

to yield to me to offer an amendment to make the fee for engaging a crew fifty cents each and for discharging twenty-five cents each, and also to offer some other amendments.

Mr. RANDALL. O no; let us vote on the bill.

Mr. WARD. I cannot yield for an amendment.

The previous question was seconded and the main question ordered; and under the operation thereof the bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

JAMES CALER.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the papers in the case of James Caler, and a report thereon by the Engineer Department; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted Mr. McDILL till next Monday on account of important business; to Mr. DOBBINS for four days on account of important business; to Mr. TURNEY for four days; and to Mr. BANKS for one week.

STEAMSHIP SERVICE BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND BRAZIL.

Mr. ELLIS, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 3630) to authorize the establishment of ocean mail-steamship service between the United States and the Empire of Brazil; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC GROUNDS IN CHICAGO.

Mr. HARRISON, by unanimous consent, reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, as a substitute for House bill No. 2850, a bill (H. R. No. 3631) to confirm to the city of Chicago, Illinois, the title to certain public lands; which was read a first and second time, recommitted, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. HARRISON. I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which this bill has been recommitted.

CURRENCY.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania, by unanimous consent, reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, as a substitute for House bill No. 3532, a bill (H. R. No. 3632) amendatory of the act entitled "An act fixing the amount of United States notes, providing for a redistribution of national-bank currency, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1874; which was read a first and second time, recommitted, and ordered to be printed.

MILITARY WAGON-ROAD IN TERRITORIES.

Mr. JOHN REILLY, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back, with a recommendation that it pass, the bill (H. R. No. 180) for the location and construction of a military wagon-road from Green River City, Wyoming Territory, to the Yellowstone National Park and to Fort Ellis, Montana Territory; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. JOHN REILLY also, from the same committee, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. No. 480) for the relief of Patrick J. O'Rourke; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

He also, by unanimous consent, from the same committee, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. No. 1769) for the relief of George A. Miller; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

He also, from the same committee, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. No. 2369) for the relief of John McCormick, late first lieutenant of volunteers, United States Army; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. PARSONS, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 3633) to amend chapter 5 of title 15 of the Revised Statutes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE.

Mr. EDEN, by unanimous consent, moved that the Committee on War Claims be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 3538) for the relief of Joseph Hartman, and moved that the same be referred to the Committee of Claims.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDEN also, by unanimous consent, moved that the Committee on War Claims be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 3539) granting a pension to Margaret Cahill, widow of James Cahill, of United States Cavalry, and moved that the same be referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDEN also, by unanimous consent, moved that the Committee on War Claims be discharged from the further consideration of the petition of John C. Hawley, and that the same be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SINGLETON, by unanimous consent, moved that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from the further consideration of the memorial of H. B. Rolfe, relating to an appropriation for the extradition of William Johnson, and that the same be referred to the Committee of Accounts.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. METCALFE, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures on the Public Buildings be increased by the addition of two members, to be appointed by the Speaker.

GEORGE A. ARMES.

Mr. GLOVER, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported, as a substitute for House bill No. 906, a bill (H. R. No. 3634) to authorize the restoration of George A. Armes to the rank of captain; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

RECONSIDERATION OF REFERENCES.

Mr. RANDALL. I move to reconsider the votes by which these various bills, &c., have been referred and recommitted; and also move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

OLD DOMINION STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

Mr. DUNNELL, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back, with a favorable recommendation, the bill (H. R. No. 3198) for the relief of the Old Dominion Steamship Company; and it was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

CLAIM OF WILLIAM WEBSTER IN NEW ZEALAND.

Mr. THOMPSON, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was read, considered, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be directed, if not inconsistent with the interests of the public service, to furnish the House copies of the correspondence between the State Department and the government of Great Britain in relation to the sequestration of the lands and property in New Zealand claimed by William Webster, an American citizen, by purchase of the native chiefs of that country before its cession to and occupation by the British government.

Mr. MACDOUGALL. I move that the House adjourn, but yield for a moment to the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. BAKER.]

Mr. BAKER, of Indiana. I ask unanimous consent to offer a resolution of inquiry asking information from the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. HOLMAN. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order is the motion to adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at five o'clock and fifteen minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following memorials, petitions, and other papers were presented at the Clerk's desk under the rule, and referred as stated:

By Mr. BURCHARD, of Illinois: The petition of citizens of Washington City, to have refunded to them taxes paid for the construction of a pavement on I street, Washington City, they having twice paid for said work, to the Committee for the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DOUGLAS: The petition of J. D. Gressit, for compensation for property destroyed by United States troops in 1863, to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELLIS: The petition of A. L. H. Crenshaw, for compensation for property taken by the United States authorities, to the same committee.

By Mr. FINLEY: The petition of John Van Riswick and others, for the improvement of the channel of the Potomac, to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PIPER: The petition of Calhoun Benham, for compensation for professional services rendered relative to the marine hospital at San Francisco, California, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAVAGE: Papers relating to the case of T. Worthington, to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. WALKER, of New York: The petition of Arcalous Wyckoff, for an extension of a patent for an improved boring-machine, to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. WALLACE, of Pennsylvania: Petitions for the acknowledgment of God and Christianity in the Constitution of the United States, signed by 4,202 citizens of Pennsylvania, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLACE, of South Carolina: The petition of J. L. Young, for compensation for carrying the mail over the Union and Spartanburgh Railroad, South Carolina, in 1860 and 1861, to the Committee of Claims.

IN SENATE.

FRIDAY, June 2, 1876.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. BYRON SUNDERLAND, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CONKLING presented the petition of Acalous Wyckoff, of Elmira, New York, praying for the passage of a law authorizing the Commissioner of Patents to hear and determine his application for an extension of his letters-patent for an improved boring-machine; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. ROBERTSON presented two memorials of citizens of South Carolina, remonstrating against the ratification of that portion of the treaty with the Hawaiian government admitting the importation of rice into the United States free of duty; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

WILLIAM H. NESSLE.

Mr. SHERMAN. Upon the recommendation of the Committee on Claims, the bill (H. R. No. 37) for the relief of William H. Nessle was indefinitely postponed the other day. I have papers relating to the claim which I will furnish to the committee. These additional papers cover the point of objection made by the committee, I am told. I move that the action of the Senate indefinitely postponing the bill be reconsidered, and that it be recommitted to the Committee on Claims with the additional papers.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WRIGHT, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the petition of Michael Mayers, of Sebastian, Arkansas, praying compensation for drugs and medicines furnished the Army of the United States during the late war, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and ordered to be printed.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the petition of John S. Logan and W. L. Shadwick, of Missouri, asking for the payment of the sum of \$1,000 advanced by the Western Bank of Missouri for the use and benefit of United States troops under the command of Colonel John Edwards in 1861, of which claim they show that they are the owners, submitted a report thereon, accompanied by a bill (S. No. 890) for the relief of John S. Logan and W. L. Shadwick.

The bill was read and passed to the second reading, and the report was ordered to be printed.

FOURTH UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUIT.

Mr. THURMAN. The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 769) to alter and appoint the times for holding the circuit court of the United States for the fourth judicial circuit, and for other purposes, have instructed me to report it back with two amendments, and to ask for its immediate consideration, there being reasons stated in the letter of the judge of that circuit to us to show the necessity for passing this bill immediately. Indeed it should have been acted on before this. It can occupy no time. All the Senators from the States composing that circuit are in favor of the bill and all the judges within the circuit. I ask that it may be put upon its passage.

By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides that a term of the circuit court for the district of South Carolina shall be held at Charleston on the first Monday in April, and in Columbia on the first Monday in November in each year; and, so far as the circuit court is concerned, the State of South Carolina shall constitute but one district.

A term of the circuit court for the eastern district of North Carolina shall be held at Raleigh on the third Monday in April and November in each year.

A term of the circuit court for the western district of North Carolina shall be held at Greensborough on the first Monday of May and the second Monday of December in each year.

A term of the circuit court for the eastern district of Virginia shall be held at Richmond on the last Monday in May and the first Monday in January in each year.

A term of the circuit court for the western district of Virginia shall be held at Lynchburgh on the third Monday in January in each year, and at such places and times as the district court is now required to be held in that district.

A term of the circuit court for the district of West Virginia shall be held at Parkersburgh on the first Monday in February in each year.

A term of the circuit court for the district of Maryland shall be held at Baltimore on the first Monday in June and the first Monday in October in each year.

All cases now pending in the circuit courts for these districts shall stand for trial at the term next ensuing after the passage of the act.

The first amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was to insert after the enacting clause the following:

That instead of the regular terms now provided for by law the circuit court of the United States for the fourth judicial circuit shall be held as follows.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert at the end of the sixth section the following:

But the term of the circuit court for said district to be held at Parkersburgh on the first Monday of August, 1876, shall be held at that time.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PATTERSON asked, and by unanimous consent obtained, leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 891) for the relief of Robert Small; which was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (by request) asked, and by unanimous consent obtained, leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 892) to encourage and promote telegraphic communication between America and Asia; which was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin, it was

Ordered, That W. H. Dempsey have leave to withdraw his petition and papers from the files of the Senate.

PUBLICATION OF DISTRICT TAX-LIST.

Mr. EATON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, directed to furnish the Senate with a copy of the contract entered into with the National Republican newspaper for the publication of the list of delinquent tax-payers for the present year and inform the Senate whether the collector of taxes of said District has charged delinquent tax-payers for the publication of such list in excess of the price paid said newspaper; and, if so, by what authority the same has been done.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CHRISTIANCY and Mr. HOWE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them to the bill (H. R. No. 2571) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes; which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

E. D. FRANZ.

Mr. WRIGHT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 339) for the relief of E. D. Franz. I will state that if the Senate will consider this bill I shall move to take up the next bill on the Calendar also, as they both stand upon precisely the same facts. There is no trouble about either of them; they take no money out of the Treasury, but only provide for the issuing of a warrant in place of one that has been lost.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to E. D. Franz \$2,019.82, in lieu of check numbered 2510, drawn on the United States assistant treasurer at San Francisco, California, payable to the order of one Daniel Hazard, and indorsed by Hazard to L. & H. Huning, and by L. & H. Huning to E. D. Franz, the check being signed by J. J. Dana, major and quartermaster United States Army, which check, it is claimed, was lost on being sent by L. & H. Huning to E. D. Franz, and was never received by him. But before the payment thus authorized Franz shall execute a bond of indemnity to the United States, with sufficient sureties, against the claim of the payee in the draft, or the claim of any person in possession of or claiming the same, and also to fully indemnify the United States against all loss and damages in the premises.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to insert after the word "authorized," in line 15, the words:

The Secretary of the Treasury shall be satisfied that said check has not been paid, and further that.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

LOUIS ROSENBAUM.

Mr. WRIGHT. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 341) for the relief of Louis Rosenbaum.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Louis Rosenbaum \$1,424.37, in lieu of check numbered A 27018, on the assistant treasurer of the United States at New York, dated the 5th of January, 1874, payable to the order of Rosenbaum, and signed by M. P. Small, brevet brigadier-general and commissary of subsistence; which check, it is claimed, has been lost, and was never received by Rosenbaum. But before the payment thus authorized, Rosenbaum shall execute a bond of indemnity to the United States, with sufficient sureties, against the claim of the payee in the draft, or the claim of any person or persons in possession of or claiming the same, and also to fully indemnify the United States against all loss and damages in the premises.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, in line 14 after the word "authorized" to insert:

The Secretary of the Treasury shall be satisfied that said check has not been paid, and further that.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

NEVILLE ISLAND CAUSEWAY.

Mr. BAYARD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill No. 1400.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. No. 1400) authorizing the residents and property-owners of Neville Township, county of Allegheny, and State of Pennsylvania, to close the channel of the Ohio River on the south side of Neville Island by the construction of an embankment or causeway from the head of said island to the southern shore of said river. It provides that the Government of the United States shall not be liable for any expenses incurred in the performance of the work or by reason thereof.

Mr. SHERMAN. Where is this?

Mr. BAYARD. This is a small island in the river Ohio upon the border of the county of Allegheny, in the State of Pennsylvania. The owners of the island are residents of the State of Pennsylvania, and are separated from their county and State by a branch of the river that runs between the mainland and the island. Upon their petition that they might be allowed to have access to the mainland of their State and county by means of a causeway thrown across this branch, the matter was referred to the Chief of Engineers, General Humphreys. He in turn committed it to Colonel Merrill, the engineer in charge, who has reported that this work will be no disadvantage whatever to travel upon the Ohio River, but will be an enormous convenience to the parties owning this small island. It is a small branch of the river, and this causeway will not in any way affect the navigation of the Ohio.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection to the bill if it does not interfere with the navigation of the river.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIMS OF SOUTHERN RAILROADS.

Mr. GORDON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. No. 177) to authorize the Secretary of War to adjust and settle claims of the State of Georgia against the Government on account of the Western and Atlantic Railroad.

Mr. INGALLS. Before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the bill I would ask the Senator from Georgia if this is the bill upon which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] requested information from the Secretary of War; and if so, whether that information has been received and laid before the Senate?

Mr. GORDON. Yes, sir; and the report has been here for nearly a month, I think.

Mr. INGALLS. Has it been printed?

Mr. GORDON. It has been in print since the 4th of May.

Mr. SHERMAN rose.

Mr. GORDON. If the Senator from Ohio will allow me one moment; it will be remembered that I gave way time and again to allow abundant time for this information, and I trust that now the bill will receive consideration.

Mr. SHERMAN. I was about to submit to the Senator from Georgia whether it would not be right to wait until the Senator from Vermont returns? It was announced that he would be absent two or three days. I am informed that he is in New York. Perhaps the time has already expired when his return was expected. I have no knowledge of the contents of the bill; but I think as the Senator from Vermont gave it attention we ought at least to wait until he returns.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SHERMAN. I object until the Senator from Vermont returns.

Mr. GORDON. I will only say that while I think some consideration is due me in the matter, I also recognize the position taken by the Senator from Ohio, and I am perfectly willing that the bill should lie over, provided it can be understood by the Senate that at the very earliest moment I shall have it considered. I do not want to press the bill in the absence of the Senator from Vermont; but I can see no good reason, I must confess, for delay, as the whole information is here and everything connected with the bill, both the report of the Secretary of War and the report of the Quartermaster-General.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Georgia defers his motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

PORT OF APPRAISAL AT SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA.

Mr. McMILLAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. No. 413) establishing the port of Saint Paul, Minnesota, as a port of appraisal.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to the consideration of the bill. It provides that the provisions contained in, and the privileges accorded by, sections

2990, 2991, 2992, 2993, 2994, 2995, 2996, and 2997 of the Revised Statutes shall be extended to, and held to include, the port of Saint Paul in the collection district of Minnesota; and that the appraiser at the port of Saint Paul shall receive the same amount of salary that the deputy collector of that port now receives.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIEUTENANT JAMES B. SINCLAIR.

Mr. CLAYTON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 1071) for the relief of Lieutenant James B. Sinclair, United States Army.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. By it the President is directed to restore James B. Sinclair, first lieutenant United States Army, retired, to the rank of captain of infantry, as held by him December 31, 1870, and to place his name upon the retired-list of the Army as of the rank he held at that date.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment in line 4, to strike out the word "directed" and insert the word "authorized."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

JOHN T. KING AND L. B. CUTLER.

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont. I move to take up the bill (S. No. 872) for the relief of the family of the late John T. King and of L. B. Cutler.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was read the second time and considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The preamble recites that John T. King, lately employed as a carpenter and cabinet-maker about the Capitol, while in the discharge of his duties, was killed by an explosion of gas in the closet under the eastern stairway of the Senate, leaving a wife, three children, two grandchildren, and a mother-in-law without any means of support; and that L. B. Cutler, principal assistant in the folding-room of the Senate, was so injured, at the same time and under the same circumstances, as to be disabled for life, having a wife without means of support, and a mother to whose support he has partly contributed. The bill therefore appropriates the sum of \$3,000 for the aid and support of the family of the late John T. King, and the further sum of \$3,000 for the aid and support of L. B. Cutler, to be paid to the Secretary of the Interior in trust for the above-mentioned purposes, who may, at his discretion, pay the same to the respective parties in annual installments, or all in one payment, or invest the same for their benefit, as he may think most expedient. And a further sum equal to the amount of the previous regular compensation of King and Cutler from the 19th of May to the 30th of June, inclusive, is appropriated, to be expended immediately by the Secretary of the Interior in the manner before stated.

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont. Mr. King was about fifty years of age, and a carpenter and cabinet-maker of the first class. He has left a family of four children, three of whom were dependent upon him for support, and two grandchildren and a mother-in-law, seven in all. The other party, chief assistant in the folding-room, is L. B. Cutler, who is about forty years of age, with a wife and no children, but a mother who has partly been dependent upon him. He is very much disabled; I understand will be so for life; that is, his hands will be bent up so that it will be impossible for him to perform manual labor of any sort.

Under the circumstances the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, by which the resolution directing them to consider and report, by bill or otherwise, upon this subject has been considered, concluded, as there were so many dependent parties interested, that it would be better to appropriate a specific sum and leave it in trust in the hands of some proper person to be distributed, either in purchasing a home, or paid out for the use and benefit of the family in annual installments as it might seem best, or that it might be invested in United States funds, so as to allow them to have an annual installment for their use and benefit, as the Secretary of the Interior should deem proper.

While I am up I desire to say that the accident was not perhaps the fault of these men who were engaged at the time in this closet, and certainly was not the fault of the engineer in charge of the Senate gas-fixtures. It is supposed to have been caused by some person who left the room with the burner partly open, which permitted the upper portion of the closet to be filled with gas, and when the proper explosive mixture had been made of the gas and air, upon lighting the gas it exploded. That it arose from this cause is quite evident, because there has been no leakage there of the gas-pipes since, and all that has been done has been to take off the bracket. It is supposed that some party using the closet the day before or early that morning, in turning off the gas turned it too far or left it burning, and the closing of the door extinguished the flame, and afterward there was an escape of gas, so that when the burner came to be lighted again it caused the explosion.

I think under the circumstances, considering that these men left

their families entirely destitute, there will be no hesitation on the part of the Senate to make this appropriation.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont. I move that the words "use and" be inserted in the eleventh line before "benefit;" so as to read "for their use and benefit."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed unanimously.

JUDSON S. POST.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask for the present consideration of Senate bill No. 770, for the relief of Judson S. Post, of Missouri, which was reported favorably from the Committee on Claims, and is for a very just claim.

There being no objection, the bill (S. No. 770) for the relief of Judson S. Post, of Missouri, late disbursing officer of the United States Navy, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It is a direction to the Secretary of the Treasury to refund to Judson S. Post, late a disbursing officer of the United States Navy, \$202.59, being the amount of interest on a principal amounting to \$450.24, and which latter amount was a portion of \$784.14, claimed to have been due from him to the United States, and paid by him upon the final settlement of his accounts as a disbursing officer of the United States Navy; and upon which sum of \$450.24 he also paid interest to the United States, amounting to \$202.59.

The committee proposed to amend the bill in line 21 by striking out the word "be" and inserting "he."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. I call for the reading of the report.

Mr. COCKRELL. I can state in a moment all there is in the report. Judson S. Post was a paymaster; and after he resigned and left the service, a claim was presented against him by the Treasury Department. Suits were threatened, and he paid the amount claimed with interest, not having his accounts to refer to. When he got his accounts, he went to the Treasury Department, made a settlement, and they found that he had already paid that amount which they had claimed. They paid him back the principal which he had paid, but the interest which he had paid on that was covered into the Treasury, and it takes an act of Congress to get it out. There is a letter of the Secretary of the Treasury which explains the matter fully.

Mr. SHERMAN. When a man pays over money voluntarily under the threat of a lawsuit, he ought not under the common principles of law to be paid at all, because the presumption of the law is that he would not pay unless it was due; and the threat of a lawsuit is not a legal compulsion. That is not either the act of God or of a public enemy that would justify him in paying over money illegally; and certainly we ought not to pay interest on that interest.

Mr. COCKRELL. He is not asking for interest on interest; he is only asking for the interest which he paid on what the Government claimed, and which he did not owe; he paid interest to the Government, and asks it back.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to hear the report of the committee; it seems to me we are setting a dangerous example.

The Chief Clerk read the following report, submitted by Mr. CAPERTON from the Committee on Claims on the 26th of April last:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred, with accompanying papers, the bill (S. No. 770) for the relief of Judson S. Post, late disbursing officer of the United States Navy, having had the same under consideration, submit the following report:

It appears from the papers in the case that on the final settlement of the accounts of claimant, as disbursing officer of the United States Navy, he was charged with, and compelled to pay, the sum of \$74.14 as principal and \$32.84 as interest on the same from the 8th of April, 1868, at the rate of 6 per cent. per annum.

On subsequent investigation it was found by the Department that of this principal sum of \$74.14, \$450.24 had been wrongfully charged against claimant, and that amount was refunded to him; but his application for repayment of the interest already paid into the Treasury by claimant, amounting to \$202.59, was rejected, for the reason that said interest had been covered into the Treasury, and could not be refunded except by special act of Congress.

It would seem that under this state of facts claimant is clearly entitled to have this interest refunded to him, and the committee therefore recommend the passage of this bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILBUR F. M'DANIELS.

Mr. SHERMAN. I offer the following resolution, which I think will meet the general acceptance of the Senate:

Resolved, That there be paid out of the contingent fund to Wilbur F. McDaniel, a page of the Senate, seriously hurt while in the employ of the Senate, the amount of his pay during the residue of this session.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to unanimously.

ADJUSTMENT OF ACCOUNTS.

Mr. BOUTWELL. I move to proceed to consider Senate bill No. 825.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. No. 825) to provide for the more speedy adjustment of the accounts of the Treasurer of the United States was read the second time, and considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the proper accounting officers of the Treasury,

upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, to cause such settlements to be made as may be necessary from time to time for the proper and speedy adjustment of the accounts of the Treasurer of the United States and of United States disbursing officers, agents, and clerks, crediting any of these parties from the appropriation for "losses by default," which is hereby created, with the amount or amounts of any deficiency which may have arisen in their respective accounts from the failure of any assistant treasurer, designated or national-bank depository of the United States to pay over, as required by law, the amount of public moneys deposited therewith for safe-keeping and disbursement, and charging such amount or amounts to the defaulting assistant treasurer, designated or national-bank depository on account of the appropriation. All payments made by such defaulting parties, and all sums recovered from them or their sureties on this account, are to be paid into the Treasury and carried by warrant to the respective credits of the parties defaulting and to the credit of the appropriation hereby created.

Mr. BOUTWELL. I move to amend in the tenth line by inserting the word "postmasters" after "disbursing officers."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

F. M. BLOUNT.

Mr. LOGAN. I move to take up House bill No. 915.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H. R. No. 915) for the relief of F. M. Blount, of Chicago, Illinois, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides for the payment to F. M. Blount, a clerk in the office of the assistant treasurer of the United States at Chicago, Illinois, of \$500, to re-imburse him for a like sum paid by him into the Treasury of the United States out of his own private means, and so paid by him to make good a loss to the Treasury caused by his having taken, in the discharge of his duties as such clerk, a counterfeit \$500 United States Treasury note.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NOTARIES PUBLIC.

Mr. CONKLING. I ask the Senate to consider House bill No. 1803 in reference to notaries public.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. No. 1803) to provide for the appointment of commissioners for taking affidavits, and so forth, for the courts of the United States, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on the Judiciary proposed to amend the bill by striking out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof inserting:

That notaries public of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized to take depositions and do all other acts in relation to taking testimony to be used in the courts of the United States, take acknowledgments and affidavits, in the same manner and with the same effect as commissioners of the United States circuit court may now lawfully take or do.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CONKLING, the title was amended so as to read: A bill to authorize notaries public to take affidavits and the like in the courts of the United States.

SWAMP AND OVERFLOWED LANDS IN FLORIDA.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. I move for the consideration of Senate bill No. 49.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. No. 49) to confirm to the State of Florida the swamp and overflowed lands granted under the act of September 28, 1850, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Public Lands reported the bill, with an amendment to strike out the second and third sections, as follows:

SEC. 2. That all lands in the State of Florida which have been returned as impracticable to survey by reason of being swamp or overflowed shall be certified to said State as swamp and overflowed lands by the Commissioner of the General Land Office: *Provided, however*, That said Commissioner may require the governor of said State to furnish additional evidence with respect to the character of said lands before certifying the same as aforesaid.

SEC. 3. That in such townships in the State of Florida as are notoriously swamp or overflowed, or where satisfactory evidence shall be furnished to the Commissioner of the General Land Office that such townships are entirely swamp and overflowed, it shall not be necessary to subdivide such townships, but to run only the exterior lines; and where large quantities of land are notoriously swamp or overflowed, or are shown to be such by satisfactory evidence as aforesaid, the Commissioner may direct the surveyor-general to make segregation surveys thereof, running only the exterior lines, upon application to the surveyor-general by the governor of said State. And when surveys are made as herein authorized, the surveyor-general shall report the same, with maps thereof, to the General Land Office, representing and describing what land was swamp and overflowed according to the best evidence he can obtain. And it shall be the duty of the Commissioner of the General Land Office to certify over to the State of Florida, as swamp and overflowed, all the lands represented as such upon the maps or in the returns of the surveyor-general, or which shall be determined to be such upon the testimony taken before the surveyor-general, the decision of the surveyor-general thereon to be subject to the approval of the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

So as to leave the first section as follows:

That the Commissioner of the General Land Office is hereby authorized and required to receive and examine the selections of swamp lands in the State of Florida heretofore presented to the surveyor-general of said State, and allow or disallow said selections, according to the provisions of the act of Congress approved September 28, 1850, entitled "An act to enable the State of Arkansas and other States to reclaim the swamp lands within their limits," without prejudice to legal entries or the rights of *bona fide* settlers under the homestead laws of the United States prior to the date of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WRIGHT. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida what is the necessity for this special legislation? Why did not the State obtain these lands under prior legislation? Was it because of any fault on the part of the State officers or because of fault on the part of the officers here? What is the occasion of the passage of this bill?

Mr. JONES, of Florida. I regret that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. McDONALD] who reported this bill is not now in his seat, but I think I can give the Senator the information desired.

Owing to the action of the Interior Department this bill is deemed necessary. Under the act of 1850 the State of Florida became entitled to the swamp and overflowed lands in that State. It was made the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to certify those lands to the State. In 1860 an act was passed limiting the period for making the selections to two years or the following Legislature in each State after the passage of the act. In the mean time the war broke out; there was no Legislature. The selections had all been made, but the Secretary of the Interior would not receive them because this limitation had expired. The matter was investigated by the Committee on Public Lands and this bill reported.

I think the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the Railroad Company *vs.* Smith covers the point; but the Land Office has taken a different view of it, and has refused to accept these lands unless an act of this kind be passed.

Mr. WRIGHT. May I inquire of the Senator whether this matter has been referred to the Land Department, and whether there is any communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office on the subject approving the proposed legislation?

Mr. JONES, of Florida. I see that the Senator who reported the bill is not now in his seat, and I do not know what communication he may have had with that Department; but I know that that Department has persistently refused to certify those lands in accordance with the law of 1850 and the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the Railroad Company *vs.* Smith, in which they held that the title to the lands vested in the State by the act and could not be divested or lost by any omission or act of the Secretary of the Interior. It is merely to make the Secretary of the Interior accept those lists that this bill is asked to be passed.

Mr. WRIGHT. In view of the importance of this measure, and as the Senator from Indiana is not present, I should like to make some inquiry into the question as to what action has been taken by the Department. Will the Senator have any objection to let the bill be passed over for the present?

Mr. JONES, of Florida. Certainly not.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over if there be no objection.

JOSEPH WILSON.

Mr. McCREERY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill No. 2836.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H. R. No. 2836) for the relief of Joseph Wilson, of Bourbon County, Kentucky, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides for paying to Joseph Wilson, of Bourbon County, Kentucky, \$15,300, in full compensation for ninety mules captured from him by rebels at Beltsville, Maryland, in the year 1864, which mules were presented at the picket-lines of the defenses around Washington in part fulfillment of a contract to deliver in that city five hundred mules.

Mr. INGALLS. Is there a report in that case?

Mr. COCKRELL. The House report was adopted by the Senate Committee on Claims.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the following report, submitted by Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Claims, on the 12th of June, 1874:

The Committee on Claims, to whom were referred the papers and petition of Joseph Wilson, of Kentucky, asking to have his contract for delivery of mules in 1864 referred to the Court of Claims, report as follows:

On the 2d of July, 1864, Joseph Wilson, of Paris, Kentucky, made a contract, by order of Major-General Meigs, with General D. H. Rucker, for the delivery of five hundred mules of the usual size, age, &c., and to be inspected by the Government inspectors, at \$17 each; two hundred to be delivered at Washington in five days from date of contract, and three hundred within twenty-five days. The two hundred were delivered and accepted within the five days named in the contract. On July 12, ten days after date of contract, Wilson's men drove to the picket-lines of United States troops near Bladensburg one hundred and seventy mules. Owing to the rebels being in force near and around Washington, Secretary Stanton had caused an order to be given allowing no one to pass in or out of the Federal lines. After some delay and effort to get the mules within the United States lines, they were driven back a short distance and put into a field. Two of the men in charge staid with the mules. One of the men attempted to get into the city but failed to do so that day. Next morning, by taking the railroad-cars, he did get in, and after some delay succeeded in getting an order to bring in the mules; but before his return the rebels had captured and driven off the one hundred and seventy mules. Wilson, the contractor and owner, was not with the mules at the time they were refused entrance into Washington or when captured, but came the next day, when he and his men followed the route of the captured mules until they crossed into

Virginia, succeeded in picking up eighty of the one hundred and seventy mules, leaving ninety lost or taken. There were also five horses taken, but for them Wilson clearly has no claim whatever against the Government, as he had no contract to deliver horses.

The facts as to coming to pickets with mules and being refused entrance into Washington; the capture of the mules by the rebels, and the following to recover mules; also the number taken and regained, are sworn to by Elias J. Kennedy and Thomas Dowden; also, circumstances show the facts. There is no doubt of the contract having been made by Wilson, and that the one hundred and seventy mules would have been delivered in Washington, July 12, but for the order not to let anybody pass in or out.

The claim has been in Congress or the Quartermaster's Department until this Congress. Wilson asks to have his claim under contract referred to the Court of Claims, to be tried by the rules of said court. His excuse for not going to the court within the six years allowed by law is that his claim was before Congress, and he expected it to be allowed there, and did not know he could go to the Court of Claims until it was too late. He now prays that his claim be referred to Court of Claims, to be acted upon by that court.

The committee recommend that the claim be referred to the Court of Claims, to be passed upon by them, and report a bill accordingly.

Mr. CONKLING. I did not hear the whole of the report. May I inquire if there is any evidence that this claimant asked for a guard, or in any way put the authorities in condition to furnish him a guard for any of this property?

Mr. SHERMAN. Or notified anybody that these were mules belonging to the Government—the commandant, or anybody else?

Mr. INGALLS. It is very evident that that cannot be the report referred to by the Senator from Missouri, because the bill provides for the payment of a certain amount of money out of the Treasury, whereas the report just read recommends that the claim be referred to the Court of Claims for consideration.

Mr. COCKRELL. I will state to the Senator from Kansas that that is not the report which was adopted by the Committee on Claims and submitted. I have sent for it. That report is in the hands of the printer, and it has been sent for. It is a very full report, and I think explains the objections made by the Senator from New York and the Senator from Ohio. I think if that report were here and read, it would be satisfactory. It covers those points, I think, definitely.

Mr. CONKLING. Would it not be better to let the bill lie until we have the report? I do not object at all; but I ask the Senator whether it would not be better?

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from Kentucky called up the bill.

Mr. McCREERY. I think it very likely the report will be here in the course of a few minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Time is passing.

Mr. McMILLAN. If the Senator will yield to me, I will move to proceed to the consideration of another bill, which will not require discussion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The morning hour has expired.

Mr. McMILLAN. I ask for the consideration of Senate bill No. 369.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. If it is likely to occupy time, I cannot consent.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER NAVIGATION.

Mr. McMILLAN. I think there will be no discussion whatever on the bill and it will pass without delay. It is a matter which has received the consideration of the Committee on Commerce, and the report is unanimous. It is a bill to exempt vessels engaged in the Mississippi navigation from entry and clearance. It is done with the full concurrence and knowledge of the Secretary of the Treasury, between whom and myself last fall there was some correspondence in regard to the matter, and it has had full consideration there.

There being no objection, the bill (S. No. 369) to exempt all vessels engaged in the navigation of the Mississippi River and its tributaries above the port of New Orleans from entries and clearances, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Commerce proposed to amend the bill by striking out of line 5 the word "and," and inserting after the words "4352" the words "4353, 4354, 4355, and 4356;" and in line 13, after the word "also," striking out the word "procuring," and inserting "to procure;" so as to make the bill read:

That the provisions of sections 4349, 4350, 4351, 4352, 4353, 4354, 4355, and 4356 of the Revised Statutes, requiring the master of every vessel licensed to carry on the coasting trade, laden in part with foreign merchandise or distilled spirits, to procure a permit from the customs officer of the port at which his vessel was laden, authorizing him to proceed to his port of destination, and also to procure a permit from the port of destination for the unloading of his cargo, shall not be held to include vessels engaged in the navigation of the Mississippi River or tributaries above the port of New Orleans.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

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

A bill (H. R. No. 2935) to promote the efficiency of the Army of the United States, to provide for its gradual reduction, and to consolidate certain of its staff departments, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. No. 3156) to perfect the revision of the Statutes of the United States; and

A joint resolution (H. R. No. 119) authorizing the Secretary of War

to loan to the authorities of Steubenville, Ohio, two pieces of artillery, to be used in celebrating July 4, 1876.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

- A bill (S. No. 3) for the relief of Alvis Smith;
- A bill (S. No. 43) granting a pension to Uriah Bundy;
- A bill (S. No. 121) granting a pension to John Pierson;
- A bill (S. No. 165) for the relief of Michael W. Brock, of Meigs County, Tennessee, late a private in Company D, Tenth Tennessee Volunteers;
- A bill (S. No. 545) granting a pension to Abraham Ellis; and
- A bill (S. No. 641) granting a pension to Julia Scroggin.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada, submitted four amendments from the Committee on Contingent Expenses intended to be proposed to the bill (H. R. No. 2571) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes; which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

BILLS BECOME LAWS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. U. S. GRANT, jr., his Secretary, announced that the following bills, having been received by him on the 20th of May last, and not having been returned by him to the Senate, wherein they originated, within ten days, (Sundays excepted,) as prescribed by the Constitution, have become laws without his signature:

An act (S. No. 168) for the relief of the legal representatives of George Schwartz, deceased, late a private in Company F, Fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry; and

An act (S. No. 384) for the relief of Mrs. Eliza Potter, widow of Lorenzo T. Potter, deceased, late of Charleston, South Carolina.

WILLIAM BATTERSBY.

Mr. NORWOOD. I desire to enter a motion to reconsider a report of a committee made the day before yesterday on the bill (S. No. 848) for the relief of William Battersby, on which the Committee on Claims made an adverse report. I enter a motion for reconsideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion will be entered.

PAPERS WITHDRAWN AND REFERRED.

On motion of Mr. STEVENSON, it was

Ordered, That the petition and papers of Britannia W. Kennon, widow of Commodore Beverly Kennon, be taken from the files of the Senate and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bill and joint resolution from the House of Representatives were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (H. R. No. 2935) to promote the efficiency of the Army of the United States, to provide for its gradual reduction, and to consolidate certain of its staff departments, and for other purposes; and

A joint resolution (H. R. No. 119) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the authorities of Steubenville, Ohio, two pieces of artillery to be used in celebrating July 4, 1876.

The bill (H. R. No. 3156) to perfect the Revision of the Statutes of the United States was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will now call up the unfinished business of yesterday, being the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. No. 2571) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. Mr. President, I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate in considering the bill to consider the amendments reported by the committee as the reading progresses. I hope there will be no objection. And contrary to my usage, Mr. President, I feel constrained to make some observations to the Senate touching the character of this bill. The departures from the usages of Congress in making the appropriations for this service, as the bill comes to the Senate, are of such a character as to properly arouse the attention of the Senate.

I wish to draw an obvious distinction on which, perhaps, very much will depend as to the action of the Senate. This bill is in its title "an act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1877." The emphasis which I would make rests on two words, "making appropriations" for the expenses of three departments of the Government, legislative, executive, and judicial.

Mr. President, we are accustomed, I think, to treat the civil service, sometimes called the civil list, as if it were a thing that is and is not, may be, or may not be, according to our fancies, our whims, or our caprices. No greater mistake can possibly take place in regard to the duties that such an apprehension would devolve on the Senate now in considering this appropriation bill. What we want to know

is the service, what it is, what relation it has to the country, and our duty in regard to it. It is our duty to make an appropriation for the civil service; and it is for the civil service as distinguished from the Government. Now, the Government of the United States is a mere abstraction, as provided by the Constitution, independent of the civil service. It is a proposition for a Government without any vitality or force in it independent of the civil service. From this statement it will be seen that our devotion to the civil service must be as our obligation is, precisely what it is to the Government of the United States. Congress is authorized by the Constitution to provide for the civil service. When that civil service is provided it is the hands of the Government of the United States by which all things are done in the name of the Government of the United States; and therefore any one will see that our obligations to it are to maintain it, support it, defend it, provide for it annually as for the Government of the United States.

Then another idea. It is an established service which forces an obligation upon every man in office and out of office to regard it and respect and provide for it. That is the nature of this measure. It is not an act so much to determine what the public service ought to be; it is not a provision to establish the public service. That was established as long ago as 1789, has been revised by sundry statutes from that time down; but it is a matter of solemn fact, a service provided by law; and when we know what it is and are called upon to appropriate for it, the obligation of the law is the rule, and no speculation about what it ought to be and is not is at all admissible on a question of appropriations. Senators will see at a glance that an attempt to determine what the appropriations ought to be on a bill that appropriates for the entire civil service of the country \$20,000,000, to distribute that and undertake here on the floor of the Senate to tell what each man ought to have, would be absurd. Therefore I present this bill to you under the obligations of the law to do precisely what is implied in the title of the bill, to appropriate for the expenses of these Departments of the Government and for the civil service as established by law.

So much by way of preface as to the character of this bill and the obligation that arises from it; and the pertinency of these remarks will appear when I say that the committee have come to the conclusion that these obligations of the law have not been fully met; this duty has not been performed so far as appears by the bill as it comes to the Senate; and I will state to the Senate the particulars in which it has not been done.

In the first place, the bill does not provide for the salaries as established by law.

In the second place, it does not provide for the civil list as established by law, but has greatly reduced it.

In the third place, it does not provide for various substantive divisions or branches of the public service as established by law.

To these three particulars, in the brief words I shall address to the Senate, I desire to invite your attention. It reduces the compensation from 10 to 20 per cent., and that upon what I should call a horizontal rule, applicable to a diverse service which the Senate will see at once would be an impossible thing without danger of great injustice to those connected with the service. It reduces the civil list, by which I mean the numerical force of the Departments, about 22½ per cent., (nearly one-fourth of the entire force,) and it omits all provision for several Bureaus and distinct divisions of the public service; for instance, the Indian Bureau, the Signal Service, the surveyors-general of the Territories, the Bureau of Military Justice, and several other minor and less important divisions.

Now allow me to invite your attention to the question of the salaries. The reduction of the salaries is, as I have said, averaging from 10 to 20 per cent. That applies to a civil list embracing in these Departments over five thousand persons. It applies principally to clerks of the second, third, and fourth classes. These constitute the great body of that force. It does not apply to those under the first class. The salaries of these classes, as the Senate know, are, naming them in the order in which I have named the classes, \$1,400, \$1,600, and \$1,800.

Now, let us consider for a moment the reasons for any reduction of these salaries. They were established in 1853 and 1854, and from that time down to the present they have not been touched. They remain, and have remained from that day to this as established in those years. The supposition on the part of the committee is this, if these salaries were properly established in those times at those rates, are they unreasonable at the present time? The presumption seems to be against it. Then all our information from the Departments is precisely on that line. They are not too high; they are not high enough, it is said in the Departments, and verily believed, to command that kind of talent which the public service really demands.

The committee, therefore, content themselves with the inferences which would be drawn from the fact that these salaries were established in 1853 and 1854, have remained to the present time, the character of the times then, and the fact that they have been sustained all this time, and the additional fact that the expenses of living here in the city of Washington now over the expenses at the time when these salaries were established must be very great; it is said nearly double.

But, Mr. President, in addition to all that, the committee felt that they were not at liberty to exercise any discretion in regard to the

salaries. The committee are acting as an appropriation committee to provide for the salaries and the expenses of the Government as established by the law. They have remained without complaint, except that they were too low, from that time down to the present; and if the committee had been inclined to believe that they were too high, the only thing the committee could do would be to refer that question to the Senate. But under the obligations of the law to appropriate for the expenses as they are found to exist, the committee recommend non-concurrence with the House in all these questions of salaries, and they amended the bill accordingly.

Mr. COCKRELL. When were these salaries fixed did the Senator say?

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. In 1853 and 1854.

Mr. COCKRELL. The majority of them?

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. The large majority of them; the great bulk of them.

Now, Mr. President, I come to the reduction in the civil list; and I will state to the Senate what the reduction has been as the bill comes to the Senate and what it is as reported from the committee of the Senate.

The number in the civil list in the Departments is 5,308, as provided for in this bill. Twenty-two and six-tenths per cent. of that is the reduction, which amounts to 1,203, nearly one-fourth of the entire force. These and other reductions and omissions in the bill would reduce the expenses \$5,739,440.39. The reduction of the civil list, it will be seen, is one-fourth of the entire service. On the face of it, who that is at all acquainted with the necessities which every public man knows have pressed upon Congress since 1867 for reduction and retrenchment, and the reductions that have been made from year to year, believes that a condition of things exists to-day that will admit of reducing the service in these Executive Departments one-fourth? The very statement of the proposition shows that there must be some mistake about it, that it cannot be so, is not so. I say that is the probability.

This bill in the aggregate, as I have said, proposes to reduce the expenses \$5,739,440.39. That is just about one-third of the entire expenditures of the civil service of the country as it has been appropriated for the last four or five years.

The committee of the Senate propose to make a reduction of \$2,130,398, which is just about one-half of the reduction proposed by the House. The Senate committee's reduction of the civil list is 318 as against 1,203 on the part of the House, which is a reduction of between 6 and 7 per cent. of the numerical force. This is a reduction from the estimates of this year of \$2,130,398, reducing the estimated appropriations from \$19,138,678 to \$17,010,876.

For 1874 the amount of appropriations for this service was \$20,758,255.50; for 1875, \$18,734,422.20. The present bill, as I have already stated, amended as the committee propose, is \$17,010,876.

In confirmation of what I observed a few moments ago as to the gradual reduction in this service in the interest of public economy the last few years, whoever examines these bills will find that this reduction has been gradual and uniform through these years. It will be seen that in the year 1875 the appropriations were two millions and more less than for 1874, and that the bill for 1876-'77, as contemplated by the report of your committee, is \$1,700,000 below that of last year. This is shown by the following table:

Statement of amount of legislative bill for 1876; amount recommended by House for 1877; amount recommended by Senate committee for 1877.

| | 1876. | House bill, 1877. | Recommended by Senate committee. | Increase over House bill. |
|---|--------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Compensation and mileage, Senators..... | \$400,000 00 | \$363,000 00 | \$400,000 00 | \$37,000 00 |
| Officers and employes of Senate..... | 146,268 80 | 100,050 00 | 161,682 80 | 61,632 80 |
| Contingent expenses, Senate..... | 143,640 00 | 72,690 00 | 82,618 00 | 9,928 00 |
| Reporting debates, Senate..... | 25,000 00 | 22,500 00 | 25,000 00 | 2,500 00 |
| Capitol police..... | 52,600 00 | 28,600 00 | 48,400 00 | 19,800 00 |
| Compensation and mileage, House of Representatives..... | 1,650,000 00 | 1,459,000 00 | 1,650,000 00 | 191,000 00 |
| Officers and employes of House..... | 227,074 70 | 170,150 00 | 200,243 20 | 39,093 20 |
| Contingent expenses, House..... | 185,385 00 | 122,088 00 | 124,608 00 | 2,520 00 |
| Library of Congress..... | 63,986 00 | 44,850 00 | 50,780 00 | 5,930 00 |
| Public Printer..... | 17,617 60 | | 17,614 00 | 17,614 00 |
| Public Buildings and Grounds..... | 52,328 00 | 32,008 00 | 41,408 00 | 9,400 00 |
| Executive..... | 78,400 00 | 64,446 11 | 76,400 00 | 11,953 89 |
| State Department..... | 246,550 00 | 123,289 00 | 208,370 00 | 85,080 00 |
| official postage-stamps..... | 25,000 00 | 20,000 00 | 20,000 00 | |
| Treasury Department..... | 3,430,336 50 | 2,290,321 50 | 2,982,310 00 | 682,988 50 |
| official postage-stamps..... | 100,000 00 | 80,000 00 | 200,000 00 | 120,000 00 |
| Independent Treasury..... | 445,880 00 | 360,730 00 | 418,240 00 | 45,510 00 |
| Collecting internal revenue..... | 5,051,000 00 | 3,491,000 00 | 4,241,000 00 | 755,000 00 |
| Mints and assay offices..... | 1,220,145 00 | 810,110 00 | 1,199,310 00 | 389,200 00 |
| Territorial governments..... | 351,441 40 | 180,700 00 | 237,820 00 | 45,120 00 |
| War Department..... | 1,081,240 00 | 774,720 00 | 1,033,900 00 | 279,180 00 |
| official postage-stamps..... | 85,669 00 | 70,000 00 | 70,000 00 | |
| Navy Department..... | 141,240 00 | 105,550 00 | 132,940 00 | 27,390 00 |
| official postage-stamps..... | 20,000 00 | 17,000 00 | 17,000 00 | |

Statement of amount of legislative bill for 1876, &c.—Continued.

| | 1876. | House bill, 1877. | Recommended by Senate committee. | Increase over House bill. |
|--|---------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Interior Department, Secretary's office..... | \$161,640 00 | \$103,840 00 | \$127,740 00 | \$23,900 00 |
| official postage-stamps..... | 125,000 00 | 125,000 00 | 125,000 00 | |
| Land Office..... | 300,960 00 | 242,380 00 | 300,960 00 | 58,580 00 |
| Indian Office..... | 77,880 00 | | 75,880 00 | 75,880 00 |
| Pension Office..... | 564,580 00 | 388,920 00 | 565,280 00 | 176,360 00 |
| Patent Office..... | 731,400 00 | 575,620 00 | 671,400 00 | 95,780 00 |
| Bureau of Education..... | 35,570 00 | 18,890 00 | 35,570 00 | 16,680 00 |
| Surveyors-general and clerks..... | 151,300 00 | | 143,000 00 | 143,000 00 |
| Post-Office Department..... | 524,452 00 | 433,070 00 | 550,912 00 | 117,842 00 |
| Department of Agriculture..... | 185,130 00 | 155,860 00 | 179,580 00 | 23,720 00 |
| official postage-stamps..... | 52,000 00 | 4,000 00 | 4,000 00 | |
| United States courts, marshals, attorneys, &c..... | 397,250 00 | 325,500 00 | 391,950 00 | 6,450 00 |
| Court of Claims..... | 35,390 00 | 31,640 00 | 33,340 00 | 1,700 00 |
| to pay judgments of..... | 400,000 00 | | | |
| Department of Justice..... | 138,320 00 | 96,720 00 | 117,020 00 | 20,300 00 |
| official postage-stamps..... | 10,000 00 | 1,000 00 | 5,000 00 | 4,000 00 |
| Total..... | 19,131,674 00 | 13,392,233 61 | 17,000,276 00 | 3,608,042 39 |

Increase recommended to House bill by the committee..... \$3,608,042 39
Decrease, as recommended by committee, from bill for 1875-'76..... 2,131,398 00

Here, Mr. President, the question arises whether we can sustain a lower reduction than is recommended by the committee; and upon this point I desire to say that the committee have taken the utmost pains with a view of ascertaining the lowest point to which the civil list could be reduced numerically so as not to cripple the public service, and to this end we put ourselves in communication with the heads of the Departments, enjoined upon them to make personal investigation into the public service through the Departments, the Bureaus, the divisions, and upon such investigation to present to the committee the figures giving the lowest reduction practicable to be made consistent with the public service.

I submit a table to be published in the RECORD, showing specifically the reduction contemplated:

Number of employes appropriated for for the fiscal year 1875-'76, recommended by House bill and by Senate committee for fiscal year 1876-'77.

| | 1875-'76. | House bill. | Senate committee. |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------|
| Library of Congress..... | 17 | 14 | 17 |
| Capitol police..... | 39 | 28 | 36 |
| State Department..... | 90 | 76 | 104 |
| TREASURY DEPARTMENT. | | | |
| Secretary's Office..... | 357 | 284 | 313 |
| Division of Loans and Currency..... | 127 | 79 | 94 |
| Supervising Architect..... | 18 | 12 | 14 |
| First Comptroller..... | 49 | 39 | 49 |
| Second Comptroller..... | 74 | 48 | 69 |
| Commissioner of Customs..... | 32 | 21 | 32 |
| First Auditor..... | 51 | 36 | 51 |
| Second Auditor..... | 176 | 108 | 163 |
| Third Auditor..... | 173 | 110 | 149 |
| Fourth Auditor..... | 56 | 42 | 54 |
| Fifth Auditor..... | 35 | 26 | 30 |
| Sixth Auditor..... | 233 | 216 | 233 |
| Treasurer..... | 138 | 107 | 116 |
| Division of Loans..... | 217 | 161 | 197 |
| Redeeming National Currency..... | 152 | 114 | 114 |
| Register of the Treasury..... | 55 | 39 | 49 |
| Division of Loans..... | 153 | 105 | 117 |
| Comptroller of the Currency..... | 95 | 65 | 82 |
| Redeeming National Currency..... | 30 | 20 | 20 |
| Commissioner of Internal Revenue..... | 241 | 194 | 217 |
| Light-House Board..... | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Bureau of Statistics..... | 41 | 27 | 32 |
| Bureau of Engraving and Printing..... | 23 | 15 | 15 |
| Total Treasury Department*..... | 2,536 | 1,878 | 2,213 |
| INDEPENDENT TREASURY. | | | |
| Assistant treasurer, New York..... | 82 | 82 | 82 |
| Boston..... | 21 | 21 | 21 |
| San Francisco..... | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Philadelphia..... | 27 | 27 | 27 |
| Baltimore..... | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| Saint Louis..... | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Chicago..... | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Cincinnati..... | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| New Orleans..... | 10 | 9 | 10 |
| Total Independent Treasury..... | 196 | 195 | 196 |

* House reduction, 25 per cent.; Senate reduction, 13 per cent.

Number of employes appropriated for, fiscal year 1875-'76, &c.—Continued.

| | 1875-'76. | House bill. | Senate committee. |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------|
| MINTS AND ASSAY OFFICES. | | | |
| Director of the Mint..... | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Mint at Philadelphia..... | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| San Francisco..... | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Carson..... | 11 | 10 | 11 |
| Denver..... | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| New Orleans..... | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Assay office, New York..... | 14 | 13 | 14 |
| Helena..... | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Boisé City..... | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Charlotte..... | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Total mints and assay offices..... | 72 | 69 | 72 |
| WAR DEPARTMENT. | | | |
| Secretary of War..... | 65 | 56 | 61 |
| Adjutant-General..... | 249 | 173 | 249 |
| Inspector-General..... | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Bureau of Military Justice..... | 10 | 9 | 9 |
| Signal Office..... | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Quartermaster-General..... | 147 | 115 | 137 |
| Commissary-General..... | 30 | 25 | 30 |
| Surgeon-General..... | 169 | 138 | 179 |
| Chief of Ordnance..... | 20 | 16 | 20 |
| Paymaster-General..... | 59 | 39 | 52 |
| Chief of Engineers..... | 22 | 18 | 20 |
| Total War Department..... | 776 | 572 | 762 |
| NAVY DEPARTMENT. | | | |
| Secretary of the Navy..... | 20 | 16 | 20 |
| Bureau Yards and Docks..... | 9 | 8 | 9 |
| Equipment and Recruiting..... | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| Navigation..... | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Ordnance..... | 7 | 6 | 7 |
| Construction and Repair..... | 9 | 7 | 9 |
| Steam Engineering..... | 6 | 4 | 6 |
| Provisions and Clothing..... | 11 | 9 | 11 |
| Medicine and Surgery..... | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Total Navy Department..... | 80 | 66 | 80 |
| INTERIOR DEPARTMENT. | | | |
| Secretary's Office..... | 45 | 40 | 45 |
| Watchmen for building..... | 29 | 19 | 19 |
| Land Office..... | 201 | 167 | 201 |
| Pension Office..... | 365 | 270 | 365 |
| Indian Office..... | 51 | 51 | 51 |
| Patent Office..... | 335 | 294 | 335 |
| Bureau of Education..... | 13 | 11 | 13 |
| Total Interior Department..... | 1,039 | 801 | 1,029 |
| POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT. | | | |
| Post-Office Department..... | 354 | 308 | 374 |
| DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE. | | | |
| Attorney-General's Office..... | 34 | 29 | 32 |
| Solicitor of the Treasury..... | 16 | 13 | 16 |
| Total Department of Justice..... | 50 | 42 | 48 |
| DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE. | | | |
| Department of Agriculture..... | 59 | 56 | 59 |
| Total number of employes *..... | 5,308 | 4,105 | 4,990 |

* Reduction made by House, 22.6 per cent.; reduction made by Senate committee, 6 per cent.

The committee have come to the conclusion, resting on the judgment of the Departments and the information from the Departments, that as low as the public service can go is a reduction of between 6 and 7 per cent., which is a numerical reduction of three hundred and eighteen.

Mr. President, we are now several years from the close of the war, and it is a marvel in the eyes of some people that the public service is still so large as it is; but we ought not to forget that although peace has come, although the armies have disbanded, we are still dealing with the consequences of the war. The incidents of the war are still with us and still felt in these Departments. Now to the end that the Senate may see precisely whether this force is all employed, I have procured tables which I think will tend very strongly to show that the force they have in these Departments is no greater than is needed. Here is a comparative statement of work performed in the several Bureaus of the Treasury Department specified—which I will send to the Chair and would be glad to have go into the RECORD—in these Departments and several Bureaus and Divisions as compared with a year previous to the year 1861.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, (Mr. ANTHONY in the chair.) The Secretary will read the paper.

