

The Scranton Tribune

Published Daily, Except Sunday, by The Tribune Publishing Company, at Fifty Cents a Month. LIVERY & RICHARD, Editor. O. F. BIXBEE, Business Manager.

New York Office: 150 Nassau St., N. S. VIRELAND, Sole Agent for Foreign Advertising. Entered at the Postoffice at Scranton, Pa., as Second-Class Mail Matter.

When space will permit, the Tribune is always glad to print letters from its friends bearing on current topics, but its rule is that these must be signed, for publication, by the writer's real name, and the condition precedent to acceptance is that all contributions shall be subject to editorial revision.

SCRANTON, OCTOBER 23, 1900.

REPUBLICAN NOMINATIONS.

National. President—WILLIAM MCKINLEY. Vice-President—THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

State. Congressmen-at-Large—GALUSHA A. GROW, ROBERT H. FÖRSTERER. Auditor General—E. B. HARBENBERGH.

County. Congress—WILLIAM CONNELL. Judge—GEORGE M. WATSON. Sheriff—JOHN H. FELLOWS.

Trustees—J. A. SCRANTON. District Attorney—WILLIAM R. LEWIS. Prothonotary—JOHN COPELAND.

Clerk of Court—THOMAS P. DANIELS. Recorder of Deeds—EMIL BONN. Register of Wills—W. K. BUCK. Jury Commissioners—EDWARD B. STURGES.

Legislature. First District—THOMAS J. REYNOLDS. Second District—JOHN SCHUEER, JR. Third District—EDWARD JAMES, JR. Fourth District—P. A. PHILLIPS.

"If there is any one who believes the gold standard is a good thing, or that it must be maintained, I warn him not to cast his vote for me, because I promise him it will not be maintained in this country longer than I am able to get rid of it."—William Jennings Bryan, in a speech at Knoxville, Tenn., delivered Sept. 16, 1896.

"The party stands where it did in 1896 on the money question."—William Jennings Bryan, Zanesville, O., September 4, 1890.

A National Office.

THE SUCCESSFUL working out of the splendid policies of administration which have been instituted during the first term of William McKinley requires more than Mr. McKinley's election. Without a congress in political sympathy with him the president of the United States is powerless and all the united political opponents more concerned with the manufacture of partisan capital than with the prosperity and development of the country.

The indications, at this time, are that William McKinley will be re-elected by a larger majority, both of the vote in the electoral college and of the popular vote, than was cast for him four years ago. If the election of congressmen were at large instead of by separate districts, this triumph of the presidential nominee would insure a congress to work in unison with him; but by our method of electing congressmen disturbance in special localities and disappointments growing out of patronage distribution complicate the problem with factors that have no proper bearing on the principles at stake. In too many districts the office of congressman is looked upon as a local spoil, when in fact it is essentially national in its significance and bearing.

The congressman from a given district represents more than a majority of the voters in that district and the influence of his official action extends far beyond the boundaries of his district. The effect of his vote at Washington reaches every portion of the United States and affects every citizen. This is especially true when the majority in congress is small; when a few votes practically exercise the balance of congressional power.

These considerations should enter into the minds of a citizen when determining how he should cast his ballot for this office. If he is mindful of the public welfare, and if he wants to see the man of his choice for president supported by a majority in congress which will enable that man to carry out his policies of government, he will not permit any merely local prejudice or personal ill-feeling to sway him, and above all he will not select the nominee of his party for this important national office as the proper target for a personal attack. To do so would be inconsistent with his support of the head of the national ticket.

In deciding how to vote two weeks hence, don't consult prejudice, consult common sense. Republican administration has given good times. Democratic administration gave frightfully bad times. Judge the future by the past. Turn the Democracy to us.

Tin Plate Once More.

SEVERAL recent occasions the local organ of calamity, in its endeavor to sand-bag the local tin plate project and thus deprive Scranton of a promising new industry, likely to be peddled as a feeder to business after the removal of the steel mills, has asked us to name an independent tin plate plant in successful operation against the competition of the American Tin Plate company, otherwise known as the tin plate "trust." We take pleasure in naming not only one, but three establishments operated successfully outside of the "trust," and cheerfully recommend the editor of the Times to detail an expert to make an examination of their properties and books.

