combined, etc.

I understand the gentleman's criticism to be that the resolution in the form reported would not embrace the "Whisky Trust," the Standard Oil Company—

Mr. RANDALL. I desire to embrace also gas companies and all "trusts."

Mr. BACON. The gentleman wishes to include "trusts" of every description, and he suggests, as I understand, that some of the articles to which these "trusts" relate are not "necessaries of life." The committee, as I understand, see no objection to the changes which the gentleman proposes; and if he will send his amendments to the Clerk's desk, no objection will come from me, at any rate, to their insertion.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I understand the whole object of this resolution is to investigate these gigantic "trusts."

Mr. BACON. To investigate these "trusts," whether gigantic or small.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. It may be proper to state that the committee was satisfied the "trusts" referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania were included in the proposition as reported.

Mr. RANDALL. It can do no harm to make the language plainer.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Of course the committee is perfectly willing such organizations should be specified; but we were certain they were not excluded.

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman is certain they were not excluded; I want to be certain they are included. There are two amendments which I have suggested—one to the preamble and one to the resolution itself.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will read the first amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the preamble so as to read:

"Whereas it is alleged that certain individuals and corporations in the United States engaged in manufacturing, mining, or dealing in some of the necessities of life and other productions have combined for the purpose of controlling or curtailing the production or supply of the same," etc.

Mr. WEAVER. Would that include express companies?

Mr. BACON. No, sir; not as I understand it.

Mr. RAYNER. A number of these "trusts" are made up of different companies which, having been incorporated by different States, have entered into these combinations. Does this include such organizations?

Mr. BACON. It does, as we understand.

Mr. RAYNER. I think it excludes one of the very companies you ought to get at, the Standard Oil Company. I think that is excluded by the terms of the resolution.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Then I trust the language will be so amended as to include every such organization. That was the intention of the committee.

Mr. BRUMM. I hope the resolution will be amended so as to include the large anthracite-coal monopolies.

Mr. RAYNER. It does not include them now.

Mr. BRUMM. It ought to do so.

Mr. BACON. I think the House is under a misapprehension in regard to what this resolution contemplates. In the opinion of the committee, this House has no right to institute an investigation into the private affairs of any corporation formed under the laws of any State and transacting business solely within the limits of the State of which it is a corporation.

Mr. RAYNER. Allow me to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BACON. Permit me to finish my statement.

Mr. RAYNER. It is in that connection.

Mr. BACON. In a moment. But the committee understand that where a combination or combinations have been formed, partly of private individuals and partly of corporations, which corporations are not incorporated in the same States and reach over State lines and engage in interstate commerce, and such combinations are not in the power of the State Legislature creating such corporations, they are therefore within the reach of the legislative power of this body, and for that reason, as it is without any question the right of this House to make this investigation, we have put in only those combinations not incorporated under the laws of any State, so that they can not refuse to come here and answer any question put to them nor shelter themselves under their State charters.

Mr. RANDALL. I suggest to the gentleman from Maryland to strike out the words "any incorporated," as that would reach the result he has in view.

Mr. RAYNER. I ask whether corporations incorporated in the State of Pennsylvania, having the right to transact business under that incorporation in other States, and a number of States give that right, whether such corporations would be reached by this resolution?

Mr. BACON. Yes, they would be reached by the resolution if they are in combination with any other corporation.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to offer an amendment which I think will answer the purpose.

Mr. BACON. Gentlemen, one at a time. [Laughter.] I will answer every question as intelligently as I can, but I must answer them in their order.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, is there room there for another? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Gentlemen will retire to their seats and preserve order.

Mr. BACON. I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER].

Mr. GUENTHER. I wish to ask whether you will have the power to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of contracts relating to these combinations?

Mr. BACON. That is embraced in the power granted by the resolution.

Mr. GUENTHER. Power to compel attendance of witnesses and to compel them to testify and produce papers.

Mr. BACON. The committee will have all the power the House has.