The Secretary began to read the following table:

Comparative statement of work performed in the several Bureaus of the Treasury Department, below specified, during the years ending June 30, 1860, and June 30, 1875, respectively.

| | 1860. | 1875. |
|---|------------------|--------------------|
| FIRST AUDITOR'S OFFICE. | | |
| Number of accounts for money received..... | 1,985 | 7,065 |
| Amount involved..... | \$157,596,761 36 | \$1,144,320,298 80 |
| Number of accounts for money disbursed..... | 8,334 | 17,994 |
| Amount involved..... | \$125,630,648 78 | \$1,491,427,101 07 |
| Expenses..... | 42,340 00 | 76,780 00 |
| Cost per account..... | 4 10 | 3 06 |
| SECOND AUDITOR'S OFFICE. | | |
| Number of accounts settled..... | 2,174 | 25,347 |
| Amount involved..... | \$9,972,757 31 | \$27,536,257 49 |
| Letters, claims, &c., received..... | 5,042 | 118,602 |
| Letters written..... | 8,003 | 131,321 |
| Number of employes..... | 24 | 176 |
| Expenses..... | \$35,540 | \$245,480 |
| Number of accounts settled to each employé..... | 90 | 144 |
| Number of letters received to each employé..... | 210 | 673 |
| Number of letters written to each employé..... | 333 | 746 |
| Cost per account..... | \$16 34 | \$9 68 |
| THIRD AUDITOR'S OFFICE. | | |
| Number of accounts settled..... | 2,300 | 19,138 |
| Amount involved..... | \$14,501,815 00 | \$53,418,828 50 |
| Number of employes..... | 61 | 173 |
| Expenses..... | \$20,940 00 | \$237,000 00 |
| Average salary of each clerk..... | 1,490 82 | 1,312 13 |
| Average amount settled by each clerk..... | 239,210 00 | 308,779 30 |
| Number of accounts settled by each clerk..... | 39½ | 111 5-9 |
| Average cost per account..... | \$35 00 | \$12 30 |
| FOURTH AUDITOR'S OFFICE. | | |
| Number of accounts adjusted..... | 320 | 1,111 |
| Number of vouchers embraced in same..... | 58,098 | 189,451 |
| Amount involved..... | \$17,442,757 43 | \$42,109,708 61 |
| Number of prize-claims settled..... | 2 | 2,842 |
| Amount of prize-money distributed..... | 346 | \$358,588 39 |
| Number of general claims adjusted..... | 1,552 | 11 5-9 |
| Amount disbursed in above settlements..... | \$74,682 15 | \$243,561 89 |
| Monthly statements from paymasters received and examined..... | | 1,500 |
| Certificates of service furnished Commissioner of Pensions..... | 780 | 340 |
| Number of pay requisitions entered..... | 11,856,201 98 | 26,498,130 39 |
| Amount..... | 115 | 218 |
| Number of refunding requisitions..... | \$326,608 09 | \$4,697,428 00 |
| Amount..... | 1,867 | 1,428 |
| Number of allotments registered..... | 5,252 | 17,333 |
| Number of letters received and registered..... | 5,673 | 21,839 |
| Number of letters written..... | 15 | 45 |
| Number of clerks employed..... | \$27,740 00 | \$78,328 25 |
| Expenses..... | | |
| FIFTH AUDITOR'S OFFICE. | | |
| Number of accounts adjusted..... | 1,347 | 11,697 |
| Number of clerks employed..... | 8 | 33 |
| Expenses..... | \$17,840 00 | \$52,400 00 |
| Cost per settlement..... | 1,324 | 4 43 |
| OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS. | | |
| Receipts..... | \$53,166,728 09 | \$159,117,443 87 |
| Disbursements..... | 6,542 912 67 | 19,726,337 81 |
| Letters written..... | 5,426 | 12,345 |
| Letters received..... | 3,683 | 10,838 |
| Letters recorded..... | 5,426 | 10,318 |
| Returns received and examined..... | | 10,824 |
| Number of oaths registered..... | | 5,841 |
| Number of appointments registered..... | | 5,600 |
| Number of clerks employed..... | 11 | 29 |
| Expenses..... | \$20,440 00 | \$45,420 07 |
| FIRST COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE. | | |
| Accounts revised and balances recorded..... | 7,580 | 21,533 |
| Requisitions..... | 1,116 | 4,435 |
| Warrants entered and posted..... | 17,022 | 48,407 |
| Letters written, &c..... | 3,732 | 12,252 |
| Internal-revenue tax-lists received and entered..... | | 2,715 |
| Internal-revenue reports copied, &c..... | | 3,558 |
| Powers of attorney examined and entered..... | 63 | 1,527 |
| Expenses..... | \$28,201 00 | \$73,768 00 |
| REGISTER'S OFFICE. | | |
| Certificates of registry recorded..... | 2,738 | 2,608 |
| Emoluments recorded..... | 7,269 | 7,266 |
| Statements of tonnage published..... | 7 | 26 |
| Warrants registered..... | 16,376 | 47,979 |
| Drafts registered..... | 13,852 | 43,016 |
| Entry of accounts, journal pages..... | 1,709 | 4,558 |
| Certificates for settlements of accounts..... | 3,424 | 14,972 |
| Accounts received..... | 14,111 | 23,538 |

Comparative statement of work performed in the several Bureaus of the Treasury Department, &c.—Continued.

| | 1860. | 1875. |
|-------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Division receipts and expenditures: | | |
| ledger headings..... | 1,213 | 3,305 |
| entries in ledgers..... | 26,120 | 66,661 |
| Ledger accounts, loan division..... | 1,500 | 40,000 |
| Number of employes..... | 37 | *208 |
| Average salary of each employe..... | \$1,397 00 | \$1,176 00 |

* Two large divisions of the office (note and coupon, and note and fractional currency) were not established in 1860.

Having read some of the items—

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. Perhaps that will suffice.

Whoever takes pains to examine this table will be astonished, I think, at the disparity in the work and the service of these years. Going back to the year 1860, the work in these Departments was comparatively nominal. Coming to 1875, it is immense. In 1860 in the First Auditor's Office there were nineteen hundred and eighty-one subjects examined against seven thousand and sixty-five in 1875. In 1860 the accounts involved \$157,000,000, against \$1,144,000,000 in 1875.

The expenses in that Bureau for 1860 were \$42,340; in 1875, \$76,780; whereas the work performed is more than fourfold, and with this relative expense: in 1860, \$4.10 per account, as against \$3.06 in 1875. That is true of the entire service in this Department, as I believe. This is the Treasury Department I am speaking of, and it illustrates this general fact, that the civil service as it exists to-day numerically is justified by the work done and by the demands of the public service for labor to be performed.

The impression is abroad undoubtedly in the country that the service might be greatly reduced and that it is really excessive and extravagant. When we look at the figures and see, for instance, that in 1860 the ordinary civil expenses of the Government are said to have been \$69,000,000, and when last year we know that they were \$274,000,000, it puts every intelligent man, of course, upon his inquiry whence this disparity? I present the tables which will explain it.

It must be remembered that we have passed through since 1860 a very extraordinary period in our history requiring a very great expenditure of money. These tables which I hold in my hand institute a comparison of expenditures for the years 1859 and 1875. In 1859 the expenditures were \$68,984,690.09; in 1875 they were \$274,623,392.84; making a difference it will be seen of \$205,638,702.75. It will be seen that the business of the committee is to account for that two hundred and five and odd million dollars which is in excess of the service of 1859. That is accounted for in this way: Three constituent elements enter into it: first, the war and the expenses incident to the war; second, the natural growth of the service through the natural growth of the country; and third, that new service which has been ingrafted upon the public service since 1859 and 1860.

This increase will be found in the expenses of Congress; the executive; the judiciary; miscellaneous civil; the foreign intercourse; miscellaneous; Interior; military establishment; naval establishment; public debt. The public debt, \$100,455,080.60, entered into these \$205,000,000 last year. Six million dollars and more were to the naval establishment; military establishment, \$19,000,000; Interior Department, \$33,000,000—I speak in round numbers only—miscellaneous, \$32,000,000; foreign intercourse, \$2,000,000; miscellaneous civil, \$1,000,000; judiciary, \$2,454,780; executive, \$4,000,000; and Congress, \$2,203,000.

I send the tables to the Reporter and ask that they may be printed with my remarks.

Statement of the disbursements of the United States Government for the fiscal years 1859 and 1875.

| | 1859. | 1875. |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| CIVIL. | | |
| Congress: | | |
| Senate—salaries..... | \$283,953 44 | \$614,698 18 |
| miscellaneous and contingent expenses..... | 230,037 28 | 86,269 94 |
| House of Representatives—salaries..... | 780,704 41 | 1,792,656 76 |
| miscellaneous and contingent expenses..... | 496,569 21 | 247,685 03 |
| Library—salaries..... | 9,000 00 | 29,294 04 |
| miscellaneous and contingent expenses..... | 10,600 00 | 44,379 31 |
| Public printing—salaries..... | 10,022 15 | 11,336 40 |
| miscellaneous and contingent expenses..... | 426,058 74 | 1,674,615 19 |
| Botanic Garden—salaries..... | 5,121 50 | 12,145 98 |
| miscellaneous and contingent expenses..... | 4,144 16 | 12,913 04 |
| Court of Claims—salaries..... | 32,245 06 | 30,087 25 |
| miscellaneous and contingent expenses..... | 6,536 00 | 5,000 00 |
| Total Congress..... | 2,354,991 95 | 4,568,081 12 |
| EXECUTIVE. | | |
| Executive proper..... | 41,564 40 | 71,800 00 |
| State Department..... | 62,082 06 | 96,738 30 |

Statement of the disbursements of the United States Government for the fiscal years 1859 and 1875—Continued.

| | 1859. | 1875. |
|---|--------------|---------------|
| Treasury Department—Secretary's Office..... | | |
| First Comptroller..... | \$47,884 36 | \$476,698 97 |
| Second Comptroller..... | 27,751 38 | 72,454 75 |
| First Auditor..... | 26,840 00 | 110,926 07 |
| Second Auditor..... | 35,940 00 | 72,908 81 |
| Third Auditor..... | 35,366 87 | 266,583 62 |
| Fourth Auditor..... | 132,650 93 | 246,801 97 |
| Fifth Auditor..... | 26,801 99 | 77,697 46 |
| Sixth Auditor..... | 17,823 33 | 51,304 83 |
| Supervising Architect..... | 172,196 19 | 299,620 00 |
| Treasurer..... | 27,340 00 | 31,423 51 |
| Register..... | 51,777 48 | 414,361 44 |
| Solicitor..... | 17,140 00 | 243,337 50 |
| Commissioner of Customs..... | 20,440 00 | 49,159 02 |
| Comptroller of Currency..... | 9,240 00 | 134,764 01 |
| Light-House Board..... | | 14,801 91 |
| Engraving and Printing..... | | 26,200 00 |
| Superintendent of Buildings..... | 17,400 00 | 88,143 70 |
| miscellaneous salaries..... | | 116,355 78 |
| Department of Justice..... | 15,239 61 | 77,059 13 |
| Commissioner of Agriculture..... | | 335,166 80 |
| Commissioner of Internal Revenue..... | | 59,403 23 |
| Bureau of Statistics..... | | 446,612 37 |
| Post-Office Department..... | 158,595 00 | 1,018,903 17 |
| War Department..... | 124,917 13 | 121,735 20 |
| Navy Department..... | 97,879 41 | 1,314,388 15 |
| Interior Department..... | 585,019 87 | 613,467 73 |
| Miscellaneous and contingent expenses..... | 339,309 42 | |
| Total Executive..... | 2,091,199 43 | 6,948,217 74 |
| JUDICIARY. | | |
| Compensation..... | 239,058 81 | 391,002 40 |
| Expenses of United States courts..... | 1,019,345 77 | 3,322,182 27 |
| Total judiciary..... | 1,258,404 58 | 3,713,184 67 |
| MISCELLANEOUS CIVIL. | | |
| Territorial governments..... | 177,737 66 | 247,194 53 |
| Independent Treasury..... | 38,800 00 | 365,220 20 |
| Public land offices..... | 91,210 68 | 611,879 89 |
| Inspection of steam-vessels..... | 81,442 33 | 212,392 02 |
| Mints and assay offices..... | 141,851 48 | 164,228 01 |
| Total miscellaneous civil..... | 531,042 15 | 1,600,914 65 |
| Total civil..... | 6,235,638 11 | 16,830,398 18 |
| FOREIGN INTERCOURSE. | | |
| Diplomatic salaries..... | 327,132 66 | 319,379 68 |
| Consular salaries..... | 316,132 21 | 462,861 43 |
| Contingencies of consulates..... | 95,366 62 | 159,518 98 |
| Relief and protection of American seamen..... | 210,125 39 | 35,099 21 |
| Rescuing seamen from shipwreck..... | 10,000 00 | 1,896 56 |
| Survey of boundary between United States and British possessions..... | 71,000 00 | 39,865 00 |
| American and Mexican claims commission..... | | 20,363 66 |
| American and Spanish claims commission..... | | 14,021 51 |
| American and British claims commission..... | | 2,093 25 |
| Return of consular receipts..... | | 32,225 02 |
| Exposition at Vienna..... | | 6,172 66 |
| Alabama claims commission..... | | 84,374 70 |
| Awards to British claimants..... | | 1,929,219 00 |
| Contingent and miscellaneous..... | 137,233 93 | 87,547 17 |
| Deduct excess of repayments..... | 1,166,990 81 | |
| Total foreign intercourse..... | 1,035,860 02 | 3,195,237 23 |
| MISCELLANEOUS. | | |
| Mint establishment..... | 624,300 63 | 1,244,618 40 |
| Branch-mint buildings..... | | 145,780 93 |
| Coast Survey..... | 419,700 00 | 780,635 44 |
| Light-house establishment..... | 1,062,450 42 | 1,778,841 52 |
| Building and repairs of light-houses..... | 182,254 56 | 1,165,198 72 |
| Refunding excess of deposits for unascertained duties..... | 600,613 58 | 1,863,657 85 |
| Life-saving service, including new stations..... | 13,260 97 | 203,113 32 |
| Custom-houses, court-houses, post-offices, &c..... | 1,595,723 86 | 8,055,054 86 |
| Furniture, &c., for public buildings..... | | 448,169 78 |
| Repairs of public buildings..... | 480,642 86 | 328,289 21 |
| Collecting customs revenue..... | 3,441,544 14 | 7,028,521 80 |
| Debitures and drawbacks under customs laws..... | 592,557 30 | 1,629,398 02 |
| Refunding duties erroneously collected..... | 15,520 35 | 9,810 93 |
| Marine hospital establishment, including buildings..... | 700,686 80 | 472,478 34 |
| Mail-steamship service..... | 614,453 41 | 650,000 00 |
| Deficiencies in postal revenues..... | 4,200,000 00 | 6,562,216 39 |
| Suppressing counterfeiting and fraud..... | 2,215 45 | 120,615 20 |
| Contingent expenses, Independent Treasury..... | 27,018 73 | 95,159 57 |
| Public buildings and grounds in Washington..... | 1,444,900 90 | 809,176 43 |
| Capitol extension, repairs, &c..... | 980,000 00 | 69,800 00 |
| Columbia Institute for Deaf and Dumb..... | 5,841 00 | 77,000 00 |
| Metropolitan police..... | 28,698 33 | 208,006 62 |
| Support of transient paupers..... | 6,000 00 | 15,000 00 |
| Survey of public lands..... | 817,292 94 | 1,253,187 13 |
| Repayment for lands erroneously sold..... | 67,276 48 | 35,056 55 |
| Five per cent. fund to States..... | 33,836 40 | 94,436 53 |
| Relief acts..... | 50,542 36 | 157,813 59 |
| Expenses of District of Columbia..... | 111,358 74 | 339,583 96 |
| Smithsonian Institution, including building..... | 30,910 14 | 69,050 83 |
| Indemnity for swamp lands..... | 14,897 15 | 43,386 94 |

Statement of the disbursements of the United States Government for the fiscal years 1859 and 1875—Continued.

| | 1859. | 1875. |
|--|---------------|----------------|
| Agricultural Reports..... | \$60,000 00 | \$46,700 00 |
| Payment for coins, &c., destroyed at Chicago..... | | 809 04 |
| Revenue-cutter service..... | | 897,985 85 |
| Building revenue-cutters..... | 17,014 82 | 88,107 81 |
| Compensation in lieu of moiety..... | | 67,134 18 |
| Assessing and collecting internal-revenue..... | | 4,289,442 71 |
| Violations of internal-revenue laws..... | | 30,095 00 |
| Internal-revenue stamps, paper, and dies..... | | 627,649 97 |
| Refunding internal revenue erroneously collected..... | | 169,286 77 |
| Internal-revenue allowances and drawbacks..... | | 32,248 73 |
| Redemption of stamps..... | | 31,867 05 |
| Return of proceeds of captured property..... | | 880,619 34 |
| Expenses of national loan..... | | 552,397 97 |
| Refunding national debt..... | | 150,255 51 |
| Expense national currency..... | | 330,978 27 |
| Extension of Capitol grounds..... | | 220,000 00 |
| Building for State, War, and Navy Departments..... | | 1,049,039 54 |
| Government Hospital for Insane..... | | 215,107 00 |
| Charitable institutions in Washington..... | | 229,308 33 |
| Expenses of eighth and ninth census..... | | 23,569 40 |
| Penitentiaries in Territories..... | | 14,791 13 |
| Board of health, District of Columbia..... | | 41,388 50 |
| Inquiries into causes of steam-boiler explosions..... | | 8,474 01 |
| Refunding proceeds of cotton seized..... | | 36,938 72 |
| Southern claims commission..... | | 51,800 00 |
| Re-issuing national currency..... | | 64,244 76 |
| Postage..... | | 1,092,165 13 |
| Interest on 3 65 bonds of District of Columbia..... | | 154,554 64 |
| Payment of indebtedness of District of Columbia..... | | 1,300,000 00 |
| Expenses of Bureau of Engraving and Printing..... | | 1,581,669 41 |
| Purchase and management of Louisville and Port-land Canal..... | | |
| Vaults, safes, and locks for public buildings..... | | 107,794 31 |
| International exhibition at Philadelphia..... | | 103,487 95 |
| Indemnity to Dempsey & O'Toole..... | | 26,300 00 |
| Distribution of seeds, (grasshopper ravages)..... | | 29,433 89 |
| Unenumerated items..... | 238,592 93 | 30,000 00 |
| Judgments of Court of Claims..... | | 215,892 49 |
| | | 516,531 35 |
| Deduct excess of repayments..... | 18,495,144 25 | |
| | 20,858 43 | |
| Total miscellaneous..... | 18,474,285 82 | 51,045,067 57 |
| INTERIOR DEPARTMENT. | | |
| Indians..... | 3,532,874 25 | 8,384,656 82 |
| Pensions..... | 1,221,098 35 | 29,456,216 22 |
| Total Interior Department..... | 4,753,972 60 | 37,840,873 04 |
| MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT. | | |
| Pay Department..... | 3,945,078 08 | 10,944,666 31 |
| Commissary Department..... | 2,791,457 68 | 2,851,334 74 |
| Quartermaster's Department..... | 9,975,626 95 | 13,253,571 74 |
| Ordnance Department..... | 1,318,486 98 | 1,758,965 26 |
| Medical Department..... | 110,036 12 | 344,887 94 |
| Military Academy..... | 182,659 40 | 99,401 79 |
| Expenses of recruiting..... | 65,139 92 | 50,259 88 |
| Contingencies of the Army..... | 10,733 15 | 35,557 59 |
| Signal Service..... | | 422,641 58 |
| Refugees, freedmen, and abandoned lands..... | | 34,317 36 |
| Bounties to soldiers..... | | 291,480 00 |
| Re-imbursing States for raising volunteers..... | 227,176 48 | 139,958 32 |
| Claims of loyal citizens for supplies..... | | 1,265,170 40 |
| Relief acts..... | 108,379 78 | 377,831 46 |
| Forts and fortifications..... | 1,273,195 60 | 1,128,980 31 |
| Improvements of rivers and harbors..... | 567,202 25 | 6,380,811 18 |
| Re-imbursing Kentucky, expenses in suppressing rebellion..... | | 35,490 65 |
| Suppressing Indian hostilities..... | 23,375 21 | 88,980 30 |
| National Asylum for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers..... | | 911,505 12 |
| Washington and Oregon volunteers..... | | 8,574 00 |
| Horses and other property lost in military service..... | | 83,720 68 |
| Soldiers' Home..... | | 154,604 01 |
| Miscellaneous..... | 535,311 77 | 457,935 36 |
| Total military establishment..... | 21,133,859 37 | 41,190,645 98 |
| NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT. | | |
| Pay and contingencies of the Navy..... | 4,346,166 12 | 6,542,521 61 |
| Marine Corps..... | 674,463 26 | 1,176,325 43 |
| Navigation..... | 92,589 34 | 221,383 52 |
| Ordnance..... | 146,291 66 | 508,744 91 |
| Provisions and Clothing..... | 992,769 11 | 1,736,770 63 |
| Medicine and Surgery..... | 68,736 09 | 133,175 52 |
| Equipment and Recruiting..... | 2,365,837 57 | 1,175,252 09 |
| Construction and Repair..... | 3,554,630 92 | 4,339,412 00 |
| Steam Engineering..... | 457,985 91 | 1,812,043 55 |
| Yards and Docks..... | 1,477,212 46 | 2,519,755 20 |
| Relief acts..... | 15,250 54 | 140,278 97 |
| Transit of Venus..... | | 70,964 43 |
| Prize-money to captors..... | | 842,582 22 |
| Miscellaneous..... | 520,677 23 | 218,416 19 |
| Total naval establishment..... | 14,712,610 21 | 21,497,626 27 |
| PUBLIC DEBT. | | |
| Interest on the public debt..... | 2,638,463 96 | 103,093,544 57 |
| Total net ordinary disbursements..... | 68,984,690 09 | 274,623,392 84 |

| Disbursements in 1875 in excess of 1859. | | |
|--|----------------|--|
| Congress..... | \$2,213,089 17 | |
| Executive..... | 4,857,018 31 | |
| Judiciary..... | 2,454,780 09 | |
| Miscellaneous civil..... | 1,069,872 50 | |
| Foreign intercourse..... | 2,159,377 21 | |
| Miscellaneous..... | 32,570,781 75 | |
| Interior..... | 33,086,900 44 | |
| Military establishment..... | 19,986,786 61 | |
| Naval establishment..... | 6,785,016 06 | |
| Public debt..... | 100,455,080 61 | |
| Total disbursements in 1875 in excess of 1859..... | 205,638,702 75 | |
| The excess of expenditures may be classified under each head as follows: | | |
| CONGRESS. | | |
| Natural growth: | | |
| Senate and House..... | \$950,045 57 | |
| Library, Botanic Garden, and Court of Claims..... | 73,172 90 | |
| Public printing..... | 1,189,870 70 | |
| | \$2,213,089 17 | |
| EXECUTIVE. | | |
| Natural growth: | | |
| Executive proper..... | \$30,235 60 | |
| State Department..... | 34,656 24 | |
| Light-House Board..... | 4,961 91 | |
| Post-Office Department..... | 288,017 39 | |
| Interior Department..... | 729,368 28 | |
| | 1,087,239 42 | |
| New: | | |
| Supervising Architect..... | 31,423 51 | |
| Commissioner of Agriculture..... | 77,059 12 | |
| Bureau of Statistics..... | 59,403 23 | |
| | 167,885 86 | |
| Natural growth and war: | | |
| Treasury Department..... | 1,724,502 21 | |
| Department of Justice..... | 101,116 17 | |
| | 1,825,618 38 | |
| Due wholly to the war: | | |
| Comptroller of Currency..... | 134,764 01 | |
| Engraving and Printing..... | 26,200 00 | |
| Miscellaneous salaries..... | 88,143 70 | |
| Commissioner of Internal Revenue..... | 335,166 80 | |
| War Department..... | 893,986 04 | |
| Navy Department..... | 23,655 79 | |
| Miscellaneous expenses..... | 274,158 31 | |
| | 1,776,274 65 | |
| | 4,857,018 31 | |
| JUDICIARY. | | |
| Natural growth and war: | | |
| Compensation..... | 151,943 59 | |
| Expenses of courts..... | 2,302,503 28 | |
| | 2,454,780 09 | |
| MISCELLANEOUS CIVIL. | | |
| Natural growth: | | |
| Territorial governments..... | 69,456 87 | |
| Independent Treasury..... | 326,420 20 | |
| Public land offices..... | 520,669 21 | |
| Inspection of steam-vessels..... | 130,949 69 | |
| Mints and assay offices..... | 22,376 53 | |
| | 1,069,871 50 | |
| FOREIGN INTERCOURSE. | | |
| Natural growth: | | |
| Salaries and miscellaneous..... | 70,308 01 | |
| New: | | |
| Claims commissions, &c..... | 74,875 50 | |
| Due wholly to the war: | | |
| Alabama claims commission and awards to claimants..... | 2,014,193 70 | |
| | 2,159,377 21 | |
| MISCELLANEOUS. | | |
| Natural growth: | | |
| Mint establishment..... | 620,317 77 | |
| Coast Survey..... | 360,935 44 | |
| Light-house establishment..... | 716,391 10 | |
| Life-saving service..... | 189,852 35 | |
| Collecting customs revenues..... | 3,586,977 66 | |
| Postal revenues, in deficiency..... | 2,362,216 30 | |
| Steamship service..... | 35,516 59 | |
| Counterfeiting and fraud..... | 118,399 75 | |
| Contingent expenses Independent Treasury..... | 68,140 84 | |
| Survey of public lands..... | 435,894 19 | |
| District of Columbia..... | 228,235 92 | |
| Swamp lands..... | 28,489 79 | |
| Miscellaneous items..... | 93,169 52 | |
| | 8,844,536 52 | |
| New: | | |
| Metropolitan police..... | 179,308 29 | |
| Coins destroyed at Chicago..... | 809 04 | |
| Revenue-cutter service..... | 897,985 85 | |
| Compensation in lieu of moiety..... | 67,134 18 | |
| Charitable institutions..... | 229,308 33 | |
| Penitentiaries in Territories..... | 14,791 13 | |
| Board of Health, D. C..... | 41,388 50 | |
| Steam-boiler explosions..... | 8,474 01 | |
| Postage..... | 1,092,165 13 | |
| Interest on bonds of D. C..... | 154,554 64 | |
| Indebtedness of D. C..... | 1,300,000 00 | |
| International exhibition..... | 26,300 00 | |
| Dempsey & O'Toole..... | 29,433 89 | |
| Distribution of seeds..... | 30,000 00 | |
| | 4,001,652 99 | |
| Improvements: | | |
| Branch mint buildings..... | 145,780 93 | |
| Building light-houses..... | 982,944 16 | |
| Custom-houses, court-houses, &c..... | 6,459,331 00 | |
| Furniture for public buildings..... | 448,169 78 | |
| Columbia Institute..... | 71,159 00 | |
| Smithsonian Institute..... | 38,140 74 | |

| | | |
|---|---------------|-----------------|
| Revenue-cutters..... | \$71,092 99 | |
| Capitol grounds..... | 220,000 00 | |
| Building for State, War, and Navy Departments..... | 1,049,059 54 | |
| Hospital for Insane..... | 215,107 00 | |
| Louisville and Portland Canal..... | 107,794 31 | |
| Vaults, safes, &c., for public build- ings..... | 103,487 95 | |
| Due wholly to the war: | | \$9,912,067 40 |
| Relief acts..... | 101,271 23 | |
| Collecting internal revenue..... | 4,289,442 71 | |
| Violations of internal-revenue laws..... | 30,095 00 | |
| Stamps, paper, and dies..... | 627,649 97 | |
| Expenses of national loan..... | 552,397 97 | |
| Refunding national debt..... | 150,255 51 | |
| Expenses of national currency..... | 330,978 27 | |
| Southern claims commission..... | 51,800 00 | |
| Re-issuing national currency..... | 64,244 76 | |
| Bureau of Engraving and Printing..... | 1,581,609 41 | |
| Judgments of Court of Claims..... | 516,531 35 | |
| Expenditures from moneys re- ceived in excess of duties, &c.: Refunding excess of deposits for duties..... | 1,254,044 27 | |
| Delentures and drawbacks, cus- toms..... | 1,036,770 72 | |
| Refunding duties erroneously col- lected..... | 169,286 77 | |
| Allowance and drawbacks, internal revenue..... | 32,248 73 | |
| Redemption of stamps..... | 31,867 05 | |
| Return of proceeds of captured property..... | 880,619 34 | |
| Refunding proceeds of cotton seized..... | 36,938 72 | |
| | | 3,441,775 60 |
| Less expenditures in 1859 in ex- cess of 1875, as follows: | | \$34,496,368 69 |
| Repairs of public buildings..... | 98,353 65 | |
| Refunding duties erroneously col- lected..... | 5,709 42 | |
| Marine hospital establishment..... | 222,208 46 | |
| Public buildings, &c., in Washing- ton..... | 635,733 47 | |
| Capitol extension..... | 910,200 00 | |
| Repayment for lands erroneously sold..... | 32,239 93 | |
| Agricultural Reports..... | 13,300 00 | |
| Unenumerated items..... | 22,700 44 | |
| | 1,946,445 37 | |
| Deduct excess of repayments..... | 20,858 43 | |
| | | 1,922,587 94 |
| INTERIOR DEPARTMENT. | | |
| Natural growth: | | |
| Indians..... | 4,851 782 57 | |
| Due wholly to the war: | | |
| Pensions..... | 23,235,117 87 | |
| | | 33,086,900 44 |
| MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT. | | |
| New: | | |
| Signal Service..... | 422,641 58 | |
| Washington and Oregon volunteers..... | 8,574 00 | |
| Soldiers' Home..... | 154,604 01 | |
| | | 585,819 59 |
| Improvements: | | |
| Improving rivers and harbors..... | | 5,813,608 93 |
| Due wholly to the war: | | |
| Pay Department..... | 6,999,588 23 | |
| Commissary Department..... | 59,877 06 | |
| Quartermaster's Department..... | 3,277,944 79 | |
| Ordnance Department..... | 440,478 28 | |
| Medical Department..... | 234,851 62 | |
| Contingencies of the Army..... | 24,824 44 | |
| Refugees and freedmen..... | 34,317 36 | |
| Bounties..... | 291,480 00 | |
| Claims of loyal citizens..... | 1,265,170 40 | |
| Relief acts..... | 209,451 68 | |
| Re-imbursing Kentucky for raising volunteers..... | 35,490 65 | |
| Asylum for Volunteer Soldiers..... | 911,505 12 | |
| Horses lost in service..... | 83,720 68 | |
| Suppressing Indian hostilities..... | 65,605 09 | |
| | | 13,994,305 60 |
| Less expenditures in 1859 in ex- cess of 1875, as follows: | | 20,393,734 12 |
| Military Academy..... | 83,257 61 | |
| Expenses of recruiting..... | 14,880 04 | |
| Re-imbursing States for raising vol- unteers..... | 87,218 16 | |
| Fort and fortifications..... | 144,215 29 | |
| Miscellaneous..... | 77,376 41 | |
| | | 406,947 51 |
| NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT. | | 19,986,786 61 |
| New: | | |
| Transit of Venus..... | | 70,964 43 |
| Improvements: | | |
| Construction and Repairs..... | 784,781 08 | |
| Steam Engineering..... | 1,354,057 64 | |
| | | 2,138,838 72 |
| Due wholly to the war: | | |
| Pay and contingent of the Navy..... | 2,196,355 49 | |
| Marine Corps..... | 501,862 17 | |
| Navigation..... | 188,794 18 | |
| Ordnance..... | 362,453 25 | |

| | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| Provisions and Clothing..... | \$744,001 52 | |
| Medicine and Surgery..... | 64,439 43 | |
| Yards and Docks..... | 1,042,542 74 | |
| Relief acts..... | 125,028 43 | |
| Prize-money to captors..... | 842,582 22 | |
| | | \$6,068,059 43 |
| Less expenditures in 1859 in ex- cess of 1875, as follows: | | 8,277,262 58 |
| Equipment and recruiting..... | 1,190,585 48 | |
| Miscellaneous..... | 302,261 04 | |
| | | 1,492,846 52 |
| | | \$6,785,016 06 |
| PUBLIC DEBT. | | |
| Due wholly to the war: | | |
| Interest on the public debt..... | | 100,455,080 61 |
| Total excess of expenditures in 1875 over 1859..... | | 205,638,702 75 |
| CLASSIFICATION. | | |
| New: | | |
| Executive..... | 167,885 86 | |
| Foreign intercourse..... | 74,875 50 | |
| Miscellaneous..... | 4,001,652 99 | |
| Military establishment..... | 585,819 59 | |
| Naval establishment..... | 70,964 43 | |
| | | 4,901,198 37 |
| Improvements: | | |
| Miscellaneous..... | 9,912,067 40 | |
| Military establishment..... | 5,813,608 93 | |
| Naval establishment..... | 2,138,838 72 | |
| | | 17,864,515 05 |
| Natural growth: | | |
| Congress..... | 2,213,089 17 | |
| Executive..... | 1,087,239 42 | |
| Miscellaneous civil..... | 1,009,872 50 | |
| Foreign intercourse..... | 70,308 01 | |
| Miscellaneous..... | 8,844,536 52 | |
| Interior..... | 4,851,782 57 | |
| | | 18,136,828 19 |
| Natural growth and war: | | |
| Executive..... | 1,825,618 38 | |
| Judiciary..... | 2,454,780 09 | |
| | | 4,280,398 47 |
| Due wholly to the war: | | |
| Executive..... | 1,776,274 65 | |
| Foreign intercourse..... | 2,014,193 70 | |
| Miscellaneous..... | 8,296,336 18 | |
| Interior Department..... | 28,235,117 87 | |
| Military establishment..... | 13,994,305 60 | |
| Naval establishment..... | 6,068,059 43 | |
| Public debt..... | 100,455,080 61 | |
| | | 160,839,368 04 |
| Expenditures from moneys re- ceived in excess of duties, &c.: | | |
| Miscellaneous..... | | 3,441,775 60 |
| | | 209,464,083 72 |
| Less expenditures in 1859 in excess of 1875: | | |
| Miscellaneous..... | 1,925,586 94 | |
| Military establishment..... | 406,947 51 | |
| Naval establishment..... | 1,492,846 52 | |
| | | 3,825,380 97 |
| Grand total..... | | 205,638,702 75 |

Mr. EATON. I should like to say to my friend from Maine that he has seen the tables and has to his own satisfaction, doubtless, given good reason for the large increase in the expenditures of the Government; but there ought not to be a final vote asked on the question now before the Senate until the tables can be printed, so that we may see precisely the various items. I have thought myself, having spent a good deal of time in the study of this subject, that the great difference could not be satisfactorily explained. I am well aware of the \$100,000,000 in regard to the public-debt interest, and the \$29,000,000 in regard to the additional pensions, but there are one hundred and fifty other millions that I am not so well satisfied of; and therefore I should like to see this matter in print before I vote.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. My honorable friend will have the satisfaction, I hope, of being enlightened on this subject; for here are the tables giving the items of increase.

Mr. EATON. I have not the advantage my friend from Maine has; I have not seen the tables.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. The Senator will find one thing, if he examines it carefully, as I am sure he will, that the civil service of the country is conducted at the present time in such a manner as that all sorts of expenditures and appropriations come to the surface. There is a specific accountability in the public service that never existed in the history of the Government up to 1870. If the Senator will take pains to look at the estimates which are annually made, he will see an account-current, which is an accurate statement of every branch of the public service, of every dollar appropriated to it and every dollar expended; and unless there is some great inaccuracy about it, in some way overlooked, each Senator may be as well informed in regard to the expenditures and receipts of the Government, so far as shown through appropriations and expenditures, as he is of the statements of his own county.

Mr. President, I was about to conclude this part of the subject by saying that it is apparent first, that we appropriate for these legislative, executive, and judicial expenses according to law.

Mr. BAYARD. Will the Senator allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. Certainly.

Mr. BAYARD. I am disposed to concur with the honorable Senator from Maine in his definition of an appropriation bill, and that its object and its tenor simply should be to provide money to carry into effect existing laws. This is what may be termed the generic description of an appropriation bill; but I wish to submit to the honorable Senator and the majority of the Senate whether that definition has not been so overlooked by the invariable practice of this body for the last fifteen or eighteen years, that to establish it now and adhere to it strictly, when we stand in the closing weeks of the session, would simply be saying to the co-ordinate branch of Congress: "You have, according to the accepted idea and invariable custom of legislation of these two Houses of Congress for the past eighteen years, proceeded to economize by changing the salaries of existing offices in the way of amendments to appropriation bills; we recognize this as the practice; we have not objected to it; we have accepted it as proper in practice, although perhaps not in theory; and yet, now, without notice to you, having suffered you to go on, prepare these bills with great elaboration, at great cost of time and pains, we tell you now that we propose suddenly to shut down upon you with this new, this technical, but perfectly unaccustomed theory, that an appropriation bill shall not be suffered to change the provisions of existing law either in respect to the existence of an office, or in respect of the salary allowed by law for performing its duties."

Mr. President, I do not think this can be sustained. I do not think it either practical or just that it should be proposed now. I will agree with the honorable Senator—and when I agree with him I am always better satisfied with my own judgment—that it would be well that it should be understood by each House of Congress that we will not amend existing laws under color of making appropriations to carry them into effect. But let us know that in advance; do not say to the co-ordinate branch of Congress, "Your labors for the last six months shall go for naught. We know that you have proceeded as your predecessors in office did; we know that you have been carrying out simply a custom which has almost hardened into law by acquiescence in both branches of Congress, and now suddenly you are to be informed that this practice is at an end, and therefore, instead of abolishing an office confessedly useless by a law for that purpose, you shall not reach the same result by withholding compensation for that office; and, there being no compensation, the office necessarily falls." It has been done. I would appeal to no man's experience more confidently than to that of the honorable Senator from Maine to show that where at times we have thought an office was illy paid we have increased the salary, to show that we thought the office was overpaid we diminished the salary, or where we thought the office was useless we simply dropped it by making no appropriation of money to execute it. The last has been very frequent. Sometimes we have created an office by simply passing an appropriation for the performance of certain duties, the office not having existed before in form of law.

Is it just, wise, practicable, that those who are carrying on in their place their appropriate share of this Government's duty, suddenly to tell them the practice so long concurred in by the Senate is suddenly to be reversed and an appropriation bill is to be treated by the Senate *strictissimi jure*; that you are simply to appropriate money according to law as it exists, and you are to remedy no defects, accede to no reforms, carry out no economies however needed by the times, in a mode of legislation that we have admitted by frequent practice to have been right and proper for fifteen years past or more? It does seem to me that such action would not be marked by that comity, by that sense of justice to the people we represent, or to our co-laborers in the other branch of the Legislature which is their due. No, sir; the question as to all these amendments, of all these proposed reforms, must be judged by us, not merely as to the method in which they come to us from the House but as to their merits. Therefore, where the House of Representatives has attempted an economy which I think wise, I shall give them my aid in sustaining it; where my judgment does not concur with theirs, I shall oppose their judgment; and where the judgments of the two Houses shall be found to be in conflict, then I trust the usual and ordinary methods of attempted reconciliation of variant views will be made through means of committees of conference, in which we cannot expect that our ideas will wholly prevail, nor can the other House expect that its ideas will be accepted without some concessions on their part. We must consider carefully their proposed reforms, and if they be actual and useful, accept them in a deferential and proper spirit, and not reject them because they do not come to us in the shape of repealing laws, but rather in the shape of modified appropriations; which, as I have said, is in accordance with the unquestioned practice of the two Houses for the past fifteen years.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. Mr. President, I doubt very much whether I shall disagree with my honorable friend, or whether there be any disagreement between us, when we understand each other as to what is meant by appropriating according to the law. The Senator speaks of a usage by which salaries have been changed upon appropriation bills. The Senator knows that that is exceptional. My honorable friend must know that it has not been the usage of the Senate to change salaries; that never was done in an appropriation bill by applying a rule to the whole body of salaries; that never was attempted before, never was attempted—

Mr. BAYARD. To what salaries does the Senator refer?

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. To all the salaries in the Departments above those of twelve-hundred-dollar clerks.

Mr. BAYARD. I am very sure that I have served with my friend on committees of conference where there was a very great alteration in the pay of various officers.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. Yes, sir; but my honorable friend will understand me when I finish my remark. Was it ever known before in the history of legislation that an appropriation committee undertook to change the entire salaries of the whole force in the Executive Departments by applying a rule of a certain per cent. reduction to the whole body of salaries?

Mr. BAYARD. I do not know that it was.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. Of course it never was.

Mr. BAYARD. I merely mean to say that I do not see any difference in principle whether you apply it to one or many. I see no difference in principle between making what you call a horizontal reduction of such a per cent. on all salaries and taking the salary of one man at \$1,500 and raising it to \$2,000, or reducing it from \$2,000 to \$1,500.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. If my honorable friend was receiving a salary of \$1,400, and a horizontal rule of 20 per cent. was applied to him and not to others, I think he would see the difference in the principle; at any rate he would see the difference in the result, and he would feel probably the effect of it. What I am commenting upon here is the fact that instead of appropriating for the salaries as provided by law a general horizontal rule is applied to the whole body of salaries, reducing them according to a certain per cent. That is unprecedented.

Mr. BAYARD. It is not unprecedented in principle.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. That cannot be done with a diverse service without manifest injustice. As to the rule to which my honorable friend refers, it has not been the practice, although almost every year some change has been made in somebody's salary. As a general proposition, such a change has been made with reference to those salaries which had no existence except by an appropriation. We sometimes make a service by an appropriation. That is a flexible thing.

Mr. BAYARD. Are not appropriation bills almost always the accustomed machinery by which these results are accomplished?

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. In those cases; but does not my honorable friend know that the salaries of first, second, third, and fourth class clerks, established in 1854, have never been changed, neither on an appropriation bill nor any other bill, and they constitute the great body of the force? They have never been changed at all, but are precisely what they were as established in 1854. That shows conclusively that Congress has not been in the habit on appropriation bills or anywhere else of changing salaries. That is precisely the thing that the committee recommend they shall not do on this bill, and that is all there is of it. When you come to the question whether any salary can be changed, the committee agree to that because they have done it. There are exceptional cases, and there are instances in this very bill as reported. I do not understand that there is any question of the propriety or fitness of the duty of the Committee on Appropriations involved in the case.

On the question of the reduction of the numerical force we have endeavored to meet the House of Representatives on the most liberal terms, and we have no difficulty with them except as to the question of how much the service can be reduced. That must always be a flexible service, and it is precisely what we have been doing these many years since the close of the war, cutting down the numerical force year by year. It has been done, as we think and as the committee report, a little too strongly on the other side of the Capitol, and therefore the Senate committee recommend a lower figure. That is all there is of that question.

Therefore on principle I think I should not disagree with the Senator from Delaware as to what should be done. The whole case, then, on the question involved in the bill is, will the Senate of the United States appropriate according to law, as a general proposition, the salaries which were fixed in 1853 and 1854? Will they adhere to that law and so non-concur with the House of Representatives? If that is done, then all the labor which relates to the amendment of the salaries becomes a mere nominal affair, and of course the Senate will have to settle that question on the very first line where an amendment occurs.

On the other proposition, the reduction of the salaries, the same thing does not occur, but Senators must vote in regard to that question as their judgment dictates. On the other proposition I think they should vote on the obligations of the law.

I wish to direct the attention of the Senate to two or three other things which have a general bearing on this particular subject, as a matter of general interest, possibly more than anything else. I mean the revenues and expenditures of the Government. I give a comparative estimate of the expenditures of certain periods.

March 4, 1861, the national debt was \$90,580,873.73; on the 4th of March, 1875, the national debt was \$2,232,284,531.92. The totality of this national debt of the first period at the close of a continuous administration of twenty years in the same hands was quite inconsequential; but the fact of its existence at all at that juncture and under the circumstances was an apparent violation of the traditional policy of the Government, as well as of every sound principle of just public economy. It had been created in a period of profound peace

and by a resort to loans and at extraordinary rates. The totality of the debt of 1875 was indeed truly appalling; but it had been incurred in the defense of the Union and Constitution and by practice not unusual in the exigency of war. During the period while civil war was raging, from 1861 to 1865, "the last man and the last dollar" was the only limit upon the nation's endurance and expenditure, and by the truly patriotic no account-current of expenses of that period will be sharply demanded of the cost in blood and treasure. The possessions of the present and the promises of the future are cheap at any sacrifice; but a rigid accountability may be required of the period that lies this side of 1865, after the close of the war—the surrender, the mustering out of the national forces, when it had become possible to inspect, reduce, and retrench the public expenditures. Consider the financial situation of 1866, when Congress was left to deal with the results, consequences, and incidents of the war; an appalling public debt, funded and unfunded; a greatly extended public service, and a large section of the country divided, disordered, revolutionized, and unreconstructed.

The net ordinary expenses of the year 1866 were \$385,954,731.43, while the gross expenditures of that year reached \$1,139,344,081.91. Of the net ordinary expenses of that year, those of the War Department were \$283,154,676.06. A large force was still retained and necessary under the disordered condition of the South and the Indian country. The Navy, although rapidly reduced, was still above its ordinary maximum, and it would require time to bring it to its former condition. The expenses of that Department were \$43,285,662. The Indian service had been much demoralized during the prevalent disorder, treaties broken and disregarded by both parties, amounting in all to \$3,295,729.32. Pensions had risen from \$1,600,802 in 1860 to \$15,605,589 in 1865. The civil service proper had increased from \$27,000,000 in 1860 to \$40,000,000 in 1866. In 1875 the net ordinary expenditures had been reduced from \$385,954,731.43 to \$171,529,847.27, a reduction in the civil branch of the service between the years 1865 and 1875 of \$214,424,882.16.

To realize the significance and pertinency of this statement it will be necessary to consider that this reduction took place in the branch of the civil service which we are now to appropriate for as the ordinary expenditures of the Government; and it was a reduction of a little less than two-thirds.

An analysis of this general reduction of expenditures may be itemized thus: On the Army the reduction was \$242,000,000 in round numbers; Navy, \$22,264,000. In the Indian service the increase has been \$4,000,000; in Pensions, \$14,000,000; and the Departments and all other branches of the public service, \$31,000,000. The increase in the Indian service arises from various considerations which it is hardly worth while for me in this connection to speak of; but particularly it grows out of the fact of the acquisition from the Indians of the whole plains country lying between the Missouri River and the Rocky Mountains; and such provision is made for their present and future support as would naturally grow out of so large a transaction.

The net ordinary receipts from all sources in 1866 were \$519,949,564.38. In 1875 they were \$848,020,771.41, a reduction in the revenues of \$328,071,207.03. In 1866 the national debt, funded and unfunded, was \$2,773,236,173.69. In 1875 it had been reduced to \$2,232,284,531.95, being an aggregate reduction of \$540,951,641.74.

The financial policy enforced since 1866 in the interests of public economy and the national faith gives the country in 1875 as its result a reduction of the national debt of \$540,951,641.74, and the relief of public burdens by the way of a reduction of the taxes in the years 1866, 1867, 1868, and 1870 of \$319,000,000.

During the war the political policy seemed to be to "tax, fight, and emancipate." The war over, the financial policy has been the protection of public credit, the redemption of the national obligations, and the retrenchment of the public expenditures. Under this policy the public faith has been kept, the national obligations have been performed, the public debt dissolving and disappearing, the burden of taxation counted by hundreds of millions has been removed from the industries of the people, and the net ordinary expenditures of the Government have been reduced other hundreds of millions, until at the present time these expenditures closely approximate the period of peace before the war.

Just one other consideration, Mr. President, upon this general topic, and then I shall have done. An impression doubtless prevails somewhat that the civil service is redundant and needs vigorous pruning, and that the public expenditures are excessive and unjust. I may be allowed to glance at the general financial revenues and expenditures both in the present and in the past by way of comparison. The civil service of the country, in its necessity, is a growth, and increases with its progress and the development of its institutions, and is a fair index to these characteristics of its life. In the beginning of the Government in 1789 the civil list embraced the President of the United States, the Vice-President, the legislative and judicial departments, and the public offices, namely, the Treasury, the State Department, the commissioners for settling with the States and governments of the Territories northwest and southwest. This was the sum-total of the civil service in 1789. It must be a matter of great curiosity to contemplate the comparative insignificance, the nominal character of the civil service as it existed in 1789. I have it here before me, [holding up a thin octavo volume.] The whole civil service which we are now providing for was summed up in substantially what I

have stated. The entire receipts of that year from imposts were but \$4,000,000, and the balance was simply from fines and forfeitures, a nominal amount. The whole expenditure from 1789 down to 1791, two years, was \$706,720.29. By 1865 the civil list had been re-enforced by the creation of five executive departments, many bureaus, numerous divisions, and innumerable clerks, something over five thousand in all, at an expense for the two years 1864 and 1865 of more than \$40,000,000 as against \$706,000 in 1789 and 1790. The gross receipts for the early period from all sources were \$10,457,492, of which \$4,542,949.41 were from customs and fines and forfeitures, the balance chiefly raised by loans. The ordinary expenditures for the later period were \$1,621,109,000. The gross receipts of the corresponding period, 1874 and 1875, were \$1,420,222,908.62 and the gross expenditures \$1,406,699,326.31.

While these figures not inaptly signify by their magnitude the grandeur and power of the Government in 1875, compared with its small beginnings, they do not necessarily or truly mark the general progress of the nation, as so large a proportion of these receipts and expenditures are extraordinary in their character and spring from the incidents of the civil war, still felt in these years. The receipts and expenditures by decades are the better index of the national progress. Let me present that statement:

Comparative statement of the expenditures of the Government by decades.

| | Net ordinary expenditures. | Gross expenditures. |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------|
| First decade, 1791 to 1800 | \$41,403,420 22 | \$86,965,371 78 |
| Second decade, 1801 to 1810 | 53,826,543 10 | 133,209,683 19 |
| Third decade, 1811 to 1820 | 190,657,278 15 | 323,667,211 57 |
| Fourth decade, 1821 to 1830 | 122,033,078 92 | 229,414,961 48 |
| Fifth decade, 1831 to 1840 | 241,632,544 51 | 304,257,676 17 |
| Sixth decade, 1841 to 1850 | 306,907,179 53 | 390,784,350 10 |
| Seventh decade, 1851 to 1860 | 568,363,368 00 | 618,200,605 84 |
| Eighth decade, 1861 to 1870 | 4,420,205,388 32 | 9,347,329,336 28 |
| Five years of ninth decade, 1871 to 1875 | 856,923,153 94 | 3,304,950,546 33 |
| Total | 6,801,956,954 69 | 14,797,839,742 74 |

| | | |
|---|-------|--------|
| Increase per cent. second over first decade | 30 | 53.2 |
| Increase per cent. third over second decade | 254.2 | 142.1 |
| Decrease per cent. fourth over third decade | 35.9 | 23.9 |
| Increase per cent. fifth over fourth decade | 97.9 | 32.6 |
| Increase per cent. sixth over fifth decade | 27 | 28.4 |
| Increase per cent. seventh over sixth decade | 85.1 | 73.6 |
| Increase per cent. eighth over seventh decade | 677.6 | 1278.2 |
| Decrease per cent. ninth over eighth decade* | 61.2 | 29.2 |

* Estimating the expenditures of the last half of decade to be the same as for the first half.

By the tables which I submit it will be seen that the ratio of increase bears marked relation to each, except in those periods of extraordinary expenditures by war or other public exigency. Of this, the first, second, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh periods, it will be seen, are examples; the third and eighth are exceptions to the rule, and embrace two periods of war which mark our national history. The growth of the nation, measured by this rule, in the second decade should exceed the first by 30 per cent.; the fourth (the third being exceptional) should have been 35 per cent. over third; the fifth 97 per cent. over the fourth; the sixth 27 per cent. over the fifth; the seventh 85 per cent. over the sixth; and, the eighth being exceptional, the ninth should be 121 per cent. over the seventh.

The gross receipts of the Government from March 4, 1789, to June 30, 1875, inclusive, were \$14,973,305,670.59. Of this sum, \$12,703,645,059.91, equivalent to 84 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the whole sum, has been received by the present party administration since 1861. The gross expenditures during this period have been \$14,797,839,742.74, of which 84 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. has been expended since 1861. Thus, of the \$20,771,145,413.33 received and disbursed by the National Government, 84 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. has been received and disbursed in the last fifteen years, while 15 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. alone was disbursed in former years.

It must indeed be conceded that the national expenditures in the last fifteen years, since the republican party came into power, have been upon a scale quite unprecedented in this, perhaps in any, country. The public exigencies in this remarkable period of our history, which seemed to demand them, alone can justify or palliate them.

Whatever diversity of opinion there may be as to the character of these exigencies and the method of dealing with them, one thing must be admitted, that the financial achievements of this period—the vast revenues and expenditures raised and disbursed whereby the nation was enabled to wage successful war and at the same time maintain the public credit and keep the public faith—are scarcely less signal than its triumphs in the field.

Mr. EATON. I desire to ask my friend from Maine a question. I have not had time to make a synopsis of the bill up to this time, but I understood the Senator to say that the committee had agreed measurably with the House in the reduction of the number of officers. Am I correct in that?

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. I do not think I quite comprehend the Senator's question.

Mr. EATON. I may have misunderstood the Senator from Maine;

but I did understand him to say that the committee had agreed with the House measurably in the reduction of the number of officers.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. No; not quite that. What I meant to say was that on the principle of reducing the numerical force the committee proposed to agree with the House in reducing the service to such a point as in their judgment would be consistent with the public service; but we do differ as to where that point is. The committee do not recommend the same reduction in numerical force.

Mr. EATON. I would ask the Senator, then, if he has it so arranged that he can answer me what reduction of the force has been made in the Treasury Department from last year, if any?

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. I do not think I can state it precisely.

Mr. EATON. Can the Senator state, then, what the whole reduction is?

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. The whole reduction numerically is three hundred and eighteen.

Mr. EATON. Three hundred and eighteen employes?

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. Yes, sir, and clerks.

Mr. EATON. In all the Departments?

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. Yes, sir; between 6 and 7 per cent. of the entire force.

Mr. EATON. I desire to state one fact here. Whether it has been brought to the attention of the honorable Senator from Maine or not I do not know. A committee was appointed, which has not yet reported, of which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BOUTWELL] was the chairman—I have the honor to be upon that committee—whose duty it was to examine into the various Departments and suggest if possible any re-organization of any of them. It was suggested by one or two members of that committee that it was wrong as a matter of principle that the employes of the various Departments should be required to work but six hours a day. Taking into consideration the number of hours of labor which are performed by all the various industries of the country and demanded by them, it was suggested that the labor of these Government employes should be increased one hour. I am informed that their labor has been increased from six to seven hours, or at least various employes have stated to me that they had been so notified. I would suggest that as there are three or four thousand employes in the various Departments of the Government—and I suppose I understate it—if their term of duty is increased an hour a day, it would be just so many thousand hours a day additional. If there be four thousand, it would be four thousand hours; and a very little exercise of arithmetic would show how much reduction of force that would take from the various Departments.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. I will say to my honorable friend that the estimates which I have submitted here to-day from the heads of the Departments will be found to have been based upon that consideration already, and that that principle has been applied.

Mr. EATON. So I supposed.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. The reduction recommended by the head of the Treasury Department is based in part upon the consideration of additional hours, or that consideration enters into the estimate. With additional hours he submits that the public service can be carried on with the force he recommends.

Mr. EATON. Certainly that consideration does not enter far enough into his estimate. If you add an additional hour the reduction will be more than three hundred or four hundred. An hour a day, if there be four thousand employes, is four thousand hours a day to be added to the service of the employes. The reduction—I have not my pencil in my hand—would be more than five hundred clerks. I submit that this matter should be looked into with some care. I do not wish to take up the time of the Senate now upon that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, (Mr. ANTHONY in the chair.) The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill. The Chair understands it to be the sense of the Senate that the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations shall be acted upon as they are reached.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the bill. The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was in lines 10 and 11, to increase the appropriation for compensation of Senators from \$333,000 to \$370,000, and in line 11 after the word "dollars" to strike out the words:

And from and after the 30th of June next, the compensation of said Senators shall be \$4,500 per annum.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I am very sorry that the Senate is so thin when a question so important as the pay of its own members is involved; but a question far more important is the probable effect upon the appropriation bills of the wide differences between the two Houses upon the many questions presented by each of their vital bills. I had made up my mind for one, until within the last few hours, that I would vote in deference to the judgment of the House of Representatives for a decrease in the pay of Senators, upon the ground that the House had fixed their own pay at \$4,500, and as they probably would not be willing that Senators should have \$5,000 and they \$4,500, I was willing for the sake of economy to agree with them at their own valuation of their own services. I am rather inclined to do it now; but the considerations presented by the Senator from Maine ought to be considered by a full Senate. It seems to me that the vote on this first proposition ought to settle the fate of the entire bill. I have read it with a good deal of care. The House of Representatives have greatly changed the civil service of the Government. They have not only reduced the number of employes and reduced the pay, but they have imported and grafted upon the bill very important legislative

provisions. Among others there is a page or two of amendments to the revenue law which I am sure I have not considered, and I know the Committee on Finance have not had an opportunity to examine and to consult the proper authorities of the Government about to ascertain whether they are right or not. I notice through the bill other important legislative provisions.

The Senate of the United States cannot deny that the House of Representatives have the power to propose amendments to an appropriation bill, because we have done it time out of mind. Therefore we are precluded from making any point of order upon them. Nor is it possible to make any such objection, because by the Constitution itself each House must prescribe its own rules of procedure and its own mode of legislation. Hence we have no right to object to their mode of proceeding or to the changes proposed to existing law. We are precluded from even a criticism upon their amendments to appropriation bills, from the fact that the House is the sole judge of its own bills, and the Senate has since the foundation of the Government passed many and important legislative amendments to appropriation bills.

I therefore leave that point out of the view; but it is perfectly manifest that this bill is to be the subject of contest between the two Houses, and now at the outset of the controversy we ought to be careful that we are right, that we do nothing but what is right, that we assent to everything that is reasonable, and then stand upon our position until the end of this Congress, if necessary. It is manifest there is to be a contest over this and other appropriation bills, and at the beginning of the discussion to-day we should take our stand upon the ground we intend to occupy as to this bill with a full vote, so that every Senator, after full investigation, may say that "I know I am right and here I mean to stand."

The first question presented is, shall we consent to a reduction of our pay of \$500 a year? I repeat that, if this was left to me, I would say "yes" at once; if the House of Representatives thinks the condition of the country is so bad, that our finances are so bad, that it is necessary to reduce the pay of members of Congress, well and good; and, as they propose to reduce their own pay, we might very fairly and properly, without any demagogism, with the utmost desire to promote the public good, say, "Very well; we are certainly willing to submit to that sacrifice, if you are." But, if we adopt that principle as to Senators and Members, we cannot then refuse to carry out the logic of the argument and apply it to other officers of the Government. Who are the officers of the Government affected by this bill? In the first place, there is the President of the United States. It is proposed to force the reduction of the salary of the President of the United States from \$50,000, what the law is now, to \$25,000 a year.