The first of these plants is a six-million factory at Washington, Pa., operated by the Tyler Charcoal Iron mills. A visit to this establishment will satisfy any fair-minded man that it is a success. The second plant to which we direct our pessimistic friend's attention is a two-million factory located at Avonmore, Pa.; it is operated by the Alconia company, of Pittsburgh. We suggest that the Times editor include this establishment in his itinerary of investigation. At Muskegon,

Mich., the Champion Iron and Steel company conducts a four-million plant in independence from the American Tin Plate company, and our information is that its operations are fully up to the expectations of the founders. Let the Times disprove this if it can. We do not, in this connection, include the twenty-million plant now in process of construction at Sharon, Pa., for the reason that this has not yet been put into operation. The men concerned in it, however, are practical business men, possessing ample capital and the fact that they are willing to invest this capital in so large a plant justifies the inference that they know what they are about.

We have no doubt that the election of Bryan, now happily improbable, would seriously interfere with, if not effectually prevent, the completion of the local tin plate enterprise. The gentlemen who have subscribed to the capital stock of this plant have had experience with Democratic times, and it has convinced them that Democratic national administration is unfavorable to business prosperity. It will be remembered that it was only a short time ago that the Democratic campaign centers were ridiculing the possibility of establishing a successful tin plate industry in the United States. Everybody recollects their derisive howls at the tin plate schedule of the McKinley tariff bill. The Democratic orators and editors this year do not contend that it is impossible to establish successful tin plate industries in the United States, because the fact of the establishment of such industries is too manifest for contradiction. Like their complaints at the Spanish-American war, the present burden of their comment is that the American tin plate industry has been too successful. Years ago they said no tin plate company could form and do business at a profit in the United States. Now they complain that the consolidated company which has grouped together a large number of tin plate mills scattered about the country, is making too much profit and doing too much business.

It must be clear from these premises that in Democratic eyes prosperity is an unpardonable crime.

President Kruger has made a mistake in not keeping his press bureau in operation a few weeks longer. For a man who put up such a determined resistance against heavy odds Oom Paul is today receiving very little attention from the correspondents and messenger boys who were cheering him on to battle a few months ago.

John Sherman.

IN POINT of extent and variety of public service and experience the illustrious career closed yesterday will rank among the great careers of modern times. It was the career of an incessantly busy man who applied to public affairs the same assiduous study, attention to details and personal fidelity to fiduciary relations that make successful bankers, merchants or other business men. It offers to young men the lesson that where wonderful genius is lacking as a personal endowment a good substitute can be had in the ability to work hard and take infinite pains.

John Sherman had no silver spoon in his upbringing. From his twelfth year he was self-supporting. He never had a college education; his school was national and men. Up to the time of his entrance into the legal profession at Mansfield, O., in 1844, after a period of close study of law-books in his brother's office, his career was not different from those of most of the young men of his time. But when, at 21 years of age, he found himself admitted to the bar with clients few, he turned to politics, got himself elected a national delegate to the Whig convention that nominated Zachary Taylor for president; went in the same capacity four years later to the Baltimore convention which nominated Winfield Scott and in 1855, when 32 years old, was elected to represent the Mansfield district in congress. He had what many young men in those days lacked—he had push.

Yet it is a singular fact in reviewing this man's long and fruitful service in congress, which from that day was interrupted but twice, and then by calls to other forms of public work, that not even in his younger days was he enthusiastic. He went into the Fremont movement, not only because he did not want slavery extended, but also because he did not want it abolished. His report as acting chairman of the committee which inquired into the border ruffian troubles in Kansas gave a list of facts most judiciously digested and it helped greatly in the formation of public sentiment but it was notably dispassionate. Then and afterward John Sherman seemed to make it a rule when considering matters of a public character always to eliminate from the operations of his mind any trace of the personal feelings of John Sherman. His animation was intellectual rather than passionate. The one notable exception to this rule was when, during Cleveland's second term, he got fired up over the Spanish outrages in Cuba; but no sooner was he made secretary of state in the spring of the following year than he immediately cooled off and he remained cool to the end.