Mr. BRUMM. Would your resolution include a combination of corporations chartered in one State for, say, mining purposes, who combine not only with each other, but with individual mining proprietors whose collieries are in other States, and who also combine with carrying companies, although their charters may all be from one State, yet their rights extend to other States; would your resolution cover combinations of that kind?

Mr. BACON. If I understand the language of the resolution, it does; and it was so intended to do.

Mr. BRUMM. Then I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. McADOO. Does it include combinations of foreign agents or agents of foreign manufactures in the United States to raise the price of imported articles? [Cries of "Louder!"] Will this inquiry reach a combination on the part of agents for the sale of foreign goods in the United States to raise the price of those foreign goods and to depress the price of domestic products?

Mr. BACON. Yes; I think it will.

Mr. McADOO. Then I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to correct an impression which I think the chairman inadvertently made upon the House, and that is as to the right of Congress to get information on this subject. The gentleman seems to give out the impression that we had no right to seek information from corporations of a State doing business in such State. If it were a question of legislation it would be different, but as a question of information this House has a right to go anywhere within the jurisdiction of the United States, inquire of anybody or company or corporation as to the business he or it is doing—to get information of anybody or any corporation as to his or its action. We have done it in procuring the Census Report, a volume containing more information than was ever published by any government in the world, which I regard as a most useful publication and one reflecting great credit on our Government. In the matter of information, we have the right to ask these corporations what they are doing, how many men they employ, the character of their business, the price paid, etc. All these questions have been asked, by the authority of Congress, by the Census Office throughout all the States in the Union. Its agents have gone from house to house asking the ages of the children and of the members of each family. I therefore think we should strike out the words which have been indicated.

Mr. RAYNER. I have an amendment to offer.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand the gentleman from Maryland has an amendment to offer which accomplishes the object which I desire to accomplish. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BACON. In reply to the gentleman from Illinois I will say that while I have no doubt of the right of the House or any member of it, or of any member of the committee, to ask questions for information,

I have nevertheless grave doubt of the right of the Government to compel answers to questions which do not in some way deal with matters in reference to which this House can legislate.

I do not understand that the author of this resolution or the committee that reported it have come into this House asking for any authority to go out and take a census. All they ask of the House is authority to compel the giving of such information as will come within what they believe to be the legitimate power of this House to legislate in regard to these pools and combinations; and in the resolution of inquiry which we ask the House to adopt here we have restricted its operation in accordance with what, in the judgment of the committee, and as we are advised by other gentlemen who are learned in the law and experienced in the practice of this House, is within the full power of the House to grant.

I yield now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] for a question.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman from New York has practically answered the question I desired to ask. Still I wish to call his attention to this point: Suppose the investigation is ordered by the House, and the committee find that there has been a combination and a conspiracy between a corporation in one State and certain citizens of that State for the purpose of advancing the price of certain commodities which enter into the daily consumption of the people; do I understand the gentleman from New York to claim, in view of that condition of affairs, that there is any power vested in this House, by authority of the Constitution or laws, to remedy that abuse inside of the State limits? Do I understand him to claim that Congress has any jurisdiction or that there is on the statute-books of the United States any law that makes such a combination or conspiracy a wrong against which you could proceed for redress? Or if you ascertain the existence of such a combination, would you have to proceed to redress the evils by some other method? And if so, I ask the gentleman to tell me by what method. Or if you find such a state of facts as the resolution alleges to exist, do you propose to go into the State courts to remedy the abuse? And, in fine, let me ask, what has Congress to do with the question at all? Are not the States amply able to take care of themselves and protect the people within their limits against that combination or that conspiracy if it exists? If they are not, sir, I want to know where your law or where the Constitution gives you authority to take the step you here propose, and if by the passage of this resolution you are not usurping to yourself an authority that is not delegated to you under the Constitution? That is the question.

Mr. HOPKINS. Let me say to the gentleman from New York, this resolution is simply to investigate as to the facts alleged. After those facts are gathered by the committee they will be accompanied by a report, and it is then for the House to determine what action it will take upon that report.