I did not happen to be present the other day when the vote was taken upon the bill to lower the President's salary. If I had been here I would have voted against that proposition on the ground that the salary of \$25,000 was fixed at the beginning of the Government, when money was more valuable than now, when the responsibilities of the President were greatly less, when his duties and labors were infinitely less. Therefore, I would not vote to reduce the salary of the President. This bill also operates, as I understand it, upon the salaries of the judges of all the courts of the United States to be hereafter appointed. We cannot reduce the salaries of those judges during their life-time. All we could do now would be to make our reductions apply to those judges who might come into office hereafter as others died or their terms lapsed; so that we should have two sets or two classes of pay in the payment of our judges. It seems to me that would not be wise.

Another class of officers more numerous than all the rest—yes, ten in number to one of any other kind—are the clerks of the various Executive Departments of the Government. I do not know how many there are, but there must be three thousand at least; consequently they are more than ten to one probably of all the executive officers of the Government here in Washington. Their pay was fixed in 1853 and 1854. It was fixed at \$1,200, \$1,400, \$1,600, and \$1,800 a year, according to grade. We know very well from our own observation of these clerks that they can scarcely get along in the expensive life at Washington, where hotel-keepers and boarding-house-keepers expect to make a year's living within three months, where marketing is high, much higher than it ought to be, and all the expenses of a family are far greater than they ought to be. I know very well that, although we should have everything here as cheaply as in Ohio, yet as a rule every such article of necessity for a household, like marketing, is at least one-third more than it is in Ohio.

Under the circumstances I do not see how any Senator, with the responsibilities that rest upon him, can vote knowingly to reduce from 10 to 20 per cent. the salaries of these officers, clerks, employes, the great body of the official life of Washington. I cannot do it. I will not do it. Their pay was fixed at a time when money was more valuable than it is now; when it was gold. A clerk might very easily in 1854 and 1855, when I first came here, lay aside three or four or five hundred dollars a year, when now he cannot by the utmost economy do so.

Therefore I say I will not vote for this general decrease; but if we apply the reduction to our own salary, the logic of the argument will be to apply it to all others, and to adopt the policy proposed by the House. If we, however, agree to the reduction of our own salaries, and apply the reduction proposed by them only to those officials

whose salaries have been raised since or during the war, there would be some logic in that. Perhaps some such proposition as that might be advocated and maintained; but when it is proposed to apply this reduction to all officers in the Government, including those most poorly paid, I simply say we cannot do it.

Therefore, I have come to the conclusion that for the present at least I will follow the action of the committee, to restore the appropriations to precisely what the law now requires. If then hereafter the House should insist upon an entire revolution of our Government, the wholesale reduction not only in the number of our employés and in the salaries of our employés, including the President of the United States, including all branches of official life except the judges who are protected by the Constitution, I will stand against that reduction as being unwise and unjust to those men personally, and injurious to the public service. But, if they are willing to apply that reduction only to those officers whose salaries have been increased since or during the war, including that of members of Congress, even to a lower figure than they now propose, I will join with them heartily and agree to their amendments. For the present, I propose to stand by the existing law.

I passed through a contest of this kind before. I remained here one year until September, I think it was. It was in 1856 that we remained here until September, and the contest I refer to was in 1859 and 1860. I passed through a contest just like this at that time. I remember it very well. We had a republican House of Representatives and a democratic Senate. The House proposed amendments to which the Senate disagreed. The Senate piled upon our appropriation bills all sorts of amendments, amounting to millions of dollars. In the last days of the session the bills came to us loaded down with amendments; and then the House took a position which was the logical sequence of the constitutional rule which requires the concurrence of two Houses of Congress to pass bills. We took our position, and stood by it, and compelled the Senate to yield to it. Our position was that whenever the law authorizes and requires a specific sum for a specific purpose that we would give such sum without abatement or reduction. We did it. Although, at that time, the disposition on the part of the House, the parties then being exactly reversed, was to cut down all appropriations, we carried out the law. Wherever the law fixed a sum or fixed the amount of a salary, we gave the full amount. We did not seek to force the Senate to change a law, and placed our action on the ground that it was not the right or duty of the House to coerce the Senate to agree to any change of existing law by an appropriation bill that the Senate did not and could not fairly and honestly assent to.

Then, on the other hand, we said to them, "We will not agree to any appropriation proposed by you, either of an indefinite character or where the amount was entirely at the will of both Houses of Congress, unless the House freely votes it without regard to your desire;" that is, you shall not coerce us to change the law or to appropriate money unless the law demands it, and we will not coerce you to change the law or to vary the law unless you agree with us that the law should be changed. Where changes could be made by the mutual assent of both Houses freely given, without any coercion, moral or physical, those ought to be made; but neither House has a right to coerce the other to adopt an amendment to a law unless by its own free will and accord. That is the rule, and that will be the result of this controversy. There is no doubt of it whatever.

As a matter of course I think the Committee on Appropriations ought now to have the deliberate sense of the Senate on these amendments. If we take our position that these amendments to the existing law do not agree with our sense of what is right and say we will not agree to them, the House of Representatives must recede from those amendments. There is no other logic. On the other hand, if the Senate committee or the Senate propose any appropriations of any character whatever, not provided for by law, and ask the House to pass them, and the House decline to pass them, the Senate committee and the Senate ought to recede from the appropriation without question or hesitation. As I understand, that is the rule under which the Committee on Appropriations have generally acted.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. The committee undoubtedly acted upon the rule submitted by the Senator, and no appropriation bill is possible without the prevalence of such a rule. The controversies of the two Houses would be endless upon any other supposition than that. In the end the proposition of law is to control the difference between the two Houses. I wish to make one suggestion to my honorable friend. He speaks about a willingness to reduce the compensation of Senators. The committee of course express no opinion about that. That comes within the general rule. That falls under the obligation to appropriate according to law. The salary of the President and the salary of Senators and Representatives was fixed by the acts of 1874. The Senator will find by looking at the act that all the salaries touched by it were to remain as fixed by law until further changed. What I wish to say is that if the Senate makes an exception in this instance the logic applies to the whole service.

Mr. SHERMAN. I stated that that was the only reason why I could not vote for the reduction; that my disposition at first was to accept the proposition of the House as to salaries of members of Congress, but that we could not do that without carrying the logic through the whole of these salaries and doing injustice to individuals who cannot afford the reduction. There is no objection to the two

Houses of Congress either enlarging or reducing salaries on appropriation bills if they both agree to it, but neither body can force the other to do it.

There was another case in 1856 still more striking. Then the House of Representatives, in a high party time, undertook to direct that certain moneys appropriated for the support of the Army should not be applied to the enforcement of the bogus laws of Kansas. I believe I had the honor to submit the motion—and I was dead in earnest about it—that no part of the money appropriated in the bill should be applied to enforcing the so-called laws of Kansas, the border-ruffian laws, as we called them. We put the amendment on the Army appropriation bill and sent it to the Senate. They disagreed, and we were held here until October or September; the latter part of September I know, for it was just before the election. We were finally compelled, although we were as dead in earnest as any House could be, to recede on the very ground and principle which I have stated, that we could not force the Senate to agree to a legislative provision in an appropriation bill unless they freely agreed to it. They said they would not agree to it, and so we remained here and finally had to recede.

Mr. BOGY. If I understand the Senator aright, he was willing to do then what he condemns now.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; I offered the amendment myself.

Mr. BOGY. And you were supported by your party at that time in Congress?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; and we had to recede, just as everybody else will have to recede under the same circumstances.

Mr. EATON. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio why he receded?

Mr. SHERMAN. Because we were compelled to do so.

Mr. EATON. Because you got tired? Was that the reason?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, my political friends would not stand by the position taken. Now let me say if there ever was a case in the history of mankind which justified a legislative body in putting on such a provision and standing by it, it was that case, for of all the infamy that ever was committed by a political party none ever exceeded the attempt that was made in 1856 to force upon the people of Kansas laws not of their making, and my friend from Missouri and all other Senators know it. There never was a case which justified resistance more strongly than that.

Mr. BOGY. I think the reverse is the fact, that you attempted to force upon the people of Kansas laws which the people did not want. That is my understanding.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will not go into that now. At any rate the House of Representatives, I being one of the party and two or three others around me—I see my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. CRAGIN] who was with us then—attempted to do what the House attempt to do now. We had to back out then, although we were supported by a strong political feeling, and were engaged in as honest a cause as ever man undertook to advocate. We took the wrong measure to enforce it; that was all.

There is another aspect of our condition that is not pleasant and makes it our duty to meet the House of Representatives in all reasonable measures of economy. I am sorry to say that our receipts have fallen short of the estimates about fourteen or fifteen million dollars this year. Our customs have fallen off about \$10,000,000 and our internal revenue has fallen off about \$4,000,000. The increase of the tax on whisky and tobacco has, as I expected, caused a decrease of the estimated revenue to the amount of about \$4,000,000, and perhaps other causes have operated to bring about this deficit.

Mr. EATON. How much in all?

Mr. SHERMAN. About fourteen or fifteen million. At the same time it is to be said that our expenses have been reduced. The action of the last Congress, through the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses, considerably reduced our expenses; so that, while our revenues are falling off, our expenses have been considerably less than they were last year. The balance of the account is not so much against us as one would suppose. It is about \$6,000,000, my friend from Maine [Mr. MORRILL] tells me. Therefore, under the operation of the laws of the last session, our expenditures have been reduced, and the deficit, compared with the estimate made at the beginning of this session, my friend from Maine tells me, is to the extent of \$6,000,000, and we ought to curtail our appropriation bills enough more to make up our sinking fund to the full amount required by law. As I understand my friend from Maine, the present Congress will do that and more. We can reduce, or even defeat, several appropriation bills which contain large sums of money, entirely at our discretion. For instance, there is the river and harbor bill, which may be raised or lowered, according to the amount of money in the Treasury. There are the appropriations for public buildings and public grounds and various works of internal improvement which may be made a graduating scale, to be raised or lowered at pleasure. There is no question, therefore, that in bills which do not affect the ordinary operations of the Government there are "ample room and verge enough" to save even the \$15,000,000 of the deficiency of estimated revenue without affecting anything that is vital or necessary to the great functions of the Government.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. I wish to say in this connection that the Senate committee have already concurred with the House of Representatives on the question of appropriations for the exterior defenses,

which are estimated at something over \$3,000,000 on a bill appropriating but \$300,000, so that in the line of the Senator's argument there would be a reduction of the expenditures from the estimates in that branch. It is undoubtedly true that, in regard to other branches of the service not fixed and established by laws as to salaries like the one we are considering, a very large reduction may be made. A reduction has already been made by the House of Representatives in the bill referred to by the Senator in regard to internal improvements which, I fancy, may be without any great detriment to the public service very largely reduced here. But that is not a matter for the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have said all that I desire to say, and perhaps I ought to apologize for saying this much now, but the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations are necessarily kindred committees. One has to deal with revenue, the other has to deal with expenditures, and it is absolutely necessary for the Committee on Finance to understand what sum is to be appropriated before they can judge how much tax is to be raised and how much money must be provided. And therefore it has been the duty of these two committees to act in co-operation. If the Committee on Appropriations should make large appropriations, we should have to make large provisions in the way of taxes. One great error committed at the last session of Congress was that the appropriations were made so large that just at the heel of the session we were compelled to pass a very illy-considered tax bill. There is no necessity for that now; because I believe the spirit of both Houses of Congress, not only of the House of Representatives, which has shown it by largely reducing expenses, but of the Senate itself, is in favor of large and wise economy; a great reduction of expenditure; and if this is done to anything like the extent that is promised by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, I have no doubt we shall not only have the ordinary surplus of revenue and enough for the sinking fund, but something over, perhaps. To accomplish it we must accept from the House of Representatives every wise measure of economy proposed by them; but they have no right to force upon us any measure in the name of economy that the Senate does not consider to be wise and proper. If we only act on that rule, to yield to them to the utmost extent that we can do it without affecting the public service, and then stand where we believe the law ought not to be changed, there ought to be and can be no conflict between the two Houses to prevent the adjournment of Congress within the present fiscal year, or shortly after.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. President, is not the logic of this bill a little different from the way in which the Senator from Ohio states it with regard to the compensation of members of Congress and the compensation of the great body of the officials at Washington—that is, the clerks in the Departments? When the salaries of the clerks were fixed at twelve, fourteen, sixteen, and eighteen hundred dollars, the salary of members of Congress was \$3,000. The salary of members of Congress has been raised from three to five thousand dollars; the salaries of the clerks remain where they were fixed in 1853. Now, if we are to take the bill logically, it seems to me that the reduction of the compensation of clerks above \$1,200—I think the bill cuts down 10 per cent. those above \$1,200—then our own compensation should be 10 per cent. below what it was when these salaries were fixed. That would make it \$2,700. If the other House desire to fix the compensation of members of Congress at \$4,500, although I think it is too low; if they put that value on their own services and on ours also, I do not see why we may not consistently agree to that part of the bill while we resist the reduction of these salaries which are the same now as they were when ours were only three-fifths of what they are.

Mr. SHERMAN. I for one say to my friend that, if the House of Representatives insist on the reduction of the pay of members of Congress, at the next stage of this bill it will be within the power of any Senator to move to recede from this amendment, and I for one will vote to do so. If the House insists on reducing the salaries of members of Congress, at the next stage of this bill I certainly will vote to recede from our amendment restoring the amount.

Mr. HOWE. Allow me to ask the Senator if there is not a constitutional difficulty in the way of that?

Mr. SHERMAN. What is it?

Mr. HOWE. Cruel and unusual punishments shall not be inflicted. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHERMAN. They administer the punishment and we have to suffer from it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. INGALLS in the chair.) The question is on the amendment which has been read.

Mr. ANTHONY. I am reminded of an error I made. I said that at the time when the compensation of clerks was fixed at \$1,200, \$1,400, \$1,600, and \$1,800, the compensation of members of Congress was \$3,000. I am informed that it was only \$8 a day then.

Mr. SHERMAN. Eight dollars a day. It was changed in the summer of 1856 to \$3,000 a year.

Mr. ANTHONY. Admitting the justice of reducing the compensation of clerks above \$1,200, the logic of the bill requires that our compensation should be put at \$7.20 a day. I do not know but that the \$8 per day of members of Congress was below \$1,200 a year, and they might escape in that way, but not otherwise.

Mr. SARGENT. Eight dollars a day during the session, I believe.

Mr. ANTHONY. During the session only, and the pay did not commence until the Senator or Member appeared in his seat.

Mr. WITHERS. Mr. President, I will say a word or two on the proposed amendment. While I am disposed to go as far as any man in the direction of economy and reducing the expenses of the Government, yet with regard to these salaries I do not think here is the line in which reduction can be most effectively consummated. I believe the extravagance with which this Government is administered, and which is made the subject of complaint by the people, arises not so much from the amount of salaries regularly paid to the officials as from the speculations and abuses which have crept into the Government, and which are very far in excess of its legitimate expenses. I believe that it is the duty of the Government to pay its employés, whether in the Senate Chamber or at the Clerk's table, a sufficient amount to support them. I believe that the salary of \$5,000 per annum is not more than sufficient to support a member of Congress in the sphere in which he is expected to move; and, if I may be pardoned for making a personal allusion, I will say that I have thus found it in my experience. I have a large family; I am blessed, I am happy to say, with a large family. I am not blessed with a large portion of this world's goods. I am not extravagant in my personal habits, and yet I have found it just as much as I can do to support my family decently upon \$5,000 per annum. I have no hesitancy in making that declaration to the Senate and to the country, and let it go for what it is worth. I shall vote, therefore, for putting the salary back to what it was before. I have no fears or apprehensions that my people will complain of it or that they will regard it as more than my services in this body are worth to them. I have nothing more to say, sir, on the subject.

Mr. ANTHONY. I suggest to the Senator in charge of this bill that the sections relating to compensation of members of Congress be passed over until we fix the compensation of the other officers of the Government and then treat all alike. If we leave the law as it is as to them, let our compensation stand; if we cut it down, let us cut ours down also.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. It will be very easy to come back to it if we shall commit that error.

Mr. SARGENT. We can make the change in the Senate.

Mr. MAXEY. Mr. President, I have always believed, and throughout life have acted upon the principle, that "the laborer is worthy of his hire." In the course of my life I have employed many people; I have always believed that it was right to pay them a fair and just compensation for the services rendered. In my professional duties as a lawyer, when at home, I have invariably charged what I believed to be a fair and just compensation for services rendered to my clients. I do not base that fee upon the footing or level of what probably would be charged by a young man who had just commenced his professional career, but I am governed by what I believe my services are worth. Now, while I may not be as valuable in the Senate Chamber as some other and more distinguished men, yet I believe that I am worth to the State of Texas, in a careful attention to the interests of the State—and no one will say that I am inattentive—the sum of \$5,000 a year. I know the fact, and it is well known to the people of Texas, that when at home my income from my profession is more than double that money. I am losing money by being here, but I agreed to come here for that amount. While I would not vote for an increase of the salary of a member of Congress, I would not vote for a decrease of it. I have never yet heard throughout the length and breadth of the State of Texas, which I represent in part, the slightest objection to paying a member of Congress \$5,000 a year, because that State is magnanimous and generous and her people expect and believe that a man should be paid according to the value of his services; and if a man is worth being in the Senate, if he ought to be here at all, he is worth \$5,000 to his State; and if he is not worth \$5,000 he had better step down and out, and let somebody come here that is worth \$5,000. That is my view of it.

In short, the sentiment of the State that I represent is to act honorably toward public officers, those engaged in the public service, and not pay them a niggardly salary. Neither am I in favor of paying a large salary. Every one who has ever served here—and, as was said by the Senator from Virginia, I speak by experience—every one who has served in Congress with a family knows that it is impossible, if he is an honest man, to save money here at \$5,000 a year. A thief can get rich at a dollar a day, if he will sell out his vote; but an honest man cannot possibly do more than support himself as a gentleman should live and as his State expects him to live at \$5,000 a year. What principle may have been adopted in arriving at this 10 per cent. idea, this horizontal figure of 10 per cent., I do not know, because I have not investigated it. This particular item I do know about, and I shall vote on the amendments as they come up, one by one. I believe that the amendment made by the Senate Committee on Appropriations in putting the pay back to what it was is right, and I have yet to see the day or hour that I would not say by vote what I believed to be right. I have never been a demagogue in my life. I hope and trust in the Lord I never shall be.

Now, Mr. President, I know the fact that the country is suffering terribly by the depressed condition of financial affairs all through the land. We all know that. We know that since the panic of 1873 poverty has been knocking at the door of very, very many of the homes of this land; and I will go as far as the farthest in doing what

I believe to be right in the way of just retrenchment and just economy. But, sir, let us be just and right to ourselves and to everybody else. It is only a day or two ago that \$750,000, more than double the amount here appropriated for this entire Senate, was voted out of the Treasury of the United States by us upon what I then believed and yet believe to be a sickly sentimentality. And yet here, when the pay of the ambassadors of the States, representing thirty-seven States of the American Union, is to be fixed, the whole of our pay is fixed at a sum not one-half the amount that was given away upon a mere sickly sentimentality. I have some little knowledge of affairs. I would like to be controlled by what I regard as business in business transactions. I did not think that business, and I voted against it. I did not think it was right to the Government, and therefore I voted against it. I do think this is right, and I shall vote for it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WRIGHT] is quite indisposed to-day, and I have paired with him upon this bill. If he were here he would vote against the amendment restoring the President's salary to \$50,000 and for adhering to the bill as reported from the House in that respect. In that I should concur with him. Upon other portions of the bill, so far as I have had time to examine it, I would vote against the amendments offered by the committee of the Senate, and he would vote for them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations, which has been read, in lines 10, 11, 12, and 13, striking out "thirty-three" and inserting "seventy," and striking out all after the word "dollars."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will be proceeded with.

The Chief Clerk continued the reading of the bill. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was in lines 18 and 19, to increase the appropriation for salary of "Secretary of the Senate, including compensation as disbursing officer," from \$4,500 to \$4,896.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 19, to strike out "horse" and insert "horses;" in line 20, to strike out "wagon" and insert "wagons;" and after the word "for" to strike out the words "his use, 500," and insert "the Secretary's office 1,200;" so as to read:

And for hire of horses and wagons for the Secretary's office, \$1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 21 and 22, to increase the appropriation for salary of the Chief Clerk of the Senate from \$2,500 to \$3,000; and after the word "dollars," in line 22, to add:

And the additional sum of \$1,000 while the said office is held by the present incumbent, and no longer.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 25, before the word "minute," to strike out the word "and;" in line 26, after the word "clerk," to strike out the words "at \$2,250 each" and insert "and;" in line 28, after the word "thousand," to insert "five hundred and ninety-two;" and after the word "dollars" to insert the word "each;" so as to read:

Principal clerk, principal executive clerk, minute and journal clerk, and financial clerk in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, \$2,592 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 29, after the word "librarian," to strike out the words "\$1,800;" in line 30, before "clerks," to strike out "five" and insert "seven;" and in line 31, after the word "thousand," to insert the words "two hundred and twenty;" so as to read:

Librarian and seven clerks in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, at \$2,220 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 32, to increase the appropriation for salary of clerk of printing records from \$1,600 to \$2,220.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 33 and 34, to increase the appropriation for salary of five clerks in the office of the Secretary of the Senate from \$1,800 each to \$2,100 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 35, to increase the appropriation for salary of keeper of the stationery of the Senate from \$1,500 to \$2,102.40.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 37, to increase the appropriation for salary of one messenger in the office of the Secretary of the Senate from \$1,200 to \$1,296.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert after line 37 the words:

Four laborers in the office of the Secretary of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert after line 38 the words:

One special policeman, \$1,296.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 41, to increase the appropriation for salary of secretary to the Vice-President from \$1,800 to \$2,102.40.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 44, to increase the appropriation for salary of clerk to the Committee on Finance from \$2,200 to \$2,320.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 45, to increase the appropriation for salary of clerk to the Committee on Claims from \$2,000 to \$2,220.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert after the word "dollars," in line 47, the words:

Clerk to the Committee on Commerce, \$2,220; clerk to the Committee on the Judiciary, \$2,220; clerk to the Committee on Private Land Claims, \$2,220.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 52, to increase the appropriation for salary of assistant keeper of the stationery from \$1,200 to \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 54, to increase the appropriation for salary of Sergeant-at-Arms and Doorkeeper from \$4,000 to \$4,320.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 55, to increase the appropriation for salary of assistant doorkeeper from \$2,000 to \$2,592.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 56 and 57, to increase the appropriation for salary of acting assistant doorkeeper from \$1,800 to \$2,592.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was after the word "dollars," in line 57, to strike out the words:

Chief messenger assisting Doorkeeper, \$1,800.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Three messengers, acting as assistant doorkeepers, at \$1,800 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 61, to increase the appropriation for salary of Postmaster to the Senate from \$2,000 to \$2,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 62, to increase the appropriation for salary of assistant postmaster and mail-carrier from \$1,800 to \$2,088.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 63 and 64, to increase the appropriation for salary of two mail-carriers from "\$125 per month during the session," to "\$1,200 each."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 66, to increase the appropriation for salary of superintendent of the document-room from \$1,800 to \$2,160.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 67, before the word "assistant" to strike out "one" and insert "two," and to strike out "assistant" and insert "assistants;" and in line 68, to strike out "\$200" and insert "\$440 each;" so as to read:

Two assistants in document-room, at \$1,440 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 69 and 70, to increase the appropriation for salary of superintendent of the folding-room from \$1,800 to \$2,160.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 71, after the word "one" to strike out "clerk" and insert "assistant;" so as to read:

One assistant in the folding-room, \$1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 72, before the word "messengers" to strike out "23" and insert "20," and to strike out the words "hundred and twenty-five dollars per month each during the session" and insert "thousand four hundred and forty dollars each;" so as to read:

Twenty messengers, at \$1,440 each.

Mr. ANTHONY. I move to amend the amendment of the committee after line 72, by making the "twenty" read "twenty-one," and after the word "messengers" inserting "one of whom shall act as upholsterer under direction of the Sergeant-at-Arms."

That is to retain in service here a messenger who acts as upholsterer, which is very necessary in this large number of rooms, for carpeting and for chairs, &c. The Sergeant-at-Arms, whom I have consulted on the subject, has no doubt it will be an economy. Otherwise the same service will have to be obtained from without at much greater expense.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The Chief Clerk continued the reading of the bill.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was in line 76, to increase the appropriation for salary of chief engineer of the Senate from \$1,800 to \$2,160.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 77 before the word "assistant" to strike out "two" and insert "three;" and in line 78, after "thousand," to strike out "two hundred" and insert "four hundred and forty;" so as to read:

Three assistant engineers, at \$1,440 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 80, to increase the appropriation for salary of assistant engineer in charge of the Senate elevator from \$1,200 to \$1,440.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 81, to increase the appropriation for salary of two firemen from \$900 each to \$1,095 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 82, after the word "each" to insert the words:

Three skilled laborers, at \$1,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 83, before the word "laborers" to strike out "seven" and insert "ten;" so as to read:

Ten laborers, at \$720 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 84, to strike out the words "and one female" and insert "to pay Kate Dodson;" and in line 85, to strike out "600" and insert "720;" so as to read:

To pay Kate Dodson, in charge of the ladies' retiring-room, \$720.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 86, after the words "telegraph operator" to strike out the words "at the rate of \$100 per month;" so as to read:

Telegraph operator, during the session, \$400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 87, before the word "laborers" to strike out "ten" and insert "seventeen;" in lines 89 and 90, to strike out "2,400" and insert "4,080;" so as to read:

And seventeen laborers at the rate of \$720 per annum during the session of the Senate, \$4,080.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ANTHONY] to the fact that his amendment will require an addition to the total footing in lines 91 and 92, which is the subject-matter of the next amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. WEST] will take charge of amending the aggregate to meet my amendment.

Mr. WEST. As there will evidently be a necessity to amend the total amount by the addition \$1,440 according to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, which was conceded by the Senate, I call the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill to the fact that there is an omission at the bottom of page 2, line 38, requiring an additional amount; and then we should make the alteration in lines 92 and 93 to correspond. It is an oversight in the bill. What amount is necessary to insert for the four laborers provided for in line 38?

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. Seven hundred and twenty dollars each.

Mr. WEST. Then I move to amend, after line 38, by adding the words "at \$720 each."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WEST. Now I move to amend by changing the amount of "\$161,632.80" to "\$166,002.80," in lines 92 and 93, being the aggregate of all the items from line 15 to that point.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. The Senator is in error about that. Although the amendment in line 38 did not specify the sum, the computation was upon that basis.

Mr. WEST. Very good. I see where the error is. Then I withdraw the last amendment and make it embrace simply the amount as amended on motion of the Senator from Rhode Island and make it \$163,120.80.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. That would be right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I suggest that the Secretary read this bill by paragraphs, so that each paragraph be read through as it will read when amended. I think it would facilitate the consideration of the bill to adopt that course. I know it has been adopted elsewhere, and it would save much labor to the Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By consent that order can be observed. If no objection is made, the bill will be read in that order.

The Chief Clerk continued the reading of the bill.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was in line 100, after the word "for," to strike out "twenty-one" and insert "twenty-eight," and, after the word "at," to strike out "5" and insert "6;" and in line 101, after the word "session," to strike out "12,600" and insert "20,328;" so as to read:

For twenty-eight clerks to committees, at \$6 per day during the session, \$20,328.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 103, after the words "Senate Chamber," to strike out the word "including;" and in line 107, after the word "employed," to strike out "four thousand two" and insert "five thousand four;" so as to read:

For fourteen pages for the Senate Chamber, two riding pages, one page for the Vice-President's room, and one page for the office of the Secretary of the Senate, at the rate of \$2.50 per day while actually employed, \$5,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 110, to increase the appropriation for hire of horses and mail-wagons for carrying the mails from \$2,000 to \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was after the word "dollars" in line 110, to strike out the words:

And the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate is hereby directed to advertise in one of the daily papers in Washington, District of Columbia, for one week, for proposals for furnishing horses and wagons for carrying the mails, books, and other documents between the city post-office and the Departments and residences of members and the Senate post-office and folding-room and document room; said proposals to include for the carrying of said mails, books, boxes, and documents the use of three horses and wagons during the session of Congress, one of which shall be in use during the year; and he shall contract with the lowest responsible bidder for such service for the term of one year.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS. I suggest to the Clerk, if there is no objection—of course we can stop at any time—to read the bill as it would read if amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the course now being pursued.

Mr. DAVIS. It will save time.

The Chief Clerk resumed the reading of the bill.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was in line 123, after the word "folding," to strike out "books;" so as to read:

For materials for folding, \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 125 and 126, to strike out the words:

For labor in folding books, speeches, and pamphlets, \$3,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

For four folders, at not exceeding \$3 per day, under the direction of the superintendent of the folding-room, \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 133, 134, and 135, in the item as to the price paid for folding the daily RECORD and speeches in the folding-room of the Senate, from not exceeding \$2.50 to not exceeding \$2 per thousand, and speeches from not exceeding \$1.50 to not exceeding \$1 per thousand.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 143, to increase the appropriation for reporting the debates and proceedings of the Senate from \$22,500 to \$25,000, and after the word "dollars" to insert "payable in equal monthly installments."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 151, in the appropriations for the Capitol police, to increase the appropriation for salary of one captain from \$1,600 to \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 152, before the word "lieutenants," to strike out "two" and insert "three," and, after the word "thousand," to strike out "two" and insert "six;" so as to read:

Three lieutenants at \$1,600 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 153, before the word "privates" to strike out "twenty-one" and insert "twenty-four;" and in line 154, after the word "thousand" to insert "400;" so as to read:

Twenty-four privates, at \$1,400 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 154, before the word "watchmen," to strike out "four" and insert "eight;" and in line 155 after the word "at" to strike out "900" and insert "1,000;" so as to read:

And eight watchmen, at \$1,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 156, to increase the total appropriation for the Capitol police from \$28,600 to \$48,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 162 and 163, to increase the appropriation for salary of Members of the House of Representatives and Delegates from Territories from \$1,359,000 to \$1,550,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 164, after the word "dollars," to strike out the words:

And from and after the 30th of June next, the compensation of said Members and Delegates shall be \$4,500 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 171, after the word "Representatives," to strike out the words "4,700" and insert:

Including compensation as disbursing-officer of the contingent fund, \$4,896.

So as to read:

Clerk of the House of Representatives, including compensation as disbursing-officer of the contingent fund, \$4,896.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 174, to strike out "horse" and insert "horses," and to strike out "wagon" and insert "wagons;" and after "the" to strike out "Clerk, five hundred" and insert "clerk's office, one thousand two hundred;" so as to read:

And for hire of horses and wagons for use of the Clerk's office, \$1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 176, after the word "clerk" to

Insert the word "and," and after "journal clerk" to insert "\$3,000 each;" so as to read:

Chief Clerk and journal clerk, \$3,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 177, after "reading clerks" to strike out the word "and," and after "tally clerk" to strike out the words "five in all, at \$2,250 each; for;" in line 179, after "enrolling clerk," to strike out "four" and insert "seven;" and in line 180, after the word "thousand," to insert "five hundred and ninety-two;" so as to read:

Two reading clerks, tally clerk, disbursing clerk, file clerk, printing and bill clerk, and enrolling clerk, seven in all, at \$2,592 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 182 and 183, after "newspaper clerk" to strike out the words "superintendent of document-room;" in line 184 to strike out the word "engineer" and insert "assistant librarian;" and after the word "at" to strike out "1,800" and insert "2,160;" so as to read:

For assistant Chief Clerk, assistant to enrolling clerk, resolution, petition, and distributing clerk, newspaper clerk, index clerk, librarian, and assistant librarian, eight in all, at \$2,160 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 188, after the word "dollars" to strike out "two" and insert "one chief messenger in the office of the Clerk of the House at \$5.76 per day; three messengers and one;" so as to read:

One chief messenger in the office of the Clerk of the House at \$5.76 per day; three messengers and one messenger assisting librarian, at \$1,440 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 191 and 192, to strike out the words "for book-keeper, four clerks" and insert "one engineer, \$1,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 193, before the word "assistant" to strike out "two" and insert "three;" after the word "engineers" to strike out the words "and all engineers and others who are engaged in heating and ventilating the House shall be subject to the orders of, and in all respects under the direction of the Doorkeeper, seven in all;" and in line 197, after the word "thousand" to strike out "two hundred" and insert "four hundred and forty;" so as to read:

And three assistant engineers, at \$1,440 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 198, before the word "firemen" to strike out "four" and insert "six;" and after the word "at" to strike out "900" and insert "1,095;" so as to read:

For six firemen at \$1,095 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 203, after "telegraph operator" to strike out the words "at \$100 per month during the session" and insert "\$400;" so as to read:

And one telegraph operator, \$400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 205 and 206, to increase the appropriation for salary of clerk to the Committee of Ways and Means from \$2,400 to \$2,592.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 207 and 208, to increase the appropriation for salary of messenger to the Committee of Ways and Means from \$1,200 to \$1,314.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 209, to increase the appropriation for salary of clerk to the Committee on Appropriations from \$2,400 to \$2,592.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 211, to increase the appropriation for salary of messenger to the Committee on Appropriations from \$1,200 to \$1,314.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 213, to increase the appropriation for salary of clerk to the Committee on Claims from \$2,000 to \$2,160.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 215, to increase the appropriation for salary of clerk to the Committee on Public Lands from \$2,000 to \$2,160.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 216, to increase the appropriation for salary of clerk to the Committee on War Claims from \$2,000 to \$2,160.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 217, to increase the appropriation for salary of clerk to Speaker's table from \$1,500 to \$2,102.40.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 219, to increase the appropriation for salary of private secretary to the Speaker from \$1,800 to \$2,102.40.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 222, to increase the appropriation for salary of the Sergeant-at-Arms from \$4,000 to \$4,320.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 222 and 223, after the appropriation for salary of Sergeant-at-Arms to strike out the words:

For one horse and wagon for his use, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 224, to increase the appropriation for salary of clerk to the Sergeant-at-Arms from \$2,000 to \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 225 and 226, to increase the appropriation for salary of paying teller for the Sergeant-at-Arms from \$2,000 to \$2,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 227, to increase the appropriation for salary of messenger to the Sergeant-at-Arms from \$1,200 to \$1,440.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 228, to increase the appropriation for salary of the Doorkeeper from \$2,500 to \$2,592.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 229 and 230, to increase the appropriation for salary of the Assistant Doorkeeper from \$2,000 to \$2,592.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 230 and 231, to strike out the words:

Clerk for Doorkeeper, \$1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 231 and 232, to increase the appropriation for salary of the House Postmaster from \$2,200 to \$2,592.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 233, to increase the appropriation for salary of first assistant postmaster from \$1,800 to \$2,088.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 234, before the word "messengers," to strike out "12" and insert "18;" after the word "messengers," to strike out the words "during the session, at \$125 per month each, and two;" and in line 236, after the word "thousand," to strike out "200" and insert "440," so as to read, "eighteen messengers at \$1,440 each."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 239, to increase the appropriation for salary of five official reporters of the proceedings and debates of the House of Representatives from \$4,500 to \$5,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 241, to reduce the appropriation for compensation of two stenographers for committees of the House from \$4,500 to \$4,200 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 245 and 246, to increase the appropriation for salary of superintendent of the folding-room from \$1,500 to \$2,160.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 251, to increase the appropriation for salary of superintendent and chief assistant in the document-room from \$1,800 to \$2,160 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 253, to increase the appropriation for salary of document file-clerk from \$1,200 to \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 263, to increase the appropriation for salary of one laborer (Henry Douglas) from \$340 to \$917.50.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 266 and 267, to increase the total appropriation for compensation of the officers, clerks, messengers, and others receiving an annual salary in the service of the House of Representatives from \$173,860 to \$209,243.20.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 274, in the appropriations for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives, to strike out "5" and insert "6" before "dollars;" and in line 275, after the word "session," to strike out "12,600" and insert "15,120;" so as to read:

For twenty-one clerks to committees, at \$6 per day during the session, \$15,120.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 277, after the word "folding," to strike out the word "books;" so as to read:

For materials for folding, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in lines 284, 285, and 286, in the items as to folding in the folding-room of the House of Representatives, to reduce the price for folding the daily RECORD from not exceeding \$2.50 per thousand to not exceeding \$2 per thousand, and for folding speeches from not exceeding \$1.50 per thousand to not exceeding \$1 per thousand.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. On page 12, line 270, it strikes me that the word "current" should be stricken out in the clause—

And the fourteen messengers on the soldiers' roll shall be employed during the current year.

That should read "the next fiscal year," undoubtedly. We cannot

be appropriating for this year. That has already been appropriated for. I therefore move to strike out "current" and insert "next fiscal."

Mr. DAVIS. This is a House item. I am inclined to think they meant this to be just as it is.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. For this year?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. We have already appropriated for that. We can amend it and arrange it in conference.

Mr. DAVIS. Looking at it in that light, if there should be an error either way it can be arranged in conference.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. Or in the Senate when the bill shall come out of committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, (Mr. ALLISON in the chair.) The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Maine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Chief Clerk resumed the reading of the bill.

The next amendment was to strike out after the word "dollars," in line 290, the words:

And the Postmaster of the House of Representatives is hereby directed to advertise in one of the daily papers in Washington, District of Columbia, for one week, for proposals for furnishing horses and wagons for carrying the mails, books, and other documents between the city post-office and the House post-office and folding-room and document-room, and the Departments and residences of members; said proposals to include for carrying of said mails, books, boxes, and documents the use of seven horses and wagons during the session of Congress, two of which shall be in use during the year; and he shall contract with the lowest responsible bidder for such service for the term of one year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert after line 321 the following clauses:

Public printing:

For compensation of the Congressional Printer, and the clerks and messengers in his office, \$15,114.

For contingent expenses of his office, namely: For stationery, postage, advertising, traveling expenses, horses and wagons, and miscellaneous items, \$2,500.

Mr. EATON. I do not quite understand this. On looking at the bill I discover that it is not an alteration of the text in the House bill, but an addition by the committee of the Senate. I see here no alteration, no change in a sum, but new matter entirely.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. It is new matter entirely; that is to say, new in this particular bill; but it was left out and is restored.

Mr. EATON. And under the same great claim of law!

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. Precisely. It is one of the branches of the service which is entirely omitted by the House bill.

Mr. EATON. There is so much talk about this congressional printing that I am very sorry to see this back here.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. The Senator will see that, whatever question may arise, we have the establishment and must provide for it. Whatever may be done, the establishment is there to be maintained.

Mr. EATON. Will the committee inform us why this was left out in the House?

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. I am not advised about it. If I am right in my inference, I should say they are investigating the subject; and I have seen in the papers—not to speak of anything that transpires in the House—that there was a proposition somewhere to contract for the printing, but nothing has transpired in the House yet, I believe, on that topic. Of course, when we had before us a bill to appropriate for all the service established by law, we presented this as a service not provided for in the House appropriation bill. If the law is changed, this will go out as a matter of course; but, as at present advised, it seemed to the committee that there was nothing to be done but to make this appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Chief Clerk resumed the reading of the bill.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was in lines 331 and 332, in the appropriation for the Library of Congress, to increase the appropriation for salary of the Librarian from \$3,600 to \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 332, before the word "assistants," to strike out "thirteen" and insert "sixteen;" in line 333, after "thousand," to strike out "two hundred and fifty" and insert "five hundred;" in line 334, after "thousand," to strike out "six" and insert "eight;" in line 335, after "each," to strike out "two" and insert "three;" in line 336, after "thousand," to strike out "four hundred and fifty" and insert "six hundred;" in line 337, after "thousand," to strike out "three hundred" and insert "four hundred and forty;" in line 338, after the word "each," to strike out "two" and insert "three;" in line 339, after the word "each," to strike out "one" and insert "two;" and in lines 340 and 341, after the word "all," to strike out "23,410" and insert "29,340;" so as to read:

And for sixteen assistant librarians, three at \$2,500 each, two at \$1,800 each, three at \$1,600 each, two at \$1,440 each, three at \$1,200 each, two at \$1,000, and one at \$960 per annum; in all, \$29,340.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 359, before the word "assistants," to insert the word "for;" and in line 361, after the word "Congress," to insert the words "\$6,000;" so as to read:

For assistants in Botanic Garden and green-houses and two additional laborers, under the direction of the Library Committee of Congress, \$6,000.

Mr. HOWE. On this part of the bill I desire at some time, when it shall suit the convenience of the Senator in charge of the bill, to propose several amendments.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. If it is agreeable to the Senator to allow the bill to be read through, it will then be open for amendments from all quarters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin to present his amendments and have them printed.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. That has already been done.

Mr. HOWE. Here is an amendment moved by the Committee on Appropriations. If it is agreed to, will it be subject to amendment hereafter?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. When we are in the Senate.

Mr. HOWE. But in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. SHERMAN. Not as to amount.

Mr. HOWE. The committee proposed to fix the sum at \$6,000. It ought to be about \$8,000.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. What is the point?

Mr. HOWE. In line 361 you propose to fix that appropriation at \$6,000. We are of the opinion that it should be about \$8,000. I have not the figures before me, but they are before the Committee on Appropriations. The question is, if this amendment is agreed to now can it be changed in committee?

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. The Senator has proposed an amendment which amends that paragraph in several particulars. I suggest to him to allow it to go.

Mr. HOWE. Be passed over?

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Wisconsin to offer an amendment striking out "six" and inserting "eight?"

Mr. HOWE. No, sir; I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Maine that this paragraph be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the whole paragraph is to be reserved from line 358 to line 365.

The Chief Clerk resumed the reading of the bill.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was in line 368, to increase the appropriation for salary of clerk in the office of public buildings and grounds from \$1,300 to \$1,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 371, before the word "gardener," to strike out "public" and insert "landscape;" and after the word "thousand," to strike out "2" and insert "8;" so as to read:

For landscape gardener, \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 376, to increase the appropriation for "a foreman and laborers employed in the public grounds" from \$13,256 to \$21,456.

Mr. EATON. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee how this large difference comes between his committee and the committee of the House? I see "for a foreman and laborers employed in the public grounds \$13,256" in the House bill, and the amendment is \$21,456. Is that a matter of law? Are there just so many men to be employed at just such a price?

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. That is a matter of discretion entirely.

Mr. EATON. The discretion is larger when exercised by the committee of the Senate.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. The answer to that is, that this is the usual appropriation. All that can be said about an appropriation of that kind is that of course the Senate committee have no means of knowing precisely what number of laborers are required; but it has been found in years of experience that that number or about that number is required, and so, acting upon former appropriations and the supposition arising from the service as established in that way, the committee propose the amendment.

Mr. EATON. I would suggest to my honorable friend that while I am very ready to vote to keep as many men in employment as are necessary for the public good, as well as for the interests of the individual laborers, labor is not as high as it was two years ago and the same amount of money will hire more laborers to-day than could have been hired for it two or three years ago or even last year. The price of labor, I know, is reduced.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. If the Senator will look at the bill carefully, with the estimates and appropriations of last year, he will see that the Committee on Appropriations, as to all these contingent expenses and as to the employment of laborers, have been disposed to meet the views expressed by the bill from the House just as far as was practicable. In regard to this particular measure, all I have to say is that this sum is precisely what was appropriated for the same purpose last year. It may be when it comes to a committee of conference that we shall have to take off half of it.

Mr. EATON. I would rather increase the contingent expenses than the fixed salaries for such a purpose, so as to employ labor.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. The House of Representatives may say "that is one of the questions where we have a discretion," and we may have to recognize that fact.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was to insert after line 385:

Provided, That the architect of the Capitol shall have the care and superintendence of the Capitol, including lighting, heating, and ventilating, and repairs; and shall submit, through the Secretary of the Interior, estimates thereof: *And provided further*, That all the duties relative to the Capitol building, heretofore performed by the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds, shall hereafter be performed by the architect of the Capitol, whose office shall be in the Capitol building, and who shall have the appointment and direction of the employes connected therewith.

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont. I ask the chairman of the committee to allow this amendment to be passed over. I am not sure that the phraseology is quite right. I think the purpose of the amendment is correct, but that some of the duties are performed by other officers of the Capitol intended to be embraced now in this amendment which would not be included. It would be therefore just and proper that this amendment should be revised a little hereafter.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. It may be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over. The next amendment was in line 398, in the appropriations for employes at the Executive Mansion, before the word "night," to strike out "two" and insert "one;" to strike out the word "watchmen" and insert "watchman;" and after "at" to strike out the words "\$1,000 each" and insert "\$900;" so as to read:

One night watchman, at \$900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was after the word "dollars," in line 399, to insert:

One night usher, at \$1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 400, to strike out the word "policemen" and insert the word "day ushers;" and in line 401 after the word "thousand" to insert the words "two hundred;" so as to read:

Two day ushers at \$1,200 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 403, to increase the total appropriation for employes at the Executive Mansion from \$7,264 to \$7,764.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 417, after the word "States," to strike out the words:

Up to the 4th of March 1877, at the rate of.

In line 418, after the word "dollars," to strike out the words:

Per annum, \$33,611.11; and from said day to the 30th of June, 1877, both days inclusive, at the rate of \$25,000 per annum, \$8,135; in all \$41,746.11; and on and after the 4th day of March, 1877, the salary of the President of the United States shall be \$25,000 per annum;

So as to read:

For compensation of the President of the United States, \$50,000.

Mr. MCCREERY. Mr. President, it is a source of profound regret that those who are disposed to curtail the expenditures of the Government by a reduction of the salaries of its officers have had the misfortune in each and every instance to begin in the wrong way or at the wrong place. What that good and perfect way may be, or where the precise starting-point could have been made in order to meet the individual views of the members of this body, it is difficult to determine; nor is it material, according to my understanding, since it is contemplated that there should be a general reduction of salaries, from the highest to the lowest position under this Government, wherever the joint action of the two Houses of Congress can bring about that result. If officials shall ascertain that their salaries are less than a fair compensation for their services, their resignation at any moment will relieve them of their responsibility and stop their unrequited toil.

It has been often and strenuously contended in behalf of high salaries that they are necessary to secure the best talent in the country. They have been frequently and largely augmented, but there are few who will seriously assert that the standard of integrity and capacity has been elevated in consequence. Have we not reason to apprehend that the truth will be found in the reverse of the proposition? There are some too who, like the President, have such reverence for exalted position that they would appropriate large amounts of public money to enable the incumbents to maintain the dignity of their places. Dignity is a very fine thing and comprises the stock in trade of very many worthy and respectable gentlemen; but fine as it is, the powers of analysis have never been able to assign its market value. Dignity is so apt to degenerate into pomposity, pride, and vanity, that it might be a dangerous experiment to offer very large premiums for its successful cultivation. Besides, the faithful discharge of the duty pertaining to any of the Departments of this Government will be sufficient to engross the time and attention of any man; and the gratification of his personal tastes had as well be postponed to his retirement, when he may wear as much dignity as he pleases without detriment to the public service.

It is believed as a general proposition that the decay of public virtue and the undermining of public liberty in all countries may be dated from the exact period at which the salaries of their officials had reached the highest point. Liberty is endangered when power, privilege, patronage, and wealth are monopolized by the few, while the multitude drift into poverty and neglect. Public employment may

be so remunerative as to become entirely incompatible with the freedom of elections, and that freedom may be achieved by a reduction of salaries with far greater certainty than by the enactment of penal statutes.

One of the objections to high salaries is that the incumbent occupies too much of his time in devising plans for spending his money, and if his expenditures are lavish the influence is hurtful to all around him. The vice of extravagance is as contagious as the small-pox, and more destructive than the Asiatic cholera. Give the President \$140 a day for pocket-money, and half as much more in the shape of perquisites, besides house rent, furniture, and fuel, and you will preach in vain to his subordinates of economy and simplicity. The laws of fashion are inexorable, and men, women, and children will plunge into the vortex even though ruin and death should be the consequence.

It has been truly said that we are imitative beings, and it is one of the peculiarities of our nature that we copy the follies, the defects, and even the misfortunes of others, in preference to imitating their virtues. A tree fell upon Ben Hardin when he was a young man, crushing his right hand so that he was never able afterward to touch his thumb with his fingers. When he became distinguished it was painful to witness the performance of his more enthusiastic admirers whose right hands formed a backward curve even more unnatural than his own.

In view, then, of the weakness of human nature, let us not offer the temptation of high salaries to lead our officials into the frivolities of fashion. But, on the contrary, let us make an effort at the inculcation of lessons and habits of republican simplicity and republican economy. The Senate has given the right vote already, a vote which will receive the sanction of nine-tenths of your constituencies. Let us neither be persuaded nor driven to retreat from the strong position which we have deliberately taken. Let us make no compromise with the salary grab, which has been rebuked and denounced by the American people from one end of this Union to the other.

I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MCCREERY. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. I wish to say a single word about this proposition. Of course we can make no change which will affect the President's salary now. Obviously my friend from Kentucky does not expect to reduce the salary of the President of the United States at the present time. The principle upon which we have been acting is to provide the salaries according to law and wait for future consideration to change the law which is to affect salaries in the future. I suggest, therefore, that the Senator's proposition at best would not be very effectual. It could not by any possibility be effective on the President's salary until after the 4th of March next, and we should only be legislating at any event for the residue of the time from the 4th of March until the 30th of June. Therefore, it strikes me that my honorable friend must see that the amendment is immaterial. As Congress convenes again next year, of course it can fix such salary at that time as it chooses; but from the 1st of July, when this bill takes effect, until the 4th of March we can do nothing toward affecting by legislation the salary of the President of the United States. I suggest to my honorable friend that he ought not to urge any opposition to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SARGENT. Mr. President, a bill has passed both Houses by the ordinary majority, I believe in neither House reaching two-thirds, certainly not in the Senate, reducing the President's salary after next March to \$25,000. That bill in the ordinary course of legislative proceeding went to the President, and the President has returned it with his objections. It is now pending in this body, having been reported back from the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment with the recommendation that it pass notwithstanding the veto. A two-thirds vote of the Senate and of the House will make that bill a law; and if it becomes a law, of course after the 4th of March next the salary of the President will be but \$25,000. The Constitution plainly points out this method by which it may become a law notwithstanding the objections of the President, and it seems to me it would be more in consonance with the dignity of the Senate to take the direct question upon the passage of that bill notwithstanding the veto of the President, rather than to incorporate a provision in this bill to the surprise of the Executive, which would compel him either to veto a bill necessary to the whole civil service of the Government or yield the objection which he has signified to us, as was his right under the Constitution of the United States.

Therefore it seems to me, whatever might be the private and individual opinions of Senators upon that bill, and however they might vote upon the question of passing it notwithstanding the objections of the President, that this is hardly fair to the executive office and hardly recognizing the constitutional right of the President to pass upon that question when presented to him in the proper form.

This consideration certainly has very great weight in my mind, and I suggest to the Senator from Kentucky whether we ought not to refrain from bringing coercion to bear upon the President of the United States after he has constitutionally and fairly presented his objection to this particular legislation. For that reason I think the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations should be adopted, irre-

spective of what individual Senators may think should be the fate of the other bill when it comes up for action.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, when the bill reducing the salary of the Executive to \$25,000 was before the Senate I voted for it for satisfactory reasons, and I will do so again should it be presented. When the diplomatic appropriation bill was before the Senate the question came up in regard to the amendments reducing the salaries of foreign ministers, consuls, &c. I took the ground then that the office of the Committee on Appropriations and the office of an appropriation bill was to make appropriations to meet the demands then provided for by law; that it was not the office of an appropriation committee to consider whether an officer should have a certain salary, but it was the office of that committee to make appropriations to meet what the law demanded already for his salary; that if the law gave to a foreign minister a certain amount as his salary, the office of the appropriation committee was to make an appropriation to meet that, and not to consider the question whether his salary ought to be cut down one-fourth or one-half; that that was a question which should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations and be the subject of a distinct and separate act; that if it was competent for the Appropriation Committees to consider the amount of salaries due to officers of the United States, it would draw to those committees nearly the entire business of the Government, and one committee in each House could not attend to it; that it was utterly impossible.

Therefore I think the duty of this committee is to make the appropriation for the President's salary and for other salaries according to the law as it now stands. If those salaries are too high, the law ought to be changed; but as to what changes should be made in salaries in regard to office of President or foreign ministers or consuls or judges or matters of that kind, these are things for separate legislation, to be considered by the committees to which they naturally belong, and should be properly and fully considered. It is not in the capacity of the Committee on Appropriations, however able it may be, to consider and understand all these questions, and thus virtually to absorb to itself the whole administration of the Government.

Mr. LOGAN. I merely wish to say a word in reference to this amendment. When the bill was before the Senate reducing the President's salary after the 4th of March next, I gave the same vote that has been mentioned by the Senator from Indiana, in favor of the bill, but this is a very different proposition. This is a proposition by the Committee on Appropriations, as I understand it, to appropriate the money now that the law says is the amount the President shall receive. By striking out that amendment we should say in an appropriation bill that the President shall not have that amount of money which the law gives him, but that he may have a claim against the Government for it, and therefore may go to the courts or wherever he has a right to go in order to obtain his salary. I do not suppose there is any Senator—and I listened with a great deal of pleasure to my friend from Kentucky, as I always do—who desires to put himself in the position of antagonizing the law itself. As was well said by the Senator from California, if the law is wrong we should repeal it, but as long as it is the law we should conform to it. We made the law ourselves. This very Senate passed the bill.

Mr. BOGY. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question? Does the present bill only appropriate \$25,000 as the salary of the President when the law allows him \$50,000 a year?

Mr. LOGAN. Yes, sir; that is the proposition of the House. The House bill appropriates but \$25,000 when the law allows him \$50,000. The committee of the Senate move to strike out the \$25,000 and allow the appropriation to stand as the law does. That is the way I understand it. As the bill came from the House it reads:

For compensation of the President of the United States up to the 4th of March, 1877, at the rate of \$50,000 per annum, \$33,611.11; and from said day to the 30th of June, 1877, both days inclusive, at the rate of \$25,000 per annum, \$8,135.

Mr. INGALLS. To commence at the expiration of the present term. It gives the President at the rate of \$50,000 to the end of the term.

Mr. BOGY. Yes; I understand the bill appropriates at the rate of \$50,000 until the next 4th of March.

Mr. LOGAN. Certainly; and after that it appropriates at the rate of \$25,000. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. SHERMAN. It changes the salary after the 4th of March.

Mr. LOGAN. It changes the salary, but the committee of the Senate move to strike out the words which change it, leaving it at \$50,000, as fixed by law.

Mr. INGALLS. It does not change the salary of the incumbent.

Mr. LOGAN. Not at all. I understand that. Of course it does not change the salary of the incumbent. I am not speaking of that. That we have no right to do under the Constitution. I am speaking of the law as it exists, applying to the present incumbent and to his successor.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. If the Senator will allow me, the bill as it came from the House provides at the rate of \$50,000, as established by law, up to the 4th of March.

Mr. LOGAN. Certainly, up to 1877; and then after that at the rate of \$25,000.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. Of course, that does two things. It repeals the present salary, and contemplates establishing another salary. That is a question not within the jurisdiction of the committee. It is impossible for us to consider that question any way. We could

concur in it blindly; but in doing that we should not perform our duty in regard to it. It is our duty to appropriate the salaries as fixed by law extending to a certain period.

Mr. LOGAN. It goes beyond the 4th of March.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. It goes beyond the 4th of March, so that there was nothing left in the world to the committee, obeying the obligations of the law, but to strike out the provision and appropriate at the rate of \$50,000, which they have done.

Mr. LOGAN. That is the way I understood it precisely, although the Senator from Missouri perhaps misunderstood me. I said that the law as it exists now allows \$50,000 per annum for the President; that this bill appropriates \$50,000 up to the 4th of March next, and that after that it appropriates \$25,000, according to the House; and the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate is to strike out \$25,000 after the 4th of March, as I understand the chairman of the committee, leaving it as the law now stands.

Mr. MORRILL, of Maine. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOGAN. That is exactly what I was saying. Otherwise we should be undertaking here in the Senate, by refusing to appropriate money under the law, to reduce the salary, a thing we have no right to do. As long as the bill runs beyond the 4th of March next—as long as it carries the appropriations—it must conform to the law, or else it is no appropriation bill under the law; that is, it does not comply with the law.

In reference to another point, I desire to say in answer to my friend from Kentucky that this seems to me to be—I will not use the word "dare"—but it seems to me to be thrusting in the face of the President, to force him to do that which he has told us he will not do. That is to say, the President has said by his veto of what is called the salary bill for the President that he will not agree that the salary shall be reduced, and that is a question for us to determine on his veto. It is now proposed to say to him, "Although we have not acted on your veto, yet we will thrust the same thing in your face in an appropriation bill, and we will see whether you will veto that or not." That is the meaning of this provision, and nothing else. You can soften the term as much as you choose; you may talk about salaries just as you please, and about their being too high or too low, but that is not the question. The question is, Shall the Congress of the United States appropriate money according to the law as the law exists at the time the appropriation is made?