We shall not try in this brief article to consider in detail John Sherman's public services; his peculiar personality has for us the large interest. His services are of record where all who wish may study and ponder. Undoubtedly the greatest single act of his life was his part in effecting specie redemption; this made his fame international and has caused contemporaries to rate him as a financier alongside Gallatin and Hamilton. Whether this rating is extravagant or not, time will tell. One thing, though, is certain. As congressman, senator and cabinet official John Sherman exemplified to an unusual degree the virtues of industry, candor, public and private integrity and a mind open to the reception of new thoughts and new facts. He was a partisan but not a bigot; he was no time on impossible reforms and took the world

BRYAN'S REVOLUTIONARY THREATS.

SECRETARY GAGE has shown clearly the power which Bryan might use, as president, to nullify the gold standard law, if so disposed. It becomes then a momentous question what his disposition in the matter would be, and as to this there can be no doubt. Mr. Bryan has pledged himself in public speeches to use every power, regular and irregular, direct and indirect, to force the country upon a silver basis, if he is elected president.

BRYAN'S CHICAGO THREAT.

Bryan gives, in his "First Battle," the full text of his speech in the campaign of 1896 to the business men of Chicago. This speech, being addressed specially to business men, was supposed to declare his plans and policies with more deliberation and care than an ordinary effusion on the stump. In the report of this speech, since coolly and deliberately embodied in his book, on page 687, he says:

"And then I propose that we shall say to our foreign creditors that we intend to pay our coin obligations in either gold or silver. I propose that we shall say to them: 'Gentlemen, if you conspire to make that silver dollar worth less than the gold dollar, we shall pay you in that silver dollar.' You say that that is repudiation. I deny it. They bought our bonds only a short time ago and they made a difference between coin bonds and gold bonds, charging for the risk they took, and now let them have the risk which they charged for. Do you say that they have a right to charge us more because of the risk they took, and that we have not the right to exercise the option which they calculated on?"

A POLICY OF REVENGE.

It will be noted that Bryan proposed here a policy which was to be followed, not because of any supposed benefit to the country but solely to secure revenge upon the foreign bondholder. He did not stop to consider the question of saving off the limb on which the country is sitting and starting it down toward a silver basis by paying interest in silver. The only purpose animating him was that of "getting even" with the foreign bondholders.

THE PHILADELPHIA THREAT.

Mr. Bryan's threat to have it out with the bondholders is a matter that concerns not those individuals alone but the whole country; hence it is significant to know that the threat of striking them over the shoulders of labor and industry was not confined to one speech or one occasion. Many times in the campaign he reiterated his determination to resort to extreme and even irregular measures to attack the bondholders and the gold standard. Thus in his speech at Philadelphia (report on page 47 of his book) he boldly declared:

"I have said that if there was anybody who believed the maintenance of the gold standard absolutely essential, he ought not to vote for me at all. If I can prevent the maintenance of the gold standard, you can rely upon me doing it upon the very first opportunity that the people will give me."

DOUBTFUL AND IRREGULAR POWERS.

It was no mere slip of the tongue which caused Mr. Bryan to speak of attacking the gold standard by irregular and extra legal means. He did not want his followers to understand that he would use only such power as the law might give him to force the country on a silver basis. Instead, in an extraordinary speech made at Ottumwa, Iowa, where he spoke of the "people taking the reins in their own hands," he said also (page 596 of his book):

"I believe in the restoration of bimetalism, and if I have behind me the hearts, as well as the votes, of the American people, you may depend upon it that no power in this country or any other nation will prevent the opening of our mints to the free coinage of silver on equal terms with gold and at the present ratio."

Taken by itself this might have been thought a slip of the tongue, but not so when viewed in connection with the speeches at Chicago and Philadelphia, together with the still more formal one at Madison Square. Few men in America have ever spoken of taking any official action or invoking any power over and above that authorized by the votes of the people. The legal ballot is the measure of legal power. But Mr. Bryan told his listeners at Ottumwa that if he was to have not only the votes of the people but their hearts, then no power could withstand him. A moment later, in the same speech, he spoke of the people waiting until patience was exhausted, then arousing themselves and taking the reins of government into their own hands—a course transcending the law and appealing to the forces of revolution.

CHALLENGE TO THE SUPREME COURT.

The full significance of these utterances is only to be understood when they are considered in the light of the still earlier and more formal one made at Madison Square (Bryan's book, page 320), where he said:

"I shall always refuse to apologize for the exercise of the right to dissent from a decision of the Supreme court."