Mr. SCOTT. I beg leave to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that we made an investigation by a select committee, which was authorized to go to St. Louis, Mo., and to report to the Congress then in session on the great strike and labor trouble prevailing in that region. What did that investigation amount to?

Mr. HOPKINS. Let me answer the gentleman by another question: Because one criminal is acquitted, is that a reason for ceasing to try to enforce the criminal laws?

Mr. SCOTT. I am not trying to acquit any criminal. [Laughter.]

Mr. BACON. In answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I can only say that it seems to me the suggestions he makes in regard to the constitutional limitations and powers of the House over this subject will more properly apply to the legislation which the House may undertake to enact after the resolution now presented has been enforced. But here is a crying abuse, something that everybody understands, which the newspapers tell us daily is committing a serious injury to the best interests of the people of the country. It has been held by the State courts to be beyond their power of correction. The purpose of this resolution of the gentleman from Illinois, as I understand it, is to ascertain the accuracy of this information, and when the facts are laid before Congress for it to apply such remedy as may be within its legislative power to apply. That is the purpose of the investigation and the reason it seems wise to the committee to adopt it.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois who introduced the resolution.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a misunderstanding as to the meaning and intent of this resolution. I did not intend at the time I drew and introduced the resolution that its effect should be to appoint a "smelling committee" to invade the borders of the States and investigate the affairs of the people doing business within State lines under State laws and charters. The resolution simply recites that there is a large class of trusts and combinations which, by reason of a monopoly and by combination, can increase the price of certain of the necessities of life, mentioning particularly coal, sugar, and other necessities of life.

The object of the resolution was to ascertain, if possible, what effect these combinations of trusts have had upon the prices of these necessities of life; whether or not, by reason of the tariff, they are thus enabled to place a greater price upon them, and that is certainly a sub-

ject within the jurisdiction of Congress. There are some industrious and energetic men in this country who would like to have a corner upon sunshine and levy a tariff of a thousand dollars each on every ray of foreign sunlight.

The tariff laws, we believe in Chicago, are sometimes perverted from their legitimate purposes, and are turned against the people for the benefit of those who should not have such privileges.

Mr. NELSON. Will the gentleman from Illinois allow me a question?

Mr. MASON. Yes, sir.

Mr. NELSON. Have you any doubt in your own mind but that the tariff laws indirectly co-operate to aid these trusts?

Mr. MASON. I will say in response to the gentleman from Minnesota that I have no doubt there is a class of trusts and a class of men who take advantage of the tariff laws. We who believe in a high protective tariff think there should be some way to avoid taking advantage of the laws and perverting them from their proper purpose. But so far as I am concerned, expressing also, I believe, the sentiments of the people of my district, I presume, if there is a proper way of meeting that, this committee can report a proper bill, but if there is no way to protect the people from these exactions of trusts except the revision of the tariff, so far as I am concerned I am ready to vote for that now.

Mr. DINGLEY. Will the gentleman permit me a single question?

Mr. MASON. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. I think this resolution speaks of a trust which has raised the price of anthracite coal.

Mr. MASON. I think not. It recites that a sugar trust has raised the price of sugar. The original resolution has been amended since perhaps the gentleman from Maine saw it.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is there any duty imposed on anthracite coal?

Mr. MASON. No, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. Then this has nothing directly to do with the tariff?

Mr. MASON. I think the gentleman is right in that statement, if anthracite coal is included in the resolution.

Mr. MILLIKEN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania seems to be very anxious to include anthracite coal, and there is no tariff on that article.

Mr. BRUMM. Is it not true the greatest monopolies we have in this country are the monopolies of such things as can not be produced abroad or come into competition with American products? First, there is coal-oil. We never import coal-oil. Next, there is the Western Union Telegraph monopoly; that can not be interfered with by foreign competition. Next, there is anthracite coal. We have got all the anthracite coal in the world, at least of this peculiar kind, and there is never a ton of it imported, and there is no tariff on it. What I have mentioned will include about all the greatest monopolies we have got.

Now, if there is no tariff on them and no competition with foreign producers, how can the tariff in that sense have any effect on these monopolies?

