

Mr. McMILLAN. I had no idea it would embarrass the bill. Gentlemen did not seem ready to proceed.

Mr. McCREERY. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have not yielded the floor yet.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Minnesota is on the floor.

Mr. McMILLAN. Is my motion in order?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Not to postpone and take up. The Senator can move to postpone.

Mr. McMILLAN. Then I move to postpone.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Minnesota moves to postpone the present bill.

Mr. SARGENT. I ask the friends of the bill under consideration to resist the attempt to lay it aside. I appeal to the considerations I have heretofore urged. I do not wish to take up the time of the Senate uselessly, but I make the appeal to the friends of the bill to stand by me in the position which it seems to me this legislation holds and with some regard to the considerations I have heretofore urged.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the Senator from California yield to me a moment?

Mr. McMILLAN. If the Senator from California will consent that this bill be taken subject to the regular order.

Mr. SARGENT. I cannot consent at all. Every possible means has been used to get me off the floor by moving the consideration of this bill, by motions to adjourn, by motions for an executive session, by taking up this and that bill. I see no way except to stand still objecting, and I do object and appeal to the friends of this legislation to stand by me in that course.

Mr. McMU LAN. As the Senator desires to proceed with the regular order, if it can be done, I shall withdraw the motion I made.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. RANSOM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. NORWOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANSOM. I desire to make a very small motion, Mr. President, that I trust will meet with the approbation of the chairman of the Committee on Pensions. I desire to ask the Senate to reconsider the vote by which the bill for the relief of John Wood, of North Carolina, was indefinitely postponed so that it may be put upon the Calendar.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Can that be done pending the regular order?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It cannot.

Mr. RANSOM. I will ask to enter that motion.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That cannot be done.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Not unless by unanimous consent.

Mr. RANSOM. I will ask unanimous consent to enter it, not to interrupt the regular order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and unanimous consent is given.

Mr. McCREERY. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was not agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Georgia is entitled to the floor.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. President, at twenty minutes past ten o'clock I announced that my hour for seeking repose in sleep had arrived. It is now a quarter to eleven. I appeal to the Senator from California in charge of the bill to allow the Senate to adjourn. He knows that I have stuck to him closer than a brother during all the day, and I propose to stick to him to the last; but I advise him and the Senate that if they have eyes to close they can prepare to close them now. [Laughter.] There is but an hour and a quarter left before the Sabbath. I shall certainly occupy all of that time and much more; and when the Sabbath comes the remainder of my remarks

Perhaps may turn out a sang,
Perhaps turn out a sermon.

We shall certainly be here until one or two or three o'clock, and I suggest to my friend from California that he had better prepare his bed.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. EATON] suggests that he would like me to get through with that part of my speech which relates to the adjournment. I say to him that I am speaking to the question of adjournment every moment. I desire an adjournment. I do not desire anything else but an adjournment, and I am ready now to yield the floor to any member of the Senate who desires to move to adjourn. Where is the Senator from Kentucky, [Mr. McCREERY?] [Laughter.] I will yield the floor for a motion to go into executive session. Where is the Senator from Rhode Island, [Mr. ANTHONY?] [Laughter.] Will the Senator move to go into executive session?

Mr. ANTHONY. My motions have had so bad a fate lately that I think I shall hardly renew them. I should like very much to have an executive session.

Mr. NORWOOD. Then, Mr. President, no one being ready to move to adjourn, I will proceed.

Is there any benefit that can accrue to this Government from the passage of this bill? The benefit can only be one of two kinds. It must be either in our foreign relations or it must be in our domestic economy. In one of these two ways we must be benefited, or the bill under consideration should not be passed.

First, let us inquire whether we shall be benefited in our relations to other governments.

It is supposed by the Senator from California that the possession of these islands is necessary in order to protect this vast domain and to prevent the subjugation of forty-five million people by some foreign foe that may invade us at some unknown time when we may not be prepared for our own defense. Those islands lie west of California, half way to China. They are as far from California almost as London is from New York; and yet it is insisted by the Senator from California that those islands are necessary to the Government of the United States as a military outpost, as a place for naval armament, as a *point d'appui* for the protection and the defense of the Government of the United States.

This is the main consideration that is urged for the acquisition of those islands.

The argument that the United States Government is dependent upon those islands for their defense is the strongest evidence of the weakness of the case, and it is evidence further that there is something more in this bill than the general good of the people of the United States. Of that I shall have more to say hereafter.

I say the suggestion that it is necessary to have those islands for our defense is hardly worthy of consideration; and but for the distinguished Senator, who has urged it with so much earnestness, I should not refer to it at all. The idea that 45,000,000 people who are segregated and insulated upon a continent, with the territory that we possess, with the resources that are at our command, with a railroad from ocean to ocean which can be traversed within five days, not being capable of defending themselves or protecting themselves against any force that any power on the earth, or that all the powers of the earth might bring against us, is not to be entertained for a moment.

But, again, it is said that we need those islands for our commercial interests. That is not true. We have a treaty existing with the King of the Hawaiian Islands, or the Sandwich Islands, by which we have a lodgment upon those shores that is sufficient for commerce so long as peace exists, and it is not necessary that this treaty shall go into effect in order that we may enjoy the advantages which are necessary in time of peace. In a time of war we do not need them for defense; we can take care of ourselves.

Mr. WEST. I ask the Senator from Georgia to yield to me.

Mr. NORWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. WEST. I desire to say that in making the motion that I did some time ago to adjourn, I submitted it at a time when I thought it was reasonable for the Senate to cease its labors for the day. Finding, however, that that was not the disposition the proceedings have been continued. Now, I have to propose to the Senator who is so much interested in this bill, the Senator from California, that if the Senate adjourns at this time those who are opposed to the bill will resort to no parliamentary tactics or efforts to talk the bill out of time on Monday when it comes up in the regular order.

Mr. SARGENT. I certainly will accept that. I think it is frank and fair. I am willing to accept it, and rely upon the sense of good faith of Senators generally to carry it out as stated. I think that proposition will be acceptable.

Mr. GORDON. I simply desire that this matter shall be thoroughly understood. Of course it is not understood by the Senator from California, for we have had a conversation about it, nor must it be understood by the Senate, that there is any promise that no remarks will be made upon the bill.

Mr. SARGENT. Not at all.

Mr. GORDON. I desire myself to be heard upon the question.

Mr. SARGENT. Unquestionably; I think that is the right of Senators.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] is not present, who has charge of the constitutional amendment, which I know he intends to press.

Mr. SARGENT. Nevertheless the Hawaiian bill is the unfinished business.

Mr. WEST. There is no doubt but that there is a majority of the Senate in favor of this bill.

Mr. LOGAN. What bill?

Mr. WEST. The Hawaiian treaty bill.

Mr. LOGAN. Let us pass it now, then.

Mr. WEST. You have no quorum to pass it, and you cannot keep us here till daylight to pass it. Therefore I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. LOGAN. I object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and (at eleven o'clock and eleven minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, August 12, 1876.

The House met at eleven o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. I. L. TOWNSEND.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of their clerks, informed the House that the Senate receded from their disagreement to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. No. 846) to punish the counterfeiting of trade-mark goods and the sale or dealing in of counterfeit trade-mark goods.

The message further announced that the Senate insisted upon its amendments disagreed to by the House to the bill (H. R. No. 3962) to provide means to defray the expenses of the District of Columbia until December 1, 1876, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed as managers of the conference on the part of the Senate Mr. WINDOM, Mr. EDMUNDS, and Mr. KERNAN.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. No. 3473) 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 further insisted upon its amendments, and requested a further conference upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed as the managers of the conference on the part of the Senate Mr. WINDOM, Mr. LOGAN, and Mr. KERNAN.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House was requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

A bill (H. R. No. 3628) establishing post-roads.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed, without amendments, bills of the House of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. No. 1089) granting a pension to Thomas I. Fox, late a private of Company C, Fifty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers;

A bill (H. R. No. 1713) for the relief of Berthold Loewenthal, of Chicago, Illinois;

A bill (H. R. No. 2271) to increase the pension of Mrs. Hannah W. Sumner, widow of Major-General Edwin V. Sumner;

A bill (H. R. No. 3209) to authorize the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to receive lands in payment of judgments to eastern band of Cherokee Indians;

A bill (H. R. No. 3374) for the relief of Harry E. Eastman, late lieutenant-colonel Second Wisconsin Cavalry Volunteers;

A bill (H. R. No. 3678) to change the name of the pleasure-yacht Lydia to that of Sylph; and

A bill (H. R. No. 3849) for the relief of James W. Harvey and James Livesey, of the firm of Harvey & Livesey, of Wisconsin.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed, and requested the concurrence of the House in, bills of the following titles:

A bill (S. No. 492) making an appropriation for the erection of a light-house and fog-bell on Whale Rock, at the entrance of Narraganset Bay;

A bill (S. No. 832) to increase the pension of Helen M. Stansbury; and

A bill (S. No. 951) to remove the political disabilities of Stephen D. Lee, of the State of Mississippi, and others.

COMMITTEE ON ENROLLED BILLS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. In pursuance of the order of the House, made on yesterday, the Chair will appoint as additional members of the Committee on Enrolled Bills Mr. POPPLETON of Ohio, and Mr. BAKER of Indiana.

PUBLICATION OF COAST SURVEY REPORTS.

Mr. SINGLETON. I am instructed by the Committee on Printing to report back, with a recommendation that the same be adopted, a concurrent resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives, (the Senate concurring,) That 1,000 extra copies of the report of the Superintendent of the Coast Survey for the year ending June 30, 1874, and the same number of copies of his report for the year ending June 30, 1875, be printed, to be distributed by the Superintendent of the Coast Survey.

Mr. SINGLETON. That resolution was originally introduced by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. WARD,] a member of the Committee on Commerce of this House. It received the approval of that committee, who recommended its passage, and it was referred to the Committee on Printing. I am instructed by the Committee on Printing to ask that it now be acted upon by the House.

The concurrent resolution was then agreed to.

EXPENSES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. RANDALL. I desire to enter a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the House on yesterday asked a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. No. 3962) to provide means to defray the expenses of the District of Columbia until December 1, 1876.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The motion to reconsider will be entered upon the Journal.

EXPENSES OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Mr. SINGLETON. I am instructed by the Committee on Printing to ask unanimous consent to have taken from the Speaker's table and

referred to the Committee on Printing Senate bill No. 1035, to provide for paying the expenses of the Joint Committee on Printing in making an inquiry in relation to the public printing.

There was no objection; and the bill was taken from the Speaker's table, read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of their clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, with amendments; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (H. R. No. 984) to provide for the sale of certain lands in Kansas.

CONSULAR AND DIPLOMATIC APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SINGLETON. I submit the report which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. No. 1594) making appropriations for the consular and diplomatic service of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend, and do recommend, to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 16, 51, 77, 82, 87, 91, 94, 98, 105, 107, and 108.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 78, 79, 81, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 90, 92, 93, 95, 96, 97, 100, 101, 103, 104, 111, 113, 115, 116, 117, 119, and 121.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 14 and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out of said amendment "Portugal, Switzerland, Greece, Denmark, Ecuador, Colombia, and Bolivia," and strike out "one hundred" and insert "fifty-two," and strike out "five thousand" and insert "five hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 18, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

Add as a new paragraph:

"For salaries of charges d'affaires to Denmark, Greece, Switzerland, Portugal, and Paraguay and Uruguay, at \$5,000 each, \$25,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 24, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 41, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out of said amendment "Swatow;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 53 and 59, and agree to the paragraph where the amendments occur, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said paragraph insert the following:

"Cork, Dublin, Prescott, Port Sarnia, St. Johns, (Canada East,) Barbadoes, Fort Erie, Leeds, Dundee, Leith, Toronto, Hamilton, Halifax, St. Johns, (New Brunswick,) Kingston, (Jamaica,) Nassau, (New Providence,) Cardiff, Port Louis, (Mauritius,) Bermuda, Quebec."

And the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 63, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "Vlandivostock;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 74, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "Goderich, Windsor, (Canada,) Malta," and restore "Windsor, (Nova Scotia);" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 75, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "Nantes and La Rochelle;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 76, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "Port Mahon and Valencia;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 80, and agree to the same with amendment as follows: Strike out "Santa Cruz;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 89, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "Maranham;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 99, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out of said amendment "51,000" and insert "42,600;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 102, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "6" and insert "5;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 106, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "and thirty-one thousand and eight" and insert "fifteen thousand," and strike out "hundred and fifty;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 109, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "700" and insert "1,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 110, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "9" and insert "2;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 112, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "4" and insert "2;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "10" and insert "9;" and in line 2, page 9 of the bill, strike out "thousand" and insert "five hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 118, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "two thousand six" and insert "three thousand one;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 120, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 122, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

Insert as a new paragraph:

"For compensation of such diplomatic and consular officers heretofore compensated by salaries for whose salaries no appropriation is made by this act, such amount

as shall be necessary to pay their salaries as fixed by law until they shall have notice to close their offices, which notice shall be at once sent to them by the Secretary of State, and for the time allowed by law for transit from their respective posts to their places of residence, \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

And the Senate agree to the same.

O. R. SINGLETON,
W. S. HOLMAN,
CHARLES FOSTER.
Managers on the part of the House.

A. A. SARGENT,
GEO. S. BOUTWELL,
T. M. NORWOOD.
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. SINGLETON. Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered that this is the fourth committee of conference on this bill. We have had a great many difficulties to encounter in coming to a proper understanding and agreement. The principle upon which we have settled this question is that we divide the money difference between the Senate and the House, giving to the Senate conferees, after consultation with the Secretary of State, the privilege of continuing salaries as fixed by law, but withdrawing both from the diplomatic and consular service such ministers and such consuls as were deemed to be least important for our foreign relations. In carrying out that agreement upon the diplomatic part of the bill, Portugal, Switzerland, Bolivia, Ecuador, Colombia, Paraguay and Uruguay, Greece, and Denmark have been left out from the list of ministers resident. They are to be withdrawn entirely; and I repeat again, that has been done, after consultation on the part of the Senate conferees with the Secretary of State, as being the least likely to cripple our foreign service.

