

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 31, 1883.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. F. D. POWER.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

SUGAR IN WAREHOUSES.

Mr. KASSON. I ask consent of the House this morning to take up a brief bill, known as the sugar warehousing bill, introduced originally by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND], and that it be passed at this time.

Mr. GIBSON. I object.

Mr. KASSON. I will state that it has been reported unanimously from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. FLOWER. Let it be read.

Mr. GIBSON. I object to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Objection being made, the bill is not before the House.

G. MILSOM, H. SPENDELOW, AND G. V. WATSON.

Mr. SHELLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 3885) for the relief of George Milsom, Henry Spendelow, and George V. Watson, now on the Private Calendar, be taken from the Calendar and re-committed to the Committee on Patents.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

HOUR OF DAILY ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. REED. The Committee on the Rules, to which was referred a resolution in reference to the hour at which the daily sessions of the House shall terminate, has directed me to report a substitute therefor, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That commencing with to-day daily sessions shall not expire earlier than 6 p. m. for the remainder of the session: *Provided, however*, That the Speaker may in his discretion entertain one motion each day to adjourn before that time.

The SPEAKER. What action does the gentleman desire on this resolution?

Mr. REED. I desire to have it adopted, if there is no objection on the other side.

Mr. HAMMOND, of Georgia. Under the rules it must lie over one day.

Mr. REED. It must unquestionably, if the gentleman makes that point.

Mr. HAMMOND, of Georgia. I do make it.

The SPEAKER. It will lie over as unfinished business.

CLARA WIBLE.

Mr. MATSON, by unanimous consent, reported back from the Committee on Invalid Pensions without amendment the bill (H. R. 3267) granting a pension to Clara Wible; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

ALASKA.

The SPEAKER, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a resolution of the Board of Trade of Portland, Oregon, in regard to Alaskan matters; which was referred to the Committee on the Territories, and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. VALENTINE, until Monday next, on account of important business.

To Mr. PAUL, for four days from February 1.

COMPENDIUM OF CENSUS.

Mr. HERBERT, by unanimous consent, introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 330) requiring the Public Printer to transmit to Congress as soon as may be five hundred unbound copies of the Compendium of the Census, for the use of members; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

CENSUS.

Mr. CASWELL. I ask unanimous consent that we take from the Speaker's table, for the purpose of acting on the amendments of the Senate, joint resolution (H. Res. 323) making appropriations for continuing the work of the Tenth Census. This matter will take but a moment.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was taken from the Speaker's table, and the House proceeded to the consideration of the Senate amendments, which were read, as follows:

In line 1 strike out "two" and insert "one;" so as to read: "the sum of \$100,000."
Strike out all after the word "bureau," in line 4, down to and including "first," in line 7, and insert "for the fiscal year ending June 30."

Mr. CASWELL. I move concurrence in these amendments.

The amendments were concurred in.

Mr. CASWELL moved to consider the vote by which the amend-

ments were concurred in; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIDGE FROM OMAHA TO COUNCIL BLUFFS.

Mr. VALENTINE, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. 7474) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River directly between the cities of Omaha, in the State of Nebraska, and Council Bluffs, in the State of Iowa, and to establish the same as a post-road; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

THE PRINTING OF AGRICULTURAL REPORT.

Mr. VALENTINE also, by unanimous consent, introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 331) for the printing of the Agricultural Report for the year 1883; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KELLEY. I move that the morning hour for the call of committees be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to (two-thirds voting in favor thereof).

SUPERINTENDENT'S RESIDENCE, NAVAL ACADEMY.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back with a favorable recommendation the following resolution; which was read, considered, and adopted:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby requested to inform the House, at his earliest convenience, when, by whom, and for what reasons the old mansion at the Naval Academy, long used and occupied by the superintendent as a residence, was condemned and torn down and other foundations laid for a new building on the same site; also to state the total estimated cost of new building, if one is proposed, including furniture and fixtures, and to specify the items of appropriations under which expenditures therefor have been made and estimates submitted to Congress.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

TARIFF.

Mr. KELLEY. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to resume consideration of the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. BURROWS, of Michigan, in the chair, and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7313) to impose duties on foreign imports, and for other purposes.

The pending paragraph was the following:

Alumina, alum, patent alum, alum substitute, sulphate of alumina, and aluminous cake and alum in crystals or ground, 60 cents per hundred pounds.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose last evening the pending question was on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAMMOND] to strike out line 232.

Mr. HAMMOND. I withdraw that motion, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARLISLE] desires to offer an amendment to the same line.

Mr. CARLISLE. I move to amend by striking out in line 232 the word "sixty" and inserting "thirty," so as to make the duty 30 cents per hundred pounds, which will be nearly 25 per cent. ad valorem.

This article is used to a large extent in manufactures, and I think the specific rate I propose, which is equivalent to 25 per cent. ad valorem, is ample.

A MEMBER. Had not the gentleman better make it 40 cents?

Mr. CARLISLE. I am willing to make it 40.

Mr. RANDALL. What is that equivalent to?

Mr. CARLISLE. Thirty cents per hundred pounds would be equivalent to 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. RANDALL. Then 40 cents is an intermediate rate.

Mr. CARLISLE. I will take a vote, Mr. Chairman, first on 30.

Mr. RANDALL. Make it 40.

The CHAIRMAN. The question first before the committee is on the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CARLISLE. I move to strike out "sixty" and insert "forty."

Mr. KELLEY. I desire to say under the existing duty the price of alum has been much cheapened, and it has been shown that while bleaching powders and other articles entering, for instance, into the manufacture of paper, which were on the free-list, had increased in price, alum, the one protected article of the number, had not only not increased but had diminished. And I can not see any reason for reducing the existing duty on that article.

Mr. CARLISLE. If it be a fact, and I am not going to question the accuracy of the gentleman's statement, that the price of alum has fallen since the imposition of the duty of 60 cents per one hundred pounds, then it follows inevitably that 60 cents per one hundred pounds is a much greater ad valorem rate on the value of the article than its first price. So in every instance where the price of an article subject to a specific rate is less now than it was when it was imposed, it is the duty of this House, if it intends to preserve the same equivalent ad valorem rate,

to reduce the specific rate. And it is in view of that fact I make the motion to impose 40 cents, which in my judgment will be a much cheaper equivalent ad valorem rate than 60 cents was when Congress put it on this article.

Mr. KELLEY. There are large importations under the existing duty, and the price has not risen; and I hope the proposed amendment will be voted down.

Mr. CARLISLE. Let us have a division on this.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 42, noes 54.

Mr. RANDALL. I suggest 50 cents.

Mr. MILLS. Let us have tellers.

Mr. CARLISLE. Some gentlemen desire a vote by tellers on this.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order that no quorum has voted?

Mr. CARLISLE. I dislike to make the point of order that there is no quorum, but this is a meritorious amendment, in my judgment, and I must do so in order to get a further division of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order having been made that no quorum has voted, the Chair will appoint Mr. CARLISLE and Mr. HASKELL as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 65, noes 62.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Quinia and cinchonidia, sulphate and salts of, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. TUCKER and Mr. FLOWER rose and moved to strike out the words just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia, on the committee.

Mr. TUCKER. My motion is to strike out the words "quinia and cinchonidia, sulphate and salts of, 10 per cent. ad valorem;" and I yield the floor to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FLOWER. Mr. Chairman, on Friday last I asked the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KASSON], a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means, this question, and I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. FLOWER. If you do not need the money you collect on quinine why then do you collect it?

Mr. KASSON. We have to collect money on something.

Mr. FLOWER. Why?

Mr. KASSON. For revenue. On your suggestion we do not need any duty on sugar, and take it all off. We do not need it on cigars and tobacco, and take it all off.

I asked that question, Mr. Chairman, knowing that the Tariff Commission had allowed quinine to come into this country free, and that it had been coming into this country free since 1879; and I asked the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KASSON], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the question to find out the reason for taxing quinine, and I learn it was for the same reason we taxed sugar and tobacco. I know there is a tax on sugar and tobacco, and I am willing to pay it, but I did not know we were framing a bill to raise more revenue. I supposed it was to reduce revenue, and if there be any good reason why quinine should be taxed I wanted the honorable gentleman frankly to tell me what it was. I did not know but the ingredients which entered into the manufacture of quinine had something to do with this tax, and that the six gentlemen who manufacture quinine in this country might want some protection on account of those articles which entered into its manufacture.

I want to take the side of the men who did not appear before the commission, the men suffering from fever, and to protect them a little. This tariff bill protects everybody except the sick man, and I want to protect him; and that is the reason why I have moved to strike out the lines which the Clerk has read: "quinia and cinchonidia, sulphate and salts of, 10 per cent. ad valorem."

If the honorable gentleman from Iowa has any reason to give why this tax should not come off, I should like to hear it now.

Mr. KASSON rose, but yielded the floor to Mr. KELLEY.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons why the duty should be retained on quinia and cinchonidia. They are manufactured articles; they are articles the production of which consume dutiable and taxable goods. They are in their purity as essential to the health of the American people as any medicines known to that people. A pure supply of the product is an important element in excluding adulterated foreign quinine and cinchonidia.

Mr. DUNN. Will the gentleman allow me a question in this connection?

Mr. KELLEY. No; not in the five minutes. I am going to ask that the Clerk read a letter from one of the leading dealers in drugs and medicines in the city of Saint Louis, Kansas City, and other places, giving the reason why this duty may be maintained and showing that it can not possibly fall upon the retail consumer because prices can not be adjusted under our system of coinage and the quantities of duty affected on the foreign purchase of this article.

The Clerk read as follows:

SAINT LOUIS, Mo., January 25, 1883.

SIR: You are of course thoroughly familiar with the various views on the question relative to the duty on quinine, and as the matter seems now before Congress for action, we take the liberty as your constituents to give you our

opinions in the premises. The writer of this has been in the drug business very nearly thirty-five years—seventeen years in the retail business in Fort Wayne, Indiana, and since 1865 in this city as a jobber—and we believe that it is not only unjust to the manufacturers of quinine in this country to have this article placed on the free-list, but it is also an injury to the parties dealing in this staple. The only argument in favor of free quinine used by its advocates is that the poor fever-stricken patients are paying a blood tax to the monopolists (American manufacturers). Now, this is a most fallacious theory as we know from our extensive experience. An ounce of quinine weighs 435 grains. The article is generally bought in quantities by the consumers, of 20, 30, or 60 grains. The prices charged are either 1 cent per grain or 1½ cents per grain, and these prices have rated, and rate to-day all over the country, no matter whether the retail druggists paid \$2 or \$3 per ounce; and the price is the same to-day when they pay \$1.75 per ounce. While we are always glad to see the retailers make a good profit, we believe it will not impose a burden upon him if he has to pay 20 cents more per ounce, and it will act as a governor to keep prices more uniform. While quinine has never been a profitable article for the jobber it has been less so since July 1, 1879, when it became free.

Cinchonidia: This article has been used as a substitute for quinine, being a by-product in the manufacture of this article, and is sometimes called "the poor man's quinine." It was not known until some ten years ago by the trade, and its introduction is almost entirely due to the efforts of Powers & Weightman, of Philadelphia. It is a great acquisition in materia medica as an anti-periodic and in colds. This article now pays a duty of 40 per cent., but we understand efforts are being made to place it on the free-list. This would surely be very unfair if not an outrage. We beg to suggest that you kindly use your influence to have Congress pass an act placing 10 per cent. on quinine and all salts of quinine, including the sulphates, and 25 per cent. on cinchonidia and all salts of cinchonidia, including the sulphate.

We inclose a circular which will give you some additional points, and, with the highest regards, we are,

Your obedient servants,

MEYER BROS. & CO.

Hon. GEORGE G. VEST,
Senator, Washington, D. C.

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

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

I desire, Mr. Chairman, to give notice to the committee that at the proper time, if the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Virginia shall pass, I will move to insert on the free-list "quinia and cinchonidia, sulphate and salts of," so that it may not come in under the unenumerated clauses at an average rate of duty of 25 per cent. ad valorem, but shall be entirely upon the free-list.

Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of this question it seems to me that no argument whatever is necessary to demonstrate the importance of retaining these articles upon the free-list. No bill was passed by the Forty-sixth Congress that met with such unanimous praise and commendation on the part of the great body of the American people as the bill putting the salts and sulphates of quinine and cinchonidia on the free-list.

There are two questions that suggest themselves to us in this connection: One is, has the passage of that bill stopped or retarded in any manner the manufacture of these salts in this country; and the next is, has the passage of that bill cheapened these salts and sulphates to the people of this country. The answers to these questions are very simple. So far from retarding the manufacture, I have in my hand tables showing that since the passage of that act on June 30, 1879, which was the date of the passage of the bill, up to the present time, there has been not only no decrease in the manufacture but there has been an increase, two establishments having sprung into existence since that time, while the prices have steadily declined. With reference to the question as to whether these articles have been cheapened by the passage of that bill, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the table prepared by Mr. J. S. Moore, who probably has as much general information upon the subject of the tariff as any other citizen in this country, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee always excepted. [Laughter]. From January, 1879, to June 30, 1879, the price of taxed quinine as shown by these tables was \$3.63 per ounce. From July 1, 1879, to December 31, 1879, after the free-quinine bill had gone into operation, the price was \$3.29 per ounce, making a saving to the people of 34 cents per ounce. In 1877 taxed quinine sold at \$3.76 per ounce, and in the year 1880 free quinine sold at \$3.03 per ounce, a saving of 73 cents.

In the year 1878 taxed quinine sold for \$3.52 an ounce, and in 1881 free quinine sold for \$2.47½ per ounce, showing the immense saving of \$1.08½ per ounce under the operations of the free-quinine bill. Or take it in this way: the average price of quinine from January 1, 1877, to July, 1879, was \$3.64½ per ounce, and during the two and a half years from July, 1879, to December, 1881, the average price of free quinine was \$2.86 per ounce, or a reduction of 78½ cents per ounce.

Now, I have tried every imaginable way to find out exactly what amount of quinine was consumed in the United States, and the very best approximate estimate that I have been able to reach is that it amounts to some 2,000,000 of ounces per annum. The saving, therefore, which resulted from the passage of this free-quinine bill is over \$1,500,000 a year to the people of this country; and taking it for the three years since the passage of this bill, the saving to the American people has been over \$4,500,000.

I ask the honorable chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means if in the literature of petitions that have crowded his committee-room—that audience chamber of protection—a single, solitary consumer of quinine, white or black, male or female, "including Indians not taxed" [laughter], has ever asked that august body to restore 1 cent of duty

on that drug? I guarantee that there is not one, and I defy the gentleman from Pennsylvania to exhibit a single instance where any cry has ever come up for the reimposition of the tax on quinine, unless it came from the jobber, manufacturer, or dealer in some form, who is interested in keeping this tax upon the people.

In all this bad bill of 140 pages, which is cumulative in its wickedness and progressive in its devilment, the proposition to restore the duty on quinine is the climacteric and *ultima Thule* of its meanness. [Laughter.] No bill has ever emanated from the Committee on Ways and Means, a committee whose name should be changed by resolution of this House to that of the "friends of the poor" [laughter]—no proposition has ever emanated from that committee which compares with this either in its aggregated or segregated iniquity. [Laughter and applause.]

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

Mr. HOUSE rose and yielded his time to Mr. MCKENZIE.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. KELLEY. I rise to a question of order. I believe the rule is that speeches shall alternate for and against a proposition.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I do not think it is worthy of the honorable chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who has occupied so much of the valuable time of this House and the world at large [laughter], to object to my proceeding.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCKENZIE] is entitled to the floor and will proceed.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his courtesy. In all its dreary pages this 140-page bill is unredeemed by a single feature which looks to the benefit of either the Government of the United States or the people themselves except such as are manufacturers, jobbers, or monopolists, and I defy the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] to show such a feature if it exist.

The ague-stricken people of this country will call this Congress accursed if the tax on this drug is restored. They pronounced your party unworthy of confidence last November. They demanded reform in our tariff system, and it comes with ill grace from you after having been repudiated at the polls to reinstate a tax for which not one single solitary voter in America has petitioned except those who have a direct pecuniary interest in its imposition.

You had as well attempt to lay a tax on air and God's sun-light, which I honestly believe you would do if a single citizen or firm in the city of Philadelphia were engaged in the manufacture of either. [Laughter.] I desire to ask this honorable Committee on Ways and Means if they are willing to go on record as championing a bill which looks to the relief from taxation of all "proprietary medicines," preparations that have caused more wry faces and more pained viscera than all other preparations known to human ingenuity in the matter of physical torture; and as still insisting upon the reimposition of a tax upon quinine, which "brings healing on its wings" to every bed of sickness in the land?

By the way, I got a circular-letter this morning from Rosengarten & Sons, telling me of the outrageous injustice being done to the industry they are following. They threatened us in 1879, when the bill was passed taking the tax off this drug, with the stoppage of their factory. But they are running still, and two additional factories have been started since the removal of the duty. Now, Mr. Chairman, the case before the House stands thus. Powers & Weightman against the sick people of the United States; Rosengarten & Sons against the fever hospitals. The majority of the Ways and Means Committee appear for the plaintiff, and I desire, Mr. Chairman, to have my name entered as attorney for the defense. [Applause.]

I realize that numbers and ability are arrayed against me, but, poor advocate as I am, I feel that my cause is so just I can plead it successfully before that great jury to whom you last appealed and who brought in a verdict of guilty without the recommendation of mercy. [Laughter and applause.]

You may defeat this amendment here; you may fail to strike these two lines out of this infamous bill; but we will appeal it to the American people, and I have no sort of doubt as to the result. If you enact this tax you lend yourselves to the spread of malarial fever; and I want every man as he passes between the tellers here who desires to promote the establishment of pest-houses and fever hospitals, who wants to add rack and pain to beds of sickness, who wants to appear as the confederate of death, to record himself in favor of the restoration of the duty on quinine. [Laughter and applause.]

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

Mr. MCKENZIE. I sincerely hope the House in its kindness will give me five minutes more.

Mr. KELLEY. I move that the gentleman have leave to print.

A MEMBER. It is too good to print without being listened to.

Mr. KELLEY. I desire to say if we throw open these questions for general debate in committee there will be no controlling the legislation of the House. I object to any extension of time in the Committee of the Whole. I have no objection to the gentleman printing his remarks.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I make an appeal to the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania. I am going out of Congress but desire to be heard now on behalf of the tax-payers of the country; and this is probably the last despairing appeal I shall ever make to the stony-hearted gentlemen on that side of the House. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the question. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that he may be allowed five minutes more.

Mr. BRUMM. I object.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted. Does the gentleman from Kentucky withdraw the *pro forma* amendment?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Yes, sir.

Mr. REAGAN. I renew it, and yield my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCKENZIE].

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas. The Committee on Ways and Means—

Mr. MILLER. I rise to a point of order. I desire to know under what rule this debate is going on.

The CHAIRMAN. What point of order does the gentleman make?

Mr. MILLER. I make the point of order that a *pro forma* amendment can not be debated, and that debate is limited to five minutes on either side. I ask the Chair to have paragraph 5 of Rule XXIII read.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been the universal custom to allow debate on *pro forma* amendments.

Mr. MILLER. I object, and ask to have the Chair rule on the point of order. I ask the Clerk to read the rule which I send to the desk.

Mr. HASKELL. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania allow me to say a word?

Mr. MILLER. After the rule is read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania objects to debate on *pro forma* amendments, and asks that paragraph 5 of Rule XXIII be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

When general debate is closed by order of the House, any member shall be allowed five minutes to explain any amendment he may offer, after which the member who shall first obtain the floor shall be allowed to speak five minutes in opposition to it, and there shall be no further debate thereon; but the same privilege of debate shall be allowed in favor of and against any amendment that may be offered to an amendment; and neither an amendment nor an amendment to an amendment shall be withdrawn by the mover thereof unless by the unanimous consent of the committee.

Mr. HASKELL. Let me say a word, for I think it may be of some service to our friends on both sides of the House. However desirable it may be to cut off *pro forma* amendments and debate thereon, if my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLER] will think a moment he will see that this bill is so peculiar in its nature, almost every line of it being a separate and distinct item, that all a member has to do in order to get an opportunity to speak for five minutes is to move some substantial amendment of the rate of duty proposed. Therefore, it will amount to the same thing precisely as what is technically termed a *pro forma* amendment.

Therefore, I believe it is best not to raise any point of order on *pro forma* amendments or to attempt to get a fine ruling of the Chair on the *pro forma* idea, and so attempt to hold men closely to the rule as to confining them in argument to the subject-matter of the amendment, for the simple reason that all a member has to do when checked on that line is to move some substantial amendment by way of changing the rate of duty proposed. That is the reason why members of the Committee on Ways and Means have made no objection to such amendments.

Mr. MILLER. I shall insist upon the Chair ruling on this question of order. Unless some such action is taken this bill will not have passed this Committee of the Whole before the 4th day of March next.

Yesterday I observed that amendment after amendment was offered to each line of this bill as we reached it, and often, too, by persons who did not seem to understand even the form or substance of the amendments they were offering. The propriety of taxing beeswax, soap, and castor-oil was discussed at length, and the time of the House taken up, as though the people of this country would be crushed by such legislation.

If it was the intention of the opponents of this bill to offer and discuss amendments which were germane I would not raise this point of order. But when I observe that such amendments are offered for the sole purpose of retarding the progress of the bill, for the sole purpose of preventing the action of the Committee of the Whole upon it, then I raise this point of order and I ask the Chair to rule on it.