Mr. MASON. I do not think it can have any effect on them. I have been under the impression that this body has no jurisdiction over the affairs of States. If the gentleman wishes to amend this resolution, or to offer some other to take in a larger field for observation and examination, I have no objection. But this merely looks to one relief.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. MASON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLIKEN. If the tariff has nothing to do with these trusts, why drag it into the debate upon this resolution?

Mr. MASON. If the gentleman will consider for a moment he will perceive that I have said nothing of that kind. But if he had paid attention he would have comprehended that the tariff on sugar has a good deal to do with allowing the sugar trust to increase prices.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Perhaps I might understand that better if it were explained. But I will agree with the gentleman to repeal the duty on sugar, if he wants to do that.

Mr. MASON. If the duty on sugar raises the price of sugar so that producers and dealers can sell it at a given price, if you take off the duty then this trust can not exist except by taking in by a syndicate all the sugar products of the world.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MASON. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANDALL. Do you not consider that the price of sugar, like that of most other commodities, is regulated by the natural law of demand and supply?

On what may be considered the average grade of sugar of 90 degrees the duty is 2 cents; and during the existence of that duty of 2 cents sugar has been lower in price than at any time in the history of the country.

Mr. MASON. Then, would the gentleman argue, if the people of this country take off the \$60,000,000 they pay in duty on sugar the sugar would be higher in price?

Mr. RANDALL. I think the price would be regulated by the natural law of demand and supply. As I have stated, the 2 cents tax has not raised the price, but lowered it.

Mr. MASON. Then I do not see how the sugar trust can exist—

Mr. RANDALL. I know nothing about the sugar trust, and I care nothing about it. But I can state the business reason why sugar is higher than six months ago; and that is because the excessive production in the four great sugar-producing countries of Europe and Cuba, the United States, and elsewhere was so great that they could not sell all that was produced.

Now, it has come to the knowledge of these people that there must be a decrease in the production of sugar, and we are therefore informed that the sugar product this year will be about three hundred thousand tons less than it was last year, and the effect of that has been to raise the price of sugar about a cent a pound.

Mr. MASON. If the "sugar trust," which everybody knows has been formed within the past twelve months, has not increased the price of sugar, will the gentleman explain the object of the organization of the trust?

Mr. RANDALL. I do not care what the object is, but if it is to get a higher price for sugar, the very best way to defeat it is to call public attention to the subject in the manner provided for in this resolution.

Mr. MASON. Very well; you, then, are for the resolution. I am much obliged to you.

Mr. CUTCHEON. Mr. Speaker, may we have the resolution reported once more?

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to propose an amendment to the pending amendment.

Mr. BACON. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RAYNER. I am heartily in favor, Mr. Speaker, of the resolution, but my opinion about it is that it does not go far enough, because it excludes from its operation the very sort of trusts that ought to be included under it. By its terms, the resolution expressly excludes every corporation incorporated by a State. In other words, if there is a corporation incorporated by the State of Maryland that has combined with another corporation, incorporated by the State of Pennsylvania, for the purpose of "pooling" or otherwise controlling the market, and raising prices, such a combination, by the terms of this resolution, is excluded from its operation. Therefore, I say the resolution does not go far enough. It has been very well said by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM] that the question of tariff is only an incidental question in reference to this resolution. There are many corporations that have combined together in relation to which the question of tariff does not arise at all. Take, for example, the case of the Western Union Telegraph Company, which has combined with or swallowed up every other telegraph company in the country for the purpose of controlling prices. Take what is probably the most important case that will come under the consideration of this committee, the Standard Oil Company. What is the Standard Oil Company? It is not a combination of individuals at all. It is a combination of different corporations, each one of which has been created by the sovereignty of its particular State, and which has combined with other corporations to go into that "trust."

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. RAYNER. Will the gentleman give me a little more time?

Mr. BACON. I can not.

Mr. RAYNER. Just one minute more.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman has fifteen minutes remaining.