We have deducted from contingent expenses \$25,000 and from *chargés d'affaires* \$20,250. And then in place of ministers we have sent *chargés* to Portugal, Switzerland, Greece, Denmark, and Paraguay and Uruguay. This makes \$82,750 saved upon the diplomatic part of the bill, being one-half of the difference between the two Houses.

So far as the consular service is concerned we have left out consuls at certain ports, as follows: Swatow, Southampton, Valdivostock, Malta, Oporto, Santa Cruz, Port Said, Nantes, La Rochelle, Port Mahon, Valencia, Stettin, Maranhão, Cyprus, Bucharest, Venice, Milan, Gaboon, Turk's Island, Hakodadi, Goderich and Windsor, (Canada,) making twenty-two. We have reduced the allowance to consular clerks \$8,000 and to interpreters \$1,500. We have taken from the amount appropriated for the difference in exchange bills drawn by our foreign ministers \$38,000, from contingent expenses \$16,850, from the Spanish claims commission \$500, from counsel for commission \$500, from rent of prisons \$2,000, and from wages of keepers, &c., \$500.

We have deducted from the allowance for care of American seamen \$25,000, leaving \$75,000 still to be expended for that purpose, whereas last year it only cost sixty-three thousand some hundred dollars. The amount is deemed to be amply sufficient.

In the consular service there has been saved to the country \$125,318. The whole amount which has been saved on the appropriation of last year is \$203,068.

We have not obtained all that we should like to have done. We believed the reductions might have been carried further, but we have done the best we could under the circumstances, and we think it will be satisfactory to the country. If any gentleman desires to ask a question, I will yield him the floor for that purpose.

Mr. CONGER. I should like to ask the gentleman to inform me in regard to the status of the consulate at Windsor, Canada West, and also of the consulate at Sarnia.

Mr. SINGLETON. Windsor has been stricken out.

Mr. CONGER. But what about Sarnia?

Mr. SINGLETON. That has not been stricken out.

Mr. CONGER. Is there any provision made for a consulate at Windsor?

Mr. SINGLETON. No, sir; none at all.

Mr. CONGER. Windsor, Canada West, is one of the largest ports of entry on the lakes, Detroit being opposite to it. There is a large emigration going there which needs the services of a consul. It is more important, except Port Huron, than any other place on the lake.

Mr. SINGLETON. I will state to the gentleman that under our bill Windsor was not stricken out, but his friends and the Secretary of State have brought about this result, for which we are not at all responsible.

Mr. CONGER. The gentleman says Secretary of State. I ask if the Secretary did not consent merely to state what particular places ought to be left out with the least damage to the service?

Mr. SINGLETON. That is exactly what I have stated to the House.

Mr. CONGER. The Secretary of State, therefore, under that compulsion, has agreed to the omission of Windsor, Canada West?

Mr. SINGLETON. That is what I stated to the House, and I will repeat it, that by our bill Windsor was retained. This has been done in conference committee, under the advice of the Secretary of State, believing it would result in less damage to our service to remove the consul at Windsor, Canada West, than a consul at some other place which has been retained.

Now one word in reference to the last clause of the bill.

Mr. CONGER. I should like to ask the gentleman whether he will give an opportunity for some remarks?

Mr. SINGLETON. I will certainly do so. We have provided in the last section of the bill for paying the salaries of those who are

abroad now and who are to be withdrawn up to the time when they shall receive the notice of their discharge. This is only right and proper. It will take on the average nearly a month to give them that notice, and therefore, they will be entitled to receive pay up to the time notice is given to shut up their offices. In addition, we propose to pay their expenses home as the law authorizes. For this purpose \$25,000 is set apart, or so much as may be necessary. It was not deemed proper nor just to leave them in a foreign land dismissed from the service without any fault of their own, with perhaps not means sufficient to get home.

Mr. MONROE. I desire to ask the gentleman from Mississippi one question. Perhaps I should have been sufficiently informed upon the point if I had heard every word that he said. I wish to ask what change, if any, has been made in the salaries of consuls of the rank of consul of the consulate at Rio?

Mr. SINGLETON. There has been no change made at all in the salaries of consuls or of ministers. They are allowed to stand as they were before. The reduction has been in the contingent expenses and in withdrawing certain ministers and consuls.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman from Mississippi yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SINGLETON. Yes, sir.

Mr. FOSTER. In agreeing to this conference report, Mr. Speaker, I have not found my judgment in accord with the report. I have agreed to it because we wanted to come to some agreement. No law has been repealed; no salary has been reduced. The reduction accomplished has been by the withdrawal of service, by the withdrawal of diplomats in the diplomatic service, and by the withdrawal of consuls in the consular service. This was done after a conference with the Secretary of State and his assistants, they stating to us that the withdrawals they suggested were the ones that would do the least harm. They did not concede that these withdrawals could be made without doing some harm to the service. I have felt, Mr. Speaker, that it was our duty, if possible, to come to an agreement, and for the purpose of coming to an agreement I have assented to this report, feeling it was the best we could obtain. I have not felt we have been doing right by the service, particularly so far as the consulates are concerned. I have always felt that the tax we impose upon the commerce of the country should be paid back for the benefit of the commerce we tax, and that when we use the money that we are paid from this tax for other purposes we violate a trust.

Mr. RANDALL. These reductions, as I understand them, are rather against the occupant of the diplomatic consular places than the service itself.

Mr. CONGER. Will the gentleman from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. SINGLETON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CONGER. Having heard only the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi of the number of consuls and the places from which they are withdrawn, I cannot refer to the importance of several of them as I should like to do. I desire to say, however, that some of those which I heard mentioned are in remote parts of the world, where the consul, aside from any duties he may have in regard to the commerce and commercial interests of the United States, is the only representative of this Government to take charge of our sailors in large regions of the distant parts of the world. Now we tax the sailors of the United States enough, at the rate of forty cents a month, to furnish them with some officer into whatever part of the world they may go, to settle their differences and to provide for their return home when they are shipwrecked, or when they are lost, or when they are left by chance behind their ships.

In hearing the names of some of these consulates that are withdrawn I am free to say that there are among them places in distant parts of the world where our ships go, where a sailor cannot find within hundreds of miles any consul to afford him the remedies which the law requires. But I pass that by. I desire to refer, as an example of the manner in which these consulates have been discontinued, to the consulate at Windsor, opposite the city of Detroit, in my own State—a consulate the fees of which are more than double the salary of the officer, and have been so for years, which with the railroads coming from Canada, and through Canada from New York, from Buffalo, and the suspension bridge into the United States is absolutely necessary to the commercial business of Michigan, of Chicago, of Cincinnati, and all those places that require a consular certificate to the consignments and invoices of goods. Here is a consulate at a salary of \$1,500 removed from a point one of the most important on all the lake, and where the fees more than double, I think more than treble, every year the salary of the consul.

What shall those men do? The law requires a certificate of every entry and every invoice. What shall the emigrants do coming from Canada, as they come to the number of five or six thousand a year to that point? Shall they send to Niagara? Shall they send to Toronto? For they must have consular certificates before they can bring their goods into the United States. What is the economy which shall destroy a consulate upon one of the great highways of emigration to this country? What kind of benefit is it to the Government of the United States to destroy a consulate which furnishes in fees, I will venture to say, more than treble the salary of the consul?

And if this be so in a case within my own knowledge, how may it be in other cases? And what can be the economy of discontinuing these consulates? We make large charges on emigrants and consignors of

goods for the certificate of the consul; and from Canada many of the goods that come by the Saint Lawrence to Chicago, to Saint Louis, to Cincinnati, to Milwaukee, to Detroit, to almost all our western and northwestern cities, come by way of Detroit and by way of Port Huron, entered under the consular certificate, and passed in bond in transportation to these cities, and the duties assessed and paid when they arrive at their destination.

Now you have removed the only means by which these consular certificates which must be given at the last port of departure, which is Windsor in this case. You propose to legislate out of office the only officer who can give his certificate of at least one-half of the importations that come by the way of the Saint Lawrence to all of the cities of the West and of the Northwest, and I here speak of this so that gentlemen may remember when they hear complaints from merchants and emigrants, from the press and the people, they will remember that I have protested and do protest against any reduction of consulates that are so very necessary, and with this reduction, if there were no other objections to the bill as proposed to be enacted by the conference committee I should feel compelled from a sense of duty to oppose the report of the committee, and to vote against it, and to prevent its passage as far as it may be in my power.

Mr. SINGLETON. The gentleman must remember that the House struck out forty-one consulates, and that the report of the committee of conference only strikes out eighteen, it being a compromise report.

Mr. HOAR. Did not the Secretary of State say that the omission of these consulates would be a great public calamity or would prove a source of public calamity?

Mr. SINGLETON. That is exactly what I stated.

Mr. HOAR. O, I think not. I think the gentleman said that it was at the instance of the Secretary of State that this consulate was omitted.

Mr. SINGLETON. If there is a need for a consular agent there at present with fees, all the President has to do is to appoint him.

Mr. CONGER. But a consular agent cannot give these certificates.

Mr. SINGLETON. I do not see why he cannot.

Mr. CONGER. The law does not permit.

Mr. SINGLETON. I call for the previous question on the report of the committee of conference.

The previous question was seconded and the main question ordered; and under the operation thereof the report of the committee of conference was agreed to.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

APPROPRIATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. RANDALL. I desire to call up the motion to reconsider the vote by which a conference was agreed to on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. No. 3962) providing means to defray the expenses of the District of Columbia until December 1, 1876. I am compelled to do it now, because I am apprised that the conference committee is in session.

Mr. BANKS. The motion cannot be acted upon until the papers are in the possession of the House.

Mr. RANDALL. I desire to make a statement in reference to this matter.

Mr. BANKS. I made the statement which I have made as a question of order.

Mr. RANDALL. This bill was reported to the House from the Committee for the District of Columbia, and it authorized the commissioners of this District to borrow in anticipation of the revenues derived from taxation \$413,000. The Senate amended the bill and made it an actual appropriation of half a million dollars for this District, changing the entire bill from what originally belonged to the Committee for the District of Columbia to an appropriation which belongs to the Committee on Appropriations. During my absence from the House the bill was taken up and the amendment of the Senate was non-concurred in without explanation or discussion. I believe a conference committee has been appointed, and I would not have known of it had not my attention been called to it by the vigilant gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. MORRISON,] the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means. What I want to get at is this, that the subject having been thoroughly considered during this session of Congress by the Committee on Appropriations in connection with the appropriations for the District of Columbia, that committee shall have charge of it and the right to consider the subject.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that the papers are all in possession of the House at this time.

Mr. RANDALL. Yes, the papers are in the possession of the House, and not in the committee of conference, strangely enough.

Mr. REAGAN. I ask the Clerk to read the amendments of the Senate.

The Clerk read the amendments of the Senate, as follows:

That the sum of \$500,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be paid into the treasury of the District of Columbia as the share of the United States toward the expenses of said District for the year beginning July 1, 1876.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act making an appropriation to aid in defraying the expenses of the District of Columbia."

Mr. REAGAN. Is this a bill to pay the interest on the debt of the District of Columbia?

Mr. RANDALL. No, sir. The bill as sent over to the Senate, which was reported by the District Committee of this House, authorized the commissioners of the District of Columbia to anticipate by a temporary loan a little over \$400,000 of the revenues to be derived from taxation, because Congress had failed to fix the rate of taxation in time, so that they might have money enough to run the government of the District of Columbia between now and December next. They had I believe \$250,000 in the treasury, and this would give them \$640,000. I may not be quite correct in my figures, but that is about the amount. That will cover the expenses of the District government between now and next December.

Now, the amendment of the Senate to the bill is a clear, naked appropriation out of the Treasury, which this House has refused to make, and which I do not think the House understood intelligibly at the time they non-concurred and appointed a committee of conference.

Mr. KASSON. Does the gentleman think it wise for us to increase the debt of the District of Columbia so long as we admit that there is some liability on the part of the United States to pay its share of the expenses of the District government?

Mr. RANDALL. I believe the District government can run for the sum provided for by the House bill; but in no event am I in favor of giving half a million dollars out of the Treasury of the Government for the benefit of this District.

Mr. KASSON. I am not familiar with all the details, but I am familiar with the difference of principle between the two bills. The one bill authorizes a loan, which must be paid by somebody.

Mr. RANDALL. By the people of the District.

Mr. KASSON. Subject, of course, to the appropriation which the Congress may make hereafter as its share of the expenses of the District government.

Mr. RANDALL. Not at all.

Mr. KASSON. Let me finish my sentence. The bill as it comes from the Senate substitutes two things: first, a direct appropriation in lieu of a loan, and second a declaration that that appropriation is the share of the United States in the expenses of the District. I believe that is all the difference between the two bills.

Mr. RANDALL. The House bill authorized the commissioners of the District to anticipate the revenues from taxation. The Senate bill gives them all those revenues, and appropriates a half a million more out of the public Treasury of the United States.

Mr. KASSON. But I believe I am not mistaken when I say that it has never been claimed that the entire expenses of the government of this District shall be paid by taxes levied on the people of the District.

Mr. RANDALL. This bill—

Mr. KASSON. One moment. I hope the gentleman will not interrupt me till I have completed my statement.

Mr. RANDALL. I am entitled to the floor, and you hold it from me.

Mr. KASSON. Certainly, by your courtesy. We have always admitted that the United States is liable to pay a proportion of the expenses of the District government. The gentleman himself has never denied that. The only objection that can be taken to the bill as it comes from the Senate is that it now fixes that proportion at the sum appropriated. The bill as it went from the House left that proportion to be fixed hereafter, and requires the expenses of the District to be paid out of the taxes, which cannot now be realized, and authorizes the District commissioners to make a loan in anticipation. I do not ask the gentleman to do anything about this one way or the other, but only that the House shall understand what the bill is.

Mr. RANDALL. I only want to state a fact. There is no danger in the world that the District will not get money enough out of the Treasury. Year before last the appropriations for the District were nearly \$3,000,000, and last year they were very large; I do not remember the exact amount.

Mr. FOSTER. They were a little over a million of dollars last year, I think.

Mr. RANDALL. That is, we appropriated about \$4,000,000 in two years. Now I say there is no danger but what the District will get its share out of the United States Treasury, its adequate and equitable share. I now call the previous question.

