

A bill (H. R. 6409) for the relief of Perry R. Nye;  
 A bill (H. R. 10171) granting a pension to Rachel Rogers;  
 A bill (H. R. 11243) granting a pension to Mary E. McQueen; and  
 A bill (H. R. 200) granting a pension to Walter O. Watson.

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

A bill (H. R. 2788) granting a pension to Lieut. George T. Russell;  
 A bill (H. R. 5174) granting a pension to Statira Young;  
 A bill (H. R. 2471) granting a pension to Anna M. Noyes;  
 A bill (H. R. 10661) granting a pension to Mrs. Sophia Vogelsang;  
 A bill (H. R. 10287) for the relief of Catharine Teegardin; and  
 A bill (H. R. 2472) granting a pension to Lydia A. Eaton.

#### PACIFIC RAILROAD COMMISSION REPORT.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a report from the Committee on Printing on a resolution to print extra copies of the reports of the Pacific Railroad Commission presented yesterday by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], who is absent this morning. The concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the House 10,000 copies of the President's message and accompanying reports of the majority and minority of the Pacific Railroad Commission.*

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment proposed by the Committee on Printing will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all of the resolution after the word "concurring" and to insert:

That there be printed 15,000 copies of the President's message and accompanying majority and minority reports of the Pacific Railway Commission, 5,000 for the use of the Senate and 10,000 for the use of the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was concurred in.

#### AMENDMENT TO TRUSTS BILL.

Mr. TURPIE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3445) to declare unlawful trusts and combinations in restraint of trade and production; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 9271) for the relief of James A. Stewart; and  
 Joint resolution (H. Res. 221) to continue the provisions of a joint resolution entitled a "Joint resolution to continue the provisions of a joint resolution entitled a 'Joint resolution to provide temporarily for the expenditures of the Government.'"

#### THE COPPER TRUST.

Mr. PLATT. I wish to introduce a resolution, and I should like to say a few words before presenting it formally to the Senate.

I am very much gratified that the bill reported by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] from the Finance Committee on the subject of trusts and also the amendments proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] show that an interest, and a just interest, is being taken in the danger of these trusts and in devising some way to reach them, and to relieve the people from their operation. But in looking over the bill reported, and also the amendments suggested by the Senator from Mississippi, it seems to me that there is one class of trusts which is not reached by either the bill or the amendments. I do not know that it is possible to reach them, and yet there are some reasons why those particular trusts are more injurious to the people of the United States than those which the bill and the amendments are calculated to reach.

I refer to trusts or syndicates organized entirely outside of the United States for the purpose of controlling the markets within the United States, and it is therefore that I propose to introduce a resolution asking the Finance Committee to inquire with regard to one such trust and see what the facts are in relation to it, and if there may not be some way in which this more dangerous, as it seems to me, or at least equally dangerous, trust or syndicate may be reached and its operations prevented. I refer to what is called the copper syndicate, which, as I understand, is organized entirely by foreign capital and has its headquarters in Paris.

I am not aware that any persons in this country are connected with it. If they are I want that fact brought out. I do not care whom the resolution hits. If it hits any persons in this country I desire to have them hit.

This foreign syndicate, as I understand, controls now the production of all the copper in the world. It has, I understand, made contracts with the owners of mines in the United States to buy the production of the copper mines for a limited period, I think three years, and is now negotiating for the purchase of the production of all the output of copper mines in the United States for twelve years longer.

I do not understand that the price for which they contract for this

copper is much above the market price, so that the real profit, the great profit made by the syndicate, goes entirely into the hands of these foreign capitalists and is taken out of the consumers in the United States of all articles into the composition of which copper enters. If it be so that we can reach a trust of that sort, I think it is very desirable to do so, as indeed I will say I am anxious that all unlawful trusts or combinations in this country should be reached and punished.

I do not think the tariff has anything to do with this trust or syndicate; indeed, I do not think it has anything to do with any of them; but I do not speak upon that subject, for when a syndicate controls the production of an article throughout the world it is manifest that it is of no consequence so far as the operations of that syndicate are concerned and the profits, the abnormal and outrageous profits, which they may make out of the consumers of the article, whether there is a tariff upon it or not. The article might be entirely free of duty and yet the same results would follow.

I do not know whether this is the only syndicate which attempts to control the production of any particular article throughout the entire world or not; but if we can not reach this syndicate it is manifest that others will be formed to control the price of every article throughout the entire world which is susceptible of being controlled by a company with great capital and with great enterprise.

In the matter of coffee, perhaps no trust has been already organized which controls so thoroughly the price and production of coffee as does this copper syndicate control the price of copper, but it will be seen how easy it would be for a Paris company organized as this is to control the production and price of coffee, tea, and many of the necessities of life.

As I said, I am earnestly and anxiously desirous that all such combinations shall be reached, prevented, and punished, and this equally with any of them.

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

Mr. PLATT. Let the resolution be read.

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

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be, and is hereby, instructed to inquire whether a foreign syndicate, combination, or trust controls the production of copper in the United States and has thereby largely increased the price of all articles made therefrom to the consumers; and if so, whether any legislation can be devised to relieve the people of the United States from such injurious effects of the operation of such foreign combination, trust, or syndicate, and report by bill or otherwise.*

Mr. BLAIR. I was going to ask the Senator from Connecticut if any method has occurred to his own mind by which the legislation of this country can control the operations of a foreign syndicate unless we by our tariff laws exclude the commodities of that foreign syndicate?

Mr. PLATT. That would not do it, because it is the production of the United States which they would sell to the people of the United States then.