Mr. BACON. Then I yield one minute more to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RAYNER. Take the case that is now agitating the public mind to a large extent, the case of the Reading coal strike. The Philadelphia and Reading Railroad Company is a corporation created by the State of Pennsylvania. The physical termini of the road are within that State, but it ships its products all over the country. That company has entered into a conspiracy to strike down labor in the Schuylkill region and to raise the price of coal, yet it is excluded from the operation of this resolution, because the resolution expressly says that it is not to include any corporation created by a State. If you are going to have an investigation of these pools and combinations, you should include them all.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman is mistaken about the scope of the resolution.

Several members addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state the question. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] proposes an amendment to the pending amendment, which will be read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out in the last paragraph all after the word "names," which occurs in next to the last line of said paragraph.

A MEMBER. How will it read as amended?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The amendment strikes out the words "but are not incorporated under the laws of any State."

The Chair is inclined to think that this is not an amendment to the pending amendment. It does not cohere with the pending amendment. The gentleman can withdraw his amendment now and offer it later. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Maryland here-

after for that purpose. There is one pending amendment, and the only proposition in the nature of an amendment admissible now is an amendment to that.

Mr. BACON. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I simply desire to call the attention of my friend from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] to the language of this preamble. The language to which he objects is part of the preamble, not a part of the resolution, and upon an examination of that language he will find that it is not subject to the criticism which he makes upon it. It does not exclude corporations that are individual members of such trusts; it simply recites that the trusts, pools, combines or combinations, or whatever names they may be known under, are not incorporated, but it does not exclude such combinations whether the individual members of them are corporations or individuals. I do not think, therefore, that the resolution is open to the criticism of the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RAYNER. Of course the preamble does not make the law; I know that very well. But if the gentleman will look at the resolving part he will find this:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures be, and the same is hereby, directed to inquire into the names, number, and extent of such alleged combinations, etc.

Now, what are "such alleged combinations?" "Such alleged combinations" in the preamble exclude the very class of corporations which it is most desirable to reach.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. I do not understand, Mr. Speaker, that these alleged combinations or trusts are incorporated at all.

Mr. SPRINGER. Oh, yes.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. They are voluntary associations of individuals and corporations. The individual members of these combinations or trusts are incorporated, but the combinations or trusts themselves are not incorporated.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. We have no objection to the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will have read the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL], which is the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the second line of the preamble, after the word "manufacturing," insert "producing."

In the third line, after the word "life," insert "and other productions."

In line 5 of the resolution, after the word "life," insert "and of all such productions."

Mr. DUNN. I desire to offer an amendment to that amendment.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that the first of the amendments just read is, properly speaking, the only one pending. The amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DUNN] will have to be made to that amendment.

Mr. DUNN. I want to make an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. McCREARY. I desire to offer a substitute for the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. My proposition is to strike out the preamble. I see no reason for a preamble which simply recites that it is "alleged" by certain individuals that certain facts exist. What we want is simply to adopt the resolution; it is not necessary to state what is "alleged" by certain individuals. Therefore, as a substitute for the pending amendments, I move to strike out the preamble so that we may then adopt the resolution.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. If the preamble were struck out, the whole resolution would have to be modified.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. A substitute can not be voted on till the text is perfected.

Mr. BACON. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, this discussion has reached a point where all gentlemen desiring to express themselves on the subject-matter of the resolution have done so, and I therefore move the previous question.

Mr. LYNCH. I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from New York has demanded the previous question.

Mr. GUENTHER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Would it be in order now to ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended for one hour so that he may parcel out that hour to other members who wish to address the House on this question?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from New York, having the floor, has demanded the previous question.

Mr. GUENTHER. Then I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended for one hour.

Several members objected.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. We do not want this thing talked to death.

Mr. GUENTHER. I have no purpose of that kind—just the contrary. I want a resolution adopted which will amount to something.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. The committee think this resolution very comprehensive and effective.

Mr. GUENTHER. If witnesses refuse to appear or to produce

papers when called for there is no power to compel them under this resolution.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. The committee can come to the House and obtain the necessary power.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I think the resolution in its present form is sufficient.