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

Mr. ATKINS. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ATKINS. I desire to inquire if the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCKENZIE] did not withdraw his amendment by unanimous consent; and if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REAGAN] did not thereupon renew it and yield the time, to which he was entitled under the rule, to the gentleman from Kentucky? If so, is not the gentleman from Kentucky in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ATKINS] states is the fact. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCKENZIE] withdrew his *pro forma* amendment, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REAGAN] then took the floor, renewed the amendment and yielded his time to the gentleman from Kentucky. The Chair therefore rules that the gentleman from Kentucky is in order, and will proceed.

Mr. MCKENZIE. All these irrelevant remarks which have been made on a point of order are somewhat damaging to the continuity of my speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I decline to yield to the solemn gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky declines to yield, and will proceed.

Mr. MCKENZIE. The remarks of the cool-headed, mild-mannered, unfrenzied gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLER] have added great solemnity to these proceedings, and I therefore proceed with my remarks with great misgivings.

I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that last year, as members will possibly recollect, I objected to the delegation of the powers of the Committee on Ways and Means to that association of middle aged and highly unprejudiced specialists known as the Tariff Commission. [Laughter.] I did not then believe that the Tariff Commission had any more ability to revise our system of revenue than had the Committee on Ways and Means. But after reading the bill reported by that committee, and comparing it with the report of the Tariff Commission and its recommendations, I desire publicly to retract every utterance I made on that occasion. [Laughter.]

Now, look at the free-list of this bill; it is full of goodness and wisdom and benevolence. I see here, and thank God for it, that the Committee on Ways and Means have put "blood" on the free-list. [Laughter.] Sir, if you were to levy a tax of only 1 cent a gallon on all the blood which you have extracted, through the means of your infamous tariff, from the American people, you could pay the national debt in twelve months and have a large surplus in the Federal Treasury. Considering the enormous amount that you have heretofore extracted, you need not levy any prohibitory duties on it, nor need you permit it to come in free. It is already a drug in the market.

Then I find that the committee has put "bone-dust" on the free-list. My God, gentlemen, you are manufacturing bone-dust in pauper graveyards whenever you propose to tax quinine, and you are making it very fast. [Laughter.]

You have put "musk and civet" on the free-list. Now, when I come to contemplate this bill, looking at it in its altitude and its pulchritude, in its concavity and its convexity, in its obliquity and its iniquity, I feel like exclaiming with old King Lear when contemplating the ingratitude of his daughters, "Give me an ounce of civet, good apothecary, to sweeten my imagination." [Laughter.]

You have exempted "ipecac" from duty. Ah, gentlemen, you need not put that on the free-list to create nausea enough in the stomachs of the American people to lead them to spew your party out in 1884. [Laughter.]

And you have put "leeches" on the free-list. That I suppose is for the purpose of exempting the protected "barons" and the Committee on Ways and Means. [Laughter.]

Then you have put upon the free-list an article called "divi-divi." What that is God Almighty and a few protected individuals only know. I presume it is meant to protect these "barons," and to suggest that the Committee on Ways and Means wants a double quantity of whatever "divy" is. [Laughter.]

You have put diamonds on the free-list. Now, gentlemen, if there is anything on the face of the earth that grinds the poor people of this land into the very dirt, it is the tax on diamonds. [Laughter.]

You have put "joss sticks" on the free-list. Still ministering to the spiritual wants of the Chinese. [Laughter.] You are willing that the heathern within our borders may burn incense to his unknown god free from taxation while the humble American worshiper is taxed 25 per cent. upon the Bible which points his way to heaven. [Applause.] I saw a lot of you at the Chinese minister's the other night; and while you may despise his civilization you manifested a very high appreciation of his punch. [Laughter.] Asiatic civilization when it comes to the matter of "cheap labor" does not suit the average Republican; but the terrapin and champagne *frappé* of the "heathen Chinese," I am forced to conclude, met with the unqualified approbation of gentlemen on the other side of the House. [Laughter.]

You have also put on the free-list "junk, old, not otherwise provided for." This was done for the protection of the Ways and Means Committee. They are fast growing old; and thank God an indignant people will shortly relegate them to the shades of private life. They may stray out of this country some time, and if they ever come back they will have to come in under the head of "old junk, not otherwise provided for." [Great laughter and applause.] I am glad you put this on the free-list, because it will save you from undergoing inquisitorial processes in a Democratic custom-house. [Laughter.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MCLEAN, of Missouri, obtained the floor.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I desire five minutes more. [Cries of "Go on!"]
Mr. MCLEAN, of Missouri. I will allow the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCKENZIE] to occupy five minutes more.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I insist that both sides have a right to be heard.

Mr. COBB. They will be.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MCLEAN], who will proceed for five minutes.

Mr. KELLEY. I hold that the gentleman has no right to yield under the rules.

Mr. MCLEAN, of Missouri. In regard to this matter of quinine I wish to say that the poor are not affected by this 10 per cent. duty. To prove this I wish to have read two letters from men who are engaged largely in business and know what they are talking about.

Mr. CHACE. What branch of business?

Mr. MCLEAN, of Missouri. They are large wholesale druggists in Saint Louis.

Mr. CHACE. Not manufacturers?

Mr. MCLEAN, of Missouri. Not manufacturers, either of them.

Mr. CHACE. Those are men we want to hear.

The Clerk proceeded to read the following letters:

OFFICE OF RICHARDSON & CO.,
Saint Louis, January 26, 1883.

DEAR SIR: In view of the approaching legislation affecting chemicals, &c., in the proposed revision of the tariff, we desire to call your attention more particularly to the articles sulphate of quinine and sulphate of cinchonidia and their salts. We would particularly urge that a duty of 10 per cent. on the former and 25 per cent. on the latter shall be enacted, as there is no doubt but what our American manufacturers are clearly entitled to this protection. They have suffered a great deal within the last twelve months from foreign competition, and this competition can not be possibly overcome by a less protection than that above mentioned. This is an industry that should not be lost to the country, and one which must eventually cause suffering if it should be.

We inclose you an article by Mr. A. H. Jones, which will give some facts worthy of notice. The largest manufactory of quinine was formerly located in Philadelphia; it is now located in Milan, Italy. The imports of quinine in 1879 were 228,000 ounces, and in 1882, 795,000 ounces. If our American manufacturers had been able to compete with a free tariff against foreign manufactures, we feel assured that they would not have allowed this large increase to take place.

We shall be glad if this matter will interest you sufficiently to give it that attention which it requires, and we trust also that your interest may be for the protection of our American manufacturers to the extent above indicated on these important articles.

Yours truly,

RICHARDSON & CO.

Hon. Dr. J. H. MCLEAN,
House of Representatives United States, Washington, D. C.

SAINT LOUIS, January 26, 1883.

DEAR SIR: Allow us to call your attention to the bill soon to come before the House in regard to the duty on quinine and cinchonidia. We believe that a 10 per cent. duty on quinine and the present duty of 25 per cent. on cinchonidia and their salts are no injury to the consumer and only just to the manufacturers in this country.

We believe that putting them on the free-list will eventually destroy the manufacture of them in this country, and we shall be at the mercy of European manufacturers and prices will be higher than with a duty to protect our home manufactures. Also, in case of a war with any European power our supply will be cut off and we will be great sufferers without it. We ask your influence to maintain the duty of 25 per cent. on cinchonidia and its salts and have a duty of 10 per cent. placed on quinine.

Respectfully,

GEORGE K. HOPKINS & CO.

Hon. J. H. MCLEAN,
House of Representatives, Washington city.

[During the reading of the foregoing letters, when the five minutes of Mr. MCLEAN, of Missouri, had expired, he obtained leave that the letters be published entire in the RECORD.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted.

Mr. REAGAN. I withdraw it.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I renew it. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph now under consideration, imposing a duty of 10 per cent. upon quinine, is one of the many inconsistencies to be found in this bill. The advocates of the bill admit that the measure is an effort on their part to decrease the revenues of the Government; yet we find that this duty of 10 per cent. imposed on quinine will, according to the estimate submitted with the bill, yield to the Government an annual revenue in round numbers of \$155,000.

Now, this article of quinine is a prime necessity. With us in the South it is particularly so. Down there, where malarial chills and fevers are indigenous and where they are popularly supposed to be most prevalent, it is almost as much a necessity with us as the food which goes alike into the palaces of the rich and the hovels of the poor for the sustaining of life and the giving of health and strength.

I desire to submit a few figures and facts in connection with this matter of quinine and its importation into the United States. First, however, let me state that this bill takes off all duty upon cinchona bark and all other barks from which quinine is manufactured; but it takes quinine from the free-list, where it has been since 1879, and puts it back upon the dutiable list. The evidence taken before the Tariff Commission shows that there are but 4,000,000 ounces of quinine manufactured annually in the world; and of these 4,000,000 ounces the United States alone consume 1,600,000 ounces—more than one-third of the whole manufacture. The testimony taken before the commission fur-

ther shows that of the 1,600,000 ounces consumed in the United States 800,000 ounces are manufactured in this country. There are in the United States only five quinine manufactories; and only five hundred persons are employed in its manufacture. This is the testimony of Dr. Robbins, himself a manufacturer of quinine in New York, who testified before the Tariff Commission.

I repeat that all the barks from which quinine is made are in this bill put on the free-list. Until the 1st of January of the present year there was a duty of 10 per cent. upon cinchona bark imported from the East Indies; but cinchona bark imported from South America, from which the greatest quantity comes, has been four years, and for aught I know longer than that, on the free-list. Since the 1st of January all these barks have been free; and this bill continues them on the free-list while at the same time it imposes a duty of 10 per cent. on the manufactured article.

Now, sir, as to price (and I desire to controvert the statements read in the paper which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] sent up to the Clerk's desk to be read and the paper which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MCLEAN] sent up to be read), I have studied the testimony taken before the Tariff Commission with respect to this article, and the result of that study is, that before quinine was placed on the free-list it was worth per ounce from \$3 to \$4, and that since it has been on the free-list, with the exception—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I desire but a few minutes more.

Mr. KELLEY. I ask that the gentleman from Louisiana have leave to print.

Mr. COX, of New York. He does not ask leave to print.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. I have in twenty-one years never seen the time extended in Committee of the Whole. I have seen one gentleman make twelve five-minute speeches, but the opposite side was allowed to be heard to the extent of five minutes between each two. And I can not consent to abandon so wholesome a rule here where we meet for the discussion of the price and the details of revenue bills. I mean no discourtesy to the gentleman, but I do mean to insist so far as I can on the maintenance of one of the most wholesome of parliamentary rules.

I desire to say, as a protectionist, there should be a duty on this manufacture as upon all others. It is a manufacture requiring a most expensive plant. Its vases of platinum can not be produced in this country and can not be repaired here, and they must keep a supply on hand for use for transportation and return and for absence in foreign workshops. They must keep large stocks of bark and solvents, all of which are taxed or dutiable, until recently, since the 1st of January, for until then that which came from the best fields, those of India and Java, paid 10 per cent. duty. That was abolished in accordance with the treaty with the Netherlands.

Now, sir, we have neither a protective tariff nor a revenue tariff on quinine or cinchonidia or their ingredients. The bark that was in the country to be manufactured, as is shown by our commercial reports, has been exported because with all their costly plant the American manufacturer would not consume it.

Now, what we are entitled to is revenue from these articles or their elements, and if it be true that the protective principle develops the production and reduces the price of other commodities, the law is equally true as to these important drugs.

All that is said in general about cheapening these vital drugs I assent to; but I say to gentlemen on this side their whole theory in reference to protection, as has been said on the other side, is a sham, a snare, and a delusion, or moderate protection will give you pure quinine and cinchonidia and keep down its price.

I say to gentlemen on that side of the House who prate of a revenue tariff that we are entitled to some revenue from these costly and important drugs. The letters from druggists already read hold that this duty distributes over four hundred and thirty-five grains to the ounce, can not be felt by the consumers, and it is merely transferring the guarantee, so the manufacturer may have a chance in his own market, for the retailer who buys at whatever price he can buy sells at the same rate, because no coin will measure the reduction of duty.

Sir, prices have fluctuated in this country always with the price throughout the commercial world. Quinine has been at \$4 in London and at \$2, and our market has always gone up and down with it, and the repeal of the duty, so long as the remaining duty on cinchonidia enabled our manufacturers to produce some, has been kept down.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the present amendment is exhausted.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I withdraw it.

Mr. COX, of New York. I renew it; and I merely desire to say if this amendment please—

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. Can the amendment be withdrawn except by unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. It can not.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. I objected as well as I could.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair heard no objection, and the Chair has recognized the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COX, of New York. I should like to make an amendment if this amendment is voted down to make it 5 per cent.

Mr. BLANCHARD. But suppose it is not?

Mr. COX, of New York. I presume the House will understand the argument already made by my friend from Kentucky [Mr. MCKENZIE] and the figures presented by my friend from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD], and the House will remember what ought to be remembered by every single member of Congress, that this proposition practically places quinine just where it was before our reform on that subject. I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD].

Mr. BLANCHARD. I thank my friend from New York. Now, Mr. Chairman, continuing the statement I was about to make when interrupted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I state that the testimony taken before the Tariff Commission shows that prior to 1879, at which time quinine was placed on the free-list, it was worth from \$3 to \$4 an ounce, and that after that time, with the exception of a short period following the placing of quinine on the free-list, it was worth only \$2 an ounce.

But I will state further that until the duty upon quinine was repealed, or it was placed upon the free-list, the article was worth at retail 2 cents a grain and sold at that rate throughout the country. Now, however, since the tariff duty has been removed the evidence taken before the Tariff Commission shows that the consumer can obtain it for 1½ cents per grain, being a difference of 25 per cent. in his favor. Now, Mr. Chairman, in further rebuttal of the statements made in the letters which the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Missouri sent up to be read from the desk, I desire to read from some of the testimony which was taken before the Tariff Commission, and presumably under oath, while the statements contained in the letters to which I have referred were *ex parte* statements and made without the sanction of an oath. I infer that this testimony was taken under oath, at all events it was taken under the official sanction of a committee authorized by Congress, and I will read from that testimony and desire to call the attention of the Representatives on that side (the Republican side) from the great State of Illinois, and especially the gentlemen who represent on that side the city of Chicago, to what I am about to read, because the testimony is chiefly from druggists in that city.

I find embodied in the statement of Mr. Robert H. Cowdery, made before that commission, he representing the druggists' association of the city of Chicago, and whose testimony is found on page 942 of the first volume of the evidence taken before the Tariff Commission, on the point as to whether consumers of quinine have been benefited or not by the repeal of the duty on that article, the following:

I have copied several letters which I have received and which I will read.

Mr. William Dale, of Chicago, says:

"I can see no reason why the tax on quinine should be reimposed. The consumer does not want it, the retail pharmacist does not desire it, and the only persons known to favor its reimposition are the manufacturers, and they only for their own gain, not ours. After considering the great fortunes made by the manufacturers on quinine with the tax on, I am not in favor of again taxing quinine in order that they may make a still greater profit. I fail to see where the injustice is in having quinine duty free. My customers get their quinine 25 per cent. cheaper now than when quinine was taxed for the benefit of the manufacturer, and at my customers' expense."

Dr. Dyche, of the firm of D. R. Dyche & Co., says:

"I am in favor of keeping quinine duty free. The price has been materially reduced to the consumer, and no one who understands what he is talking of would make statements to the contrary were he properly informed. This reduced price to the consumer is directly due to the reduced price to us, as compared to the price when the duty was on. I see no injustice in not retaxing quinine. I do see an injustice to the whole nation when quinine is taxed."

U. Gray Bartlett, professor of chemistry, doing business on the corner of Indiana avenue and Twenty-second street, says:

"I stamp all such statements as false, as far as I am concerned. I sell quinine 25 per cent. less than when the duty was on in 1879. The attempted reimposition of the tax I would regard as a fraud on the community."

J. H. Wilson, retail dealer, doing business at Michigan avenue and Twenty-second street, says:

"I have sold quinine 25 per cent. less than my price in 1879, when the tax was on, and have done so since it touched \$1.90. I have not raised it since this advance of 50 and 60 cents an ounce. I regard it an injustice to raise the price when we have just made our prices uniform to the consumer."

I will not, Mr. Chairman, weary the committee further with reading from the testimony, but will say that to the same effect as the above are the statements of Mr. Forsyth, of Forsyth & Co.; of Manville & Foote; of Peter Van Schaach, of Van Schaach, Stevenson & Co.; of O. F. Fuller, of the firm of Fuller & Fuller; and many others, all showing a reduction of 25 per cent. to the consumer as the result of the removal of the duty on quinine in 1879.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say only a few words on this subject, and in reply to the remarks made and the figures submitted by the gentleman from Louisiana, as well as in response to the figures submitted by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCKENZIE]. Both refer to the present price of quinine as the resultant of the relief of duty imposition since the year 1879. The statement is not substantiated by the facts. The schedule of prices at which quinine has sold in the American market exhibits the quotation of \$1.18 (for large packages) an ounce in 1859 and 1860, when the duty upon quinine was double the amount proposed in this bill, and from 1860 the price has changed almost every month, like any other product, manufacture, or commodity in the American market. Therefore the mere fact of the imposition of duty or the relief of duty upon the foreign product had no effect whatever, when quinine

came into competition with quinine in the trade centers of the world, as an element affecting its price in our own market. Quinine of necessity varied just as the crude elements or materials entering into the perfection of the drug varied in price, and supply and demand held their inexorable relations.

In response to the gentleman from Kentucky I desire to state that he has failed to inform the committee that the price of quinine has advanced in the markets of the world. That while quinine in 1877 rated in the American market at \$3.76 an ounce and in the London market at \$4 an ounce, variations in its price have run from that day to this, not only in the American market but in every market; and to-day in London quinine is quoted at \$2 or a little less per ounce, and in the American market at \$1.75 per ounce. The gentleman has emphasized the changes in the American market and leaves the inference that here alone it is cheaper, because of the act of 1879 allowing its importation duty free.

But such is not the fact. When the drug was cheap with us it was correspondingly cheap elsewhere. When high with us it was high elsewhere. The marking free under our tariff schedule has in nowise reduced either the wholesale or retail price.

I will submit for the information of the House the following, and ask the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Kentucky to explain the proposition on their basis of duty imposed as the forerunner of high prices, and free quinine as the basis of low prices:

In 1860 quinine sold in the American market at \$1.18 per ounce; quinine and the barks were dutiable. In 1867 quinine sold here at \$2; the bark was dutiable at 20 per cent. and quinine was dutiable 45 per cent. and premium on gold at 32 per cent. In 1880 quinine was admitted free; its price, however, ruled in the market at \$3.06 per ounce. In 1879 quinine in London sold as high as 13 shillings and 6 pence and as low as 10 shillings and 3 pence; in 1880 as high as 12 shillings and 8 pence and as low as 11 shillings; in 1881 as high as 12 shillings and as low as 8 shillings; in 1882 from 9 to 10 shillings; and in 1883, 8 shillings. If the gentleman can adjust these variable prices upon his proposition that our duty rate caused them, I will yield the question. But I assert that quinine is cheaper to-day than at other periods, because either the crude elements are cheaper or the market figure is fixed because the supply exceeds the demand.

Let us not forget, Mr. Chairman, that there are but fifteen manufactories of this drug in the world, and under the fostering care of protection we have in this country five of these great establishments. In passing, I would remark that under the tariff of 1846, so often and so affectionately referred to by the other side as the model Democratic tariff, quinine was 20 per cent., and the barks were protected. Our five great establishments stand to-day as the monuments of a well-fostered system of protection, capable of supplying the American market with the finest quality of the drug, equipped with skilled workmen and managed by men who by study and experience are masters of their profession.

These five establishments can largely supply the American market, and this market is the largest consuming market in the world. Of the 4,000,000 ounces of total product the American market consumes 1,600,000. But a few years ago we had the largest manufactory of quinine in the world. The act of 1879 making quinine free passed, and the great establishment is limited in its production, and to-day the great house in the manufacture of the drug is located in Milan, Italy. We have fostered this industry until it is almost able to stand alone and compete with other countries. This bill recommends but 10 per cent. duty. The gentleman's amendment would strike out this small protection, and by so doing strike down a manufacture that has grown and developed and been fostered for sixty years under our generous laws, and thus destroy and throw aside all that has been gained. Under the protection given, cinchonidia—now 40 per cent., but by the bill fixed at 10 per cent.—is included in the gentleman's amendment to wipe out. In consequence of this limited protection upon cinchonidia the five American houses have been enabled to run about half time or half capacity. If the amendment prevails I announce with regret that every American manufactory will be compelled to close.

Is it wise policy, is it far-seeing statesmanship, to destroy a home supply for the world's greatest market, with all the knowledge gained during our civil war, not only as to the efficacy of this drug but of its absolute necessity, and depend upon either England, France, Italy, or Germany? Even if we do not manufacture to full capacity or fully supply our home demand, should we not protect and foster to the limited extent of 10 per cent. our fully equipped and completed establishments? Can we afford to depend upon a foreign supply when we know by sad experience the absolute necessity our climate and diseases imperatively demand? I have but time to suggest the thought. I shall not elaborate it. I grant the correctness of the gentleman's statement, that the bark is now admitted free, but do not admit the sequence that our manufactories should be able to produce without protection. The bark is only one of the elements of quinine.

Our manufactories are largely taxed in other ways, adding materially to the cost of the drug. A large part of the material that enters into the building and equipping of the factories, duties on all that they use, eat, and wear. The same taxes and wages that are paid by other manu-

facturers, taxes upon the crude materials, such as soda-ash, fusel oil, and alcohol, in fact everything that enters into our policy of protection to home industry, that has given us our land of plenty and peace, with a Treasury rich and able to meet every obligation and a people contented and happy. Only 10 per cent. is recommended by the committee. No man can claim that it is a prohibitory tax. It is scarcely protection; it is best stated by the word "compensatory protection." Why strike at this great industry and foster hundreds of others? With a little help it will soon control every market; deprive it of the 10 per cent. and you become dependent upon a foreign supply that when you most require it can demand any price and you will have to pay it.