This, he it remembered, is from the same man who talks about invoking powers coming, not from the ballots, but from "the hearts of the people," and of the multitude taking the reins in their own hands and of securing revenge on the foreign holders of our bonds.

REVOLUTIONARY BRYANISM.

These are revolutionary doctrines, one and all. There is no lawful or constitutional power in this country, coming from "the hearts of the people," as distinguished from their ballots. It takes a three-fourths vote to amend the Constitution, and a mere majority of the people cannot take the reins into their own hands. Equally certain is it that foreign holders of our bonds cannot be discriminated against and paid in a different coin from those at home. The Supreme court would be bound to prevent any such action. Bryan, of course, knew that and hence the significance of his threat and warning to that tribunal.

Mr. Bryan knew as well in 1896 as he does now, that some able lawyers have persistently claimed, that, as a matter of mere legal duty, the Supreme court would be compelled to declare against a change in the obligations of contracts from a gold standard to a silver basis. Bryan, of course, denies that, but is not content to stop there.

HE PLAINLY MEANS TO "DISSENT FROM THE DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT," NOT ONLY IN THAT INSTANCE BUT IN ANY OTHERS WHERE THAT TRIBUNAL MIGHT FEEL BOUND TO UPHOLD THE GOLD STANDARD AND THE OBLIGATIONS OF THE LAW, AS AGAINST THE INVOCATION OF IRREGULAR AND UNAUTHORIZED POWERS DERIVED FROM "THE HEARTS OF THE PEOPLE," AND NOT FROM BALLOTS CAST IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CONSTITUTION AND THE LAWS.

It would no doubt be dangerous for Bryan to nullify the gold standard law by paying the interest on bonds in silver, but he would have to baffle his own utterances if he stopped there. The revolutionary programme which he proposes goes much farther than that. What is to be the response of law-abiding and law-respecting voters?

very much as he found it, but the trend of his industry was always onward and upward and the contributions which he made along these lines to the progress of his country entitle him to grateful remembrance throughout all time. He often lamented that he had chosen to pursue a public vocation; he often envied men who were not in the political game, but though his trials were many and his disappointments not few he has left behind a monument of honorable activity for party and country sufficient to compensate for all his political buffeting; and his example will appeal to all who consider that it is the coward's part to shrink any labor or responsibility which duty brings.

Hon. Adlai Stevenson is willing that the Republican party should have some comfort. He cheerfully places Pennsylvania in the McKinley column.

A vote for Conroy for congress is a vote for free silver, free trade and the furling of Old Glory where it floats as established power.

nited efforts will give the Republicans of Lackawanna county victory on every office in contest. Clean the Democrats out.

"Anything to elect Schadt" is fast becoming the Democratic programme. Republicans, prepare to repel this attack.

Why should the cream of local politics always be skimmed for the personal benefit of Christy Boland?

New York were members of the committee and they were given power to administer oaths, examine witnesses, compel the attendance of persons and the production of papers and make their investigation a thorough one. More than 100 witnesses, including H. A. Havemeyer and Claus Spreckels, of sugar fame; Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Flagler and others of the Standard Oil company, and representatives of the cotton bagging trust and whiskey trust were examined. A thousand pages of testimony were taken and the committee delayed its report until long before the expiration of congress, when it presented its testimony but made no recommendation as to legislation, "owing to the present difference of opinion between members of the committee."

In 1894 the Democrats again grappled with the trust problem, adding to the Wilson-Gorman tariff law a series of provisions purporting to authorize the regulation of trusts, but which neither the Democratic president nor the Democratic officials who were in power when the act came into existence made, so far as is known, any attempt to put into operation. The Democratic professional agitators have spent much verbal effort against the trust laws since then, but have added to United States statutes any law providing means for their extinction. Even Mr. Bryan, who omits no opportunity to declare hostility to trusts, offers no legislative remedy other than through constitutional amendment. In his address before the Trust conference in Chicago, on Sept. 16, 1898, he said: "I believe we ought to have remedies in both state and nation, and that there should be concurrent remedies. I believe in addition to a state remedy there must be a federal remedy, and I believe congress has, or should have the power to place restrictions and limitations, even to the point of prohibition, upon any corporation organized in one state that wants to do business outside of the state. Congress ought now to pass such a law. If it is essential and so declared by the Supreme court I am in favor of an amendment to the constitution that will give to congress power to destroy every trust in the country. If it is essential and so declared by the Supreme court I am in favor of an amendment to the constitution that will give to congress power to regulate trusts, only five Democrats voted for it, while practically every Republican in the house voted for the measure, but as it required a two-thirds vote, the Democrats were strong enough to defeat it."