Mr. McCREERY. If my friend will allow me a word, I will say that I thrust nothing in the President's face offensively. I come here to discharge my duty as a legislator.

Mr. LOGAN. The Senator will not understand me as saying that he individually thrusts anything in the President's face. I say that this bill itself is thrusting into the President's face a direct proposition to him to go back on what he has already done by forcing him to sign this bill. I do not say that the Senator himself intends any such thing. I only mean that that is what the bill does, without any intention perhaps; but that is the meaning of it. I do not claim that any one intends it. I only say that if the Senator himself, or any other Senator entertaining the same views that he does in reference to the reduction of salaries, had as President sent a veto to the House or Senate in reference to a bill, and if an appropriation bill coming up as this does before the action of Congress on that veto message, the two Houses should put the very same proposition in that appropriation bill without acting on his veto message and should send it to him, my judgment is that the Senator himself would say, "Gentlemen, you have got to act on my veto message; I cannot sign your bill." Therefore I say it is thrusting in the face of the President a proposition which we have not acted on. That is the meaning of the bill.

As I said, I voted for the bill reducing the salary when it passed the Senate. I do not know whether I shall vote for it or not again. That is a matter which I shall act in reference to according to my judgment at the time; but the right way to do is to bring the bill up and see how we shall vote.

We took the ground on the first appropriation bill presented to the Senate at this session that we would appropriate in accordance with the law. That was the ground the Senate took, looking on that as being the office of an appropriation bill, the function that the Appropriation Committee was to discharge. We have stood by it. If we were right then, we are right now. Hence, I say, we ought to appropriate money in accordance with the law requiring the money. If the law is wrong, we ought to repeal the law, but not reduce appropriations when the law requires the amount of money allowed to the persons, no matter whether officers, contractors, or others, entitled to it. Their personality makes no difference. You leave the amount in excess of the appropriation as a claim against the Government, to produce litigation and trouble; and that is all that it amounts to.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. President, I think this is a very striking illustration of the vice of introducing positive legislation into an appropriation bill. This bill as it comes from the House appropriates, as I understand, at the rate of \$50,000 for the President's salary during the present year, and subsequent to that reduces the appropriation to the rate of \$25,000, and in the same clause of the appropriation bill is a positive legislative provision that on and after the 4th of March, 1877, the salary of the President shall be \$25,000 per annum.

We have here affirmative legislation upon a matter distinct from the appropriation bill. We have pending in the Senate now the veto

of the President of the United States upon a bill embracing the subject-matter of the President's salary, and that is to come up before the Senate for its action. This same provision now is introduced into this appropriation bill, and if it is retained there, a majority of the Senate can pass this provision, and the President will be required either to approve that law or to veto the whole appropriation bill. There is an instance of coercion brought to bear upon the Executive which never should be tolerated by the legislative body of the Government; and, for one, it would be astonishing to me if the Senate of the United States should ever consent to such a provision as that.

I voted against the reduction of the President's salary when that bill was here before. I shall vote in favor of sustaining the veto of the President upon that bill. I have no doubt upon what the policy of the Government should be in regard to the salary of the President; and so far as I am concerned I act upon what I consider to be sound judgment in fixing that salary. But independent of that question, it seems to me that this is a striking instance of the viciousness of this kind of legislation, and I do hope that it will not meet with approbation in the Senate.

Mr. MAXEY. When the bill reducing the President's salary to \$25,000 was before the Senate, I voted for the reduction. Among the reasons which I had, and which I believe I gave, was that the increase was tacked to an appropriation bill, and that the Congress of the United States had swept off as far as was within its power all the back-salary law. Here we had the opportunity of bringing the law back to what it was aforesaid by making it operate on the President from and after the 4th of March next. I voted then in that way because I thought it right, and I shall vote again in the same way.

The Appropriation Committee of the House, it occurs to me, made the appropriation correctly, making the appropriation, as will be seen by reference to the part proposed to be stricken out, at the rate of \$50,000 per annum up to and including the 4th day of March, and from and after that date at the rate of \$25,000 per annum. It will be borne in mind that the bill reducing the President's salary to \$25,000 passed both Houses of Congress, went to the President, was returned to the House where it originated with his objections. The bill, then, is simply held in abeyance for the action of Congress, which has a right to pass the bill over that veto by the vote of two-thirds of each House. Now suppose that bill does receive the vote of two-thirds of each House, then the President's salary from and after the 4th of March will be only \$25,000; and yet this bill, as amended, would make an appropriation of \$50,000 to meet the \$25,000 salary in that case. That does not look to me very reasonable. Suppose, however, that the appropriation shall be made at the rate of \$25,000 per annum and that the two Houses shall fail to sustain the other bill by a vote of two-thirds. That bill would therefore fall and the law would remain as it was aforesaid. It would be entirely proper for those who entertain the opinion I do about it to vote then to increase the appropriation to what the law required; but, as I do believe the \$25,000 is right, that the bill as it passed before is right, and that it is only held in abeyance for the action of the two Houses, as they have the constitutional right to act notwithstanding the President's veto, I shall vote for the \$25,000, or rather I shall vote against the amendment of the Senate committee and sustain the same vote that I gave before, reducing the salary to \$25,000.

Now it is said (and the Senator from Minnesota makes that point) that a portion of the clause stricken out proposes original, substantive legislation, that from and after the 4th day of March, 1877, the salary shall be only \$25,000. In so far as that part of it is concerned, I do not think it ought to be there, because a proper bill was passed in both Houses and sent to the President for his signature, vetoed by him, and that bill does settle the question as an original, substantive bill in and of itself properly coming before the two Houses for their action; and that is the way the question should be settled.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. President, we have just decided, and I think properly, that our compensation shall be \$5,000 a year, which is one-fifth of the compensation of the President of the United States. When the compensation of the President was fixed at \$25,000 the compensation of members of Congress, I think, was less than \$1,500 a year. The Senator from Ohio can tell me.

Mr. SHERMAN. Six dollars a day.

Mr. ANTHONY. Then certainly the original relation between the President and members of Congress as to salary was fixed at about ten to one, and now we propose to make it five to one.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, on the 3d of March, 1873, in an appropriation bill, the salary of the President of the United States was increased from \$25,000 to \$50,000; the pay of Senators and members of Congress was increased from \$5,000 to \$7,500. I suppose that every member of the Senate has a very vivid recollection of the condemnation of that portion of that appropriation bill. It was so severely condemned that two or three bills were introduced into the Senate and I suppose half a dozen into the other House on the very first day of the next session, to repeal that portion of the law which increased the salary of members of Congress. Nothing was about that clause which increased the salary of the President, for the simple reason that it could not be constitutionally decreased, the Constitution providing that the salary of the President shall be neither increased nor diminished during his term of office. If it could have been repealed *in toto*, unquestionably it would have been done.

This, now, is the first opportunity we have had, excepting the bill that passed a few days ago and which has been vetoed, of restoring the law to what it was formerly as to the President, of going back to the law as it existed before the condemnation of the act increasing these salaries. It is true that our bill has been vetoed, but for the life of me I cannot see why the simple fact that the President has vetoed it should make a change in the opinion of any Senator who voted for that bill. I voted for the decrease of salary. I voted for it for the simple reason that I considered that that whole act was condemned by the voice of the people, and I cannot see the reason why we should not repeal the other objectionable portion when we have the opportunity. That opportunity came a few days ago. I voted for the reduction of the salary, and I cannot see now why I should change my vote. If it was right then, I think I ought to give the same vote now. When that bill shall be presented for action which has been vetoed, I will vote to pass the bill notwithstanding the veto, and for the same reason I shall vote now as I would vote on that occasion and as I voted before.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. President, I gave my vote, which was in accordance with my judgment, against the bill reducing the salary of the President of the United States; and it was a matter of gratification to myself when his objections to that bill were received here in this body. I felt thankful that the President had the independence to veto that bill, and to state, in the manly, straightforward manner in which he did, the reasons for his objections. I have read the newspapers, sir; they furnish us a variety of information in these days upon all subjects, and they teach a high code of morals, as they say; but I have not seen in any press of any authority a single word that has not commended the veto message of the President of the United States. I have seen in many democratic papers—I do not see so much of those as I do of those who harmonize with my own opinions—but I have seen no objection anywhere; and, broadcast over the land, there has come to be, so far as anything can be universal, a universal approbation of that veto message; and why? Because \$50,000 is a paltry sum for the Chief Executive of this country. He is the man to bestow the hospitalities of your nation; and there is running through the minds of all our good people a respect for the Government; and they want to see those hospitalities in a moderate degree bestowed. They produce their impression upon the foreigner who comes here; he knows what are the hospitalities of other governments; and the sum you afford your Executive to bestow those hospitalities, which are right and appropriate, and which commend themselves to the good judgment of all men, can be discharged but in a very humble degree by the limited sum of \$50,000.

Now, to come to this question, there are some reasons why this amendment ought to be adopted, and I will state those: In looking around and in casting ahead, I see that we must all exercise the Christian virtue of patience; we have got to live here in this hot atmosphere through the long summer months, and it may be a very good reason that this clause should remain in the bill, because we know every one of us that it will share the same fate with the Executive that the bill separately did—reducing that salary; and in that patient virtue which we all must cultivate we shall have a severe test of it perhaps. It will not take us more than two or three weeks longer to originate another appropriation bill and pass it through this body after this shall have been vetoed by the President. I assume he would do it; he cannot do otherwise. We may as well see that and look it in the face.

Upon a bill which contains nothing but the express provision of reducing that salary, I can see no reason why a man who voted for that bill should vote to sustain the veto; but when we see the reasons which the Executive has given, and the reasons which will compel him to do the same thing with this bill, I ask if it is wise, I ask if it is statesman-like, I ask if it is of any earthly use to pursue this course? It may be gratifying to individuals to put this clause here. But for what good? *Cui bono?* I should like very well to know what good it can do. It can do no earthly possible good. It does seem to me, therefore, when I come to the reasons which would control my vote not to put it in, that, for the reasons which I have stated, I would not vote for the provision, because I do not believe in it, and therefore I shall vote to strike it out. But if I held the opinion which other Senators do and were in favor of reducing the salary, I would not vote for it here, but I would vote for it and meet it in a distinct proposition by itself. I would do so because we are admonished of what must necessarily be the result if it is put in here.

I hope the Senate will have the wisdom not to load this bill in this way.

Mr. CLAYTON. When the proposition to reduce the President's salary was before the Senate originally, I voted for it; and when that proposition comes before the Senate again to be considered in connection with the President's veto, with the lights now before me, I shall vote again for the proposition to reduce the salary. But it seems to me that the proposition is one which now requires a two-thirds vote of this body. Until that two-thirds vote is had and the proposition is disposed of, I should regard it as an improper thing to anticipate what the Senate may do or may not do by a clause in an appropriation bill. I say that I shall, when that proposition comes up in its proper shape, vote to decrease this salary; but until it is determined by a two-thirds vote of the Senate that the salary shall

be reduced to \$25,000, I cannot vote for a proposition of this character in an appropriation bill.

Mr. WEST. The Senate has now been in continuous and diligent session for five hours, and has made more than ordinary progress on an appropriation bill of this character. The weather is warm, and there is a proposition now pending here upon which I presume many of our colleagues, not anticipating it to-day, would be glad to put themselves on record. I move, therefore, with a view to give them an opportunity to do so, that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. HOWE. I want an executive session.

Mr. WEST. I will change my motion and move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After six minutes spent in executive session the doors were re-opened, and (at five o'clock and two minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, June 2, 1876.

The House met at twelve o'clock m. Prayer by Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

CONSULAR AND DIPLOMATIC APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SINGLETON. I rise to a privileged question. When I made some days ago the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the bill making appropriations for the consular and diplomatic service of the Government it should have appeared on the Journal that the committee was discharged. I ask that that may be done.

Mr. RANDALL. I would suggest that the gentleman should move that the committee be now discharged.

Mr. SINGLETON. I make that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. HAMILTON, of Indiana, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

An act (S. No. 3) for the relief of Alvis Smith;

An act (S. No. 43) granting a pension to Uriah Bundy;

An act (S. No. 121) granting a pension to John Pierson;

An act (S. No. 165) for the relief of Michael W. Brock, of Meigs County, Tennessee, late a private in Company D, Tenth Tennessee Volunteers;

An act (S. No. 545) granting a pension to Abraham Ellis; and

An act (S. No. 641) granting a pension to Julia Scroggin.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. RANDALL. I move that the rules be suspended and that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, (Mr. SPRINGER in the chair,) and resumed the consideration of the special order, the bill (H. R. No. 3478) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the House, general debate on this bill has been closed; and the Clerk will proceed to read it by paragraphs for amendment.

Mr. RANDALL. I desire to make a statement. When this bill was sent to the Committee of the Whole, it was agreed that general debate should be closed in one hour and a half. One gentleman spoke over half an hour. The gentleman from Texas, [Mr. MILLS,] to whom the other half hour had been promised, was unavoidably absent, and I moved to proceed to consider the bill by paragraphs. I hope the gentleman from Texas will not be cut off from the privilege promised him by reason of his inability to be present on that occasion. I therefore ask unanimous consent that he have thirty minutes on this bill, as originally arranged.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. I do not propose to consume half of the time given me by the committee; and I would not claim any of the valuable time of the House at this late day but that matters involved in this Indian appropriation bill are of local interest to the people whom I represent. I shall consume but a few moments of the time of the committee and will yield the remainder of my time to my colleague, Governor THROCKMORTON.

I desire to call the attention of the committee to the condition of Texas in regard to the reservation at Fort Sill. There is an Indian reservation immediately upon the confines of our State. The boundary that divides that reservation from the people of Texas is Red River. On the northern side of Red River is a reservation on which the Kiowas and Comanches and other tribes of Indians hostile to our

people are placed and on the south side are the people of Texas, against whom they have entertained a long hostility.

The selection of that reservation, Mr. Chairman, was most unfortunate; unfortunate for the people of Texas and unfortunate for the good of the Indians, if they were to be benefited by the selection. As stated by the officers of the United States Army who have been placed in contact with these Indians on our frontiers, the Comanches have had for long years a feud; indeed it has become traditionary with them that there is a feud between them and the people of Texas as irreconcilable as were the feuds between the ancient Carthaginians and Romans. The officers of the Government have so reported this fact to the Army. It stands upon the record of our Government; and General Pope himself, who is particularly friendly to the peace policy, states the selection of the Fort Sill reservation, immediately on the confines of Texas, where the Comanche Indians would be tempted to strike those whom they regard their hereditary foes, was most unwise.

Now, sir, I shall ask when this bill comes to be amended, when we come to discuss it by paragraphs, the Comanche and Kiowa Indians shall be removed from the Fort Sill reservation to the Baxter Springs reservation, in the northeastern portion of the Indian Territory.

There were a portion of the Comanche Indians who still remained upon the plains when these were taken to the Fort Sill reservation, and on the invitation of the Government made their homes there. The Government finally induced the wild Indians still remaining on the plains to go to the Indian Territory; but, instead of carrying these additional Comanches to the Fort Sill reservation, they carried them to the reservation in the northeastern portion of the Indian Territory known as the Baxter Springs reservation. The Indian Commissioner is at the present time negotiating with the Kiowas and Comanches to induce them to consent to leave the Fort Sill reservation and go to the other. It is, however, very difficult to get these savages to consent to leave a field that invites them to indulge their sanguinary appetites upon our people. It is very difficult to induce them to abandon the advantages presented by contact with our people and their rich herds. They know if they go to the Baxter Springs reservation they must be content to be fed by the Government; they must be content to follow the methods of peace; they must be content to lay down their scalping-knives; they must be content to abandon the pursuits of war and the enjoyment of its booty.

It is expecting too much from him when you suppose that by any act of diplomacy—and he is the master of that art as well as you are—he will consent to place in your hands the surrender of these advantages. We have to control the Indian; control him for his own good; control him against his own inclination; and I propose that the Government of the United States, while it has undertaken to feed and clothe and educate and Christianize him, shall also exert its moral and physical power to compel him to cease waging this warfare upon our people. Take him where the distance itself interposes an insuperable barrier against his invasions of our territory and the plunder of our people. Situated at Baxter Springs they will have a line of railroad to pass; they will have the Choctaws, Cherokees, Creeks, and Chickasaws, all friendly tribes, to pass through before they can get to our people, and they will be there as well taken care of as at Fort Sill. The Indian Commissioner wants them to go there, and is to-day using all his best efforts to get them to consent. In this the Commissioner is actuated by a desire to serve the best interests of the Indians. I want the Government simply to say that he *must* go; that he must be placed where war will be to him an impossibility; where he may receive all the bounty of the Government, but at the same time shall be rendered powerless to carry on a merciless war upon her citizens.

That, sir, is one of the amendments I shall offer to the bill; that it shall be the duty of the Indian Commissioner to remove these Indians to the Baxter Springs reservation, and take care of them there, just as he is taking care of them at the Fort Sill reservation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to read what General Pope says in his report in 1871, and I ask the attention of the House to it.

The Clerk read as follows:

It is to be understood that what I say of these Indians refers to this department only. It is possible and likely that small parties of both Kiowas and Comanches have made some raids into Texas, but I have had no reports indicating it. The reservations of these Indians are so situated as to furnish them every facility for such depredations in Texas, upon the settlements of which State they have long been accustomed to raid, and it would be surprising if with such conveniences and temptations they did not occasionally depredate in that region; but as with the Cheyennes and Arapahoes, I believe these hostile acts will become less and less frequent, provided always that the present system of treatment is adhered to faithfully, namely, that the troops be authorized to follow the raiders onto the reservations, seize the criminals, and turn them over to the civil authorities of Texas, and that the Indian Department withhold rations and supplies from the Indian tribe concerned until prisoners, stock, and other property captured in these raids be returned to the Indian agent.

Mr. MILLS. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the report of General Pope for 1870, 1871, and 1872, I believe. I send up another report to the Clerk's desk and ask that the paragraph marked be read. It is from the same officer.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Arapahoes have, almost to a man, been peaceful during this year. The Cheyennes as a body have, I believe, also been peaceful, though some of their young men committed some depredations, and probably murdered one or two men in the early part of the summer.

The Kiowas have been altogether the worst Indians we have had to deal with. I think it almost certain that nearly all, if not quite all, of the depredations and murders committed south of the Arkansas River since May 1 are to be charged to this tribe. They are now, as they have been for twenty-five years past, the most faithless, cruel, and unreliable of all the Indians of the plains. The Comanches have joined them, however, in the depredations committed in Texas, which these Indians can never be made to understand is embraced in any treaty with them. The Texas settlements are and have always been considered by the Indians legitimate prey, and they cannot be made to understand that any treaty restrains them as against the settlements of that State. I think the location of these reservations along the northern line of Texas was hardly judicious. Under the circumstances, which are known to every officer familiar with the history of these Indians, the farther from Texas these reservations could be located the better. Having established the reservation where it is, it would perhaps be impolitic to remove it; but the military force stationed at Fort Sill ought, under the peculiar circumstances, to be invested with much greater jurisdiction over the Indians there than is now the case. It is not necessary, however, to add anything to what I have already said on this subject.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it will be seen that General Pope says in that report that the selection of Fort Sill was unfortunate. He says that the Comanches are too closely situated to the State of Texas. He says that they cannot be made to understand by any number of treaties which may be made with them that they are bound to regard treaty obligations so far as the people of Texas are concerned. If this is the conviction on their minds, it is wise in us, if that conviction cannot be removed, to remove them as far away from the people of that State as it is possible for them to be, to prevent them from waging war upon us.

There is one other measure I ask the committee to adopt as a precautionary measure for the protection of our people, and that is that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs shall prohibit the Kiowas and Comanches and the affiliated bands from crossing the Red River at all. I hope, Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen will not understand that this is a cruel measure toward these people. It is not asked in any spirit of revenge. It is not asked to gratify any revengeful disposition on the part of the people I represent. It is asked simply as a measure of safety to the lives, liberty, and property of my people. It is just such a measure as we had to adopt toward the Sioux of the Northwest. They were at one time granted leave to pass beyond the southern boundaries of their reservations and hunt the buffalo on the headwaters of the Republican River, but this right which was granted to them for the purpose of indulging their desire for the chase was perverted, as the Indians always pervert these privileges, to make war upon those whom they understand have taken from them their land and country. They understand that the white people have taken their country from them; they understand that their fathers owned all the land from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans; their traditions that are handed down from lip to lip tell them that they have been despoiled of their inheritance, and they still cherish in their bosoms a spirit of revenge, and will indulge its gratification whenever the opportunity presents itself, whether it be against the people of the North or South. It is necessary, if we desire to act in the spirit of philanthropy, that we shall so restrain them that it shall be impossible for them to gratify their brutal and savage appetites.

Now, I ask that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs shall issue his order, and shall enforce it, prohibiting the Kiowas and Comanches, and all bands affiliated with them, from crossing Red River, just as the Sioux were prevented from crossing the southern boundary of their reservation under the pretense of hunting buffalo on the Republican River, when they really went for the purpose of stealing the property of the people, and in many instances committing much graver crimes.

These are simply police regulations that I propose for the protection of the people I represent. I have no disposition to injure the Indians. I would do all I could to help them; because if you do not restrain them from the commission of these crimes the result will be that they will go on the war-path and numbers of them will lose their lives. More than one hundred of them have been slain in my State in conflicts between the Indians and the people during the last few years, as reported by the adjutant-general of the State of Texas. If they are allowed to carry on their predatory warfare, it will result in an extermination of the race.

The course proposed by me will enable you to carry on your policy of improving his condition and of elevating him in the scale of civilization. You know very well, gentlemen, that permitting him to carry on this continual predatory warfare retards his progress in civilization. I ask this measure in the interest of the people whom I represent. I urge you to remove them from the Fort Sill reservation to the more distant one, and that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs shall order that they shall not be permitted to cross Red River under the pretext of hunting buffalo, but really for the purpose of hunting the cattle and horses of the people. I yield the residue of my time to my colleague, [Mr. THROCKMORTON.]

Mr. THROCKMORTON. I propose to add a word or two to the remarks of my colleague who has just spoken in favor of the amendments he proposes. Those who are acquainted with this Fort Sill reservation know that the reservation is upon the borders of the settlements of the State of Texas. The reservation covers a very large scope of territory. And upon that reservation are situated the Arapahoes, Cheyennes, Kiowas, Comanches, Wichitas, and other tribes known as the affiliated bands, a very large number indeed, I suppose embracing some eighteen thousand, located within what is known as the Fort Sill reservation.

These Indians, situated as they are immediately in close proximity

to the settlements of Northern Texas, and where there is but one military post within one hundred and forty or one hundred and fifty miles, and then a distance of seventy-five miles before you reach another military post—these Indians cross the Red River, go along the border of Texas from Red River to the Rio Grande, pass between the military posts, commit their depredations, and return again to their plains almost before they are known to be off their reservations; at least that is the system which has heretofore prevailed under the agents having them in charge.

Texas has for long years suffered from these depredations. Before the war the State of Texas kept regiment after regiment of troops in the field, in addition to the troops furnished by the United States, for the protection of her frontier. I need not remind this House that before the war, under the administration of General Houston, a man recognized throughout the length and breadth of this country as a friend of the Indians, these depredations were so constant and terrible that he was obliged to call upon the Legislature of that State, and he was furnished a regiment of troops for the purpose of protecting the frontier. No man in Texas or out of Texas who knew the character of General Houston and his long endeavor to subserve the interests of the Indian can believe for a moment that he was actuated by any other motive than a desire to properly manage the Indians and protect the people of Texas.

During the war, as a matter of course, Texas had to defend her borders herself, for the Confederate States could furnish her no assistance. And since the war, for the first few years, notwithstanding the border was crimsoned with blood and all the streams of our country were dyed with the blood of our citizens, we were not permitted by the Federal Government to defend our people, but were prohibited by an act of Congress from putting troops into the field for that purpose.

Later, however, when better counsels prevailed, the State was permitted to put troops in the field for the purpose of protecting her citizens against the murders and robberies of these Indians, and in the last few years she has incurred a debt for this purpose and paid out money to the extent of a million of dollars.

Mr. REAGAN. A million and a half of dollars.

Mr. THROCKMORTON. And by the assistance of the troops of the United States and the valor and vigilant conduct of our own volunteer troops we have to-day, for the first time in a quarter of a century, more peace and quiet on the border than ever before. It is a historic fact, as stated by my colleague, [Mr. MILLS,] that the Comanche Indians believe it to be their duty as well as their interest to keep up a constant warfare on the people of Texas.

Now, one word especially in regard to the suggestion made by my colleague that these Indians should be removed to the Baxter Springs reservation. A little more than fifteen months ago General McKenzie and other officers of the Army, with the volunteers of Texas, drove these Indians, after many skirmishes and after much loss of life among the troops of the United States and the volunteers of Texas, to their strongholds, where they made a last stand. In the various battles and skirmishes that took place there some 3,000 of them were captured. In the Indian appropriation bill of the last session of Congress the sum of \$300,000, I believe, was appropriated for the purpose of feeding and clothing these 3,000 captured Indians, upon the condition that they should be removed from this Fort Sill reservation that had been set aside for them, and placed upon the Baxter Springs reservation, and they were removed there and are there to-day, as I understand.

We now propose, as a measure of peace and economy on the part of the Government and of justice to the people of Texas, that all of these other tribes of Indians shall be removed to the Baxter Springs reservation. I would not have my friends from Missouri and Kansas believe for a moment that we desire to put these wild hordes upon their borders so that they may depredate upon their constituents. Such would not be the result. If they are placed upon the Baxter Springs reservation they will be in the midst of semi-civilized Indians upon the borders of Missouri and Kansas. They would not for a moment think of going into those densely populated sections for the purpose of depredating upon the people of those States; they could not go westward without going through the country of the Cherokees, Creeks, Osages, and other semi-civilized tribes.

But situated as they are to-day upon the border of Texas, they can cross the Red River and go along down through those widely scattered settlements and between the military posts, and commit their depredations and return before it is known they are in the country. As a measure of economy to the Government, as a measure of justice to our people, and as an act of humanity to the Indians themselves, this policy should be pursued.

It is to be hoped that in the passage of this bill the Committee of the Whole and the House will remember that it is better for these Indians that they should receive their rations for short periods of time—for not more than a week at any one time—and that they should always be required to answer to the roll-call, every one of them, or be accounted for satisfactorily, before any rations should be issued to them.

Under the policy that has heretofore obtained, rations have been issued to these people at long intervals and in great quantities, so as to be destructive to their interests and a waste of the bounty provided by the Government for their support and maintenance. This

system, I fear, has operated also to the enrichment of those who have had the Indians in charge.

I have on my desk, but I will not trouble the committee with reading, a report made by an officer of the Army in 1869, embracing the testimony of agents, sub-agents, parties employed about the agencies, and interpreters to these various Indian tribes. This evidence shows that from week to week, from month to month, and from year to year, these Indians, fed by the Government, received arms and ammunition; that they left their reservation without any let or hindrance, went down into Texas, brought back the scalps of women and children, brought back captive women and children, as well as multiplied thousands of head of stock to their reservation. These things were a matter of notoriety. The Indians held their war dances around the agencies; they invited neighboring tribes to witness and participate in the proceedings.

These things were known to the agents. This officer gives the testimony fully in his report, which has been filed in the Interior Department from that time to this. Members would be astonished if they could read the recital of facts as given by this officer and the testimony taken upon the ground from the very persons who witnessed these proceedings.

I will not detain the committee longer; but I do trust that it will take into careful consideration the proposition submitted by my colleague, [Mr. MILLS,] and that we shall provide first that these Indians shall be removed to the Baxter Springs reservation; and secondly, that they shall not be permitted to cross the Red River in their hunting expeditions.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. RANDALL. I now ask that the consideration of the bill by paragraphs be proceeded with.

The Clerk read as follows:

APACHES, KIOWAS, AND COMANCHES.

For ninth of thirty installments, as provided to be expended under the tenth article of treaty of October 21, 1867, concluded at Medicine Lodge Creek, in Kansas, with the Kioyas and Comanches, and under the third article of treaty of the same date with the Apaches, \$30,000.

Mr. MILLS. I move to add after the paragraph just read the following:

The Secretary of the Interior shall, before the 1st day of September, 1876, remove all of said Indians from the Fort Sill reservation, on Red River, to the Baxter Springs reservation, in the northeastern part of the Indian Territory.

Mr. RANDALL. That will involve an expenditure of money; and the gentleman does not provide for the appropriation of any money for this purpose. These Indians are already in the Indian Territory, and number about three thousand. We have treaty stipulations with them under the treaty of 1867. I hesitate, therefore, to accept this amendment; indeed I have no authority from the Committee on Appropriations to accept it; but I would like to know from the gentleman the probable cost of this removal.

Mr. MILLS. I have not made any estimate of the cost; it cannot be a great deal. The Fort Sill reservation is in the southwestern part of the Indian Territory and the Baxter Springs reservation in the northeastern part.

Mr. RANDALL. It seems to me that under treaty stipulations these Indians have a right to be where they are. I not only feel unable to accept the amendment on the part of the committee, but I must resist its adoption. The treaty of October 1, 1867, provides, I believe—I ask the gentleman from Texas whether it does not—that these Indians shall be where they are. I am unwilling to violate the stipulations of that treaty.

Mr. MILLS. The amendment merely provides for the removal of these Indians to the Baxter Springs reservation.

Mr. SEELYE. I understood the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. RANDALL] to raise a point of order on this amendment.

Mr. RANDALL. I did not raise any point of order, but I said that these Indians are where they are under the stipulations of the treaty of October 1, 1867; and I do not deem it proper to interfere with their rights and remove them among other Indians, who perhaps do not want to be assimilated or associated with them. I therefore resist the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. SEELYE. I quite agree with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; but, in addition to that, the amendment seems to me contrary to the rule, as it is new legislation and is not in the interest of retrenchment. I supposed the gentleman from Pennsylvania had raised that point of order.

Mr. RANDALL. That did not occur to me at the time. I oppose the proposition on its merits.

Mr. MILLS. It is too late to raise the point of order after the amendment has been discussed.

Mr. HANCOCK. I wish to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations whether he is quite sure that he is correct in his statement as to the treaty guaranteeing to these Indians this particular locality? I think he will find he is somewhat mistaken. I am not very positive; but I think under the treaty these Indians are entitled to a location on a reservation within the limits of the Indian Territory; but I do not think the treaty specifically indicates this particular locality as the one which they are entitled to occupy.

Mr. RANDALL. I will send for the treaty.

Mr. FRANKLIN. I wish to put a question to the gentleman from

Texas, [Mr. MILLS.] Have we authority to remove these wild tribes among the civilized tribes without the consent of the latter? Shall we not in doing so break treaty stipulations?

Mr. HANCOCK. I do not think that question arises. When it does, it will be then time enough to consider it.

Mr. MILLS. The wild Comanches of the plains are now at the Baxter Springs reservation, where we want these other Comanches and Kioyas now at Fort Sill reservation also to be removed.

Mr. GUNTER. I should like to ask my friend from Texas a question.

Mr. MILLS. Certainly.

Mr. GUNTER. What is the extent of the Baxter Springs reservation?

Mr. MILLS. I cannot answer, nor can I give the extent of the Fort Sill reservation; but I understand it is large enough for the purpose contemplated by my amendment.

Mr. GUNTER. It is about fifteen miles in extent. I will now ask the gentleman what is the number of Indians already on the Baxter Springs reservation?

Mr. RANDALL. The number of Indians provided for under the census is twenty-nine hundred and seventy.

Mr. GUNTER. There is that number now upon this territory fifteen miles square, for that is about the extent of the Baxter Springs reservation, and it is proposed to put three thousand additional Indians there to be taken from the Fort Sill reservation.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to say in response to my friend from Arkansas that, as I stated in my remarks this morning, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs thinks it amply sufficient, and is using his best efforts to get the Comanches at the Fort Sill reservation to accept the proposition he makes to go to this Baxter Springs reservation.

Mr. GUNTER. That may be true.

Mr. MILLS. He thinks it best to remove these Indians to the Baxter Springs reservation, and that there is ample room for them.

Mr. GUNTER. It seems to me it will be unjust to the Indians now on the Baxter Springs reservation to impose upon them thirty or thirty-five hundred more inhabitants to occupy this territory of fifteen miles square.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Let me ask the gentleman what tribes occupy the Baxter Springs reservation?

Mr. BLAND. I rise to a point of order on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MILLS. There are remnants of several tribes there.

Mr. BLAND. I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to raise the point of order on the amendment, or that he intended to do so. If he has not raised the point of order, I now raise it and insist upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman raise the point of order on the amendment?

Mr. BLAND. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLAND. I rise to a point of order on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas that it does not come within the rule. In other words, it changes existing law, and at the same time is not in the line of retrenchment.

Mr. MILLS. What existing law does it change?

Mr. BLAND. I understand there is a law or treaty with these Indians, and it certainly does change that, and without the consent of the Indians. Not only that, but it interferes with other tribes of Indians settled upon this reservation under existing treaties and laws.

Mr. RANDALL. With permission of the committee I will ask the Clerk to read article 2 of the treaty of 1867 with these Indians.

Mr. MILLS. I say the point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not too late to raise the point of order at this time. The gentleman from Missouri has risen to a point of order on this amendment.

Mr. BLAND. I wish the article of the treaty with these Indians to be read in connection with the point of order. It will involve an expenditure of money to remove these Indians.

Mr. RANDALL. I ask the Clerk to read article 2 of the treaty.

The Clerk read as follows:

ART. 2. The United States agrees that the following district of country, to wit: commencing at a point where the Washita River crosses the ninety-eighth meridian west from Greenwich; thence up the Washita River, in the middle of the main channel thereof, to a point thirty miles, by river, west of Fort Cobb, as now established; thence due west to the north fork of Red River, provided said line strikes said river east of the one hundredth meridian of west longitude; if not, then only to said meridian line, and thence south, on said meridian line, to the said north fork of Red River; thence down said north fork, in the middle of the main channel thereof, from the point where it may be first intersected by the lines above described, to the main Red River; thence down said river, in the middle of the main channel thereof, to its intersection with the ninety-eighth meridian of longitude west from Greenwich; thence north, on said meridian line, to the place of beginning, shall be, and the same is hereby, set apart for the absolute and undisturbed use and occupation of the tribes herein named, and for such other friendly tribes or individual Indians as, from time to time, they may be willing, (with the consent of the United States, to admit among them; and the United States now solemnly agrees that no persons except those herein authorized so to do, and except such officers, agents, and employees of the Government as may be authorized to enter upon Indian reservation in discharge of duties enjoined by law, shall ever be permitted to pass over, settle upon, or reside in the territory described in this article, or in such territory as may be added to this reservation, for the use of said Indians.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether that refers to this reservation?

Mr. RANDALL. I understand these Indians are on that reservation as laid down there, and that the treaty not only restricts them to that territory, but provides that nobody shall interfere with them.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to ask the gentleman further, does he understand that the Congress of the United States has any power to make any treaty with any people in the world to put them on this territory belonging to the Creeks, Choctaws, Chickasaws, and Cherokees in violation of the treaty with them?

Mr. RANDALL. That is a question of law, and of Indian practice perhaps, with which I am not as familiar as the gentleman from Texas. I am neither a lawyer nor have I been brought in immediate contact with these Indians. But I do know what good faith is; and I do understand that when the United States gave to these Indians a specified territory, when they remain upon that territory under the terms of the treaty they ought not by Congress, without due and full consideration and for full and valid reasons, to be disturbed.

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows what is good faith, he ought to know that the Government of the United States had no right to take that territory from the Choctaws and Cherokees and the Creek Indians and give it to the Comanches and Kiowas. They had no more right to give them that territory than they had to give Philadelphia to them; not a particle. And it was a violation of the rights of those Indians to make that contract with the Comanches and Kiowas.

Mr. RANDALL. It is a treaty made at Medicine Lodge, in Kansas, with the Indians, and this is the first time I have heard that the United States did anything in that matter which they had not a right to do. They certainly did it in good faith and for the peace both of the Indian and of the white, and for the safety of the citizen.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to remind the committee that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] has raised a question of order upon this amendment, and to that the Chair desires members to speak, and not upon the merits of the question. If any gentlemen desire to discuss the point of order the Chair will hear them.

Mr. BLAND. I had the statute read in order to sustain the point of order, and no one will dispute that this statute is law, and that this amendment will change it, and that it will require an expenditure of money to remove these Indians and to support them on this reservation; so that, instead of its being in the line of retrenchment, the amendment is in the line of expenditure, and is unjust toward these Indians on this reservation. And it changes existing law as to the Indians now on the reservation at Baxter Springs. It changes all the statutes with reference to those Indians.

Mr. FRANKLIN. I desire to say in addition to what my colleague [Mr. BLAND] has stated, that we have no right to remove these Indians as contemplated by this amendment to reservations occupied by civilized tribes unless they consent to it, or unless we think, in the exercise of that discretionary power with which we are clothed in this respect, that the best interests of the Indians and the Government demand that they should be removed.

The removal of these Indians from their present locality is not authorized by law, nor does either justice or humanity demand it. It would not only be a menace to the peace and quietude of the civilized tribes among whom it is sought to bring them, but, sir, it would endanger the peace and prosperity of the great States of Missouri, Kansas, and Arkansas. This policy is all wrong.

What we want on our border is more civilization and less barbarism. I know it is the policy in some quarters to make the Indian Territory the home of all the wild tribes of the plains. But I trust a higher destiny is in the near future for that God-favored land, and that the day will soon dawn that will subordinate the people of what is known as the Indian Territory to the same laws and the same civilization that we as a nation enjoy.

Why, sir, the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] means only that he desires to shift the danger. He desires to transfer it from the borders of Texas to the borders of Missouri and Kansas; but it shall never be done without my protest. I shall never remain silent in my seat and allow such an outrage to be perpetrated against my State. This is a question in which the people I have the honor to represent are deeply interested. We desire to see the cloud of barbarism driven from our borders, and do not intend it shall be more securely fastened there without our protest. The great State of Kansas, between whose people and those I have the honor to represent a reciprocity of interests exists, is also deeply interested in this measure; and even if my own State were not involved, her interests in this matter would cause me to protest against the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state to the gentleman from Missouri that the discussion of the merits of the question is not now in order. The discussion is now confined to the question of order raised by the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. BLAND.]

Mr. FRANKLIN. I know the question of order is before the House, but by common consent I supposed we were discussing the merits of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question properly under discussion is the point of order raised by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The point of order would no doubt have been well taken if taken in time, but the amendment had been offered and had been considered by the committee, and several members had spoken to the merits of the amendment before the point of order was made.

In fact the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. RANDALL,] who made objection to the amendment upon the ground of its merits, stated to the committee in the hearing of the Chair a few moments ago that he had omitted to raise the point of order at the proper time. Therefore I submit that although the point of order might be well taken otherwise, inasmuch as it comes too late, it is necessarily the duty of the Chair to rule the amendment in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to remind the gentleman that points of order on this bill were reserved before its commitment, and that all points of order are pending on the bill all the time.

Mr. O'BRIEN. But the Chair will perceive that although all points of order are necessarily subject to the decision of the Chair, having been reserved before the bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole, it is necessary, under rulings which have been made time out of mind, and so often that it would be hardly worth while to quote them, that the point of order when taken must be taken before the amendment is discussed; because it would be folly that an amendment should be proposed to a bill of this character in committee and after an elaborate discussion on the merits of the amendment it should fall to the ground because it would still be in time to raise the point of order that it changed existing legislation or was not germane.

Mr. HOLMAN. I desire to say a single word on this question. The disposition of the point of order simply settles the right of the member to offer the amendment, as in the case of every other matter brought before the House; and it has been uniformly held that the point of order as to whether the subject was rightly before the House must be made before debate. After consideration, even the very briefest consideration, it has been uniformly held that the point of order cannot be made. The point of order in this case would of course be well made if made in time; but certainly it is now too late to make it.

Mr. SEELYE. In reference to the objection made by the gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. O'BRIEN,] that the point of order was made too late, I will say that I rose to present this point of order immediately upon the offering of the amendment. But I understood the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to raise it himself. In the confusion I did not distinctly hear his remarks, but supposed they related to the point of order. Otherwise I would have presented the point of order before any debate took place on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state that he is prepared to decide the point of order raised by the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. BLAND.]

Mr. THROCKMORTON. I desire to discuss the merits of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas. Mr. THROCKMORTON. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] makes the point that there is an existing statute which is in conflict with this amendment. I would ask the gentleman from Missouri if he does not know that that was a contract between the Indians and the Government of the United States, and does he not know, and does not the whole country know, that these Indians have violated that contract from the time it was made, and to such an extent that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs eighteen months ago removed a portion of the tribe to the Baxter Springs reservation?

Mr. BLAND. I presume the gentleman will allow me to answer his question. He asks whether it be a contract or not. Is it an existing law on the statute-book? As to any violation of it, that is an outside matter. We are here considering that law.

Mr. THROCKMORTON. The gentleman knows that he assisted to make an appropriation at the last session of Congress to pay troops conducting a war against these Indians for violation of their contract.

Now, one word in regard to the question of the increase of expenditures. This amendment is in the line of reduction. Why so? Because you will find in the bill that there are hundreds of thousands of dollars appropriated for transportation of supplies to these Indians. If they are placed upon the Baxter Springs reservation, it will save thousands of dollars in these expenditures. It is therefore in the line of retrenchment, and hence the point of order is not well taken in either particular.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SEELYE] having been under the impression that this point of order was raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] at the proper time and having acted on that supposition, it is only justice to him that the point of order should now be entertained.

Mr. MILLS. Does the Chair desire to do injustice to me in order to do justice to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I desire to ask whether we are to be governed by the rules of the House or by the misunderstanding of any member?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will decide the point of order; he will not answer the question of the gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. O'BRIEN.] The Chair desires to state that good faith in the deliberations of this body should characterize all our proceedings, and that when a member of the House rises in his place and states that he understood a point of order to have been raised or he would have raised it himself, the Chair must take his word for it. The Chair understood the gentleman from Massachusetts to so state, and upon that statement the Chair will decide the point of order upon its merits.

The Chair will hold in reference to this amendment that, as he understands it, it is a change of the existing law, and that, being a change of existing law, it must appear in the second place that it is germane to the subject-matter of the bill, and in the third place that it reduces expenditures. The Chair has no difficulty in holding that it is germane, but the Chair does not see upon the face of the proposition that it is a retrenchment of expenditures; on the contrary, it would appear that it would cost something to have this transfer made; and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order, and rules the amendment out.

Mr. MILLS. I offer the following amendment, to come in at the same place:

And the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed and required to prohibit the Kiowas, Comanches, Apaches, Kickapoos, Cheyennes, Arapahoes, Wichitas and bands affiliated with them from crossing Red River from the Fort Sill reservation into Texas, and for that purpose shall use the military force at said reservation; and he is also directed to issue rations to said Indians for only one week at a time, and then only to such of them as shall be present.

Mr. THROCKMORTON. I would suggest to my colleague that instead of saying the Secretary of the Interior, he say whatever Department of the Government that shall have charge of the Indians.

Mr. SEELYE. I submit that that amendment is liable to the same point of order made upon the last one. The provision contemplates I think what we all desire and would vote for if it were presented in a suitable form in a separate bill; but it is new legislation, and it is not certain but that it will cause additional expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts raises the point of order that this amendment is subject to the same point of order as the last.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to discuss the point of order. I am not at all astonished at the objection coming from the gentleman from Massachusetts to any relief that the people of my State ask against the Kiowa and Comanche Indians. I have been accustomed during the three years which I have served in this House trying to represent the interests of my people to meet objection from that side of the House to every measure proposed for the protection of our people.

Now, sir, I presented an amendment to this bill a few moments ago to remove these Indians from their present reservation at Fort Sill; that was ruled out because we could not take them away. I now present an amendment that they shall stay on their present reservation, and the point is made by the same gentleman that it is new legislation to require them to stay on the reservation, and it is new legislation to remove them from it. That is the predicament the gentleman is in. My amendment simply requires them to stand by the law and remain where the law has placed them. I say that the Congress of the United States has no right to grant to anybody the right to come in the sovereign State of Texas and hunt the buffalo or for any other purpose not granted in the Constitution of the United States. I simply ask that the Indians be required to remain where they are, and as a measure for carrying out that purpose that they shall be required to answer the roll-call once a week and draw their rations. In the bill of the last session they were required to be present and rations were issued only to those present once a week. It is the simplest manner of keeping them there, because if you issue them rations once a month, as some of the agents do, they get their rations and go down as far as Neece, eight hundred miles from their reservation, and kill our people and despoil them of their property. They have drawn their rations, their arms, their ammunition, and all their equipments, and they go upon a campaign into Texas and then come back home again. Now, as a precaution against these raids, we ask that they shall be required to stay on their reservations, and that as the means of that they shall have their rations only once a week.

Mr. REAGAN. I desire to state—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind the gentleman that the point of order raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SEELYE] is pending.

Mr. REAGAN. I understand that, and I desire to discuss it for a moment, and to add a word to what my colleague [Mr. MILLS] has said. The clause of the bill which it is proposed to amend makes an appropriation of \$30,000 for paying installments to the Indians and for carrying out provisions of the treaty under which they are settled on the reservation, which covers the rations and supplies furnished them. The amendment of my colleague [Mr. MILLS] couples itself with this appropriation in an incidental way, which I take it is in harmony with the object of the bill, and with the object had in view by the treaty the provisions of which are intended to be carried out by this bill.

There can be no pretense that there is any incongruity between the proposed amendment and the portion of the bill proposed to be amended. The object of the amendment is to require the Secretary of the Interior to take steps to keep these Indians on their reservation in conformity with the stipulations of their treaty obligations. In addition to that, and as a means of making them conform to the provisions of the treaty while receiving the bounty of the Government and being fed by it, their supplies are to be issued to them at limited times, once a week instead of monthly as now, and they are to be issued only to such of them as are present at roll-call.

The object of this amendment is apparent in view of the remarks made by my colleagues [Mr. MILLS and Mr. THROCKMORTON] who have addressed the Committee of the Whole on the main proposition

this morning. The Indians now leave their reservation in violation of the spirit and perhaps the very terms of the treaty, go along down the frontier of Texas, murder our people, plunder the country of horses and other stock, and return to their reservation. Having drawn the rations which the Government furnished them in the interest of peace and humanity, and which they ought to consume on their reservation, they avail themselves of this bounty of the Government while they are engaged in murder and theft on the frontier.

Is there any parliamentary rule that will prevent this Congress, when making an appropriation to carry out the stipulations of this treaty in good faith and to preserve the main objects of the treaty and of our Indian policy, from carrying out that other high obligation of preserving the lives and property of our people from the lawless depredations of these Indians who are fed by the Government?

I submit that the point of order is not well taken; that this amendment is incident to the bill and connects itself necessarily with it, and is in the very spirit of the treaty, the obligatory law, the contract between the Indians and the whites. It is a proposition to compel the Indians to stay north of the Red River, on this reservation, and to compel them to be there to receive their supplies and rations. It is necessary to the good faith of the treaty, to the good faith of the law, and to a due observance of the law both by the Government and the Indians, in connection with the safety of the lives and the security of the property of our people.

Mr. KASSON. I would like for a moment—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SEELYE] on the point of order.

Mr. KASSON. On this point of order I would like to call the attention of the gentlemen from Texas to a difficulty which they can avoid, if I understand correctly the gentleman from Texas who last spoke, [Mr. REAGAN.] This amendment, as offered by the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. MILLS,] provides substantially that the Secretary of the Interior shall be hereby directed and required to prohibit the Indians from crossing the Red River; and then it goes on to provide that for that purpose he shall use the military force at said reservation, and issue rations weekly, &c. It will be observed that, as drawn, the amendment puts a portion of the Army under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, which of course it is impossible to do.

Mr. MILLS. Does not the gentleman know that the Secretary of the Interior controls the Indians on the reservation?

Mr. KASSON. Not the military force, but he is required to execute his proper constitutional authority. What I was going to suggest is this—

Mr. MILLS. I will strike that out if you want it struck out.

Mr. KASSON. It is undoubtedly within the line even of the old rule touching amendments to appropriation bills, that there be a restrictive clause as to the manner of disbursing the amount appropriated. The last clause of the amendment, to which I understand the most importance is attached, (and I agree with the gentleman in that,) provides, as a means of keeping the Indians on the reservation, that their rations shall be issued in a particular way. The mere enactment by Congress that the Indians shall remain there is a *brutum fulmen*; the Indians will not obey it. But if you provide a means for the disbursement of the appropriations, so as to require the Indians to be there once a week to receive their rations, I agree that it may answer the purpose designed. I suggest that instead of providing that the Secretary of the Interior shall use the military force there, the constitutionality of which I doubt, the amendment should be confined to the issue of rations, which is certainly within the old rule regulating amendments to appropriation bills.

Mr. REAGAN. I wish to make a suggestion in relation to the amendment. I think it probable that the language of the amendment had better be modified so as to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to require the Indians to remain upon the reservation and not to go south of Red River, without specifying any authority on his part over the Army, but leaving him to control that question according to the ordinary practice of the Government; and with that modification I think the amendment will not be subject to the point of order.

Mr. MILLS. I accept the suggestion, and will modify the amendment accordingly.

Mr. RANDALL. I cannot see but that Congress has the right to put a restriction upon the manner of the administration of this fund. I have looked through the treaty, and I see in it nothing that prevents this. On the contrary, I find there an express provision that these Indians shall remain upon their reservation.

Mr. KASSON. That is the law now.

Mr. RANDALL. But it seems to me—and I make the suggestion to the gentleman from Texas who proposes this amendment—that this is not an appropriate place for it. The item now under consideration is for the payment of \$30,000 in cash, under the third article of the treaty. The next item relates to clothing; the next, to pay of carpenter, farmer, &c.; the next, to the pay of physician and teacher. But the gentleman will find on page 48 of this bill a general appropriation for the Indians; and I think the amendment would there come in appropriately.

So far as regards the specification as to who shall enforce this restriction, I would prefer to have the amendment say simply "the proper authority," until we determine whether the authority shall be in the Interior or the War Department.

One of the best modes in the world to keep these Indians at peace is to distribute rations to them at short intervals. Under this system the Indian is obliged to present himself, and it can be readily seen whether or not he is on the war-path. The Sioux Indians, for instance, are now on the war-path, as they have been before. They do not come in themselves to draw their rations, but they send their relatives, who draw the rations according to the census of the tribe or band. The result is that in this way the Indians of the Sioux Nation, although on the war-path, secure by indirection rations from the Government. I think this restriction, if it can be inserted at the appropriate place, is proper and wise, and in the interest of peace.

Mr. THROCKMORTON. I ask my colleague to withdraw his amendment and offer it again when we come to page 48, where it will be more appropriate.

Mr. MILLS. I withdraw the amendment for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and the amendment is withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows, under the head "Apaches, Kiowas, and Comanches:"

For purchase of clothing, as provided in the same treaties, \$15,000.

For pay of carpenter, farmer, blacksmith, miller, and engineer, \$5,200.

For pay of physician and teacher, \$2,500.

Mr. HOLMAN. I suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and to the gentleman from Texas that there would seem to be no impropriety in proposing a limitation upon the expenditure of these sums of money, by providing that they be paid to the Indians only on the condition of their remaining peaceably within the limits of the reservation heretofore assigned to them, and that the Secretary of the Interior shall adopt such regulations as may be necessary to secure that result. Otherwise it would seem that these tribes would be entitled to receive under our appropriations the several sums of money provided for them whether they comply with the conditions imposed in the appropriations or not. It seems quite clear that the Government should not pay these sums of money, even though they are in pursuance of express treaty stipulations, unless the Indians themselves conform to the conditions of the treaty; one of the most important conditions on their part being that they shall not depart from the reservations assigned to them.

Mr. RANDALL. I submit to the gentleman from Indiana that this is only in accordance with natural law. Is there any nation on the earth that would feed its enemies while they are destroying its citizens?

Mr. REAGAN. Our Government has done that for fifteen or twenty years.

Mr. HOLMAN. I propose to submit the following amendment, to which I invite the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. SEELYE,] who has always felt an interest in this subject:

Provided, however, That the sums of money aforesaid—

Embracing the several previous appropriations—four altogether—shall not be paid to or expended for the benefit of said Indians unless they shall remain peaceably within the limits of the reservations heretofore assigned to them; and this provision shall be carried into effect under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

Mr. RANDALL. I object to the latter clause of that amendment. The first part I think it would be wise to adopt.

Mr. HOLMAN. Then I will offer the amendment in the following form:

At the end of the twentieth line insert the following:

Provided, however, That the sums of money aforesaid shall not be paid to or expended for the benefit of said Indians unless they shall remain peaceably within the limits of the reservations heretofore assigned to them.

Mr. RANDALL. That is right. I would like to have that adopted as a general provision with reference to all the Indians.

Mr. HOLMAN. I suppose the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SEELYE] does not object to this.

Mr. SEELYE. I think it is right.

Mr. HOLMAN. This clause applies of course only to these four items of appropriation.

Mr. RANDALL. If it were applied to the Sioux Nation, it would save the Government half a million of dollars. I hope the gentleman from Indiana will modify the amendment so as to give it a general scope to include all Indians.

Mr. HOLMAN. With that view I will withdraw the amendment for the present, so that it may be offered at the end of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. SEELYE. In regard to making this amendment a general provision, I would like to suggest that there is some legislation contemplated and already brought before Congress from the Executive Department referring to the removal of the Sioux from their reservation. This amendment as a general provision might, if strictly interpreted, interfere with such legislation. I think that, so far as it applies to the particular paragraphs under consideration, it is unobjectionable.

Mr. RANDALL. The trouble is that the Sioux are now removing our citizens to eternity.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. HOLMAN. The limitation would of course apply to the Indians remaining on such territory as might be assigned to them at any particular time.

The Clerk read as follows:

For this amount, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to furnish subsistence, \$100,000: *Provided,* That the River Crows shall share alike with the other Crow Indians in the subsistence furnished.

Mr. SCALES. I am directed by the Committee on Indian Affairs to offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 316, page 14, strike out "100" and insert "130," so it will read "\$130,000."

Mr. SCALES. I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the object, as far as we can, is to appropriate a sufficient quantity to answer the purpose for which it is intended. The appropriation for these Indians last year amounted to \$165,000. Fifteen thousand dollars of that was appropriated for the removal of the River Crow Indians. Take that from \$165,000, and you have \$150,000 left. After consultation with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, we came to the conclusion we could get along with an increase of \$30,000, that is, \$20,000 less than we had during the last fiscal year.

Now, sir, the number of these Indians is forty-two hundred and twelve, twelve hundred of River Crows and three thousand of Mountain Crows. The amount appropriated by the bill this year is just the amount appropriated for the Mountain Crows last year. If you ascertain the number of rations necessary for these Indians, counting a ration at eleven cents, the whole amount will make \$168,630, which is largely in excess of the amount now asked for by the Committee on Appropriations, and largely in excess of the amount asked for by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

The appropriation as now proposed is only \$100,000. We ask it to be put at \$130,000, and as I have said, calculating at eleven cents a ration, and giving those Indians one ration each for one year, the amount will be a great deal more than we ask for. Does not that demonstrate beyond any sort of doubt that it is absolutely necessary for them?

It is the established practice of this Government, and has been for some years, that these Indians must be fed. They are especially friendly to the whites and hostile to the Sioux. They stand, sir, as a sort of wall between the outer settlements and the Sioux Indians, and they deserve consideration at our hands on this account. Now, can they be fed for one dollar less money? I doubt whether they can be fed for that sum. If they cannot, why attempt to supply them on a sum which we must know from this calculation will not answer the purpose.

I know the anxiety to retrench. No man goes before me in that purpose. I can say to the Committee on Appropriations that they have done a good work. They are endeavoring to do a good work now. I admit they are actuated by proper and high motives in this thing; but when we call to their attention these facts, I hope they will give these Indians what will be absolutely necessary for their support, and not have at the end of the year a deficiency to make up in feeding these Indians.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these Indians cannot starve. The buffalo are disappearing, and their hunting-grounds are no longer available. The Government says they must be fed. It has engaged to feed them. Will this House do it? I leave the responsibility with it.

Mr. RANDALL. In reference to this amendment the committee acted advisedly. They deemed the River Crows should be consolidated with the Mountain Crows in the appropriation.

In regard to the appropriation as embraced in the clause which the gentleman from North Carolina seeks to amend, I will only say that the Government is in no manner bound to do anything for these Crow Indians except as gratuity and as a peace-offering, for the treaty expired two years ago under which we were bound to make these payments. The committee reached the conclusion that \$100,000 was adequate if properly expended, as we hope it will be under the provisions of this bill—that it was quite adequate for the River Crows as well as the Mountain Crows.

This proposition brings me somewhat directly to the scope of this bill, and that is this whole Indian matter should be transferred to the Army, when we shall have the rations delivered honestly to the Indians, thus putting an end at once to the complaints made by the Indians they are being defrauded, that they are being cheated out of what is their due.