England, ever wise in making a foreign market for her industries, as early as 1855 sent explorations to South America to get seeds and cuttings of the cinchona plant in order to cultivate it.

Markham's Cinchona recites the thrilling history of his efforts to accomplish the work and the final success of his undertakings. He began plantations in the Neilgherry Hills, on the southwest extremity of India, the first experiment, and carried them on at an expense of over \$1,500,000, until the result has proved an unqualified success; but not only has the government the satisfaction of seeing the yearly sales of cultivated cinchona barks from their plantations, amounting to thousands of pounds sterling, but in addition, the fact is announced that already every dollar of their expenditure has been repaid actually and with interest, and millions of trees have been planted not only on the main land, but the Island of Ceylon, by private enterprise, is reaping immensely large sums from the plantations from cuttings and seeds furnished by the government.

And now the English Government is stimulating the introduction of the tree into Jamaica, and the Dutch Government has immense plantations in the Island of Java which are very successful. Truly does this illustrate not only the wisdom of their policy from a commercial standpoint, but in addition the serious importance they consider the certain source of the valuable medicine so indispensable now to humanity, and with what practical steps they have been identified to prove their interest. Ten per cent. is now asked, but if the committee's recommendation stands these five manufactories now so well established may live, but can not either grow or develop. If you take it from them they will be, after sixty years of protection, destroyed.

I do not consider it necessary to discuss the question that a 10 per cent. duty upon quinine can make any difference in the price paid by the purchaser in the retail form. Sufficient has been said in the testimony before the commission as well as by the letters read from the Clerk's desk in the time of the gentleman from Missouri. I ask the House to gravely consider the importance of maintaining this industry, not only from a commercial standpoint, but as an indispensable medicament that becomes as necessary during conditions of war as either a military or naval armament.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted. The *pro forma* amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. KELLEY. I move that the committee now rise, that we may go into the House for the purpose of limiting debate on this paragraph.

Mr. CARLISLE. I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will allow some member of the committee on Ways and Means on this side to occupy a few minutes on this question.

Mr. KELLEY. I withdraw my motion, and will renew it after the gentleman from Kentucky shall have been heard.

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

I shall not undertake to reply to all that has been said by the two gentlemen from Pennsylvania who have just addressed the committee, but I desire to call the attention of the committee again to the fact that everything which enters into the manufacture of this article is free except soda ash and alcohol. And when we attempted the other day to give to the manufacturers free alcohol for use in the arts the point of order was made against the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania himself, and it was ruled out by the Chair. The bark is already free under an act passed at the last session. The gentleman from Pennsylvania tells us, however, that the platinum from which their retorts and vases are made can not be produced in this country.

Mr. KELLEY. Or manufactured.

Mr. CARLISLE. Or manufactured in this country or repaired in this country. But if the gentleman will turn to the bill he has reported he will find platinum and vases and retorts for use for chemical purposes are all made free.

Mr. KELLEY. I did not mean to controvert that proposition. I was speaking of the question of capital involved.

Mr. CARLISLE. These articles are all made free for the benefit of these manufacturers; and if the gentleman's argument in support of a tariff for revenue be sound—and I admit it is—these articles should be put, according to his theory as expressed this morning, upon the dutiable list, in order that the Government may derive some revenue from them, because they are not produced in this country and every dollar of tax paid upon them would go into the Treasury.

Mr. KELLEY. My friend will pardon me. I was not stating my argument, but was stating the argument of that side of the House.

Mr. CARLISLE. But for the benefit of these manufacturers we have put them on the free-list. I repeat that everything is free except soda-

ash and alcohol. I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the manufacturers of quinine can use the same alcohol over and over again; that after having used it once as a solvent it is subjected to a process by which the alcohol is recovered and used again and again in the manufacture of quinine? But notwithstanding this, I am willing to give them free alcohol. I am willing now to permit them and all other manufacturers who use alcohol in the arts to withdraw it from bonded warehouses without the payment of tax and use it free, and I regret that my friend from Pennsylvania does not agree with me on that subject.

Mr. COX, of New York. I desire to ask the gentleman from Kentucky a question. Who asks for this tax? What manufacturers, whether located in New York or anywhere else? I want to know.

Mr. CARLISLE. So far as I know all the manufacturers of quinine ask for this.

Mr. COX, of New York. How many are there?

Mr. CARLISLE. Five, as I understand it.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. And there are only fifteen in the whole world?

Mr. TUCKER rose.

Mr. KELLEY. Remarking that the alcohol which evaporates can not be recovered, I move that the committee do now rise for the purpose of asking the House to limit debate.

Mr. CARLISLE. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania dispute my statement that the alcohol can be recovered?

Mr. KELLEY. What evaporates can not, and that is a large percentage.

The motion of Mr. KELLEY was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURROWS, of Michigan, reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7313) to impose duties upon foreign imports, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. KELLEY. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of resuming the consideration of the tariff bill; and pending that, I move that all debate on lines 243 and 244, and all amendments thereto, be limited to ten minutes.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. I move to amend by making the limit thirty minutes.

The question being taken on the amendment, there were—ayes 61, noes 101.

So the amendment was not agreed to.

Mr. SPRINGER. I move to amend by making the limit twenty minutes. I think that will be fair.

Mr. ROBESON. Gentlemen have already had thirty minutes on that side.

Mr. SPRINGER. Twenty minutes on this blood tax is not too much.

The question being taken on Mr. SPRINGER'S amendment, there were—ayes 42, noes 106.

Before the result of the vote was announced,

Mr. SPRINGER called for tellers.

Tellers were not ordered; there being but 13 in the affirmative, not one-fifth of a quorum.

So the amendment was not agreed to.

The motion of Mr. KELLEY to limit debate was then agreed to.

Mr. KELLEY moved to reconsider the vote just taken; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. KELLEY. I now move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. BURROWS, of Michigan, in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole, and resumes the consideration of the bill to impose duties upon foreign imports and for other purposes. By order of the House all debate upon the pending paragraph and amendments thereto has been limited to ten minutes.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. I move to strike out the last word. The advocates of protection have in this instance abandoned their usual grounds in support of a protective tariff. Heretofore they have urged the plausible pretext that it is maintained for the purpose of benefiting American labor. This morning they put forth no argument in the interest of labor, but solely in the interest of five manufacturing establishments in this country which they seek to enrich at the expense of the American laborer as well as all others.

When this question came up before the Forty-sixth Congress there were forty bills or more pending to put quinine on the free-list, one of the first being introduced by myself. And when the vote was finally taken on the proposition the majority in each House of Congress was more than two-thirds in favor of the bill.

When the question was presented to the Tariff Commission, after giving a hearing to these very parties now petitioning for a restoration of the duty on quinine that commission unanimously reported to Congress

that it was not an industry that needed any protection and decided that the article should remain on the free-list.

If we analyze all the arguments that have been advanced on the other side of this House the fact stands out prominently that they are all simply and purely in favor of re-establishing a monopoly of the most obnoxious character. What do they seek to do by this tariff? They are seeking to put a tax on the unfortunate victims of malarial diseases for which there is no absolute specific except quinine, in order to enrich five manufacturing establishments in Philadelphia and New York.

I feel it my duty, representing thousands of people who are yearly afflicted by malarial diseases, to say a word in their behalf and enter my protest against this unjust tax.

I wish that in this Committee of the Whole there was an opportunity to call the yeas and nays on this proposition, so that I might see uncovered those gentlemen on this floor who fail in their duty to the people by passing between the tellers and voting against this proposition. They are thereby enabled to conceal from their constituents their favoritism for these monopolists.

This is a most vicious tax; it is a most inhuman tax; it is the cruelest of all the taxes upon this list. It is nothing more nor less than a tax on the sick and unfortunate victims of fever and other diseases throughout this land for which quinine is a remedy and the only accepted specific.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MCCOOK. I have no disposition, of course, to prolong this discussion. But in answer to an inquiry made by my colleague [Mr. COX] as to who ask for the imposition of this tax I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read a letter from a gentleman in the same district in which my colleague [Mr. COX] lives (and also like him one of my constituents), asking the restoration of this tax. He presents the matter so much better than I can that I ask that his letter be read as a portion of my remarks.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEW YORK, January 25, 1883.

DEAR GENERAL: I take the liberty of addressing you a few lines relative to the tariff bill as prepared by the "House committee," particularly that portion of it referring to sulphate quinine and sulphate cinchonidia.

Being one of the largest dealers in these articles in this market, we are in a position to speak intelligently on the subject.

Viewing the case from an impartial standpoint (having nothing to gain or lose should the articles go on the free-list or a duty be imposed), I believe "a duty of 10 per cent. on quinia and all salts of quinia, including the sulphate, and a duty of 25 per cent. on cinchonidia and all salts of cinchonidia, including the sulphate," to be just and equitable and absolutely necessary for the protection of these industries in this country. The duty asked for is light and only sufficient to put the American manufacturers in a position to compete with the foreign makers, who are enabled to procure the crude materials necessary for manufacturing these articles in the markets abroad under more favorable conditions than our American manufacturers.

In the Senate bill sulphate quinine and sulphate cinchonidia are both proposed to be made free.

In the House bill both are noted for 10 per cent. duty.

The business of this country has been seriously interfered with by the removal of the duty. The American product is about one-half of what it amounted to before the article of quinine was made free.

The importation of sulphate quinine for the year ending June 30, 1879, was 228,348 ounces; June 30, 1880, was 416,998 ounces; June 30, 1881, was 408,851 ounces; June 30, 1882, was 794,495 ounces. Of course this amount of foreign quinine took the place of the same quantity that could have been made here had it not been admitted free of duty.

The importations of cinchona bark in Europe and the United States also show the effect of this legislation:

Year.	Europe.	United States.
	Packages.	Packages.
1872	32,016	34,473
1874	36,950	42,720
1881	141,812	31,400

The increase from 32,016 in Europe to 141,812 is a remarkable showing, while here it has fallen off.

The largest quinine manufactory is now in Milan, Italy. Formerly it was in Philadelphia. If both quinine and cinchonidia should be placed on the free-list we would look for a suspension of the business in this country. Therefore, knowing your sentiments (as expressed upon the platform and to the writer in personal conversation) on this most important matter of the tariff, I do not hesitate to ask you to cast your vote and influence in favor of a duty of 10 per cent. on quinine and 25 per cent. on cinchonidia, particularly as all other American industries are protected and the manufacturers of these articles have been made martyrs to the hue and cry for free trade. I remain, with kind regards, as ever,

Yours, very truly,

ANDREW B. ROGERS, JR.

Hon. ANSON G. MCCOOK.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate upon the pending amendment has been exhausted.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the House the time for debate upon the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto has expired.

Mr. COX, of New York. What is the pending amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is the motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER], to strike out the lines which will be read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Quinia and cinchonidia, sulphate and salts of, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. COX, of New York. I want that voted out. If I can not get it out I will move an amendment.

The question was taken on the motion to strike out; and upon a division there were—ayes 108, noes 57. [Applause.]

So the motion to strike out was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following:

Natural and imitation mineral waters and all wholly artificial mineral waters containing not more than one quart each, 3 cents per bottle or jug; containing more than one quart or fraction thereof, 3 cents additional for each bottle or jug.

Mr. KELLEY. I am instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to move as a substitute for the paragraph just read that which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Imitation mineral waters and all artificial mineral waters shall pay upon bottles or jugs containing not more than one quart each, 3 cents per bottle or jug; containing more than one quart, 3 cents for each additional quart or fraction thereof.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. Does that amendment confine the tax to the bottle and take it off the water entirely?

Mr. KELLEY. It is a duty on imitation and artificial mineral waters.

Mr. KASSON. As I stated the other day, it is intended to put all natural mineral waters on the free-list. To effect that purpose the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means proposes this amendment, which, as I understand it, leaves the tax on artificial and imitation mineral waters at the rate proposed.

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

Mr. KASSON. Certainly.

Mr. TUCKER. Does the three-cents-a-bottle duty proposed in this amendment include the duty which is levied in another portion of the bill on bottles?

Mr. KASSON. It ought not to be an additional duty.

Mr. TUCKER. Would it not be better that the amendment now offered should include all the duty, as well that on the bottle as that on the water in the bottle?

Mr. KASSON. That is what I understand to be the intention of the committee. If it is not clear, it ought to be clear.

Mr. KELLEY. The substitute which I have submitted from the committee places a duty upon bottles or jugs containing artificial mineral water.

Mr. TUCKER. The duty named in the amendment is 3 cents a bottle?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TUCKER. I understand that the duty on the bottle alone, if it came in without any contents, would be about 1½ cents.

Mr. KELLEY. I do not so understand.

Mr. CARLISLE. A cent and a half a pound.

Mr. KELLEY. The understanding in committee seemed to be that it was about this rate. These bottles generally weigh more than a pound—some of them more than two pounds.

Mr. TUCKER. I have a paper before me stating the weight of one dozen quart bottles as 16.5 pounds.

Mr. KASSON. The chairman of our committee will allow me to say that I had prepared, in accordance as I supposed with the order of the committee—and it was upon my motion, as the gentleman will remember, that the committee acted—an amendment to read as follows:

All imitations of natural waters, and all artificial mineral waters in bottles or jugs containing not more than one quart each, 3 cents per bottle or jug; containing more than one quart, 3 cents additional for each bottle or jug.

Then there should be a clause somewhere to make this include the tax upon the bottles.

Mr. TUCKER. Let the gentleman add a clause to that effect.

Mr. KASSON. I will add the words "which shall include the duty upon the bottle."

Mr. HAMMOND, of Georgia. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania taxes the bottle, not the water.

Mr. KASSON. It struck me in that way.

Mr. KELLEY. The gentleman from Iowa intimates that this is my own amendment, not an amendment of the committee. It was furnished to me by the clerk of the committee from the committee's minutes. It is the committee's proposition.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. Let it be again read.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. HAMMOND, of Georgia. I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania by adding "and upon such bottle or jug there shall be no other duty imposed."

Mr. KASSON and Mr. HASKELL. That is right.

Mr. KELLEY. On behalf of the committee I accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] as modified by the acceptance of the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. Now, Mr. Chairman, as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania I move to strike out the words "natural and," allowing the remainder of the section to stand.

Mr. HASKELL. Those words are struck out by the pending amendment.

Mr. KELLEY. My amendment leaves out all natural waters.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. I will explain the object of my amendment. My purpose is to leave both the natural water and the bottle which contains it free of duty. I do not see any excuse for taxing either. The bottle will not come into competition with bottles made in this country, because the foreign bottle has to come in with the water.

Mr. KELLEY. That question will arise in proper time when reached in the course of this bill. The pending amendment does not include natural waters.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. I understood the gentleman's amendment to embrace the bottle containing natural water.

Mr. KELLEY. Not at all; it carefully excludes it.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. Then I withdraw my amendment.

The question being taken upon the amendment of Mr. KELLEY as modified, it was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. I move to amend the paragraph as now amended by striking out "3 cents per bottle" and inserting "1½ cents per pound."

A MEMBER. We can not weigh all these bottles?

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. One of them can be weighed; and if they are all alike, you can calculate the weight of all the bottles in the package.

Mr. HASKELL. They are not all alike.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. They are not all different, are they?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state his amendment again?

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. It is to strike out "3 cents per bottle" and insert "1½ cents a pound."

Mr. ROBESON. Would not that impose a higher tax in proportion upon the jug which is worth nothing and is not manufactured in this country, than on the bottle which is worth something and the manufacture of which employs a great many workmen?

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. I think not. It imposes a uniform tax on all these bottles. As I understand the fact, the bottles in which mineral water is imported are all resold and reused. I do not see any reason why there should be two rates of duty on these bottles.

Mr. KASSON. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that the higher reason which ought to control our action on that amendment is this: Neither the gentleman from Kentucky nor myself want to give an advantage to artificial and imitation waters over the genuine natural waters. We have had a petition, signed by the best medical talent in the United States, hundreds in number, asking that natural mineral waters should be admitted free of duty. We wish to make a distinction between natural and artificial mineral waters, and this does not make too much of a distinction.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. I do not see how this makes a distinction between the two.

Mr. BRIGGS. I rise to a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRIGGS. As I understand, this proposes to strike out something just inserted.

The CHAIRMAN. It does.

Mr. BRIGGS. I make the point of order that it is not admissible.

The CHAIRMAN. The point is made too late, and the gentleman from Kentucky will proceed with his remarks.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. I do not see how a tax of 3 cents still levied on these mineral waters which are made artificially will accomplish the purpose stated by the gentleman, as the others, I understand from him, are brought in free, and there is no tax either on the bottles or upon the waters; that is, upon the natural mineral waters imported into this country.

Mr. KASSON. In other parts of the bill, unless changed, there will be the same tax of 1½ cents the gentleman proposes.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. On natural waters?

Mr. KELLEY. That will be in order when it is reached in its turn. The gentleman is raising a question in advance of its proper order about natural mineral waters and the bottles. We will come to it in order if the gentleman will allow us discussion on this.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARDY. I offer an amendment, to come in as a substitute for the amendment just adopted, and my object in offering it is to give a clear description of just exactly what is intended.

Mr. KELLEY. We object, on the point of order that the clerk had proceeded to read the next paragraph, and further amendment is not in order.

Mr. RANDALL. Do not object until the amendment has been read.

Mr. HARDY. I claimed the floor at once.

Mr. KELLEY. Reserving the point of order, I will let the amendment be read.

Mr. BRIGGS. I object to the discussion until it has been read from the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mineral waters impregnated with carbonic acid or other minerals by artificial means, 3 cents per bottle or jug; bottles containing more than one quart or fraction thereof, 3 cents for each quart or additional fraction thereof.

Mr. HARDY. It is a definition of what are artificial and what are

imitation mineral waters. I ask the Committee on Ways and Means to accept it.

Mr. KELLEY. I am not authorized to accept such an amendment.

Mr. HARDY. I withdraw the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Barium, baryta, or barytes, crude and sulphate and carbonate of, unmanufactured, one-fifth of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. KASSON. I move to strike out that clause, and desire the judgment of the committee. This is a raw material.

Mr. RANDALL. Before the lines are struck out I move to strike out the word "barium."

Mr. CARLISLE. It is of course in order to perfect the paragraph before the vote is taken on the motion to strike out.

Mr. RANDALL. Certainly.

Mr. TUCKER. The word "barium" was inserted at the instance of the chemical expert we had before the committee, who spoke of all the other articles which follow in the same paragraph as salts or oxides of barytes, and that barium was the proper heading of the whole section.

Mr. RANDALL. Notwithstanding the information given to the committee by the chemical expert, I am advised that the word is used improperly and unnecessarily as a descriptive word, and that information came to me from practical manufacturing chemists.

Mr. TUCKER. I have no objection to that.

Mr. RANDALL. That is all. I am not conversant myself in chemistry, but I am advised it is proper to take that out.

Mr. TUCKER. I will say to the gentleman and to the committee what is chemically true of barium is that it is a metal, just as iron is a metal.

Mr. RANDALL. But it is never used as here.

Mr. TUCKER. But when you come to the iron schedule you put at the head "iron," and then say "oxides and sulphates of." This is merely intended to say that barium is to be followed by these other articles which are composed of barium as a metallic base.

Mr. KASSON. I wish to say the definition of barium is a metallic base of baryta.

Mr. RANDALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. KASSON. And baryta or barytes is but one of the simple earths. My principle, as I have frequently stated, is to favor the raw material; this is very common and is the basis of many other things. I think there is no objection to this going on the free-list. There may be a question as to the advanced form. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. RANDALL. My amendment should be voted on first, to strike out "barium." All the others are used to adulterate white-lead paint.

Mr. KASSON. If I understand the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, it is only to strike out the word "barium."

Mr. RANDALL. That is all; and I make the motion because I think it ought not to be there.

Mr. KASSON. I give way for that motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in line 251, to strike out the word "barium."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I trust the motion of the gentleman from Iowa will not prevail. This, Mr. Chairman, is an important product in the State of Virginia.

Mr. MARSH. What is the motion pending?

The CHAIRMAN. The motion pending is the motion proposed by the gentleman from Iowa to strike out, which has been read twice.

Mr. MARSH. Can it not be again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the pending amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. BRIGGS. Has it not been debated already under the rule?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I was proceeding to say, Mr. Chairman, that I trust the motion of the gentleman from Iowa will be voted down, for the reason that this is a valuable product in the State of Virginia; and the duty which we have put upon this material is only in proper relation with the duty on materials of like character. It is but a fair duty when contrasted with other crude materials. I think we ought to stand by this bill and by its symmetry; and for that reason I hope the proposition of the gentleman from Iowa will not be accepted by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is exhausted.

Mr. KELLEY. I desire to say in addition that it is a reduction from one-half cent a pound to one-fifth of a cent a pound, and I do not think the duty ought to be removed entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Iowa, to strike out lines 251 and 252.