Mr. BLAIR. If that be so—

Mr. PLATT. No prohibition of importation, let me say, would reach the matter. I will answer the Senator's question. I have not thought of this matter sufficiently to know whether there is any way in which it can be reached, but I have thought of it sufficiently to know that we ought to give serious and earnest consideration to the determination of the question whether we may not relieve against the operations of such a combination as they are carried on in this country. I do not know that there is any means by which it can be reached, but I think the subject worthy of the investigation of the Senate and of Congress.

Mr. BLAIR. It had occurred to me that perhaps the Senator might have in his mind a course of legislation or of action something like what I shall state. The foreign syndicate, controlling the production of the entire world, of course would furnish the only purchaser of the production of the United States; but if in some way the operations of the foreign syndicate could be excluded from the United States, the United States producer would have the market of the United States, and in controlling the market of the United States he might find the natural employment of his capital and his labor in the production, in this instance, of copper. But if the foreign syndicate is beyond the legislative control of the United States, he is left at liberty to contract with the American producer, and the American producer is forced to contract with him in order to find a market, because the foreign syndicate may undersell the American producer, unless he chooses to sell to the foreign syndicate, and thus ruin the American producer unless the American producer of copper finds his protection against that foreign competitor by the protective tariff.

It is in that view that I wish to ask the Senator from Connecticut and the Senators who are discussing this matter if it may not turn out that the protective tariff, so far from being the source and origin of trusts, may in the end become our only protection against trusts, especially when they have grown to the magnitude they have already assumed, in some instances controlling the production of the entire world and being located beyond the legislative jurisdiction of this country.

Mr. PLATT. I say very frankly to the Senator from New Hampshire that I do not desire to encumber this investigation with any tariff discussion. If there is relief through taxation or want of taxation in any way, I desire to have the relief granted. I do not care how that relief is reached. I know that we ought to protect our people against such combinations, whether organized here or abroad. Nor do I understand that the Senator from New Hampshire would object to any method by which we could reach and prevent such a trust and its injurious operation upon our citizens.

Mr. BLAIR. By no means; but I am only thinking and anticipating in my own mind a problem of difficulty that everybody must meet with in grappling with this subject. The only means by which we can possibly control the operation of these great trusts, which become dangerous in proportion to their world-wide effect, is by legislative control within our own jurisdiction.

It is perfectly manifest that we can pass no law here which will break up a Parisian corporation or a London corporation, and unless we can control the laws of trade so far as to exclude the property of a foreign syndicate which is produced outside of our own geographical lines, the lines within which our legislation is operative, it seems to me perfectly clear that we can not reach the real difficulty. The only way we can do that is by tariff legislation, not necessarily by a revenue tariff, but protective legislation, that is, legislation which excludes the foreign article, whether by a high tax or by an absolute prohibition irrespective of the tax, or by a tax so high as to amount to practical prohibition; for it is manifest that until we have some legislative obstacle of this kind interposed between the American producer and the foreign syndicate controlling all other production in the same direction, as copper in this instance—until we can put that legislative obstacle between our producer and the foreigner we can do nothing which would be effective at all. But if we can exclude the foreigner with his article so that he can not reach the American market, then we have the American production and we have the American market under our own control and can break up any American trust.

I do not wish to take any further time on the matter now.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, yesterday morning I had the honor to present to the Senate some amendments to the bill reported by the Finance Committee on the subject of trusts. In introducing the amendments I made a short explanation of their meaning. I did not go beyond that. I made no reference to or discussion of any party question which might be connected with the general subject. I had supposed, and I now suppose, that the evil of these trusts was so great, the demand for a remedy, if a remedy could be found, was so emergent, that all classes and sections of our country were about equally injured by the operation of these trusts, and that there would be such a unanimous concurrence of opinion on both sides of the Chamber as to the necessity of remedial legislation that about the only discussion which could arise with reference to any proposed remedy would be as to its constitutionality and its efficiency.

However, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], after I took my seat, put to me several interrogatories, and as they were respectfully put and were somewhat, though not very, pertinent to the matter of my amendments, I sought occasion yesterday to respond to the questions which he propounded. But the course which the business of the Senate took was such that another matter of a more exciting nature occupied the attention of the Senate until, I believe, an hour after the usual time of adjournment.

I propose, therefore, as briefly as I can this morning to answer the questions propounded to me by the Senator from Massachusetts, and in doing so I may, and probably will, enlarge a little upon the considerations which induced me to offer the amendments.

I think, if I do not misremember the Senator from Massachusetts, that an inquiry or an objection of this sort was propounded: that in my amendments I had made no description of what trusts were. That is true. What I offered to the Senate were in the nature of amendments to a bill. In the first section of that bill there is a definition of what the trusts prohibited by the bill are. I accepted that definition, and referred, in the various sections of the amendments which I offered, to that section of the original bill—the first section—as containing the accepted definition of trusts. So no complaint can be made against my amendments upon that ground.

I alluded yesterday morning to an apprehension I had that, however well intentioned the bill offered by the Finance Committee might be, it might prove in the end utterly fruitless for want of constitutional power to pass it. I refrained then, as I refrain now, from expressing any positive opinion on that subject. If it were clear, if I were certain that the first section of the bill offered by the Senator from Ohio would be valid constitutional law, I should have less concern for the fate of my amendments than I have now.

I will read in the hearing of the Senate a few extracts from the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States which will justify my apprehension, and which I fear (because I am very anxious to have legislation upon this subject) may prove an insuperable obstacle to the efficiency of the measure proposed by the Senator from Ohio. Yesterday I quoted a case, *Venzie vs. Moor*. I propose to read a short extract from that case.

Mr. BROWN. From what volume does the Senator read?