Mr. REAGAN. So far as the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] is concerned I do not propose to say a word. I understand that this bill as it comes from the Senate makes an appropriation of \$500,000, while the bill of the House appropriated something over \$400,000.

Mr. RANDALL. No; the bill as it comes from the Senate is a clean cut out of the Treasury of half a million of dollars, while the House bill merely authorized the District commissioners by a loan to anticipate the revenues from taxation by some \$400,000. I now insist upon the previous question.

The previous question was seconded and the main question ordered, upon a division, yeas 113, noes not counted.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] to reconsider the vote by which the House on yesterday disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill of the House (H. R. No. 3962) to provide means to defray the expenses of the District of Columbia until December 1, 1876, and asked a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WILLARD. I have just come into the House and did not know that this subject was to be called up.

Mr. RANDALL. I did not know when it was called up yesterday.

Mr. WILLARD. This bill originally came from the Committee for the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is too late now for any further discussion except by unanimous consent, the main question having been ordered.

Mr. WILLARD. I hope the motion to reconsider will be voted down.

Mr. RANDALL. We will see whether it will be voted down or not.

The question was taken on the motion to reconsider; and upon a division there were—ayes 104, noes 24.

Mr. PAGE. No quorum has voted.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is a further count demanded?

Mr. KASSON. I hope no further count will be demanded.

Mr. PAGE. I withdraw the point that no quorum voted.

No further count being asked, the motion to reconsider was declared to be carried.

Mr. RANDALL. I now move that the bill, with the Senate amendments thereto, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KASSON. I ask consent that the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. WILLARD,] the chairman of the House committee of conference on this bill and a member of the Committee for the District of Columbia from which the bill was originally reported, be allowed to make a statement before the vote is taken.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That requires unanimous consent, the previous question now operating.

Mr. RANDALL. I have no objection.

There being no objection, leave was accordingly granted.

Mr. WILLARD. I desire simply to say, in the first place, that this bill was originally reported from the Committee for the District of Columbia, and provided that the commissioners of the District might anticipate by a loan, to be paid out of the revenues to be derived by the taxes assessed under the tax bill passed by this Congress, the amount necessary to pay the expenses of the government of this District until December 1, 1876.

The bill having passed the House went to the Senate, and was sent back to us with a Senate amendment. As a matter of course, I as well as the other members of the Committee for the District of Columbia supposed that the bill properly belonged to our committee, and I therefore asked unanimous consent last evening to have the bill taken from the Speaker's table so that a conference might be had on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. The conference committee has been appointed on the part of the House and also on the part of the Senate, and just now, while this conference committee was in session, I learned that there was an effort made in the House to take the bill from that conference committee and refer it to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RANDALL. I made that motion, and the gentleman knows it. He went to the Clerk's desk and found out the fact.

Mr. WILLARD. I knew that the motion was entered, but I did not suppose that it was to be acted on. Furthermore, I wish to raise this point of order—

Mr. RANDALL. Too late.

Mr. WILLARD. I raise the point of order that the bill was properly in the possession of the Senate, not of the House, as the Senate was the body that agreed to the conference. The bill, as I supposed, belonged properly to the Senate; and I expected that it would be found there. When the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate sought to find the bill which he supposed was on the table of the President *pro tempore*, he found it had been sent over to this House improperly.

Mr. RANDALL. It came over here properly; and in the haste—

Mr. HOAR. I call the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] to order.

Mr. WILLARD. I hope that under these circumstances the House will not send this bill to the Committee on Appropriations, where it does not properly belong.

Mr. RANDALL. This bill originated, as the gentleman states, in the Committee for the District of Columbia; but he will remember distinctly that he was in conference with the Committee on Appropriations as to the manner in which this allowance should be made to the District, and that the Committee on Appropriations only gave their assent to it in the form in which it was originally passed. He will further remember that yesterday afternoon, before he made his motion to take the bill from the Speaker's table, he was in conference with me, and that I did not assent to his proposition at all.

Mr. WILLARD. I did not understand that the gentleman disented from the proposition to have the bill go to a conference committee.

Mr. RANDALL. I told the gentleman in that conversation that we could not give any more money to the District; did I not?

Mr. WILLARD. I did not suppose there was any objection to having the bill go to a conference committee.

Mr. RANDALL. The whole character of the bill has been changed; it is now made an appropriation bill and embraces an entire plan of appropriations for the District.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. RANDALL to refer

the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, there were—ayes 107, noes 45.

Mr. WILLARD called for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. RANDALL and Mr. WILLARD were appointed.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 86, noes 45.

So the motion of Mr. RANDALL was agreed to.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

RE-IMBURSEMENT OF BALTIMORE MUNICIPAL AUTHORITIES.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent to have taken from the Private Calendar and passed the bill (H. R. No. 2690) to refund to the mayor and city council of Baltimore certain moneys illegally assessed and collected for internal-revenue tax.

Mr. CONGER. I object.

JOHN J. ANDERSON.

Mr. STONE. I ask unanimous consent to have taken from the Private Calendar for consideration now the bill (S. No. 628) for the relief of John J. Anderson, surviving copartner of the firm of Anderson & White.

Mr. BAKER, of Indiana. I object.

Mr. STONE. I ask the House to indulge me a moment while I make a statement.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Objection is made.

INVESTIGATION OF SOLDIERS' HOMES.

Mr. THORNBURGH. I ask unanimous consent to submit the following resolution:

Resolved, That \$2,500 may be drawn from the contingent fund of the House on the order of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to pay the necessary expenses of the investigation of the volunteer soldiers' homes ordered by the House.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution adopted by the House yesterday failed to include a provision for paying the expenses of this investigation.

Mr. STONE. If this resolution requires unanimous consent, I object.

Mr. THORNBURGH. I did not object to the gentleman's request for unanimous consent.

STOCKBRIDGE AND MUNSEE INDIANS.

Mr. CATE. I ask unanimous consent to have taken up and put on its passage now a bill reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs entitled "A bill (H. R. No. 4086) for the relief of the Stockbridge and Munsee tribes of Indians in the State of Wisconsin."

Mr. STONE. I object.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. RANDALL. I ask that the message from the Senate in regard to the action of that body on the Indian appropriation bill be read. The Senate has non-concurred in the report of the conference committee on that bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
August 11, 1876.

Resolved, That the Senate disagree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on 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, and ask a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. WINDOM, Mr. LOGAN, and Mr. KERNAN be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. RANDALL. I desire to state that there is but a single difficulty about this bill, and that is not of much importance. If a new committee be appointed a conclusion will be reached almost immediately. I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendments and agree to the further conference asked by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* announced the appointment of Mr. RANDALL, Mr. SCALES, and Mr. HURLBUT as conferees on the part of the House.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. HEREFORD, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to print in the RECORD as part of the debates some remarks which he had prepared on the subject of the extravagance and corruption of the administration. [See Appendix.]

Mr. SPENCER, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to print in the RECORD as part of the debates some remarks which he had prepared on the condition of the country. [See Appendix.]

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania. I demand the regular order of business.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order of business has been demanded, and the House now resumes the consideration of the motion made by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] on Thursday last to reconsider the vote by which the message of the President of the United States accompanying the sundry civil appropriation bill was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LYNCH] is entitled

to the floor for thirty minutes, the remaining portion of the hour of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. TOWNSEND.]

Mr. FORT. I rise to make a report from the Committee of Accounts.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. This is a motion to reconsider and is privileged, and a report from the Committee of Accounts is not of higher privilege so as to supersede it.

Mr. LYNCH. On Saturday last I asked the House to allow me an extension of time beyond the thirty minutes so kindly yielded to me by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but objection was made by the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. BLAND.] I understand that he does not now insist on his objection. I therefore ask unanimous consent of the House that my time shall be extended thirty minutes, so I may occupy the floor for one hour.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection, and the time of the gentleman is extended for thirty minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the House for its courtesy in allowing me to occupy the floor for an hour. It is not my purpose to reply to the speech which was made by my colleague from the fifth district, [Mr. HOOKER,] but to reply to some of the points which were so ably and so eloquently presented by my colleague from the first district, [Mr. LAMAR.] It is not my purpose, however, to refer to the first part of his speech, as I have no disposition or inclination to discuss the theory of our Government, the constitutional limitations of power, the propriety or impropriety of Federal interference in the domestic affairs of a State. I shall endeavor to confine myself to what I believe to be the living issues of to-day—those which are now agitating the public mind.

Now, sir, the political status of the colored race of this country is in some respects an unfortunate one. In my humble judgment it is unfortunate that the status of that race is necessarily made the subject of political discussion. I had hoped that after the last three amendments to the Constitution had been ratified, and the colored people invested with all of their rights, civil and political, so far as constitutional declarations and statutory enactments could fix them, that all political parties would acquiesce in these results to such an extent as to remove from the politics of the country this race question. I had hoped that the elevation, the advancement, and the protection of this race would be the aim, the object, and the aspiration of all political parties. This race issue will not be removed from the politics of the country, in my judgment, until that is done, and that it should be done I believe every honest man must admit.

Before proceeding to answer the points which were so forcibly made by my colleague from the first district, I hope I will be pardoned for digressing a little, for the purpose of explaining to the House and the country why it is that the colored people in the State of Mississippi are in favor of general amnesty. I have been desirous of making a remark or two on this point ever since the amnesty debates of last winter, but have not had an opportunity to do so. As this question has a direct bearing on the southern situation, I presume it will not be inappropriate for me to do so now.

After the passage of the reconstruction acts by Congress conferring upon the colored people the right to vote, we found ourselves in a very peculiar position. The voting population of the South was composed of three distinct elements: the ex-confederate soldiers and those who sympathized with them, the ex-Federal soldiers who had concluded to locate at the South, and the colored race. These elements have been, and were at that time, politically antagonistic to each other. The colored men could not be expected to identify themselves with any other than the republican party, and yet they could not fail to see and realize the fact that that party, to have a permanent existence and a firm and solid foundation, must include in its membership a large percentage of the wealth and the intelligence of the State, some of those who fought on the side of the confederacy.

How to bring the republican party into existence in that State upon such a basis as would render possible a harmonious union of these conflicting elements and at the same time be in harmony with the great republican party of the Union, was the task we had before us. To make this union possible, the colored men very generously and magnanimously, traits for which I presume all will admit they are particularly characterized, declared in language which could not be misunderstood that if those who had fought and upheld the "lost cause" would renounce all allegiance to that cause, announce it as their determination to stand by and defend the Union, and concede to the colored men every right and privilege they claimed for themselves—in other words, identify themselves with the great republican party—if they would do this, that they, the colored men, would support them just as heartily, just as earnestly, and just as enthusiastically as they would support those who fought for the cause of the Union; and to give emphasis to this declaration they were willing to incorporate in the platform of the republican party of that State, and did incorporate, a plank pledging the party to this doctrine of equal rights for every man and amnesty for the late rebels.

This was done. Upon this platform the republican party of Mississippi was brought into existence; and I stand upon the floor of the House of Representatives to-day for the purpose of declaring what I know to be true, that this party as thus organized, including in its membership as it does not less than nineteen-twentieths of the colored men of the South; including in its membership as it does not less than nineteen-twentieths of the ex-Federal soldiers in the State;

including in its membership as it does not less than one-fifth and possibly more of the ex-confederate soldiers in the State; this party as thus organized includes in its membership a majority of not less than thirty thousand of the qualified voters of that State. It was so strong, so powerful, so overwhelming in numbers that nothing short of organized terrorism and armed violence, such as was unfortunately resorted to by the democratic party of that State last year, could crush it out of existence or defeat it at the polls.

I may be pardoned, Mr. Speaker, for remarking here that the white men who are identified with the republican party of the State of Mississippi, not northern men merely but southern men, ex-confederates, represent a large percentage of the wealth, the intelligence, and the moral worth of the white people of that State. They are as a class men who would be accepted in any community as high-toned, honest, honorable citizens and valuable members of society. They are as a class men whom the democracy in former days delighted to honor with the highest positions in the gift of the people of the State. They are admitted to be men of character, men of ability, men of standing and of unquestionable reputation. None of my democratic colleagues, I venture to assert, will deny this; for they know it to be true. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, this is why we have placed ourselves upon this broad, liberal, and conservative platform in addition to the fact that the colored people are particularly desirous of showing to their white brethren that they have no disposition to oppress them or deprive them of a single right they claim for themselves.

I will now refer to some of the points made by my honorable colleague. In giving his reasons for the present unfortunate condition of affairs at the South, there was one remark made by him that touched my sensitive feeling. And that was the comparison, apparently at least, of the colored people with the Mongolian race, that has been imported from China to America. It is certainly known by southern as well as northern men that the colored people of this country are thoroughly American; born and raised upon American soil and under the influence of American institutions; not American citizens by adoption, but by birth; worshiping the same God that the white men worship; identified with the same religious denominations that the white race is identified with; imbued with every sentiment of love of country, devotion to the Constitution, and loyalty to the flag that the white race is imbued with; identified in every conceivable particular with American institutions and with American liberty. For my honorable colleague, unwittingly as I believe, to compare this race with the untutored, the uncivilized, the unchristianized, and the un-Americanized Mongolian, that has been imported from China to America, was unjust, ungenerous, and unfair. I do not wish to be understood as detracting anything from that great and powerful race, but it is known that they are not American; and that cannot be said of the colored race, for they are.

RECONSTRUCTION.

Now, sir, let me say something with regard to the policy of reconstruction. It will be remembered by those who heard the speech of my colleague that he made the remark that the reconstruction policy of the Government was the foundation of all of the political evils at the South; that that was the foundation of the color-line in politics, because the reconstruction policy of the Government enfranchised the colored men and disfranchised the white men; and that therefore there was a gulf between the two races, and that was the cause of the race struggles of the South and all the evils of which we complain. Before answering that argument let us see what are the logical deductions to be drawn from it. If it be true, as he asserted, that the enfranchisement of the colored men at the South was the cause of all of our troubles there, it seems to me that we can draw no other deduction from that argument (if there is anything in it) than that the only effectual remedy is to remove the cause; that you cannot remove it unless you disfranchise them and remand them back to their former condition. That seems to me to be the logical deduction to be drawn from the argument, though he did not say so, and I do not wish to be understood as placing him in the attitude of advocating that proposition. I am merely stating what seems to me the only conclusion to be arrived at as the logical result of the argument.