Mr. RANDALL. I desire to have the Chair state whether the previous question, if now ordered, would prevent the House from voting on the proposition of the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HATCH. That is pending.

Mr. RANDALL. I would like to know from the Chair whether it is pending.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is not pending.

Mr. RANDALL. Then the previous question should be voted down, so that the House may have an opportunity to vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland.

A MEMBER. Let it be considered as pending by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland will be considered as pending. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BACON. I now call the previous question on the resolution and pending amendments, and I insist on a vote.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Would it be in order to move to recommit this resolution, with the amendments, to the Committee on Manufactures?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Oh, no.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. It must be apparent to the House that every member has some amendment which he desires to offer. Now, it seems to me, if the resolution is to be adopted, it ought to be properly considered, and should be made broad enough to cover all the subjects it is intended to embrace. The only way of accomplishing this is to recommit the resolution, with the amendments, and let the Committee on Manufactures report a resolution in proper shape.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Illinois has the right to make the motion he has indicated.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. I move, then, to recommit the resolution, with the amendments, to the Committee on Manufactures, so that they may report a new resolution to the House.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I move to amend that motion by adding the instructions which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

And if the said committee report, by bill or otherwise, a provision looking to the regulation of the business of companies formed and hitherto controlled and regulated by State laws, passed by the Legislatures of the several States of the Union, then that said committee report a proper eulogy and epitaph commemorative of the life, public service, and death of the ancient doctrine of State's rights, with the time and circumstances of the abandonment of said doctrine by the Democratic party.

[Laughter.]

Mr. RANDALL. I make a point of order on the amendment that it is not germane.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BRUMM. I move to amend by striking out all of the first line of the resolution after the word "resolved," and inserting the following: That a special committee of the House be appointed, and.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RANDALL. Is not the question on ordering the previous question?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment to the motion to recommit.

Several MEMBERS. What is the question?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] to recommit, to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM] moves an amendment.

Mr. BRUMM. I call for the reading of the motion as it will be if amended.

The Clerk read the motion as it would be if amended.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DUNN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DUNN. Is it in order now to substitute the Judiciary Committee for the Committee on Manufactures?

Mr. RANDALL. This committee has originated it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It would not be germane to the pending amendment.

The question recurred on Mr. BRUMM's amendment, and it was rejected.

Mr. DUNN. I move to strike out "Manufactures" and insert "Judiciary."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LYNCH. I move the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting in the second line of the preamble, after the word "engaged," the words "as common carriers or."

Mr. RAYNER. Let that amendment be again read.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. BACON. Is this an amendment of the resolution or of the motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Of the motion to recommit.

Mr. RAYNER. Read it as it will be if amended.

The amendment was read as it would be if amended.

Mr. BACON. I now demand the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman has not the floor.

Mr. HOLMES. I ask the gentleman to withdraw it.

Mr. LYNCH'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. I demand the previous question on my motion to recommit.

Mr. BACON. I hope that will be done.

Mr. BRUMM. I wish to include, merely, "internal revenue."

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the demand for the previous question.

The previous question was ordered; and under the operation thereof the motion to recommit was disagreed to.

Mr. BACON. I now demand the previous question on the adoption of the resolution and amendments.

Mr. GUENTHER. Is it time to offer a substitute?

Mr. BURROWS. If this resolution prevail will it not be in order for the House at any time to enlarge the scope of this inquiry? [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question first recurs upon the amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "manufacturing," in the second line of the preamble, insert "producing."

Mr. RANDALL. I hope that will be agreed to.

The amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the third line of the preamble, after the word "life," insert "and other productions."

Mr. BACON. That is right.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the fifth line of the resolution, after the word "life," insert "and all productions."

Mr. BACON. That is right.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAYNER. I move, in the first paragraph, after the word "names," to strike out "which are not incorporated under the law of any other State."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WEAVER. Let the resolution be read as amended.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It has been read.

The resolution, as amended, was then adopted.

Mr. BACON moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution, as amended, was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

JOSEPH COX.