Mr. GEORGE. Fourteenth Howard, Supreme Court Reports. I read from page 573. The court, referring to the phrase in the Constitution, "commerce with foreign nations" and "among the States," say:

The phrase can never be applied to transactions wholly internal, between citizens of the same community, or to a polity and laws whose ends and purposes and operations are restricted to the territory and soil and jurisdiction of such community. Nor can it be properly concluded that because—

This language I desire especially to call the attention of the Senate to, because I fear that in oblivion or forgetfulness of the force of this language the first section of the bill is framed—

Nor can it be properly concluded that because the products of domestic enterprise in agriculture or manufactures or in the arts may ultimately become the subjects of foreign commerce, that the control of the means or the encouragements by which enterprise is fostered and protected, is legitimately within the import of the phrase "foreign commerce," or fairly implied in any investiture of the power to regulate such commerce. A pretension as far-reaching as this—

Now, this is the very point in controversy—

would extend to contracts between citizen and citizen of the same State, would control the pursuits of the planter, the grazier, the manufacturer, the mechanic, the immense operations of the collieries and mines and furnaces of the country, for there is not one of these avocations the results of which may not become the subjects of foreign commerce—

And you might say of interstate commerce the same—

and be borne either by turnpikes, canals, or railroads from point to point within the several States towards an ultimate destination like the one above mentioned.

That case was decided in the year 1852. Quite recently it was cited and confirmed by Chief-Justice Waite in the one hundred and second volume of United States Reports as valid constitutional law.

I referred also yesterday to another case as indicating the exact point of time when the power of the States over articles which became the subjects of interstate and foreign commerce ceased and where the power of the United States began. I will read a short sentence from that opinion. In the case of *Coe vs. Erroll*, one hundred and sixteenth United States Reports, page 525, will be found the following:

There must be—

Say the court—

a point of time when they—

That is, subjects of commerce—

cease to be governed exclusively by the domestic law and begin to be governed and protected by the national law of commercial regulation, and that moment seems to us to be a legitimate one for this purpose, in which they commence their final movement for transportation from the State of their origin to that of their destination.

In view of these and numerous other decisions of the Supreme Court, I have grave apprehensions, I have serious fears, that if we pass the bill unamended which was introduced by the Senator from Ohio and recommended by the Committee on Finance, when we have passed it we shall have done nothing, absolutely nothing, in the way of suppressing trusts. That bill attempts to subject to the power of Congress articles of merchandise before they become objects of interstate or foreign commerce.

For these reasons, my attention having been called to this matter some time ago by my distinguished friend from Texas who sits to my right [Mr. REAGAN], I applied my mind to see if some other mode than direct legislation, which I feared was not warranted by the Constitution of the United States, could not be invented, which would be efficacious to remove from our midst these great pests, these great evils arising in our commercial intercourse. I suggested to that Senator then one of the provisions embraced in my amendments, and that was the provision of outlawry.

That may seem a little harsh, but I may call the attention of Senators who are members of the bar—and nearly all are members of the bar—to the fact that this outlawry of illegal contracts, of illegal combinations, of illegal actions, is one of the oldest and most cherished principles of the common law. I have but to call the attention of Senators to the fact that from the earliest period of the common law it has been settled that where two men or more are engaged in a common illegal business, neither has the right to sue the other with reference to that business. That is expressed in the legal phrase, very familiar to Senators, *in pari delicto potior est conditio defendentis*.

The courts will not interfere. They allow the parties to wrong each other, if it may be called a wrong when two parties being engaged in a common wrong against society, one of them gains an advantage in the wrong of the other. So in this outlawry, which I regard as the most efficacious means that can be provided, I have precedent, I have the common law coming down to us from ages.

I will say no more, then, upon that point, except to indicate to Senators in what a terrible condition these trust-men will be when, if that section is passed, they can bring no suit in a United States court upon any contract made with reference to the trusts. If they sell their goods they can not collect the money.

But that is not all of it, because the amendment refers not only to contracts, but it prevents suits for any wrongs committed to them in reference to these goods. So if there be a trespass committed by an outside party, if there should be such a trespass as the taking of the goods forcibly from the possession of any member of the trust and applying

them to the party's own use, there would be no action of trover, no action of detinue, no action of any sort which would enable the party to recover damages. So if there be a contract of transportation made with reference to these goods, the bill of lading would give no right of action for any breach of that contract. If the common carrier burned the goods, converted them to his own use, threw them overboard at sea, or committed any other wrong against them, the owner being a member of a trust would have no remedy.

It strikes me, therefore, that if that section is adopted we should give, as far as the Federal courts are concerned, such a blow to these trusts that they would never be able to recover from it.

I desire also to call attention to a distinction, and a very important distinction, between the remedy given by the Senator from Ohio, where he makes the party injured plaintiff, and the remedy in the amendments which I have had the honor to offer. In the case of a plaintiff, the party has to go out and seek evidence and all that sort of thing, and bring his action. In the case provided for in my amendments he must stand still until the other side move against him, and then he has nothing to do but to prove to the court that the suit is about this illegal trust, and on that he turns the other side out of court, recovers double damages, and has his lawyer's fees paid besides.

Mr. President, after these introductory remarks, I propose now to answer the questions propounded to me by the Senator from Massachusetts. I read from his speech:

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?

In answer to the first branch of that, I am bound to say that, unless my information is wrong, there is a Standard Oil trust in this country. In reference to the second branch of the interrogatory—

Is the Standard Oil Company one of the trusts which the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Texas want to have suppressed?

I have to say that it is one of the very trusts which I expect to be suppressed by the amendments which I have offered. Certainly coming within the category of the fourth section, to which I have just alluded, that trust will be crippled as any other trust.