Mark you, Mr. Chairman, the whole of this money, as I said before, is a mere gratuity. There is no stipulation of any treaty by which we are bound to pay this money. I affirm, after careful consideration with people from the Territory where these Indians are located, (they are in Montana,) the amount here appropriated is adequate—that \$100,000 is amply sufficient to feed these River and Mountain Crow Indians if properly and economically expended. I hope, therefore, the amendment will not prevail.

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

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations did me the honor to consult me with regard to this appropriation. I found upon consultation with the committee of which he is the head that they had struck out the entire appropriation for the Crow Indians.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the gentleman allow me to correct him?

We were considering the propriety of striking out the appropriation on the ground that we were not bound to give a cent.

Mr. MAGINNIS. The chairman states the question correctly. They were considering the propriety of striking out the whole appropri-

tion on the ground that the Government was not obliged to give these Indians a cent. But I had the honor of showing the committee that while it was true that the old treaty had expired, a new one had been made by Mr. Brunot which had not yet been acted on. I further called to the attention of the chairman the fact that these Indians were friendly Indians, and were worth half a regiment of cavalry to us on the frontier as a guard between us and the Sioux; and I believe it was on that ground that the committee agreed to make this appropriation.

Mr. RANDALL. I desire to say, in justice to the gentleman from Montana, that it was mainly due to the information he gave me and the arguments he used in favor of the Crows that I placed this amount in the bill. But the gentleman must admit that there is no treaty whatever by which we are bound to pay a cent. Mr. Brunot might as well have made a treaty with me as with an Indian tribe.

Mr. MAGINNIS. That may be true; but, as I have said, I pointed out that these are friendly Indians and worth as much to us as a troop of cavalry. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations asked me whether any of those Indians were engaged in agriculture. I frankly admitted they were not, but urged that the appropriation of \$30,000 should be made for them as Indians roaming. I was told by the chairman of the committee that some officer of the Department had informed him that there were no Indians roaming, so that they were stricken out. While I am thankful to the committee for what they have given, I would very much like to have the appropriation put back for Indians roaming, and give these worthy Indians \$30,000 additional.

The Crows and their country have been sacrificed to the Sioux. The Sioux have been allowed to invade their reservation and drive them from their agency; and yet they are our faithful friends, and even now are marching with our troops and acting as scouts for the command of General Gibbon on the Yellowstone. I urge a generous treatment for the Crows.

Mr. SEELYE. This Indian appropriation bill has been very carefully considered by the Committee on Indian Affairs; and with reference to the point which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations made, that we have no treaty stipulations with these Indians, I think it might be said that we have no treaty stipulations whereby we provide almshouses for the poor or hospitals for the sick or places of refuge for the needy and distressed. There are no treaty stipulations for these ends. Why, then, do we provide them? Simply because it is human and Christian to do it; simply because it would be unworthy of us not to do it. And when we contemplate the fact that these Indians have been made dependent upon us for their subsistence by us, by our own encroachments upon their hunting-grounds, it becomes the height of folly, even if we might not say of wickedness, to refuse them this.

Now, if we are to provide the subsistence at all let us do it not extravagantly; let us do it with economy, but let us do it wisely. It would not be wise to build almshouses for the poor with no roofs on; to build hospitals for the sick without furnishing any beds. It is not wise to furnish these Indian tribes with a part of the subsistence they need and refuse them the remainder. One hundred and thirty thousand dollars is, as the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs has so successfully shown, barely sufficient; it is doubtful whether it be sufficient to meet the ends required.

Mr. RANDALL. I do not know how much time the Committee on Indian Affairs has given to the review of this appropriation bill, but I can answer for myself and other members of the Committee on Appropriations that we have given as much as two months to the consideration of it. I had never heard that our bill was under review by the Committee on Indian Affairs till within a few days.

Now, sir, I affirm, as I believe upon the fullest information, after consulting with gentlemen in the Territories—not the Delegates alone, but after consultation all around—that we have been liberal in giving this \$100,000 when we are in nowise bound to do it. I admit that all that is said as to the disposition of the Crows is true.

Mr. SCALES. Do I understand the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations as casting censure on the Committee on Indian Affairs for reviewing this appropriation bill?

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman can understand me to say just what my language implies. I cast no censure on anybody, but the gentleman can give his own interpretation to my language as he pleases.

Mr. SCALES. I want to know what interpretation the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations pleases to put upon it?

Mr. RANDALL. I have said that \$100,000 for this purpose is quite ample, and I feel I should be doing wrong if I did not stand here and resist, with the information I have, any appropriation additional to that amount.

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

Mr. STEELE. I renew it.

I desire to say just one word in reference to this amendment, as I think the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs has fallen into an error as to what the amount of the appropriation was last year for the subsistence of the Crow Indians. By reference to the appropriation bill of last year I find that \$100,000 was appropriated for the subsistence of the Crow Indians, of which \$15,000 was allowed to be used in removing the agencies and erecting a new agency within the limits of their reservation, leaving \$85,000 out of that fund for subsistence; and that for the River Crows there was appropriated \$30,000 for sub-

sistence; so that the entire appropriation for the subsistence of these two tribes of Crows last year was \$115,000. The agencies have been consolidated, and there is a reduction in the amount of the appropriation of \$15,000.

The other \$30,000 to which the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs has alluded consisted of \$20,000 for Indians engaged in agriculture and \$10,000 for Indians roving. They are under different heads of appropriation. The appropriation for the subsistence of these Indians is reduced by the present bill from what it was last year \$15,000.

Mr. SCALES. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has thought proper to use language here—

Mr. RANDALL. Just one minute; what language?

Mr. SCALES. I will state it. He has thought proper to use language here which he declines to interpret for himself when the interpretation is doubtful, and which he delegates to me to interpret.

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman misunderstood me. I in no manner reflected on his committee, and I said so.

Mr. SCALES. I understood the gentleman to decline to say so.

Mr. RANDALL. I said so promptly. Your committee have a perfect right to review the action of the Committee on Appropriations in reference to this bill. I understand that, and so far from not exercising that right the Committee on Appropriations has received a subcommittee from your committee.

Mr. SCALES. Well, I can say this, that so far as I am concerned, representing the Committee on Indian Affairs, I did apply to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and was denied the opportunity of considering the bill; at least, he declined to give me any time within which it could be considered. But I find no fault with that. I am not complaining of that. I only complain of the doubtful language used. The gentleman said that we examined the matter only two nights. I saw that statement in a newspaper, and did not know where it came from, and it is a little suggestive that the language in the newspaper is the same identically as that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania here to-day.

Mr. RANDALL. I want to say that I never published anything in relation to this matter in the newspapers. And what I say here is that you had given two nights to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. SCALES. I hope I shall not be interrupted further, for I have but a few moments more. All I desire to say is this, that I understand the duty of the Committee on Indian Affairs is this: that they have in charge under the orders of the House all matters pertaining to the Indians upon which we have to legislate.

The bill came before our committee, sir—how? The Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the officer appointed by law to look after these matters, called our attention to the bill, and he asked us to hear him. What was it our duty to do under the circumstances? The gentleman from Pennsylvania says that he has considered this matter for two months. The Commissioner had given twelve months of his time to the questions involved in the bill, and he showed to the committee after making a calculation that the amount required for rations, estimating them at eleven cents each, would amount to \$38,000 more than he had asked for, and that he could not get along with less than \$130,000, the amount asked for by this amendment. That is why the Committee on Indian Affairs offer this amendment. We are not here to antagonize the Committee on Appropriations. I concede to the chairman of that committee all that he claims; I concede that he is entitled to great credit from this House and the country for all he has done in the work of retrenchment; I wish to detract nothing from him; but I think that the Committee on Indian Affairs have duties to perform, and for one, in the face of every opposition from whatever source it may come or from whatever party, I shall perform my duty.

Now in regard to what was said by the gentleman who last addressed you, I say that he is clearly in error. It is true there was one appropriation of \$100,000; in another place there was an appropriation of \$20,000; and in all there were appropriations of \$165,000, \$15,000 of which was for the removal of the tribe.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. RANDALL. I desire to state in reply to the gentleman from North Carolina when he relies on the statements and urgency of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs that, if we had acted exclusively under his advice, there would have been no reduction in any part of this bill. I concede to that gentleman entire integrity of purpose and entire integrity of action; but the very fact that he is but of recent occupancy of that Office shows that he is not fully advised in regard to it. I therefore hope that this amendment will not prevail.

The question was taken on the amendment; and there were—ayes 60, noes 68; no quorum voting.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. SCALES and Mr. RANDALL were appointed.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 73, noes 75. So the amendment was not agreed to.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill, and read as follows:

For seventh of thirty installments to purchase such articles as may be considered proper by the Secretary of the Interior for Indians roaming and for Indians engaged in agriculture, \$150,000.

Mr. SEELYE. I move to amend that clause by striking out "150" and inserting "200;" so as to make the amount \$200,000.

Mr. Chairman, the reason for this in the first place is that it is

needed, and, in the second place, there is a treaty stipulation which provides for more than twice this amount. Two hundred thousand dollars was furnished to the Indians for this purpose last year. By the treaty of 1868 thirty annual installments of \$10 for each Indian roaming and \$20 for each Indian engaged in agriculture were agreed to be paid. Now of these Indians there are 43,000 by the most accurate estimates that can be made. At the smallest treaty stipulation, that of \$10 for each one, it would amount to twice the sum called for last year and this year; and therefore I trust there will be no objection to the amendment.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment involves the whole consideration of the Sioux question. I judge that, if the Committee on Appropriations had this appropriation to consider now, they would give no such sum of money to the discretion of any officer to feed the Sioux nation while that nation is in a condition of hostility.

We know what is the condition there. What do we see there? We see that these very Sioux Indians whom we are engaged in feeding, all of them who are able to bear arms, are going off and joining the band under Sitting Bull, and are absolutely joining with him in his indiscriminate crusade upon the white citizens. Only to-day we have in the press a statement that as many as forty-five of our citizens have been put to death.

Mr. SEELYE. Will the gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. RANDALL. I will speak generally as to the Sioux Nation.

Mr. SEELYE. I understand that perfectly, and I have later information than perhaps has fallen to his knowledge, which it will be for the information and benefit of the House to learn.

I hold in my hand a report of one of the official inspectors of the Indian service, lately returned from a special inspection of affairs at the Red Cloud and Spotted Tail agencies, giving very important information respecting the hostilities there and what Indians are engaged in them. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] will allow, I would like to have the Clerk read a paragraph from that report.

Mr. RANDALL. After I get through you can have it read. What I was alluding to comes to us by telegraph this morning; it is not a report a week or a month old.

Mr. SEELYE. This report will show us by whom these atrocities are committed, and also the cause which instigated these atrocities.

Mr. RANDALL. If it does then it must be words of prophecy, because these murders to which I refer have only just taken place. Our citizens who have gone there are being put to death by the hostile Indians, by the very Indians which we feed and make fat. As soon as these buck warriors smell the war-path they go off and assist the Sioux Indians to put our citizens to death.

Mr. SEELYE. The gentleman may save himself the expenditure of a great deal of breath if he will simply hear—

Mr. RANDALL. We have already expended more than a million of dollars on these people. But for the wise provision suggested by the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. HOLMAN,] and which will be incorporated in this bill, I would be in favor of spending not more than one-half the sum proposed on these people.

In reference to this amendment, so far as I know the Sioux Indians do not observe their treaty obligations; they pay no attention to them. When the opportunity is offered their young warriors go off to commit hostilities upon our people, uniting with the Sioux, about four thousand of whom are constantly upon the war-path. I hope therefore that not only will this amount not be increased, but that additional safeguards will be thrown around the appropriation, so that these rations shall be issued to them only weekly, and that they shall be required to come in person to receive them. When these Indians go off on the war-path they leave their relatives behind them, and they obtain the rations and assist in the support of the Indians who are murdering our people. I think that in consideration of the lives of our own citizens we would be justified in not giving any money or any ammunition of any sort or kind, either for the gun or the stomach, to these Indians.

[Here the hammer fell.]

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

Mr. SEELYE. I move to strike out the last word, and ask the Clerk to read a paragraph I have marked in the report of Mr. Vandever, United States Indian inspector, for the information of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] and of the House.

Mr. ATKINS. What is the date of the report?

Mr. SEELYE. It is dated at Cheyenne, May 20, 1876.

The Clerk read as follows:

CAUSE OF THE WAR.

I believe that the present disturbed state of affairs on the roads leading to the Black Hills and along the Indian border results from General Crook's late expedition and the preparations now making for renewed hostilities, and not from the occupation of the Black Hills by the white people. Up to the time of General Crook's first movement the Indians, though dissatisfied with the occupation of the Black Hills, had made no war, and there was comparative safety for those who were going to or returning from that country. The Black Hills region had been solemnly guaranteed to the Indians by a treaty made by the Government with them ten years ago. When gold was found to exist there, white people began to flock in; the Indians protested, but made no serious effort to prevent immigration. The Government called the Indians to a council and proposed negotiating for the country, but made no offer for it. The council ended without agreement, and both parties retired to think further of the matter, the Indians understanding, as they say, that the Government would submit a proposition to them at a future

time. Immigration still continued to pour into the Black Hills and the Indians waited in peace. At this juncture of affairs a military expedition was sent into their country and they were driven to hostilities. We are now experiencing the bitter fruits of war with a barbarous race, who are only seeking to defend from invasion the country we had guaranteed to them by solemn treaty.

Mr. SEELYE. We have here a statement from the last report and the most accurate information by a most trustworthy observer, that these Indians, instead of violating their treaties, have observed them in the face of great outrages, outrages committed by the unwarranted movements of a military force in that region. Therefore, instead of cutting off the appropriation because they have broken their treaty obligations, the argument of the gentleman would lead to the keeping in of the appropriation and even to enlarging it because they have kept their treaties. The number of Indians there is at least 40,000, and by treaty stipulations which they have kept inviolate they ought to have \$400,000. The bill proposes to give them \$150,000; the amendment I have offered proposes \$200,000.

Mr. STEELE. I desire to say a word in reference to this report of the Indian inspector, Mr. Vandever, referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. SEELYE.] The impression sought to be created by this report is that the military are responsible for the present condition of affairs in the Territory of Wyoming and in that section of country known to the people at large as the Black Hills. This agent reports that—

The Indians at both the agencies are peaceable and well-disposed. The disturbances now occurring on this border are occasioned by the raiding of hostile Indians from the north, who followed General Crook back from his recent expedition. They are now retaliating for his invasion, and not for the occupation of the Black Hills by miners.

Further on he says that Red Cloud and Spotted Tail both state that—

There would have been no war if the soldiers had not first gone into that country and made an attack upon a camp of peaceful Indians who were on their return to the agency. General Crook, they say, did not get within seventy-five miles of any camp of hostile Indians.

He goes on to say:

The camp that was destroyed consisted of nine Sioux lodges and about forty lodges of Cheyennes, who were moving slowly with all their women, children, and old people. They knew that the soldiers were approaching, but took no precautions to elude an attack, for they had done nothing to provoke one.

Now all this goes to show that these people attacked were friendly Indians. A little further on he says:

The Indians believe that Crook was worsted in this encounter and obliged to return with haste, and this emboldens them to follow up their success by attacks upon Black Hills immigrants and upon settlers near the Platte River.

Were these peaceable Indians, these nine and forty lodges, the persons that were "following up their success" by attacks on immigrants and settlers? No, sir; the Indians engaged in hostilities at the present time are the hostile Sioux from the north, and I doubt not large numbers of the agency Sioux. There are and have been no friendly Indians of the Sioux tribe in the northern country.

I say that there are not enough of the hostile Sioux Indians in the northern country there to overrun that section of country as it is being overrun to-day—not enough of them if every one of them were upon the war-path. A man might as well tell me he had put a lighted torch into a barrel of gunpowder and it did not explode as to tell me the Indians at Red Cloud and Spotted Tail agencies are not on the war-path to-day.

Has the expedition which has gone out against these hostile Indians grown out of any fault on the part of the military department? In the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the year 1873, I find he uses this language in speaking of this Sioux question:

Also, that all Sioux Indians be required to remain on the Sioux reservation, and that any found off, or refusing to come in and treat with the Government, be forced in and brought to obedience by the military.

That was the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1873. In 1875 he uses the following language:

It will probably be found necessary to compel the northern non-treaty Sioux, under the leadership of Sitting Bull, who have never yet in any way recognized the United States Government, except by snatching rations occasionally at an agency, and such outlaws from the several agencies as have attached themselves to these same hostiles, to cease marauding and settle down, as the other Sioux have done, at some designated point. This may occasion conflict between this band of Indians and the soldiers.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Wyoming whether he is in favor of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. STEELE. I will answer the gentleman's question when I come to it.

Mr. PAGE. I fear your time will have expired before you come to it. Mr. STEELE. I am speaking to the general proposition in reference to the protection of the frontier, which interests me and my people quite as much as it does the gentleman from California.

Now the Secretary of the Interior says, in his report to the first session of the Forty-fourth Congress:

There are still some roving bands of hostile Sioux in the Big Horn and Powder River country of Dakota and Montana which should be subjugated and compelled to cease their raids and depredations upon other tribes and upon the whites. When this is done there will be but little trouble, with a fair degree of tact, intelligence, and force, to control our entire Indian population.

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

Mr. SEELYE. I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. MAGINNIS. I renew it, and yield my time to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. STEELE. I have read extracts from these reports, Mr. Chairman, to show that this very expedition which has gone into the Sioux country went at the instance and on the request of the Interior Department. It was sent into the Sioux country because those Indians were raiding not only upon the white settlements but upon the Crows in Montana, the Shoshones in Wyoming, and the Pawnees in Nebraska. Those Sioux were raiding upon every one they could reach by traveling hundreds of miles away from their reservations, murdering and plundering alike the white settlers and friendly Indians. Therefore it is that the Interior Department called upon the military arm of the Government to punish them. But, sir, now the trouble has come, this report seems to try to throw the entire responsibility upon the military.

The depredations which have been committed in that country, however, Mr. Chairman, are not of recent origin, nor caused by General Crook's expedition. I hold in my hand the annual message of the governor of Wyoming to the Legislative Assembly of that Territory, under date of November 2, 1875—by Governor Thayer, an ex-Senator—and I will read but one extract to show, before there was any trouble in reference to these expeditions or any trouble in reference to the Black Hills of any consequence, what then was the condition of affairs in that country:

Reliable documentary evidence has been furnished me, showing that since July, 1868, seventy-three citizens, engaged in lawful callings, have been slain by Indian marauders. Also, that more than six hundred thousand dollars' worth of stock have been stolen by them during the same time. These murders have been committed and the theft of this large amount of property has taken place on land ceded to the United States, and from which the Indians are excluded.

That was before there was any of this difficulty. I say it is undoubtedly true that the agency Sioux Indians are to-day on the war-path, raiding upon and slaying our people at every opportunity. From the existing condition of affairs it is utterly impossible this statement can be denied. There were not enough Indians under Sitting Bull, Crazy Horse, and other chiefs of the northern Sioux to have overrun that country as it is being overrun to-day; and I hope some attention will be given to the protection of the people on the frontiers as well as to feeding the Indians.

Mr. MAGINNIS. There seems to be a disposition in some quarters to censure the military authorities for sending out the late expedition against the hostile Sioux Indians, as if such an expedition was wholly unauthorized. I might repeat what has been said before by myself on another occasion, that the expedition against Sitting Bull and Crazy Horse and the hostile northern Sioux was only made by officers of the Army after four repeated applications from the Interior Department, and three of which applications originated with the peace commission; and I might add, after repeated applications upon my part to General Sheridan and to the War Department for the protection of the people I represent. And yet the impression is attempted to be created that the military, in violation of the peace policy and against the protest of its defenders, entered upon an entirely unauthorized invasion of the Sioux country. Why, sir, no one knows better than the Commissioner of Indian Affairs that the hostile northern Sioux never have treated with the United States, or in any manner recognized its authority. They never came to any conference with the United States commissioners but once, and that was in the year 1866, at Fort Union, when Sitting Bull, after obtaining by stratagem and guile the presents brought to him, and in addition twenty kegs of powder, drove the commissioner across the river, the very commissioner sent out to give him presents on the part of the Government. He invited the commissioner who headed that peaceful delegation to go out and fight a duel with him, and told him that it gave him pleasure to kill the white men; that they were unworthy of his rifle, but that he loved to "strike them on the head with his war-club, and make them bleat like buffalo calves."

What has been the condition of affairs in that country in spite of your appropriations? A large portion of the Sioux at the Red Cloud agency, drawing rations and ammunition, have supplied the hostile Indians and aided them in raiding on the frontier of Montana. The stock stolen from our people after the murder of our farmers and freighters are taken to the agencies and sold to their relatives there. From these also, at the same time, they get arms and ammunition, trading horses and mules stolen from our people for breech-loading guns and fixed ammunition issued and traded to these so-called peaceable and friendly Sioux. These Indians that you feed and fatten at these agencies have shed hypocritical tears over the hostility of the northern bands, and repeatedly said they would join the Army to chastise the hostiles; but the very first time a United States Army expedition goes out to chastise those Indians who have defied the Government for ten years, raiding on Indians and whites alike, the so-called peaceable Indians make protest against such deserved chastisement; and, forgetting all their promises of good behavior and all their jeremiads against their intractable brethren, make an excuse to leave their reservations and to join the hostile bands upon the war-path. These are the allies you have bought with thirteen millions of blood money, the people who professed to be anxious to join our arms in bringing Sitting Bull and his outlaws to order. They refused to join your forces, and give aid and comfort to the enemy. And, sir, that is all there is of buying a peace with these barbarians. Portions of them

under treaties with the United States will remain in pretended peace at agencies and be receiving rations and supplies while others are on the war-path sharing the supplies, and in return dividing the plunder. Thus they secure the benefits both of peace and war; and the first time the Government makes a demonstration against the openly hostile Indians, the peaceable agency Indians, well fed and in good condition, are ready to join their murdering and marauding brethren in open war.

Mr. LUTTRELL. Is it not the fact that the Indians who are receiving goods at the agencies furnish supplies to those who are on the war-path?

Mr. MAGINNIS. That is largely the fact. And the only way to settle this question is for the military arm of this Government to separate the peaceable from the warlike Indians and then chastise the latter. The trouble is that these Sioux, who have never been defeated by the United States forces, and with the conceit of all barbarians, think the United States cannot conquer them. They are on the war-path and they will remain on the war-path till they are taught to acknowledge the power of this Government. The trial of strength can no longer be averted or postponed. The issue must be settled, and when it is settled the Sioux problem will be solved.

Mr. SEELYE. I renew the amendment, to say that I have been a little amused, if both of the gentlemen who have just addressed us will pardon me for saying so, at the tenor of their remarks. In the first place, they both argue that General Vandever must be mistaken, because there are not Indians enough in the Northwest in a savage state to make these raids. In the next place they argue that the military in their expeditions are all right, because so long as they have been in the Northwest they have been obliged to make these expeditions. I may be pardoned if I find a little difficulty in knowing on which of these two horns of the dilemma they prefer to be impaled. We have the simple truth here before us in the last report of a trustworthy agent. We are to remember also that all the reports that come by telegraph are reports under the control of the military, and from experience during the last winter we all know what mistaken reports those telegrams have given.

Mr. RANDALL. There are just two points in this controversy and the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SEELYE] which it is proper to notice. The first is that the article which he caused to be read in its very first line recognizes the fact that war existed, and went simply to show the cause of it. The gentleman, therefore, and I agree upon that fact, that war does exist there. Then I ask whether this policy should be continued; whether it is absolutely essential to feed these Indians who are engaged in aiding and assisting those who are on the war-path?

The next point is as to the number of these Sioux. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the assertion with a good deal of confidence as to the number of Indians there. I have heard all sorts of statements as to the entire number of the Sioux, ranging from 50,000 down to 30,000; and my judgment is, as far as I can ascertain the facts, that 30,000 or 35,000 is the outside number of the Sioux in that region. Now, in reference to the number at the Red Cloud agency I want to have read a paragraph from a pamphlet of Professor Marsh.

The Clerk read as follows:

NUMBER OF INDIANS AT AGENCY OVERESTIMATED.

There is good reason to believe that the number of Indians supplied with provisions at Red Cloud agency has been largely overestimated, resulting in extensive losses to the Government. According to the provision returns of Agent Saville for the fourth quarter of 1874, which he rendered to the Interior Department, there were 15,117 Indians who received rations at the agency October 1, 1874. The same official document states that on November 8 (the day before my arrival) there were 12,351 Indians fed at the agency. I was informed by the agent and other persons immediately connected with the agency that two or three thousand of these Indians belonged to the northern tribes and were encamped within a short distance of the agency, on the north side of White River. Agent Saville subsequently confirmed this statement in an interview with Rev. S. D. Hinman and myself, in Washington, May 31, 1875, and stated, also, that some of these northern Indians received annuities at the annual issue, November 12, 1874. A few days after the issue of annuity goods, when about to start with my expedition across White River to the northward, I was informed by the agent and others that the northern Indians were still in camp there; but on crossing the river with my party I found less than forty lodges by actual count, and ascertained that all, or nearly all, of these were Ogallallas, belonging to Red Cloud's band. During the next ten days, moreover, I repeatedly crossed the great northern trails leading to the Black Hills, and ascertained beyond a doubt that no considerable body of Indians had recently passed over them. For these reasons, and others which I deem equally conclusive, I believe the thousands of northern Indians officially reported at this agency to be a myth.

The number of Indians actually at Red Cloud agency when I was there in November last could not have been more than twelve hundred lodges, or eighty-four hundred individuals. Judging from all the information I could obtain, I doubt if this number has been exceeded within the last two years. Some observers best qualified to judge placed the number lower, and among these was Jules Ecoffey, of Fort Laramie, whom I have known for several years. He was with me at the agency, acted as my interpreter in one council, and is personally acquainted with nearly all the Indians there. The statement of the agent that on October 1 there were at the agency over 15,000 Indians no disinterested person familiar with the facts believes for a moment, especially as at that time the wilder Indians had not commenced to return to the agency for the winter.

Mr. SEELYE. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter. It is most important that we make no mistake respecting the number of these Indians. The Sioux problem is the most difficult of all the Indian problems. And while I will say nothing respecting the authority which has just been read, I have other authority which I think all of us will recognize as certainly not inferior to that which has

been given. The commission sent out to the Black Hills, of which Senator ALLISON was chairman, reports as follows, (I read from the last report of the Indian Commissioner, page 192:)

There are at Red Cloud and Spotted Tail agencies at least twenty thousand Indians now subsisted and cared for by the United States.

I have only to add the numbers at the other Sioux agencies. Now the numbers at the other five agencies of the Sioux are, by actual count, brought before us, and when added to those at Red Cloud and Spotted Tail make up a total number of 43,484.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there can hardly be any exaggeration of the importance of this precise point, and I desire that the House will give attention to the actual method taken of learning the exact number of persons. Says a letter received from the Red Cloud agent, not from Agent Saville, but from Agent Hastings, an agent against whom a word has never been said, giving the actual method and the reason for affirming the existence of this large number of these Indians—I ask the Clerk to read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

RED CLOUD AGENCY, NEBRASKA, May 19, 1876.

SIR: In reply to your communication of the 2d instant, marked F, I would respectfully inform you that the heads of different bands were notified to get their people close together. A separate party worked in each camp at the same time, so as to prevent as far as possible the Indians from being counted twice; each lodge was visited and the people contained therein counted and entered on the list; a ticket to correspond was given to the representative of each lodge, which was afterward brought to the office and checked up with the list.

The number of Sioux counted are about equally divided between the Ogallallas, Wagogas, and Cut-off bands.

The Indians made no resistance to the count. The following named persons were engaged in taking the census: William Garnett, William Roland, Tod Randall, Dr. L. A. Brewes, Frederick Kennedy, and Richard Outholtdt.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

JAS. S. HASTINGS,
United States Indian Agent.

Hon. J. Q. SMITH,
Commissioner Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C.

Mr. SEELYE. I now ask that a similar letter be read from the agent at the Spotted Tail agency, that we may see that the same careful method of enumeration has been pursued, though it should be said also that this is a recent enumeration, affirming the enumeration that had been made before.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPOTTED TAIL AGENCY, NEBRASKA,
May 20, 1876.

SIR: I have the honor to reply, in answer to your letter of the 2d instant, relative to the enumeration of Indians, as follows: The method followed in making the count of these Indians was to go to every camp, visit each lodge, call the head of the family, and take his statement.

As to the measure and manner of resistance, no active resistance was offered, although it was strongly talked of; and it was only when I fixed the time when I would visit their camps, and went there personally, that I overcame their opposition.

I was accompanied and assisted by L. A. Brewer, agency physician; Louis Bordeaux, agency interpreter; and Whirlwind Soldier, an Indian.

The result of the count by bands was as follows: * * * Bands, 223; families, 1,274; average, 7.42; total, 9,606.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

E. A. HOWARD,
United States Indian Agent.

Hon. COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. RANDALL. I am willing to have the House rest its judgment between the statements of Professor Marsh and the statements of these Indian agents.

Mr. SEELYE. If the gentleman will allow me, what I read was not entirely the statements of Indian agents. Here we have the report of the commission of the United States of which Senator ALLISON was chairman, from which I read.

Mr. RANDALL. The Indian agents are directly interested, and they admit that under their manner of taking this census they were liable to imposition; but the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] reminds me that that was not the statement of Senator ALLISON.

Mr. BLOUNT. He had nothing to do with the enumeration of the Indians.

Mr. SEELYE. The gentleman does not deny that what I read was a statement from the report of Senator ALLISON?

Mr. BLOUNT. I merely state that he had nothing to do with the enumeration of the Indians.

Mr. SEELYE. But I read from the report of the Black Hills commission; the gentleman does not deny that.

Mr. BLOUNT. I only state that Senator ALLISON had nothing to do with the enumeration of the Indians.

Mr. SEELYE. This was a statement to which Senator ALLISON attached his name.

Mr. RANDALL. The Indian agents are interested in augmenting the number of the tribes; but in addition to that, the admission by these agents of the manner in which they take this census tells at once plainly that the information we have from Professor Marsh and others well acquainted with the numbering of the Sioux Indians shows that the number has been overestimated. The agent goes to the heads of families and asks them the number of their families. Well, each Indian has a direct interest in duplicating the number of his family, so that he may get twice the number of rations; for instance, if he chooses to say that his family consists of ten, when it really only consists of five, he secures a double quantity of food.

I think the House can safely rely on the opinion of Professor Marsh, which is corroborated to me by a gentleman who formerly was a Delegate in this House, who expressed the same opinion that the number of Sioux was about thirty thousand, and he has lived twenty years among them; and the very man upon whom the gentleman from Massachusetts relies has since been discharged, as I am advised, from his conduct.

Mr. SEELYE. Not at all; the gentleman is entirely misinformed.

Mr. RANDALL. I am advised by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] that it was so stated before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SEELYE. The gentleman from Georgia will allow me to say that both the gentlemen from whom these letters are received are still in the service.

Mr. RANDALL. Is Mr. Saville?

Mr. SEELYE. Mr. Saville has not been quoted here by myself.

Mr. BLOUNT. That was the authority you referred to from the report of the commission.

Mr. SEELYE. The gentleman is still mistaken.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question. This is a very important question, and I want him to inform the House how Mr. Marsh made his enumeration?

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Marsh of course only learned from what he could hear and by personal observation, and he gave it in the letter which has been quoted. I gave also another person's statement who is entirely familiar with the Indians, and he gave it as a disinterested party.

Mr. FOSTER. He says, from his own statement, "They are at best mere estimates, without any of the aids of an actual enumeration."

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

The question recurred on Mr. SEELYE's amendment; and, being put, there were on a division ayes 42, noes not counted.

So the amendment was not agreed to.

Mr. LUTTRELL. I move to strike out "\$150,000," my object being to strike out the whole appropriation. My reasons for making this motion are simply these: I do not believe in furnishing supplies to an open enemy, nor do I believe that any gentleman on this floor can conscientiously vote to furnish supplies to that tribe of Indians, when he must know that they are slaughtering indiscriminately men, women, and children in that Territory. I am opposed to furnishing a dollar to any one of them. Let us say to the Sioux Indians who have gone upon the war-path, leaving their infirm and decrepit and their wives and children for us to support while they are slaughtering our wives and children on the frontier, that they must support their own wives and children, and they shall not receive one dollar from the United States until they return from the war-path. Let us do this, and when they find they are compelled to support their families, they will return from the war-path speedily enough.

I am opposed to furnishing one dollar to these Indians. I have seen in years gone by too much of this sort of thing. During the last twenty-five years that I have resided on the frontier I have never known an Indian war but what in every instance those Indians who remained on the reservation and who remained within the limits of civilization received powder and other munitions of war and then went forth in the night-time and furnished them to those who were on the war-path. I appeal to my friend from Texas [Mr. MILLS] to substantiate what I say upon this point. It has been so in every instance while I have been on the frontier that supplies were furnished to those on the war-path by the Indians who remained in camp during the day.

During the late Indian war in Northern California and Oregon the Indians received their supplies in the day-time and at night sent them off by their trusted runners to those on the war-path, and the runners came back the next day hungry. I want no more of this furnishing supplies to Indians either on or off the reservation until they come back and lay down their arms.

Mr. MILLS. I move as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. LUTTRELL] to add to the pending paragraph the following:

Provided, That none of said sums shall be paid to said Indians until they shall cease their hostilities against the white people.

Mr. LUTTRELL. I accept the substitute.

The amendment of Mr. LUTTRELL, as modified, was then agreed to.

The Clerk read the following:

For this amount, to be expended in the purchase of beef, flour, bacon, sugar, and coffee, in proportionate quantities, for 35,000 persons, for subsistence of the Yankton Sioux and Poncas, and for purposes of their civilization, \$1,000,000: *Provided, That no portion of the appropriation hereby made for feeding the Sioux Indians, parties to the treaty of April 29, 1868, shall be available or be used for that purpose unless the said Indians shall first agree to relinquish all right and claim to any country outside the boundaries of the permanent reservation established by the said treaty for said Indians.*

Mr. SEELYE. I move to amend the paragraph just read by striking out "\$1,000,000" and inserting in lieu "\$1,250,000." And I will state that this amendment, as well as the one I offered before, is submitted by direction of the Committee on Indian Affairs.

I do not wish to go over the points that have already been discussed; but, in addition to them, let me say that the appropriation for this item last year was \$1,100,000. Before the year was completed it

was found that there was a deficiency, which it has been necessary to supply by a deficiency bill of \$150,000, making the whole sum actually used during the present fiscal year for the subsistence alone of the Sioux \$1,250,000. That is the amendment which the Indian Committee feel it necessary to offer to the bill at this point.

Let me say, as illustrating the reason for it, that if, as I concede is proved as authentically as any statement in respect to the number of these Indians can be proved, if there are 43,484 of these Indians, then at eleven cents a day each for rations it will require \$1,745,822.60 for the year, that is even at eleven cents a day each. Now the actual cost of full rations is fourteen cents a day, which would make the expenditure for the year \$2,320,032.

We all know that this passing a deficiency bill is a reprehensible matter for many reasons; reprehensible in relation to the manner of legislation, and especially reprehensible on the ground of playing fast and loose with these Indians. We shall be obliged to pass such a deficiency bill before the year is over unless we make a sufficient appropriation now.

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman has not given us quite all the information concerning the appropriation of last year for this purpose. The estimate last year was for \$1,500,000, and Congress at the last session reduced it to \$1,100,000; in other words, took off \$400,000 from the estimate. The estimate this year was for \$1,400,000, and the Committee on Appropriations have reduced it exactly the same amount that it was reduced last year.

I admit that there was a deficiency, but I attribute that deficiency entirely to mismanagement. There ought never to have been a deficiency at all. The Committee on Appropriations deem that \$1,000,000 is adequate, if the Indians receive the full value that they should receive of what is due to them from the appropriation of a million dollars. It is alleged—I am not able to prove it, but it comes to us from almost every quarter—that the justification for the Indians going upon the war-path is that they do not get what they are entitled to and what the Government has agreed to give them.

Gentlemen conversant with these Indian matters go so far as to estimate the possible percentage of which the Indian is deprived in his intercourse with the agent, and those under the agent, from double weights of beef, from impure and defective flour, from spoiled bacon, and in various ways as to quality and quantity. It is alleged that that percentage to which I have alluded will range from 30 to 35 per cent. I have no doubt but what the million dollars here appropriated, if given to the Army to distribute, as provided for in another portion of the bill, will go quite as far as the million and a quarter dollars did last year.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that the inspections are made now by Army officers.

Mr. RANDALL. I am not now speaking of inspection. When that matter comes up, I will show how that is made to cost the Government by means of excessive payments for the inspection of a mere modicum of goods. I am talking now about the delivery of the goods to the Indians. It is the deliberate judgment of those conversant with the subject that the Indians do not get within 25 or 30 per cent. of the amount of goods and food that they should get under the appropriation. I hope, therefore, that this amendment will not prevail.

Mr. LUTTRELL. And the Indians do not get even all the goods that the officers inspect.

Mr. SEELYE. I move to amend the amendment by striking out the last word. Mr. Chairman, nothing is easier than to indulge in vague and random statements upon this whole Indian question. I have confined myself, however, to actual figures from the best enumeration that can be made; and I put it to the House that with this number of Sioux to be fed and this cost of rations, \$1,000,000 cannot be sufficient.

Mr. RANDALL. Why, sir, they told us last year that \$1,500,000 would be required; and yet they did with \$1,250,000, even including the deficiency appropriation. We are therefore safe in assuming that if they ask now for \$1,400,000 that amount may safely be reduced in the same proportion.

Mr. SEELYE. The gentleman will pardon me for saying that that is very much as if a man should say that because he had for one year reduced the forage for his horse 50 per cent. below his estimate, therefore he might the next year make a still further reduction of 25 or 50 per cent.

Mr. RANDALL. I would not let the Indians have money or supplies while they are in arms.

Mr. SEELYE. I have simply to say that the appropriation last year did not cover the amount required, and the necessity for a deficiency bill arose from the Indians breaking away from their reservations and engaging in just those raids of which gentlemen complain.

Mr. RANDALL. We were made to pay the bills because of the decision of a council which brought no good, and which was clearly without authority of law.

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

The question then recurred on the amendment of Mr. SEELYE to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,250,000," to be expended for beef, flour, &c., for Yankton Sioux and Poncas.

The amendment was not agreed to.

Mr. SEELYE. I am also directed by the same committee to offer the following amendment, to which I think there will be no objection from any quarter:

At the end of the paragraph insert the following: *Provided*, That \$150,000 of this sum may be used for the subsistence of the Arapahoes and Cheyennes wherever they may be found.

Mr. RANDALL. I suggest to the gentleman that there are already appropriations embraced in this bill for the Arapahoes and Cheyennes if they are on reservations.

Mr. SEELYE. Those are the southern Arapahoes and Cheyennes. This provision is for the northern Cheyennes and Arapahoes. Some of them are at Red Cloud agency.

Mr. RANDALL. Is there any treaty with them? I am not aware of any.

Mr. SEELYE. Some of them are at Red Cloud agency at present.

Mr. RANDALL. Then they will be fed as part of the Sioux Nation.

Mr. SEELYE. They will not be fed as part of the Sioux under a strict interpretation of the law.

Mr. RANDALL. They have been fed.

Mr. SEELYE. That has been done from necessity, not by authority of law. This proposition is simply to make provision by law for doing this thing.

Mr. THROCKMORTON. I call the gentleman's attention to page 24 of the bill which makes provision for the northern Cheyennes and Arapahoes.

Mr. SEELYE. That is not a provision for their subsistence; and it is more than probable that during the year these Arapahoes and Cheyennes who are now at the Red Cloud agency may be removed—perhaps to Arizona. The object of this provision is simply that a part of this appropriation may be expended for their subsistence wherever they may be.

Mr. RANDALL. I understand exactly what will be the result of that. If we say that there may be taken from this appropriation of \$1,000,000 \$150,000 for another tribe of Indians, then next year we shall inevitably have a deficiency appropriation asked for on the ground we did not give the Sioux enough. With great respect to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I must say that in my judgment this is a mere entering-wedge for a deficiency next year. If these Indians are at the Red Cloud agency they will be fed there. If they are removed elsewhere, the Government must bear the expenses of their removal; an appropriation must be made for their removal into Arizona upon the reservation.

Mr. ELKINS. Into the Indian Territory.

Mr. RANDALL. Until these Indians are removed, there is no occasion to make any distinction among the Indians at Red Cloud agency. I hope therefore that the amendment will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the amendment is exhausted.

Mr. SEELYE. I move to amend the amendment by striking out the last word. I want to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to what he has evidently forgotten. On page 25 of this bill there is a provision, which we have already passed, that these "northern Cheyennes and Arapahoes shall remove to their reservation in the Indian Territory before the delivery of the supplies appropriated for by the foregoing clauses."

Mr. RANDALL. But there is no money appropriated.

Mr. SEELYE. Exactly; and this is a provision that these Indians may be paid from this appropriation.

Mr. RANDALL. Whenever the Indian Commissioner proposes to remove them to the Indian Territory then he will, and of necessity must, come to Congress for money for that purpose. He cannot move those Indians down there without an appropriation. While they are where they are they can be fed as heretofore.

Mr. SEELYE. Suppose Congress is not in session; what should the Commissioner do? He is required to remove them by the bill.

Mr. LUTTRELL. How many are there of the Cheyennes and Arapahoes?

Mr. SEELYE. About four thousand.

Mr. LUTTRELL. Forty-two thousand dollars is appropriated for them already.

Mr. SEELYE. But that is not for subsistence.

Mr. LUTTRELL. On pages 24 and 25, \$42,000 is appropriated for the Arapahoes and northern Cheyennes.

Mr. SEELYE. That is not for their subsistence.

Mr. RANDALL. It is not asked for in the estimates. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs never spoke to me about it, and I have had frequent intercourse with him as well as with other officers of the Indian Bureau.

Mr. SEELYE. I withdraw my formal amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SEELYE's amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

APACHES OF ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO.

For this amount, to subsist and properly care for the Apache Indians in Arizona and New Mexico who have been or may be collected on reservations in New Mexico or Arizona, \$400,000.

Mr. MORGAN. I move to amend line 1143, page 47, by inserting "and fifty" after the word "hundred," so it will read "\$450,000."

Mr. Chairman, the amount appropriated last year for the subsistence and care of the Apache Indians of Arizona and New Mexico was \$450,000. That amount proved entirely inadequate to the proper care of those Indians. They were reported in a starving condition during this winter, and we were compelled to appropriate additional amounts, which we did in the deficiency bill: \$25,000 for the Apache

Indians in New Mexico and \$50,000 for the Apache Indians in Arizona. That was barely sufficient to carry them through.

The estimated number of Apache Indians in these Territories is about nine thousand. I put the number at eight thousand. That would require 2,920,000 rations to feed them for a year. A ration costs the Government on those reservations about fifteen cents. That would make the cost of feeding them \$438,000. Eight thousand is a low estimate for the Apache Indians in Arizona and New Mexico.

There is no reason why we are able to feed these Indians for a less amount this year than during the last year. Game is diminishing on the reservation, and I consider it important that an amount should be appropriated sufficient to provide for these Indians. They were inclined to leave the reservation, and it required a military force only a few weeks ago to keep them upon it. It is certain at least that the Apache Indians, if they are not fed, will not starve, but will leave the reservation and make raids upon the white settlements. I deem it a matter of economy we should keep up the appropriation sufficient to feed these Indians. If we do not feed them, we are likely to be involved in another Indian war, which will cost vastly more than to feed the Indians. I hope, therefore, as a matter of retrenchment, for the purpose of saving expense, the committee will accept this amendment and increase the appropriation to \$450,000, which is \$75,000 less than was expended last year.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, these Apaches are bold, rich, ag-

gressive Indians, whose history shows they are willing to fight upon equal terms with anybody. They have been fed, as the gentleman has stated. The truth is no one dare go near most of the Apaches in New Mexico and Arizona. Such as do seldom come back. The appropriation last year, so far as I have been able to gather from the statements of the Bureau—the \$450,000 appropriated up to the present time, has been expended in this manner: for goods, \$28,461.99; for supplies, \$301,989.34, and for employes the enormous sum of \$23,696; but under the provision of this bill we shall not have to pay those employes, and therefore that will be saved. The expenditure for transportation was \$16,196.22 and for various sundries \$3,760.25. It makes in the aggregate only \$374,103.84. If you deduct the amount which the employes cost you will find according to their own showing—and I shall take occasion to publish their own statements—there has been up to this time, excluding the disbursements for employes, only \$350,000 expended. That is all that is now necessary; but, in the abundance of caution, so that nothing shall be lacking to secure these Indians in peace—and, as I have said, they are rich Indians, industrious Indians, aggressive Indians, willing to fight on equal terms with anybody—in the abundance of caution we have agreed to an appropriation of \$400,000, rather than the amount shown to be all that has been expended up to this time out of the appropriation heretofore made. I ask attention to the tables, which I append to my remarks:

Statement of disbursements made from the appropriations for the Indian Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1876.

| Heads of appropriations. | Amounts advanced to agents for disbursement. | Pay of special agents. | Buildings at agencies, and repairs. | Clothing. | Medicines and medical supplies. | Annuity goods. | Subsistence supplies. | Agricultural and miscellaneous supplies. | Expenses of transportation and storage. | Advertising expenses. | Pay of regular employes at agencies. | Pay of temporary employes at agencies. | Support of schools. |
|---|--|------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|--|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| Incidental expenses of Indian service in— | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. | Dol. |
| Arizona | 36,631 86 | | | | | | 383 12 | 7,168 13 | 1,068 82 | 4 50 | 5,684 97 | 237 73 | 1,151 93 |
| California | 51,314 70 | | | | | | 12,201 88 | 8,526 29 | 2,169 58 | | 10,300 00 | 2,029 60 | 747 39 |
| Colorado | 2,120 00 | 750 00 | | | | | 79 00 | 100 60 | | 13 42 | | 5 00 | |
| Dakota | 14,305 43 | 120 00 | | | 39 25 | | 2,209 65 | 206 23 | 132 75 | | | 26 00 | 93 75 |
| Idaho | 5,093 00 | | | | 27 50 | | 93 42 | 1,566 85 | 458 01 | 21 17 | | 444 60 | 1,000 28 |
| Montana | 12,318 71 | | | | 71 00 | | 1,360 03 | 23 00 | | | | 225 00 | 206 25 |
| Nevada | 34,405 21 | | 2,310 08 | | 91 77 | | 5,856 91 | 3,636 17 | 288 32 | 55 08 | 3,050 00 | 736 38 | |
| New Mexico | 20,996 23 | | | | 96 35 | | 5,721 96 | 5,232 91 | 202 42 | 48 24 | 4,482 80 | | 2,000 00 |
| Oregon | 24,700 00 | | | | 29 34 | | 1,196 20 | 5,886 96 | 1,915 33 | 28 49 | 7,544 35 | | 364 57 |
| Utah | 12,400 00 | | | | | | 4,258 67 | 557 65 | 1,345 68 | 35 00 | 1,800 00 | | |
| Washington | 22,500 00 | | | | | | 1,393 27 | 4,065 02 | 2,069 21 | | 3,857 13 | 2,041 46 | 279 35 |
| Wyoming | 1,350 00 | | | | | | | | 90 50 | | | | |
| Settlement, subsistence, and support of Shoshones and Bannacks in Idaho and Southeastern Oregon | 10,000 00 | | | | | | 257 71 | 4,338 85 | 398 20 | | | | |
| Support and civilization of the Sioux at Fort Peck agency | 10,486 75 | | | | 246 93 | | | 1,548 14 | | 113 00 | 3,874 55 | | 216 19 |
| Subsistence and civilization of the Arickarees, Gros Ventres, and Mandans | 22,946 42 | | | 113 40 | | | 1,231 57 | 8,469 94 | 37 78 | | 2,339 54 | 2,314 87 | |
| Collecting and subsisting Apaches of Arizona and New Mexico | 70,492 27 | | | | 54 50 | | 5,094 03 | 8,792 36 | 767 50 | | 19,553 80 | 4,142 24 | |
| Subsistence of the Arapahoes, Cheyennes, Apaches, Kiowas, Comanches, and Wichitas | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subsistence and civilization of Indians on the Malheur reservation | 35,000 00 | | | | 56 49 | 9,044 63 | 2,772 29 | 6,238 51 | 2,250 09 | | 2,299 73 | | |
| Subsistence of Kansas Indians; re-imbursable | 14,573 63 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Settlement, subsistence, and support of Modocs, now residing in Indian Territory | 7,000 00 | | | 336 71 | 14 90 | | 1,204 82 | 100 30 | 9 40 | | 135 56 | | 264 00 |
| Colonizing and supporting the Wichitas and other affiliated bands | 15,800 00 | | | 94 85 | | | | 1,865 96 | 486 60 | | 2,930 01 | 10 00 | 567 81 |
| Fulfilling treaty with Sisseton and Wahpeton and Santee Sioux, of Lake Traverse and Devil's Lake | 29,693 67 | | 2,857 90 | 1,044 74 | 49 00 | | 1,784 47 | 4,402 43 | 268 38 | | 5,871 07 | 2,035 15 | 3,720 55 |
| Fulfilling treaty with Sioux, Yankton tribe | 17,500 00 | | | | | | | 4,055 55 | | | 5,246 67 | 2,200 00 | 1,765 85 |
| Fulfilling treaty with Tabeguache, Muache, Capote, Weeminuche, Yampa, Grand River, and Uintah bands of Utes | 17,590 00 | | | | | | 2,545 42 | 3,936 67 | | 56 00 | | | 16 50 |
| | 489,219 88 | 870 00 | 5,167 98 | 2,094 85 | 871 88 | 9,044 63 | 46,974 74 | 84,058 97 | 14,055 05 | 507 65 | 78,970 18 | 16,448 05 | 12,394 42 |

| Heads of appropriations. | Teachers. | Traveling expenses of superintendents and agents. | Incidental expenses of agencies. | Rent of Tule River farm. | Mills and mill machinery. | Rent of agency buildings. | Total amount expended from each appropriation. | Balance unexpended. | Number of agencies and number of accounts on file from each for the present fiscal year. |
|---|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| Incidental expenses of Indian service in— | Dollars. | Dollars. | Dollars. | Dollars. | Dollars. | Dollars. | Dollars. | Dollars. | |
| Arizona | 1,371 24 | 1,089 09 | 75 40 | | | | 18,234 95 | 18,396 91 | 6 agencies, 3 acct's from 4, and 2 from 2. |
| California | | 1,186 11 | | 1,440 00 | 3,406 94 | | 42,007 79 | 9,306 91 | 4 agencies, 3 acct's from each. |
| Colorado | | 592 70 | | | | | 1,540 72 | 579 28 | 3 agencies, 3 acct's from 1, and 2 from 2. |
| Dakota | 300 00 | 1,425 58 | 1,170 37 | | | | 5,723 58 | 8,581 85 | 12 agencies, 3 retn's from 6, and 2 from 2. |
| Idaho | 200 00 | 37 00 | 138 22 | | | | 3,987 05 | 1,107 95 | 2 agencies, 3 returns from each. |
| Montana | 223 10 | 1,985 78 | 237 45 | | | | 4,336 61 | 7,982 10 | 6 agencies, 3 from 3, and 2 from 2. |
| Nevada | 150 00 | 1,101 73 | 427 54 | | | | 17,703 98 | 16,701 23 | Nevada agency, 2 returns received. |
| New Mexico | 1,071 95 | 603 05 | 864 46 | | | | 20,324 14 | 672 09 | 6 agencies, 3 from 5, and 2 from 1. |
| Oregon | | 658 97 | 123 00 | | | | 17,747 21 | 6,952 79 | 6 agencies, 3 from 3, and 2 from 3. |
| Utah | 250 00 | 486 00 | 237 00 | | | | 8,970 00 | 3,430 00 | 1 agency, 2 returns from same. |
| Washington | 1,923 64 | 427 12 | 551 39 | | 800 00 | | 17,407 59 | 5,092 41 | 7 agencies, 3 from 6, and 2 from 1. |
| Wyoming | | 311 77 | 88 68 | | | | — 490 95 | — 859 05 | 1 agency, 2 returns received. |

Statement of disbursements made from the appropriations for the Indian Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1876—Continued.

| Heads of appropriations. | Teachers. | Traveling expenses of superintendents and agents. | Incidental expenses of agencies. | Rent of Tule River farm. | Mills and mill machinery. | Rent of agency buildings. | Total amount expended from each appropriation. | Balance unexpended. | Number of agencies and number of accounts on file from each for the present fiscal year. |
|---|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| Dollars. | Dollars. | Dollars. | Dollars. | Dollars. | Dollars. | Dollars. | Dollars. | Dollars. | |
| Settlement, subsistence, and support of Shoshones and Bannacks in Idaho and Southeastern Oregon. | | | | | | | 4,994 76 | 5,005 24 | 1 agency, 3 returns received. |
| Support and civilization of the Sioux at Fort Peck agency. | | | | | | | 5,998 81 | 4,487 94 | 1 agency, 2 returns received. |
| Subsistence and civilization of the Arickarees, Gros Ventres, and Mandans. | | | 60 00 | | | | 14,567 10 | 8,379 32 | 1 agency, 2 returns received. |
| Collecting and subsisting Apaches of Arizona and New Mexico. | 225 00 | | 122 10 | | 1,150 00 | 1,675 00 | 42,476 53 | 23,015 74 | 6 agencies, 3 from 5, and 2 from 1. |
| Subsistence of the Arapahoes, Cheyennes, Apaches, Kiowas, Comanches, and Wichitas. | | | | | | | | | No funds sent to agents. |
| Subsistence and civilization of Indians on the Malheur reservation. | | | 91 13 | | | | 22,752 87 | 12,247 13 | 1 agency, 3 accounts received. |
| Subsistence of Kansas Indians; re-imbursable. | | | | | | | 14,573 63 | | 1 agency, no returns received. |
| Settlement, subsistence, and support of Modocs, now residing in Indian Territory. | | | | | | | 2,065 69 | 4,934 31 | 1 agency, 2 returns received. |
| Colonizing and supporting the Wichitas and other affiliated bands. | | | 44 45 | | | | 5,999 68 | 9,800 32 | 1 agency, 2 returns received. |
| Fulfilling treaty with Sisseton and Wahpeton and Santee Sioux, of Lake Traverse and Devil's Lake. | 2,140 92 | | 24 68 | | | | 24,799 29 | 4,894 30 | 2 agencies, 3 returns from each. |
| Fulfilling treaty with Sioux, Yankton tribe. | 1,040 00 | | | | | | 14,308 07 | 3,191 93 | 1 agency, 3 returns received. |
| Fulfilling treaty with Tabeguache, Muache, Capote, Weeminuche, Yampa, Grand River, and Uintah band of Utes. | | | | | | | 6,554 59 | 11,035 41 | 3 agencies, 2 from 2, and 3 from 1. |
| Total | 8,900 85 | 9,904 90 | 4,235 87 | 1,440 00 | 5,356 94 | 1,675 00 | 302,991 96 | 186,227 92 | |

Statement showing disbursements to May 4, 1876, from miscellaneous and incidental Indian appropriations for the fiscal year 1876.

| Heads of appropriations. | References to estimate for 1877. | Amount appropriated for 1876. | Erection of buildings at agencies. | Annuity goods and clothing. | Subsistence supplies. | Agricultural and miscellaneous supplies. | Expenses of transportation. |
|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Page. | | | | | | | |
| Fulfilling treaty with Sisseton and Wahpeton and Santee Sioux of Lake Traverse and Devil's Lake. | a104 | \$20,000 | | \$14,658 95 | \$33,465 64 | \$675 00 | \$1,393 52 |
| Fulfilling treaty with Sioux, Yankton tribe. | b104 | 40,000 | | 20,192 17 | | | |
| Fulfilling treaty with Tabeguache, Muache, Capote, Weeminuche, Yampa, and Grand River and Uintah bands of Utes. | c105 | 50,000 | | 15,192 60 | 13,048 72 | | 4,168 68 |
| Settlement, subsistence, and support of Shoshones and Bannacks in Idaho and Southeastern Oregon. | d106 | 20,000 | | 291 39 | 1,583 10 | 3,697 00 | 91 12 |
| Support and civilization of the Sioux at Fort Peck agency. | e106 | 100,000 | \$950 00 | 9,414 87 | 50,666 98 | | 2,546 41 |
| Subsistence and civilization of Arickarees, Gros Ventres, and Mandans. | f106 | 85,000 | 12,000 00 | 11,156 48 | 29,754 43 | | 4,184 26 |
| Collecting and subsisting Apaches of Arizona and New Mexico. | g107 | 450,000 | | 22,467 96 | 281,142 98 | 12,054 00 | 16,196 22 |
| Subsistence of the Arapahoes, Cheyennes, Apaches, Kiowas, Comanches, and Wichitas. | 107 | 300,000 | | 2,200 00 | 131,857 70 | | 15,433 60 |
| Subsistence and civilization of Indians on the Malheur reservation. | 107 | 35,000 | | | | | |
| Subsistence of Kansas Indians, re-imbursable. | 107 | 20,000 | | 566 14 | 3,437 92 | | |
| Settlement, subsistence, and support of Modocs now residing in Indian Territory. | 107 | 10,000 | | | | | |
| Colonizing and supporting the Wichitas and other affiliated bands. | 107 | 50,000 | 9,000 00 | 9,981 01 | 2,978 93 | | 1,992 32 |
| Incidental expenses of Indian service in— | | | | | | | |
| Arizona. | g108 | 65,000 | | 3,441 46 | 3,750 00 | | 133 64 |
| California. | 108 | 60,000 | | 308 62 | | | 232 50 |
| Colorado. | 108 | 5,000 | | | | | 715 45 |
| Dakota. | 108 | 20,000 | | 289 55 | | | 93 00 |
| Idaho. | 108 | 10,000 | | | 190 16 | | 616 95 |
| Montana. | 108 | 20,000 | | | | | 83 80 |
| Nevada. | 108 | 35,000 | | | | | 160 10 |
| New Mexico. | g108 | 40,000 | | 592 25 | 8,120 01 | | |
| Oregon. | 109 | 45,000 | 7,000 00 | | | | 216 05 |
| Utah. | 109 | 20,000 | | 4,667 18 | | | 801 38 |
| Washington. | 109 | 25,000 | | | | | |
| Wyoming. | 109 | 5,000 | | | | | |
| Total | | 1,590,000 | 28,950 00 | 115,420 63 | 559,996 57 | 16,426 00 | 49,059 00 |

| Heads of appropriations. | Inspection of annuity goods and supplies. | Expenses of advertising for and purchase of goods and supplies. | Telegrams. | Purchase of land. | Pay of employees and incidental expenses of agencies, forage, &c., including supplies purchased by agents. | Total amount expended from each appropriation. | Balance unexpended. |
|---|---|---|------------|-------------------|--|--|---------------------|
| Fulfilling treaty with Sisseton and Wahpeton and Santee Sioux of Lake Traverse and Devil's Lake. | | \$37 50 | | | \$29,693 67 | \$79,922 23 | \$77 72 |
| Fulfilling treaty with Sioux, Yankton tribe. | | | | | 17,500 00 | 37,692 17 | 2,307 83 |
| Fulfilling treaty with Tabeguache, Muache, Capote, Weeminuche, Yampa, and Grand River and Uintah bands of Utes. | | | | | 17,590 00 | 50,000 00 | |
| Settlement, subsistence, and support of Shoshones and Bannacks in Idaho and Southeastern Oregon. | | | | | 10,000 00 | 15,662 61 | 4,337 39 |
| Support and civilization of the Sioux at Fort Peck agency. | \$87 35 | 816 78 | | | 10,486 75 | 74,969 14 | 25,030 86 |
| Subsistence and civilization of Arickarees, Gros Ventres, and Mandans. | 354 65 | 408 35 | | | 22,946 42 | 80,804 59 | 4,195 41 |
| Collecting and subsisting Apaches of Arizona and New Mexico. | 635 75 | | | | 70,492 27 | 403,009 18 | 46,990 82 |
| Subsistence of the Arapahoes, Cheyennes, Apaches, Kiowas, Comanches, and Wichitas. | 471 20 | 2,892 34 | | | | 152,854 84 | 147,145 16 |

Statement showing disbursements to May 4, 1876, from miscellaneous and incidental Indian appropriations for the fiscal year 1876.—Continued.

| Heads of appropriations. | Inspection of annuities, goods and supplies. | | | | | | Total amount expended from each appropriation. | Balance unexpended. |
|--|--|---|------------|-------------------|---|--|--|---------------------|
| | Inspection of annuities, goods and supplies. | Expenses of advertising for and purchase of goods and supplies. | Telegrams. | Purchase of land. | Pay of employes and incidental expenses of agencies, forage, &c., including supplies purchased by agents. | | | |
| Subsistence and civilization of Indians on the Malheur reservation..... | | | | | \$35,000 00 | | \$35,000 00 | |
| Subsistence of Kansas Indians, re-imbursable..... | | | | | 14,573 63 | | 14,573 63 | \$1,422 31 |
| Settlement, subsistence, and support of Modocs now residing in Indian Territory..... | | | | \$3,000 | 7,000 00 | | 10,000 00 | |
| Colonizing and supporting the Wichitas and other affiliated bands..... | \$189 34 | | | | 15,800 00 | | 39,941 60 | 10,058 40 |
| Incidental expenses of Indian service in— | | | | | | | | |
| Arizona..... | | \$4,342 08 | \$141 60 | | 36,631 86 | | 48,440 64 | 16,559 36 |
| California..... | 488 00 | 270 66 | 80 23 | | 51,314 70 | | 52,694 71 | 7,305 29 |
| Colorado..... | | 550 89 | 54 60 | | 2,120 00 | | 3,410 94 | 1,539 06 |
| Dakota..... | 1,074 07 | 2,816 69 | 696 72 | | 14,305 43 | | 19,275 46 | 724 51 |
| Idaho..... | 148 48 | 1,759 81 | 36 23 | | 5,095 00 | | 7,846 63 | 2,153 37 |
| Montana..... | 728 45 | 1,805 72 | 129 38 | | 12,318 71 | | 15,066 06 | 4,933 94 |
| Nevada..... | | | 2 50 | | 34,405 21 | | 34,567 81 | 432 19 |
| New Mexico..... | | 2,918 74 | 77 65 | | 20,996 23 | | 32,704 88 | 7,295 12 |
| Oregon..... | 2,084 10 | | 93 80 | | 24,700 00 | | 34,993 95 | 10,906 05 |
| Utah..... | | 1,952 79 | | | 12,400 00 | | 19,221 35 | 178 65 |
| Washington..... | 1,084 10 | | 43 88 | | 22,500 00 | | 23,627 98 | 1,372 02 |
| Wyoming..... | 350 00 | 661 90 | 39 93 | | 1,350 00 | | 2,401 83 | 2,598 17 |
| Total..... | 7,715 49 | 21,234 25 | 1,396 52 | 3,000 | 489,219 88 | | 1,292,416 34 | 297,588 66 |

NOTES.

| | Appropriation. | Annuities. | Subsistence. | Pay of employes, &c. |
|---|----------------|-------------|--------------|----------------------|
| (a) Sioux, Sisseton, Wahpeton, &c..... | \$80,000 | \$14,658 00 | \$33,465 00 | \$29,693 00 |
| (b) Yankton Sioux..... | 40,000 | 20,192 00 | | 17,500 00 |
| (c) Utes..... | 50,000 | 15,192 00 | 13,048 00 | 17,590 00 |
| (d) Shoshones and Bannacks..... | 20,000 | 201 39 | 1,583 10 | 10,000 00 |
| (e) Fort Peck..... | 100,000 | 9,414 87 | 50,666 98 | 10,486 75 |
| (f) Arickarees, Gros Ventres, &c.*..... | 85,000 | 11,156 48 | 29,754 43 | 22,946 42 |
| (g) Apaches..... | 450,000 | 22,467 96 | 281,142 98 | 70,492 27 |

* Buildings, \$12,000.