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana. I move, by unanimous consent, to discharge the Committee on Invalid Pensions from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2131) for the relief of Joseph Cox, administrator of Charles Pastors, deceased, and to put it upon its passage at this time.

The bill was read, as follows:

Whereas Charles Pastors, of Randolph County, Indiana, was, on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1884, granted a pension, for which a certificate was then and there duly issued to him; that there was due said Pastors on said certificate the sum of \$483.73; that a voucher for said sum was duly executed by said Pastors, in his lifetime, and returned to the proper United States pension agent at Indianapolis, Ind.; and

Whereas said Pastors, on the 25th day of January, A. D. 1884, and before he received the check for said sum, died, leaving no widow or child surviving him; and

Whereas afterwards, to wit, on the 31st day of January, A. D. 1884, the United States pension agent aforesaid issued a check for the sum aforesaid payable to said Pastors; and

Whereas said check was delivered to Joseph Cox, who was the duly appointed administrator of said Pastors, as a part of his (said Pastors's) estate; and

Whereas the said Cox, as such administrator, under the direction of the circuit court of said Randolph County, applied, in good faith, the proceeds of said check, to wit, the sum aforesaid, to the payment of the funeral expenses and other indebtedness of said Pastors; and

Whereas the United States has brought suit against the said Joseph Cox to recover the sum aforesaid: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That said Joseph Cox be, and he is hereby, fully acquitted and discharged from all liability to the United States on account of the collection of the check aforesaid, or the appropriation thereof, or of its proceeds, or of the sum of the \$483.73 so allowed said Charles Pastors, deceased, as aforesaid.

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana. I wish to say that the Pension Office is in favor of this bill, and the suit is suspended to enable me to get this relief.

There was no objection, and the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of the bill; and it was ordered

to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BLAND. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. PAYSON. I ask unanimous consent to present a bill for reference.

Mr. BLAND. Very well.

SALES OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. PAYSON, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. 5934) to confirm certain sales of public lands, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

The motion of Mr. BLAND was then agreed to; and accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

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

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 5935) for the relief of F. W. Carroll—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VANDEVER: A bill (H. R. 5936) granting a pension to Mary L. Mannon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 5937) for the relief of A. M. Benjamin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5938) for the relief of John C. Phillips—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYNUM: A bill (H. R. 5939) for the relief of Matthew E. Jackson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5940) for the relief of George Gallahue—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5941) granting a pension to Nicholas Klock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5942) granting a pension to John McCurley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5943) granting a pension to John Sheaffer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLMES: A bill (H. R. 5944) granting a pension to John T. Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONGER: A bill (H. R. 5945) granting a pension to Joanna W. Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LYMAN: A bill (H. R. 5946) for the relief of Sarah C. Hyland, widow of Edward F. Hyland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. A. R. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 5947) for the relief of officers and men of Thirty-fourth Regiment Iowa Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 5948) for the relief of Charles E. Wheeler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5949) for the relief of Lipman Meyer—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FUNSTON: A bill (H. R. 5950) to increase the pension of John Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFFOON: A bill (H. R. 5951) to provide for the issue to William Clabaugh of bonds of the District of Columbia on account of the M street bridge across Rock Creek, in the city of Washington—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5952) for the relief of S. B. Younglore—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. G. M. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5953) for the relief of Margaret Holland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAGAN: A bill (H. R. 5954) for the relief of Catherine M. Pritchard—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAYNER: A bill (H. R. 5955) for the relief of Peter Targaron—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'DONNELL: A bill (H. R. 5956) to increase the pension of Israel C. Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEARD: A bill (H. R. 5957) granting a pension to Aaron Sternes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5958) granting a pension to Morgan Welsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 5959) granting an increase of pension to Michael Corbin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITCH: A bill (H. R. 5960) granting a pension to Charles Ludemann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 5961) to increase the pension now paid to Mrs. D. P. Woodbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWER: A bill (H. R. 5962) for the relief of John S. Leary and Matthew N. Leary, jr., executors of Matthew N. Leary, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.