But, Mr. President, I have not to rely upon my statement now as to my anxiety to suppress that trust. I have a record in the Senate extending back several years, which shows how I stand on that subject. Before I refer to that record, however, in order to show its pertinency, I will read a question or two propounded by the Senator from Massachusetts to the Senator from Texas, because it shows that in his mind the evil indicated, or the advantage which that trust had as indicated in the question, was one of the great evils to be suppressed:

Mr. HOAR. My question was whether in the transportation of their manufactured products they had not had large advantages by transportation by rail over other manufacturers, referring, as the previous part of his speech shows, by the word "they," to the Standard Oil Company. I think that is about the great advantage which that trust has over all others, and I regard that as one of the great evils which build up trusts and monopolies and crush out little men and little enterprises. So, Mr. President, when the interstate-commerce law was first passed a few years ago, when the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, now absent [Mr. VANCE], offered an amendment expressly and pointedly directed to the suppression of this advantage by requiring all railroad companies to transport goods of small shippers or in small lots at the same price as similar goods were transported for large shippers, I advocated it. It had my earnest support. It did not have the advocacy of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Again, during the present session, being moved thereto by a letter from a competitor of the Standard Oil Company, a small enterprise struggling to maintain its foothold on the commerce of the country against that mammoth and gigantic institution, I offered an amendment to the interstate-commerce bill then pending before us, in the following words:

*Provided*, That it shall be unlawful for any common carrier subject to the provisions of this act to carry or transport any commodity for any shipper in a car or vehicle owned, leased, or in any way controlled by such shipper, unless the said common carrier shall charge for the transportation of said goods, wares, and merchandise so carried the same price exactly as would have been charged if the same had been shipped in cars belonging to said carrier: *And provided further*, That it shall be unlawful for any shipper to make any contract with any carrier to convey the property of such shipper in cars or vehicles owned or controlled by such shipper.

The point was, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] can well inform the Senate, that this mammoth institution had its own cars, had its own tanks in which oil was transported, and using its cars and using its tanks it had such an advantage over the small shipper as to crush out opposition. I offered that; I supported it with all the ability I possessed; and I withdrew it only, as the Senator from Illinois will remember, because he assured me that the matter should have serious consideration and action at as early a day as practicable.

Thus, Mr. President, it appears, so far as the Standard Oil Company is concerned, I have been advocating measures to destroy its supremacy for years. I have not heard that the Senator from Massachusetts joined with me or with any one else in these efforts. So then so far from wish-

ing to protect or favor the Standard Oil Company, I regard it now as I have regarded it from the time of my commencement in service in this body to be my duty, whenever I could and by whatever lawful means I might use, to destroy the advantages which such corporations had over smaller enterprises.

That the Standard Oil Company may be partly owned by Democrats does not concern me. Why, Mr. President, I have not assumed that these trusts were carried on solely by members of one party to the exclusion of members of the other. If I were called upon to pass any criminal law for murder or mayhem or any other crime it would not be a proper or valid consideration to me to consider whether alone members of one party or of the other were guilty. Sir, it is my duty, and I take pleasure in discharging it, to assist in passing any legislation in this body which will benefit the people of this country, whether that legislation strikes down Democrats or Republicans. No Democrat has a right to my favor if he be engaged in any enterprise against the rights, the interests, the prosperity, or the happiness of the American people.

Further the Senator from Massachusetts asked:

Is it represented in the Cabinet at this moment?

That is another question that was propounded. I have no knowledge that it has any member in the Cabinet. I presume from what I have heard and what occurred yesterday between the Senator from Ohio [Mr. PAYNE] and the Senator from Massachusetts that he must have referred to Mr. Whitney, because he is a relative of some member of the Standard Oil trust. That he entered into it has not been shown; that he has acted in any way improperly with reference to it has not been shown. But this has been shown, or this is known, that not since the foundation of this Government has there been a man in the office of Secretary of the Navy who has been more efficient, more honorable, more devoted to the interests of the country intrusted to his hands than the present Secretary. I might say a little further, in view of the statement which was made on this floor by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK] several years ago, that more money had been appropriated by Congress for the Navy since the war and up to a time several years ago than had been appropriated for that purpose from the foundation of the Government up to the close of the war, and yet we were without a navy. There are no scandals in that Department now; no Secor-Robeson contracts there. There is no suspicion resting upon that officer that one single dollar of money appropriated out of the Treasury to be used by him for Navy purpose has not been fully, completely, and honestly applied to that purpose.

Is it represented in the Senate?

What a curious question, a very curious question; but it was propounded. The answer was made yesterday. I will not answer that.

Is it represented in the councils of any important political party in this country?

What does that mean? Does it mean that the Standard Oil Company as a corporation has allied its fortunes with any political party in this country? If it does, I fail to recognize that it belongs to the party to which I belong. Or does it mean that some of the stockholders in it may belong to the Democratic party? If so, it may be so; but it is equally true, as stated by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. PAYNE] yesterday, that nearly all of them belong to the other party.

Having made that statement, I wish to make another. I do not think the Democratic party is responsible for the fact that some of the members of that trust belong to it, nor do I think the Republican party is responsible for the fact that some of the members of that trust belong to it. Whether they belong to one party or the other, or both, it is the duty of the Senate—and so far as I may be able I will perform that duty—to pass such legislation as may prevent its plundering and injuring the people of this country.

The next question is:

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?

I understand there is a sugar trust, but it is not located in Louisiana. It is not among the farmers and planters of that State who produce sugar. They, as well as we, as well as the rest of the country, are the victims of this trust, which is located in New York, and which is composed of men who do not raise sugar, but who buy sugar and refine it; and unless I have read the history of the times very inaccurately of late, I find that this trust has not only combined to raise the price of the refined article to the consumer, but has combined to reduce the price to the producer. They rob with an equal hand, the producer by combining together and saying to him, "We will not pay but so much for your sugar," and then by an equal combination they say to the consumer, "You shall not have this sugar unless you pay what we demand." As to that trust, if the Senator from Massachusetts has any evidence that it was consulted in relation to the formation of the Mills bill, he is invited, so far as I may extend the invitation, to produce the evidence. I do not believe it exists.