How blatant are Mr. Bryan's words, and even those of the present Democratic platform, declaring for "an unbridled free market, and city and against private monopoly in every form," to the workingman of New York who has felt the grip of the Ice Trust, now world-famous. At its head stands Augustus Van Wyck, the master mind who put into shape the Kansas City platform. The object of this trust, it was widely known, "is to coin fever and thirst in the districts of the country." The Tammany bosses, who made the Kansas City platform.

This platform was read to the Democratic convention by Senator J. K. Jones, of Arkansas, Senator Jones is a member of the finance committee of the United States senate, and took an influential part in framing what is known as the "Sugar Trust" of 1894. Senator Jones next distinguished himself as a foe to the Sugar Trust a few months ago, when the Porto Rican Relief bill was under consideration in the senate. It was proposed to use the money collected as duties on Porto Rican products which had been brought into the United States for the benefit of the island. That did not strike Senator Jones favorably and he offered an amendment providing that the money should be returned to those from whom it had been collected. If his amendment had been adopted nearly twelve hundred thousand dollars would have been paid out of the national treasury into the treasury of the Sugar Trust instead of being used for the benefit of Porto Rico. But the Republican senate did not adopt the amendment offered by Senator Jones, who was one of the framers of the Kansas City platform, and is the chairman of the Bryan national campaign committee.

Representative Richardson, permanent chairman of the Kansas City platform, and chairman of the Democratic congressional campaign committee, also featured himself in the last session of congress by his attitude toward "trusts and monopolies." He offered a series of joint resolutions aimed against them. One provided for the abolition of duties on sugar and molasses produced in Cuba and Porto Rico and brought into the United States. After consideration by the ways and means committee it appears that the resolution be reported back to the house with an adverse recommendation. On this motion Mr. Richardson voted in the negative. From the adverse report of the committee it appears that if the joint resolution should become law the sugar consumers of the United States would derive no benefit whatever from it, but that the sugar trust would be increased by the sum of fourteen million dollars a year more, and that sugar growers of the United States would be deprived of a large measure of the protection necessary to the maintenance and growth of that important domestic industry. From time to time each of the "great leaders" who manufacture stuffed trusts to throw mud at, and worse legislation to curb the real monopolistic combination, has shown his hand. Yet they cover up their tracks by ignoring history and attempting to place the blame upon the Republican party, which has a long record of work in the interest of the laborer and anti-monopolists.

That all combinations of capital are harmful to the workingman is a disputed fact. That is the reason the Republican party has declared against a constitutional prohibition of the concentration of capital. The United States Department of Labor made public July, 1900, the result of a careful investigation of trusts and industrial combinations. The report was prepared by Professor J. W. Jenks, of Cornell university, the trust expert of the United States industrial commission and the material was collected by special agents and experts of the United States Department of Labor. As far as statistics were available the report shows in general a greater number of persons employed and higher wages paid in the same establishment after the combination than before. Of fourteen establishments giving returns nine show an increase in the average wages of the operatives and foremen, four show a decrease, and in one there has been no change. Out of these fourteen companies ten were formed in the years 1898 and 1899, so that comparison of conditions before and after is a very direct one. In seven cases out of the fourteen the wages of traveling salesmen increased, in two they decreased, and in one they remained the same. In two cases no traveling salesmen had been employed by the companies entering in the combination, whereas after the combination was made such men were put to work. In one case in which traveling salesmen had been employed by the separate companies their services were dispensed with after the combination. The average annual wages of skilled laborers have increased in ten cases and decreased in two. The average annual wages of unskilled laborer have increased in ten cases, decreased in one and remained the same in one, after the combination. Taking the employes as a whole, the results show that out of twelve cases reporting there had been an increase of wages in nine cases and a decrease in three. Taking all employes collectively in each of the thirteen combinations reporting, there have been but two cases of a decrease in the number of employes and but one case of a decrease in the total annual wages paid. That there are combinations that antagonize the interest of the workingman, and after the entire nation the Republican party has always contended, and these it has always striven to suppress.