† Pay of employes: New Mexico, \$20,996.23; Arizona, \$36,631.86; total employes, &c., Arizona and New Mexico, \$128,120.36, in total appropriation of \$555,000.

Mr. ELKINS. I rise to say one word in support of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri on behalf, as I understand it, of the Indian Committee. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations says first that these are bold and aggressive Indians; then he says they are rich and industrious Indians. He says they are everything else but peaceable, and that people who have gone near them scarcely ever return. I merely desire to observe that his remarks are full of contradictions and betray a painful want of information on the subject of which he spoke.

Now for the gentleman's information. I want to say that one band of these Apache Indians are in the main hostile, but are now on a reservation. We have a policy with these Indians. It is the policy of the Government adopted and promulgated after many trials, and briefly stated, is to feed the Indians and keep them on reservations rather than fight them. You cannot do this by promising to feed them and failing to do so. Now the gentleman knows as well as he knows anything that the sum of \$525,000 has been given to feed these Indians during the last fiscal year. He knows that there was an appropriation last year of \$450,000 in the regular appropriation bill, and that \$75,000 have been appropriated this year by way of a deficiency. I hold in my hand the report of General Hatch, the present able and efficient district commander of New Mexico, to General Pope, to the effect that if he had not recently made speedy disposition of the troops, and placed them in the vicinity of one of these reservations, there might have been an outbreak. This was about the time the last supplies were exhausted, and the only thing that saved this outbreak was the check by General Hatch and the appropriation of a certain sum to purchase supplies.

I appeal to the gentlemen of this committee whether it is not poor economy to try to retrench by starving these Indians, thereby hoping to save to the Treasury a sum of \$50,000, when it will cost in another direction by the movement of troops in the event of war perhaps \$500,000 and perhaps \$1,000,000. I am confident that the movement of troops to subdue the hostile disposition manifested by these Apaches at the Hot Springs agency cost the Government not an inconsiderable sum of money.

Why is it that this policy is pursued of reducing the appropriation at every session, and incurring the risk of an Indian war, large expenditures, and the destruction of the lives and the property of the people? The Government has to pay it all in the end. Last session the appropriations were too small, and it is proposed to reduce them still further now, when to do so will render an Indian war imminent and imperil the lives and property of large numbers of people on the frontier.

I desire to submit this point to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. There are ninety-two hundred and forty-eight Indians in these two Territories to be provided for by this appropria-

tion. The gentleman proposes to give them \$400,000. The Territory of Arizona is in the southwest part of the United States, the farthest point of transportation without railway connection, and therefore it costs more money to get goods there than to any other point of the country; and I submit that \$30, which is about the average amount for each head after deducting the expenses of transportation, &c., is too small a sum to feed the Indians. I do not care how the gentleman makes it up or by what kind of arithmetic he reaches his conclusions, I say it is impossible to support these Indians on an average of \$30 a year for each head. They are not industrious, as the gentleman says; they have no stock; their hunting-grounds yield them little or no game, and all they have to depend upon is the small pittance from the Government.

Mr. RANDALL. They raise corn.

Mr. ELKINS. An Apache never did raise corn.

Mr. RANDALL. They raise corn in Northern Arizona.

Mr. ELKINS. That is not done by the Apaches; that is on another reservation by the Navajoes. The gentleman is entirely mistaken.

There is one more point I desire to make. I appeal to the House in all candor to consider that this is really a question of blood. Men, women, and children have been murdered by these Indians, and I submit the Government had better pay millions of dollars per annum than to allow its citizens to be murdered. It is no answer to say that the conduct of bad white men is partly the cause of the Indian troubles. This Government is able to subdue bad white men as well as bad Indians, and should protect the peaceable citizen from both. It is no answer to say that these appropriations are spent here and there improperly. It is the duty of the Government to check all these abuses, carry out its policy, and prevent fraud. But its first, greatest, and highest duty is to protect its citizens, particularly the poor frontiersman and his family. I wish to give an instance which occurred in a recent threatened outbreak at a ranch on the stage line between New Mexico and Arizona in the month of February last, where the Indians had been supposed to be peaceable. And what I relate is of common notoriety and in the records of the Indian Bureau.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania, obtained the floor, and yielded his time to Mr. ELKINS.

Mr. ELKINS. There were three men working at this point on their farms. They were doing well, and perfectly safe to all intents and purposes, when in broad daylight they were shot down by the Apaches while at their plows, their stock taken, and houses burned. I appeal to gentlemen of this House to endeavor to bring this question home to themselves and their families; I appeal to you who are here in this marble palace, or your homes, with your wives and loved ones safe, suppose that one of your family had been the victim and stricken

down in this way, how would you feel toward the Government if it had failed in its duty to feed these Indians or in giving protection?

I come back, then, to this proposition, that the Government should be strong enough to give protection wherever its flag floats, and that it should be strong all around against bad white men as well as against hostile red men. I do not speak on behalf of Indian agents. But I ask you to do what is necessary to police the country and to protect human life. And let it not be said that this Government is so weak that it is on a level with the government of Turkey, that cannot afford protection to the people who desire to search for the tomb of Christ in the Holy Land from the wandering Bedouins.

You have in the heart of this continent and within the jurisdiction of the Government a few thousand roving, restless Indians that resist and defy you more than the Bedouins do Turkey, and render the lives and property of your citizens in constant danger, and up to date, for some reason, the Government has never demonstrated it had the power to subdue them and compel them to peace and respect for the flag. And this is because the Indian knows you have no fixed policy, and if you do it is not carried out. You promise to feed him, break your promise, and in doing so cause a war, the destruction of the lives and property of your citizens, and in the end conclude an honorable peace and treaty, which is kept until it suits the convenience of either party to break it.

Now I say you must adopt either the one policy or the other. You must fight the Indian and subdue him, or you must feed him. He says, "If you feed me I will stay on the reservation; if you do not I am going to kill, and take food wherever I can find it." He has the same instinct as the white man; and when the white man cannot get food for himself and his children he will steal, and, if necessary, will even kill in order to get it. You cannot expect anything better from an Indian.

Before I conclude, let me finish my calculation about the \$30 per Indian. This insignificant sum of \$30 is to support one person for a whole year. I ask the House just to think of it. There are 9,248 of these Indians to be fed out of an appropriation of \$400,000. Deducting for transportation and all expenses of every kind, there is left an average of \$30, and I say the Indian cannot live upon that. If you pass this bill you invite the Indians to a feast of slaughter. There is no way to avoid it.

I know something about this question. I have respect for the gentleman's [Mr. RANDALL] knowledge of the science of government, but he knows nothing in the world about Indians. But that does not touch the main point. What I want the House to do is for them to give a sufficient appropriation to feed these Indians. Give them enough to keep them on their reservations; and if your officers in charge fail to do their duty pass laws to punish them. It is the duty of the Government to keep its pledges and obligations to these Indians, and also to see that its officers perform their duty.

But it is said that Indians run away from their reservations. Well, sir, suppose 10 per cent. run away, you have still 90 per cent. remaining on the reservation who might otherwise be roaming abroad committing depredations and murdering our citizens. Now, sir, the other day when the river and harbor bill was under consideration an appropriation of nearly \$6,000,000 was rushed through without discussion under a suspension of the rules; but this is a question in which the distant West had no interest.

If these Apaches were roaming around the city of Philadelphia and one of the gentleman's Quaker constituents was killed, there would be no objection to an appropriation, and millions of dollars would be spent to keep them on their reservations or to do anything else that might be required to protect human life.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I have said, the House rushed through the other day the river and harbor bill, which was reported by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, [Mr. HERFORD,] and everybody voted for it. This was remarkable and extraordinary success in legislation; in these economical times almost without a parallel. But this is not without explanation. There is a river or a piece of one, a creek or a hollow that sometimes has water in it, in each congressional district and the public necessity requires all these should be cleared out at once.

Mr. RANDALL. Not everybody.

Mr. ELKINS. I did not hear the gentleman talk against it.

Mr. RANDALL. I had no chance.

Mr. ELKINS. That is remarkable.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ELKINS. I want a few words more.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is exhausted on the amendment.

Mr. RANDALL. How much time do you want?

Mr. ELKINS. Say about three minutes.

Mr. KELLEY. I move to strike out the last word, and yield my time to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ELKINS. As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, in the river and harbor bill the House gave five or six millions of dollars for that purpose, and yet you refuse to appropriate money to keep your pledges to the Indian tribes, thereby inciting them to go forth upon raids to commit murder and rapine and destruction of property. The trouble is the Indian reservations are all in the Territories; if there was a large one in each congressional district, I think the difficulty would soon disappear and millions would be voted without a word.

The river and harbor bill went through without objection from a

single member—\$6,000,000 voted away in less than an hour by a House determined upon retrenchment and reduction of expenditures. If during these perilous times, any branch of public improvement and work could be suspended for a season, it was work upon our rivers and harbors. Human life and blood, the safety of the property of citizens, did not call loudly for this work to go on. But, sir, on the other hand, an honorable necessity, interest in the welfare of your citizens on the distant confines of the Republic, safety of life and property, do demand that a sufficient sum be appropriated to retain these Indians on reservations.

But, sir, when the river and harbor bill was up for consideration I did not hear the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations say a word against it, nor the six millions it gave away; although he was suffering, literally sick to get an opportunity to oppose it, yet I did not hear a feeble word or see him make a feeble attempt to do so; and the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. HOLMAN,] I do not see him in his seat—I beg pardon, I did not notice he was in the chair—did not say a word on the subject, nor shed a single tear at the disappearance of six millions at one dash from the Treasury. There is a river in Indiana, certainly one in the gentleman's district, and yet in the face of this record you refuse to vote a sufficient amount for the protection of the men who are hewing down the forests and carving out an empire in the West. Gentlemen talk about these things being sentimental, but it is not sentiment; these are facts. If it were in the power of the distant West to vote or be heard the result might be different, but we are without power; you do not care how many of our people are killed. But if the Sioux or some of those industrious Apaches of whom the gentleman from Pennsylvania speaks should be let loose in the neighborhood of Philadelphia or some of the Atlantic States, hundreds of millions would be appropriated, without a word being said against it, to feed them and keep them on their reservations.

Now I have perhaps said more than I should; but I do appeal to the House to grant us a proper appropriation. This kind of economy will cost blood and property. The New Mexico Indians are mostly peaceable and we have but few Apaches there, so that it cannot be charged that I am advocating this measure in order that the money may be expended in my Territory. Most of the Indians there have commenced agricultural pursuits, except the Apaches. I am speaking rather in the interest of Arizona, and I beg the House and the gentlemen in the majority to protect these people, and to give a sufficient appropriation of money.

Mr. RANDALL. I have nothing to do with discussing the river and harbor bill.

Mr. ELKINS. That is what I say is the matter with you.

Mr. RANDALL. The gentlemen who voted for that bill assumed the responsibility for it. I was one of the number who happened to be against it, and I am so recorded. It was passed under a suspension of the rules, whereby I was deprived, as was every other gentleman in the House, of an opportunity to discuss it. But here is an appropriation that I have an opportunity to discuss, and I think I am able to show that the sum which the bill recommends is quite adequate. The very papers which came from the Department on this subject go to show that of the \$450,000 appropriated last year there is yet an unexpended balance of \$46,900, and the sum which they state is necessary to be given to the employes either for their pay or expenditures is \$70,492.27; and of that sum \$28,015.74 is yet unaccounted for by the agents. This is a statement from the Bureau only received by me last night. It shows the taking out of \$28,000 for employes; in fact \$350,000 would be adequate here instead of \$400,000. Now, in such a state of facts the committee would not be justified in recommending or the House justified in voting any additional sum beyond the \$400,000. I ask for a vote.

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

Mr. THROCKMORTON. I move to strike out the last word. I wish to ask the Delegate from New Mexico if it is not notorious that the Apaches own large flocks and herds?

Mr. ELKINS. Not the Apaches, but the Navajos; they own large flocks of sheep.

Mr. THROCKMORTON. Then do I understand that they do own large flocks?

Mr. ELKINS. No; the gentleman is mistaken. The Navajos and some of the Utes own flocks and herds; but not the Apaches.

Mr. THROCKMORTON. Where is the Apache reservation?

Mr. ELKINS. There are two reservations in the Territory, the Hot Springs reservation on one side of the Rio Grande, and the reservation near Fort Stanton, on the eastern side of the Rio Grande, nearer Texas.

Mr. THROCKMORTON. I would like, if I could conscientiously do so, to support the amendment. But I believe it would be rather impolitic to appropriate this money for these Indians, and I am willing to stand by the Committee on Appropriations. It is notorious that, no matter how much these Indians are fed, you cannot keep them upon their reservations, but they will commit depredations upon the people of Mexico and Texas. I have a letter in my hand from the adjutant-general of the State of Texas in regard to these very Indians, setting forth that the Apaches from this very reservation in New Mexico came down in our country and stole our property, and were followed by our troops directly back to this very reservation. I

think the amount named here is sufficient; let the Indians live within that amount. If they go off their reservation, then let the military punish them.

Mr. ELKINS. I agree with you there.

Mr. THROCKMORTON. I withdraw my formal amendment.

The question was then taken upon the amendment moved by Mr. MORGAN to increase the appropriation from \$400,000 to \$450,000, and it was not agreed to; upon a division, ayes 45, noes not counted.

The Clerk read the following:

Arapahoes, Cheyennes, Apaches, Kiowas, Comanches, and Wichitas: For subsistence of the Arapahoes, Cheyennes, Apaches, Kiowas, Comanches, and Wichitas, and transportation of the same, who have been collected upon the reservations set apart for their use and occupation, \$250,000.

Mr. MILLS. I move to amend by adding to the paragraph just read that which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

And the Secretary of War is hereby directed and required to prohibit the Kiowas, Comanches, Apaches, Kickapoos, Cheyennes, Arapahoes, Wichitas, and bands affiliated with them from crossing the Red River from the Fort Sill reservation into Texas; and rations shall be issued to said Indians for only one week at a time, and then only to such of them as shall be present.

Mr. PAGE. I move to amend the amendment by striking out "Secretary of War" and inserting "Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. MILLS. This amendment which I have offered is the same in substance as the one discussed some time ago, and which I withdrew in deference to the opinion of some gentleman in the House that it would be more appropriately offered to another portion of the bill.

The amendment suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. PAGE] was then discussed. It was contended by some gentlemen on the other side of the House, the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. KASSON,] I believe, that the Secretary of the Interior could have nothing to do with the military force on that reservation. It would be necessary to use some force if war parties started from Fort Sill reservation to go into Texas, in order to prevent them from crossing the Red River.

Whenever the Secretary of the Interior needs to use any military to manage these Indians he calls upon the military arm stationed at Fort Sill reservation. If the Indians are kept under the control of the Interior Department, the Secretary of War would be called upon by the Interior Department to use this force to police the Red River and keep the Indians from crossing it. This amendment has been changed to meet the views of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SEELYE] and others who objected to it in the form in which it was before offered. I think there can be no objection to it as it now stands.

Mr. RANDALL. There is no objection to it.

The amendment of Mr. MILLS was then agreed to.

Mr. RANDALL. I am instructed by the Committee on Appropriations to offer an amendment at this place, to come in as a new paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Civilization and subsistence of Indians on the Malheur reservation: For this amount, or so much thereof as may be necessary, in the purchase of goods, subsistence stores, &c., for the Indians collected on the Malheur reservation, Oregon, and in instructing them in agricultural and mechanical pursuits, providing employes, educating children, procuring medicine and medical attendance, care for and support of the aged, sick, and infirm, for the helpless orphans of said Indians, or in any other respect to promote their civilization, comfort, and improvement, \$25,000.

Mr. MILLS. I understood that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. RANDALL] was going to offer an amendment to the pending paragraph, and therefore I gave way. I have another amendment to offer.

Mr. RANDALL. I have no objection to the gentleman offering his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph will be open to amendment after the pending amendment has been voted on.

The amendment of Mr. RANDALL was then adopted.

Mr. MILLS. I move to further amend by inserting after the amendment adopted on my motion the following:

And no arms or ammunition shall be issued, sold, or given to any of the Indians above named, and all arms and ammunition shall be taken from any Indian who may be proven to have committed any depredations on the whites or on friendly Indians.

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. RANDALL. I am instructed by the Committee on Appropriations to move to insert as a new paragraph after the one last adopted that which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Civilization and subsistence of Indians of the central superintendency. For this amount, or so much thereof as may be necessary to carry on the work of aiding and instructing the Indians of the central superintendency in the arts of civilization, in providing clothing, food, and lodging for the children attending school, in caring for the orphans, the sick, and the helpless, and in assisting the Indians generally to locate themselves in permanent homes, and sustain themselves by the pursuits of civilized life, \$10,000.

Mr. SEELYE. I move to amend the amendment so as to make the amount \$20,000, which is very desirable for this very desirable end.

Mr. RANDALL. The amount given for this purpose last year was \$10,000. I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SEELYE] that this money is spent by very good hands.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the gentleman assent to \$15,000? That is \$5,000 more than was appropriated last year.

Mr. SEELYE. But it costs \$20,000 to do this.

Mr. RANDALL. No, sir.

Mr. SEELYE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The additional expense was paid by these agents and superintendents of the Society of Friends, the body of men who the gentleman desires to change for military supervision.

Mr. RANDALL. No, sir; the military bill does not propose to interfere in any respect with the peace commissioners from the Society of Friends who go there; the gentleman is mistaken in that. I think \$15,000 is quite adequate.

Mr. SEELYE. I will accept \$15,000.

Mr. THROCKMORTON. I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations whether these Indians are not already provided for under the different heads?

Mr. RANDALL. This is an additional appropriation. It is in fact a mark of respect to the Society of Friends.

Mr. THROCKMORTON. These Indians, under their respective heads, are provided for already. This is an additional appropriation, a mere gratuity. I am opposed to the amendment of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, as well as the additional amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. SEELYE.]

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THROCKMORTON] will not object to this amendment. The expenditure is to be made under the auspices of the Society of Friends, who have carried their benevolent efforts in behalf of the Indians to a very unusual extent, further perhaps than almost any other of our various organized bodies of Christian people. I trust that, in view of the certainty that this money will be judiciously expended, the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. PAGE. What is the amount proposed to be appropriated by the amendment in its present shape?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moved to amend by inserting \$15,000 instead of \$10,000, which was accepted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question being taken on the amendment as modified, it was agreed to, there being ayes 80, noes not counted.

The Clerk read as follows:

MODOC.

For this amount, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to provide, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, settlements, clothing, food, agricultural implements, and seeds for the Modoc Indians that have been removed to, and are now residing within, the Indian Territory, \$5,000.

Mr. PAGE. I am instructed by the Committee on Indian Affairs to offer the following as an additional section, which is accepted, as I understand, by the Committee on Appropriations:

That the sum of \$2,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated for the benefit of the Tonkawa Indians now at the military post of Fort Griffin, Texas; that the money herein appropriated shall be expended for the benefit of said Indians by the commanding officer at Fort Griffin, under such conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs: *Provided*, That no part of said fund shall be applied to the removal of said Indians from the vicinity of such military post to any Indian reservation: *And provided further*, That such appropriation shall be applied *pro rata* to such Lipan Indians as may have been heretofore incorporated into the Tonkawa tribe and which still reside with such tribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRANSPORTATION.

For the necessary expenses of transportation of such goods, provisions, and other articles for the various tribes of Indians provided for by this act, \$147,000.

Mr. SEELYE. I am directed by the Committee on Indian Affairs to move an amendment, to strike out in the paragraph just read "\$147,000" and insert \$219,200. This transportation of course must be provided for. The Indian Bureau has been obliged to expend during the present year \$278,000 for transportation, and there are outstanding obligations which will make the sum over \$300,000. This amendment appears to me to be necessary.

Mr. RANDALL. I will state the manner in which we have reached the various amounts to be appropriated for transportation. The amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts takes I believe in every instance the estimates of the Commissioner, while the committee in various places have taken as a basis the amount expended in transportation during the last year, except in one case, that of the Sioux. For transportation for the Apaches, Kiowas, and Comanches the Commissioner asked for \$10,000, whereas it appears that but \$3,500 was expended last year. For the Cheyennes and Arapahoes \$10,000 is asked, but only \$5,500 was expended last year. For the various bands of Chippewas \$5,000 was asked, and the full amount has been allowed by the committee. For the Crows \$10,000 was asked, and has been allowed. For the Flatheads and other confederated tribes the Commissioner asked for \$2,000; but we have given only \$1,500, the amount expended last year. For the Navajoes we have given \$5,000, the amount of the estimate. For the Nez Percés we have allowed nothing; the amount asked for was \$1,000. The amount expended was very light; and it came, I understand, out of the general appropriation. For the Northern Cheyennes and Arapahoes we allow \$1,000, the amount expended last year; the amount asked for was \$2,500. For transportation of Shoshones and Banacks we appropriate \$4,000, the amount expended last year; while the amount asked was \$5,000. For the Yankton Sioux we give \$1,200; the full amount asked for. For the Tabequache, Muache, and others we give \$5,000, the amount expended last year, instead of

\$10,000, the amount asked. The estimate for the Sioux we cut down from \$150,000 to \$100,000. It is agreed that by the proposed change in the method of transporting rations and other Indian supplies, so that they shall be distributed under the War Department from the military posts instead of being transported long distances by wagons, a large sum of money now expended for transportation will be saved. If we shall be disappointed and the proposed transfer of Indian affairs to the War Department should not be made, we shall advise that the amount be increased. We believe, however, that under the management of the War Department \$50,000 can be saved in transportation. It is a simple question of arithmetic; and I think the committee are right about it.

Mr. SEELYE. I have not learned that mules or railroads work in transportation any cheaper for the military than others. I do not go into that, but say the gentleman has not spoken with his usual accuracy in reference to figures. The column of figures from which he has read as the amount expended during the last year is the amount appropriated. It has been necessary to expend a larger amount for transportation in order to get the goods to their destination, and sums have been taken from other appropriations. For instance, the gentleman says there has been expended for the Shoshones and Bannacks \$4,000. That is the amount appropriated. Five thousand eight hundred and twenty-two dollars and twenty-four cents have been expended; and the same is true all through the list he has read.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 41, noes 97.

So Mr. SEELYE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. DUNNELL. I move the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the collection of statistics and historical data respecting the Indians of the United States, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, \$3,500.

Mr. DUNNELL. That amendment restores to the Indian appropriation bill a clause which has been in the last two appropriation bills, providing for the collection of statistics and historical data respecting the Indian tribes. A gentleman has been at work on the matter provided for in this clause, and has made considerable progress, and expense has been incurred in the purchase of type, so the several Indian languages should properly be represented. The entire expenditure already made will be utterly lost to the Indian Department and the country unless for another year this appropriation may be provided. I hope the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will consent to the insertion of this small amendment.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 49, noes 69.

So the amendment was disagreed to.

Mr. THROCKMORTON. I think after the paragraph in reference to transportation there should be added a provision that all contracts hereafter shall be let to the lowest bidder after advertisement. That has heretofore been the policy.

Mr. RANDALL. I submit the following amendment:

Provided, That hereafter contracts for transportation shall be advertised and let to the lowest bidder.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANDALL. I move the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker *pro tempore* [Mr. COX] having resumed the chair, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had according to order had under consideration a bill (H. R. No. 3478) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MAIL-CONTRACTS INVESTIGATION.

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. I move, by unanimous consent, that the testimony taken before the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads in the investigation into mail contracts be ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

GENEVA AWARD.

Mr. LORD. I ask unanimous consent that the Geneva award bill be taken up on Monday next. It is now the special order from day to day. Inasmuch as I have to be absent on Tuesday for an indefinite period of time, I think it is reasonable the House should grant the motion I make to have the Geneva award bill set down for Monday next after the morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that the order may be made.

Mr. KELLEY. I suggest the gentleman add the words "immediately after the morning hour."

Mr. LORD. I so modify my motion.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GAUSE. I ask, by unanimous consent, to go to the Speaker's table for the purpose of taking up and putting on its passage a bill, (H. R. No. 155.)

Mr. BLAINE. Was unanimous consent given to take up the Geneva award bill on Monday next, to the exclusion of the right to suspend the rules on that day?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is very rarely that such unanimous consent is granted.

Mr. BLAINE. That must be put in or else motions to suspend the rules will be in order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is the understanding that the motion made by the gentleman from New York in reference to the Geneva award bill excludes the right to suspend the rules.

Mr. PAGE. Does the Chair decide that excludes the right to suspend the rules on Monday next?

Mr. LORD. The arrangement made with you will be carried out.

Mr. PAGE. Very well.

Mr. KELLEY. Therefore it was I suggested the insertion of the words "immediately after the morning hour." If it is to be some time during the day, I object. If immediately after the morning hour, so as to give time for the discussion of that important bill, then I have no objection.

Mr. LORD. That was the motion.

Mr. KELLEY. It is an important bill, and should not be crowded into half an hour. There should be time for discussion. I wish to be instructed by the discussion, for I confess my opinions are not clear.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair did not understand there was any limitation upon debate.

Mr. KELLEY. There will be if the day be spent in suspensions of the rules.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It comes up immediately after the morning hour.

Mr. PAGE. After the second call?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The first and second call are within the morning hour.

Mr. WHITE. Would it then be in order to suspend the rules?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Not until after the Geneva award is disposed of.

Mr. WHITE. Does that require unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It does.

Mr. WHITE. I object.

Mr. LORD. I thought it had been carried.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair must decide that the objection of the gentleman from Kentucky comes too late.

Mr. HOLMAN. The moment the Chair began to state the order proposed to be made, I asked what the subject-matter was. In the midst of the confusion I had not heard what it was. I did not understand the proposition which was pending before the House, and I rose to inquire what it was. A proposition to deprive the House of the right to suspend the rules on Monday is a very important matter. At the same time I am anxious that the gentleman from New York shall get the subject before the House on Monday.

Mr. BLAINE. The gentleman from Indiana must see that the assignment is not worth making unless it involves the suspension of the right to move to suspend the rules, because the instant you start the bill a motion to suspend the rules will remove it from the floor.

Mr. HOLMAN. Does this involve a suspension of the right to move to suspend the rules during the entire day?

Mr. BLAINE. Only until this bill is disposed of.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will again put the question. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LORD] asks the unanimous consent of the House that the Geneva arbitration award bill shall be set down as the special order, to the exclusion of the right to move to suspend the rules after the morning hour on Monday. It requires unanimous consent to make that order. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLMAN. I do not object if it is fixed for two o'clock.

Mr. JONES, of Kentucky. I object. I shall object to any privilege being given to new business till special orders which are now lying over shall be reached.

Mr. LORD. I ask the gentleman from Kentucky to hear me for a moment. This bill for which I desire Monday to be assigned is in its proper place. Except one small matter, it is ahead of all other business on the Calendar. I might call it up at any time to-morrow or Monday. All I ask is that, inasmuch as I have to leave the House on Tuesday, perhaps for an indefinite period, and as I have yielded on this bill several times for other matters, I ask this House to be so courteous in that regard, this being a matter of such importance, as to allow me to call it up on Monday. It is of no consequence for me to present it, unless it is assigned for consideration immediately after the morning hour.

Mr. JONES, of Kentucky. May I ask the gentleman from New York for what period his bill was originally made a special order?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill relating to the Geneva award was on March 16 made a special order for March 29 after the morning hour. The bill reported by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JONES] was made a special order on March 30 for the 18th of April, after the morning hour.

Mr. JONES, of Kentucky. The bill of the gentleman from New York having been made a special order before mine, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. HOLMAN. I would suggest to the gentleman from New York that he say two o'clock, instead of after the morning hour.

Mr. LORD. Very well.

There being no further objection, the bill (H. R. No. 2685) for the distribution of the unappropriated moneys of the Geneva award was

made the special order for Monday at two o'clock, to the exclusion of all other orders and of motions to suspend the rules, until disposed of.

DISTRICT COURTS IN ARKANSAS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will now read the title of the Senate bill which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GAUSE] desires to take from the Speaker's table and put upon its passage.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. No. 155) to amend sections 533, 556, 571, and 572 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

Mr. GAUSE. The bill simply provides for changes in the arrangement of the district courts in Arkansas. It is very important that it should be passed, and I think there can be no objection to it.

Mr. HOLMAN. Let the bill be read.

The bill was read.

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

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is, Will the House consider this bill at this time?

Mr. BURCHARD, of Illinois. A recess has been ordered; and I suggest that the gentleman from California modify his motion so that the House shall take a recess.

Mr. PHILLIPS, of Kansas. I object to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. PAGE. I move that the House take a recess, but yield to my colleague [Mr. LUTTRELL] to offer a resolution for reference.

NAVY-YARD AT MARE ISLAND.

Mr. LUTTRELL. I ask unanimous consent to offer the following resolution for reference to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Resolved, That a committee of five members of this House be appointed by the Speaker, and they are hereby instructed to make inquiry into certain alleged frauds and abuses existing at the navy-yard at Mare Island, California, and that said committee have the right to send for persons and papers, to employ a stenographer and an expert accountant, that they have leave to sit during the recess, and that they make report to the next session of this House.

Mr. KELLEY. I object, and I shall continue to object until these investigations are conducted with open doors.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of their clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, with amendments; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (H. R. No. 339) for the relief of E. D. Franz;

A bill (H. R. No. 341) for the relief of Louis Rosenbaum;

A bill (H. R. No. 1071) for the relief of Lieutenant James B. Sinclair, United States Army; and

A bill (H. R. No. 1803) to provide for the appointment of commissioners for taking affidavits, &c., for the courts of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. No. 42) granting a pension to Francis Bernard;

A bill (H. R. No. 915) for the relief of F. M. Blount, of Chicago, Illinois;

A bill (H. R. No. 1992) granting an additional pension to Mary P. Abeel;

A bill (H. R. No. 2291) granting a pension to John H. Garrison;

A bill (H. R. No. 2306) granting a pension to John McIntire;

A bill (H. R. No. 2447) transferring the custody of certain Indian trust funds; and

A bill (H. R. No. 1400) authorizing the residents and property-owners of Neville Township, County of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania, to close the channel of the Ohio River on the south side of Neville Island by the construction of an embankment or causeway from the head of said island to the southern shore of said river.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

An act (S. No. 105) for the relief of Dickson Shinault, late assistant keeper of the light-vessel at Wolf Trap light-station, in the State of Virginia;

An act (S. No. 118) granting a pension to James H. Woodard;

An act (S. No. 294) for the relief of Charles E. Hedges;

An act (S. No. 369) to exempt vessels engaged in navigating the Mississippi River and its tributaries above the port of New Orleans from entries and clearances;

An act (S. No. 413) establishing the port of Saint Paul, Minnesota, as a port of appraisal;

An act (S. No. 471) to re-open the lands of the Fort Sedgwick military reservation to settlement and occupation as public lands;

An act (S. No. 539) to provide for an increase of pension in favor of Martin Kelly;

An act (S. No. 558) making a further appropriation for the erection of Government buildings in Dover, Delaware;

An act (S. No. 634) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the joint-stock company of the Young Men's Christian Association of Washington," approved March 2, 1867;

An act (S. No. 675) to enable Horace L. Emery to make an application to the Commissioner of Patents for the extension of letters-patent for improvement in cotton-ginning machines;

An act (S. No. 676) authorizing the construction of a light-house and fog-bell on Round Island, Straits of Mackinac;

An act (S. No. 678) for the relief of Ephraim P. Abbott;

An act (S. No. 769) to alter and appoint the times for holding the circuit court of the United States for the fourth judicial circuit, and for other purposes;

An act (S. No. 770) for the relief of Judson S. Post, of Missouri, late disbursing officer of the United States Navy;

An act (S. No. 825) to provide for the more speedy adjustment of the accounts of the Treasurer of the United States; and

An act (S. No. 872) for the relief of the family of the late John T. King, and of L. B. Cutler.

MILITARY BRIDGE OVER BIG SIOUX RIVER, IOWA.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting copy of the report of the General of the Army upon the subject of the repair of the military bridge over the Big Sioux River, Iowa; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

BRANT ISLAND LIGHT-HOUSE.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting letter from engineer secretary of the Light-House Board, in reference to the destruction of the Brant Island light-house by fire; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ARMY PROMOTIONS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting petition of officers of the Army asking for rule of promotion in the line of the Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CARRIAGE HIRE FOR WAR DEPARTMENT.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a statement of amounts paid for cost of carriage hire for the War Department from March 4, 1869, to March 1, 1876; which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

ENGINEER CORPS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a communication from the Chief of Engineers, containing information as to the Engineer Corps, called for by House resolution of April 27, 1876; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SUBSISTENCE FURNISHED TO MEN OF THE SIGNAL CORPS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Commissary-General of Subsistence concerning the cost of subsistence furnished men of the Signal Corps during the past and present fiscal years; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. COOK was granted leave of absence for a few days on account of sickness.

Mr. MACKEY, of Pennsylvania, was granted leave of absence for six days on account of business.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. O'BRIEN, by unanimous consent, leave was granted for the withdrawal from the files of the House of the papers in the claim of Joseph H. J. Rutter, presented to the Thirty-ninth Congress, and upon which no adverse report had been made.

And then, on motion of Mr. HOLMAN, the House (at five o'clock and twenty minutes p. m.) took a recess until seven o'clock and thirty minutes p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House re-assembled at half past seven o'clock p. m., Mr. Cox in the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*.

TARIFF BILL.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, (Mr. SPRINGER in the chair,) and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 3132) to revise and simplify existing laws imposing duties on imports and to reduce taxation.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration makes such a radical reduction in our present tariff law that it is an impossibility for those who favor protection to the laboring interests of the country to undertake to perfect it by amendments, as it would require a change of rate in nearly every item embraced within the bill. I had hoped that the committee would take our present law and amend it, by increasing and diminishing its rates wherever necessary, so as to make it fully and strictly protective to every industry within this country; placing upon the free list every article shipped from abroad that we do not grow or produce here by labor which enters into general consumption by the rich and poor alike, such as tea and coffee, so as to make them as cheap to the consumer as possible; but, upon all arti-

cles of luxury shipped from abroad, such as fine wines and brandies, silks, broadcloths, laces, diamonds, &c., put the tariff high, so as to make as much revenue out of them as they will stand, as they are consumed almost entirely by the wealthy, and it makes but little difference to them what an article costs, as they seldom stop to inquire the price when they need it for use. By this kind of tariff we would protect our labor and enrich our own country, and place the heaviest burdens of taxation upon the wealthy, who are best able to stand them, and at the same time raise revenue to support the Government without making our manufactured articles any dearer to the consumer. But instead of this the committee has brought forward a bill that does not make the proper discriminations between articles of necessity and luxury shipped from abroad, and with rates so low upon the articles we manufacture that they would not protect our labor from the impoverishing competition of the cheap labor of Europe, which would as certainly destroy our manufacturing establishments, and thereby seriously injure the material interests of the country or compel our laboring people to work at the same wages that are paid for labor in Europe, as that the weak must give way to the strong when they come in contact. Either would be very detrimental to us as a nation, for breaking down our manufacturing establishments would bring ruin upon the country, and to reduce our laboring people to the cheap wages of Europe would fill the land with untold misery and want. I feel that nothing but harm would grow out of this bill if enacted into a law. I shall therefore do everything I can to prevent its passage.

Every man upon this floor, with perhaps one or two exceptions, admits the necessity of a tariff, but we differ as to the kind we should have. One portion insists that its real purpose should be to raise revenue, and not to give protection to labor, except that incidental protection that a cheap or revenue tariff, as it is called, would give; these are called free-traders; while the other class insists that its real purpose should be to protect labor and at the same time raise revenue; this class are called protectionists.

The bill under discussion is gotten up to suit the views of the free-traders, in opposition to the present law, which is regarded as protective in its character.

The questions involved within this discussion affect the real and substantial interests of the country more than any others that can come before Congress. They embrace the subject of taxation as well as the financial and laboring interests of the nation, which are the vital questions of the day. They should therefore be fairly presented and discussed, with a view to enlighten, and not to deceive, the people.

The advocates of this bill are opposed to a protective tariff for the reason, as they say, it dwarfs our industries, closes the markets of the world against us, increases the price of all manufactured articles, and thereby robs and impoverishes the laboring people of the country. Is that true? I insist that it is not, but it is the very reverse of truth. I hold that if our tariff was made strictly protective to our industries, as above indicated, and the interest upon our money made low so that money could be used profitably in business, they would be the greatest blessing that Congress could possibly bestow upon the whole country, and especially upon the laboring-people. Such enactments would at once revive business, establish confidence among our people, put all of our manufacturing establishments in full operation, and thousands more would spring up all over the country, adding prosperity and wealth to our people; laborers would be increased by the millions, and all would be employed at wages that would not only enable them to live, but to properly clothe and educate their children. The markets of the world would then be supplied from our workshops. Competition among our own manufacturers would be so great that products, instead of being high and thereby robbing and impoverishing the poor, would be made cheaper to the people. In short, every department of business throughout the country would be made prosperous and our people made happy. These are propositions, to my mind, that can be made as plain and clear as the noon-day sun.

If we should pass this bill I would feel that we had inflicted upon the country one of the greatest calamities that could possibly befall it. Within two years most of the manufacturing establishments in the United States would be closed, unless the laboring people of this country would be content to work for the same wages that the laboring people of Europe do. If the advocates of this bill desire that the laboring people of this country should be reduced to a state of pauperism, they have struck upon the exact plan to accomplish it. With such a tariff how would it be possible for our manufacturers to do business and compete with the manufacturers of Europe where their machinery and means for manufacturing are superior to ours; where interest on money that is used in manufacturing is about 60 per cent. and labor at least 50 per cent. cheaper than it is here, and all kinds of transportation less in the same proportion than we have to pay? I say how would it be possible for any manufacturer in this country to do business and compete with this cheap money, cheap labor, and cheap transportation of Europe, unless we reduce the wages of our laborers to the low prices paid there? It would be an utter impossibility for any one to manufacture here unless that was done.

Is it the object, then, of the advocates of this bill to stop manufacturing in this country unless our manufacturers will produce articles here as cheap as they are produced in Europe? How can they manufacture here as cheap as there unless interest and labor are made

lower? The good book teaches us that the laborer is worthy of his hire. All admit that he is not properly rewarded in Europe for the services that are rendered. Capital there gets more than its share. Should it be our policy, then, to grind labor here as it is ground there by requiring it to work at wages that are not equal in value to the services rendered? I hope no man can be found on this floor who will advocate any such doctrine. It should be our policy, then, to lower interest but not the price of labor, for the reason that capital is now much better paid here than labor. The earnings of capital and labor should be placed upon an equality and kept so, as nearly as possible; it would be much better in the end for both. To do that, interest must be reduced and the price of labor raised rather than lowered, until interest and labor, after all expenses are paid, will find the same level in price. But the advocates of this bill, by lowering the tariff on all articles manufactured in this country, do the very reverse of that. They let interest remain where it is, but reduce the tariff about one-third, which will reduce the price of labor but not interest. Do they expect by any such short-sighted policy as that to cheapen goods in this country so as to benefit the people? It will not do so. The only effect of the lowering of the tariff on the products we manufacture in this country will be to dwarf our manufacturing interests by closing many of our workshops, check the growth of the country, produce general stagnation in business, injure the farmers, mechanics, and merchants, and impoverish the day-laborers. This will produce, I admit, a decline in the price of goods as well as every other commodity while our manufactories are thus being destroyed; but it will be through the general ruin and prostration of business, and not through prosperity to the country. Building up the country by such a policy is on a par with the theory of bleeding a man in order to give him strength, when blood is the very thing he needs for that purpose. All wealth comes from labor. Is it our policy, then, to grind our labor instead of fostering it, in order to get wealth out of it? By this grinding process we make the rich richer and the poor poorer; we render the few happy by giving them wealth, but make the masses wretched and miserable by reducing them to poverty.

This bill is based upon the idea that if our tariff is high, then goods are dear; if the tariff is low, then goods are cheap. Nothing can be more preposterous than that. Competition is what regulates prices, and not the tariff. The true purpose of a tariff should be to produce healthy competition. If it is too high or too low, it may fail to produce the required competition and then goods would be dear under either. For example, if we should put the tariff so high on articles we manufacture in this country that it would prohibit the European manufacturers from bringing their products here for sale, in that case we would prevent the foreign article coming in competition with those we manufactured, and it would make everything we manufactured dear, unless the competition among our manufacturers would be great enough to keep down the price. On the other hand, if we should make the tariff so low that the foreign manufacturers with their cheap money and cheap labor could bring their goods here and sell them lower than we could afford to manufacture them with money and labor at our prices, then our manufacturers would be compelled to stop work or lose money. So soon as they would stop the European manufacturers would have no competition to keep them down in price; then they would put up prices and articles would be dearer. A tariff, then, that is too high or too low would be injurious to the country, for each would fail to produce healthy competition. What we want is one that will give ample protection to our labor; not so high as to prohibit the foreign manufacturers from coming into fair competition, nor so low that we cannot manufacture and pay to our laborers good wages. With a tariff that will thus protect our labor competition will be strong, the market steady, and if interest was low goods would be as cheap as they are in Canada.

This bill reduces the tariff so low that if it should become a law we could not manufacture under it with interest and wages at their present rates. Our manufacturers would be compelled to retire from the contest, and our laborers would have to seek the plow for a support for themselves and families. Then we would have to depend upon Europe for our manufactured articles, and in a very short time we would find them costing us more than we now pay; for when our manufacturing establishments are once broken down, the competition that now regulates and keeps the price of articles at reasonable rates would be gone, and we would be completely in the hands of the European manufacturers. They would then have the articles to sell, and we would be compelled to purchase them. They would fix the prices, and we would have them to pay, and we would soon find them higher than now.

I know that many will treat this argument lightly and insist that our manufacturing establishments under a low tariff would not be closed but would continue as now. What would induce them to continue? They could not make their salt manufacturing under a tariff as low as this, with interest and wages as now paid in this country. The European manufacturers could and would, with their cheap money and cheap labor, undersell and break every one of our manufacturers who would undertake to do business, with perhaps a few exceptions. Manufacturing under a low tariff would be the most uncertain and unsatisfactory business that a man could follow in this country, for the reason that, in order to make a reasonable profit on

the money invested and compete successfully with the European manufacturers, it would require a heavy reduction of wages that would keep up a constant war between the operators and the laborers. Experience has shown us that when labor is not properly paid it is restive and uncertain, it will combine and strike; that injures the manufacturer as well as the laborer, for strikes frequently prevent the manufacturers from complying with their engagements to fill orders, and thereby seriously injures their business by loss of trade as well as actual loss of money, and while it lasts it deprives the laborers of their daily wages and brings suffering upon their families. At present interest is so high and foreign competition so great that our manufacturers are not making any money; many of them have closed their shops and others working only half time, and in order to keep their heads above water and prevent loss they have cut down wages. This has made labor restive and caused strikes, and the country has been seriously injured and the people are suffering on account of it. To now reduce the tariff would cause a still heavier reduction of wages, which would only make matters worse instead of better. Capital is cowardly at best, and with these troubles caused by a low tariff manufacturing would be so uncertain and so unpromising that capital would be driven almost entirely from the business. A protective tariff with low interest would prevent all this. It would insure capital that engaged in manufacturing against loss from unequal competition from abroad and enable it to pay labor good and satisfactory wages; this would keep down strikes, increase manufacturing, create strong home competition, make business steady, manufactured articles cheaper, and the whole country prosperous.

I admit if we should not lower interest but put wages down to the pauper prices paid in Europe we might with our natural advantages keep up manufactures here under this low tariff. But who would be benefited by so doing? None but the few. It would destroy the laboring-men of the country, the very class that needs protection. With our present tariff, which is much higher than the rates proposed in this bill, do we not find many of our workshops now closed? Why? Because interest is so high and our monetary matters so unsettled that men are afraid to engage in business. Experience has shown them that interest eats faster than the profits on business will make. If in addition to this burden of interest we reduce the tariff, what will be the result? We will let in goods manufactured abroad at much cheaper rates than now, and, for the purpose of breaking down our manufactories, they will be offered at reduced rates. If our manufacturers are to put down the price of their goods so as to compete with these cheap goods, they must rob labor of that difference or stop work, or break. No other alternative is left them. The laboring-man can see that the reduction of the tariff means that much reduction in his wages, and he must work at these reduced wages or quit the shop and go to the plow or starve.

Ah, but says the advocate of the cheap tariff, by reducing the tariff do we not let in the cheap goods and make it that much better for the poor man? Will he not get his goods cheaper than now? Let us see. When our manufacturing establishments are once broken down, how long will these foreign goods remain cheap? About as long as the freights on our railroads remain cheap, after our water lines of transportation are frozen up late in the fall. Our water lines of transportation furnish the competition that brings down the price in freights on the railroads and keeps them down, as long as they are open, the same as our home manufacturing establishments compete with the foreign manufacturers and keep down their prices. These home manufacturing establishments can only be maintained by putting a tariff on all articles manufactured abroad where we manufacture the same article in this country. That tariff should be high enough, so that when the foreign manufacturer pays for making the article in Europe, including all expense, and pays the transportation here, and then pays our tariff, it will have cost him as much as the same article costs our manufacturer here to make it—including insurance, interest, and good living wages to our laborers; then each manufacturer stands upon an equality, and can compete fairly; the one that will sell his goods the cheapest will get the trade. But if we put the tariff so low that manufacturing cannot be carried on in this country, then we destroy our manufacturing interests, impoverish our laboring men, and at the same time destroy the competition that keeps down the price of all articles that we consume. Then the foreign merchants and manufacturers will have us within our power, and will take advantage of our necessities, and put up the price of all articles to suit themselves, the same as our railroads do when competition is broken down by reason of our water lines of transportation freezing up.

These foreign merchants and manufacturers are no better than our railroad kings, and we know from sad experience that they take advantage of our necessities whenever they can. And so will the foreign manufacturers and merchants do the same thing when they have the opportunity. The argument that the competition among the foreign manufacturers, were our manufacturing establishments broken down would be sufficient to keep the price of articles cheap, is unsound. If not, why is it that the competition among the railroads does not keep down the price of freights when our water lines of transportation are frozen up? For they furnish as much competition with each other and are far more able to supply the demand than the foreign manufacturers would be in the case put. The reason for it in the case of the railroads is this: the demand for shipments is

so great and there being no way to ship except by the railroads, they have the shippers entirely within their power, and, so having them, they fix the rates to suit themselves and the shippers have them to pay. So would the foreign merchants and manufacturers take the advantage of us if our manufacturing establishments were broken down; for in that case our demand for goods would be so great, and there would be no way of supplying that demand except to purchase from them, for the reason that we could get them nowhere else; then they would have us as completely in their power as the railroads have the shippers after the water lines of transportation freeze up; and they would then fix the prices and we would have them to pay.

But, says one, that could not be so; for as soon as prices would go up our manufacturers would again commence operations, and that would create competition and bring down the prices. I cannot see what inducements there would be for our manufacturers to commence work again under such circumstances, after having been compelled to stop, for several reasons. First, it would cost them considerable money to start work. Second, they could not do so without skilled labor; and that would be very difficult to get, for such labor would not remain in this country after our manufacturing establishments were once broken down; and neither could it be induced to return here to work on uncertainties as to the time it would be employed, nor unless it received better wages here than were paid abroad. In the third place they would have no assurance without a protective tariff that they would not lose all they invested to commence manufacturing; for the reason as soon as they were ready to start work the European manufacturers could and would drop the price of goods so low that they could not turn a wheel in their establishments without losing money; the result would be that they would have to abandon the enterprise and lose all the money they put into it. So soon as the abandonment would take place, all competition would be destroyed; then up would go the price of goods again.

There is no use of any one insisting that our manufacturers would carry on their business under a low tariff the same as now unless the price of labor was put down, so that they could compete with the cheap labor of Europe. It would be utterly impossible for them to do so without reducing wages to that extent; and it is perfect folly to insist that they could or would do so without such a reduction of wages. A reduction of the tariff, then, means nothing more nor less than a reduction of the laboring-man's wages.

Why any one can insist that a cheap or revenue tariff, as it is called, is better for the people and the country than a protective tariff, I cannot understand. Under our present tariff we purchased last year from abroad over five hundred and forty-seven million dollars' worth of foreign products and collected from them in tariff duties over one hundred and fifty-four million dollars. Was not that enough to purchase from abroad? Under this bill, in order to collect the same amount of revenue it will require us to purchase abroad each year about seven hundred million dollars' worth of products. Does not every one see and know that every dollar's worth of manufactured products that we purchase abroad, where we produce the same kind of article in this country, we to that extent rob labor here? We now have at least a half a million of laborers that are idle, suffering and starving for employment. Is that the kind of tariff system that we need to build up our country and make it prosperous—a system that robs our labor by making nothing at home, but purchasing everything abroad? Such a policy would ruin and impoverish any nation or people upon the face of the earth. But, says one, "Our laborers need not be idle. If they will not work as cheap in the shops as other people, let them go to the plow and there seek honest employment." If they should all go to the plow, that would close our workshops and make farmers out of all our laborers, which would be disastrous to our farming interests, as I will presently show.

Many delude themselves with the idea that under a cheap tariff our people would be more prosperous, because the manufactured articles we consume would be so much cheaper to them. Says one, my suit of clothes cost me \$60 in the city of New York, when I could have gone across the line into Canada and purchased the same article for thirty-five or forty dollars. But, says he, it is this abominable, outrageous, swindling, protective tariff that makes this difference. Why should we not break it down and let in those cheap goods to be worn and enjoyed by our people? Why will we suffer our poor laborers, farmers, and mechanics to be thus robbed for the benefit of the bloated manufacturers, who are sapping the life-blood from the people? We have been taxed long enough for their support. If they cannot manufacture goods as cheap as our neighbors across the line, let them quit and go at something else. Cheap goods are what we want and must have, and these we cannot have as long as we have this robbing protective tariff. This is the argument of the free trader. It is plausible and even winning when presented in the eloquent and fascinating tones of the distinguished gentlemen, Mr. COX, of New York, and Messrs. BURCHARD and MORRISON, of Illinois, who are all in favor of cheap goods, but against low interest. But this argument, when once dissected and its results clearly understood, if carried into full operation, will disclose the most destructive policy to all the material interests of the country, and especially to our laboring people, that could possibly be adopted.