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.

Unfortunately I have some, and those who are dependent upon me have some knowledge by sad experience by being the victims of the rapacity of the cotton-seed-oil trust. I have that evidence that such a trust exists. I do not know who its members are; I can not point to the hand that strikes the blow, but I know the people of Mississippi have felt the blow. Since I have been referred to so pointedly in that matter as if I had some special knowledge on it, I will divulge to the Senate all that I know.

Some years ago cotton-seed mills began to be built in the State of Mississippi. There was one at the capital of the State; there was one over on the Mississippi River, I believe about Greenville; there was one at the residence of my colleague [Mr. WALTHALL]; there was one at Meridian, and one at Vicksburg, in all some six or eight scattered throughout the State; and the first thing I learned about the operations of these cotton-seed-oil mills was that they took the map of the State of Mississippi and drew lines around the various counties and numbered them.

Number 1, embracing six or eight or ten counties, according to the map, belonged to this mill; number 2 belonged to that mill, number 3 to the other, and so on all the way through. So the cotton-seed raised in the district allotted to a particular mill could not be shipped except (for they had an arrangement with the railroads) by extra charges to another. I was raising cotton. I felt the injustice of this, and I entered into a correspondence with a firm in Cincinnati that advertised that they would furnish us what they called plantation cotton-seed-oil mills, mills of small cost, so that each man who had a gin and a steam-engine might press his own cotton-seed. I was about to consummate that arrangement when one day, speaking to a distinguished member of this body, now not here, the then junior Senator from Tennessee, Judge Jackson, as to the enterprise, he informed me, "You had better go slow; there is some sort of an arrangement among the refiners of cotton-seed oil that unless you comply with certain terms"—which I have now forgotten, but they were so onerous that I would not comply with them—"they will not refine your oil, and you will press your cotton-seed, make your crude oil, which in that stage is worthless, and will have nobody to refine it." He gave me some experience on that subject which he had himself. I thereupon desisted.

Then the scene shifted again. The refiners first combined, but yet the mills were independent except in the way I have mentioned. Some two or three years ago they took another step. That came from New York, as I am informed—I do not know it; I believe the statement however—a grand trust was formed and into that trust were put nearly all these independent cotton-seed-oil mills in the South. What happened then? Does the Senator imagine that because I am a cotton man and represent a cotton constituency we feel any interest in preserving and protecting this cotton-seed-oil trust?

I will tell the Senator and the country what happened. Immediately all competition as to the price of cotton-seed was destroyed because there remained but one purchaser and it fixed its own terms, reduced the price paid to the producer 20, 30, and even as much as 40 per cent. That is the interest now that a cotton man, a man from Mississippi representing a cotton constituency, has in drawing a bill intended to put down trusts, to so draw it that the cotton-seed-oil trust shall not be hurt!

While I am on that subject I will allude to another trust not mentioned in my amendments—indeed none of them is specially mentioned but all are included—that is equally as unjust and equally as onerous to the people of Mississippi, and in fact to the whole South, as the cotton-seed-oil trust, and that is what is called the cotton-bagging trust. That is of recent formation, I understand. Some gentlemen, I suppose I ought to say capitalists, some business men have combined and got control of the factories making cotton bagging, the whole of them, and the price of cotton bagging has been advanced very nearly 100 per cent., and the farmers of Mississippi are to-day endeavoring to find some substitute to cover their cotton instead of using this bagging.

I am a cotton man; the people of Mississippi are cotton men; and that is the way that we have been injured by these trusts, and it is one reason why my energies have been somewhat stimulated to provide, if I could, a remedy against them.

I ask the Senator from Massachusetts or any other Senator who feels any interest in this matter to look over the amendments which I have offered and see if he can find any distinction between one trust and another. Certainly I thought of none when I penned the amendments. Section 4, the first one, outlaws every one of them, as I have explained to the Senate. Section 6, which outlaws them on the railroads, applies to every one of them. Section 5, which provides for a suspension of duties upon similar articles, applies to every one of them. Section 7 is upon a different matter entirely, as I explained yesterday.

So the three sections which I have proposed as amendments to the bill of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] apply in terms fully as much to one trust as another. If the Senator from Massachusetts or if any other Senator can devise anything better, anything more efficient, anything more certain to crush out these infamous combinations against the prosperity and the happiness of the people of this country, he will have my hearty co-operation and my sincere thanks. I would not pro-

tect any one of them. I regret that the Constitution of my country does not give me power to deal with them more directly than I think it does.

The Senator from Massachusetts said:

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?

In answer to that question I can not give the reason why, because I have not done the thing. I have endeavored to strike all, and I will venture to say that if the amendments which I have offered (which possibly ought to be perfected in their phraseology or in some way, because they were drawn up in some haste) are adopted, there will not be a trust of any sort in this country in twelve months after the law is passed.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator from Mississippi a question in that connection?

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I ask whether his amendment does not in fact—I will not imply in the question that it is done designedly—steer clear of punishing all trusts and combinations to reduce the wages of labor?

Mr. GEORGE. I have not heard of any such trust. If there be any suggested, prepare your amendment and I will accept it. That would be in my opinion the meanest of all the trusts that could be formed.

Mr. HOAR. Amen.

Mr. GEORGE. And if the Senator from Massachusetts knows of the existence of any such trust I hope he will not exhaust his interest in the matter by criticising me for not having provided against it, but will come here and make the provision himself. He shall have my hearty co-operation in the effort.

Another matter. The Senator was very hard to satisfy. He imagined that I had drawn my amendments carefully not to hurt anybody that was hurting me, and then he objected most seriously to the machinery that I provided for.

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.