In no country upon the globe does the welfare of the workingman receive as much attention as it does in the United States. Laws to better the condition of the laborer have been passed from time to time. That it may be said that as far as legislation can effect that end the toiler is protected a great deal more in the United States than in any other country. To whom honor for this is due is shown in the following resume:

The Coolie Trade Prohibited—This law was passed Feb. 19, 1862; amended Feb. 9, 1863, and further amended March 2, 1865. President Grant, in his message Dec. 7, 1874, laid before congress a recommendation for the enforcement of the law. The legislation on these several acts was accomplished by the Republicans in 1862, in the Thirty-seventh congress, and in 1869, in the Forty-third congress.

Penalty Abolished—This act was passed in the Thirty-ninth congress, when both houses were Republican by a large majority, March 2, 1867.

Inspection of Steam Vessels—Passed during the Forty-third congress, when the Republicans were in power in both houses.

Protection of Seamen—Passed during the Forty-second congress, when both houses were under control of the Republicans. It was amended during the Forty-third congress, when the Republicans were in control of both houses.

Involuntary Servitude of Foreigners Abrogated

Passed during the Forty-third congress, when both houses were under control of the Republicans.

Hours of Labor, Letter Carriers—Law limiting letter carriers to eight hours a day. Passed in the house without division.

Department of Labor—Passed the house April 10, 1888. Passed the senate May 23, 1888. All votes cast against the bill were Democratic.

Alien Contract Labor—Passed the house during the Fifty-first congress without division Aug. 20, 1890. Passed without division Aug. 20, 1890. Passed the senate with verbal amendments Sept. 27, 1890.

Board of Arbitration—Passed the house on April 3, 1886, with thirty votes against bill, all being Democratic.

Prohibited—Passed the house March, 1867. Passed the senate Feb. 28, 1867. All the votes against the bill were Democratic.

Board of Arbitration—Passed the house on April 3, 1886, with thirty votes against bill, all being Democratic.

Hours of Labor, Letter Carriers—Law limiting letter carriers to eight hours a day. Passed in the house without division.

Department of Labor—Passed the house April 10, 1888. Passed the senate May 23, 1888. All votes cast against the bill were Democratic.

Alien Contract Labor—Passed the house during the Fifty-first congress without division Aug. 20, 1890. Passed without division Aug. 20, 1890. Passed the senate with verbal amendments Sept. 27, 1890.

Board of Arbitration—Passed the house on April 3, 1886, with thirty votes against bill, all being Democratic.

Prohibited—Passed the house March, 1867. Passed the senate Feb. 28, 1867. All the votes against the bill were Democratic.

Board of Arbitration—Passed the house on April 3, 1886, with thirty votes against bill, all being Democratic.

Hours of Labor, Letter Carriers—Law limiting letter carriers to eight hours a day. Passed in the house without division.

Department of Labor—Passed the house April 10, 1888. Passed the senate May 23, 1888. All votes cast against the bill were Democratic.

Alien Contract Labor—Passed the house during the Fifty-first congress without division Aug. 20, 1890. Passed without division Aug. 20, 1890. Passed the senate with verbal amendments Sept. 27, 1890.

Board of Arbitration—Passed the house on April 3, 1886, with thirty votes against bill, all being Democratic.

Prohibited—Passed the house March, 1867. Passed the senate Feb. 28, 1867. All the votes against the bill were Democratic.

Board of Arbitration—Passed the house on April 3, 1886, with thirty votes against bill, all being Democratic.

Hours of Labor, Letter Carriers—Law limiting letter carriers to eight hours a day. Passed in the house without division.

Department of Labor—Passed the house April 10, 1888. Passed the senate May 23, 1888. All votes cast against the bill were Democratic.

Alien Contract Labor—Passed the house during the Fifty-first congress without division Aug. 20, 1890. Passed without division Aug. 20, 1890. Passed the senate with verbal amendments Sept. 27, 1890.

Board of Arbitration—Passed the house on April 3, 1886, with thirty votes against bill, all being Democratic.