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

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] has referred to this article as an industry of importance in the State of Virginia. Barytes is an earth, it is true, and is a raw material, just like iron ore and all the

ores of copper are raw materials, none of which I find on the free-list in this bill. Barytes is mined for in the earth, and as a crude material is prepared for the market in Virginia as well as in other parts of the country. The present rate of duty, as appears here from the tabulated statement furnished by the Treasury Department, is one-half a cent per pound. I proposed in committee, when it was proposed there to reduce it to one-third of a cent—I proposed to reduce it to one-fifth of a cent. I said that was sufficient; that our people would be content with one-fifth of a cent a pound, that is to say, two-tenths of a cent per pound, while it is under the present tariff system five-tenths of a cent. Under the present rate of duty it pays an ad valorem rate of 72 per cent., and I propose to make it two-fifths of the present rate of duty.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as you are reducing all protective duties, I am perfectly willing to do so, and, as I said, that every industry in Virginia shall bear equally in the reduction which every other industry in all other parts of the country must bear. This two-fifths of a cent per pound duty, as I said, is sufficient in my judgment for that industry in our State. That brings the duty down and below 30 per cent., while at present it is, as I have said, over 70 ad valorem.

Mr. KASSON. Does the gentleman from Virginia affirm that this industry in Virginia needs protection?

Mr. TUCKER. I do not affirm it.

Mr. KASSON. Then if it needs no protection why does the gentleman ask for it?

Mr. ROBESON. Let me ask the gentleman from Virginia if it does not employ Virginia labor to mine it?

Mr. TUCKER. It does.

Mr. ROBESON. And they are paid for that labor?

Mr. TUCKER. They are.

Mr. ROBESON. If it is imported and sold in the markets of this country it is produced by some other labor?

Mr. TUCKER. Yes; produced by pauper labor.

Mr. ROBESON. And in that case it is not produced by the labor of Virginia and they receive no wages from its production?

Mr. TUCKER. Undoubtedly so.

Mr. ROBESON. Then I go for Virginia labor all the time and I favor its protection.

Mr. HERR. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Iowa, if he will give me his attention a moment, has not given this subject much thought or investigation. This barytes, I wish to say to this committee, is an element in the industries of this country with which I am somewhat familiar. I have seen thousands of tons of it, and have been engaged in its mining and manufacture myself. It is not an interest that is local in Virginia, but it is largely manufactured in Missouri. There are enormous enterprises there which make it by the thousands of tons per month. It is an article that needs protection simply because it is mined in Spain at little expense and is sent to this country as ballast and comes in free, and consequently comes in competition with the mines of Virginia, Missouri, and other places. It is used in cheapening paints. It has been also used in large quantities for other manufactures.

A MEMBER. It is used, then, for fraudulent purposes.

Mr. HERR. It may be also used more or less in perpetrating frauds. It is a white, tasteless substance when first mined, as white as snow, and in its crude form it costs very nearly as much as in its refined form, because it involves but very little expense to manufacture it, the expense of manufacturing being very slight, as it is merely ground up and washed; and if persons claim protection, I think my friend from Virginia would find there is as much reason for protection for this as in the case of the metals.

Mr. TUCKER. I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

The question being taken on Mr. KASSON's amendment, it was not agreed to.

The Clerk read lines 255 to 258, as follows:

Barium, chloride of, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Barium, all salts of, fit for medicinal use, and not otherwise enumerated or provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. RANDALL. I move to strike out the lines just read. I am advised those four lines should go out and that the articles named should be remitted to the general class of 25 per cent. ad valorem.

The amendment was not agreed to.

The Clerk read line 259, as follows:

Refined borax, 5 cents per pound.

Mr. ROSECRANS. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add the following:

"And all other salts, compounds, and products used in manufacturing or the arts, 8 cents for each pound of anhydrous borax theoretically obtained therefrom."

Mr. ROSECRANS. I desire to state to the committee that the object of that amendment is to make the tariff on borax and the products from which that salt is obtained conformable to principle and to chemistry. In the first place, I would state that this salt—refined borax—is largely used by blacksmiths, steel-workers, and manufacturers of glazed earthenware of the finer sorts, and also for the preservation of meats, so that its use is widely diffused over the country.

A second fact that I wish to state is that the trade in or supply of that salt since 1842 has been mainly in the hands of one large firm in the city of New York, and that that firm has managed the tariff so as to keep the control of the market up to the time when borax produced in the Pacific States began to appear in the New York markets; that is to say in the year 1873.

A third fact that I wish to state is that since that time the production of borax on the Pacific coast, mainly from the arid alkaline plains in Southeastern California, Nevada, and Utah, is made in this way. The crude salt is taken from the ground, lixiviated, concentrated, and crystallized. Those are the sources from which the salt is produced.

Among the deposits found on our coast there are a few where the salt though impure and crude is very rich; and those few spots afford this salt at a moderate price. But the average cost of producing it from those plains amounts to about 7½ cents a pound. Before the Committee on Ways and Means the firm in New York which has monopolized the trade stated that at the time of the appearance of that salt in New York the market price was 33 cents a pound.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAGE. I rise to offer a substitute.

Mr. ROSECRANS. I should like to have a few moments more.

Mr. PAGE. I will say to my colleague [Mr. ROSECRANS] we have the same object in view but I am afraid his amendment is not specific enough, and I desire to offer an amendment which provides a specific duty. I send it to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out line 259 and insert as follows:

"Pure boracic acid, 7 cents per pound; commercial boracic acid, 6 cents per pound; refined borax, 5 cents per pound; borate of lime, 5 cents per pound; crude borax, 5 cents per pound."

Mr. PAGE. I think the Committee on Ways and Means ought to accept this amendment. There is no reason, in my judgment, that can be given why boracic acid should be put upon the free-list. It is known to the committee that out of one pound of boracic acid one and a half pounds or more of refined borax can be produced. Therefore with this duty there is no protection at all to this industry; and I can not conceive how the Committee on Ways and Means of this House overlooked this fact. I more than half believe it was done by mistake. When they have given protection as they ought to many industries that use borax it seems strange that an industry like this, confined as it is almost exclusively to the Pacific coast, should not have the protection of a duty that will at least protect it. It seems to me that the committee ought to accept this, and I believe this House will.

I am a protectionist; I have always acted with the protectionists of this House; I speak for a people that demand protection for their borax and for the labor expended upon it. And I believe that while you protect other industries that use this material 50 and 60 per cent.—to which I have no objection but will give it my support—you ought at the same time to protect an industry which has grown up within the last few years on the Pacific coast.

Mr. RANDALL. I ask the gentleman from California whether the rate of duty he proposes would not be actually more than protection; whether it would not be prohibitory?

Mr. PAGE. I think not.

Mr. RANDALL. I did not know; I merely asked the question for information.

Mr. PAGE. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] that if you admit boracic acid free you give no protection to refined borax. I only ask a sufficient rate to protect that industry, and I appeal to the American House of Representatives, which is always in favor of protecting every infant industry and the labor of the country, to put this on a par with other articles that are protected in this bill.

California or the Pacific coast produced nearly 4,000,000 pounds of borax during the past year. And it is said that you can make one and seven-tenths of a pound of refined borax out of a pound of boracic acid.

I do not know how that is done. My colleague [Mr. ROSECRANS] knows better than I do; but it is a fact, as was well demonstrated before the Committee on Ways and Means.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HASKELL and Mr. BERRY rose.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BERRY] on the right of the Chair.

Mr. HASKELL. I would like to know, after two speeches have been made in favor of this proposition, if this side of the House can not be recognized for a moment to say a word against it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from California on the left of the Chair [Mr. PAGE] to speak against the amendment of his colleague [Mr. ROSECRANS]. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kansas next.

Mr. BERRY. All I wish to say is this: It is well known to this House that I am not a protectionist. But human nature is human nature, and whenever the hog is to be cut up and divided around we on the Pacific coast desire a piece of the hog, some of the pork. [Laughter.]

Now, here is absolutely an infant industry. On the Pacific coast is found the crude material, and it has been difficult to manufacture the

refined article from it even with a duty of 10 cents a pound. Practically we have had no duty, because, as has been stated here, of the admission free of the boracic acid from which refined borax is produced. That acid costs absolutely nothing; it comes from the bowels of the earth; and all that it costs to lay it down in this country is the expense of handling and transportation.

On the Pacific coast much of our country is absolutely worthless for any purpose except the production of the crude material from which borax is manufactured. It yields that substance in large quantities. If we had cheap labor and good facilities for transportation we would require no protection. But it is known to this House that labor in California receives higher compensation than in any other part of the country.

If it is the desire of gentlemen on this floor to protect American labor, here is an opportunity to do it. If you will place on this article a tariff duty such as you are placing on other articles, we will ask no further protection. But until that is done we can not compete with other countries in the manufacture of refined borax.

In arranging your tariff we desire that you shall not overlook the Pacific coast, as has been done heretofore on almost every occasion. We demand at the hands of this House equal rights, nothing more.

Mr. HASKELL. I hope gentlemen on the other side will give me a moment's attention. I believe the gentleman from California [Mr. ROSECRANS] will admit that boracic acid is now free.

Mr. ROSECRANS. It has been free since 1873.

Mr. HASKELL. And that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PAGE] proposes to put a duty of 8 cents a pound on boracic acid.

Mr. ROSECRANS. On anhydrite of borax.

Mr. HASKELL. Refined borax in the United States is to-day worth about 12 cents a pound.

Mr. ROSECRANS. Thirteen cents a pound.

Mr. HASKELL. And the amendment proposes a duty of 8 cents a pound on an article which is now free.

Mr. BERRY. I want the gentleman to understand that I do not advocate that amendment.

Mr. HASKELL. I want merely to have the thing understood, to see if I was right about this matter. The only borax beds in the United States are to be found in California and Nevada: Teel's Lake, in Nevada, and one or two places in California where the crude residuum is scraped up from the beds of lakes and springs.

Mr. ROSECRANS. And also in Utah.

Mr. HASKELL. I think my friend from California [Mr. ROSECRANS] was urging yesterday that all crude materials yielding but little revenue should be put on the free-list.

Mr. ROSECRANS. If the gentleman will allow me, I did not say any such thing.

Mr. HASKELL. Now, I want to go as far as anybody in perfecting this bill.

Mr. ROSECRANS. All I wanted was to put on the free-list articles that did not produce any revenue.

Mr. HASKELL. I desire to ask this question: a duty of 8 cents a pound on boracic acid, the crude material found in the western parts of this country, would be prohibitory, would it not?

Mr. ROSECRANS. No, sir.

Mr. HASKELL. It would be about 75 per cent. ad valorem, and it looks to me as if it might possibly be prohibitory.

Mr. ROSECRANS. Not by any means.

Mr. HASKELL. I will offer one further suggestion, because I am a protectionist, and I am talking to gentlemen who when their ox is gored are very sensitive.

If you do not put such a rate of duty on this article as will permit its importation, then you will find the country in this condition: the only sources of supply of the crude material which we have in this country are in California and Nevada. From our manufactories in the East and the Mississippi Valley run the great monopoly lines of railroads to the country of the gentleman from California.

Therefore, if a duty is placed on this article so that the people of the Eastern part of the country can not import it at all it would be a serious blow to industries located on Eastern tidewaters, because it will be impossible for them to transport the crude material across the country on account of the high rate of freight.

Now, in adjusting this matter, in closing I desire to say simply that I will leave the whole thing to the considerate judgment of the House. All I ask is that my free-trade friends on the other side of the House who are clamorous for a prohibitory duty on this article shall consent to have such a rate of duty fixed upon it that importation will be possible and competition may be established. If that is done I will not say a word in opposition to it.

Mr. BERRY. Let me ask the gentleman a question? Will not your protection cheapen the article?

Mr. HASKELL. Yes, sir, if you—

Mr. BERRY. And have you not competition in transportation by the route around the Horn and that across the country? [Here the hammer fell.] I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. PAGE. I renew it. I do not wish to detain the committee;

but will only state that since borax was discovered on the Pacific coast the price of English borax has been reduced from 30 to 15 cents per pound, and the price of boracic acid has also been reduced. This American industry ought to be protected. We only desire enough duty to protect those who are engaged in this industry in the United States.

Mr. ROSECRANS. I rise to oppose the *pro forma* amendment of my colleague. I wish to explain the difficulties which appear to exist with regard to the introduction of free boracic acid. Let me say, as I said in the beginning, that the successive Committees of Ways and Means since 1842 have been managed by the men who have this trade in their hands, so as to enrich themselves without bringing revenue to the Government. I call attention to the fact that in 1873 they had so managed that borax was selling for 33 cents a pound; and all the blacksmith shops in the United States were consumers, as well as all persons engaged in the manufacture of fine pottery. It is even used as a detergent in making soap liquids. When California borax came into the market what did the men controlling this interest do? They had boracic acid put on the free-list, and borax taxed 10 cents a pound. What for? To exclude borax and to enable those who had control of the European market for boracic acid to manufacture refined borax in this country and keep up the price as high as they could. Did they succeed in keeping it up to the price at which it was held before the introduction of California borax? No, they did not; because California borax came into competition; but having in their hands free boracic acid, the crude article of which the gentleman from Kansas speaks, they were enabled to destroy our industries and tax our people at their free will.

I wish to refer to a statement before me showing the duty on these articles under the various tariffs from 1842. The duty imposed on boracic acid by the tariff of 1842 was 5 per cent. Then the gentleman who now manages this business made his advent into this country. Refined borax under that tariff was free. The duty on borate of lime was 25 per cent. ad valorem. In 1846 Congress determined to put a 20 per cent. leveler on the tariff. Then, boracic acid being taxed 20 per cent., refined borax was taxed 25 per cent., and borate of lime 20 per cent. In 1857 there was a reduction in the tariff. The rate on boracic acid was then fixed at 4 per cent. and on refined borax at 30 per cent. Thus the refined borax was excluded, and the control of this article was continued in the same hands. The duty on borate of lime under the tariff of 1857 was 12 per cent. By the tariff of 1861 the duty on boracic acid was 10 per cent., on refined borax 3 cents a pound, and on borate of lime 10 per cent. These rates continued up to 1867, when there was another change, all these changes being for the purpose of enabling this one large monopoly to control the market. From 1867 to the present time 10 cents a pound duty has been charged on all refined borax imported into this country. What is the consequence? Last year the whole revenue obtained from the importation of refined borax was less than \$500. In the mean time this firm has been importing boracic acid free, thus forestalling the markets of Europe—

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. PAGE. I withdraw my *pro forma* amendment.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. ROSECRANS, it was not agreed to.

Mr. PAGE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 259 add:
"Pure boracic acid, 5 cents per pound; commercial boracic acid, 5 cents per pound; borate of lime, 5 cents per pound; crude borax, 5 cents per pound."

Mr. KELLEY. On commercial or crude boracic acid the duty should be lower than on the pure. I suggest that the gentleman modify his amendment by naming 3 cents instead of 5 as the duty on commercial boracic acid.

Mr. HASKELL. And the same rate on borate of lime.

Mr. PAGE. I modify my amendment by adopting the suggestions of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HASKELL].

Mr. KASSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to vote for this large addition to our dutiable articles. I wish to say to my friend from California that the information before the Committee on Ways and Means—certainly that which came to me—was that California has most remarkable natural facilities for the production of these articles; that their beds compare favorably with the best beds in the world. From a statement I recollect very distinctly the profits of this concern were said to be enormous under existing conditions and would remain enormous under such arrangements as we effect by the bill. If the gentleman from California says that concern is not making reasonable profits in California, and that it needs protection in order to continue the industry in California with reasonable profit, then a new basis for our action will be presented.

Mr. ROSECRANS. The only information before the committee was a letter of Pfizer & Co., in New York, the very men who hold the monopoly and have held it for forty years.

Mr. KASSON. I do not remember that.

Mr. HASKELL. Let me say about the monopoly, that boracic acid comes from Italy.

Mr. ROSECRANS. And these people have the monopoly of it.

Mr. HASKELL. Any man can import it who chooses to go into the

business; and simply because there is only one in the business does not prove to my mind that there is any monopoly, especially when any other person can import it who chooses to do so.

Mr. BERRY. I wish to say a word in addition, and that is this, that this company not only, as I understand it, hold the control, but have a lease of the Italian product. Now here in our country is a crude material that costs nothing except for labor, and those gentlemen on the other side of the House who claim this bill is for the protection of labor should agree to what we ask, especially when it is no more than will give us sufficient protection in order that we may take up from the earth this raw material and manufacture it into a merchantable commodity. The material itself costs nothing, and only transportation and labor are required to bring it as a commercial commodity into the market.

I say it is a case of pure protection to labor, and I wish to see whether gentlemen who are so loud in their profession of a desire to protect labor will in this instance break down this monopoly so as to enable our infant industries on the Pacific coast to have a small portion of this "hog." [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. STEELE. Did not the gentleman from California at the last session of Congress come in here and ask us to protect his people from so much cheap labor? [Laughter.]

Mr. BERRY. We do not want slave labor in this country. That day has passed. We are in favor of freemen.

Mr. STEELE. If you get the protection you ask in this instance for your infant industry in California, will you then vote for the bill?

Mr. BERRY. If you take out of it some of the rascalities and infamies which it now contains, I may perhaps do so.

Mr. STEELE. In other words, you want the bill made just to suit you and not to suit anybody else, or you will vote against it. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. ROSECRANS. I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, offered a moment ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the gentleman's colleague [Mr. PAGE].

Mr. ROSECRANS. I will move, then, an amendment to come in as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will again be read.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. PAGE. Now let the Clerk read what will come in as a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Boracic acid, 6 cents per pound.
Commercial boracic acid, 5 cents per pound.
Refined borax, 3 cents per pound.
Borate of lime, 4 cents per pound.
Crude borax, 4 cents per pound.

Mr. ROSECRANS. I should like to have the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The only reason I have for wanting his particular attention is that it arranges the different salts of borax which come into the market and which we want to use in their chemical order. I ask his favorable attention to the amendment, for the other is crude and unfair. I object to it especially for the reason, first, that it is not made to express and be in accord with the chemical order of these different salts of borax.

Mr. KELLEY. I have no amendment pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending amendment is that offered by the gentleman's colleague.

Mr. ROSECRANS. I have the same objection to the amendment. I thought it was offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question recurred on Mr. PAGE's amendment.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 56, noes 37.

Mr. ROSECRANS's substitute was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cement, Roman, Portland, and all others, ground and unground, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. CARLISLE. I move to strike out "20" and insert "10" per cent. ad valorem. I know of no reason why this article should be taxed at 20 per cent. It is an article of universal necessity and in general use, and unless the gentlemen on the other side of the House on the Committee on Ways and Means can give some good reason for retaining this rate of duty I think it should be reduced. Cement is an article used for building, as everybody knows.

Mr. KELLEY. The present rate is 20.

Mr. CARLISLE. I know that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was not agreed to.

Mr. SPRINGER. I move to amend by striking out "20" in this line and inserting "15."

Mr. KELLEY. There is a verbal correction in the line just passed, line 256, which I desire to make. The word "baryta" should be substituted for "barium" in this line, as there are no salts of barium, but there are of baryta.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the verbal amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. I now offer the amendment which I suggested, to strike out "20," in line 261, and insert "15."

Mr. HASKELL. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois if he wants to increase the duty 5 cents on the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. SPRINGER. That amendment was lost. The committee voted down the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky, and now I propose to insert "15" as the rate of duty upon cement, instead of 20 per cent., as proposed by this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard upon the amendment?

Mr. SPRINGER. Only a word. I need not refer the gentleman to what the President has said upon this subject [laughter], but I can refer him to what he said upon another subject, a sort of a general point in connection with the tariff, and which I commend to his prayerful attention. The President said in a recent message communicated to the House:

It is one of the truest maxims of political economy that all taxes are burdensome, however wisely or prudently imposed.

The Tariff Commission stated in its report that a general reduction of duties would be made all along the line, averaging from 20 to 25 per cent. That was recommended by them, as I understand it. I have looked, Mr. Chairman, in vain for that general reduction. Here is an item which seems to me that the language used by the Tariff Commission very properly applies to, and where we have a right to ask the Representatives of the people that the wise recommendation of the Tariff Commission shall be carried out. A reduction here to 15 per cent. ad valorem would be about a reduction equal to the 25 per cent. recommended by the Tariff Commission, and which it was conceded in that report we ought to have.

Further than that, Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of this committee to the fact that while cement is a manufactured article to some extent, yet it is practically in the nature of a raw material. It is the material used by mechanics and farmers in constructing their houses, wells, cisterns, &c., to a large extent, and should be made as free as possible in order that their homes, the shelter which is required by the people of this country in the winter time, and especially the laboring people who are little able to pay for expensive houses, should be made as cheap to them as possible.

It is one article that enters very largely into general consumption and nearly all classes of the laboring people of this country, especially those who are engaged in building, are concerned with. It is therefore, I say, a matter of justice and equity that it should be made as cheap as possible to the people of the United States.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 44, noes 76.

So the amendment was not agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whiting and Paris white, dry, three-quarters of 1 cent per pound; ground in oil, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. CARLISLE. I move to strike out "three-quarters," in line 262, and insert "one-quarter;" and I propose to follow that with the proposition to strike out "one," in line 263, and to insert "one-half."

This, it seems to me, is a most extraordinary rate of duty proposed by the Committee on Ways and Means to be imposed upon this article, which is in very general use throughout the country, and is an article of absolute necessity to farmers who desire to preserve their fences and buildings from worms or from the weather. One hundred and ninety-three and one half per cent. ad valorem is proposed by this bill to be imposed upon Paris white, an article, I repeat, of the greatest necessity to every farmer in the country who proposes to paint his fences or his farm building. I do not think that this committee, when its attention is called to the fact that this high rate of duty is imposed, will sustain it.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. I would like to have read for the information—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman rise to oppose the amendment?

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. No; I rise to favor it. I ask my colleague, as he has not exhausted his time, to yield to me.