That is not a very extraordinary power to put in the hands of the President. It is a common power to place in the hands of the President of the United States. I have looked into that matter a little this morning and I find that upon our statute-book there exists an authority given to the President of the United States to reduce taxes on certain contingencies and on certain others to restore them. There are several proclamations of the President of the United States upon that subject very recently. The retaliation bill of 1887 gave the power, not the distinct power given to the President by my amendments, but it gave him even greater power to stop all commercial intercourse with one or our neighbors. I believe the Senator voted for that.

I call his attention to some other instances. In volume 24 of the Statutes at Large, page 1025, will be found a proclamation of the President reducing certain duties and taxes as to the nation of Colombia upon certain conditions. In 1884 President Arthur, in pursuance of law, made a proclamation reducing certain duties imposed by law, under authority given to him that when he was satisfied that certain other things were done by another country he might issue the proclamation. He issued it; the duties were reduced; and President Cleveland discovering that President Arthur had made a mistake as to the existence of the fact upon which he was authorized to issue his proclamation reducing the duties, issued his proclamation restoring them.

Mr. PLATT. To what does the Senator refer?

Mr. GEORGE. Porto Rico and Cuba.

So, sir, it is a very common exercise of power by the President. He does not change the revenue laws. Congress enacts that under a certain state of facts the tax shall be so and so, and under another state of facts the tax shall be thus and so. The President only determines under the power given to him by Congress whether the one state of facts exists or the other.

I believe that I have noticed about everything which the Senator from Massachusetts propounded. I have simply endeavored to answer questions, though of course I have had to make some little explanations, and having done so I will close.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] rose and announced his purpose to answer some six or eight questions which I had proposed to him and to the Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN] yesterday. The Senator from Mississippi has undertaken to deal at all, I think, with two of those questions only. The remainder of the hour or hour and a half of his speech seems to have been expended in an attempt to commend himself to the admiration of mankind as a wise, industrious, and faithful Senator. I desire for one to express my hearty concurrence with the honorable Senator from Mississippi in that opinion and to admit that he has been faithful, industrious, and, to the extent of his power, considering his political opinions, not an unwise public servant in this regard.



I think, however, neither that Senator nor the Senator from Ohio [Mr. PAYNE]—whom I saw in his seat a moment ago, but I do not see now—in what he said yesterday will succeed in removing from the minds of the people of this country the belief that the managers of the Standard Oil Company, the two men who notoriously control its concerns and whose vast fortunes are notoriously the result of that monopoly, contribute largely to the treasury of the Democratic party and are largely the directors of its councils. I do not think the people of the country believe that from Democratic power in this Republic there is to come any considerable restraint upon the trusts the Senator from Mississippi has described.

I called attention the other day to a bill introduced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] and to a speech made by that Senator in its support, in which he denounced the contribution of money to political campaign funds by office-holders in this country. He denounced it as a fruitful source of corruption and of oppression. He provided in his bill that any person holding an executive office in this country who should be guilty of subscribing money for campaign purposes to affect an election should be sent to the penitentiary and should vacate at once the office he held, and should be rendered incapable of holding any office of trust or confidence in this country in the future, and besides be fined not exceeding \$10,000.

Now I wish to read an extract from the New York World, the chief Democratic paper in this country, the organ of the Democratic party in this country, of August 27, 1888, setting forth the condition of the subscriptions to the Democratic campaign fund at that time, and the Senate and the country will judge how much the Democratic party in general believe in the denunciations by one Democratic Senator in this body of subscriptions by executive officers to campaign funds and in the denunciation by two more Democratic Senators in this body of the existence of these great trusts. Here is the article:

**DEMOCRATIC AMMUNITION—A DOZEN HEAVY CHECKS CONTRIBUTED TO DEFRAY CAMPAIGN EXPENSES.**

President Cleveland is not alone in his contribution to the campaign fund. His check for \$10,000 on Riggs & Co., the Washington bankers, has been "seen" by Chairman Brice, who "goes" him \$10,000 better, and Congressman WILLIAM L. SCOTT does the same thing. That makes a round \$40,000 from two of the wealthiest workers in the party. Secretary Whitney chips in \$10,000 and Secretary Endicott has followed suit. Don M. Dickinson has made a similar subscription. Pat Kelly, of Minnesota, Chairman William H. Barnum, Herman Oelrichs, and Oliver Payne each made a like contribution, so that with the President's subscription the grand total foots up \$120,000, and many counties are yet to be heard from.

I suppose Oliver Payne is the chief manager of the Standard Oil Company, a gentleman whom the Senator from Ohio, who seemed to know all about it, affirms was one of the Democratic managers of that company. I suppose Mr. William H. Barnum is one of the largest controllers of railroad manufacturing iron monopolies that exist in this country. I suppose Mr. Herman Oelrichs—though that I get from an informant who does not profess himself to be sure, and I may be mistaken about that—is a very extensive brewer. Perhaps I am in error in that particular. Some gentleman on the other side shakes his head, and therefore I will withdraw the suggestion, because, as I stated, it does not stand on such a foundation that I am willing to affirm it. But leaving that out, here is the Democratic campaign fund starting off when \$120,000, according to the New York World, subscribed, with the possible exception of one or two of those names, only by executive officers of this country, and the managers of these enormous trusts and monopolies. And how idle is it for the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Texas to say they are opposed to these things as Democrats and that they do not want any partisan suggestions!

The Senator, in his speech which I read from the other day, proceeded to discourse about Mr. Blaine, who was an eminent Republican—quoted a speech of his, and then discoursed about the Democratic party and the Republican party, and how much the Republican party was to blame and the shortcomings of its platform in this matter; and when we disclose these facts in answer to these taunts from the other side of the Chamber, our honorable friends just fold their arms and say *Mea virtute ne involvo*—do not let us have any partisanship in this thing!