Prohibited—Passed the house March, 1867. Passed the senate Feb. 28, 1867. All the votes against the bill were Democratic.

Board of Arbitration—Passed the house on April 3, 1886, with thirty votes against bill, all being Democratic.

Hours of Labor, Letter Carriers—Law limiting letter carriers to eight hours a day. Passed in the house without division.

Department of Labor—Passed the house April 10, 1888. Passed the senate May 23, 1888. All votes cast against the bill were Democratic.

Alien Contract Labor—Passed the house during the Fifty-first congress without division Aug. 20, 1890. Passed without division Aug. 20, 1890. Passed the senate with verbal amendments Sept. 27, 1890.

Board of Arbitration—Passed the house on April 3, 1886, with thirty votes against bill, all being Democratic.

Prohibited—Passed the house March, 1867. Passed the senate Feb. 28, 1867. All the votes against the bill were Democratic.

Board of Arbitration—Passed the house on April 3, 1886, with thirty votes against bill, all being Democratic.

Hours of Labor, Letter Carriers—Law limiting letter carriers to eight hours a day. Passed in the house without division.

Department of Labor—Passed the house April 10, 1888. Passed the senate May 23, 1888. All votes cast against the bill were Democratic.

Alien Contract Labor—Passed the house during the Fifty-first congress without division Aug. 20, 1890. Passed without division Aug. 20, 1890. Passed the senate with verbal amendments Sept. 27, 1890.

Board of Arbitration—Passed the house on April 3, 1886, with thirty votes against bill, all being Democratic.

Prohibited—Passed the house March, 1867. Passed the senate Feb. 28, 1867. All the votes against the bill were Democratic.

Board of Arbitration—Passed the house on April 3, 1886, with thirty votes against bill, all being Democratic.

Hours of Labor, Letter Carriers—Law limiting letter carriers to eight hours a day. Passed in the house without division.

Department of Labor—Passed the house April 10, 1888. Passed the senate May 23, 1888. All votes cast against the bill were Democratic.

Alien Contract Labor—Passed the house during the Fifty-first congress without division Aug. 20, 1890. Passed without division Aug. 20, 1890. Passed the senate with verbal amendments Sept. 27, 1890.

Board of Arbitration—Passed the house on April 3, 1886, with thirty votes against bill, all being Democratic.

Prohibited—Passed the house March, 1867. Passed the senate Feb. 28, 1867. All the votes against the bill were Democratic.

Board of Arbitration—Passed the house on April 3, 1886, with thirty votes against bill, all being Democratic.

Hours of Labor, Letter Carriers—Law limiting letter carriers to eight hours a day. Passed in the house without division.

Department of Labor—Passed the house April 10, 1888. Passed the senate May 23, 1888. All votes cast against the bill were Democratic.

Alien Contract Labor—Passed the house during the Fifty-first congress without division Aug. 20, 1890. Passed without division Aug. 20, 1890. Passed the senate with verbal amendments Sept. 27, 1890.

Board of Arbitration—Passed the house on April 3, 1886, with thirty votes against bill, all being Democratic.

Prohibited—Passed the house March, 1867. Passed the senate Feb. 28, 1867. All the votes against the bill were Democratic.

Board of Arbitration—Passed the house on April 3, 1886, with thirty votes against bill, all being Democratic.

Hours of Labor, Letter Carriers—Law limiting letter carriers to eight hours a day. Passed in the house without division.

Department of Labor—Passed the house April 10, 1888. Passed the senate May 23, 1888. All votes cast against the bill were Democratic.

Alien Contract Labor—Passed the house during the Fifty-first congress without division Aug. 20, 1890. Passed without division Aug. 20, 1890. Passed the senate with verbal amendments Sept. 27, 1890.

Board of Arbitration—Passed the house on April 3, 1886, with thirty votes against bill, all being Democratic.

Prohibited—Passed the house March, 1867. Passed the senate Feb. 28, 1867. All the votes against the bill were Democratic.

Board of Arbitration—Passed the house on April 3, 1886, with thirty votes against bill, all being Democratic.

Hours of Labor, Letter Carriers—Law limiting letter carriers to eight hours a day. Passed in the house without division.

Department of Labor—Passed the house April 10, 1888. Passed the senate May 23, 1888. All votes