A suit of clothes that costs in this country \$60 falls under the head

of luxuries. They are worn only by the rich and well-to-do. They are not worn by the poor. We do not manufacture the class of goods in this country that these fine suits are made from. It should be our policy to put the tariff high on this class of goods. The tax thus raised goes to support the Government; the wealthy pay it and can afford to stand it. But if we come down to the class of goods, both cotton and woolen, that are manufactured in this country, such as are worn by our laborers, farmers, and mechanics, and their families, we will find them about as cheap as we could purchase them in Canada. In the manufacture of these fine broadcloths we have no home manufactories that are able as yet to compete with the foreign article so as to bring down the price; but when we come to calicoes, shirtings, casinets, jeans, and the classes of goods that are worn by the masses of our people, they are low in prices and much cheaper than they would be if we had to depend upon Europe for them. It is a mistaken notion to suppose that our manufacturers, after they make an article, can then add the price of the tariff and make it that much higher to the consumer. Take the article of prints or calicoes; the tariff on them ranges from 5 to 6½ cents per square yard, and yet we can purchase all we want from our own manufacturers at 5 and 6 cents per yard. Will any one say that the tariff adds to the price of these calicoes? Shirtings are cheap in the same proportion. Take the various classes of steel and iron; the tariff on these is high, with two or three exceptions. Yet they are as cheap here as in Canada, where they have no tariff. The various kinds of iron, such as the farmers consume, can now be purchased at wholesale from 2½ to 3 cents per pound, and the best American steel at 15 cents per pound. Does any one want iron and steel cheaper than that? Salt, with a tariff of 12 cents on the hundred pounds when in barrels, is now quoted in the West at \$1.40 per barrel; that includes the barrel and transportation. At the salt manufactories it can be purchased in bulk at 12½ cents per bushel. Is not that cheap enough? With a tariff from 10 to 12 cents per pound on wool, our farmers are enabled to raise it and compete in price with the foreign article; and still the manufactured articles made from wool under a tariff which is above 50 per cent. are as cheap, if not cheaper, under our present tariff than in 1857 and 1860, when the tariff was much lower than now. For example, we paid at wholesale for—

| | Prices in 1857 and 1860 in gold. | Prices in 1875 in green- backs. |
|------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| Kentucky jeans | 26 to 28 cents. | 30 cents. |
| Tweeds | 60 to 60½ cents. | 50 to 62½ cents. |
| Sackings | \$1.10. | \$1.10 to \$1.15. |
| Flannels | 26 to 34 cents. | 27 to 30 cents. |
| All-wool doekins | 80 to 85 cents. | 80 to 85 cents. |
| Satinets | 60 to 65 cents. | 60 to 65 cents. |

I have given the prices of these articles for 1875. At the present time they are still lower. Will any one say, then, that our tariff has made these various articles dearer to our consumers, when they are really cheaper than they were before the war, when the tariff was much lower than now? Why is it that these articles are so cheap when the tariff is high enough to be protective? It is because capital feels secure under a protective tariff and goes readily into manufacturing. Each manufacturing establishment that is erected creates that much additional competition, and this competition has become so great, that it has brought down prices about as low as our farmers, mechanics, and laboring-men can ask them, unless interest on money is made cheaper; for it must be remembered that all these manufactured articles are produced by labor, and if made cheaper except by lowering interest or improvement in machinery, it must be ground from the sweat and toil of labor, in which reduction all laboring-men will have to bear their proportion. If it had not been for our protective system capital would not have gone into manufacturing, and our country would not have been enriched as it is, and we would have been without the competition that has made manufactured articles so cheap, and to-day would have been suffering under the curse and blight of free trade and high prices. Under the cry of making cheap goods, which means simply cheap broadcloths and articles of luxury that we do not manufacture and which are consumed alone by the wealthy, for the class of goods used by our laboring people are now cheap, these free-traders expect to alarm the masses and induce them to join in breaking down our protective system, under the pretext that the articles they consume would be so much cheaper to them under a low tariff. Protection they say robs the laboring-man, while I assert it is his truest and best friend.

Take the case of the farmer. A protective tariff is what he wants and must have in order to make him really prosperous, for this reason: The farmer works hard all the season and raises a fine crop. What benefit is this crop to him unless he has a good market for it? How can he have this kind of market unless there are human beings and animals under their employ, engaged in labor other than farming, and at wages that will warrant them in consuming these products at good prices? This market the farmer wants near him; if possible, within his own county, so as to save transportation; he does not want it hundreds and thousands of miles away from him, so that the cost

of transportation would eat up the value of the products and leave him nothing for his labor in raising them. Then, how is it possible for the farmer to have these human beings near him, working at profitable wages, so as to give him this good home market, unless they are engaged in manufacturing or the mining of coal or iron ore, or some other industry other than farming, induced by the prosperity of the country growing out of our manufacturing interests; and how can we keep up this manufacturing that stimulates and keeps up these other industries, and pay to these laborers this living price for their labor unless we protect them against the cheap labor of Europe? And how can we give this protection except by a tariff?

These are questions that the western farmers want the free-traders to answer when they undertake to show how a protective tariff robs them. Farmers who live near manufacturing or mining settlements, where a large number of laborers reside with their families, know the benefits of the market that they create for their products; and it will be a very difficult undertaking for the free-traders to convince them that this market is not worth more to them than one where the consumers are hundreds and thousands of miles away. A protective tariff builds up these manufacturing and mining settlements all over the country, while a cheap tariff destroys them. If goods are so cheap in Europe and Canada, why are not the farmers and laboring-men there, where they enjoy free trade, as prosperous as the farmers and laboring-men in this country? Will some free-trader please answer?

The honorable gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. BURCHARD,] in his argument the other day when this bill was under consideration, said that the manufacturing States were wealthier than the agricultural States, and upon that fact he based his argument that it was our high tariff duties that were enriching the manufacturers at the expense of the agriculturists. He omitted to mention the fact that the farmers within those manufacturing States were among the wealthiest classes within them. The true reason of the great wealth and prosperity of the manufacturing States is on account of their diversity of labor. The farmers raise good crops and the laborers in the mines and the shops consume them at good prices and save their transportation to a distant market. These laborers get good wages and spend most that they make in the neighborhood where they work, and as a natural result these States grow rich. I am anxious to have our agricultural and cotton States in the West and South, that are filled with coal and iron, to profit by the example of these manufacturing States of the East and induce manufacturing establishments in their midst. This can only be done by a protective tariff. We should therefore vote down this bill.

Every man who has given the subject any thought must know that if our manufacturers in this country have to pay from 8 to 10 per cent. for money to use in their business, when the European manufacturers can get theirs at 5 per cent., and have to pay at least 50 per cent. more for their labor than the European manufacturers do for theirs, and at least one-third more for all kinds of transportation than is paid in Europe, that it is an impossibility for our manufacturers to carry on business in this country and compete with the foreign manufacturers unless we protect them by a tariff against this difference in price of money, labor, and transportation. The report of Hon. Edward Young, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, for the year 1875 shows that during that year the average rate of per cent. of our present tariff upon all articles shipped from abroad upon which a duty was charged was 40.62 per cent., which according to his estimate is about 8 per cent. less than the difference in the price of labor in this country and Europe, saying nothing about the difference in the cost of money and transportation here as compared with its cost there. Cannot any one see the hardships with which our manufacturers have to contend in order to do business under our present tariff when they pay good wages to our laborers?

But to mend matters this bill under discussion is brought forward. What does it do? It lowers our present tariff duties on an average about one-third, which would make the average percentage of the tariff if this bill was adopted less than 29 per cent., with interest on money in this country 60 per cent. higher than it is in Europe (for the difference between 5 and 8 per cent. makes a difference of 60 per cent.) and labor 50 and transportation at least 33½ per cent. higher here than there. How could it be expected that any man of sense would risk his money in manufacturing under such a tariff when the articles he made had to come in competition with articles from abroad that were manufactured with this cheap money and cheap labor? Is it not the height of folly for any one to contend that we could or would manufacture here under such a tariff as this? The free-traders all over the country, who as a general rule belong to the wealthy class, are raising a hue and cry against the tariff and insisting that it is what is making the hard times and impoverishing our people, when in truth and in fact it is the high interest on money that is robbing and impoverishing our people, and not the tariff. If the committee had turned its attention to the lowering of interest instead of tinkering with the tariff, it would have been much better for the country. Our present tariff is full low now upon many of the articles we manufacture in order to give the necessary protection to labor; and if we undertake to carry on manufacturing in this country with a tariff less than our present one, except on a few articles, it will require the difference to be taken from the price of labor, for capital will have its profit if labor has to suffer; and every man who earns his bread by

the sweat of his brow, including the farmers, mechanics, and laborers, must share in that loss. And this loss to the laboring-man by reduction of the tariff below the true standard will be far greater than the saving he will make in the reduced prices of the manufactured articles that he will consume, for the reduction in price, if any, will be brought about by prostration in business.

If we put the tariff so low that we cannot manufacture in this country, then our laborers must go to the plow. What then will become of our farming interests? If every laboring-man raises his own bread and meat, who will consume the surplus products of the farms? Where will the farmers find a market? The free-traders say: If they cannot find a market in this country they must ship their products to Europe, where we purchase our manufactured articles, and sell them there. But Europe does not purchase but a small portion of the surplus products raised by our present number of farmers. What would be the result if all of our laborers were turned into farmers? The statistics for the last thirty years show that we have not been able to sell abroad more than one-tenth of our surplus from the farms. Europe has plenty of farmers, and they raise good crops. When the season is good they want but little from us. When the crop is a failure there, like it is here sometimes, then they want more. But a great farming country like this cannot afford to depend upon a foreign market for its products when that market is not able to consume one-tenth of our surplus. If we wish to be prosperous we must make a home market, and that can only be done by building up manufacturing establishments all over the country that will employ millions of laborers, who, with their wives and children, will furnish mouths to eat up the products of our farms when cultivated to their fullest capacity. If these laborers are paid good wages they will be prosperous, and can afford to pay to the farmers good prices that will make the farmers prosperous.

When the farmers and laborers of the country are prosperous they always feel like enjoying their prosperity. Then they want new houses, barns, wagons, plows, buggies, harness, reapers, mowers, good clothes, hats, boots, shoes, &c. To make all these would give the carpenters, bricklayers, stone-masons, blacksmiths, tailors, hatters, shoemakers, merchants, &c., plenty of employment at good wages and profits. The country being thus made prosperous, the lawyers, doctors, bankers, and in short all kinds of business men would have all they could do, and all, from the highest to the lowest, from the richest to the poorest, would share in the grand results thus produced. But, on the contrary, if the farmers have a poor market for their products, they can make but a bare support for their families; then they purchase but little from the stores and make but few improvements on their farms. They make their old wagons, plows, harness, &c., last as long as possible. In consequence of this the merchants and mechanics have but little employment and the country remains poor and at a stand-still.

True prosperity must come from labor. To have that we must first look to the true interests of the tiller of the soil, the man who digs wealth from the earth, and see that he is all right. He can only be made so by giving him a good home market for his products. This market can only be given, as I have shown, by the employment of laborers at good wages in manufacturing establishments distributed throughout the country, and these can only be kept up so as to pay these living wages by a protective tariff. By thus protecting our labor and keeping prosperity in the country, we do not make the manufactured products any dearer to the consumer; but, on the contrary, we make them cheaper.

The old saying that the consumer pays the duty is only true of certain articles we ship from abroad. For example, we do not grow in this country either tea or coffee. By putting a tariff on them we simply make them that much higher in price to those who consume them. In that case the consumer pays the duty; and so of all other articles that we ship from abroad where we do not produce the same kind in this country by labor. But upon all articles we ship from abroad, where we produce the same kind in this country by labor, the tariff that we put upon that class, if it is sufficient to protect our labor, does not make the article any dearer to the consumer, and upon such articles it is the foreign merchants and manufacturers who pay the duty, and not the consumers in this country. This is a proposition that can be demonstrated and made clear beyond question. The consumers of this country do not pay it for this reason: A protective tariff builds up and sustains our manufactures. They being numerous, and distributed throughout the country, keep the supply equal to the demand, and thereby create strong competition with each other as well as with the articles shipped from abroad. This competition makes each manufacturer come down in his prices, and the one that will sell the cheapest gets the trade. This home competition is what regulates the price of all articles in our market and keeps them as cheap as they are. To illustrate this more fully take the article of Bessemer steel. We did not manufacture that article in this country to any extent beyond mere experiments until 1868. Prior to our manufacture of it we never bought a single ton of it from Europe for less than \$112 in gold, and most of the time the price ranged from \$130 to \$150 per ton in gold. During the war, when \$1 in gold was worth \$2.80 in currency, this steel then cost us at the rate of \$400 per ton in currency.

The English merchants and manufacturers could have sold us this steel for a much less price than they did and still have made enormous

profits, but they would not. Why? Because we were not in condition to compel them. We wanted the article and were compelled to have it. The English merchants knew that, and also knew that we could not get it except from them. That gave them the advantage of us, and then they fixed the price and we had it to pay. During this time there was a tariff on this Bessemer steel, and our consumers then not only paid this tariff, but they paid an outrageous price for the steel besides. But as soon as we commenced manufacturing it in this country, what was the result? It commenced falling in price at once, and in a very short time we could purchase it in currency at less rates than we could purchase it in gold before we commenced manufacturing it. And as our manufactures of this steel increased in numbers and capacity, the competition increased in the same proportion, and the price continued to fall, until now we can purchase all the Bessemer steel we want for \$60 a ton in currency. I know it is said that its price was made high because there was a patent on its manufacture. I admit that that made a difference of \$5 per ton on rails and \$10 per ton on all other kinds in the price; but the great cause of the high price was on account of the European manufacturers having a monopoly in its manufacture. But as soon as we commenced manufacturing this steel our tariff served a new purpose, and at once became a shield of protection to our labor against the impoverishing competition of the cheap labor of Europe engaged in manufacturing this same article, the same as a strong breakwater protects the shipping within the harbor and prevents its destruction by a heavy sea driven against its walls by the furious storms of the ocean. So that the English manufacturer, after he paid all the expenses of manufacturing this steel in Europe and paid for shipping it to this country, and then paid our tariff—this steel cost him as much as it cost us to manufacture it in this country, we paying to our laborers a living price for their labor.

This tariff then protected our manufacturers and prevented them from being broken down, because it prevented the English manufacturers from putting down the price of this steel lower than we could manufacture it here and pay our labor a good price unless they did it at a loss to themselves. By this protection then we have been enabled to build up this home competition, which has brought down the price of this steel in currency to one-half what its price was in gold before we commenced manufacturing it. Now, if by this protective tariff we have been enabled to manufacture this steel and pay to our laborers good wages, and at the same time cheapen the article to our consumers one-half—and we compel the foreign merchants and manufacturers to pay this tariff into our Treasury before we permit them to sell this steel to our people at this reduced price—I submit whether it is not a fact that cannot be disputed, that it is the foreign merchants and manufacturers that pay this tariff on this steel, and not our people; for they now pay the tariff and sell us this steel for \$60 per ton in currency, when before we commenced the manufacture of it we paid the tariff and then paid them from \$112 to \$150 per ton in gold for it. Quite a healthy difference.

If we should do away with this protective tariff, we would break down our manufactures and thereby destroy the very competition that made this steel cheap and now keeps down its price as well as the price of all other articles that we manufacture, as I have shown. We would then be dependent upon Europe again for this steel as well as the manufactured articles we consume; her merchants and manufacturers would then fix the prices and we would have them to pay. Before we commenced the manufacture of this steel we were completely within the power of Europe as to its price, but now we are independent of her, and it was our protective tariff that made us so. It is her people that now pays this tariff on this steel, and not ours, and still the article is cheaper to us; and so it will be of all other articles we manufacture if we will only make our tariff strictly protective, so as to keep up strong competition with our own manufacturers. There is nothing but competition that can control and regulate prices and keep them cheap. In this country we can only keep up this competition by sustaining our manufactures, and that can only be done by a protective tariff. With such a tariff we maintain our manufactures, develop our resources, open and work our mines of coal and iron, make more valuable our stone and timber, improve the cultivation of our farms, add wealth to the country, increase our population and make our people more prosperous, and at the same time make the articles we manufacture cheaper to our consumers, lighten our burdens of taxation by making the foreign merchants and manufacturers pay the duties that go to support our Government on all articles shipped from abroad, where we manufacture the same kind in this country.

Because Europe is able, on account of her cheap money, cheap labor, and cheap transportation, to manufacture and sell to us cheaper than we can manufacture the same articles in this country, is no evidence that she would do so, unless we are in condition to compel her, and that we can only be by keeping up our home competition by a protective tariff. To show how cheap Europe would sell to us if we had no manufactures in operation to create this home competition, take the case of France, in one article alone, after her war with Prussia. That war destroyed most of her iron manufacturing establishments. At its close her people were compelled to have iron, but had no means of their own to regulate the price by any kind of home competition that amounted to anything. The other nations of Europe had iron to sell and the French people were compelled to purchase it. Did these nations stop to inquire at what price they could

sell iron to the French people so as to make a good living profit to themselves, without any kind of extortion from their French neighbors who had been so sorely tried by the war? No; the only thing they thought of was how much they could exact from them without any reference to their necessities. Iron, as we all remember, in 1872 and 1873, during the time France was being thus bled, went up in price more than double what it was before the French market was opened up to them. And just so it would be with us if we are ever shortsighted enough to put our tariff so low that we cannot manufacture in this country without impoverishing our labor and crippling all the industries of the country. Expecting to supply ourselves with cheap goods from abroad, we will be badly sold. Europe will sell to us cheap goods, and pay our tariff duties that go to the support of our Government, and save our people that burden of taxation, while our manufactories are in full blast and we are in condition to dictate terms as to price; but when we place ourselves in a condition that they and not we can fix the price, then look out. They would rob us as they did France; all they want is the opportunity. A protective tariff is our sheet-anchor of safety, and whenever we cease to maintain it we will find our laboring people out of employment, and suffering for the want of bread.

Europe has wealth and she has greatness, but each is confined to the few. The great masses of her people are poor; they work hard and are permitted to enjoy but few of the comforts of life; most of them have to put up with a bare subsistence. There capital controls labor and forces it to work for low wages. If we allow our working people in our manufacturing establishments to come in competition with this cheap labor of Europe, cannot every one see that ours must give way to it and fall to its level in price or quit the shop and go to the plow? If they quit the shop, that destroys our manufacturing, injures our prosperity as a nation, takes from our farmers their home market; for these laborers would then raise their own bread and meat, and turns us over to the foreign merchant to be robbed by exorbitant prices as France was plundered after her war with Prussia. On the other hand, if our laborers remain in the shops at the reduced prices of the European laborer, their fate is sealed, and they will rapidly sink to his level, and there remain until a protective policy shall have been inaugurated that will give them relief. Does any one desire that our laboring people shall be thus reduced? If not, there is but one way, in my judgment, to prevent it; and that is, to cheapen the interest on our money so that it can be used in business, and then protect our labor from the cheap labor of Europe by a tariff. By so doing, as I have shown, we build up the country and make it prosperous, make all articles we manufacture cheaper to the consumer, supply the markets of the world from our workshops, and make the foreign manufacturers pay our tariff duties that go to the support of the Government on all articles we manufacture, and save our people from that burden of taxation.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the passage of this bill, both for its policy and for its specific provisions. It is a long step in the way of free trade, a policy that ignores all the obligations of nationality and knows no home and no country, and, without reference to difference of age, population, wealth, habits, education, or institutions, would make one rule applicable alike to the poor and weak, and to the rich and powerful, and subject a people sparse in numbers, and with undeveloped resources, to the unequal contest of competition with the accumulated power of nations who hold a controlling position in the great manufacturing and commercial interests of the world. In this contest, as in all others the weak must go down before the strong. The strong will crush and clear away all attempts at competition and with relentless despotism take possession of the markets of the weak, force upon them the products of their own industry, and remit the whole population to idleness and its inseparable result, moral and pecuniary bankruptcy. This has been the experience of the world. Fearful illustrations are to be found in Turkey and Portugal, who voluntarily burdened themselves with the policy, and Ireland and India, upon whom it was forced by conquest and arbitrary foreign rule. We ourselves have temporarily tried the experiment on several memorable occasions. Under its blight on every occasion we reached the brink of national ruin, and only rescued ourselves by resorting to the protection of a tariff on foreign products to equalize the condition of this country with its competitors. There is a form of invasion, that of overreaching trade inspired by avarice, pressing its conquest with all the power of wealth and diplomacy and craft, to depress and destroy the productive power of the rival nation, that its people may be made tributary to the aggressor. This conquest degrades the labor and subjugates the spirit and genius of a people, and is more hopelessly destructive than any military aggression. The basis of power in every country is its labor. The gifts of soil, minerals, all the bounties of Providence, are worthless, except so far as developed and improved by labor. It is the wealth of the nation. The power of physical and intellectual effort is the only property of a people worth contemplating. The existing physical results or accumulation at any given time, considered of themselves, are so destructible and evanescent that they do not deserve to be accounted wealth, but the capability of production applied to the physical resources of a country sustaining the accumulation of industrial results; this is the wealth of manhood, the most valuable of all wealths, the enduring power that builds up and sustains civilization. But this is only achieved by developing all the faculties of a nation. Nature in

her economy has distributed her gifts in infinite variety of form and material in the sea and in the land, and bestowed upon man a corresponding variety and adaptation of faculties, appealing to him for a wide and varied exertion in the appropriation and use of the resources placed beneath his hand. It is forbidden that we should all be engaged in one pursuit.

No people ever were or can be prosperously or happily employed in one pursuit. The talent of a nation cannot be developed by the exercise of the faculties only necessary for one pursuit. The competition of a whole people in one pursuit renders the results of labor worthless. The law of nature is diversification. This gives to each variety of effort its due reward. France and England are illustrations of diversified industry, where every faculty has been developed, where genius and skill have been cherished until they have made these nations magnificent theaters of domestic exchange, and enabled them to cover the seas with a commerce that fills every market and proclaims their triumphs on every shore. There is no more inviting field for diversified industry than our own country. In the amplitude of its territory, in its climate, in the variety of its soil and its products, in its inexhaustible and varied deposits of minerals, and in its vast and wonderful internal water system it challenges and invites the enterprise and skill of mankind. The duty of this Government, as of every other, and peculiarly of this with our natural advantages, is to protect and foster its labor. Its whole energies should be bent to the work of promoting and cherishing every industrial pursuit, and cultivating to its highest efficiency every faculty and endowment of its people; and it should render available to the disciplined brain and skilled hand every natural resource.

Free trade ignores all this, and arrays itself against all governmental interference and care for the labor of the country. It madly makes war upon labor and domestic exchange to give supremacy to foreign commerce, which in the nature of things is but a secondary necessity. The province of foreign commerce is the exchange by one nation of the commodities which it can produce with others for the commodities of the others which it cannot produce. This is strictly foreign commerce. But if one nation depends for its manufactured articles upon purchase and money payments, the money-paying nation must become exhausted; and as the skill and labor bestowed upon most of the manufactured articles of commerce contribute most to their value, adding to the raw material in most cases double and treble and in many a hundred-fold, if they furnish only the raw material, whether it be in breadstuffs or any other material, or partly raw material and the balance in money, and purchase with it their manufactures, they must inevitably and constantly become the debtor, and sooner or later find themselves exhausted. The balance must be against them, for the value of the manufactures consumed in every civilized country exceeds the money of the nation and the value of the export of raw material; and as the mere production of raw material can furnish but partial employment, and that of a rude and cheap order, the larger portion of the people must be unemployed, and the whole population doomed to the burden and oppression of the poverty that results from the idleness of any considerable proportion of a nation's population. Money against manufactures cannot sustain a commerce, for no nation has money enough; nor can raw material, including the results of agriculture, against manufactures sustain a commerce, for they are all too proportionately distributed among the nations to require sufficient exchange.

Great Britain, under the shield and defense of a rigid protective system, developed all her resources, trained 7,000,000 of her people to the highest grades of skilled industry, supplied all the demands of her own people with manufactures, and having conquered India and the isles of the sea, and held on to her possessions in North and South America, and generally played the hard-handed aggressor all around the world, and secured a monopoly of half its markets and resources, with one-third of her population trained to manufactures, and insupportable except by manufactures, she resolved to become the great workshop of the world, and do the world's manufacturing, and force the world to employ her to do it, and pay her for it at her own price; and her protective statutes having given her the complete mastery, and repealed themselves by their success, the more consistently to induce the younger and weaker nations to fall into an unequal competition with her, she formally repealed most of her tariffs, and proclaimed herself the champion of free trade. She has intrenched herself in all our sea-ports in the interest of free trade and importation. She has organized and established her free-trade leagues, filled the country with free-trade emissaries, scattered abroad its publications, subsidized the press, and imported here her Oxford professors and all the brood of the parasites of shopocracy to popularize free trade; and with their stale and flippant misrepresentations of Adam Smith, and their jargon of pedantic nonsense they everywhere beset our people to convince them that it is cheaper to buy than to produce, and more profitable to employ and pay foreign labor than our own, and here they find ready coadjutors in the importers, who never add a dollar to the common stock, but gamble with the fruits of toil, and clip their fortunes from the muscle and brain of the masses; and in those who only know of labor in its most abject condition and barbarous form, guided by little more than brute instinct, and who have subsisted upon its results at such arm's length that their association with it has taught them to regard it with contempt and aversion in all conditions; and in all those who, tenacious of their own interest, totally

ignore that of others who are always eager for Government support and would deny it to all others; who always say my interest, my county, my district, my State, but never say my country; who, because they may need no protection, cannot bear that anybody else should be protected, and would be content to prosper themselves in the midst of general ruin all around them—all these would use the Government for their exclusive benefit, and prevent it from its grand purpose, the care of the whole people and their welfare.

Great Britain and all the other manufacturing nations say to us, "Do not manufacture at all; leave the market for manufactured goods to us; content yourselves with planting and sowing and leave to us the results of science and the mechanic arts. Your people are not constituted for successful manufacture." Upon this country they have fixed their eyes as the great receptacle of the diversified labor of Europe. This people, they say, shall hoe and plant and hew wood and draw water and be content in rudeness and simplicity to produce and furnish breadstuffs and raw material and gold, and leave to Europe the science and skill and its wages. All very well for Europe, so long as it could last. It would be all very well for them if we would leave to them all the high grades of employment for men and machinery at their own price, with a paying employment for their shipping, bringing to us their costly products and lading back with our raw materials and our money. A single man with his pick and shovel may in a day mine the elements worth but a few dollars that constitute when combined a ton of merchant iron; but many hands and much machinery must be employed to reduce them to the form of the merchant iron, worth eight or ten fold as much as the rude elements; and again, a whole well-appointed manufacturing establishment, with its varied machinery and array of skillful artisans, may be profitably employed in converting that ton of merchant iron into polished cutlery or into implements or machinery of a thousand forms, worth a thousand-fold the value of the original elements. So with the fleece of wool, the bale of cotton, the bundle of flax, the cocoon of silk, that clothe the peasant and robe the prince. So with the bag of sand that makes the glittering mirror, and so with the cumbersome rock that to the chisel yields up the column and the arch that support and grace the palace. They all say you may have the ore, the wool, the cotton, the flax, the cocoon, the sand, the rock, and exchange them with us for the cutlery, the machinery, the delicate instruments, the robe, the mirror, and the column; and they all say if you will not surrender the business of manufacturing you must take off your tariff and let us into your markets in free competition with yourselves that we may have employment for our people and capital. And the importers and shippers join in the cry and say, either surrender your manufactures or abolish your tariff, and give us commerce. To us they offer the alternative of either retrograding two centuries in the arts and ultimate bankruptcy or the degradation of our labor to serfdom to compete with their cheap labor and cheap money. This is the choice free trade would give to the labor of this country, and this is the condition upon which it would permit the country to build up its manufacturing and commercial interests.

With these conditions we are but too compliant. Even under the present tariff, called by free-traders a prohibitory tariff, we have imported the following list of articles of foreign manufacture to take the place of our domestic manufactures. There is not one of them whose material we do not produce in abundance and whose manufacture we cannot excel in:

Copper, ore, pigs, bars, ingots, old.
Copper, manufactures of.
Cotton, and manufactures of.
Glass and glassware.
Iron, pig, scrap, cast, and rolled.
Hardware, forged iron and fire-arms.
Machinery.
Cutlery, files, saws, and tools.
Steel rails.
Steel, ingots, bars, sheets, and wire.
Manufactured iron and steel, not specified.
Lead, pigs, bars, and old.
Printing and writing paper.
Provisions, (meats, poultry, lard, butter, &c.)
Salt.
Silk, and manufactures of.
Watches, watch movements, and material.
Wood, boards, deals, planks, joists, and scantling.
Wood, shingles and other lumber, except sawed or hewed.
Wool, and manufactures of.
Wheat and wheat flour.
White lead.
Zinc, blocks, pigs, and sheets.

Yes, to deny our own people employment, and to depress our business and contribute to the distress of the country, we have paid for them to other countries in 1872, \$240,294,813; in 1873, \$232,423,897, and in 1874, \$167,753,194; altogether, \$640,471,904 in three years. In fourteen years, from 1861 to 1874, we have paid in settling balances of trade \$765,867,166, and in eight years prior to 1875, \$431,992,761 for the same purpose, in gold. But for this we should have been relieved of all our financial embarrassments, and long ago our currency would have been at par and redeemed in gold. The balance of trade has been slowly, but steadily, growing less under the operation of the present tariff, until it has nearly or quite disappeared. If this tariff be continued the balance of trade will be in our favor, and by the accumulation of gold in the country in a few years we may be able to resume specie payment upon a sound and enduring basis. Under

the free-trade tendencies of this bill, striking as it does at the life of our most important manufactures, we never will resume specie payment, for we will never have the means to do it with.

Instead of reducing this tariff and increasing the free list, we should place a strong tariff on at least two-thirds of the present free list. It should pay at least twenty-five millions additional duties. I am not speaking alone for manufactures. I am speaking for the Government and its financial honor; for the agriculture, the manufactures, the mining, and transportation, and trade; for all the business of the country. They are all affected by this question. We are struggling under a severe depression. In all departments of employment labor is suffering. In my own State, great and strong as she is, the energies of her people are paralyzed. Go into her great coal-fields, whose condition is a reliable index of the business condition of the country—the source of the power that fuses all the ore and propels all the factories and all the transportation of the country on land and water—and see there the millions of capital idle, and a hundred thousand miners, who, in the depth and darkness of the earth, develop the wealth of the country and support themselves and families with more peril and more courage than any other class of men.

See them on half time and half pay waiting and trusting for better times. But England is worse off than we are. Her land is filled with financial distress and the wreck of enterprise, her millions are idle and cry for bread, and her mills and marts are crowded with her manufactured goods without a market. She is looking with longing eyes to see this bill pass. It would bring her relief more than any legislation she can do. Pass this bill, and one brief month will fill our market with her goods at starvation prices and extinguish the last hope of our industry. Shall we do it? Shall we abandon our own, and defy that Scripture that has denounced as worse than an infidel him that will not provide for his own household?

Agriculture and manufactures first, and then commerce. Commerce must spring from domestic production, and before it can be sustained that production must supply all the demand of domestic consumption and furnish a surplus for exportation equal to the importation. This is the only condition upon which a foreign commerce can be profitable to any people. Commerce has carried civilization to the ends of the earth and been a mighty agent in elevating the condition of mankind. Long lines of wharves, stately warehouses, harbors crowded with rich argosies, and the bustle and display of commerce are poetic and imposing, and the subject of justifiable pride when it brings home in profit the riches of other lands; but when it comes like a many-winged monster to carry away the substance of the country, burden it with debt, and destroy its financial independence, it is not the display of prosperity, but the delusive pageant that leads to ruin.

Free trade taunts us with the question, how long do you want protection? How long will your infancy last? To this question we answer, we want protection until our home production of all that we can produce shall be equal to our home consumption. By that time our manufacturing interests will be so diffused throughout the country that the raw material will be converted in its own locality and agriculture will find its market at home, and not waste half its value in wandering across the continent and the ocean to find a purchaser in a foreign land. Then the expense of transportation will be taken off the ponderous and clumsy raw material and provisions and placed upon the compact and costly fabrics whose values will bear it.

Then home competition will furnish cheaper and better fabrics than we get abroad, then our infancy will be ended, and with full growth we will enter into free competition with the manufacturers of the world. We deny that we have always been protected and that protection is a failure. Up to the adoption of the present tariff we never had over twelve years of what could be called protection, and then but four or five years at a time. The first tariff that protected anything was the tariff of 1824, and that was only partial. The tariff of 1828, a very high tariff, lasted five years, and then on the sliding scale of a compromise descended so rapidly that it came to nothing in nine years, and in its descent gave us the panic of 1837, with its shipplasters, idleness, and beggary which lasted till 1842, and on the way, in 1840, turned the democrats and free trade out of power. In 1842 the whigs established a high protective tariff which rapidly restored the country to prosperity, and became so popular for its beneficence that the democrats in the contest of 1844 made it the labor of the campaign to prove their candidate a better protective-tariff man than Henry Clay, and with a campaign banner with a lie for its motto swindled Pennsylvania into voting for "Polk, Dallas, and the tariff of 1842." This put the democracy into power again. In 1846 they repealed the tariff of 1842, and gave us a revenue tariff "with incidental protection," which means the protection that cannot be prevented.

In 1857 the tariff was again reduced, and we had free trade with its most approved agonies: a panic that lasted until 1860. So that up to the rebellion we had about twelve years of more or less protection, and at such intervals and with such agitation that it served only to awaken the hopes of the people for a little while and then leave them to disappointment and despair. Instead of an infancy fostered and raised into strength, we have been occasionally promised and caressed for a little while only to undergo with more suffering Lord Brougham's and Joseph Humes's proposed strangling in the cradle. We rescued ourselves from distress by the tariff of 1824 and 1825, and again by the tariff of 1842, and again by the tariff of 1860.

The necessities of the country have continued the tariff of 1860 with some amendments for sixteen years, the longest period any tariff has been let alone under this Government. It was not established as has been said, for the purposes of the war; it was enacted before and without reference to the war, although with some amendments it has enabled us to pay the interest on the war debt. Though assailed as a prohibitory enormity by free trade, our imports under it in 1874 amounted to about six hundred millions, with a free list of one hundred and eighty millions, of which we might have produced at least two-thirds, so that on four hundred and twenty millions it raised us one hundred and sixty millions of revenue. Under this tariff we raised more than one hundred millions during most of the years of the war, with steadily increasing imports.

Under this tariff, up to the financial panic of 1873, this country was more prosperous than ever before. Manufactures sprang into existence all over the country, agriculture unburdened itself of debt, the people were everywhere employed and liberally rewarded, immigration crowded to our shores with money and skillful hands, new States were populated and organized, and the productive power of the country filled it with abundance. In the ten years from 1860 to 1870, in the nine old or Eastern and Middle manufacturing States, our manufactures increased 120 per cent. and in nine Western States 257 per cent.

The value of the iron and steel product of the country may be safely estimated at from one hundred and twenty-five to one hundred and fifty million dollars, having trebled in ten years; and of this amount from fifty to fifty-five millions was paid for labor.

The coal trade of the United States shows an equal advance, the production going up from twenty-two and a half million tons in 1864 to forty-five and a half millions in 1874, an increase of 100 per cent. Much the larger portion of this coal was consumed by manufactures, at least 8,000,000 tons in the manufacture of iron and steel, besides a large amount of charcoal. About \$30,000,000 in wages was paid for labor in mining coal to make iron and steel, besides all used in the infinite variety of iron and steel manufacture. There were about 150,000 miners mining coal, about 60,000 men engaged in making iron and steel, and the wages paid to these two employments amount to from eighty to ninety million dollars, and from thirty-five to forty millions in Pennsylvania alone. In 1874 the iron-ore product of Lake Superior was worth nine millions. In 1873 five western States, Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri, produced 372,000 tons of pig-iron, about one-eighth of the whole product of the country, paying for labor about \$8,000,000; and in 1874 the product of pig-iron of the whole country was about two and a half million tons.

In 1860 all the manufactures of the country amounted to about nineteen hundred millions, in 1870 to four thousand two hundred and fifty millions. In 1860 we exported of manufactures about fifty millions, and in 1874 over ninety millions. In nine western States in 1860 the value of manufactures was two hundred and twenty-nine millions, and in 1870 more than eight hundred millions. About 1,200,000 persons are employed in trade and transportation. At least half this employment comes from manufactures. Our iron and steel manufactories and a great variety of cotton and woolen and wood manufactories are of sufficient capacity to supply the country.

The gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. BURCHARD,] who seems to think that the chief blessing of the world is low prices, and that the only object of Government is low prices, and that if western farmers could buy their manufactures for nothing this country would be an Elysium, appeared the other day to fight the battle of free trade, and produced a bewildering array of tabulated figures to annihilate our manufactures, and he seems to have proved to his own satisfaction by these figures that the more manufactures are protected, and the more manufacturing is done in the country, the higher prices become. Figures it is said will not lie. But there is one thing certain, figures, and facts which they represent, may both be made to produce false results by incongruous combinations and false relations to each other. Facts, like anything else, may be misapplied. The gentleman gave us an illustration of this when he set to work to prove that protection as a policy permanently enhances the price of manufactures, by citing instances and illustrations of what we admit is the temporary result of a tariff, that for a certain time succeeding the laying on or increasing of a tariff on a given manufacture its price is increased. While he failed to prove his proposition, he accomplished what is calculated to mislead all those who would content themselves with his say-so without further inquiry.

No such temporary effects truthfully illustrate protection. While for a time a tariff having excluded or limited the importation of a certain fabric will raise the price of the domestic manufacture, yet that very increased price will induce competition to the extent of the capacity for production which will reduce the price ultimately as low as will sustain the manufacture. The same law will govern here as governs the price of foreign manufactures. The temporary results exhibited in his elaborate tables are not the *criteria* by which to measure the continuous history of a business. In the long run, in either foreign or domestic manufacture or in anything else, the law of supply and demand regulate the price.

For the sake of the argument, suppose the tariff should permanently raise the price of manufactured articles. No branch of business can stand alone and independent of all others. They all depend upon and sympathize with each other, and no one great interest can exclusively

appropriate to itself the benefit of excessive reward. High prices for manufactures affect the prices in every department of trade and directly raise the price of labor and raw materials of every description, including provisions, and thus compensate for any increase in the price of manufactures. But he says that the high prices of manufactures increase the burden of the whole people who purchase them, while they only confer this reciprocal benefit upon the immediate locality where they are produced. This is impossible in the nature of things. The increase in the price of manufactures or of grain or provisions in New York is felt simultaneously in every town and hamlet and on every farm in the land; and so a tariff protecting a manufacturer in Massachusetts or Pennsylvania is felt in its appreciating power upon the whole business of the country. There is not a day's work or bushel of wheat or pound of beef that is not affected by it from Massachusetts to Texas. This can no more be prevented than a wave of the sea can be prevented from seeking its level.

But suppose this is true, what is gained by this raising the price of everything? Has a day's wages or a bushel of wheat more purchasing power than it had when we were without a tariff and without manufactures and prices were low? It has more purchasing power for the reason that the wheat has a market and labor has employment for which they both receive the means of purchasing, and without a market and employment they cannot command the means of purchasing at all. Under free trade, wheat and provisions can go to a foreign market. Yes, to a limited extent, not to exceed one-eighth of the product of the country, with the expenses of transportation, insurance, and all the other charges that attend it on its long journey to reach a competition with the produce of all the world. But what is to become of the other seven-eighths? The home market for one-fourth of it is gone with the abandoned manufactures. And what becomes of your labor that found employment in manufactures? A portion of it, the most valuable, the choicest skill goes to other countries to enrich other lands, and the remainder, from two to three millions of operatives, are driven by necessity into agriculture, adding their production to the already marketless millions. What then will grain and provisions be worth? It would not be worth harvesting. Then with free trade foreign manufactures will have the market to themselves without any competition from us, and we shall be able to buy at their prices, and not ours. Then, with provisions we will pay them so far as they will take them. Yes, out of a surplus product of two or three thousand millions of farm products we will exchange three hundred millions' worth, if they need them, and as we have nothing else to exchange we will pay the balance of three or four hundred million dollars in money, or go into bankruptcy to pay the balance of trade against us. This is no tariff. This is free trade and its low prices.

As I have already said, protection does not permanently enhance the price of manufactures. The home market being assured and confidence in the stability of the protective policy established, capital will seek investment in manufactures, as it has done in the iron business, and the home competition, aided by perfected machinery and skill, with the abundant facilities of the country, will produce all the fabrics required by our people, of as good quality and as cheap as they can be produced anywhere. The question is, who shall do the business and receive the pay, and whether we shall manufacture for ourselves, employ our own people and keep our money at home, or buy our goods abroad, send our money out of the country, and deny our people employment? If anybody doubts that under a protective tariff our markets can be supplied with cheap goods by ourselves, let him look to-day at the prices of all American woolen and cotton goods and American iron and its manufactures, and see every market full of better and cheaper goods than England ever sent here under free trade. Our people are getting to know it. They are getting tired of the free-trade cry, "Buy where you can buy cheapest and sell where you can sell dearest." They have got to understand what Carlyle meant by cheap and nasty. They do not want English cinder iron nor English shoddy. They do not want English prints that lose one-third of their market value the first time they are dipped in the wash-tub. They prefer that she should cheat somebody else with them at free-trade prices even if she has to steal American trade-marks to get them off her hands.

The gentleman says, buy where you can buy cheapest and sell where you can sell dearest. Where it costs two bushels of wheat to sell one to a foreign market it is, to say the least, questionable whether this is not rather costly selling than selling dear. Transportation across a continent and over the sea cannot be done for nothing and will require a great amount of grangering to reduce it to nothing. In his ecstasy over the English market he ignores with contempt the market of our own people for the products of the West, and broadly proclaims Great Britain the only market, and boasts that the West feeds 15,000,000 of Englishmen. I certainly have no objection to his feeding all mankind, but inasmuch as all the bread-stuffs and provisions shipped from this country to all the world amount to less than two hundred and fifty millions, and John Bull gets less than two hundred millions, his 15,000,000 of Englishmen fare pretty slim on about \$13 *per capita* per annum, the slimmest feeding any English ever got since they learned to eat beef and drink ale.

The farm products of the country amount to about twenty-six hundred millions. Two hundred and fifty millions go abroad, leaving twenty-three hundred and fifty millions at home. Who consumes it?

The manufacturing interest in producing its five thousand millions, worth of fabrics supports one-fourth, or eleven millions of the people, and consumes and pays for about six hundred millions of farm products, a sum equal to the whole export or import trade of the nation. Truly the gentleman must have looked at his country's enterprise through a pair of British spectacles.

The chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means is also troubled with the low-price fever. By his bill he taxes tea and coffee, articles we cannot produce, and which cannot be considered as luxuries, but which as articles of food have really become necessities to all classes. Also he has taken tin and several other indispensable articles that we cannot produce from the free list and placed them on the dutiable list, and on these would raise a tax of twenty-five millions, so as to enable him to attack and cut down nearly all the domestic manufactures of the country. He reduces the tariff on pig-iron, one of our staples, \$2 per ton, and on all descriptions of iron and steel manufactures from one-third to one-half; and so on, and worse, to the end, closing out with an additional free list of about sixty articles which we can produce, including even fire-brick and paving-stone. Under the present tariff nearly one-third of all our imports are free; but this is not enough to meet all the demands of free trade. Under this bill more than a third of the imports will be free, and the balance will be reduced to a scanty revenue tariff that will starve the Treasury and open the gates to a competition from abroad that must completely overwhelm our own manufactures and put them out of all competition, and give the market to foreign manufacturers at their own terms. This has always been the result of a low tariff upon the staples of this country.

But in the fever for low prices the destruction of American interests seems to be a matter of small moment. The great foreign importing interest must be taken care of, even at the price of American labor and prosperity, even if it overwhelms us with a hopeless balance of trade and bankruptcy. Low prices! The chairman is haunted by the price of a few blankets, and the burden of his speech is given to these blankets. They cost 56 cents in London and 110 cents in New York. Well, suppose they are free, does he expect to buy them in New York as cheap as in London? Nobody will bring them to New York for nothing nor sell them in New York without a profit. They are now made by ourselves with our own demand for them. Make them free, or reduce them to a purely revenue tariff, and the English will then transport them here and charge all their own competition will admit of.

The chairman also undertakes to prove that protection does not make a home market. He says the "home market" is a cheat and catch-word of the protectionists; that the overgrowth of grain has outgrown the wondrous growth of population, not only in the country at large, but in Pennsylvania, the chief seat of protection, and proves it by saying we now produce as much to the person as in 1860. That in 1860 Pennsylvania produced $4\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of wheat and 9.7 bushels of corn, and in 1875 $4\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of wheat and $11\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of corn to the person; and so the pretense of a home market there for the product of the grain fields is a sham and a cheat. And that in 1860 not 10 per cent. of our agricultural products were exported for market, estimating by export of wheat and corn, and that in 1875 22 per cent. of our whole products had to find a foreign market.

Let us examine this a little and see how much there is in this proof. First, Pennsylvania produces a little less wheat to the person than in 1860, and about two bushels of corn more to the person. The wheat crop increased in Pennsylvania about 2,000,000 bushels, and the corn crop about 16,000,000 bushels. Pennsylvania contains at least 4,000,000 of people; one-third, or over 1,300,000 of that people are supported by manufactures, and consume one-third of the whole amount consumed by the whole Commonwealth, which is equal to more than one-third of the amount of exports of breadstuffs and provisions from this country to Great Britain. In fifteen years her population has increased 29½ per cent. of her present population, while the rest of the country has increased about 28 per cent. The value of her live stock has increased 38 per cent. in the same time, while that of the rest of the country has increased 28 per cent. Her live stock is worth twenty millions, and her whole farm products are worth two hundred millions, and grand as is her agriculture, with the help of her manufacturing and mining interests, she furnishes her own market for it all. He says in 1860 we exported 9.9 per cent. of the wheat and $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 per cent. of the corn crop, and in 1875, 33.2 per cent. of wheat and 2½ per cent. of corn, and that the export of wheat and corn in 1860 was 10.2 per cent. of the combined crop, and 22 per cent. in 1875.

But what does this show? Why, that the increase of export has been 11½ per cent. But the increased product of corn and wheat has been 23½ per cent., so that the percentage of increased export has not kept up with the percentage of increased production by 11½ per cent. And the percentage of increased home consumption is just that much greater than the percentage of increased exportation. Truly this looks as though something had increased the home market.

This computation is on his own tables. But it is really still stronger against him. The census shows the wheat crop of 1870 to have reached the enormous amount of 287,745,626 bushels, while for the purpose of his argument he has stated it in 1875 to amount only to 219,333,395 bushels, making the crop 68,412,231 bushels less in 1875 than in 1870; evidently a mistake, and which would make for home consumption that much more at least.

The farm products in the whole country have increased 28 per cent. and the population in the same ratio. One-fourth of the employment of the country is furnished by its manufactures, and 11,000,000 of its people are supported by them, consuming one-fourth of the farm products of the country, being more than double the whole exports of both breadstuffs and provisions.

So much for the great question of a home market. So much on the question of free trade and protection. The only obstacle in the way of harmony upon the question of protection between the agricultural and manufacturing interests is the hope of agriculture in the European market, and this I regard as but temporary; and in concluding I make the prediction that within the next five years these two great interests will be one on the question of protection and all the questions involved in it. This very hour India is taking possession of the English bread market, and within the next five years that vast region of productiveness, where eighty million bushels of wheat in useless surplus rots on the ground, will supply every European market. Our agriculture, unable even with all its labor-saving machinery to compete with the labor of millions who will produce wheat for two or three rupees per month, will be forced into sympathy with the manufacturing interest, and it will be found at home and in Congress with irresistible power in favor of protection and a home market. Then the Government will discharge its duty to its industry, and in return the labor of the country will come up in its majesty and bless the land with prosperity.

[Mr. MILLIKEN next addressed the committee. His remarks will appear in the Appendix.]

RAILROADS AND CHEAP TRANSPORTATION.

Mr. MACKEY, of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee that reported the bill under consideration, I desire to say a few words in favor of its passage, and am the more anxious that it may be favorably considered by the House from the fact that I earnestly believe that the enterprise proposed by this bill, if legislated into vitality, will contribute largely to the promotion of the productive industry of the country.

Congress, in my opinion, can make no higher contribution to the prosperity of the nation than by aiding so far as may be within its power, without encroaching upon the national Treasury, all enterprises that may be presented for the construction of railroads. Railways give employment to labor, and without them we cannot develop those resources of our country with which it is so bountifully supplied. To me it has been a source of sincere regret that this Congress has been in session for more than five months and so few measures have been perfected for the relief of the prostrate industries and starving labor of the country. Five months gone, and but little done for the people! When I go to my home and hear of the distress and suffering pervading almost all classes and conditions of our people; when I see hundreds of men with willing hands and honest hearts standing upon our streets with their hands in their pockets, and nothing there but their hands, asking not for bread but for work, that by honest toil they may earn bread for themselves, their wives, and their children, and am asked why does not Congress do something to relieve the sufferings of the people, I am at a loss for a satisfactory answer. But I take courage when measures such as that under consideration are presented to the House; for with questions such as these the interests of every laboring man of the country are involved, and I consider them of equal if not paramount importance to those of finance and currency, upon which so much has been said and so little done.

The productions of the country will be increased in proportion to the increase of the means of transportation, and if these means furnish cheap and fixed rates, the productions of labor will prove themselves to be the acknowledged basis of our wealth.

Stimulate and encourage public enterprises; give encouragement to capital to embark in railroad enterprises, in opening our mines of wealth, in establishing manufactories; protect and sustain the manufacturing interests of our country; aid in the development of our resources; utilize in the highest degree the various elements of wealth with which we are so bountifully supplied; decrease our importations by any legislation you can devise, and by similar means stimulate and increase our exports; restore the administration of the Government to that honesty, purity, and simplicity which characterized it in former days; enact such laws as will induce capital to give employment to labor, and thereby avert the impending conflict between capital and labor; restore official faithfulness to the several departments of our Government and secure economy and integrity in its administration; let the inspiration of the people be popular government honestly administered under the Constitution; give faith to energy and life to industry; repeal all laws fixing a definite time for the resumption of specie payments, and industry will revive, labor will receive employment and remuneration, and resumption will come by the natural laws of business and commerce long before it can be enforced by any arbitrary legislation.

Mr. Chairman, no subject can be presented to this House of greater importance in view of its influence on the prosperity of the country than that of cheap transportation, and the interests of the people demand that Congress shall devise that system of transportation for the mineral, agricultural, and manufactured products of the country which shall prove itself to be the cheapest, most perfect, and most enduring. An increase of railway facilities for conveying the prod-

ucts of the country from the section where produced to those of the purchaser and consumer will always increase not only the amount of the productions but also the tonnage furnished to the carrying companies, and thus the reciprocal influence prove beneficial to both.

The object of the bill under consideration is to provide for cheap transportation between the great producing regions of the West and the East, and under its provisions it is proposed to incorporate a company under the name and title of The United States Railway Corporation, authorized and empowered to obtain the necessary franchises and right of way, and title thereto, under the forms and in the manner prescribed by the laws of the States, and consolidate the same so as to create and maintain a perfect organization in and for the interests of commerce between the States, and to build and operate a railway, principally for freight, with a double track and steel rails, and with a grade not exceeding for eastward-bound traffic forty feet to the mile, to be built from some point on New York Bay to Council Bluffs, or to such other convenient point on the Missouri River, in the State of Iowa, as shall offer the best connection with the system of railways west of the Missouri River. The controlling management of the road is placed in the hands, not of stockholders, but of a board of seven commissioners appointed by the governors of the several States through which the road is to be constructed. Under the provisions of this bill no extortionate charges for transportation can be made. The tariff rates and charges are to be fixed and adjusted by commissioners, the representatives of the people who are interested in cheap transportation through the several States within whose limits the road is to be built. State laws cannot fix rates and charges except within the limits of the State in granting franchises, and it can only be done in such a manner as to aid the western producer by Congress, under the powers vested in it by the Constitution to regulate commerce among the States. This question, I believe, has not been positively decided by the highest judicial tribunal of the nation, but it is the generally accepted opinion that Congress has the power to regulate rates and charges on railroads passing through the States, and to regulate interstate commerce. In the case of *Gray vs. The Clinton Bridge Company*, in the Supreme Court of the United States, Justice Miller used the following language:

"For myself, I have no doubt of the right of Congress to prescribe all needful and proper regulations for the conduct of this immense traffic over any railroad which has voluntarily become a part of one of those lines of interstate communication, or to authorize the creation of such roads when the purposes of interstate transportation of persons and property justify and require it."

If natural highways, such as rivers and lakes, are entitled to aid from the Government, and this is not doubted, who shall say that the Government has not equally the power to aid by appropriate legislation artificial highways of commerce, such as railways and canals?

The certainty which Government control, or rather such control as is contemplated by this bill, by persons selected by the several States through which the road may pass, will give to the rates of transportation, will so largely increase the productions of the West and Northwest that reduced rates, rates as low as any that can be furnished by water communication, will assure to railroads a remunerative income, and more especially so to the road contemplated by this bill, which, with the wise provisions contained in it against fraudulent practices in its construction and management, will not be encumbered by the incubus of an excess of liabilities above its actual cost of construction.

The producer and his labor create the wealth of the country, and yet he generally is poor, while the purchaser and consumer is enabled to enjoy all the advantages afforded by wealth, simply because the fruits of the producer's toil cannot reach a market where they may be disposed of at remunerative prices, on account of the lack of cheap transportation. Of what advantage is all the agricultural and mineral wealth of the great West and Northwest if it can find no market? Statistics have been produced here to show that corn forwarded from the West to an eastern market has netted the producer but eight cents a bushel, while the carrying company's charges were six times as great; and another case in which an Iowa farmer forwarded his corn at a cost of sixty-seven cents a bushel and received for it sixty-eight cents a bushel, thus leaving him a profit of one cent a bushel to compensate him for his labor, the interest on his invested capital, and his current and necessary expenses. In every case, therefore, it is safe to say, the producer, who represents the large majority of our people, is the man who is made to suffer; and the same is true to some extent with the consumer, while the transportation companies grow rich at the expense of both producer and consumer. Monopolies are never beneficial to any except those who enjoy the special privilege of being the monopolists; and this is a class in every community which can well be dispensed with to the great advantage of the public.

It may be claimed that the bill under consideration is a monopoly in itself. This is not the case. It makes no provision to monopolize the traffic in freight, but simply through its board of managers, who will be the representatives of the people and the people's interests, regulates the charges for freight so as not to oppress those for whom the Government has been established, and without whom the Government can neither prosper nor maintain its existence, and adopt such a tariff of rates as will enable the productions of the West to be shipped to the seaboard, and be sold at such prices as will yield a fair profit to the producer and impose no extravagant charges upon the consumer. It is not a monopoly, and does not propose to take any steps toward monopolizing traffic in any manner whatever. Its de-

sign is a measure of relief to the suffering citizens of both East and West by furnishing transportation for the great natural productions of the one and the manufactures and merchandise of the other, so that a fair exchange may be effected in such a manner as will prove of advantage to both sections of the country. Certainly there can be no objections to any measure calculated to effect the purpose designed to be accomplished by the provisions of this bill.

I do not believe, sir, that the bill, if passed, will prove detrimental to existing corporations. The evident result must be to stimulate production and thus in turn benefit the transportation companies already existing and operating their several lines of railways and canals. It may modify their freight rates, but I cannot see that it will prove detrimental to their interests, if the ultimate result is to give them an increased traffic. On the other hand I can see that this increased production and increased traffic will not only prove beneficial to the carrying companies themselves, but also create a new and enlarged demand for labor, and thus give employment to thousands now suffering for the necessities of life.

It is not the design of this bill to do injustice in any sense to either individuals or corporations, but simply that the burdens may be more nearly equalized and the benefits derived from railways and similar corporations be more fairly distributed among the people. The people are entitled to this, and the public interest and the public welfare demand it.

Pass this bill and any others that authorize the construction of railways from the great producing West to the seaboard, and you will enrich the producer, improve the condition of the eastern consumer, give employment to labor, and life, vigor, and energy to the various industries of our country, and contribute more largely than by any other act within the scope of congressional power to ameliorate the condition of the workingmen of the nation.