Let us inquire whether there is anything in that view of the case. I take issue with my honorable colleague in that respect, and will endeavor to show by referring to my own State that he is entirely mistaken. Why, sir, my colleague seems to have forgotten that in the State of Mississippi we have never had any serious troubles between the two races since the re-admission of that State into the Union until the latter part of 1874 and during the campaign of 1875. Until then we never had any serious troubles whatever. The two races got along well together and never had any serious difficulty of any kind, the democratic party sometimes putting colored men on their own ticket. If, then, the enfranchisement of the colored men was the cause of all the troubles in the South, is it not remarkably strange that it took the democratic party from five to eight years to find it out? Is it not remarkably strange that we could get along so well together for five or eight years without finding out that the incorporation of the colored element into the body-politic was the cause of our difficulties? No, sir; I will tell you what was the cause. The democratic victories at the North in 1874 so encouraged and exasperated the lawless and turbulent elements at the South as to give them the entire control of the party machinery in the democratic party. That was the cause of it.

The democratic victories at the North so strengthened this element of lawlessness as to give them power to control the democratic organization and to shape its policy; and therefore the color line was drawn in politics, not because the colored men first drew it, as is sometimes charged, but because this element felt that they would be sustained by the public sentiment of the country in resorting to violent measures for the purpose of accomplishing what they could not accomplish by peaceful means. The incorporation of the colored element into the body-politic had nothing to do with it, because the two races had lived as peaceful, as quietly, as orderly together prior to that time as they possibly could have done. Every election held in Mississippi since the re-admission of the State was peaceable, quiet, orderly and, except possibly in one or two localities which were not general in their character, fair. We never had occasion to call on the Federal Government for Federal interference; we never had an occasion to bring up charges for violence in any election held in the State until the general election last year and in a local election the fall previous.

Is it not strange that the argument is now brought forward that what was done five or eight years ago was the foundation of the violence of last year? Why, the argument is fallacious, it is unsound, it is unreasonable, and cannot be substantiated.

DEMOCRATIC RULE IN MISSISSIPPI.

Now, sir, let us see what has been done in the State of Mississippi under this policy that has been inaugurated. It will be remembered that my honorable colleague in his very eloquent speech referred to the State of Louisiana, and in so doing he held up republican rule in that State as typical of republican rule in the other Southern States. But he did not make any allusion to Mississippi especially.

Now, then, when holding up republican rule in the State of Louisiana as typical of republican rule in the other Southern States, he certainly must have known that republican rule in Louisiana, as understood and explained by himself, is not typical of republican rule in Mississippi. But I presume that none of our democratic friends will object to having democratic rule in the State of Mississippi under the new order of things held up as typical of democratic government in the other Southern States.

Now let us see what it is. I cannot speak of all of it, for I have not the time to do so. As the result of the election in the State of Mississippi in November last we had a Legislature brought into existence which has characterized its proceedings by greater blunders than any that were ever complained of by any of its republican predecessors. This Legislature having been brought into existence through questionable channels—that is a mild phrase, for I have too much respect for the feelings of my colleagues to use harsh phrases in their presence—but that Legislature having been brought into existence through questionable channels, what did it do?

Among the first of its proceedings was to revolutionize the entire State government, by taking forcibly the possession of the other two departments—the executive and judicial—by turning out of office every man who stood as a stumbling-block in the way of a complete democratic ascendancy in the State. Well, they say they did it in a legal and constitutional way. Let us see about that. To get control of the executive and judicial departments of the government, it was necessary for them to impeach and remove from office both the governor and lieutenant-governor, so that the democratic president of the senate could become the acting governor. The first thing then was to get rid of the lieutenant-governor. He was impeached and removed from office on a charge of bribery. He was charged with having been bribed by two eminent lawyers to pardon a convict out of the State penitentiary; a very grave offense, for which he deserved impeachment, if true. Under the laws of Mississippi a man who proposes a bribe is just as guilty as the one who accepts it.

Those two lawyers who were charged with having bribed the lieutenant-governor happened to be very eminent and able democrats. The charge was made several months before the election and several months before the assembling of the Legislature. During that time the grand jury of Lowndes County, the county in which all three of the parties resided, thoroughly we are told, investigated this matter. This grand jury, composed of a majority of democrats, made a report to the court that all the parties to the transaction were innocent. No evidence could be produced to establish the guilt of any of them. The Legislature had no jurisdiction over the two democratic lawyers, they being private citizens. But they did have jurisdiction over the lieutenant-governor, he being a civil officer of the State. They then proceeded to investigate his conduct upon the charges upon which he had been acquitted by a democratic grand jury, no other charge being preferred against him, and pronounced him guilty, and he was accordingly impeached and removed. Now I do not say he was innocent, for I do not know; I did not investigate the matter, and I am not prepared to express an opinion upon that subject. Perhaps he was guilty; it is not necessary to answer my purpose to defend him. But the point I make is that either the democratic grand jury failed to discharge its duty for the purpose of shielding the two democratic lawyers from justice or else the Legislature was guilty of persecuting an officer for political purposes; one of the two is true, and it is not very favorable to the democratic party either way.

Now, after having got rid of the lieutenant-governor, the next thing was to get rid of the governor. Charges of impeachment were preferred against him. My time will not permit me to go over all of

them, but I will give a skeleton of some of them. He was impeached in one article for failing to remove a man from office who in the judgment of the Legislature ought to have been removed. In another article he was impeached for failing to remove a man who in the judgment of the Legislature ought to have been removed.

He was impeached in another article because he called on the President of the United States for troops to put down what he believed to be domestic violence. He was impeached in another article because he leased out the penitentiary convicts to his partisan friends. The law expressly authorized him to lease them out; there was no crime at all in leasing them out; the offense was in leasing them out to his partisan friends. The inference of course is that if he had leased them out to his partisan enemies no offense would have been committed.

These were the principal charges that were preferred against him. He was impeached on these articles and driven from his office for the sole purpose of getting a democrat in his place. After the articles had been drawn up, some of the democratic members of the Legislature had some conscientious scruples on the subject. They did not desire to vote for these articles, and therefore a public pressure had to be brought to bear upon them for the purpose of whipping them into the traces.

What was done now to accomplish that? The leading democratic paper published at the capital of the State came out with flaming head-lines: "This man must be impeached and removed from office!" How? Upon the law and the evidence that may be presented? Not at all. Upon principles of equity and justice? By no means. Then how are you to get rid of him? He must be impeached and removed, said the democratic paper, "as a party measure." I defy any of my colleagues to deny that.

Mr. SINGLETON. What paper have you got there?

Mr. LYNCH. The Clarion, of Jackson, Mississippi.

Mr. SINGLETON. Produce that paper and let me see it.

Mr. LYNCH. Certainly, I will take great pleasure in doing so. This paper said that the governor must be impeached and removed from office as a party measure. No matter what the constitution may declare, no matter what the law may provide, no matter what the evidence may be, the people demand it at their hands, and they must obey the command of the people. I ask the Clerk to read what I have marked, and to be careful and emphasize the words I have underscored. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

We cannot see that any lesson for our guidance in this matter of Governor Ames is to be drawn from the case of Andrew Johnson cited by The South. He was impeached for upholding the Constitution and laws. If Ames is impeached it will be for trampling them under foot. Nor does it follow that proceedings against the latter will fail because they failed in the case of the former. Johnson had justice on his side; Ames has not. Johnson was a republican President on trial before a republican Senate. Ames is a radical governor, who will be on trial before a democratic senate; and therefore no apprehensions need be felt that partisan influences will shield him from the penalty of his crimes. It is idle for the South to say that these proceedings "cannot be carried on as a party measure." They cannot be carried on in any other way.

It is no time for sentimentalism; practical work is needed. The democratic and other opposers of radical misrule "carried" the election, and if the full benefits of the victory are to be realized they will have to arraign Governor Ames and the other radical office-holders who have abused their trusts, and visit upon them the consequences of their crimes as "a party measure."

Mr. LYNCH. The South referred to in that article is a democratic paper that was opposed to impeaching the governor "as a party measure," and this article was in reply to The South.

Mr. FOSTER. And this Clarion is the official organ of the party?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes, sir; it is the official organ of the party, and its proprietors are the public printers of the State. I suppose my colleague [Mr. SINGLETON] has had some experience in the matter of public printing. Now, having demanded the impeachment of this man as a party measure, of course the articles of impeachment were put through the House, but one democrat, I believe, dissenting.

After the impeachment articles had gone through the house, it was found out that there were some conscientious democrats in the senate who were not altogether prepared to vote for conviction. So the next thing was to prepare the senate for conviction. But the only way to do that was to turn out enough republicans and put in enough democrats to make conviction sure.

They then proceeded to turn out republican senators. They turned out one man upon the ground that he was a foreigner, although he was ready to swear that he was born in New York. But it made no difference where he was born; a democratic vote was needed and they must have it. Therefore the republican was turned out and a democrat put in his place, who had not been elected even in the peculiar manner by which they carried the elections there last fall. He had not been elected, and had no right or title to the seat. Yet they turned out the republican and put in the democrat.

After having prepared the senate for conviction we are told that a committee waited on the governor. And I suppose some such conversation as this took place: "Governor, you have been impeached; your conviction is but a question of time. If you will resign your office, then you will save money to the State and some money to yourself." To that I suppose the governor replied something like this: "If I resign, will you withdraw your articles of impeachment?" Judging from the result the reply to that was, "Yes, certainly we will." And that was agreed upon.

The committee went back, made their report, and the articles of impeachment were immediately withdrawn, the resignation was sent in, and the proceedings thereupon came to an end. Now, in what attitude does this place them? I am not a lawyer, but it seems to me that the democratic party in that Legislature proved itself guilty of one or two things: they either acknowledged that the charges were groundless and false, without a shadow of foundation in fact, or else they were guilty of what the lawyers would call compounding a felony. I would like any democrat to deny that. One of the two must be true. Either that Legislature was guilty of compounding a felony by allowing this man to escape as a consideration for his office, or else it was a confession on their part that he was innocent of the charges brought against him. They said: "All that we want is your office; it is immaterial to us what you may have been guilty of; the sole objective point we have in view is to get a republican out and a democrat in."

Now, in a speech of my honorable colleague, [Mr. LAMAR,] which he delivered here when some proposition relative to the impeachment of the late Secretary of War was before the House, he took the very strong ground that the object of impeachment is not merely to get rid of an objectionable officer, but to punish him besides. He did not represent his Legislature in that sentiment, for they took the position that the object of an impeachment with them is to get a republican out and a democrat in. I would like to know whether the democrats on the other side of this House from the other Southern States are willing to have the Mississippi democracy held as typical of the democracy in their States. I hope for their sakes that they are not.

THE COLOR LINE—VIOLENCE.

In referring to this question of the prevalence of violence and the drawing the color line in politics, I am willing for one to give my colleague credit for everything that he says on that point. I am willing to give him credit for sincerity in deprecating the drawing of the color line and the inauguration of brute force and violence. The only thing upon which I take issue with him in that respect is this: He believes, honestly, no doubt, that in giving utterance to conservative sentiments here and elsewhere, in deprecating the drawing of the color line and the inauguration of violence, he represents the controlling element in the ranks of the democratic party in Mississippi. I believe (and I presume he will give me credit for honesty and sincerity in this opinion) that he does not.

I am willing to admit, as I said upon a former occasion, that there are in the State of Mississippi numbers of white men who are not identified with the republican party and whom I believe to be honestly opposed to these violent measures and to drawing the color line in politics. I may be pardoned for mentioning the names of one or two of these gentlemen, because their names are somewhat national; they are known to the country. I will mention for instance the present speaker of the house of representatives of Mississippi, Hon. H. M. Street. I will also mention Hon. J. W. C. Watson, of Marshall, the editor of the paper that opposed the impeachment of the governor upon party grounds; General A. M. West, of the same town; ex-Governor Charles Clarke, and ex-Governor and ex-United States Senator Albert G. Brown, of Hinds. These men, I believe, are honestly opposed to this policy of violence and the drawing of the line in politics. I have always believed that my colleague [Mr. LAMAR] was one of that number; I am willing to give him credit for it; but when he asserts that in his conservative utterances he reflects the sentiments of the controlling element of his party, I take issue with him. His position cannot be substantiated, for it is not correct.

It is sometimes said that these violent measures are sometimes necessary to get rid of bad government, heavy taxes, and dishonest officials. I have asserted on this floor more than once that this cannot be truthfully said of Mississippi. I did not make groundless assertions and empty declarations, but presented facts and figures to substantiate what I said. Not one of my democratic colleagues has denied or can deny my position on this question. In that State there was no occasion whatever for the inauguration of violent measures on the ground that bad, incompetent, or dishonest men had control of the government.

INEFFICIENCY OF STATE GOVERNMENTS.

One other point which has been made very forcibly is the inefficiency of republican State governments at the South. It is very often said that we have violence only in the States under republican rule. Without admitting that there is any foundation for this statement, (for it is not altogether true,) I say that admitting it for the sake of argument, what does it prove? It proves that the democrats will obey the laws only when made and enforced by men of their own choice, while republicans will obey the laws whether they are made and enforced by men of their own choice or by democrats. Let us admit that violence exists only in republican localities; why is it so? Simply because democrats say, "Let us have the government and we will obey the laws; if you do not, we will not." That is precisely the argument upon which the rebellion was inaugurated.

I presume no gentleman in this Hall who is familiar with the history of our Government will deny for a moment that had Frémont been elected President instead of Buchanan in 1856, the war would have been inaugurated four years sooner than it was. And I presume no one familiar with our history will deny that had Breckinridge, or even Douglas, been elected in 1860 instead of Lincoln, the war would have been postponed at least four years later.

Did not the southern democrats say, "We will stay in the Union if you let us control it; if you do not, we will not?"