Mr. CARLISLE. I will do so, simply repeating that every manufactured agricultural implement, such as wagons and all articles of that kind, must use this in paint, as well as the farmer who would preserve his buildings and fences. I yield the remainder of my time to my colleague.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. I would like to have read, in the little time I have, the evidence taken before the Tariff Commission on this subject. I will read it myself:

Paris white is made from English cliffstone, which is admitted free of duty. It costs in England 36s. per ton, or 39 cents per 100 pounds, the duty on which is \$1 per 100 pounds, or a protection of 256 per cent. It is used very largely by manufacturers of wall-paper, oil-cloths, in whitening ceilings, &c. The consumption of Paris white amounts to many thousand tons per annum. The quantity imported for the eleven months named, including whiting, amounted to only 1,619 tons, of the value of \$14,146, on which the Government received in duty \$36,249.25. As the article of cliffstone, from which this is manufactured, is

not found in this country, and the manufacture of it here employs but very few people, we would suggest that the duty be fixed at not over 25 per cent.

Whiting costs in England 20s. per ton, or 21 cents per 100 pounds, the duty on which is 1 cent per pound, or a protection of 476 per cent. It is an article of almost universal consumption, being used extensively by the wall-paper manufacturers, in the manufacture of putty, oil-cloths, and a variety of manufactures. It is made from English chalk, a substance which is not found in this country, and admitted free of duty. We are not aware of any having been imported for some time, although as the articles of Paris white and whiting are classed together in statistics, being very similar, it is difficult to state positively. We would suggest that the duty be fixed at 25 per cent.

Mr. HASKELL. If the gentleman will allow me, the duty in this bill is upon the ground and prepared whiting.

Mr. CARLISLE. And upon the dry.

Mr. HASKELL. Yes, but that is ground.

Mr. CARLISLE. It imposes the duty upon the dry whiting as well as that which is ground in oil.

Mr. HASKELL. Yes, but the dry is also ground from the cliffstone; the only difference is that one is ground in oil and the other is not.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. Here is the language of the experts in reference to it.

Mr. HASKELL. I know about the manufacture of it as well as the expert. It is ground into a flour, and that ground product is what we put in the bill; and the cost of it after it is ground is 1½ cents per pound. There is no 200 per cent. about it.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. The plain whiting costs in England 21 cents per hundred pounds, the duty on which at 1 cent is a protection of 476 per cent.

Mr. HASKELL. That is the crude.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. It is the crude I am speaking of.

Mr. HASKELL. The gentleman will find the crude is higher priced than that.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. Now here is the expert on whose testimony this action must be built, suggesting that the duty be fixed at 25 per cent. instead of 476 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. The committee's bill makes a reduction from the present tariff on whiting from 1 cent per pound to three-fourths of a cent per pound; and on "ground in oil" from 2 cents per pound to 1 cent per pound. I think the reduction is as great as ought to be made.

Mr. CARLISLE. Does the gentleman think that a rate equivalent to 193 per cent. ad valorem ought to be imposed on this article? That is what the committee still leave on it.

Mr. KELLEY. If the gentleman will accept a duty of one-half cent and leave the "ground in oil" to stand as it is I am willing to make that proposition.

Mr. CARLISLE. I want a vote on my proposition first.

The question being taken on Mr. CARLISLE's amendment, to strike out, in line 262, "three-fourths of 1 cent" and insert "one-fourth of 1 cent," there were—ayes 43, noes 73.

Mr. CARLISLE. I call for tellers. A quorum has not voted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair appoints as tellers the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. HASKELL, and the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. CARLISLE.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 74, noes 79.

So the amendment was not agreed to.

Mr. KASSON. I move now to strike out "three-fourths" and insert "one-half;" so that it will read:

Whiting and Paris white, dry, one-half of 1 cent per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARLISLE. I now move to amend line 263 by striking out "1 cent" and inserting "three-fourths of 1 cent;" so that it will read:

Ground in oil, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. KELLEY. That is too great a reduction; it affects the duty on the oil as well as the material of the whiting. It is a proposed reduction from 2 cents to three-fourths of a cent on an article on which we have laid a high duty for the oil. I am willing to see it brought down in comparison with the other items to 1 cent, and then the putty—and it may give gentlemen some information to remark that putty is simply whiting ground in oil—should be put at the same rate, 1 cent. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky will be voted down, and that "ground in oil" will be kept at 1 cent, and that putty will also be kept at 1 cent.

Mr. CARLISLE. My proposal is to reduce the 1-cent rate proposed by the committee to three-fourths of 1 cent. And if the information furnished to us by the statistician is correct, three-fourths of 1 cent will be equivalent to 129 per cent. ad valorem. It would be 193 per cent. at 1 cent per pound.

Mr. KELLEY. Does he include the value of the oil?

Mr. CARLISLE. Of course he includes the value of the oil in the article because he estimates the whole value of the article ground in oil.

Mr. ANDERSON. If I understand correctly this is a material not found in this country.

Mr. HASKELL. After it is prepared it is practically putty.

Mr. ANDERSON. But the crude material is not in this country. It is found in England. It is there ground or it is ground here. You

propose, even under the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky, to place a protection of 129 per cent. in favor of having it ground here instead of there; and you do not have the material here at all.

Mr. KELLEY. That percentage is based on the whiting, not the oil.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. KELLEY. Whiting, crude?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am talking about whiting, crude. I propose to say what I wish to say in my own way; and what I say is, there ought to be some reasonable limit somewhere to this percentage of protection. When you have got up to 100 per cent. you have got mighty good protection. An industry that can not take care of itself at 100 per cent. protection ought to wait a while.

Mr. KELLEY. That is the calculation, leaving the element of chief cost out.

Mr. CARLISLE. When the statistician estimates the value of the "ground in oil" the oil is an element of value which enters into the calculation.

Mr. ERRETT. There could be no percentage calculated, because there were no imports.

Mr. CARLISLE. Then the rate is absolutely prohibitory.

The question being taken on Mr. CARLISLE'S amendment, it was not agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 263 strike out "1 cent per pound" and insert "30 per cent. ad valorem;" so that it will read:
"Ground in oil, 30 per cent. ad valorem."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire to be heard on his amendment?

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. No, sir.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. I propose to speak to the amendment for a moment. I wish to inquire of the gentleman from Kentucky where he proposes to insert the 30 per cent. ad valorem?

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. After the words "ground in oil."

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. A rate of 1 cent per pound is only 33 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. No, sir; it is a rate of 129 per cent.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. I am obliged to the gentleman for the information he has given on this subject. I rose more particularly to call attention not only to this but to the preceding line. My opinion is an ad valorem duty should have been laid in the preceding line on whiting and Paris white, for the reason there is such a large difference between the prices of the two. Paris white is worth almost double what whiting is worth. In England Paris white is worth 39 cents per hundred pounds, while whiting is worth but 21 cents per hundred pounds. In this country Paris white is worth from 90 to 130 cents per hundred pounds, while whiting is worth from 50 to 60 cents per hundred pounds; so that one is worth almost double the other.

If a specific duty of three-fourths of 1 cent per pound is laid upon these articles it will be almost prohibitory upon whiting, while Paris white may be admitted under it. It seems to me that in all such cases, in order that equality of taxation may be provided, instead of imposing a specific duty we should have an ad valorem duty.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HASKELL. Just a word. The rate of duty proposed to be placed on this article is not especially for the protection of the whiting manufacturer. The duty proposed on whiting ground in oil amounts to only 7½ cents per gallon on the oil used in the manufacture. Unless some provision of this sort is made which will at once help the whiting men who are in that business you will open up the whole oil question, for the mixture of the whiting with the oil does not amount to much.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Kentucky. Is not the average rate of duty on oil 30 per cent.?

Mr. HASKELL. The average rate of duty on oil may be what you please; but you will not find in this bill an oil rate of less than 12 cents per gallon. A gentleman on the other side of the House moved to make the duty on cotton-seed oil 30 cents a gallon. With this rate of duty on whiting mixed with oil, the duty on the oil will be about 7 cents a gallon. It is intended to prevent cheating in oil, rather than to protect the whiting.

The question was taken on the amendment; and it was not agreed to.

Mr. KELLEY. I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURROWS, of Michigan, reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7313) to impose duties upon imports, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. ALDRICH, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 323) making appropriations for continuing the work of the Tenth Census.

IN MEMORY OF HON. J. W. SHACKELFORD.

Mr. VANCE. I ask unanimous consent that the hour of 3 o'clock p. m. on Saturday, the 17th day of February, be fixed as the time for paying due respect to the memory and character of Hon. John W. Shackelford, late a member of this House.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

MEMORIAL ADDRESS ON HON. GODLOVE S. ORTH.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I announced the death of my late colleague, Mr. ORTH, and gave notice that at an early day the House would be asked to suspend its business that the friends and associates of the deceased might pay appropriate tribute to his virtues as a Representative and a citizen. The time for these ceremonies has arrived and I offer for consideration the resolutions I now send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the business of this House be suspended that suitable honors may be paid the memory of Hon. GODLOVE S. ORTH, late a Representative from Indiana.

Resolved, That in the death of Mr. ORTH the country has sustained the loss of a safe counsellor, a patriotic citizen, and an able and faithful public servant.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect for his memory the House at the conclusion of these ceremonies shall adjourn.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

The resolutions were unanimously adopted.

Mr. BROWNE. Death, says Horace, makes no nice distinctions, but approaches all with equal step and knocks alike at the door of the hovel and the portals of the palace. During this Congress it has entered this hall, and its shadow has fallen upon O'Connor and Allen, Hawk and Lowe, Updegraff, Shackelford, and ORTH, and blended their lives here with that brighter life on the other shore. Death preaches an impressive sermon to the human soul. In the memorable words of Burke, "It feelingly teaches us what shadows we are and what shadows we pursue." However short a man's life may be there gathers about it always something of love and sympathy, and when it is gone some fond hope and bright ambition perishes. No man has lived without making some impression, for good or ill, upon his generation, and no one is wholly dead whose memory or whose example inspires the humblest to higher purposes or more noble resolves. The dead leave their work behind them as an example and a warning, to be judged by what has been accomplished, by the spirit that inspired it, and the temptations and dangers that environed it.

The career of one who saw long and honorable service in this House is now completed. It was a life full of generous deeds. Let us, like the angel of the Koran, as we stand over the dead man, speak of the good deeds he sent before him.

GODLOVE S. ORTH was born near Lebanon, in the State of Pennsylvania, April 22, 1817. He was a descendant from a Moravian family which emigrated from one of the palatinates of the old German Empire to the colony of Pennsylvania about the year 1725, under the auspices of Count Zinzendorf, the celebrated missionary. His grandfather, Balthazel Orth, was an ardent patriot in the Revolution, acted as provost-marshal for his district, and drafted members of his own family for service in the colonial army. The Hessian prisoners captured at Trenton were by the orders of Washington put into his custody, and he imprisoned them in the old stone church of the Moravians still standing at Lebanon. His ancestry lie in the adjacent church-yard, now awaiting some Old Mortality with his chisel to reproduce the epitaphs on their moss-covered tombstones.

Mr. ORTH, after securing such an education as could be obtained in the common schools of his native State, took an irregular course of instruction at the Pennsylvania College at Gettysburgh. He located there, read law in the office of Hon. James Cooper, and was admitted to the bar in March, 1839. The great West was developing very rapidly at this time, and to an enterprising and ambitious young man it was an inviting field. He was attracted by the activities and opportunities of that growing section, and soon after his admission to the bar crossed the Alleghanies and found a home by the beautiful Wabash, at La Fayette, where he continued to reside until "the wheels of his weary life stood still." Here he at once entered upon the practice of law, and young as he was, by his learning and integrity soon won a lucrative business and a place in the front rank of the profession. He took an active part in the famous and exciting campaign of 1840, and secured at a bound a position of prominence in Indiana politics.

In 1843 the Whigs of Tippecanoe County nominated him as their candidate for the State senate, and although the county was Democratic he was triumphantly elected. Though one of the youngest, he was one of the ablest of the senate, and so well did he perform his part that before the close of the term he was chosen president of that body by a most complimentary vote. He thus became acting lieutenant-governor. He remained in the senate from 1843 to 1850, and was, during a portion of this period, chairman of the committee on the judiciary, a position tendered him by a Democratic presiding officer as an evidence of the high estimate placed upon his integrity and learning by his political opponents. In 1848 he was a candidate for Presidential elector on the Taylor and Fillmore ticket, and took an active part in the memorable campaign of that year.

For ten years subsequent to the close of his service in the State senate he devoted himself almost exclusively to his profession. He did not again appear in public life until the slave power revolted against national authority and proclaimed its purpose to forcibly destroy the Union. After several of the discontented States had mustered for battle, when either a compromise or peaceful separation or war seemed inevitable, the General Assembly of Virginia invited all the States to a peace conference to meet at Washington on the 4th of February, 1861. The object of this meeting, as announced by Virginia, was to adjust, if possible, the pending struggle by an amendment of the Constitution giving further security to the rights of the people of the slave-holding States. Indiana promptly responded to this kindly invitation, and Mr. ORTH was appointed by Governor Morton one of its five commissioners to this peace congress. His associates were Caleb B. Smith, Pleasant A. Hackleman, E. W. H. Ellis, and Thomas C. Slaughter—names now canonized in the hearts of our people. Not one of these men is now living, all of them having died before Mr. ORTH. One who reviews to-day the proceedings of that notable conference will be surprised at the shortness of the roll of its survivors. Tyler and Fessenden, Morrell and Reverdy Johnson, Chase and Wadsworth, and almost all the distinguished men who met in that extraordinary assembly have passed away.

Mr. ORTH was more a listener than a talker or an actor in that congress. He soon became convinced that an honorable adjustment was hopeless; that the malcontents who inaugurated the rebellion would accept but separation or terms that would bind for all time the free States to the juggernaut of the slave-masters. To such conditions he knew his people would never submit. He believed, moreover, that the Constitution as it was, correctly interpreted and honestly enforced, gave ample protection to the institutions of the South. Although anti-slavery in his sympathies and sternly opposed to what he believed to be the encroachments of slavery, he stood for the enforcement of law, and was one of those who, if the law demanded it, "would have given Shylock a verdict for the pound of flesh although he had to take it from his own bosom."

When the peace congress adjourned Mr. ORTH was convinced that war could not long be averted, and upon his return home he addressed his people on the situation, forecasting with remarkable accuracy the future of the country. He pointed out to them the imminence of the danger confronting them and exhorted them to meet it with a courage that neither sacrifice nor suffering could subdue or dishearten.

The war opened, and from its beginning he championed the cause of the nation with all the zeal and enthusiasm of his nature. In every phase of that fearful conflict—in victory, in defeat—he gave the Union his active support, and from the first gun at Charleston Harbor until the surrender at Appomattox he insisted that a vigorous and aggressive war policy was the price of peace and union.

Mr. ORTH had but a brief experience in the military service. When in the summer of 1862 Indiana was threatened with an invasion on its southern border he responded to the call of the governor, and putting himself at the head of a company of his fellow-citizens reported for duty. He was sent to the Ohio River and put in command of the ram Hornet. He continued on duty until the emergency that called him into the service was over when he returned to his civil pursuits.

He was elected a Representative in Congress in October, 1862, and first took his seat here on the 4th of March following. He was returned by his district to the Thirty-ninth, Fortieth, Forty-first, by the State at large to the Forty-third, and again by his district to the Forty-sixth and Forty-seventh Congresses, having at the time of his death seen fourteen years of service as the trusted representative of a most intelligent constituency. No man could command the confidence of such a constituency and hold it long and unwaveringly without possessing real merit.

His services here began in the most eventful epoch in our history. The Republic was in the agonies of a most cruel civil war. Its expenses were enormous, and the generosity of its expenditure of money was only paralleled by the profligacy with which a heroic soldiery poured out their blood. Taxation seemed to have reached its uttermost limit, and yet our revenues fell far below the demands of the times.

The Treasury was empty, our finances in disorder, but the war went on, increasing in magnitude and intensifying in bitterness, until the coolest and wisest dared not predict its duration, its results to our civilization or our democratic system of government. The friends of the Union were divided in their counsels, and some began to lose hope of success. Gloom overshadowed every household. There was sadness and sorrow about every hearth-stone. "Every shore had its tale of blood and its record of suffering."

The dead lay on every hillside and in every valley, by the waters of the Ohio and under the shade of the magnolia and the cedar of the South. The roar of hostile guns mingled with the moans of the dying and the agonizing sobs of bereaved sisters and mothers. It was under such sad surroundings Mr. ORTH assumed the duties of Representative. That he conscientiously and fearlessly did the work assigned him is a part of the record of those troublous times.

After the war he had to grapple the new and perplexing questions of reconstruction, and here, too, he proved himself equal to each occasion, never forgetting the cause of freedom and ever having an eye to the glory of his country.

He served on several of the most important committees of the House, and among them the Committee on Freedmen, the Committee on Private Land Claims, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He brought to the discharge of his committee work an intelligent industry which won for him the respect and confidence of his associates and a position of influence in the House. While on the Freedmen's Committee he matured and reported several measures for the protection of that large and friendless multitude which the war was daily transforming from chattels into men. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs he was, when that question was before the country, opposed to according belligerent rights to Cuba, and on behalf of a minority of the committee presented a report embodying his views, which was sustained by the House and indorsed by the country.

During the discussion which followed he said:

I yield to no gentleman on the floor of this House in expressions of sympathy for any people who, suffering from oppression, are fighting for independence. It is an American sentiment that all men should be free. These generous impulses are part of our nature; they are among the earliest impressions of our childhood; we receive them in lineal descent from our Revolutionary ancestors; they are the proud heritage of every American. But personal sympathy must not be permitted to influence official action in derogation of the just rights of others. If my sympathy could give the Cubans independence and separate nationality they should have it before the going down of the sun. But, sir, when I am asked to entangle the Government in a controversy in which we have everything to lose and nothing to gain, I can not do it, I dare not do it, and I have the fullest confidence that this House will not do it.

Mr. ORTH advocated every advance movement of his party. He was in the fullest sympathy with the emancipation policy of Lincoln and recorded his vote for the amendment abolishing slavery. He also zealously supported the fourteenth amendment and followed these measures to their logical conclusion by aiding to put the ballot into the hands of the newly made freeman. On the subject of human rights his views were radical. He hated oppression and was intolerant of what he regarded caste legislation. He combated the anti-Chinese legislation of this Congress because he thought it an attack on liberty.

Among his last speeches in this House was an earnest and eloquent protest against this measure. He said:

The proposed legislation is based on race and color, is in derogation of justice and right, subverts the time-honored traditions of the fathers, tramples alike upon treaties and statutes, strikes at the fundamental principles of republicanism, and seeks to rob our nation of the brightest jewels in its coronet of glory.

From the landing at Plymouth Rock, from the settlement at Jamestown, down through all our varied history, our people have placed themselves on God's word and announced their belief that He had "made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." This is the foundation-stone upon which our people have erected the grandest structure of human government known to man's history.

The first political document promulgated by the feeble Colonies in vindication of their action formulated this faith into the declaration that "all men are created equal," endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which is "the pursuit of happiness," and from which followed as an inevitable corollary the doctrine of expatriation, which is the right of man to go wheresoever his tastes, his judgment, or his interest might lead him.

Upon this old gospel of liberty and equality he placed himself at the beginning of his political life and he adhered to it in his last utterances. He wrote in his creed the philosophy of Hugo:

Liberty! Equality! Fraternity! There is nothing to add—nothing to retrench. They are the three steps of the supreme ladder. Liberty is right; equality is fact; fraternity is duty. All the man is there.

Upon the adjournment of the Forty-third Congress President Grant tendered him the position of United States minister to Vienna, which he accepted. While abroad he was chosen by the almost unanimous voice of the Republican party its candidate for governor of Indiana. He resigned his mission in compliance with the request of his friends to make the race for that office. During the canvass he withdrew from the ticket because of local opposition to his candidacy which he was induced to believe would imperil the success of his party. His long term of service, his party prominence, his aggressive character, his uncompromising devotion to principle, and his firm adherence to his convictions made him a conspicuous mark for his enemies. Eminence in any walk in life, and especially in politics, invites criticism and censure. He lives to little purpose who is without foes. It is unfortunate that in our political warfare we are apt to justify the assassination of private character if it promotes partisan success. If party ends require it we too often remorselessly murder a good man's name. But the fame of him of whom I speak is safe from defamation now. He is beyond the reach of reproach. After a third of a century of public life, after ample opportunities for amassing wealth, Mr. ORTH died comparatively poor. If he had faults, venality was not one of them. His frugal, temperate, and unostentatious habits, his disregard of wealth, vindicate his character from such an imputation and rebuke those who calumniated it.

It was my good fortune to know Mr. ORTH somewhat intimately for a score of years. He was of a sunny nature, and had a cheerful word, a genial smile, and a hearty greeting for all. No man ever had friends more devoted and self-sacrificing than he. He had a personal magnetism which attracted men and held them. They stood by him in every vicissitude of his fortune. No assault upon his record or his honor weakened their faith or caused them to falter in their friendship. It was thought that at times he was unduly sensitive and too quick to suspect offense; but if this was a weakness it arose from "that chastity of honor that felt a stain as a wound." No life is wholly faultless; his had its

frailties; but when the account of its deeds here is made up there will be found a large balance on the heavenward side. He was self-reliant, and prosecuted his work with an energy that deserved success if it did not always achieve it. As a thinker and a speaker he was aggressive but tolerant; urging his point with the zeal of an enthusiast, he freely accorded honesty of purpose and conviction to those who combated his opinions. His language was simple, his manner earnest, his illustrations well chosen. There was no attempt at display—no straining after effect. He sometimes festooned his thought with an apt quotation and gave point to his logic by an appropriate anecdote. A man of convictions and integrity of purpose, before forming an opinion he examined the facts and only accepted conclusions after trying the foundations upon which they were made to rest.