Mr. President, I made two criticisms on the propositions of the Senator from Mississippi. One was suggested by a question just now and one was suggested yesterday. To those criticisms I adhere. There is not any attempt in the Senator's amendment to strike at the worst combination that exists in this country—the combination of men who mean that a large class of its laboring men shall hereafter have the rate of their wages dependent upon the will of their employers. That is a trust which not merely takes possession of and wields business instrumentalities, but by the instrumentalities which we heard described yesterday, and which will be further alluded to to-day by other Senators on this side of the Chamber, is undertaking to make the whole Government of the United States, its elections, its political affairs, the very life and strength and health of the Republic, one vast trust to be managed by the men who very recently were in arms against its life.

The President of the United States, the candidate of the gentlemen on the other side, uttered the words with a meaning and a truth which perhaps he did not intend when he declared that in the eyes of his party public office itself is a public trust. It is a public trust in the

eyes of some men, according to the definition which has been given by the Senator from Mississippi.

The other criticism which I made, and to which I adhere, upon his proposition is that it is totally repugnant to all the principles of a free government to put in the hands of the Executive Magistrate, whether George Washington, or Ulysses Grant, or Abraham Lincoln, or any other, the power, and not merely the power, but to make it his absolute duty, when he finds that the price of anything in this country is raised by an illegal combination, to issue his proclamation admitting that article free of duty. There may be ten thousand honest, simple, moderate manufacturers of the article here; there may be one hundred thousand workmen dependent upon an established and protected industry; and yet if a President of the United States of the same way of thinking with the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Texas in regard to the protective policy finds in one corner of a State somewhere, or thinks he finds, a combination to put up the price, the entire protective tariff, with all the industries dependent upon it, it is his duty to strike down and to close it. Under the Senator's proposition the importer who wanted to strike down the tariff might himself collusively create this trust and the President could not escape his duty.

How idle to compare a proposition like that with the proposition which the Senate unanimously voted for last year, that when an American ship was treated with indignity or inhospitality in a foreign port the President should have a discretion to exclude ships from that country from coming into our harbors!

I will not undertake to dwell now on the extraordinary proposition of the Senator's section 7. The workman is as much affected by some of these trusts as the agricultural laborer—as any other class of men.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE], whom I do not now see in his seat, uttered on this floor last evening, just before the Senate adjourned, this very remarkable sentence:

I will just say to the Senator—

Before I read it I will say that the Senator from Texas was replying to what he thought was an allusion of mine to Mr. MILLS. I alluded to the Mills bill, and pointed out that the occurrence complained of, suppressing free speech and free elections, had taken place in the very district of the author of the bill, which, as we conceive, is intended to strike a most powerful blow at the manufacturing industries of this country and at the wages of the workingman and the comfort and the dignity of the workingman's home. I made no other allusion to the individual, but this is the reply which the honorable Senator made:

I will just say to the Senator—

I ask the attention of the Senate and of the country to this sentence, which I have obtained from the Reporter—

I will just say to the Senator if there is any one thing in this world that the average Texan would go any number of miles out of his way to kick and kill and destroy, it is a protective tariff.

Some persons are telling us that the difference between the two parties in this country is a difference in schedules and as to tariff reform; that there is not any free-trade crusade; that there is not anybody who wants to break down the protective system; and yet here is this bill coming from Texas, the very essence and result and product of the political opinion which there prevails and which dominates in the councils of the Democratic party, and the Senator from that State, frank and honorable as he always is, announces the shallowness and hypocrisy of that pretense, and says:

If there is any one thing in this world that the average Texan would go any number of miles out of his way to kick and kill and destroy, it is a protective tariff.

Mr. STEWART. I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the Chinese bill.

Mr. PLATT. Let my resolution be acted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BERRY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. REAGAN. Does the Senator ask for a vote on his resolution?

Mr. PLATT. I should like to have the resolution passed. I did not introduce it for the purpose of stirring up any discussion, but for the purpose of having the Finance Committee immediately proceed to an investigation which I think it ought to make. There will be plenty of opportunities to speak upon some other question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pending the consideration of the resolution of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11336) a supplement to an act entitled "An act to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to Chinese," approved the 6th of May, 1882.

Mr. REAGAN. Before we pass from the consideration of the resolution I desire to say something on it.

Mr. HOAR. If the Chair please, I rise to a question of order; and that is, that the resolution offered yesterday by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] should be referred. I did not observe the Senator from Wisconsin when I rose; but I see he is now in his seat. I was about to suggest that the resolution offered by the Senator from Wisconsin should go, under the rules, as a matter of course, to the Com-

mittee on Contingent Expenses. The discussion on that subject thus far has proceeded by unanimous consent.

Mr. SPOONER. I desire to say as to that resolution that I am quite willing it shall be referred to the committee, and that such additional debate as is to be had upon it may be had when the resolution is reported back.

I have additional information in regard to the details of the transaction, and I desire to reply to the speech made by the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE], but if the resolution had been called up this morning or had been reached in its order, I should have been obliged, in view of the communications made to me by Senators on the other side giving ample reasons for its being deferred, to allow it to go over until to-morrow anyhow.

Mr. HOAR. Let it go to the committee, and let the debate take place when it comes back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution has not been called up this morning. Does the Senator desire to call it up to be referred?

Mr. HOAR. I call it up.

Mr. REAGAN. Is it in order to call that up and supersede the resolution which is pending before the Senate?

Mr. STEWART. Let it be by unanimous consent.

Mr. HOAR. Let it be referred.

Mr. REAGAN. If it is only proposed to refer the resolution, I do not object.

Mr. SPOONER. I am entirely willing that it be taken up now.

Mr. REAGAN. It ought to go to the committee. It ought to go somewhere to be amended and the preamble struck out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] is now before the Senate. Unless it be superseded by some other motion, the Chair will hold that that is the matter now pending.