Why, sir, my colleague might just as well come before the American people and contend that the election of Tilden and Hendricks is essential to the peace of the country; he might just as well say, "Elect Tilden and Hendricks and you will have peace; elect Hayes and Wheeler and you will have war." If the argument is good as applicable to a single State, it must be equally good as applicable to the nation.

If the country is ready to accept this condition of affairs, then it can do so, but it seems to me that it would be death and destruction to what are recognized as the results of the war.

CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM.

My colleague lays great stress upon civil-service reform in the Government. That is the controlling idea, he says. Let me say to the House and the country that civil-service reform does not occupy one-twentieth part of the consideration of the southern democrats. Civil-service reform does not enter into their composition. They have not got it to think about. The sole objective point with the democratic party of the South, and I presume at the North, is democratic success. It is immaterial to them what the attitude of their candidate may be on any of the public questions now before the people. It is immaterial to them whether their candidate for the Presidency be in favor of contracting the currency or expanding it. It is immaterial to them whether he be in favor of free trade or protection. It is immaterial to them whether he be really in favor of administrative reform or whether he be, as their candidate for the Presidency is now believed to be, the earnest advocate of gigantic corporations. They are willing to subordinate all other questions to the one great object of democratic success. They are willing to subordinate all other questions, without excepting the honor, the integrity, and the plighted faith of the nation. They only ask, "Give us the democratic party; that is what we want. The sole objective point with us is to get the Government into our hands and let us get our fingers on the purse-strings of the Treasury."

They have not only drawn the color line in politics for the purpose of appealing to the passions and prejudices of race, but they have drawn the sectional line for the purpose of rolling up the southern vote in behalf of the Saint Louis nominees. Civil-service reform amounts to nothing in the estimation of the democratic party south of Mason and Dixon's line. I speak of them knowingly. It may be true of those north of it also; but I speak of those south, for I know whereof I speak. The order has already gone forth from Tammany Hall, as represented by the chiefs of that organization, saying to the democratic party of the South, "Put this party into power, elect the ticket nominated at Saint Louis, and all things else will be added unto you."

I tell you that it is the only issue in the South to-day. No other public question agitates the public mind there. You may be divided at the North on questions of currency or of administrative reform, but they do not enter into politics at the South, because the democrats do not care anything about them.

CONCLUSION.

Now, sir, let me say that the South is proposed to be carried by the democratic party. Every Southern State they propose to carry as they carried Mississippi last year; a State with 30,000 republican majority reversed by giving 30,000 democratic majority nominally. They propose to carry all the others the same way, not by the power of the ballot, but by an organized system of terrorism and violence. That is the way they propose to do it.

Now let me say, in conclusion, that I am satisfied, I am convinced, that the public sentiment of the people of this country is sufficiently aroused now to see the danger we are in. I am satisfied that the people of this country are beginning to realize the importance of the situation we are in. I am satisfied that when these questions are known, when they are fully understood, the people will be determined to rise in their might and declare in language which cannot be misunderstood that this great, grand, glorious Republic must and shall be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, it is no pleasure for me to be compelled to admit the violence which exists in my own State. I would be happy if I could say truthfully that such is not the case. It gives me no pleasure to be compelled to acknowledge perfect toleration of opinion does not exist in the State of Mississippi. I have friends there on both sides. My home is there. My interests are there. My relatives are there; and I want to see the State prosperous and happy.

I want to see perfect toleration of opinion everywhere, and especially in the State where I live. I am anxious for that to be the case, and nothing would give more pleasure than to be able to declare on the floor of the House of Representatives that perfect toleration of opinion is allowed to all classes. The fact that I am compelled to acknowledge that such is not the case in many counties in the State fills me with pain, mortification, and regret, for I want to see the two races living in harmony and in peace, and friendly relations existing between both parties. That is the object of my aspiration, and it is what I hope the better judgment of the whole body of the people of that State will see is for the general good. For I can realize the fact that since the State of Mississippi has been in its present condition of turmoil our commerce has been practically destroyed; the friendly relations between the two races arrested, em-

igration to the State retarded, and the State itself almost in a disorganized condition, with a lawless class controlling it to a great extent.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LYNCH. I should like to have two minutes more.

Mr. RANDALL. Better say five.

Mr. LYNCH. I do not want more than two minutes.

There being no objection, Mr. LYNCH's time was extended.

Mr. LYNCH. In conclusion let me warn the House and the country, not with any feeling of malice, not with any feeling of hatred, for I have none, that if you expect to preserve the constitutional liberties of the people as well as to uphold the perpetuity of republican institutions you must see to it that lawlessness is crushed out at the South. I say to the northern democrats, you must see to it, with my honorable friend from New York, [Mr. LORD,] that your party stands upon the platform which that gentleman made in the resolutions introduced here yesterday to crush out mob law and violence at the South, whether proceeding from political friends or from political enemies. If the democratic party has a legitimate majority in the State of Mississippi or any other State, it is entitled to the vote of that State and ought to have it. If the republican party has a legitimate majority in that State or in any other State, it is entitled to the vote of that State and ought to have it. This is what honest men of all parties ought to be willing to say. And now, sir, I am satisfied that the people of this great Republic, realizing the necessities of the situation, will see to it that this grand and glorious Union of ours must, shall, and will be preserved. [Applause.]

Mr. LANDERS, of Indiana, rose.

ISSUE OF ARTIFICIAL LIMBS.

Mr. RUSK. I rise to present the report of a committee of conference.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. No. 1516) to regulate the issue of artificial limbs to disabled soldiers, seamen, and others, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend, and do recommend, to their respective Houses as follows:

The House concurs in the first and second amendments of the Senate, as follows: In line 1 strike out "persons" and insert "officer, soldier, seaman, and marine." In line 5, after "application," insert "or commutation therefor, as provided and limited by existing laws."

The House concurs also in the proviso added to the end of the bill with an amendment, inserting the word "not" between the words "shall" and "be" in the first line, so that it will read, "that this act shall not be subject to the proviso of an act entitled 'An act to increase pensions,' approved June 18, 1874."

J. M. RUSK,

A. V. RICE,

JOHN C. BAGBY,

Managers on the part of the House.

JOHN A. LOGAN,

J. B. GORDON,

NEWTON BOOTH,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The report of the conference committee was adopted.

Mr. RUSK moved to reconsider the vote by which the report of the conference committee was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The House resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. HALE to reconsider the vote by which the message of the President in regard to the sundry civil bill was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LANDERS, of Indiana. I regret that so much valuable time is being taken up with the discussion of this southern question. It is a question in which I have taken but little interest, inasmuch as the colored men have every legal right that white men have. Color is no longer known in our statutes, and I would not, Mr. Speaker, cast a single vote to deny them those rights. Since those rights have been secured to them it is strange that the time of this House is to be occupied in the discussion of this question. No man has made a move to deny them a single right or attempted to do so; but, on the contrary, a resolution was passed here yesterday declaring that this Congress was in favor of the execution of the laws and the Constitution, and parties offending should be speedily punished. I favored this resolution so as to give the colored man to understand that his liberties would not be jeopardized in the hands of either of the political parties. I consider this question settled, and should pass out of politics. Its agitation at this time is only for bad political purposes.

I desire to say to my democratic friends here that there is nothing that does us more injury in the North than the agitation of this question. Whenever there is trouble in the South it is an injury to us in the North. It is to the interest of the republican party that this difficulty should be kept up; and I notice here, Mr. Speaker, that our republican friends delight to talk about the riots of the South. By their acts it would seem that they rejoice when there is any difficulty in the South. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the blood of the colored man of the South should now be used to make political capital for the republican party of the North.

Mr. Speaker, it was not my purpose to speak at length upon this subject. I merely wanted to say to my southern friends that in every case where there is a difficulty in the South it recoils upon the de-

mocracy of the North. But there is one thing that has not been satisfactorily explained by any gentleman on this floor, and that is that those difficulties have occurred in every State of the South as long as they were under republican rule, and whenever a State of the South passes into democratic hands you hear of no more difficulty there between the white and the colored people. The trouble subsides at once. We are reliably informed that the election in Alabama passed off quietly. The trouble is now confined to Louisiana, South Carolina, and to Florida, States that are controlled by the republican party. Why is this? Why is it that the difficulties are alone in the States controlled by the republicans? Mr. Speaker, if the colored men of the South desire peace and quiet, it would seem they should desire the control of their States to pass into the hands of the democratic party. I can only account for this in one way; and that is, the democratic officials in the South see that the laws are executed, and that lawless men cannot impose upon colored men without being brought to the bar of justice; while in States controlled by republicans of the South they are willing to see the blood of the colored man shed to manufacture political capital for the benefit of their party in the North.

My object, Mr. Speaker, in speaking upon this occasion was not to reply to the remarks made by the gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. LYNCH,] but to reply to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARFIELD] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TOWNSEND] on the question of the remonetization of silver. The honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania in a speech some days ago declared "that there never was a government that has been able to regulate the market price between the two coins, gold and silver; that it has been found to be an impossibility; that their value fluctuates as does that of any other commodity." I agree with the gentleman. I agree that a government has never been able to properly regulate the value of these coins; but I want the gentleman to think upon one question, and that is, has the Government any more power to regulate one than both? It is admitted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that those metals are not standards of value; but the different nations having adopted them as money and fixed a value on them in payment of honest debts, has done much to give them uniform value.

I maintain that it is far more practicable to regulate the value of both than of one. If you have two metals performing the same office, whenever there is a demand for one of them or there is a scarcity of one of them by the demands from foreign countries, the other will perform the office of the one in demand. A double standard is self-regulating, while if you have but one standard, what is there to regulate it? If we had but one standard in this country, and a demand was made on us for the metal out of which it was made, there is nothing to check the advance in price of that metal, but if we have two each serves as a substitute for the other, and as a check in the advance of the other, and brings about a uniform value. The gentleman says that "you can no more regulate the price of coin metal than of grain." I admit the proposition, but I ask the gentleman whether the value of grain is not better regulated when there are two kinds of grain to perform the same office than it would be if you had but one; for instance, you have two kinds of grain which are used for breadstuffs. If the crop of one is short the other takes its place, and extravagant prices are prevented. It is just so with metals; wheat and corn regulate the value of each other, and so it is with gold and silver; they regulate the value of each other also.

The gentleman says that "if you remonetize silver and receive it for tariff dues then the Government will be compelled to buy gold to pay the interest on the public debt." I want the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TOWNSEND] to understand that the same law that defines what shall be received for tariff dues defines what shall be received for the interest on the public debt. Tariff dues are to be paid in coin and the interest on the public debt is to be paid in coin. We have as much right to pay the interest on our public debt in silver as we have to take silver coin for tariff dues. I claim the right in both instances.

The gentleman then speaks of "the great fraud," as he terms it, that would be perpetrated on the creditor class provided we remonetize silver and offer it in payment of our bonds. I say that the action of the Government in demonetizing silver was a course that would be discountenanced on any stock-board in the United States. The Government sold coin "short;" it sold that which it did not have for future delivery at the time. Let me suggest an illustration to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Suppose a stock company, say the "Pacific Mail," had one thousand shares of stock, and they would sell "short" with that understanding, and a portion of their stockholders would be purchasers, say to the extent of five hundred shares. The directors would then consolidate the stock, retiring one-half, thus increasing the value of the stocks one-half; and at the time of delivery, suppose the corporation was compelled to purchase the stock, thus increased in value as stated by the retirement of the one-half, would not that be a great fraud on all stockholders not purchasers, and would not it bankrupt the company for the benefit of the few purchasers of stock? What would be said of this board of directors? Would they be countenanced on any stock-board in the country?

That is what the United States has done. It sold coin short and then retired one-half of its coin. A greater fraud was never perpetrated upon any stock-board, and yet men who engaged in this kind of legislation, this kind of fraud against all the debtors of the country, come here, and in this Congress, and when men speak in behalf of the right,

they abuse and denounce them. Some time hence it will be remembered that when I offered an amendment to a bill to make silver a full legal tender it was denounced in a most violent speech. I want gentlemen to understand that they have a different party to deal with now and that the creditors of the country are going to be heard, and instead of meeting them with derision let them come forward with their argument. They will find that before this question is settled no denunciation will prevent an entire investigation of this matter. They will find that they will be compelled to come forward with argument rather than denunciation. If they have no argument, let them keep quiet.

When this question was first before the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARFIELD] took especial pains to denounce those who brought it forward. I want to say in regard to him that I have kindly feelings toward him—I do not entertain unkind feelings toward any gentleman on this floor—but when I read his remarks in the RECORD made in regard to this great measure of restoring silver and giving it a legal-tender quality, a great measure in the interest of the people as against a few moneyed corporations and the bondholders of the country; when I saw the manner in which this question was treated by him, I felt it due to me and to the people I represent and to the one hundred and ten Representatives who cast their votes for that measure that he should be replied to before this session closes.

I am now satisfied that this subject is not to be settled this session. I am satisfied that the bondholding interest here will filibuster this measure over to the next session. But I want those gentlemen to understand that this question is only put off. The people will settle the matter between now and the next meeting of Congress, and I venture to say that at a very early day in the next session this measure will be carried by a large majority. We propose to establish in this country the right of the people, not by taking from any individual or class of men any rights that belong to them, but to take from them rights which they have unlawfully taken from others and restore them to whom they belong.

I desire now to refer to some remarks made by the honorable gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARFIELD] in his speech upon this subject some time since.

Mr. Speaker, I quote from the honorable gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. GARFIELD:] "In 1873 we adopted a device to preserve the constancy of the value of the dollar." If the gentleman had omitted the *de*, and said we adopted a *vice*, he would have fairly expressed the law of 1873, for no more vicious legislation was ever before devised and enacted. It was not done, as the gentleman says, to "preserve the dollar," but to destroy it. It was not done, as the gentleman says, "because Congress saw that it would be difficult to preserve the dollar," but because a set of men congregated on Wall street (calling themselves brokers, and properly so, because they break everybody with whom they come in contact) saw that without such legislative action their business of gambling would be gone; therefore they sought to impose upon such members of Congress as the honorable gentleman from Ohio, and humbugged him and others into this most villainous legislation. In all of my career in both private and public life I have never known any proposition containing so many of the "essential elements of rascality and colossal swindling" as this demonetizing act of 1873.