But I can not further trace his personal or social traits or his public career. Imperfect as my sketch has been, I must leave it, knowing that all my omissions will be supplied by others.

Mr. ORTH was in declining health for some time before his death. At the close of the last session of this Congress he visited Berkeley Springs, hoping by rest and recreation to regain his wasted strength and be ready for the labors of this session. He did not find the relief he sought, but returned home an invalid. Notwithstanding his feeble and broken condition, his party friends again tendered him the Congressional nomination. He accepted the race and attempted to make a canvass, but disease had so impaired his health that he was unable to address the people, and he did little more than appear at a few of the political meetings held in his district. I saw him for the last time at the close of the campaign. It was apparent then that the end was near. Within a few months disease had made sad inroads upon the vigor of both his body and mind. He was making a manful struggle to rally his decaying energies, but the brightness of his life was fading away and the gloom of the evening fast gathering about him. Within a brief month, at his old home, with friends and family about him, death closed the scene, tender hands bore his remains to the church-yard and laid them forever away. He sleeps now all regardless of life's struggles or its storms.

While his countrymen linger around his grave their aspirations will ascend to Heaven that a kind Providence may grant our beloved country many more such men.

These are his words spoken at the bier of Thaddeus Stevens. I repeat them, and here by his new-made grave express the hope that the future of our free and prosperous Republic may be blessed with many such men as GODLOVE S. ORTH. Now—

Let us breathe a prayer above his sod
And leave him to his rest—and God.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, we have all been shocked and pained at the mortality among members of the two branches of Congress. During the present session seven members of this House have been swept away by the fell destroyer.

And on yesterday I was informed by the Librarian of Congress that since the 4th day of March, 1871, of those who were then members of either one or the other branch, or who had been since that time, twenty-two Senators have died, and sixty-nine members of this House have been called to lie down in the cold, damp grave, apart from earth, to sleep that sleep that knows no waking. How forcibly we are impressed with the words of Watts:

Prince, this clay must be your bed,
In spite of all your towers;
The tall, the wise, the reverend head
Must lie as low as ours.

I desire, Mr. Speaker, with the preparation of only a few hours, as a colleague on the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the lamented GODLOVE S. ORTH, to submit a few remarks on his life and character.

On the 16th of December last he departed this life and wound up a long, eventful, and honorable career. We now pause for a time to do honor to his memory. In your time, Mr. Speaker, and in mine, few men have filled so many positions of prominence and trust as he whom we now mourn. I can not better recount the public services rendered by him to this country than by reading from the Congressional Directory a statement which was published during his life and presumably by his consent:

GODLOVE S. ORTH, of La Fayette, was born near Lebanon, Pennsylvania, April 22, 1817; was educated at Gettysburgh College, Pennsylvania; studied law, and commenced to practice in Indiana; was a member of the State senate of Indiana in 1843, '44, '45, '46, '47, and '48, serving one year as president of that body; was a Presidential elector in 1848; was a member of the peace conference in 1861; served as captain of a company of volunteers during the war for the suppression of the rebellion; was elected to the Thirty-eighth, Thirty-ninth, Fortieth, Forty-first, and Forty-third Congresses; upon the adjournment of the Forty-third Congress he was appointed United States minister to Vienna; and was elected to the Forty-sixth and Forty-seventh Congresses.

He gave to his State six years' service in its senate; and if he had lived to the 4th of March next, he would have served fourteen years in this House. He also served in the peace congress of 1861 and in the volunteer military service of the late war; and for several years he represented his Government as minister to Vienna.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that no man could have been so often honored, and retained for so many years in high positions, who did not possess noble qualities of head and heart. His associates and acquaintances on

this floor will, I am sure, gladly unite with me in testifying to his ability and to his warm-hearted, genial, and generous nature.

I have said that he was a man of ability. His long-continued public service in various positions, the duties of which he discharged with honor to himself and benefit to his country, marked him as a man of ability. His career at the bar, even in his youth, was a brilliant and a successful one. I need not remind members around me of the high rank he took here with us; of the various chairmanships of important committees that he filled from time to time; the various important committee reports which he prepared and presented; of the various able speeches he made during his membership here. In addition to all this, Mr. Speaker, be it said that GODLOVE S. ORTH lived and died an honest man. But once during his eventful career, extending as it did over a period of nearly forty years, are we told by those who knew him longest and best, was his character assailed or his integrity impeached.

In the year 1876 Indiana was regarded as politically a doubtful State. It was regarded as an important factor, if not the deciding factor, in the Presidential election of that year. Each of the great political parties was organizing for the campaign. Each aimed to put forward its strongest and most available man as a candidate for governor. The Democratic party nominated as its candidate the lamented James D. Williams, once a prominent and popular member of this House; and the Republican party, passing by its scores of distinguished men, nominated GODLOVE S. ORTH, and recalled him from his foreign mission. Scarcely had he returned to his home, having resigned his position abroad, when rumor, oftentimes a lying jade, cast suspicion upon him, and asserted that he had fallen from duty's path and violated the rules of propriety by accepting a fee to prosecute certain claims—at a time, too, when he was a member of Congress and when those claims were undergoing investigation by Congress. A due regard for his memory prompts me now and here to say, in view of all the lights upon that subject, that this rumor was without foundation. It took the wings of the wind and flew to all parts of the country; and notwithstanding the fact that no witness, then or since, has ever been found to verify it and no record ever produced to sustain it, the only course left for Mr. ORTH to pursue in the political frenzy of the hour was to retire from the contest, to wait and watch and bide his time for vindication. He returned to his home and retired to private life; he returned to the people by whom he had often been honored, to the people who had passed in review the deeds of his life—the people who had watched him from boyhood to the time when the white flakes of age settled upon his brow—he returned to the people in whose breast there was a deep-seated conviction that GODLOVE S. ORTH was an honest man. They believed he had been wantonly pursued and persecuted. They remembered the fidelity with which he so long and so ably served them and served his country in various prominent positions. They remembered the dark hours of 1861, when the country was filled and startled with rumors of war, and how he exerted himself through the medium of the peace congress of that year to avert the horrors of war.

Failing in that effort he returned to his home, headed a military company in the volunteer service, and went forth to fight for his country, her liberty and her laws. Their admiration for the man and confidence in his integrity and his innocence inspired them with a determination to set him right before the world. This they did by electing him to the Forty-sixth Congress and re-electing him by a largely increased majority to the Forty-seventh Congress. Thus, Mr. Speaker, was his brow during his life wreathed with vindication and victory. Of the accusation against him and the manner in which his constituents repudiated and crushed it out, it may be well said—

Truth crushed to earth shall rise again;
The eternal years of God are hers;
But Error, wounded, writhes with pain,
And dies among his worshippers.

His life on earth is ended. His friends and country are left to mourn his loss. But though death has deprived them of his services, it has not taken away the result of his labor. Life leaves the body, and the body is borne to the ground from which it sprang. Fruits fall to the earth and decay, but never a fruit that did not leave its seed, and never a life that did not leave its example. The sun of man's life goes down, but the star of his example remains fixed in the firmament.

Mr. ORTH's career is ended, and his friends point with pride to his record, the record of a scholar, a statesman, and a patriot.

Oh God! It is a fearful thing
To see the human soul take wing,
In any shape, in any mood.

Mr. CALKINS. Mr. Speaker, in the few remarks I am about to submit upon the life and character of my dead colleague, I shall omit any extended reference to his public career, which has been so fitly epitomized by my colleague [Mr. BROWNE]. "At the time of his death there were few men better known in the State of Indiana than Mr. ORTH. He began his public career quite young, and passed with amazing rapidity through many grades of political life. He never attained the full measure of his ambition; but his aspirations were not higher than his merit deserved. That he did not entirely succeed is not a fault, for he was always willing to make personal sacrifices that the principles for which he struggled might obtain. He was personally popular, and held

his friendships with a firm grasp. His public speeches were earnest and sincere; and his manner unostentatious and attractive. His language was fluent and well chosen, and his zeal was fervid and impressive. He was bold in expression, plausible in argument, and pathetic in appeal. He never apologized for public action, nor took refuge in silence from public assault. He never placated an enemy at the expense of a friend, nor did he resort to doubtful expedients at the sacrifice of principle.

The basis of his political action was that of absolute justice, and his motto was "that it were better to fail in the right than to succeed in the wrong." Politically he was a thorough disciplinarian, and his remarkable success in that field was largely attributable to the solid phalanxes of his personal fairness.

He had enemies in his own political party, as all men of decided views and large individuality must have, but he possessed the skill of maintaining them in line without driving them from the party of their choice. He maintained his party leadership in his own Congressional district for a quarter of a century, and when he died was serving his seventh term in this House.

He did not escape harsh criticism; but he lived to place his triumphant vindication in the permanent records of his country which he served so long and faithfully.

As a citizen he had the respect of those who knew him best, without regard to party affiliations. As a neighbor he was obliging and as a friend he was firm and true.

His rank as a lawyer when he left the bar to enter politics was fully up to the standard of the best lawyers of the State. He was generous and charitable, and gave for the love of giving and not for the love of praise. He was gentle in disposition, and anxious to add to the "sum of human joy." He did good deeds from choice and not for personal advantage. He had a kind word for all, and was best pleased when making others happy. He had strong religious convictions, but they were not hampered by narrow constructions or uncharitable dogmatisms. The best trait of his character was found in his domestic relations; he was a loving husband and a kind, indulgent father.

His public career was remarkable, and fitly illustrates many of the rare qualities which he possessed. While in health he never was defeated for a popular office at the hands of the people. When first a State senator he was one of its youngest members and was chosen presiding officer. In this field he first won his reputation as a skillful parliamentarian, and often on the floor proved himself a quick and ready debater.

He was appointed one of the peace commission in 1861. He performed the delicate and arduous duties of that place with signal ability. His heroic devotion to the doctrine of an inseparable union of these United States, without further compromises, did much to secure the line of policy which the Administration afterward adopted. He was in thorough sympathy with Governor Morton in the arming and equipping of troops, and supported the vigorous prosecution of the war for the suppression of the rebellion. He never doubted the righteousness of the Union cause, nor despaired of final victory for our arms. He was not disheartened at reverses, nor did he flag in his zeal for the Union in the darkest hour of the rebellion.

He gave to his country his services as a volunteer and risked his life for its preservation. His services in this House during the war were one continued line of devotion to his country, and all his public acts bespoke his sympathy and love for the volunteer soldier.

His long service in this House bears testimony to his ability as a statesman. He did not often speak in debate, but when he did he commanded attention from his fellow-members. He distinguished himself while at the head of the Committee on Foreign Relations; he familiarized himself with our foreign policy, and was the author of a bill to perfect our consular and diplomatic system. He mastered the details of this department and was recognized authority on all questions affecting it. He was thoroughly American in sentiment, and was imbued with the idea of the equality of all civilized people before the law. He despised caste and took no pleasure in the shallow pretenses of foreign courts; and when he represented our country at the court of Vienna he was ambitious to represent the model republic in the simplicity of pure democracy, without being offensive, and all who knew him in that position will bear testimony to his signal triumph in that direction.

While at the head of the Committee on Foreign Affairs he became possessed of many of the secrets of the unwritten history of this country which happened during that time. His version of the acquisition of the Territory of Alaska by this country was new and interesting. I am not able to recite it with sufficient accuracy to venture to give it here. I have no doubt that when the history of the lives of Mr. Seward and Mr. Sumner are rewritten in all their details the purchase of Alaska by this country will not be an uninteresting chapter, especially if the true reason is given as understood by Mr. ORTH. I regret that the occasion did not arise while Mr. ORTH was living, which would have given him the opportunity to state his version of this matter.

Mr. ORTH was my friend. I have known him from my childhood. From his lips I have received many words of encouragement. He was in full sympathy with the men who toil and labor. He began life himself in poverty and knew what it was to succeed in spite of it. He ap-

preciated the burdens which honest toil demands and rejoiced at the success which triumphed over it. He was a lover of liberty, a friend of the oppressed, and an advocate of universal freedom.

His last sickness was painful; but he bore the tedious approach of death with patience and resignation. He looked death in the face without a shudder and calmly awaited its triumph. When the cold waters were gathering about him and the power of speech was fading away he clasped the hands of those dear to him and whispered, "Happy." Thus peacefully he passed away; and he is as far from us to-day as the patriarchs and those who perished before the flood.

As one of the members of the committee of this House I attended his funeral at his home in La Fayette, Indiana. The day was inclement, but the multitude of people from his own neighborhood as well as from all the principal points in his old Congressional district, and delegations from different parts of the State, could not be deterred from paying this last tribute of respect to his memory. All that is mortal of our dead colleague lies in the beautiful cemetery adjoining the city where he lived so long and whose people he loved so well. The verdure of spring will decorate his grave. Loving hands will strew flowers there. These will fade and wither, but the monuments he has erected by his public acts will survive forever.

Mr. ROBINSON, of New York. Again the dusky wing of death darkens the doors of this House. Another distinguished soldier has fallen in life's battle. To-day a nation pauses to pay respect to the funeral procession. As it passes I bow my head in reverence and join the weeping throng in the mournful miserere for the dead.

I have not risen to deliver a eulogy on the deceased statesman, nor shall I attempt to sketch the honorable steps by which he ascended to fame. That has been and will be done more appropriately and thoroughly by his colleagues and friends in this House and in the Senate. I have risen simply to say a word or two that may appropriately come from me in the general sorrow for his untimely death.

Mr. ORTH and I first met in the Fortieth Congress, which assembled here in its first session on the 4th of March, 1867. He had long filled a distinguished position in his adopted State, as he afterward filled places of trust and honor in national affairs, both at home and abroad.

He had been a member of the Thirty-eighth and Thirty-ninth Congresses, and at the commencement of his Congressional career just twenty years ago he was appointed a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, a position which he still occupied at the time of his death. He and I served together on that committee in the Fortieth Congress, and on the great question so thoroughly discussed and so satisfactorily settled in and by that Congress his views and mine were entirely harmonious. Those who desire to see the rights of American citizens traveling abroad warmly and vigorously vindicated in an enlarged and American view, have only to refer to his speeches during that Congress. How few of the members of this House in that Fortieth Congress do we now find on this floor? Only eleven. A dozen have been transferred to the Senate; one became President, another Vice-President, several have become governors of their several States, others in the Cabinet and in foreign service, and oh, how many have passed to the shadowy shore whose mists form an impenetrable veil to the human eye!

At the last session of this Congress he was one of those who delivered eulogies on the deceased Senator Carpenter of Wisconsin, and I remember the solemn tones of his voice as he repeated the graphic sentence of Edmund Burke on a similar occasion, and so soon to be applied to himself:

What shadows we are, and what shadows we pursue!

It so happened that in the discussion of questions coming before this House during the last session Mr. ORTH and I had some differences approaching personalities, and had it not been for his forgiving nature, superior in that respect to mine, they might have permanently estranged us from each other. Had it even been so that we had separated at the close of the last session in anger, I think I should still have claimed the privilege which I now implore of uniting with his friends and admirers in paying this justly deserved tribute to his memory. But that generous nature which governed all his actions did not allow me to separate from him with hostile feelings.

At a public meeting held in this city, composed of those who deeply sympathized with me in my course in this House and who thought that he and I did not differ so widely in sentiment upon the subject which we discussed with such apparent warmth, he preceded me in some remarks in which, though we had not for some days spoken to each other, he referred to me so kindly, and, on concluding his speech, so cordially tendered me his hand that we forgot our differences and were afterward warmer friends than ever.

We parted for our several homes, hoping to meet again in the present session to indulge in our renewed intercourse of friendship. I hoped again to grasp his generous hand, the parting pressure of which I still feel, warm with the pulsations of his noble heart. Alas! that hand is cold in the icy grasp of death and the pulses of that kindly heart have ceased to throb forever. I see in his saddened house a mournful family group, a bereaved wife and weeping children, and I mingle my tears of sympathy and sorrow with theirs in the darkened circle of their distant home.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been the custom of the two Houses of Congress from the foundation of the Government whenever death has closed the career of one of its number, to suspend for the time the course of legislation, consider his public record, and pay a tribute to his memory—a custom not only beautiful in the expression of humane and kindly sympathy, but an instinctive admonition to the living.

The public career of GODLOVE S. ORTH, who so recently moved in our midst eager in the affairs of government, was one of more than ordinary duration and embraced the most important epoch of the great State in which most of his life was passed. Nearly forty years ago Mr. ORTH entered the Legislature of Indiana as a senator at an age when he was barely eligible to the trust. Indiana was then almost a frontier State. The restless tide of emigration, it is true, had invaded with intrepid steps the pathless forests and prairies stretching far westward from the Wabash, but the early settlements of Indiana (except the old post of Vincennes) were on her southern and southeastern borders and moved slowly and painfully northward and northwestwardly through interminable and unbroken forests.

When Mr. ORTH, buoyant with youth and hope, fixed his home on the Wabash, the population of Indiana, from the Ohio to the lake, was but little more than half a million. The last of the Indian tribes which for centuries had roamed the unshorn fields from the Miami to the Wabash had but recently cast their last glance on the graves of their fathers and sadly turned their faces to the West. The wealth of the State was a self-reliant people, fertile lands, the fruits of the earth, and flocks and herds; the pioneer's cabin, whose master was more independent and more hospitable than a king, was still the landmark of every landscape; the scattered settlers on the lands, and even in towns and villages, each the independent owner of a freehold, gloried in their equal condition, even in material wealth. Such were the people who, pleased with his sturdy and manly bearing, chose young ORTH to represent them in their senate.

In those days there was little accumulated wealth in Indiana; the whole people were employed in agricultural pursuits. Yet with the eagerness of young and vigorous communities for rapid development the State had already incurred a debt the burden of which very greatly exceeded her available resources or the tax-paying ability of her people to advance a system of internal improvements, resulting in the inevitable failure. This premature enterprise terminated in a great debt with no compensating result. It was premature, for agriculture, the natural employment of a free people and of all pursuits the most ennobling, diffuses and equalizes wealth, promising slow but solid advancement, while the artificial agencies which centralize wealth develop resources with accelerated force. These agencies were as yet undeveloped in Indiana.

The people were eager to maintain the public credit, but the treasury was exhausted, and temporary expedients only resulted in the hopeless disorder of the finances of the State and the discontent and despondency of the people. At this time Mr. ORTH entered the senate of Indiana. He co-operated earnestly and effectually with older members of the house and senate, with Pennington and his associates, gentlemen of long experience (for it had been the policy of the people to keep their most trusted public servants long in their employment). Gradually the State arose from her despondency, and before Mr. ORTH left the senate the public debt had been honorably adjusted, its payment assured without oppression to the people, measures provided which were destined to place Indiana in the front rank of States in the endowment and excellency of her system of common schools—the true university of state—and the forces inaugurated which have placed Indiana in her now commanding station in the Union. Mr. ORTH was identified with all the great measures of that important period and bore an honorable part in their success.

Mr. ORTH was a Whig; he was essentially and constitutionally a Whig, an admirer of Hamilton, a disciple of Henry Clay. He was a Whig in the sense in which that term and that of Democracy most clearly express the two theories of Government, which have struggled in all the past and will in the future for mastery in this Republic. In the later years of the Whig party Indiana furnished many of its ablest and most devoted leaders. While Mr. ORTH was not at any time the recognized leader of the Whig party of the State, he stood firmly in its front rank. He was the co-worker, associate, and friend of the great Whigs of Indiana from the time he entered the senate until that party was merged for the time on the great incidental issue of slavery in the Republican party. The Whig party of Indiana, in its representative men, was never so great as in the years of its decline. During this period Nicholas McCarty, Oliver H. Smith, Albert S. White, Joseph G. Marshall, George H. Dunn, Pleasant A. Hackleman, James Rariden, John A. Matson, Henry S. Lane, George G. Dunn, Samuel W. Parker, David Wallace, John D. Defrees, and Samuel Bigger, the last of the Whig governors of the State, were the Whig leaders of Indiana. All these were the associates and co-workers of GODLOVE S. ORTH; most of them men of national reputations; two of them, the foremost of them all, never in public employment, and one of them almost the peer of Henry Clay in the brilliancy of his eloquence. I mention only the great Whig leaders of Indiana, associates and friends of Mr. ORTH, who are now no more. A few equally eminent still survive. All of them

became members of the Republican party. No period of the State and no party in the State has produced men more eminent for their virtues than the Whig leaders I have named.

Mr. ORTH was a staunch partisan and true to his political friends. While in no sense an anti-slavery leader, he did not hesitate to co-operate with the body of his political associates in the movements which ultimately formed the Republican party, and he became one of its founders; was one of its truest and most trusted leaders from its organization to the time of his death, and represented his district as a Republican in this Chamber for seven terms, the longest period, with two exceptions, in the history of the State. He entered Congress during the war, and, fully impressed with the belief that the abolition of slavery was indispensable to the public safety, he supported earnestly the amendments to the Constitution and all the measures looking to the elevation of the freedmen.

As a member of this House, Mr. ORTH, while not active in the current business, was attentive, careful, and prudent generally, and on party questions always co-operating with the body of his political friends. While not at any time the leader of his party in the House, he was at all times one of its representative men and influential in its counsels. In debate his commanding and dignified presence, deep and pleasant voice, and earnestness of manner arrested attention. His style, if not brilliant or impassioned, was persuasive, earnest, and forcible. He was not the master of superior analytical power, but was clear and lucid in the statement and generalization of the matter of debate. His speeches were carefully prepared, logical in arrangement, and elevated in sentiment.