The question of cheap transportation becomes of greater importance from the fact that while a very large proportion of the heavy products requiring transportation are produced in the West, about the same proportion of the capital to purchase, move, and market them is held in the East, and near the seaboard.

Let this Government emulate the example of almost all other nations, who have ever considered it their highest prerogative to aid in the construction of commercial highways. No subsidy, no land grant, no indorsement of bonds is asked for from the Government in this bill; and while the committee in reporting it express no opinion as to the power or policy of the Government in this respect, they believe it to be the duty of Congress to encourage by all practicable and available means the construction of great national highways by private capital and enterprise, that the interests, prosperity, and happiness of the people may be promoted.

INVENTORS AND THE PATENT OFFICE.

Mr. J. H. BAGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the subject which I propose to consider is one that has not met with much favor in this House, or perhaps it will be better to qualify my words by saying that in some of its phases it has met with opposition. There is an apparent disposition to ignore inventors when applying for extensions of their patents, and in such a manner as to indicate that a sentiment prevails that they have few rights which Congress is bound to respect, although a law exists permitting them to apply for relief, and making it the duty of this body to consider their petitions, and to grant their prayers when made in the proper manner, and when the merits of the case admit and require a favorable report from the Committee on Patents.

As a member of that committee I deem it my privilege, possibly it is my duty, to call the attention of the House and the country to the present condition of our Patent Office and system, and in a humble manner to present to view its advantages. In doing so I may evoke adverse criticism, as I intend in this connection to attempt a defense of inventors. I am well aware that here the subject is an unpopular one, and does not possess the absorbing interest which attaches to the subjects of the currency, the tariff, and other important topics that have from time to time commanded the eloquence of gentlemen on this floor, and which have, by the way, been most ably discussed. Notwithstanding this, the question possesses at least the merit of being new in the domain of discussion, and the Patent Office, being a Bureau of the Government, is a proper topic for consideration.

In view of the fact that many are inclined to antagonize the interests of inventors, particularly our granger friends, who imagine that every patent issued and every extension of a patent granted is in direct opposition to their interests and in furtherance of the interests of monopolies, it will be well for me to remind such that our material progress in the mechanic arts and agricultural pursuits has for its foundations the inventors of the world, who from their ingenious brains have worked out the plans, instruments, and results which have raised man from barbarism to civilization. I may not be justified in attributing to inventions solely this great advancement, and yet it will be difficult to point to any age where the inventor has not contributed largely.

Impelled by the love of fame, as well as the acquisition of wealth, the mind of man has been engaged in the creation of works of art, of utility, and convenience from the earliest ages, slowly at first, until in this nineteenth century the faculty has ripened and developed, and ours bears the palm as the era of great inventions. From the time when in the Garden of Eden our first parents sewed fig leaves together, inventive genius has been displayed in greater or less degree,

till in our day it has culminated in the steam-engine and the electric telegraph. The wooden plow of the ancients is abandoned and gives place to the useful and effective implement of the present time. Agricultural tools and conveniences multiply on every side, and the tiller of the soil is made glad and enriched by the introduction of speechless but many-fingered helpers, reducing his labors and causing the earth to bring forth with renewed and manifold increase. With increased populations come increased means for their support. A wise and beneficent Providence implants in man a fertile imagination, and making him the agent to carry out His great designs, directs his thoughts to the invention of useful machines, and thereby contributing to his comfort, advancement, and happiness.

The farmer, the soldier, the mariner, the manufacturer, all classes of industry have derived what appliances they have in their vocations and are still dependent upon the inventor. In the mansion of the rich or the modest home of the poor, on every side wherever it is to be seen a comfort or convenience, behold the result of the studious and active mind of the inventor. The practical results of this gift are to be seen in every direction, and in every land and upon every sea are the monuments of the impulse, the energy, and the efforts of these men of thought, imparting to the peoples of the earth a grand sentiment of progress and impelling to new glories and greater and better action the nations.

Mr. Chairman, this may not be the place for pronouncing encomiums upon inventions or for an elaborate eulogy of inventors, neither do I propose it; but a recent visit to the centennial exposition has impressed me, and no doubt it has every member of this House, with the grandeur of the conceptions of inventive genius. Observe the immense engine, which at a simple touch moves with ponderous, yet graceful dignity, inspiring every other part of the grand combination with life, performing the labors of ten thousand hands, and, like a good servant, accomplishing the desire of its master. What perfect union! what charming harmony of action! A glance at that alone should be sufficient to fill every heart with admiration for the inventive and mechanical skill which produces such grand forms and results, and dispel the feeling of envy or objection existing against the legitimate claims of the inventor.

It is true, there may be an honest difference of opinion as to these claims, one argument being that the inventor is as much entitled to his invention as the house-owner is to his property, and that he and his heirs should remain in perpetual possession, while the other side declare that his ownership should be limited to a short term of years, and then become public property, open to competition in manufacture, and the inventor deprived of personal benefit, except so far as he may take his chances with general competitors; that the term of the patent should be arbitrary, without the right of extension, regardless of the fact of inadequate reward; permitting no sympathy for him on account of poverty, or adverse circumstances, or misfortunes of any kind, leaving nothing for him but the fame he may have acquired, and which, in many instances, is taken from him by the sharp, shrewd speculator in patents, consigning the inventor not only to poverty, but oblivion. Upon this, as upon many other subjects, there are extremists, and I believe I have stated the extremes. A happy mean would be to give to a patent a long life, so that the patentee could, with a proper business tact, realize a sufficient amount to reward him for his time, labor, and ingenuity.

The present law, fixing the term at seventeen years, is generous and should be satisfactory. Under no circumstances should the patent extend beyond the statute term; for the fact that an extension can and may be obtained works a hardship to manufacturers and others who may have invested in particular machines, and whose purchased rights may be invaded by such extension. One advantage of the single term without extension is that the patentee, knowing the necessity, would be incited to proper exertions to realize from his privilege an adequate profit or reward. All exclusive privileges are of necessity monopolies, and should be so guarded and controlled by wise legislation as not to become oppressive or a burden to the people. A patent is of this character, but the invention which it commissions, being the result of individual effort, is entitled to certain consideration and protection. If an extension is permitted, as is the case under the old law, the patentee should be held to a strict compliance with that law.

One great difficulty the Committee on Patents has had to contend with in applications for first extensions is the excuse that the applicant, not understanding the law, has failed in his statements before the Commissioner and hence had his claim rejected; the Commissioner being permitted to extend, after the expiration of the original, upon proper application and evidence. Ignorance of the law should be no excuse. He who has possession of a valuable patent should be sufficiently interested in it to know the law protecting him, and should comply with its requirements or suffer. Ignorance of law is not an effectual plea before the courts, for every man is supposed to know the law and is held accountable. So with an application to Congress for an extension or an enabling act to apply to the Commissioner. Congress is the court, and if the evidence shows that the applicant has failed even in some minor detail in his application because of ignorance, his claim should be rejected by the committee. This plan would relieve the committee of much annoying investigation, and would be a warning to applicants to be wary, lest neglect should prove a bar to success. The present loose system encourages carelessness and may be productive of false representations, ignorance of law being a very safe refuge in the absence of some better excuse.

I would not include in the list to be rejected those who for a good reason, from circumstances beyond control, had failed compliance with the rules of the Patent Office. Many cases of this kind could arise, fair subjects for consideration, which might possess merit not to be disregarded, but would reject emphatically and absolutely the plea of ignorance. I am inclined to think, furthermore, that it would be better to have a general law controlling these cases, and avoid the necessity of special legislation; or even better than that, to leave it entirely with the Commissioner of Patents, without reference to Congress. This branch of the national Legislature is so large that cases of this character rarely receives proper consideration, and it is evident that the House is not always, and in fact seldom, willing to accept the conclusions of its committee. I speak from knowledge when I say that the duties of this committee have been discharged this session with a single eye to the administration of justice, and with favoritism to none.

But to return. The history of inventions is one of the most interesting to study. The Congressional Library contains many books suggestive of the benefits conferred upon the world by this class of active intellects, who have studied out and brought to light the multitude of grand devices and designs once unknown or mysteries, but now so plain and simple. The stories of self-sacrifice, of poverty, anxiety, and toil, the hopes deferred, the efforts unrewarded, the treasure spent, tell at what great cost this present age enjoys its many blessings. While the record of some mighty leader in battle, shedding the blood of nations, acquiring glory and renown and position upon the misery and ruin of his fellow-men, charms the popular eye and ear, he who has conferred a boon and added to the stock of human happiness by some useful invention receives but a passing notice and his name perhaps passes into oblivion. The arts of war are seemingly paramount to the arts of peace.

Our present patent laws, while in the main judicious, yet embody some peculiarities worthy of consideration. Notably is that of a patent taken out in a foreign land (in England) to run a stated time, which, lapsing for the non-payment of certain fees, causes the American patent to die. Issued for fourteen years, it ceases (regardless of the time it has run) with the foreign patent. In making this statement it is proper to say that no legal decision has yet been rendered upon this point; but it is the opinion of lawyers familiar with patent law that the American patent would cease by a lapse of the foreign patent, while others maintain that such consequence would follow only upon the expiration of the full term of the foreign patent. I have in vain sought for an explanation of this dependence of American law upon foreign law. There is no good reason discoverable why there should be any connection between the two, unless it be in the interest of manufacturers, and this position will not stand the test of argument. They are separate and distinct, without any bond of sympathy, and it is felt by inventors and believed by those who understand the subject that the law should be repealed. In Great Britain the law requires the payment of heavy fees at the end of the third and seventh years of the existence of the patent, and if the fees are not paid the patent terminates. Under our laws the original fee is all required, except in case of re-issue, and the patentee enjoys his privileges undisturbed, at least by the Government. Our law seems to be fair, liberal, and just, while the English is the reverse, and most oppressive to the inventor. But this is the land of invention and of progress.

It is quite possible, and no doubt is the fact, that many things are patented which cannot claim novelty to any extent, and are so simple that they hardly merit special privileges. We are made to pay royalty upon articles of the most simple construction, and upon very trivial claims, merely because some shrewd thinker has conceived the idea of asking for a patent, and the Commissioner in such cases is bound, if the article shows originality and is patentable, to grant the petition. Hence we have patents for coffee-pots, inkstands, glove-fastenings, paper boxes, stove-legs, and kindred articles entering into every day's domestic use, and oftentimes separate parts of these trifling but very useful utensils are patented. The consequence is, in many cases, that the public is obliged to pay an excessive percentage of profit for thousands of these every-day conveniences. The Government, however, receives as large a fee for issuing such patents as for the more important ones; but it is a question, and a pertinent one, whether this fee is a fair offset to the tax in the way of royalties imposed upon the people. Nevertheless these laws and rules exist, and it would be a difficult matter to draw the line between inventions that are of sufficient importance to be patented and those which are not. There would be no doubt as to the cotton-gin, the card-stripper, the sewing-machine, the mower, or the electric telegraph; there might be as to the bouquet-holder, the stove-shaker, or a patent tooth-pick.

It is an amusing fact that oftentimes the most ridiculous articles are offered for patent. There ever have been, and always will be, probably, men who indulge in the vain and illusive idea of perpetual motion, and I am credibly informed that frequent application is made for patents for this sort of thing. The God of nature, who by His almighty will keeps the universe in motion, has not yet deigned to impart to man the wondrous secret; and although He permits us to view His grand designs, the planets traveling in their orbits, all things coming in their seasons, yet He says to man, "Thus far canst thou go, and no farther."

It seems to be characteristic of inventive genius to indulge in air-castle building, and it often leads to most absurd results. The fol-

lowing, clipped from a newspaper a few days ago, although intended as a burlesque, is a fair caricature of the extravagance of some minds in the way of inventions:

Among the ridiculous patents issued from the Patent Office is one where the inventor wanted a patent for an artificial moon. His idea was to have an immense balloon, which was to be moored in the air above the town or city, and from which would be suspended an electric light or great fire. By means of this invention we were to become entirely independent of the moon and dispense with gas-lamps in the streets altogether.

Still another wanted a patent for placing a large propeller-wheel on the bow of a boat. The vessel was simply to be started by a steam-engine, and then the forward motion of the boat would cause the water to turn the wheel on the bow; and this wheel would in turn impart motion to another wheel at the stern, which is to drive the boat forward. The inventor's great fear in regard to this invention was that it would be impossible to build a boat that would be strong enough to go through the water at the immense speed he expected to attain by means of his invention; and his great object was to invent some method to keep the boat from running more than fifty miles an hour.

Another wanted to obtain a patent upon an embalming compound; and wishing to show how well it would preserve bodies, obtained the body of an infant, embalmed it in his best manner, and sent the body to the Office as a model. His model was instantly returned to him.

Applications for patents for perpetual motion are about as frequent as ever. Many of these inventions show a great deal of ingenuity, but all of them an utter lack of knowledge of the simplest laws of nature.

But there are in all departments of life the impractical and foolish as well as the practical and wise. Fortunately for us, among inventors the practical predominates.

We have the most perfect patent system in the world, and I think I have a right to say that the business of the Patent Office is conducted with more ability and economy than any other Department of the Government. The revenues of the Patent Office are always in excess of its expenditures, and at this time there is to the credit of this Bureau in the United States Treasury nearly \$900,000. What other branch of the Government can show such an exhibit as this? And yet there are those who pretend they would abolish the Office and deprive inventors of all protection.

To get an idea of the magnitude of this department, it is necessary to pay a visit to the museum of models in the magnificent building of the Interior Department. This is one of the great sights of the capital city. The visitor in Washington who neglects the opportunity of inspecting this grand museum of the results of inventive genius makes a serious omission and fails to see one of the most important and interesting features of the capital; and by the way, and in connection with this allusion to the museum and building, I wish to say that this splendid marble and granite structure was paid for in part from the revenues of the Office, the contributions of inventors in the form of fees. The act of Congress authorizing the building was approved July 4, 1836, and the amount expended from the patent fund was \$319,000.

To conduct this immense business it is necessary to have a large corps of employes, and many of them, particularly the examiners, must be experts. By experts in this connection is not meant good clerks or book-keepers, but gentlemen familiar with mechanics, scientific men, and accustomed to the workings of the Office. To attain proficiency as an examiner requires experience and special training. The Commissioner of Patents, in a letter addressed to the House of Representatives upon a reduction of the force and salaries, uses the following language, which should be conclusive:

I beg leave to suggest that the work of the Office requires special training; that even with the present pay it is not possible long to keep in Government employ many of those best fitted by talent and experience for the duty; that the credit of the Office, and the interest of inventors whose money supports the Office, and of manufacturers, whose capital to many millions is involved in patents, are imperiled by inefficient work; and that the increased number of patents and the general progress of the arts render the proper examination each year more difficult. The erroneous issue of a single patent may easily involve the loss of ten times the amount of the yearly pay of an examiner. These examiners are not only to grant patents, but to see that none are improperly granted. Inventors pay to the Government more than enough to afford the small pay now allowed. To take possession of this fund, and then furnish half-paid (and consequently poor) service, seems like a fraud on inventors.

This note indicates (and there can be no better authority upon the subject than the Commissioner) that cheap men as examiners are not profitable, and that it is not true economy to reduce the pay of this class of employes below a figure commensurate with their services; and experience has proved that it is impossible to retain them, for the same reason that actuates most men, the betterment of their condition. If they can do better, it is natural for them to do so. The argument that they have obtained their knowledge of patents while in Government employ, which knowledge qualifies them to practice as solicitors, and that because of this they should retain their places as a matter of gratitude, falls to the ground. There is no law to prevent resignations; and while the heart may beat with grateful emotions to the Government for its instructions, it becomes necessary to forego sentiment and choose between a starving salary and a fat income. The remedy is, pay according to talent and retain the valuable men.

There has been a gradual and steady increase of the business of the Office from the year 1837, the year on which the Commissioner's comparative statement commences, until the present time, and during the thirty-eight years but eight years show the expenditures in excess of the receipts. In 1837 the cash received was \$29,289.08; in 1875, \$743,453.36. The number of patents issued in 1837, 435; in 1875, 16,288—an increase so large as to seem almost incredible. A table giving a comparative statement of the business of the Office from 1837

to 1875, inclusive, is here submitted, and tells its own story. It is worthy of examination:

| Year. | Applications. | Caaveats filed. | Patents issued. | Cash received. | Cash expended. |
|-------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1837 | | | 435 | \$29,289 08 | \$33,506 98 |
| 1838 | | | 590 | 42,123 54 | 37,402 10 |
| 1839 | | | 425 | 37,960 00 | 34,543 51 |
| 1840 | 735 | 228 | 473 | 38,056 51 | 39,030 67 |
| 1841 | 847 | 312 | 495 | 40,413 01 | 52,666 87 |
| 1842 | 761 | 391 | 517 | 36,505 68 | 31,241 48 |
| 1843 | 819 | 315 | 531 | 35,315 81 | 30,776 96 |
| 1844 | 1,045 | 380 | 502 | 42,509 26 | 36,244 73 |
| 1845 | 1,246 | 452 | 502 | 51,076 14 | 39,395 65 |
| 1846 | 1,272 | 448 | 619 | 50,264 16 | 46,158 71 |
| 1847 | 1,531 | 553 | 572 | 63,111 19 | 41,878 35 |
| 1848 | 1,628 | 607 | 660 | 67,576 69 | 58,905 84 |
| 1849 | 1,955 | 595 | 1,070 | 80,752 98 | 77,716 44 |
| 1850 | 2,193 | 602 | 995 | 86,927 05 | 80,100 95 |
| 1851 | 2,958 | 760 | 869 | 95,738 61 | 86,916 93 |
| 1852 | 2,139 | 996 | 1,020 | 112,656 34 | 95,916 91 |
| 1853 | 2,673 | 901 | 958 | 121,527 45 | 132,869 83 |
| 1854 | 3,324 | 868 | 1,902 | 163,789 84 | 167,146 32 |
| 1855 | 4,435 | 906 | 2,024 | 216,459 35 | 179,540 33 |
| 1856 | 4,960 | 1,024 | 2,502 | 192,588 02 | 199,931 02 |
| 1857 | 4,771 | 1,010 | 2,910 | 196,132 01 | 211,582 09 |
| 1858 | 5,364 | 934 | 3,710 | 203,716 16 | 193,193 74 |
| 1859 | 6,225 | 1,097 | 4,538 | 245,942 15 | 210,278 41 |
| 1860 | 7,633 | 1,084 | 4,819 | 256,332 59 | 252,830 80 |
| 1861 | 4,643 | 700 | 3,340 | 137,354 44 | 221,491 91 |
| 1862 | 5,038 | 824 | 3,521 | 215,754 99 | 182,810 39 |
| 1863 | 6,014 | 787 | 4,170 | 195,593 29 | 169,414 14 |
| 1864 | 6,932 | 1,063 | 5,020 | 240,919 98 | 239,866 00 |
| 1865 | 10,644 | 1,937 | 6,616 | 348,791 84 | 274,199 34 |
| 1866 | 15,269 | 2,721 | 9,450 | 495,665 38 | 361,734 28 |
| 1867 | 21,276 | 3,597 | 13,015 | 646,581 92 | 639,263 32 |
| 1868 | 20,430 | 3,703 | 13,378 | 681,565 86 | 628,679 77 |
| 1869 | 19,271 | 3,624 | 13,986 | 693,145 81 | 456,430 78 |
| 1870 | 19,171 | 3,273 | 13,321 | 669,456 76 | 557,149 19 |
| 1871 | 19,472 | 3,366 | 13,053 | 678,716 46 | 560,395 08 |
| 1872 | 18,246 | 3,090 | 12,590 | 609,736 39 | 665,591 36 |
| 1873 | 20,414 | 3,248 | 12,864 | 703,191 77 | 691,178 96 |
| 1874 | 21,692 | 3,181 | 13,599 | 736,278 17 | 679,288 41 |
| 1875 | 21,638 | 3,024 | 16,288 | 743,453 36 | 721,657 71 |

Through the courtesy of a gentleman in the Office, I have obtained the following facts and figures, which prove the wonderful increase of business. He says:

In making this estimate I have calculated the cost to the Office to dispose of an application, whether it went to patent or was rejected, for the reason that, as a rule, rejected applications cost the Office more for examinations, &c., than those which are allowed. There were disposed of in 1856 4,960 applications; in 1865, 10,664; and in 1875, 23,250. The expenses for those years were: 1856, \$125,843 for salaries and \$31,211 for miscellaneous expenses; 1865, \$195,487 for salaries and \$75,244 for miscellaneous expenses; 1875, \$459,730 for salaries and \$63,216 for miscellaneous expenses. Hence the average expenses for application were: 1856, \$25.37 in salary and \$6.30 miscellaneous, or \$31.67 total; 1865, \$18.32 in salary and \$7.50 miscellaneous, or \$25.82 total; 1875, \$19.80 in salary and \$2.72 miscellaneous, or \$22.52 total.

But prior to each of these years there had been granted patents as follows: Previous to 1856, 14,000; 1865, 45,684; 1875, 171,000. That is, in 1865 there were three and one-fourth times as many patents and in 1875 over twelve times as many to be gone over as there were in 1856, and in 1875 three and three-quarters times as many as in 1865. The foreign patents and the technical literature increased in the same proportion. Hence these figures represent about the relative amount of labor involved in the examination of an application in those years. Assuming 1 as the standard for 1856, the proportions would be thus: 1856, 1; 1865, 3.25; 1875, 12. Yet, owing to the efforts of the last few years to thoroughly systematize the Office, the increased attention and diligence on the part of the employes, and increased facilities for examination due to the reproduction of back drawings, &c., the cost in each case was nearly \$3 less in 1875 than in 1865. There were over twice the number of cases disposed of in 1875 as in 1865, and seven and one-half times the actual work of 1865 was done in 1875. Had the salary and expense account kept pace with the work, the expense in 1875 would have been over \$2,000,000 instead of less than \$600,000.

In these estimates the cost of printing reports and Gazette, &c., for each year is not included, for the reason that they are in the nature of public documents intended for the information of Congress and the public, and the expense is not properly chargeable to the Office and was not included in the Office appropriations until a few years ago.

I have copied from the report of the Commissioner for the year 1875 the following tables (which I ask leave to print) for the purpose of showing in detail the items of receipts and expenditures connected with the Office. This is a fair exhibit of the items entering into the account each year, except as to amount, each subsequent year showing a large increase. We have here also a statement of the balance in the Treasury to the credit of the Patent Office fund, a statement of the business of the Office for 1875, and the number of patents issued to the different States and Territories.

1. Statement of moneys received.

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Amount received on applications for patents, re-issues, designs, extensions, caveats, disclaimers, appeals, and trade-marks..... | \$674,180 00 |
| Amount received for copies of specifications, drawings, and other papers..... | 45,390 85 |
| Amount received for recording assignments..... | 18,912 18 |
| Amount received for subscriptions to the Official Gazette..... | 6,646 33 |
| Amount received for registration of labels..... | 2,334 00 |
| Total..... | 743,453 36 |

2. Statement of moneys expended.

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Amount paid for salaries..... | \$430,218 00 |
| Amount paid for photolithographing current issues..... | 46,946 50 |
| Amount paid for photolithographing back issues..... | 67,322 21 |
| Amount paid for illustrations for Gazette..... | 49,426 34 |
| Amount paid for tracings of drawings..... | 34,972 90 |
| Amount paid for contingent and miscellaneous expenses, viz: | |
| Stationery..... | \$16,599 27 |
| Painting, glazing, varnishing, paper-hanging, &c..... | 1,067 21 |
| Furniture, carpeting, &c..... | 8,593 96 |
| Fitting up cases in model-rooms, carpenter's work, and repairing furniture..... | 20,073 33 |
| Plumbing and gas-fitting..... | 1,054 17 |
| English patents and foreign periodicals..... | 1,793 44 |
| Hardware..... | 2,269 61 |
| Pay of temporary clerks..... | 29,512 52 |
| Miscellaneous items, viz: Books for library, ice, subscriptions to journals, freight, washing towels, withdrawals, money refunded paid by mistake, repairing carriage and harness, keeping horse, advertising, &c..... | 11,765 46 |
| Total..... | 92,728 97 |

Total.....721,657 71

3. Statement of the balance in the Treasury of the United States on account of the patent fund.

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Amount to the credit of the patent fund January 1, 1875..... | \$65,113 97 |
| Amount of receipts during the year 1875..... | 743,453 36 |
| Total..... | 1,608,567 33 |
| From which deduct expenditures for the year 1875..... | 721,657 71 |
| Balance January 1, 1876..... | 886,909 62 |

4. Statement of the business of the Office for the year 1875.

| | |
|---|--------|
| Number of applications for patents during the year 1875..... | 21,633 |
| Number of patents issued, including re-issues and designs..... | 14,837 |
| Number of applications for extension of patents..... | 2 |
| Number of patents extended..... | 38 |
| Number of caveats filed during the year..... | 3,094 |
| Number of patents expired during the year..... | 1,323 |
| Number of patents allowed but not issued for want of final fee..... | 3,518 |
| Number of applications for registering of trade-marks..... | 1,055 |
| Number of trade-marks registered..... | 1,138 |
| Number of applications for registering of labels..... | 566 |
| Number of labels registered..... | 313 |
| Of the patents granted there were to— | |
| Citizens of the United States..... | 14,274 |
| Subjects of Great Britain..... | 358 |
| Subjects of France..... | 83 |
| Subjects of other foreign governments..... | 122 |

5.—Number of patents issued by the United States Patent Office to residents of the different States, Territories, and foreign countries, from January 1, 1875, to December 31, 1875.

[The proportion of patents to population is shown in last column.]

| States, &c. | No. of patents. | One to every— |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Alabama..... | 31 | 32,161 |
| Arizona Territory..... | 2 | 4,829 |
| Arkansas..... | 11 | 44,042 |
| California..... | 399 | 1,404 |
| Colorado Territory..... | 36 | 1,107 |
| Connecticut..... | 706 | 761 |
| Dakota Territory..... | 3 | 4,727 |
| Delaware..... | 44 | 2,841 |
| District of Columbia..... | 214 | 615 |
| Florida..... | 7 | 26,821 |
| Georgia..... | 63 | 18,795 |
| Idaho Territory..... | 1 | 14,999 |
| Illinois..... | 1,098 | 2,313 |
| Indiana..... | 378 | 4,462 |
| Iowa..... | 315 | 3,790 |
| Kansas..... | 66 | 5,521 |
| Kentucky..... | 142 | 9,303 |
| Louisiana..... | 103 | 7,057 |
| Maine..... | 158 | 3,964 |
| Maryland..... | 260 | 3,003 |
| Massachusetts..... | 1,846 | 787 |
| Michigan..... | 405 | 2,923 |
| Minnesota..... | 146 | 3,011 |
| Mississippi..... | 38 | 21,787 |
| Missouri..... | 362 | 4,754 |
| Montana Territory..... | 4 | 9,974 |
| Nebraska..... | 22 | 5,833 |
| Nevada..... | 16 | 3,669 |
| New Hampshire..... | 127 | 2,506 |
| New Jersey..... | 656 | 1,534 |
| New Mexico Territory..... | 3 | 37,101 |
| New York..... | 3,771 | 1,163 |
| North Carolina..... | 37 | 28,956 |
| Ohio..... | 1,091 | 2,443 |
| Oregon..... | 22 | 4,631 |
| Pennsylvania..... | 2,034 | 1,728 |
| Rhode Island..... | 229 | 943 |
| South Carolina..... | 46 | 17,513 |
| Tennessee..... | 117 | 10,765 |
| Texas..... | 118 | 6,939 |
| Utah Territory..... | 5 | 19,916 |
| Vermont..... | 122 | 2,709 |
| Virginia..... | 101 | 12,170 |
| Washington Territory..... | 3 | 12,710 |
| West Virginia..... | 48 | 9,209 |
| Wisconsin..... | 224 | 3,743 |
| Wyoming Territory..... | 2 | 5,759 |
| Great Britain..... | 371 | |
| France..... | 91 | |
| Other foreign countries..... | 128 | |
| United States Army..... | 5 | |
| United States Navy..... | 1 | |
| United States in general..... | | 2,412 |

Since 1872 the volume known as the Patent Office reports has not been printed; but instead the Official Gazette, a weekly publication, containing the Commissioner's decisions, decisions of the courts, designs patented, trade-marks registered, and various other matter, besides the drawings and claims patented during the week ending on the day of publication. The publication is a success, and a great improvement upon the old reports. The old reports were distributed gratuitously. It will be seen by the table that the amount received for subscriptions to the Official Gazette in 1875 was \$6,646.33. The Department is now engaged in the work of photolithographing the drawings of back issues, and when that is completed, which will be, as is estimated, in a year and a half, and possibly sooner, the expenses will be decreased from seventy-five to one hundred thousand dollars yearly.

The following statement showing the receipts of the Patent Office for the quarter ending March 31, 1875, and the quarter ending March 31, 1876, indicates the still increasing business, and, when considered with the proposition of reducing the number of employes, presents the strange anomaly of reducing the help while increasing the work. At the rate shown here we shall have the receipts of 1876 amounting to upward of \$900,000, with a large reduction in expenses.

| | 1875. | | 1876. | |
|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Receipts. | Expenses. | Receipts. | Expenses. |
| January..... | \$61,385 22 | \$60,991 68 | \$72,070 40 | \$52,624 30 |
| February..... | 60,116 24 | 50,364 91 | 74,651 62 | 52,076 34 |
| March..... | 70,122 36 | 63,397 45 | 80,459 07 | 56,553 16 |
| Total..... | 191,623 82 | 174,754 04 | 227,181 09 | 161,253 80 |

Excess of receipts over expenses March 31, 1875.....\$16,869 78
Excess of receipts over expenses March 31, 1876.....65,927 29

Should the appropriation bill pass the Senate in its present form, reducing the number of employes fifty-seven, it is very questionable as to maintaining the present business. In that event the Department would suffer seriously. The Commissioner says in the letter before referred to:

Should the proposed reduction be made, it will be impossible to keep up the business of the office.

It would be more than folly to permit so valuable a department of the Government to suffer from a false economy, and more especially a department that pays its own way, and is not, and never has been, the first dollar of taxation to the people. Says one who knows:

The income of the Patent Office should not be considered as a revenue to the Government, as it is not a general tax upon the people, but a compensation paid by a special fee for service rendered by the Government.

The honorable gentleman, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, during the discussion pending the passage of the legislative and executive appropriation bill, took a position so entirely contrary to his usual course, that it excited comment, and led to the conclusion that he had not examined the subject with his customary care. For the gentleman's wisdom and statesmanship I have a most profound respect, but that he really meant what he said upon the occasion referred to seems hardly probable. In reply to Mr. SAMPSON he said:

Mr. RANDALL. In reply to the gentleman I wish to direct his attention to the fact we have made no reduction whatever in the higher class of officers in this Bureau. If there is a legitimate source of revenue I know of it is from these patentees. There are some here who would like to break up, or at least to abridge the system of giving enormous fortunes to these patentees. Take for instance the sewing-machines. The whole people of the United States are made to contribute enormous sums of money annually on sewing-machine patents, thereby accumulating vast wealth for the few. So, too, with patents for agricultural machines. The wealth realized in this regard from the body of the people is enormous. Yet they now come here and say the expenses of this Patent Office should not be cut down. I never heard of such a proposition before. The trouble is they ought to be made to contribute toward the support of the Government which gives them a monopoly additional sums of money instead, while taking by indirection out of the pockets of the people enormous wealth.

Mr. SAMPSON. I would like to correct the gentleman. As I understand, he infers that I am in favor of cutting down the fees?

Mr. RANDALL. I do not infer anything. The gentleman stands here and wants these high salaries shall not be reduced, because the fees come out of the pockets of the patentees. He says they ought to be allowed to come in here and have every facility for the granting of patents. I think the policy of this Government should be in a different direction.

Mr. SAMPSON. Then why does not the gentleman abolish the Office altogether?

Mr. RANDALL. I am not quite certain whether I would not.

Mr. SAMPSON. If the gentleman is in favor of breaking down the inventors of the country, then let him say so.

Mr. RANDALL. I do not propose it. The gentleman is speaking in my time. I am not quite certain whether the whole system of patents in this country should not be broken up. As I said before, take your sewing-machines, take your agricultural machines, and what have they done? They have laid contributions upon the body of the people. I have no idea this Bureau shall have any greater facility than they now have. I re-affirm the fact that the compensation in this Bureau is larger than any other under the Government.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, whose large-hearted generosity is proverbial and whose motives I know are correct, will hardly justify himself upon an examination of his words. I know he would not intentionally hamper any Department of the Government or place any obstacle in the way of a proper administration. The difficulty is that he has not properly considered this Bureau. It is separate and distinct and different from any other Department. The

people are not taxed one dollar for its support, but it is sustained by a few, not in the capacity of tax-payers, but as inventors. And why the allusion to sewing-machines and agricultural machines? None can certainly have any objection to them. Living millions and millions yet unborn will venerate and bless the names of Howe, of Wilson, of McCormick, and other worthies, the originators of labor-saving machines. Perhaps they have made fortunes. To fortunes they are entitled. For a few brief years the Government permits them to enjoy a monopoly, and we living contemporaneous with them must pay them for their genius. The benefits stop not with our age, but the future, full of centuries and generations, shall enjoy these blessings when the inventors are gone and their names perhaps forgotten.

Some of us speak of inventors as though we were under no obligations to them, and as if their productions are to be found in every nook or plucked from any tree. Why should not they be entitled to a monopoly and receive enormous sums of money for the products of their brains? Do we object to a man's holding possession of a gold mine, and enriching himself therefrom, if found upon his own land? Can we prevent it? And if an inventor, delving in the regions of thought, discovers something more precious than gold for the toiling millions, coins from his brain something that may bring to thousands of households relief and comfort and happiness, shall we say to him "You shall not be protected; this is but an idea, we will wrest it from you?" If this be justice, then let us have but little of it. Let Lowell and Providence and Manchester and all the manufacturing cities of the earth answer: "From whence came your wealth? On what foundation did you build? Not from the simple hand-machines of old, but from the splendid inventions of the present age." Let the farmer of the West, as he looks over his thousand acres of waving wheat and stately corn, tell you how he will gather and harvest all this wealth. Not with the scythe and sickle, (useful yet, but still relics of the past,) but with the reaper and mower and other magnificent inventions of to-day.

But I have strayed from the Patent Office. If the suggestions of

some were adopted, it might be abolished. What then? Something worse or nothing at all. The latter would probably be satisfactory. No patent system; no protection; result, no inventions. Can it be possible that any thinking man believes that inventors puzzle their brains from a simple love of fame? I believe the principal incentive is bread and butter, or, in other words, a living, with a hope of accumulating money. Human nature is everywhere about the same in this respect, and the inventor is actuated by the same impulse as are the lawyer, the farmer, the merchant, and the laborer. Take away protection from these classes, and they must suffer. The same with the inventor, but in a greater degree. His protection is in our admirable patent system, and I think it plain that when we begin to impair its usefulness by cutting off the power of working the Office to its full capacity we do a great wrong. It has been said that we should not go backward with our postal system. That is true. We should be progressive. And so I say of the Patent Office. Both are admirable; both should be sustained.

I do not want to be understood as casting any reflections upon the Committee on Appropriations. They have done their work mostly wisely and well. They are the active agents in the work of retrenchment and reform, and there is but little chance for honest adverse criticism of their acts. I am with them heart and hand in their efforts for economy and a proper administration of the different Departments of the Government, and I say nothing against the application of the 10 per cent. principle of reduction to the salaries of some of the employes in the Patent Office. But when the proposition is made to so reduce the force as to cut off a part of the business of the Bureau, and thereby of necessity the revenue, and impairing its efficiency, I respectfully enter my protest, and can but hope that something may interpose to prevent such an unfortunate consummation. The following table will show the proposed reduction of force, and is evidence that there are some sinecures in this department or that the reduction may prove injurious. I am inclined to the latter opinion:

Table showing the personnel and appropriation for the Patent Office for the fiscal year 1875-'76, the estimate for the fiscal year 1876-'77, and the reductions for the year 1876-'77 as proposed by House bill No. 2571.

| Specified officers and employes. | Number. | | | Pay of each person of each grade. | | | Pay of all persons in each grade. | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--|--------------------------|
| | Present number. | Proposed No. by H. bill No. 2571. | Reduction from estimate. | Present pay. | Proposed pay. | Reduction in pay. | Appropriation 1875-'76. | Estimate 1876-'77. | Proposed appropriation, House bill No. 2571. | Reduction from estimate. |
| Commissioner | 1 | 1 | | \$4,500 | \$4,000 | \$500 | \$4,500 | \$4,500 | \$4,000 | \$500 |
| Assistant commissioner | 1 | 1 | | 3,000 | 2,700 | 300 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 2,700 | 300 |
| Chief clerk | 1 | 1 | | 2,500 | 2,250 | 250 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,250 | 250 |
| Examiners-in-chief | 3 | 3 | | 3,000 | 2,700 | 300 | 9,000 | 9,000 | 8,100 | 900 |
| Examiner of interferences | 1 | 1 | | 2,500 | 2,250 | 250 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,250 | 250 |
| Examiner of trade-marks | 1 | 1 | | 2,500 | 2,250 | 250 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,250 | 250 |
| Principal examiners | 24 | 24 | | 2,500 | 2,250 | 250 | 60,000 | 60,000 | 54,000 | 6,000 |
| First assistant examiners | 24 | 24 | | 1,800 | 1,620 | 180 | 43,200 | 43,200 | 38,880 | 4,320 |
| Second assistant examiners | 24 | 24 | | 1,600 | 1,440 | 160 | 38,400 | 38,400 | 34,560 | 3,840 |
| Third assistant examiners | 23 | 23 | | 1,400 | 1,260 | 140 | 32,200 | 32,200 | 28,980 | 3,220 |
| Machinist | 1 | 1 | | 1,600 | 1,400 | 200 | 1,600 | 1,600 | 1,400 | 200 |
| Clerks, class four | 6 | 5 | 1 | 1,800 | 1,600 | 200 | 11,000 | 11,000 | 10,200 | 800 |
| Clerks, class three | 7 | 5 | 2 | 1,600 | 1,450 | 150 | 11,200 | 11,200 | 7,250 | 3,950 |
| Clerks, class two | 25 | 20 | 5 | 1,400 | 1,300 | 100 | 35,000 | 35,000 | 26,000 | 9,000 |
| Clerks, class one | 40 | 35 | 5 | 1,200 | 1,200 | | 48,000 | 48,000 | 42,000 | 6,000 |
| Clerks, permanent | 30 | 26 | 4 | 1,000 | 1,000 | | 30,000 | 30,000 | 26,000 | 4,000 |
| Copyists | 50 | 40 | 10 | 900 | 900 | | 45,000 | 45,000 | 36,000 | 9,000 |
| Draftsmen, (skilled) | 3 | 3 | | 1,200 | 1,200 | | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 | |
| Messenger and purchasing clerk | 1 | 1 | | 1,000 | 1,000 | | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | |
| Skilled laborer | 1 | 1 | | 1,200 | 1,200 | | 1,200 | 1,200 | 1,200 | |
| Attendants in model-room | 6 | 4 | 2 | 1,000 | 1,000 | | 6,000 | 6,000 | 4,000 | 2,000 |
| Attendants in model-room | 6 | 4 | 2 | 900 | 900 | | 5,400 | 5,400 | 3,600 | 1,800 |
| Laborers | 50 | 40 | 10 | 720 | 720 | | 36,000 | 36,000 | 28,800 | 7,200 |
| Laborers | 6 | 6 | | 600 | 600 | | 3,600 | 3,600 | 3,600 | |
| Folders and pasters, (estimated for 1876-'77) | 16 | 16 | | 480 | | | | 7,680 | | 7,680 |
| OTHER EXPENSES. | 351 | 294 | 57 | | | | 436,400 | 444,080 | 370,220 | 73,860 |
| Contingent and miscellaneous, (including temporary clerks and laborers) | | | | | | | 80,000 | 90,000 | 60,000 | 30,000 |
| Drawing and photolithographing current and back issues | | | | | | | 100,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | |
| Official Gazette and Illustrations of Patents, July 7, 1869 to January 1, 1872 | | | | | | | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | |
| Photolithographing current issues | | | | | | | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | |
| Tracings for reproduction of back issues | | | | | | | 35,000 | 35,000 | 25,000 | 10,000 |
| | | | | | | | 295,000 | 245,000 | 205,000 | 40,000 |
| | | | | | | | 731,400 | 689,080 | 575,220 | 113,460 |

* Two of whom may be women.

† One of whom may receive \$200 additional as financial clerk.

At this point I offer a statement of the receipts and expenditures of the office for the years 1873, 1874, 1875, which shows a steady increase of receipts, but not a corresponding increase of expenditures.

The table also shows the receipts for the months of January and February of 1874, 1875, and 1876, with the same result as to receipts:

Receipts for January and February, 1874, 1875, and 1876.

| | 1874. | 1875. | 1876. |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Receipts from all sources, January | \$63,792 30 | \$61,385 22 | \$72,070 40 |
| Receipts from all sources, February | 65,911 38 | 60,116 24 | 74,651 62 |

Receipts and expenditures for the years 1873, 1874, and 1875.

| | 1873. | 1874. | 1875. |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Money received from applications for patents | \$626, 170 00 | \$656, 951 00 | \$672, 514 00 |
| Money received from copies and reeording | 77, 021 77 | 72, 315 23 | 64, 293 03 |
| Money received from Official Gazette | | 9, 011 94 | 6, 646 33 |
| Total | 703, 141 77 | 738, 278 17 | 743, 453 36 |
| Expenditures | 691, 178 98 | 679, 288 41 | 721, 657 71 |
| Surplus each year | 12, 012 79 | 58, 989 76 | 21, 795 65 |
| To credit of patent fund in United States Treasury January 1 | \$794, 111 42 | \$806, 124 21 | \$865, 113 97 |
| Number of patents, trade-marks, and labels | 16, 837 | 17, 689 | 19, 420 |

The following remarks, copied from the report of the Commissioner of Patents of January 19, 1876, in relation to the representation of the Patent Office at the centennial exposition, and the accompanying statistics, are of interest:

The Patent Office is to be represented at the centennial celebration, and a space of ten thousand square feet has been assigned for the exhibition of models of American inventions, illustrating the more important and useful industries. Models to the number of about five thousand are being selected for this purpose, being about 3 per cent. of the aggregate number in the possession of the Patent Office. These, while illustrating in part the progress of our country in "mechanical and manufacturing industries" and the development of American genius and skill, represent in one way only the results attained. Another mode of presentation of the facts and figures in the case is obtainable from the census report of 1870, and the general subject-matter index of patents granted since the year 1790.

In referring to the census, under the head of "manufactories in operation in 1870, exclusively for agricultural implements," it is found that the—

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Number of establishments in operation was | 2, 076 |
| Number of steam-engines at work | 676 |
| Horse-power | 15, 873 |
| Number of water-wheels at work | 426 |
| Horse-power | 10, 209 |
| Number of hands employed | 25, 249 |
| Capital invested | \$34, 834, 600 |
| Wages paid | 12, 151, 504 |
| Material used, value | 21, 473, 925 |

The census shows an increase of \$34,578,825 in the value of agricultural implements manufactured over the amount reported in 1860 and of \$45,224,174 over the amount reported in 1850, while the total value for the year 1870 of the "mechanical and manufacturing industries" aggregates the sum of \$4,232,335,442.

The following are the products of agricultural implements of the manufactories first above referred to, being the articles manufactured and number made:

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Cane-mills | 108 |
| Clover-hullers | 5, 206 |
| Corn-planters | 21, 709 |
| Corn-shellers | 12, 941 |
| Cotton-planters | 2, 000 |
| Cultivators | 88, 740 |
| Fanning-mills | 19, 772 |
| Grain-cradles | 103, 646 |
| Grain-drills | 32, 033 |
| Hand-rakes | 207, 310 |
| Harrowes | 9, 150 |
| Harvesters | 3, 566 |
| Hay and straw cutters | 30, 876 |
| Hay-forks | 1, 298, 360 |
| Hoes | 135, 139 |
| Horse-powers | 4, 541 |
| Horse-rakes | 80, 919 |
| Lawn-mowers | 2, 536 |
| Mowers | 33, 486 |
| Plows | 864, 947 |
| Reapers | 60, 388 |
| Reapers and mowers combined | 59, 645 |
| Rollers and scrapers | 4, 803 |
| Seed-sowers | 6, 900 |
| Scythes | 881, 244 |
| Scythe-smiths | 17, 680 |
| Separators | 1, 131 |
| Shovels | 25, 756 |
| Sickles | 300 |
| Stump-pullers | 124 |
| Threshers | 22, 934 |
| Other products | 5, 206, 789 |

For the articles above enumerated there have been granted between the years 1790 and 1873, inclusive—that is to say, since the organization of this Office, (1790,) the following patents:

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| Cane-mills | 66 |
| Clover-hullers | 100 |
| Corn-planters | 647 |
| Corn-shellers | 378 |
| Cotton-planters | 173 |
| Cultivators | 1, 617 |
| Fanning-mills | 127 |
| Grain-cradles | 18 |
| Grain-drills | 186 |
| Hand-rakes | 9 |
| Harrowes | 329 |
| Harvesters | 2, 244 |
| Hay-forks | 382 |
| Hoes | 201 |
| Horse-powers | 415 |
| Horse-rakes | 373 |
| Lawn-mowers | 38 |
| Mowers | 173 |
| Plows | 2, 451 |
| Reapers | 69 |
| Reapers and mowers combined | 61 |
| Rollers and scrapers | 141 |

| | |
|---------------|-----|
| Seed-sowers | 579 |
| Scythes | 50 |
| Scythe-smiths | 26 |
| Separators | 334 |
| Shovels | 58 |
| Sickles | 13 |
| Stump-pullers | 191 |
| Threshers | 732 |

I have further selected from the list of patents 1790-1873 the number of patents granted in some other classes or subjects of invention. These indicate the scope and versatility of the inventive genius of our country, and all enter more or less into the "mechanical and manufacturing industries" that have been referred to. They are as follows:

| | |
|--|----------|
| Bee-hives | 645 |
| Bending-machines for wood and metal | 144 |
| Boots and shoes, manufacture of, and articles used therein | 817 |
| Brick-kilns and brick-machines | 808 |
| Bridges | 425 |
| Brooms and brushes and their attachments | 750 |
| Buckles | 388 |
| Burglar-alarms | 165 |
| Burners, gas, lamp, and vapor | 793 |
| Car-brakes | 465 |
| Car-coupling | 961 |
| Car-wheels | 314 |
| Carriages and their appendages | 1, 495 |
| Churns and their appendages | 1, 391 |
| Clothes driers and wringers | 984 |
| Curtain fixtures | 364 |
| Fire-arms | 1, 203 |
| Gas and gas apparatus | 1, 399 |
| Grain, cutting, binding, and drying | 135 |
| Grinding and grist mills | 371 |
| Lamps and apparatuses | 1, 483 |
| Looms and appurtenances | 1, 210 |
| Paper, manufacture of | 269 |
| Pavements | 404 |
| Photography | 346 |
| Planing machines, wood, and metal | 384 |
| Propellers, and apparatus for | 570 |
| Printing-presses, apparatus, and material | 756 |
| Railways, apparatus, and connections | 1, 552 |
| Roofs and roofing | 506 |
| Rotary engines | 170 |
| Saw-mills and machines | 1, 981 |
| Sewing-machines and their attachments | 2, 295 |
| Steam-engines and apparatus | 1, 013 |
| Stoves | 2, 400 |
| Straw-cutters and machines | 401 |
| Sugar-mills and machinery | 343 |
| Telegraph and instruments | 566 |
| Toys | 300 |
| Tobacco-presses and manufactures | 197 |
| Valves | 1, 497 |
| Total number of patents issued since 1836 | 171, 640 |
| Total number of re-issues | 6, 630 |
| Total number of designs | 8, 883 |
| Total number of trade-marks | 3, 287 |
| Total number of labels | 464 |

In the discussion of this subject I have occasionally found gentlemen who take the ground that the interest of the inventor and manufacturer are antagonistic; but the fallacy of this position must be apparent at a glance. They are mutually dependent. As said before, the manufacturing interests have risen to their present importance and the manufactories of the world have become great hives of industry only through and by the superior and wonderful machinery which this age has produced. And on the other hand, without the capital to encourage and the courage to invest, inventive talent must have lain dormant, or if exercised, attracted no remark. This will apply to those inventions connected with manufacturing enterprises, and I do not know but it will to all industries. Had there been no cotton, Whitney might have lived in vain. Without the cotton-gin, but light production of cotton, or if produced, the separation of the seed from the cotton by the old and slow process would result in poor fabrics and fewer manufactories. But the world moves, and all things work for good. That the two are interdependent is apparent. There should be no antagonism, no collision here. Let the inventor enjoy his monopoly for the full term the law allows without disturbance, and the manufacturer, without grudging, acquiesce, paying for the device as the law directs. I cannot think of any class of citizens not interested in preserving our Patent Office and system and protecting and encouraging inventors.

Comparing the fees charged for patents in England with those under our laws, it is evident that our law-makers have kept constantly in view the encouragement and promotion of the arts. While it costs but \$35 here for any patent, the cost in Great Britain during the life, in various fees, is £175, or about \$850. Before the patent issues £25 required; at the expiration of the third year £50 must be paid, and at the end of the seventh year £100. The patentee thereafter until the expiration of his privilege, which is for fourteen years, enjoys it undisturbed. What chance under such laws for inventors? A large proportion of them are poor men, unable frequently to procure money enough to pay for an American patent. If the fees required by the English laws are not paid in time, the patent is lost beyond redemption. There is but little encouragement under the English law, it being almost restrictive, while we hold out every inducement proper and possible. By the Canadian plan, patents are issued for five, ten, or fifteen years, and a fee of twenty, forty, and sixty dollars charged, according to the length of the term. There is a certain justice and propriety in this system worthy of consideration.

A well grounded cause of complaint exists in the fact that invent-

ors frequently sell their rights to dealers or speculators in patents for a small or inadequate sum, thereby defrauding themselves of the reward the patent laws design they should enjoy. There is no way of preventing this, for a man has a legal right to sell his property. Much of the opposition to inventors arises from this very fact, and if they would be more persistent in introducing their devices into public use themselves, they would obtain much more sympathy, and undoubtedly greater profits. The last ten or fifteen years has been productive of more swindles in agricultural implements than were ever known before, and the thoughtless and swindled victims, injured and angered, seek solace in denouncing honest inventors and the patent system. But the Patent Office lives notwithstanding, and is of itself evidence of its utility and benefits, and the fact that while most every other department of the Government has been under clouds of investigation for frauds and peculations, and that nothing has been presented against an officer of this Bureau in any form, is pretty sure evidence of the honesty and ability with which it is administered. Let it be sustained, and encourage the spirit of invention.

Mr. Chairman, it may be that the future is to give us the same progress in the arts and sciences as has the past, that the coming age is big with great ideas, and is to surprise us, or those who come after us, with its aerial ships, its new motors, its improved machines, just as we have been astonished by the genius of Fulton, of Stephenson, and of Morse. We have no reason to doubt the future. We may indulge in dreams of the advancement of our race with hope and faith that such anticipations are the shadow of a reality to come. Many yet are to be added to the glorious list which contains the names of Newton, of Franklin, of Watts, of Daguerre, and the host of discoverers and inventors who have illuminated the past, and many hearts searching for mysteries will beat with emotions of pleasure at their triumphs. Said Everett, the American orator:

There are occasions in life in which a great mind lives years of rapt enjoyment in a moment. I can fancy the emotions of Galileo when, first raising the newly-constructed telescope to the heavens, he saw fulfilled the grand prophecy of Copernicus, and beheld the planet Venus crescent like the moon. It was such another moment as that when the immortal printer of Mentz and Strasburg received the first copy of the Bible into their hands, the work of their divine art; like that when Columbus, through the gray dawn of the 12th of October, 1492, beheld the shores of San Salvador; like that when the law of gravitation first revealed itself to the intellect of Newton; like that when Franklin saw, by the stiffening fibers of the hempen cord of his kite, that he held the lightning in his grasp.

It is for us to build up and sustain such institutions and departments of the Government as tend to foster the spirit of invention and discoveries.

Mr. Chairman, I have treated this subject I fear in a rather disconnected manner, and I would gladly have confided it to abler hands. While other Departments of the Government have received attention, there have been none so poor as to do the Patent Office reverence. This is my excuse.

Mr. POPPLETON. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to; and Mr. CUTLER having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, pursuant to the order of the House, had had under consideration the state of the Union generally, and particularly the bill (H. R. No. 3132) to revise and simplify existing laws imposing duties on imports, and to reduce taxation, and had come to no resolution thereon.

And then, on motion of Mr. MACDOUGALL, (at nine o'clock and twenty minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following memorials, petitions, and other papers were presented at the Clerk's desk under the rule, and referred as stated:

By Mr. ATKINS: A letter from the United States Indian agent of the Chippewas of Lake Superior, asking payment of certain claims, to the Committee of Claims.

By Mr. DIBRELL: The petition of Asa Faulkner, of Warren County, Tennessee, for pay for 1,110 pounds of cotton taken by United States authority, to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUNTON: The petition of Williams Millsaps, for a pension, to the Committee on Revolutionary Pensions.

IN SENATE.

SATURDAY, June 3, 1876.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. BYRON SUNDERLAND, D. D.

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KEY presented the petition of J. H. Johnston, of Roane County, Tennessee, late major of the Eleventh Tennessee Cavalry, praying to be reimbursed for certain moneys expended by him in recruiting his regiment during the late war; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CHRISTIANCY presented the petition of E. O. Humphreys and

74 other citizens of Kalamazoo, Michigan, praying for the repeal of the bankrupt law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALLISON. I present the petition of the Right Rev. Bishop Potter, of New York, General John A. Dix, of New York, and others, praying for an amendment to section 2505 of the Revised Statutes, so as to remove discriminations against religious societies. As it relates in some manner to taxation, I move the reference of the petition to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON presented the memorial of citizens of the Creek Nation of Indians, remonstrating against the passage of a law providing for a territorial government for the Indian Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a letter of the Secretary of the Interior, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, transmitting a copy of a report dated the 8th instant, from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, upon the subject of the cutting of timber for sale by certain members of the Stockbridge tribe of Indians upon their reservation in the State of Wisconsin; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MCCREERY presented a petition of citizens of New Orleans, Louisiana, and a petition of citizens of Louisville, Kentucky, praying for the repeal of the bankrupt law; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. ALLISON, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom the subject was referred, reported a bill (S. No. 893) to authorize the sale of certain timber cut by the Stockbridge Indians on their reservation; which was read, and passed to the second reading.

Mr. THURMAN, from the Committee on Private Land Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 374) for the adjudication of title to lands claimed by José Apis and Pablo Apis in the State of California, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was ordered to be printed, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 198) providing for the adjudication and issue of patents in mission-land cases in the State of Oregon and the Territories of Washington, Idaho, and Montana, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon; which was ordered to be printed.

SIOUX RESERVATION.

Mr. ALLISON. If there is no further morning business, I ask the Senate to take up the bill (S. No. 590) providing for an agreement with the Sioux Nation in regard to a portion of their reservation, and for other purposes, which was read and debated at considerable length some weeks ago.

Mr. INGALLS. I feel a very great interest in the subject of the bill, and every Senator who is familiar with the condition of affairs in the Black Hills country from the reports that are continually coming to us of the assaults upon emigrants and travelers must be equally convinced that something should be done; but there appear to be so few Senators present this morning that I am convinced it would be impossible for us to give this bill that consideration which it demands. I suggest that it had better be made a special order, and that we take up unobjection cases on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let us go on with the Calendar in regular order.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not like to antagonize the gentleman, but this is a very important bill; and it is made more so every day from the fact that an expedition is now on foot comprising a considerable number of the Army, which is about moving on this reservation, and the Indians themselves are in a state of great anxiety. It is supposed that very soon a general war will take place in that territory unless some arrangement is made by which a commission can go out there and talk with these Indians and treat with them.

I feel called upon to urge the passage of the bill at the very earliest moment on this account. Of course, if Senators think the Senate is not full enough this morning to consider it, I cannot press the bill.

Mr. THURMAN. I wish to say that I hope the bill will be taken up. If it will be of any advantage at all, it ought to be passed immediately. If it will not be of any advantage, let us find that out as soon as possible. I think when we are really in an Indian war, and threatened with a very extensive one, this bill is of much more consequence than the unobjection cases on the Private Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Iowa, that the Senate proceed to the present consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. No. 590) providing for an agreement with the Sioux Nation in regard to a portion of their reservation, and for other purposes, the pending question being on the amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs to add to section [6] 5 the following:

And the further sum of \$50,000 is hereby appropriated to make suitable provision to aid the said commission in the discharge of the duties required by this act, and said sums shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. PADDOCK. I am reliably informed by citizens of my State, which borders upon this reservation, that these Indians now are in a