The honorable gentleman from Ohio introduced the subject of equivalents from the law of 1869; it is manifest that he is not as ignorant upon that subject as upon the act demonetizing silver, at least he was wise enough to stop reading from that act just at the point which allowed him to place his own construction on it, a construction, I will venture to assert, few other members of this House could be found to indorse. The sentence which he refused to read explained the meaning of the words "coin and equivalent;" coin meant gold and silver and the equivalent their equivalent.

But the gentleman was wise enough to have the whole sentence printed in the RECORD when detected in his effort at special pleading upon the topic of *equivalency*. The truth is the gentleman has by his own presentation of this question destroyed his whole argument. He says "he denies the principle of equivalency." Who proposes to pay in this silver coin? It is he who "denies the principle of equivalency," for the law says gold and silver coin, which means either of them. The equivalency attaches to *paper* if offered in payment, and not to either of the metals. This is the plain construction of the law, and he is the first to give to the law any other interpretation and should be the last to thus interpret it. It is too absurd to be again repeated.

The gentleman from Ohio said, some one has said, "that there is an innate desire in the human mind to get a chance to cheat somebody." If this House desires proof of the honorable gentleman's quotation, I would refer you to his efforts in securing the passage of the law of 1873, demonetizing silver. This act deprives all the debtor class of this country of the option of offering silver in payment. That option to-day would be worth more than \$1,000,000 to the debtor class. This was no small "cheat."

And it appears the gentleman was not entirely ignorant of the effect of this act, for he says, "that Congress foresaw a difficulty ahead (he was in Congress at the time) and passed a law to guard against it."

This difficulty was just what we now seek to remedy; the cheapen-

ing of silver was foreseen. How was it foreseen? Was it not by the intercourse of the plotting bondholders of both continents with legislation that the action of speculators was foreseen?

The great wisdom of the eminent statesman from Ohio would seem to have been formed upon information of the action of a body of Shylocks, who, not content with their "pound" of "flesh," must take the "blood" also. They well knew that it was the right of the debtor to pay in the cheapest money; hence the law must be changed by demonetizing silver to deprive them of that right, as it was likely to be cheap because of the conspiracy against it, which, if not demonetized, the creditor would be compelled to take it. The gentleman from Ohio boasts of participating in this conspiracy against the debtor class by legislative enactment in changing the contract, repudiating the original.

Again I quote from the gentleman from Ohio:

A great minister once said that there were two things in human nature which when united always made iniquity complete. One was the desire to do a dishonorable thing and the other was the opportunity to do it.

It was most unfortunate that the opportunity was presented to the honorable gentleman from Ohio in 1873, and it is more to be regretted that the opportunity found him filled with the desire.

Mr. Speaker, can you picture in your mind the warm greeting that Representatives of the people met with at the festive board of the scheming bondholders, after having sold out the rights of their constituents, or rather legislated them away? Many healths were no doubt drank to the honorable gentleman from Ohio for his great liberality and generosity in seeing that they were to be paid in "honest money," seeing as they did that silver was soon to become dishonest money, as dishonest legislation had been enacted against it. The bondholders and gold-brokers no doubt exclaimed, "Gold will now advance, and we will receive our pay in it, and all this due to the generosity of the gentleman from Ohio and others. Drink them down!" O, there was no solemnity there.

If we are to be lectured upon the high moral grounds taken by the honorable gentleman, I hope it will be done by some one who was not the advocate of every measure that has been concocted in this House for the past ten years to filch from and rob the people, and still champion such jobs as "solemn pledges."

Mr. Speaker, there are but few members here who supported the iniquitous legislation of 1869, which increased the obligations of the debtor class by changing the payment from paper to coin, more than \$400,000,000 on the public debt alone. The fraud of 1873 demonetizing silver affects all debts, public and private, and is far more reaching in its effect. The Government debt is but little over two billions, while State, municipal, and individual debts amount to more than ten billion. It ill becomes that few to lecture this House or at this time to stand by those fraudulent acts on "moral" grounds.

Some weeks ago a resolution was introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POPPLETON] asking that a committee of investigation be appointed and charging that corrupt means were resorted to to pass the act of 1869, and that no less than \$5,000,000 had been paid out to secure the "solemn pledge" spoken of by the honorable gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. GARFIELD,] and if I mistake not the honorable gentleman opposed the passage of that resolution.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania. Will my friend from Indiana [Mr. LANDERS] allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LANDERS, of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the act of 1873 retired one-half of the coin of this country?

Mr. LANDERS, of Indiana. I was illustrating a case. I say that, according to the best information we have, silver constitutes about one-half of the world's money. Our silver bullion is much greater than our gold bullion, at least twice as great.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman inform me how much has been coined by our Mint during its existence of gold and silver?

Mr. LANDERS, of Indiana. I know that that is a point taken by some gentlemen. I know that they urge that only about eight million silver dollars have been coined.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania. That is so.

Mr. LANDERS, of Indiana. I understand that very well. But I wish to say that this country, until latterly, was not a silver-producing country. During the first years of the existence of this Government we obtained our silver from other countries. Now we are a great silver-producing country. In 1873 this Congress sought to undervalue its own production.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania. I want to remind the gentleman of the fact that from the organization of the Mint up to 1873, when this act was passed, the coinage of gold amounted to \$316,000,000, while the coinage of silver was only about \$145,000,000. Consequently if silver was demonetized by the act of 1873, it constituted but a small proportion of the metallic currency of this country.

Mr. LANDERS, of Indiana. Will the gentleman also inform the House that in the early days of the Republic we had an immense amount of silver coin that was of Spanish and Mexican coinage, and that silver was worth more than gold. We had but little bullion to coin ourselves.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania. I know that for the first few years we had not. But we began to coin the silver dollar in 1849, and

from that time we had our own silver dollar, and the number of silver dollars coined at our mints amounts to only about \$8,000,000. I desire to ask the gentleman another question. He contends that the word "coin" in the act of 1869 includes both gold and silver. I want to inquire of him whether it includes copper and nickel, and whether or not he would contend that the interest on the public debt could be paid in subsidiary silver coin and in coppers and nickels?

Mr. LANDERS, of Indiana. I will give the gentleman the interpretation of the word coin as made by Chief Justice Chase. In deciding a case that came from New York to the Supreme Court Chief Justice Chase said that we had two kinds of dollars; that we had the coin dollar composed of a piece of gold or silver of a certain degree of weight and fineness, and a paper dollar. Is that satisfactory to the gentleman?

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania. I know that. But I want to know if the gentleman goes further and contends that the nickels and coppers, which are also coin, should be receivable in payment of public dues?

Mr. FORT. To the extent that they are legal tender, of course they should be.

Mr. LANDERS, of Indiana. The gentleman will understand that coppers and nickels are not known in the Constitution at all, and are not coins as defined in the Constitution. It is merely trifling with this question to raise that point.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RANDALL. I rise for the purpose of submitting a report from the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the legislative, judicial, and executive appropriation bill.

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. I ask the gentleman to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. RANDALL. If it does not take too much time.

POST-ROUTE BILL.

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House bill No. 3623 establishing post-roads, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to have them referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads. As the amendments of the Senate contain an appropriation, we propose to confer with the Committee on Appropriations on that subject.

No objection was made; and the bill, with the Senate amendments, was taken from the Speaker's table, and referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Mr. RANDALL moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill and amendments were referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. I am instructed by the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads to report the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk for consideration at this time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the annual reports of the Postmaster-General, as required by section 413 of the Revised Statutes, together with the accompanying documents in relation to contracts for carrying the mails, referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, be printed.

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. The papers referred to in this resolution were some time ago referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads and are now in the committee-room.

Mr. KASSON. They have not yet been printed?

Mr. CLARK, of Missouri. They have not been, and this resolution is to direct their printing.

No objection was made; and the resolution was adopted.

PUBLICATION OF ARMY REGULATIONS.

Mr. RANDALL. I now yield for a moment to the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. BANNING.]

Mr. BANNING. I ask unanimous consent that Senate joint resolution No. 24, providing for the postponement of the publication of the Army regulations, be taken from the Speaker's table and acted on now.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas the President was, by act of Congress approved March 1, 1875, authorized to make and publish regulations for the government of the Army in accordance with existing laws; and whereas by act of Congress approved July 24, 1876, a commission was created, to which has been referred the whole subject-matter of reform and re-organization of the Army of the United States: Therefore

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That the President be requested to postpone all action in connection with the publication of said regulations until after the report of said commission is received and acted on by Congress at its next session.

Mr. BANNING. It is thought by those in charge of the publication of these regulations that inasmuch as the commission on the re-organization of the Army will report at the next session of Congress, it will be best to postpone until that time the publication of the Army Regulations, as that report may make changes in those regulations.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was taken from the Speaker's table, read three times, and passed.

Mr. BANNING moved to reconsider the vote by which the joint

resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. MAISH, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to have published in the RECORD remarks on Pennsylvania border claims. [See Appendix.]

IMPEACHMENT OF WILLIAM W. BELKNAP.

Mr. McMAHON, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 4090) to publish the proceedings in the impeachment of William W. Belknap; which was read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

REMOVAL OF DISTRICT JAIL.

Mr. HOLMAN. In order that the conference asked by the Senate may be agreed to, I ask the House to take up the bill (S. No. 842) authorizing the commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove the jail on Judiciary Square to grounds near the Washington Asylum, for the use of the District. This is a local affair. I move that the House insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* announced the appointment of Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KIMBALL as the conferees on the part of the House.

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 *pro tempore* signed the same:

An act (H. R. No. 1089) granting a pension to Thomas I. Fox, late a private of Company C, Fifty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers;

An act (H. R. No. 3022) making appropriations for the construction, repair, preservation, and completion of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes;

An act (H. R. No. 3359) making appropriations for the payment of claims reported allowed by the commissioners of claims under the act of Congress of March 3, 1871, and for other purposes;

An act (H. R. No. 3374) for the relief of Harry E. Eastman, late lieutenant-colonel Second Regiment Wisconsin Cavalry Volunteers;

An act (H. R. No. 3678) to change the name of the pleasure-yacht Lydia to that of Sylph; and

An act (H. R. No. 3849) for the relief of James W. Harvey and James Livesey, of the firm of Harvey & Livesey, of Wisconsin.

Mr. POPPLETON, from the same committee, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker *pro tempore* signed the same:

An act (S. No. 846) to punish the counterfeiting of trade-mark goods and the sale or dealing in of counterfeit trade-mark goods;

An act (S. No. 852) for the relief of Elisha E. Rice;

An act (S. No. 944) for the relief of Gilderoy M. Hardy;

An act (S. No. 990) to remove the political disabilities of Reuben Davis, of Mississippi;

An act (S. No. 1021) allowing the Pacific Mail Steamship Company to carry the mails in their new iron steam-ships;

An act (S. No. 1036) to provide for the printing and distribution of the reports of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the years 1874 and 1875;

An act (H. R. No. 1713) for the relief of Berthold Loewenthal, of Chicago, Illinois;

An act (H. R. No. 2271) to increase the pension of Mrs. Hannah W. Sumner, widow of Major-General Edwin V. Sumner; and

An act (H. R. No. 3209) to authorize the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to receive lands in payment of judgments to eastern band of Cherokee Indians.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. RANDALL. I submit the report which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate 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, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend, and do recommend, to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 70, 72, 73, 76, 175, 177, 178, 181, 182, 205, 215, 419, 443, 444, 445, 446, 460, 519, 545, 553, 554, 559, 577, 581, 590, 591, 592, 593, 614, 617, 620, 623, 625, 632, 643, 708, 709, 710, 721, 722, 763, 764, 766, 776, 810, 812, 912, 915, 921, 922, and 944.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 69, 71, 72, 79, 80, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 157, 159, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 179, 180, 213, 214, 418, 422, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 430, 450, 457, 458, 461, 468, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 503, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 518, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 550, 552, 555, 556, 558, 560, 561, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 598, 599, 600, 610, 616, 619, 631, 644, 652, 654, 655, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 706, 707, 711, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 759, 761, 762, 765, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 807, 809, 811, 842, 913, 914, 917, 918, 919, 920, 936, 937, 938, 940, 941, and 942.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 1, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: After the word "appropriated," where it occurs the second time in the enacting clause of the bill, insert "in full compensation;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 21, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out, in line 10, page 2 of the bill, the words "two hundred and twenty" and insert in lieu thereof "five hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 51, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: After the word session, in line 6, page 3 of the bill, insert ("which words 'during the session' as used in this act shall be held to mean four months;") and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 52, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "four thousand" and insert in lieu thereof "two thousand eight hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 53, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "sixty-six thousand nine hundred and twenty-two" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "seventy thousand eight hundred and two;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 66, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "thirteen," and insert in lieu thereof "thirty-seven;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 67, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "twenty-eight," and insert "fifty-two;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 74, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out therefrom the word "four" and insert "one;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 75, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "eight" and insert "six;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 77, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "forty-eight thousand and four" and insert in lieu thereof "thirty-three thousand and seven;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 81 to 136, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"For compensation of the officers, clerks, messengers, and others receiving an annual salary in the service of the House of Representatives, namely: Clerk of the House of Representatives, including compensation as disbursing officer of the contingent fund, \$4,500, and for hire of horses and wagons for the use of the Clerk's office, \$600; and the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to sign, during the recess of Congress after the first session and until the first day of the second session, the certificates for the monthly compensation of Members and Delegates in Congress, which certificates shall be in the form now in use, and shall have the like force and effect as is given to the certificate of the Speaker; Chief Clerk and journal clerk, two reading clerks, tally clerk, five in all, at \$2,500 each; disbursing clerk, file clerk, printing and bill clerk, and enrolling clerk, four in all, at \$2,250 each; for assistant to Chief Clerk, assistant to enrolling clerk, resolution and petition clerk, newspaper clerk, superintendent of document-room, index clerk, and librarian, seven in all, at \$2,000 each; distributing clerk, \$1,800; for stationery clerk, \$1,500; one document clerk and one upholsterer and locksmith, \$1,840 each; one chief messenger in the office of the Clerk of the House and one messenger assisting librarian, at \$1,440 each; book-keeper and four clerks, at \$1,600 each; one engineer, \$1,440; and two assistant engineers, at \$1,200 each; 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 Door-keeper; for five firemen, at \$900 each; one laborer, at \$820; and four laborers, at \$720 each; one page, at \$2.50 per day during the session; and one telegraph-operator at \$400; for clerk to the Committee of Ways and Means, \$2,500; messenger to the Committee of Ways and Means, \$1,200; clerk to the Committee on Appropriations, \$2,500; messenger to the Committee on Appropriations, \$1,200; clerk to the Committee of Claims, \$2,100; clerk to the Committee on Public Lands, \$2,000; clerk to the Committee on War Claims, \$2,000; clerk to Speaker's table, \$1,800; private secretary to the Speaker, \$1,800; Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives, \$4,000; for one horse and wagon for his use, \$500; clerk to the Sergeant-at-Arms, \$2,100; paying teller for the Sergeant-at-Arms, \$2,000; messenger to the Sergeant-at-Arms, \$1,200; Doorkeeper, \$2,500; assistant doorkeeper, \$2,000; clerk for Doorkeeper, \$1,200; janitor, \$1,200; Postmaster, \$2,500; first assistant postmaster, \$2,000; four messengers, at \$1,000 each; eight during the session, at \$600 each; Chaplain of the House, \$900; five official reporters of the proceedings and debates of the House, at \$5,000 each; two stenographers for committees, \$5,000 each, and this shall be in lieu of all other compensation for such services in reporting and transcribing the proceedings of each and all of said committees; superintendent of the folding-room, \$2,000; three clerks in the folding-room, one at \$1,800, and two at \$1,200; one folder in the sealing-room, \$1,200; superintendent and chief assistant in the document-room, at \$1,800 each; document file clerk, \$1,400; eight messengers, at \$1,200; ten messengers, at \$1,000; four laborers under the superintendent of the folding-room to handle books, at \$720 per annum each; seven laborers, at \$720 each; ten laborers, during the session, at the rate of \$720 each per annum, \$2,400; one laborer, at \$600; one laborer (Henry Douglas), at \$840; and for one female attendant in ladies' retiring-room, \$600; making in all, the sum of \$196,420."