I think Mr. ORTH was not a severe student. His was not the patient and self-denying industry that questioned the ages for the secrets of the origin and institutions of government. He lived in the generation of which he was a part; he loved the society of men, studied the living age, and kept abreast with its current history, and was well informed on all questions of our domestic and foreign policy.

But the social qualities of Mr. ORTH charmed me more than his talents and intellectual culture. Who that knew him and enjoyed his friendship will ever forget his clear, kindly eye, the cheerful and honest smile that lit up his strong German face, and his warm and manly greeting? In social intercourse Mr. ORTH was amiable, confiding, and cordial. He felt no distrust and was incapable of deception. His temper was joyful, generous, and hopeful. In the society of his friends his spirits were buoyant, even at times overflowing with good humor and pleasantry, but never coarse or inconsiderate of the feelings of others, and his language as chaste as that of a refined woman. He was a man of kind and generous sympathies, gentle and considerate; while easily aroused by a sense of injustice, and aggressive in defense, he was incapable of harboring a spirit of resentment or revenge. The very amiability of his disposition at times seemed to detract from the strength of his character and made him vacillate under the importunities of his friends.

Political differences and partisan feuds did not impair his social relations, and through all his service here he numbered his friends alike on both sides of this Chamber.

During the last summer, while the party contest was pending in which his political friends were struggling to secure a quorum of the House, he came to my seat with the request that I should pair with him on the pending measure and vote in his stead to make a quorum. A growing tumor, he said, required absence and medical attention. Of course I promptly yielded to his request. I thought then that I saw in his face and voice an expression of sadness. Perhaps even then the voice of the shoreless ocean he was so soon to sail had fallen upon his ear.

GODLOVE S. ORTH, after a service in public life, State and national, prolonged beyond the usual experience of our country, is dead; a voice that has so often filled this Chamber is forever silent; a heart that has throbbed with high ambition and generous emotions for so many years is forever still; a hand so warm and true in its grasp of friendship is dust and ashes. But he still lives; all of our friend that commanded our love or inspired our admiration lives in memory, survives in the realm of the infinite and the immortal. I had known him more than thirty years and had served with him many years in this Chamber, and with the record of his public services before me, differing as we had always on the leading measures of government, I am rejoiced that I can say, in the severity of truth, "that record is one of faithful public service, unmarred by a stain of dishonor, beneficial to his country, of high honor to himself."

Mr. DEUSTER. Mr. Speaker, in the ceaseless war of the fell destroyer, Death, upon humanity, another useful life has run its course long before, in our expectations, its bright period of earthly existence should have been completed.

The fine qualities of our late distinguished colleague, GODLOVE S. ORTH, have been fitly extolled by the eloquent gentlemen who have preceded me. I can essay to add but little to the well-chosen words of their eulogistic remarks, and nothing that the merits of our deceased fellow-member did not surpass far beyond the value of a mere tribute of praise.

Long prominent in public life as he had been, more than usual interest naturally attached itself to his personal acquaintance, and I therefore carefully studied the man long before our mere acquaintance, formed during the Forty-sixth Congress, ripened into the intimacy of our friendship during the present Congress. What I had seen of him before had impressed me so favorably that, upon our being brought more closely together by our service upon the Committee on Foreign Affairs, we became much attached to each other, and I had many opportunities for admiring his practical sense, his ready conceptions of a subject in all its bearings, and the faithful attention he gave to the matters placed in his experienced care. He especially placed me under personal obligations by the warm interest he took in a measure I had introduced and which is now pending before this Congress in regard to our treaty relations with Germany. He readily accepted a place upon the sub-committee which took the measure in charge, and met me frequently at home or in the committee-room to discuss this subject with all the warmth and zeal of the patriot, the cool calculation of the diplomatist, and the discernment of the statesman. Even the last work of this sub-committee bears the imprint of his genial mind, the draft of the substitute finally agreed upon being in his handwriting—a document which I shall ever treasure for its hallowed reminiscences.

GODLOVE S. ORTH was not a man easily overlooked or readily forgotten. The loss of no man in this House or its predecessor has been more deeply felt or so generally regretted. He had distinguished himself in the field, in the civil service, in the arena of forensic skill. His death has called forth expressions of sympathy and regret, not only in his own State but in the press of the whole country. To no one would it behoove us more to pay that sacred tribute—homage to the dead—than to our late associate, who closed in our midst a career of usefulness such as few can attain to during the same period of life, closed, too, while still in the prime and vigor of manhood, in the midst of life and usefulness, ripe in honors, but not in years.

His place may be filled, but will it be filled so well as he has done? His voice is silent; but the mind that caused its utterances has left its stamp upon the history of the day. He is no longer with us; but GODLOVE S. ORTH will be remembered until they who so remember him must needs ask remembrance of the future for themselves.

There is a deep, sad lesson conveyed by this solemn hour to us, the living, who see in the course of a few years so many manly bearers of illustrious names disappear from the sphere of activity in which they have filled important places. It teaches us that with the master-minds who grasped great subjects and helped to build the greatness of a nation must perish also, by the unrelenting hand of grim Death, all that vast experience, the gems of thought, the priceless knowledge, the illimitable reasoning power which carried their possessors above a multitude that stood willingly aside, into the foremost ranks of the men of the day.

Is such loss not deeply deplorable when we remember how all these qualities might have asserted themselves, as they should, during a far longer period of usefulness than that vouchsafed to many of our best men?

When the bright luster of an active mind has been dimmed by old age, we feel that nature claims its rights after the zenith of capacity has been reached; but we stand with awe in the presence of death when its icy touch silences lips that have pleaded so recently with the impassioned eloquence of strong manhood, or when its withering breath falls to the bier a man who but yesterday seemed busied in ceaseless activity.

GODLOVE S. ORTH, too, has been called from the scene of his earthly labors long before his friends, his constituents, and his country could reap the fullest advantages of his patriotism, his sagacity, his devotion. He has been removed from our midst in the maturity of his powers and abilities, with unmeasured opportunities still before him. But he has left behind him the traces of a strong mind imprinted upon important acts of legislation, upon national history itself. Mere words of acknowledgment will not do him justice. He has justly earned a warm place in the hearts of his friends, the gratitude of his State, and the respect of the country. May his memory ever be cherished.

Mr. BELTZHOVER. Mr. Speaker—

To our graves we walk
In the thick footsteps of departed men.

Seven times during the brief period of its existence this great legislative body has been halted in its deliberations by the inexorable messenger of Death. The brilliant and eloquent O'Connor fell first on the very threshold of the present term. Then Mr. Allen, the distinguished business Representative from the metropolis of the Mississippi Valley, was stricken down. Then the gallant soldier, Mr. Hawk, who carried ever with him the silent testimonial of his service and sacrifice for his country, was summoned suddenly away. Then Colonel Lowe, after a long struggle and brief fruition of the honors of his place here, heard "the inaudible and noiseless footstep" at his door. Then Mr. Updegraff died just as he had taken with great toil and endeavor a new lease upon that "habitation giddy and unsure which is built upon the public mind."

Then the venerable statesman Mr. ORTH, whose memory we are con-

vened to honor on this occasion, departed full of years and honors. And last the young and kind and genial Mr. Shackelford, in the very prime of a promising manhood, was rudely taken from his country's service and the sweet companionship of his family and his friends. No previous Congress in all the long years of our national history has had such a death-roll. With admonishing frequency the supreme and solemn problem which all the ages have striven in vain to solve has been thrust upon us. In all times and in all lands it has been the most earnest and imperishable desire of the human mind to peer beyond the sable curtain of the tomb, which never outward swings. In one unbroken caravan the myriads of mankind from creation's dawn have gone out into the mysterious night of death. No single traveler has ever yet returned; nay, more, from none of the countless millions has ever yet come back a sign or token. There is no mystery like death. There is no theme so sublime and grand as immortality. It has been the fondest dream of humanity in every age and clime, and among all classes and conditions of men, from the philosopher in the pristine days of the academy to the rudest bushman in the wilds of the jungle. When Sarpedon, the son of Jove, was slain before the walls of Troy, the greatest poet of all time, in his matchless epic, says:

Apollo, with divine ambrosia all his limbs
Anointing, clothed him in immortal robes.
To two swift bearers gave him then in charge,
Sleep and Death, twin brothers.

The learning and philosophy and revelation of three thousand years have given to the yearning world no more light than that which greeted the doubly darkened vision of the "blind old bard of Scio's rocky isle." Is it sleep or death? As we stand on the echoless shore and watch the bark of life go out and sink below the vision line of that silent, tideless sea, we can not say whether it is death or sleep whose silken hands have seized our parting friend. We can not know whether it is an ending forever or a resting between the feverish toil of life and the dawning of the work-day of eternity.

But with all its marvelous drapery in the thought and poetry and song of all the ages of the past there never was a time when there was so much indifference to death as now. Is it because after centuries of fruitless struggle with the inscrutable theme men have dropped it in despair and stand mute and resigned before the unknown and unknowable? Is it because the superstitious fear of death has faded before the brightening dawn of reason? Is it because of faith in a religion which points its promises beyond the tomb? We do not know. From whichever cause, it is clear that with the release from the ancient terror of death, either through philosophy or stoicism or faith, mankind have been infinitely the gainers. The great English philosopher says: "Men fear death as children hate to go into the dark." This is the whole reason of the subject. It is a childish, ignorant fear, unworthy of manhood and knowledge.

The more we know the less we fear, whether our knowledge be based on the cold confidence of reason or the silent submission to the inevitable or the triumphant trust of the enthusiast in faith. The basest tyrant that ever enslaved mankind is the superstitious fear of death. It has been the stock in trade on which the priesthood have lived and prospered in all times. It has been the foundation-stone on which all the countless cruelties and crimes and follies of all religions have been built. With relief from this unmanly and unreasonable dread of death humanity has turned its face toward life and its duties. The curse of all generations has been the neglect of the present for the future, the disregard of the demands of the hour and the frittering away of the narrow span of time here for the shadowy speculations on eternity.

Because men have come to a practical belief on this subject the world has sprung from the slavish toils of the past, with its priestcraft and prejudices, into the grand development of human life and thought. The ideal of this age is the enjoyment of the blessings of life and the acquisition of the means to secure them. The object of life is to live, and not to die. The Pauline precept that "no man liveth to himself" contains the grand fundamental declaration of the only unselfish purpose of existence, and embodies the substance of all the faith which is believed to-day, the faith which builds up and creates and increases human enjoyment—the religion of humanity.

The Platonic school, centuries before Paul was born, proclaimed the same great basic fact of all the faith which humanity and intelligence will ever honestly accept. This is the spirit and belief in which the statesman whom we honor to-day worked out the problem of life. To enforce and illustrate the efforts and results of his life's struggles we have referred to the marvelous changes which have followed in the wake of the world's revolutions in thought and morals and society and government.

GODLOVE STONER ORTH was born on the 22d day of April, 1817, near Lebanon, Pennsylvania. He entered Pennsylvania College, at Gettysburg, in 1834, and remained until 1837. He was the orator of his society in 1836 and its disputant in 1837. He read law and was admitted to the bar at Gettysburg in 1839. He subsequently removed to La Fayette, Indiana, where he practiced his profession and made his life's home. He was a member of the State senate of Indiana from 1843 to 1849, serving a part of the time as speaker and *ex officio* as lieutenant-

governor of the State. He was a member of the Thirty-eighth, Thirty-ninth, Fortieth, Forty-first, Forty-third, Forty-sixth, and Forty-seventh Congresses. He was a member of the peace conference of 1861, and one of the most trusted advisers of Mr. Lincoln through the war of the rebellion. He was minister to the court of Vienna in 1875-76. He was captain of Company G, Seventy-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteers. He received the degree of LL. D. from his *alma mater* in 1874. He died on the 16th day of December, 1882, in the sixty-fifth year of his age.

His life was one unceasing struggle with adverse fate, but was crowned with corresponding victories, and friendly hands can frame no more eloquent eulogy than to record the lessons which his career teaches. He was born among a quiet, industrious, frugal, farmer people. His ancestors had few opportunities for intellectual culture, and he himself had but little means and less encouragement to procure an education. He spent his early years in an atmosphere from which he could draw no inspiration or incentive to the higher and nobler aims of life. By the force of his own inherent genius and character he came up from the depths and fought his way unaided and alone to success and fame. No one can adequately understand and appreciate the obstacles which surround and bar the progress of a young man born of unlettered ancestors in an unprogressive rural district.

The sordid battle for subsistence which is waged for generations among such a people constrains their lives to the narrowest views of the ends of being. The struggle is to live, and, this achieved, the consummation of human endeavor is reached. The great satirist, Juvenal, says: "They do not easily rise whose abilities are repressed by poverty at home." From such unpropitious beginnings Mr. ORTH rose slowly and steadily, single-handed in his contest with untoward fate, until he conquered an honorable place among men. The law of compensation, which never fails in any of the arrangements of nature, contributed to help as unfavorable circumstances hindered him. He inherited in his humbleness of birth some things which were wonderful auxiliaries in his conflict with the world.

He got from his sturdy ancestors a strong and enduring frame, a clear, healthy brain, a persistent and unconquerable industry, and that rare and invaluable possession, great good common sense. He had a comprehensive and analytical intellect and a sound judgment. He was a vigorous and incisive speaker and formidable debater. He was a progressive and practical statesman and a capable and conservative legislator. Very few public men were as powerful before the people on the stump or in the forum. Very few of his contemporaries were more fully imbued with the utilitarian spirit of the times or applied themselves with more energy and intelligence to fairly meet the demands of the country on the great questions in which the people are most vitally interested. He was a cool, courageous, manly man. He knew his rights and fearlessly maintained them, as the records of the last session clearly show.

In the very zenith of his career he learned the melancholy lesson that "virtue itself 'scapes not calumnious strokes." He was the object of one of those malicious assaults which disgrace the politics of all countries, and particularly of this. This malevolent slander thwarted the pursuit of his promising career just at the critical moment when the future was fullest of hope. He utterly silenced his maligners when an opportunity came, but the poisoned shaft had done its wicked work. It served to lose the golden chance which, like the current, when it once goes by never returns. It left the dead statesman unscathed and clear, but it was an unhappy proof of the power of calumny in party politics in a free government. "Censure is the tax a man pays to the public for being eminent." But if there is one crime more dark and infamous than another it is the stabbing of fair and spotless reputation. On the tomb of myriads of worthy men, thus maimed and ruined in the midst of their fondest dreams of fame, could be appropriately written:

A falcon towering in his pride of place,
Was by a mousing owl hawked at and killed.

But it is better to have deserved success and failed than to have won the victor's crown by fraud and crime. It is the sublimest article in the faith of humanity that as the world grows wiser the shams and frauds of its hero worship will perish with the superstitions of its dying mythology, and men will then be accorded credit for what they do and not for what they were ignorantly supposed to have done. In those better days which are already breaking on the horizon of the years to come there will be an impartial and unerring forum in which the judgments of passion and prejudice and malevolence will be reversed forever. With the growth of the world's wisdom there will be a new measure of success which will give to duty done credit for the weight of calumny and contumely and malice through which a man fearlessly fought the uneven battle of life. To that serene and certain day the dead statesman whose life and services we commemorate can safely trust his fame.

In the beautiful lines of Catullus—

Qui nunc it per iter tenebriocosum
Illic unde negant redire quemquam.

He is now traveling the darksome path to that land from which they say no one ever returns. Whether the dark and silent journey will end in cold obstruction and oblivious death, or whether he will wake from his dreamless sleep in the glorious morning of another world, we do not

know. We can only fondly hope and trust that the inexorable fate which cuts the thread of mortal life may hold—

The golden key
Which ope's the palace of eternity.

Mr. PEIRCE. Mr. Speaker, it is the common lot of all to die. We know that from this fate there is no escape. It is absolutely inevitable. We may look for it and see its near approach and yet are never ready to receive the grim messenger, no matter at what hour or in what guise he may appear.

Leaves have their time to fall,
And flowers to wither at the north wind's breath,
And stars to set; but all,
Thou hast all seasons for thine own, O Death!

Death lays his icy hands on our children, young, loving, and promising, and our hearts are wrung with grief. We can not understand the mystery of their death. We see the full-grown man, in all the pride of his strength and usefulness, called from life to death, and such a dispensation seems inscrutable and marvelous.

Three-score years pass by and with them have come usefulness and honors and troops of friends, but the grim messenger calls his victim home, and in our weakness we cry out against the divine economy that makes it possible, and say that more years should be added for the enjoyment of all these achievements. Inevitable as death is, our natures always revolt at its arbitrary power. Death loves a shining mark, and we this day mourn the loss of a friend, a lawyer, a statesman, and a patriot.

Living in a stirring age, it was his fortune to serve his country at a time that called for the exercise of statesmanship and patriotism of the highest order. Few men have seen more public service, and few men have been more honored.

I need not now and here trace his steps at length from early life through all the struggles of boyhood and manhood until he achieved his final success. That has already been done by my colleague [Mr. BROWNE]. But it is a matter of absorbing interest that he had the iron will and nerve in 1839 to leave his home in Pennsylvania and seek a then far-off State, with slender means and among strangers, to win for himself a home and fame. The will and the courage that prompted him to this were sure signs of ultimate success. With all our present railroad facilities it is now hard to realize the undertaking of a journey to a new State requiring weeks in its accomplishment. He selected La Fayette for his home and lived there until his death, a period of forty-three years, and for that city he always had the greatest pride and affection. Engaging in the practice of the law at a bar composed of men notably and conspicuously able in their profession, he soon won his way to the front ranks and kept it until he entered the broader field of politics. In the practice of the law and in politics his life was full of struggles and antagonisms, and yet he won and held in the highest degree the confidence and respect of all with whom he came in contact.

It has always seemed to me that one of the most striking elements of his character was to be found in the courage of his convictions. His judgment was formed after mature and deliberate reflection, and once formed he stood by it firmly and immovably. He was never a time-server, and his record is full of instances illustrating this element of his character. I will give but one. When the issue was made upon the currency question very many of the leading men of his party were inclined to go with what seemed to be the ruling passion of the hour, and in their anxiety to catch the popular breeze sailed far away from the record of the party. The effect of these leaders so acting was demoralizing in the extreme.

Mr. ORTH had voted for the resumption act and for all the leading features of the financial policy of his party. That policy was on trial. Many thought it a mistake, and evil effects from it were prophesied freely on every hand; but well do I remember his heroism at that hour. In my city, where he was always a favorite, he was greeted with an audience that any man might be proud to face; and when he came to discuss that policy of his party how well do I remember him! With that serious, deliberate, and determined manner that always attracted and convinced, he said: "I voted for the resumption act. I believe I did right, and I should do so again." When he had finished his argument the doubting and hesitating were won completely over to him, and from that time on there was no doubt in their minds of the propriety and value of that legislation. Subsequent events have shown the wisdom of his action and the value of his services in breasting the storm of opposition and remaining steadfast to correct doctrines. Such spirits are the salvation of all parties.

Mr. ORTH possessed a kind and sympathetic heart. His hand and heart were open to every appeal and no one was ever turned away. He was especially kind and tender in looking after the interests of the needy, and when his great heart ceased to beat, and distinguished men and high officials of the State and nation were gathering to pay their last sad tribute of respect, there came also very many humble men to drop their tears. While the public were being admitted to look for the last time upon that kindly face many old friends and neighbors wept bitterly. Among those who came was an old German soldier, in whose claim for pension Mr. ORTH had especially interested himself. Crip-

pled with wounds received in honorable service under the old flag, decrepit from age, almost too feeble to walk unassisted, and braving the dangers of very bad weather, the old man had dragged himself into the house. In his hand he carried a small sprig of evergreen. Entering the room containing the remains, his eyes fell upon that face he knew and loved so well. Taking those cold hands in his and kissing them over and over again, he gave way to his grief and wept bitterly. Looking up through his tears he exclaimed: "He was kinder than a father to me! Oh, what shall I do now that he is gone!" Laying the evergreen inside the casket, he said: "I am so poor, this is the only offering I can bring to him who was so good to me." He begged that the evergreen might be buried with his friend, and turned again and again to look upon that silent face until led away by the attendants. What higher and better tribute could be paid to his goodness and greatness than this. He had been over and over elected to the highest legislative body on earth; he had been high in the counsels of the men who controlled the destinies of his people in the hours of their deepest gloom; he enjoyed the confidence of Presidents and Cabinet officers, of judges and Senators, and members of the House to which he belonged; he had represented our country at the court of one of the richest and most powerful countries of Europe, and yet he never lost the affection of the humblest of his friends at home. They were among the very first to give evidence of their appreciation of his virtues and to mourn his loss.

The life of a public man is in some respects most undesirable. He may have lived beyond reproach, but too often his entrance into politics makes him the mark for all the shafts of envy and malice. It seems impossible for any public man to receive perfectly fair treatment; and it would be difficult to find any one in public life who had not at some time been treated in such a way as to have the iron enter his soul. Mr. ORTH was in public life when public excitement ran high and at a time when partisan feeling was intense, and in the contests through which he passed he knew some of the bitterness and rancor of party strife. And yet he so pursued the even tenor of an upright way that he retained the respect and esteem of those who were most active in the opposing ranks. More than once did he allude with feelings of evident delight and satisfaction to the fact of the entire delegation from his State in Congress uniting in recommending and in urging his appointment to a foreign mission. And no one was more prompt and ready to do justice to others than he. He could not and would not consent to see any one unjustly assailed, and he would not stand by and hear a false accusation made for any mere temporary partisan purpose. At one time an estrangement came between himself and another very prominent gentleman of the opposite party, and for several years their social relations were interrupted. In a party of gentlemen one day he heard the integrity of this gentleman assailed. With flashing eye and indignant mien he came to his rescue and said: "I have known him for years. He is my political enemy and I am not on terms of personal intimacy with him; but I know him to be an honest and incorruptible man, and I will not silently allow his good name to be impeached." The incident came to the ears of the gentleman, and brought him to Mr. ORTH at once for a reconciliation, which followed, and always afterward they enjoyed each other's friendship and confidence.