Mr. REAGAN. I desire to move—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state the question. The Senator from Nevada has moved that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the bill in regard to Chinese immigration.

Mr. REAGAN. I hope the Senator from Nevada will not insist on that motion for a short time.

Mr. STEWART. I will wait until 2 o'clock, but I shall insist on it then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of the Senator from Connecticut has been considered by unanimous consent, and unless objection is made it will be regarded as under consideration by the Senate.

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. President, it occurred to me to inquire of the Senator from Connecticut why a single trust is now to be selected for investigation? I can not understand it. If it was more overwhelming, if it was more mischievous than any other trust, I could understand why it should be singled out—

Mr. STEWART. I did not yield the floor for the purpose of bringing up another subject for general discussion, because there is no time for that. I only yielded for a moment to dispose of the resolution by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Nevada to withdraw his motion until 2 o'clock.

Mr. STEWART. Well, I renew it.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask the Senator to withdraw his motion in order to enable me to call up the resolution I offered yesterday, that it may be referred to the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada withdrew his motion until 2 o'clock. The resolution of the Senator from Connecticut is pending, and upon that the Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN] has the floor.

Mr. REAGAN. I will conclude what I have to say before 2 o'clock.

I desire, Mr. President, to object to the selecting of a particular trust for the purpose of an investigation on that particular trust when there are so many others of more magnitude. If the direction had been made to investigate the mischiefs of trusts generally, I do not think there would be objection to it; but I can not understand the reason for selecting a single trust. Surely it can not be in the mind of the Senator from Connecticut to raise a question about an investigation that shall delay action on the general question of trusts.

Mr. PLATT. May I answer the Senator?

Mr. REAGAN. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT. I think I can answer the Senator's inquiry to his satisfaction. I do not know that I can, however, without infringing somewhat upon the parliamentary rules of the Senate.

I understand that there has been in another body a committee which has investigated with regard to several of the more notorious trusts in the country, has taken testimony, and it is in print; and before offering this resolution I took occasion to inquire whether this had been included at all within their investigations, and I found that it had not been. That is one reason why I directed my resolution particularly to this matter.

Another reason is that it seems to stand outside of the usual character of the trusts which we are talking about.

Mr. REAGAN. I know that the resolution speaks of a trust formed

in a foreign country over which we have no earthly jurisdiction, and the Senator is so accurate and so good a lawyer that it will not be necessary to argue such a question as that before him. If the powers of Congress enabled us to control a trust in a foreign country, then it would be worth while to make the proposed investigation. If that is the reason, the ground for investigation falls with the statement of the fact that Congress has neither the jurisdiction nor the power under the Constitution to deal with that question.

As to the investigation which is proceeding in the House of Representatives, it is true that the committee have reported a portion of the testimony which they have taken and it has been printed; but the committee have not been discharged and are, as I am informed, continuing their investigation. I trust the Senator will consent to the enlargement of his resolution, if an inquiry is necessary, so as to cover other trusts. Why select the copper trust in reference to any jurisdiction which we have? The Standard Oil trust is one of more magnitude, one that is inflicting greater injury upon the country. The sugar trust is one of great moment. It is inflicting great injury upon the country. The cotton-seed oil trust is one which, as has been explained by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], is inflicting great injury upon a large agricultural portion of the country, which furnishes for foreign export one of the largest items of export from this country—an export of some two or three hundred million dollars a year.

I need not restate what was said by the Senator from Mississippi, but simply confirm by my own knowledge the facts which he stated in regard to the use of that trust for the purpose of controlling absolutely the price of cotton-seed and cotton-seed oil.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, being the bill (S. 12) to provide for the formation and admission into the Union of the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

Mr. REAGAN. Very well. I will conclude my remarks in the morning.

Mr. STEWART. I move now that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill for the prevention of the coming of Chinese.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make that motion or ask unanimous consent?

Mr. STEWART. I ask unanimous consent, if I can have it.

Mr. HOAR. I desire with the leave of the Senate to correct or qualify a statement I made just now in regard to an individual. It will take but one moment, if the Senate will allow me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the Senator will proceed.

Mr. HOAR. In reading the list just now of the subscribers to the Democratic campaign fund, I stated that Mr. Oelrichs, I had been told, was a brewer by occupation, but I stated at the time that my informant himself was not sure, and that I could not undertake to make the statement positively. A gentleman on the other side of the Chamber shook his head, and I then stated that I presumed the information I had was an error. I am now informed that the gentleman referred to—and this I get from a very high and trustworthy quarter—is the agent of a foreign line of steam-ships, the North German Lloyd, a line of steam-ships which brings over imported labor, so far as it comes from Europe, in large quantities.

So the thing stands that the \$120,000 which this great Democratic organ says is subscribed now to their campaign fund is made up from a class of officers whom the Senator from Indiana said ought to be sent to the penitentiary for making such subscriptions, and the representatives and managers of several of the largest trusts in the country, and the agent of a large foreign steam-ship company.

Mr. STEWART. I now ask that we proceed with the Chinese bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent that the pending order be laid aside informally for the purpose of taking up the bill (H. R. 11336) a supplement to an act entitled "An act to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to Chinese," approved the 6th day of May, 1882. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and the bill is before the Senate.

KILLING OF JOSEPH HOFFMAN, WASHINGTON COUNTY, TEXAS.

Mr. SPOONER. Now, the Senator from Nevada yielding to me, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution I offered yesterday may be referred to the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin asks that the resolution to which he refers be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so referred.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 221) to continue the provisions of a joint resolution entitled a "Joint resolution to continue the provisions of a joint resolution entitled a 'Joint resolution to provide temporarily for the expenditures of the Government,'" was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CLAIMS OF POSTMASTERS.

Mr. CHACE. I move to recommit to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads the resolution directing the Postmaster-General to re-