No reference to the character of Mr. ORTH would do him justice that did not greatly emphasize his habit of industry. He believed that now was the time for the discharge of every duty, and faithfully he followed that belief. Upon receipt of a letter, no matter from whom it might come, he seemed impatient until its answer should be speeding on its way. He believed that anything worth doing at all was worth doing well, and he gave his whole attention to every matter engaging his mind. Every detail received full consideration, and the amount of work he accomplished seemed almost marvelous. As a legislator he labored not alone for general results, but it was his ambition to make every law perfect in all its details.

Mr. ORTH was passionately fond of his family circle, and here the best qualities of the heart were most apparent. He believed in the sanctity of home, and that the man who was true in his family relations could not be untrue to the honor of the nation. While he fully appreciated the honors of public life and was deeply sensible of all he had won, yet he believed they were only valuable as they come home to heighten the enjoyment of that little circle that gathered about his hearth-stone. All hopes, all honors, all aspirations, led him back to the charmed circle. Devoted, tender, and true, his loss has fallen upon that little circle with crushing force.

Mr. ORTH's nature contained a deep religious vein. Without obtruding it upon others' attention he always maintained the highest respect for religion and religious institutions. The opinion of good people always afforded him the liveliest satisfaction, and he constantly had in view the desire to so conduct himself as to bring no reproach upon himself and to merit high opinion of good men. In one of my familiar conversations with him, which were always appreciated by me, he said to me, "A member of Congress can not be too circumspect in his conduct here. He should remember that every night pious people are kneeling down and praying for him." Our friend is gone, and those who enjoyed his confidence and friendship, who loved him for his estimable qualities and so profited by his wisdom and experience, sincerely mourn his loss. But he is not lost to us. He is still with us in a

bright and enduring example. He has left to the country the legacy of a well-spent life. To the youth of the country he leaves an example of industry, of perseverance, of honesty, of patriotism, and of success, to inspire them with lofty and ambitious purposes.

Mr. DAVIS, of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of an active service, where personal cares and requirements press upon us, where our duties and responsibilities are so great that we become aggressive and headstrong in their performance and observance; in a life upon this floor, where seemingly the hours are altogether too short and the day itself but a brief hour; where strong men grapple in debate at times almost as fiercely as warriors do in battle; where the skill and adroitness of the one is only counteracted by the logic, the eloquence, and the activity of the other; where time appears to be the great desideratum and men are taught that an hour lost or diverted is almost a calamity; while thus thoroughly engaged and absorbed in these activities, oblivious apparently to matters of graver concern, we have been brought to a halt by the command of the immortal Speaker of Mankind, and reminded and admonished in the most forcible and impressive manner that we are but mortal.

How suddenly and how frequently this terrible command has been given this House is a sad remembrance to us all.

It is our custom, and as I believe an eminently proper one, that we of our own motion should stop in the activities of this Chamber, and laying aside all thought of pressing duty devote an hour to the memory and honor of those of our members who have been called hence to a higher life, to a higher sphere of action, and to the lesson which it teaches.

This hour we devote to-day to the memory of our departed friend and member, GODLOVE S. ORTH, of Indiana; and I would not that this hour should pass without rising in my place and saying a word in testimony and to the memory and to the honor of this grand old man. Old not in years, old not in appearance or in physical and mental power, but old and grand in the service of his country; a diplomat, a soldier, and a statesman, for a period of upward of forty years almost continuously he served his State and his country well.

His colleagues upon this floor, with exact data of his public service, having intimate relations and full knowledge of his public life and personal character, have spoken eloquently and in excellent taste of his great worth. I speak of him, and only briefly, as we knew him here in recent years, and as a warm friend and as a true man.

Mr. ORTH was prominent in this body as one of its leaders, both in counsel and in debate. His great experience, his thorough familiarity with the history of his country and the necessities of its people; his quick perception; his cultured mind, where were stored the treasures of a long and active public life; his steadfast adherence to the principles of his political faith, rendered him invaluable in this legislative assembly, in the preparation and in the enactment of wise and beneficial laws in the interest of the people and the country. He was specially adapted to this service in which he took great pride and labored industriously.

As a debater Mr. ORTH took high rank. Never was challenge in debate sent him which he did not instantly accept, and from a mind of remarkable resources and of great activity he supported his position with such an array of facts and illustrations, so tersely put, with argument so logical and eloquent, with an earnestness of manner, aggressive yet courteous and convincing, which carried conviction to the minds of all that he was honest in his belief and that he had the courage of his own convictions.

He was a statesman in the broader sense; he gave his energy, his great talents, and the best efforts of his mind to matters of national concern and in the interest of the general public. He was too broad for selfishness, too great to become useless through envy or jealousy, and the undermining or tearing down of another's position by secret methods for his own advancement was beneath him. He would extend the same candor to an opponent which he would expect for himself, and, taking an advanced and manly position, not obtruding, yet courageous in the consciousness of his own ability to sustain himself and the cause which he advocated by merit alone.

Mr. ORTH was strong and aggressive in his own belief, yet sensitive as a child, and warm, exceedingly warm, in his friendships.

I shall not forget how this grand old man, with his forty years of experience in public life resting so gracefully upon him and lighting up as with a halo his charming countenance, greeted me for the first time as I entered this Hall, a new and young member of this body; with that smile which was characteristic of him and which had become a part of his very nature—warm, cordial, and dignified, with outstretched hands grasping both of mine in his he bade me welcome to public life, its duties and its responsibilities. With great delicacy he pointed out the various methods of successful legislation, and gave in kindest manner such information as he thought would be of immediate service, so valuable to a new and so often unthought of by an old member. The acquaintance thus formed ripened into a warm and generous friendship, which continued uninterrupted until "his light of life went out."

Mr. ORTH was a true man in the best acceptance of that term, true to his own manhood, true to his own convictions, true to his family, true to all the requirements of his position in life, true to the end to the duties imposed upon him by an exacting and discriminating public.

Mr. ORTH was an American proud of his country, its free institutions, and of the unexampled progress of its people. When presented as the representative of this nation at court in Vienna, he addressed the foreign sovereign in the native tongue of the realm so perfectly that the Emperor immediately inquired what part of the empire he claimed as his nativity. True to his country and proud of its citizenship, thanking the Emperor for his compliment, he answered, "I am, sir, an American citizen, as my fathers before me have been for one hundred years."

The every act of this man in a long and useful public life, in his personal characteristics, the voice, the gesture, the expression, evidenced to all his thorough equipment for his service, the absolute sincerity of his motives, and the secret of his success in the brilliant career just closed.

We bow in reverential attitude to-day and mourn the loss of this distinguished member. We commemorate his virtues and pay tribute to his great achievements.

In this sad affliction we feel grateful in the consolation we have that his race is better that he lived; that it was well that such a life had been led and such an example left.

By his death this House loses one of its old and most honored members; Indiana one of her great men; the nation one of its safest counselors; the people a friend and benefactor.

Mr. DE MOTTE. Mr. Speaker, for the eighth time the shadow of death has fallen upon this House. Mr. Wood, of New York; Mr. O'Connor, of South Carolina; Mr. Allen, of Missouri; Mr. Hawk, of Illinois; Mr. Lowe, of Alabama; Mr. Updegraff, of Ohio; Mr. ORTH, of Indiana, and Mr. Shackelford, of North Carolina, have successively been stricken down while discharging the high trust committed to them by the people. There is no time, from babyhood to hoary age, when the appearance of death does not seem to us inopportune. There are no circumstances under which it is not appalling. It has been wisely ordered that we may not know the time appointed for us to die. The vast book of nature, that unfailing storehouse of knowledge, the Book divine, with its prophecies, its proverbs, and its promises, give no formula by which we may calculate the days allotted us.

We have met to-day to honor the memory of one of the oldest, most experienced, and ablest of our number; one who for many years had served the people of his State in this Chamber and in other places of dignity and responsibility. Ripe in years, vigorous in mind, wise in counsel, sincerely devoted to the service of his country and his race, we deeply deplore his loss.

GODLOVE S. ORTH was the last but one of a brilliant company of young men, who at about the same time became prominent in the politics of Indiana.

That political pentecost, the campaign of 1840, gave tongues of fire to these gifted young men. With an earnestness and power before that unknown in political discussion; with the fervor of the religious devotee, their eloquence, at the recollection of which the eyes of the survivors of that memorable campaign still kindle with enthusiasm, was irresistible in rallying the people to the support of General Harrison.

Most gifted of these and of nearly the same age were George H. Proffit, Joseph G. Marshall, George G. Dunn, Samuel W. Parker, E. W. McGaughey, Henry S. Lane, GODLOVE S. ORTH, and Richard W. Thompson. I say with the pride of a native Indianian no State in this Union, no community of people anywhere of equal numbers ever produced in one generation a more brilliant company.

Proffit was twice elected to Congress, and by the able manner in which he discharged his duties secured the fullest confidence of his constituents. In the strength of his manhood he passed away with the generation preceding this.

Marshall, estimated by those now living who knew him as the most talented and scholarly of them all, after having been the candidate of his party for governor of his State, died before 1850, beloved and honored by the people.

E. W. McGaughey was a boy in stature and in personal appearance, but a giant in intellect. Genial, witty, logical, and happy in the use of language, he was formidable upon the stump and at the bar. He was dearly beloved by his party friends, and they rallied around "Little Ned," as they familiarly called him, with an enthusiasm rarely equaled. A Whig, he was twice elected to Congress from a pronounced Democratic district. His was not a nature to endure defeat, so when defeat came he turned from the associations of his youth to a new field of labor. On his way to the then newly-discovered El Dorado on the Pacific coast, while crossing the Isthmus of Panama, he was stricken by a malignant fever, and with the roaring of the two great oceans for his requiem he died.

George G. Dunn was twice elected to Congress. Before arriving at middle age, in the midst of his usefulness and in the enjoyment of the fullest confidence of the people, he was gathered to his fathers.

Samuel W. Parker was also twice elected to Congress, and died more than a quarter of a century ago, honored by the people of the whole State.

It was given to three only of these gifted men to approach the limit of life assigned by the psalmist.

Henry S. Lane, "the Henry Clay of Indiana," as he was sometimes

appropriately called, while perhaps least ambitious for official positions, was most highly honored with them. The people of Indiana withheld from him nothing they had to bestow. He was elected to the Legislature, a member of Congress, the governor of his State, and United States Senator, in all of which positions he stood shoulder to shoulder with the ablest of his associates. Retiring from the Senate in 1867, he spent the remainder of his days in quiet usefulness in the beautiful little city which had been his home for almost half a century. Less than two years ago he went to his rest, honored and beloved by all.

The second of the trio to enter the valley and shadow was GODLOVE S. ORTH, in honor of whom this august body has set apart this hour.

He was the youngest of the brilliant company of 1840. Less gifted by nature, perhaps, than some of his companions, he made recompense therefor by unremitting study and honest, conscientious devotion to the letter as well as the spirit of the work he had in hand. Elected to the senate of his State when but twenty-five years of age, he immediately became so necessary to that body and took such high rank as a legislator and parliamentarian that after two years service he was elected president of the senate. From that time until the day of his death he was a trusted party leader. Skilled in the rare faculty of estimating his fellow-men correctly, he was an efficient organizer. Mild mannered yet plain spoken, always sincere and able to impress his associates with that sincerity, he was a peacemaker and a promoter of harmony. Deliberate, cautious, yielding when preparing for the struggles of public life, he was quick, obstinate, and aggressive when those struggles were upon him. In my judgment but few men of his disposition and habits of mind could assume his proportions in an emergency.

For forty years, with here and there an exceptional year, the people who knew him best have kept him in positions of responsibility and honor, in all of which he so demeaned himself as to command their love and confidence.

I doubt not I will be pardoned for turning for one moment from the honored dead to the honored living. Hail to thee, Dick Thompson, last of the brilliant company of 1840; peer of thy coadjutors in all things and superior to them in many! May the time be far distant when thy voice, to which the people of thy State have for forty years so eagerly turned for counsel, encouragement, and inspiration, shall be stilled in death.

The labors of GODLOVE S. ORTH are ended.

"The record of a noble life is that life's best eulogy; the history of the deeds of worthy men their most lasting epitaph."

What Mr. ORTH has accomplished for his country and his fellow-men is our inheritance.

I can make no better wish for my State nor for the nation than that their destiny for the future may be controlled by men so able, so patriotic, so wise, so good as he.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to be somewhat intimately associated with Mr. ORTH in the Forty-sixth and first session of the Forty-seventh Congress. Sitting at his side, I had rare opportunity of knowing and learning to esteem a thoroughly representative American statesman. Mr. ORTH was kind and considerate, and although a man of varied experience, a citizen who had represented his Government abroad with great ability and was not less conspicuous as a legislator in the councils of his country, he was yet unpretending, indulgent, and generous. Mr. Speaker, Mr. ORTH was proud of his country and devoted to the republican form of government. He had seen the degradation of the millions affected by the pernicious system inseparable from monarchy, and realized the full force of that great truth, "the people can best govern themselves."

He was a sincere, ardent believer in the dignity of American citizenship, and would proclaim it with as much fervor in the presence of kings as when addressing an audience in the State of Indiana. Naturalized citizens appreciate his fidelity and revere his memory; and I shall take leave to add the preamble and resolution adopted at a meeting of Irish-American citizens as a tribute to the worth of an estimable, distinguished American citizen:

CLAN-NA-GAEL HALL,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1883.

At the regular meeting of the Clan-na-Gael Association held on this date, the following preamble and resolution were passed unanimously:

Whereas we have learned of the death of the late Hon. G. S. ORTH, ex-minister to Vienna, and chairman of the sub-committee of Foreign Affairs, charged with the duty of inquiring into the cases of the American citizens imprisoned by the British in Ireland; and

Whereas Hon. Mr. ORTH, as Representative and citizen, manifested a sincere sympathy for the Irish people and those who served and suffered for them, and faithfully and efficiently performed his duty as chairman of the sub-committee above referred to: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That we, as American citizens of Irish birth or origin, express our deep and heartfelt regret at his death and the consequent loss to his family of a devoted and affectionate husband and father, to the Republic of one of its purest, noblest, and ablest Representatives and citizens, and to the Irish people of a faithful, earnest, and practical friend.

It was ordered that a copy of the above be filed with the records of the association, and that copies be forwarded to Mrs. Orth and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

On behalf of the Clan-na-Gael.

ED. MEAGHER CONDON,
JAMES DILLON,
JAMES BELLEW,
Committee on Resolutions.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, by those who were fellow-members, co-laborers, and the political associates of my lamented predecessor have his virtues been praised and his talents appropriately applauded. With tongues whose brilliancy has awakened these chambers in the presence of him of whom we would this day speak, and whose eloquence and wisdom have attracted his attention and his admiration, has his life been reviewed. All this has been said so beautifully and by words laden with such pure love that I feel all has been said that need be said.

A monument typical of the personal and political character of this distinguished statesman and patriot has been built here by friends this day; but I, as his successor to a seat in this House, and for many years his constituent and admirer, can not permit this last opportunity to pass to cast upon the mound beneath which slumbers his memory a rosebud, a leaf, some simple emblem to mark the appreciation in which I held him while living and the sorrow I feel at his loss.

He has gone from among us, and the chair he occupied will never be filled by one more pure in nature, more lofty and courageous in his actions, more kind and gentle in his every word. He won the hearts of those he chanced to meet wherever he went. He was frank, he was honest, he was plain. None loved him better than those who knew him best. In his own home city, where his daily walks were most conspicuous, was he held in highest esteem.

There was no secrecy in his private life. He was the soul of truth. History can reveal nothing which will detract from the purity of his life and character.

His politeness was one of his most prominent characteristics. It was of the genuine type, that which springs from the true goodness of heart, that politeness which ever seeks to contribute to the happiness of others and which avoids all that could give pain. He studiously avoided personal bitterness. He could discuss a political question with an opponent who differed most widely with him, without for a moment losing his temper.

But GODLOVE S. ORTH is dead. That tongue which once by its wisdom and eloquence stirred the souls of those about me here to-day now lies cold and speechless beneath the sod. But in history it will speak forever. The seat he so well filled on this floor has been taken by another. The various positions he held in the organization of this Congress are occupied by other men. The daily routine moves forward as when he was among you. Apparently there is no gap left here by his demise; but there is a vacancy, not only in the ability of this Congress, but in the heart of every one who knew him.

He has crossed the dark river. To the summons has he responded, and gone to join the innumerable caravan that moves to the mysterious realms. His death was as peaceful as his life. He went not like a slave at night, but sustained and soothed by an unflinching trust wrapped the drapery of his couch about him and has lain down to peaceful dreams.

The resolutions were adopted; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, protesting against the transfer of the United States Signal Service to the Department of the Interior—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KELLEY: The petition of 70 ship-owners, shipping-merchants, and ship-brokers, protesting against the adoption of section 13 of bill H. R. 7061, known as the shipping bill—to the same committee.

By Mr. PEELLE: The petition of George C. Thacher, Thomas Fortune, and 40 others, citizens of Shelbyville, Indiana, for a material reduction of the duty on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL: The petition of the Grand Temple of Honor of Pennsylvania, for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the manufacture and sale of all alcoholic beverages—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. RITCHIE: The petition of Foss Post No. 14, Grand Army of the Republic, of Toledo, Ohio, relative to bill H. R. 7361—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SKINNER: The petition of 27 citizens of Watertown, New York, for a reduction of the duty on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. W. G. THOMPSON: The petition of J. R. Gitchell and 52 others, citizens of Walker, Linn County, Iowa, for a reduction of the duty on sugar—to the same committee.

By Mr. VANCE: The petition of W. G. Buchanan and others, for a mail-route from Bakersville to Burnsville via Ledger, North Carolina—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WHITTHORNE: The petition of Mrs. Mary McCraw, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The following petitions, praying that Congress will not adopt any lower rate of duties on foreign manufactured products than that recommended by the Tariff Commission, were presented and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. BARR: Of 122 employes of Lebanon Furnace, Lebanon, and of 79 employes of Central Iron Works, of Harrisburgh, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. BRUMM: Of John Ralston and 103 others, and of James McCue and 327 others, of Pottsville, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. KELLEY: Of 70 shipping firms, masters, owners of vessels, and others, and of resolutions adopted by the board of wardens of the port of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. MUTCHLER: Of 135 employes of Ferndale Mills, of Ferndale, Lehigh County, and of 216 employes of the Coplay Iron Company, of Coplay, Lehigh County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. TALBOTT: Of John B. Stricker and others, employes of George P. Whittaker & Co., Principio Furnace, Maryland.

By Mr. WARD: Of employes of Springton Forge, Chester County, Pennsylvania.

The following petitions, remonstrating against the proposed transfer of the revenue marine to the Navy Department, were presented and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

By Mr. CURTIN: Of citizens of Clearfield and Centre Counties, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. HARMER: Of the Vessel-Owners and Captains' Association of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. RANDALL: Of 29 stevedores and masters of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. SKINNER: Of keeper and surfmen of life-saving station No. 1, Ellisburgh, New York.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 1, 1883.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. J. BULLOCK, D. D.

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

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. MAHONEY presented the credentials of Harrison Holt Riddleberger, chosen by the Legislature of Virginia a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1883; which were read and ordered to be filed.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of vessels stricken from the Navy Register in pursuance of the act of August 5, 1882; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a joint resolution of the Thirty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois on the subject of the Yellowstone National Park; which was read, as follows:

Preamble and joint resolutions of the Thirty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois.

Whereas the people of the State of Illinois, having a common interest in our National Park, and the maintaining of the same free to all the people of the earth visiting this region of matchless wonders and grandeur, and learning that a company of capitalists are trying to secure a lease of said park, with exclusive rights therein; and

Whereas the attention of Congress being called to said transaction by the report of Lieutenant-General Sheridan, made to the War Department November 1, 1882, and Senator Vest having reported a bill from committee to the Senate of the United States making rules and regulations for the better government of said park: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the senate and house of representatives (concurring herein). That this General Assembly, acting on behalf of the people of this State, respectfully request that our Senators and Representatives in Congress use all honorable means to secure the passage of a law that will give to the people visiting said park the right of viewing the wonders therein contained free from the extortion of monopolists or hindrance from any source whatever, so far as may be consistent with the necessary protection of the scenery and objects of curiosity and the protection of the game and fish therein contained.

Resolved, That we hereby tender to Lieutenant-General Sheridan and Senator Vest the thanks of the people of this State for their timely and earnest efforts in the preventing of said park from passing into the exclusive possession of said company, to be used by them as a cattle-ranch and for the extorting of money from tourists visiting said park.

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, requested to forward copies of these resolutions to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, and a copy of each to Lieutenant-General Sheridan and Senator Vest.

Adopted by the Senate January 16, 1883.

WM. J. CAMPBELL,
President of the Senate.

L. F. WATSON, *Secretary.*

Concurred in by the House of Representatives January 18, 1883.

LORIN C. COLLINS, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

JOHN A. REEVE, *Clerk.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

State of Illinois, ss:

I, Henry D. Dement, secretary of state of the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a preamble and joint resolution adopted by the Thirty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois, and filed in this office January 25, A. D. 1883.

In witness whereof I hereunto set my hand and affix the great seal of State. Done at Springfield, the 25th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1883.

[SEAL.]

HENRY D. DEMENT,
Secretary of State.