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 137, and agree to the text proposed to be stricken out, with an amendment as follows: Insert after the word "year," in line 6, page 8 of the bill, the following: "at a compensation not exceeding \$1,300 each."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 144, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

Add at the end of the paragraph the following:

"To pay outstanding indebtedness incurred by the committees of the House prior to June 30, 1876, \$3,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 145, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the first paragraph of said amendment insert the following:

"For compensation of the Public Printer at the rate of \$1,600 per annum, and of the clerks and employés in his office, \$12,900: *Provided*, That the term 'Public Printer' as employed in that part of the act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the current fiscal year which repeals all laws providing for the election or appointment of Public Printer shall be construed as embracing that officer whether known as Congressional Printer or Public Printer."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 146 to 155, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"For compensation of the librarian, \$4,000; and for fifteen assistant librarians, two at \$2,250 each, one at \$2,000, four at \$1,600 each, two at \$1,440 each, two at \$1,250 each, two at \$1,200 each, one at \$1,000, and one at \$960 per annum; in all, \$26,640."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 156

and 158, and agree to the same, with amendments as follows: In lieu of "nine" and "fourteen" insert respectively "seven" and "twelve;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 160, and agree to the text proposed to be stricken out, with an amendment as follows: Add at the end of the paragraph the following: "*Provided*, That not exceeding \$600 of the foregoing appropriation may be applied in payment for fuel used during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1876; and the House agree to the same."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 168, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "twenty-one" and insert "fifteen;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 173, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "three hundred and twenty" and insert in lieu thereof "two hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 174, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "eight thousand and four," and insert in lieu thereof "seven thousand seven hundred and sixty-four;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 176, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "four" and insert "two," and strike out "twenty-eight hundred and eighty" and insert "fourteen hundred and forty;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 183, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "two thousand" and insert "eighteen hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 184, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "thirteen" and insert "twelve," and strike out "eight" and insert "seven," and after the word "hundred" insert "fifty;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 185, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "four" insert "three;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 186 to 202, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the two paragraphs amended substitute the following:

"For compensation of the Secretary of State, \$8,000; three Assistant Secretaries of State, at \$3,500 each; for chief clerk, \$2,500; twelve clerks of class four; five clerks of class three; ten clerks of class one; and thirteen clerks, at \$900 each; one messenger; one assistant messenger; one superintendent of the watch, at \$1,000; six watchmen; twelve laborers; chief engineer, who shall be a machinist, \$1,200; one assistant engineer, \$1,000; four firemen, at \$720 each; twenty char-women, at \$180 each; and a conductor for the elevator, at \$720; in all \$99,220."

"For five chiefs of Bureaus and one translator, at \$2,100 each, \$12,600."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 203 to 207, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

Substitute in lieu of the amended paragraph the following:

"For proof-reading and packing the laws and documents for the various legations and consulates, including boxes and transportation of the same, \$2,500; for stationery, furniture, fixtures, and repairs, \$4,000; for books and maps, \$2,000; for extra clerk hire and copying, \$2,500; in all, \$11,000"

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 208 to 212, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

Substitute for the amended paragraph the following:

"For contingent expenses, namely: For fuel \$10,000; for lights, \$3,000; for repairs \$2,000; for care and subsistence of horses and repairs of wagons and harness, \$1,500; and for miscellaneous items, not included in the foregoing, \$3,125; in all \$19,625."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 216, with an amendment striking out the following on line 8, page 14, of the bill: "For purchase of official postage-stamps, \$20,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 217 to 241, both inclusive, with an amendment as follows:

Substitute for the amended paragraph the following:

"*Secretary's Office.*—For compensation of the Secretary of the Treasury, \$8,000; two Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury, at \$4,500 each; chief clerk and *ex-officio* superintendent of the Treasury building, \$2,700; one chief of division of warrants, estimates, and appropriations, \$2,750; one assistant chief of division of warrants, estimates, and appropriations, \$2,400; six chiefs of division, at \$2,500 each; six assistant chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; twenty-three clerks of class four; two disbursing clerks, at \$2,500 each; stenographer to the Secretary, \$2,000; nineteen clerks of class three; eighteen clerks of class two; eleven clerks of class one; twenty female clerks, at \$900 each; eight messengers and twenty-eight laborers; one captain of the watch, \$1,200; one engineer, \$1,400; one assistant engineer, \$1,000; one machinist and gas-fitter, \$1,200; one storekeeper, \$1,200; sixty watchmen, at \$720 each; and additional to two of said watchmen, acting as lieutenants of watchmen, \$180 each; six firemen, at \$720 each; seventy-five char-women, at \$180 each; in all, \$281,310."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 242 to 251, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph insert the following:

"And the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to consolidate the division of loans and the division of currency into one division; and all work now done in either division shall be done in the consolidated division, with the following employes, namely: One chief of division, at \$2,500; two assistant chiefs of division, at \$2,100 each; ten clerks of class four, and additional pay to three fourth-class clerks, namely, receiving clerk of bonds and two book-keepers, \$100 each; six clerks of class three; three clerks of class two; four clerks of class one; thirty-five clerks, at \$900 each; six messengers, at \$840 each; six laborers, at \$720 each; and six laborers, at \$2.25 per day each; in all, \$83,655.50."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 252 to 259, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph insert the following:

"*Superintending Architect.*—In the construction branch of the Treasury: For Superintending Architect, \$4,500; chief clerk, \$2,250; photographer, \$2,250; one principal clerk at \$2,000; one clerk of class four; two clerks of class three; two clerks of class one; one clerk at \$900; and one messenger; in all, \$20,140."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 260 to 268 both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*First Comptroller of the Treasury.*—For First Comptroller of the Treasury, \$5,000; deputy comptroller, \$2,700; four chiefs of division, at \$2,100 each; four clerks of class four; ten clerks of class three; eight clerks of class two; four clerks of class one; six clerks, at \$900 each; one messenger; and three laborers; in all, \$69,700."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 269 to 278, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*Second Comptroller of the Treasury.*—For Second Comptroller of the Treasury, \$5,000; deputy comptroller, \$2,700; five chiefs of division, at \$2,100 each; five clerks of class four; twelve clerks of class three; thirteen clerks of class two; eight clerks of class one; nine clerks at \$900 each; one messenger; and three laborers; in all, \$85,300."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 279 to 286, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*Commissioner of Customs.*—For Commissioner of Customs, \$4,000; deputy commissioner, \$2,250; two chiefs of division, at \$2,100 each; two clerks of class four; five clerks of class three; ten clerks of class two; nine clerks of class one; one messenger; and one laborer; in all, \$48,410."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 287 to 298, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*First Auditor.*—For the First Auditor of the Treasury, \$3,600; deputy auditor, \$2,250; four chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; two clerks of class four; six clerks of class three; seven clerks of class two; eleven clerks of class one; one messenger; and two laborers; in all, \$52,330; and for the division of loans, namely: Three clerks of class four; three clerks of class three; two clerks of class two; and two clerks of class one; in all, \$15,400."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 299 to 308, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*Second Auditor.*—For Second Auditor, \$3,600; deputy auditor, \$2,250; five chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; six clerks of class four; twenty-eight clerks of class three; sixty clerks of class two; thirty-five clerks of class one; one messenger; and eight laborers; in all, \$204,050."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 309 to 317, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*Third Auditor.*—For Third Auditor, \$3,600; deputy auditor, \$2,250; five chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; six clerks of class four; fifteen clerks of class three; sixty clerks of class two; thirty-five clerks of class one; five clerks, at \$900 each; one messenger; four laborers; and one charwoman, at \$480; in all, \$185,350."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 318 to 325, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*Fourth Auditor.*—For the Fourth Auditor, \$3,600; deputy auditor, \$2,250; three chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; two clerks of class four; sixteen clerks of class three; nine clerks of class two; nine clerks of class one; five clerks, at \$900 each; one messenger; and two laborers; in all, \$71,230."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 326 to 333, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*Fifth Auditor.*—For the Fifth Auditor, \$3,600; deputy auditor, \$2,250; two chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; two clerks of class four; six clerks of class three; five clerks of class two; six clerks of class one; three clerks, at \$900 each; one messenger; and one laborer; in all, \$41,510."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 334 to 344, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department.*—For compensation of the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department \$3,600; deputy auditor, \$2,250; eight chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; seven clerks of class four, and, additional to one clerk as disbursing clerk, \$200; fifty-two clerks of class three; sixty-five clerks of class two; thirty-six clerks of class one; one messenger; and nineteen laborers; eighteen assistants of money-orders, \$18,000; also fifteen female assistants of money-orders, at \$900 each; in all, \$298,070."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 345 to 375, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*Treasurer.*—For compensation of the Treasurer of the United States, \$6,000; assistant treasurer, \$3,600; cashier, \$3,600; assistant cashier, \$3,200; chief clerk, \$2,500; five chiefs of division, at \$2,500 each; one principal book-keeper, at \$2,500; one assistant book-keeper, at \$2,400; two tellers, at \$2,500 each; two assistant tellers, at \$2,250 each; twelve clerks of class four; twelve clerks of class three; eight clerks of class two; six clerks of class one; forty clerks, at \$900 each; five messengers; five laborers, at \$720 each; and seven laborers, at \$240 each; in all, \$157,960; and for the division of loans, namely, fifteen clerks of class four; five clerks of class three; five clerks of class two; eight clerks of class one; one hundred and eighteen counters and copyists, at \$900 each; seven messengers; and twenty-six laborers; in all, \$182,400; and for the force employed in redeeming the national currency, namely, for superintendent, \$3,500; two principal tellers and one principal book-keeper, at \$2,500 each; one assistant book-keeper, \$2,400; and two assistant tellers, at \$2,000 each; two clerks of class four; two clerks of class three; four clerks of class two; thirty-five clerks of class one; twelve clerks, at \$1,000 each; twenty-six clerks, at \$900 each; two messengers; three assistant messengers; three employees, at \$432 each; in all, \$112,336."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 376 to 390, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*Register of the Treasury.*—For compensation of the Register of the Treasury, \$4,000; assistant register, \$2,250; six clerks of class four; seven clerks of class three; ten clerks of class two; eight clerks of class one; six copyists, at \$900 each; one messenger, and three laborers; in all, \$60,250; and for the division of loans, namely, five chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; nine clerks of class four; eight clerks of class three; three clerks of class two; four clerks of class one; sixty-seven copyists and counters, at \$900 each; four messengers and four laborers; in all, \$114,540. And the office of deputy register of the Treasury is hereby abolished."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 391 to 406, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*Comptroller of the Currency.*—For Comptroller of the Currency, \$5,000; deputy comptroller, \$2,800; four chiefs of division, at \$2,200 each; one stenographer, at \$1,800; eight clerks of class four; twelve clerks of class three; nine clerks of class two; eight clerks of class one; twenty-five clerks, at \$900 each; three messengers, three laborers, and two night-watchmen, at \$720 each; in all \$102,820; and for expenses of the national currency, namely, one superintendent, at \$2,000; one teller and one book-keeper, at \$2,000 each; one assistant book-keeper, at \$2,000; fifteen clerks, at \$900 each; and one messenger; in all, \$32,340."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 407, and agree to the same, with an amendment striking out the words "five hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 408 to 417, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*Commissioner of Internal Revenue.*—For Commissioner of Internal Revenue, \$6,000; one deputy commissioner, \$3,200; two heads of division, at \$2,500 each; five heads of division, at \$2,250 each; one stenographer, \$1,800; twenty-five clerks of class four; thirty clerks of class three; forty clerks of class two; eighteen clerks of class one; fifty clerks, at \$900 each; four messengers; and ten laborers; in all, \$253,410."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 420, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out all after the word "packages" in line 25, page 21 of the bill, to the close of the paragraph; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 421, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "nine hundred and twenty" and insert "eight hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 423, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "eight hundred" and insert "four hundred and seventy-five;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 429, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "July" and insert "September;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 431, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 432, and agree to the text proposed to be stricken out, amended as follows: After the word "of," in said text, insert "not exceeding," and after the word "day," the last word in said text, add "in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury," and in lines 12 and 13, page 23 of the bill, strike out "the 30th day of June next" and insert "ten days from the passage of this act;" and the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 433 and 434, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*Light-House Board.*—For chief clerk of the Light-House Board, \$2,400; two clerks of class four; two clerks of class three; one clerk of class two; one clerk of class one; one clerk, at \$900; one messenger; and one laborer; in all, \$14,260."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 435 to 442, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*Bureau of Statistics.*—For the officer in charge of the Bureau of Statistics, \$2,400; chief clerk, \$2,000; five clerks of class four; six clerks of class three; six clerks of class two; four clerks of class one; five copyists, at \$900 each; one messenger; one laborer; and one charwoman, at \$480; in all, \$42,740. And for the additional duties imposed upon the Bureau of Statistics by the legislation of the second session of the Forty-third Congress, the sum of \$12,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, to be expended, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, in payment of the services of experts, and for other necessary expenditures connected with the collection of facts relative to the internal and foreign commerce of the United States."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 447, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the amended text and the sum proposed to be inserted and insert as a separate section at the end of the bill the following:

"Sec. —. That the Secretaries respectively of the Departments of State, Treasury, War, Navy, and Interior, and the Attorney-General are authorized to make requisitions upon the Postmaster General for the necessary amount of postage-stamps for the use of their Departments not exceeding the amount stated in the estimates submitted to Congress; and upon presentation of proper vouchers therefor at the Treasury, the amount thereof shall be credited to the appropriation for the service of the Post-Office Department for the same fiscal year."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 448, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "three thousand" insert "two thousand five hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 449, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "six" insert "five;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 451, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "4,000" insert "3,400;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 452, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "six" insert "five;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 453, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "ten" insert "nine;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 454, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "15,000" insert "12,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 455, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "15,000" insert "12,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 456, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of "20" insert "15;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 459, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out of said amendment the words "two hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 462 and 463, and agree to the same, with an amendment substituting in each case for the amount proposed "two thousand eight hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 464, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "eight" and insert "six;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 465 and 466, and agree to the same, with an amendment substituting in each case for the amount proposed "two thousand four hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 467 and 469, and agree to the same, with an amendment substituting in each case for the amount proposed "two hundred and fifty;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 470, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "two" where it occurs the second time and insert in lieu thereof "one;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 481, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "fifty thousand nine hundred and eighty;" and insert "forty-eight thousand five hundred and thirty;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 502, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "five" and insert in lieu thereof "two;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 504, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "five thousand one" and insert "four thousand two;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 517, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words proposed, and strike out, in lines 10 and 11, page 29 of the bill, the following words: "assistant fractional-currency clerk" and "dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 520, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "forty thousand and twenty" and insert "thirty-nine thousand five hundred and fifty;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 546, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "fifteen" and insert "fourteen;" strike out "seven" and insert "two;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 547, and agree to the text proposed to be stricken out, amended as follows: In lieu of "June" insert "September;" after the word "discontinue" insert "from said date," and strike out "Tucson, Arizona," and insert "Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 548, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out all after the word "Treasurer," where it occurs the second time, to the close of the paragraph, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$1,000; one clerk, \$450; one clerk, \$400; one assistant messenger, \$180; and two watchmen, at \$180 each; in all, \$2,390;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 549, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out all after the word "cashier" to the end of the paragraph and insert the following: "\$450; book-keeper, \$350; one watchman, \$180; in all, \$980;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 551, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out in line 19 of said amendment the following: "sufficient to make;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 557, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "seventeen thousand three" and insert in lieu thereof "sixteen thousand nine;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 562 to 570, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*Mint at Philadelphia.*—For salaries of the superintendent, \$4,500; for the assayer, melter and refiner, coiner, and engraver, four in all, at \$3,000 each; the assistant assayer, assistant coiner, and assistant melter and refiner, at \$2,000 each; cashier, \$2,500; chief clerk, \$2,250; book-keeper and deposit clerk, at \$1,800 each; weigh clerk, \$2,000; and two clerks, at \$1,600 each; in all, \$36,050."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 571, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "fifty" and insert "twenty;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 578, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "twenty-five thousand seven" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-four thousand nine;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 579, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "three hundred," and insert in lieu thereof "two hundred and seventy-five;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 580, and agree to strike out all after the word "dollars," in line 26, page 32 of the bill, down to the close of the paragraph; and the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 582 to 587, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*Mint at Carson, Nevada.*—For salary of superintendent, \$3,000; for assayer, melter and refiner, and coiner, at \$2,500 each; chief clerk, at \$2,250; cashier and book-keeper, at \$2,000 each; weigh clerk, \$2,000; voucher clerk and computing clerk, at \$1,800 each; assayer's clerk, at \$1,200; in all, \$23,550."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 588, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out therefrom the words "one hundred" and insert in lieu thereof "eighty;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 595 to 603, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*Assay office at New York.*—For salary of superintendent, \$4,250; for assayer, \$3,000; for melter and refiner, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; weighing clerk, \$2,500; paying clerk, \$2,000; bar clerk, \$1,800; warrant clerk, \$2,250; two calculating clerks, \$1,800 each; assistant weigh clerk, \$1,600; for assayer's first assistant, \$2,250; for assayer's second assistant, \$2,150; for assayer's third assistant, \$2,000; in all, \$32,900."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 611 and 612, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "six" and insert "four," and strike out "four" and insert "three;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 613, and agree to the same by substituting for the amount proposed "\$2,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 615, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"*Assay office at Charlotte, North Carolina.*—For salary of assayer and melter, \$1,500; for labor and other expenses, \$500; in all, \$2,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 618, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the words proposed to be inserted insert "14,500," and add at the end of the paragraph the following: "Provided, That so much of the amount of \$25,600 appropriated by act of June 20, 1874, for per diem of members of council and house of representatives, and other officers and clerks and employees of the Legislative Assembly, as is not needed for the payment of per diem, shall be applicable to the payment of mileage of members of the Legislature, and for printing, stationery, and other incidental expenses of the Legislature and the secretary's office of the Territory for the fiscal year 1875;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 621, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:
 "Territory of Colorado.—For salaries of governor, chief justice, and two associate judges, at \$3,000 each, and secretary, at \$2,000, \$14,000: *Provided*, That said officers shall only receive their compensation on the basis of the salary aforesaid up to the time of the admission of the said Territory as a State into the Union."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 622, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:
 "Territory of Dakota.—For salaries of governor, chief justice, and two associate judges, at \$3,000 each, and secretary, at \$2,000, \$14,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 624, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:
 "Territory of Idaho.—For salaries of governor, chief justice, and two associate judges, at \$3,000 each, and secretary, at \$2,000, \$14,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 626, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof "fourteen," and add at the end of the paragraph the following as a new paragraph:

"For legislative expenses, namely: For compensation and mileage of members of the Legislative Assembly, the officers and clerks, and the contingent expenses thereof, \$20,000: *Provided*, That the next Legislative Assembly shall convene at the seat of government of the Territory on the second Monday of January, 1877, and biennially thereafter."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 627, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:
 "Territory of New Mexico.—For salaries of governor, chief justice, and two associate judges, at \$3,000 each, secretary at \$2,000, and interpreter and translator in the executive office, at \$500, \$14,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 628, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:
 "Territory of Utah.—For salaries of governor, chief justice, and two associate judges, at \$3,000 each, and secretary, at \$2,000, \$14,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 629, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:
 "Territory of Washington.—For salaries of governor, chief justice, and two associate judges, at \$3,000 each, and secretary, at \$2,000, \$14,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 630, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:
 "Territory of Wyoming.—For salaries of governor, chief justice, and two associate judges, at \$3,000 each, and secretary, at \$2,000, \$14,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 633 to 642, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:
 "For compensation of the Secretary of War, \$8,000; one chief clerk, at \$2,500; one disbursing clerk, at \$2,000; two chief clerks of division, at \$1,800 each; six clerks of class four; four clerks of class three; four clerks of class two; twelve clerks of class one; eight messengers; seven laborers; six watchmen for the Northwest Executive building; in all, \$69,380."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 645 to 650, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:
 "In the office of the Adjutant-General.—One chief clerk, at \$2,000; eleven clerks of class four; seventeen clerks of class three; forty-one clerks of class two; one hundred and fifty-one clerks of class one; eight messengers, at \$840 dollars each; in all, \$294,320."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 651, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "twelve" and insert "ten;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 653, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment after the words "chief clerk," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "At \$1,800; one clerk of class three; two clerks of class one; one messenger; in all, \$6,640;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 656 to 661, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:
 "In the Office of the Quartermaster-General.—One chief clerk, at \$2,000; seven clerks of class four; nine clerks of class three; twenty-four clerks of class two; forty-eight clerks of class one; twenty copyists, at \$600 each; one female messenger, at \$30 per month; one messenger, at \$340; two assistant messengers; six laborers; one engineer, at \$1,200; one fireman; five watchmen; and one draughtsman, at \$1,800; in all, \$152,480."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 662 to 667, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:
 "In the Office of the Commissary-General.—One chief clerk, at \$2,000; one clerk of class four; three clerks of class three; four clerks of class two; ten clerks of class one; one messenger, at \$340; two laborers; two watchmen; in all, \$23,920."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 668 to 676, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:
 "In the Office of the Surgeon-General.—One chief clerk, at \$2,000; seven clerks of class four; five clerks of class three; seven clerks of class two; ninety-two clerks of class one; one anatomist at the Army Medical Museum, at \$1,600; one engineer in division of records and museum, at \$1,400; one messenger, at \$340; twenty watchmen and laborers; in all, \$161,040: *Provided*, That the Surgeon-General of the Army is hereby authorized to detail, for temporary duty in his office, in completing the catalogue of the library, one acting assistant surgeon from those now under contract, and no additional contract shall on this account be made."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 677 to 681, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:
 "In the Office of the Chief of Ordnance.—One chief clerk, at \$2,000; two clerks of

class four; two clerks of class three; two clerks of class two; six clerks of class one; one messenger; one laborer; in all, \$20,360: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to employ in this Bureau not exceeding eight enlisted men."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 682 to 690, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"In the Office of the Paymaster-General.—One chief clerk, at \$2,000; six clerks of class four; seven clerks of class three; fourteen clerks of class two; nine clerks of class one; one messenger; two watchmen; three laborers; in all, \$58,840."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 691 to 696, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"In the Office of the Chief of Engineers.—One chief clerk, at \$2,000; four clerks of class four; three clerks of class three; three clerks of class two; three clerks of class one; one messenger; two laborers; in all, \$24,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 705, and agree to the same, with the following amendment: Strike out in lines 26 and 27, page 43 of the bill, the following: "For postage on official mail matter for the War Department and its bureaus, \$70,000," and insert the following: "For compensation of superintendents of the six buildings occupied by the War Department, at \$250 each, \$1,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 712, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "thirty-five thousand six" and insert in lieu thereof "thirty-one thousand four;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 723, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "twelve" and insert in lieu thereof "nine;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 732, 733, and 734, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amended paragraph substitute the following: "For one superintendent of the building occupied by the Navy Department, and for five watchmen and two laborers; in all, \$5,200," and strike out lines 7 and 8, page 46 of the bill; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 735 to 741, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"For compensation of the Secretary of the Interior, \$8,000; Assistant Secretary, \$3,500; chief clerk, \$2,500; eight clerks of class four, who may be paid \$300 additional if the Secretary of the Interior deem it necessary and proper; five clerks of class three; five clerks of class two; five clerks of class one, one of whom shall be the telegraph-operator of the Department; three copyists; two messengers; two assistant messengers; and four laborers; in all, \$59,700."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 742, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out in line 21, page 46 of the bill, the word "eighteen" and insert "twenty-eight," and strike out in line 23, page 46 of the bill, the words "thirteen thousand nine" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty thousand one;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 743, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "seventy-five hundred" and insert "sixty-two hundred and fifty;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 744, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the words proposed by said amendment substitute the following:

"For rent of buildings for use of the Pension Office and for the Bureau of Education, \$14,000: *Provided*, That if the Secretary of the Interior can procure a fire-proof building of suitable accommodations, for a rent not exceeding the sum hereby appropriated, he shall rent the same, to take effect so soon as the present letting can be legally terminated: *And provided*, That the lease of the present buildings shall be continued if the same shall be made fire-proof by the owners thereof to the satisfaction of the said Secretary within six months from the passage of this act, without disturbing the use of the said buildings; and that any lease made for said building shall expire on nine months' notice from the Secretary of the Interior; and in case of removal the sum of \$2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is appropriated for the cost of fitting up and removal to said fire-proof building."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 745 to 758, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"General Land Office.—For the Commissioner of the General Land Office, \$4,000; chief clerk, \$2,000; recorder, \$2,000; law clerk, \$2,000; three principal clerks, at \$1,800 each; five clerks of class four; twenty-two clerks of class three; forty clerks of class two; seventy clerks of class one; one draughtsman, \$1,600; one assistant draughtsman, \$1,400; two messengers; three assistant messengers; eight laborers; and two packers; in all, \$213,640: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, shall be, and he is hereby, authorized to use any portion of said appropriation for piece-work, or by the day, month, or year, at such rate or rates as he may deem just and fair, not exceeding a salary of \$900 per annum."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 760, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted insert "twenty-seven thousand five hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 774, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "four" and insert "two;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 775, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "seven" and insert "six;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 777 to 783, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"For contingent expenses of the office, namely: For actual expenses of clerks detailed to investigate suspected frauds and attempts at fraud, as provided by law, \$50,000; for stationery, \$6,000; for carpets, mats, furniture, awnings, and repairs of the same, \$2,000; for fuel, gas, engraving and retouching plates; for bounty-land warrants, printing and binding the same, engraving and printing pension certificates; for repairs of building, and for other necessary expenses of the office, including two daily newspapers, \$4,500; in all, \$62,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 784 to 804, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"United States Patent Office.—For compensation of the Commissioner of the Patent Office, \$4,500; for assistant commissioner, \$3,000; for chief clerk, \$2,250; three examiners-in-chief, at \$3,000 each; examiner in charge of interferences, \$2,500;

trade-mark examiner, \$2,250; twenty-two principal examiners, at \$2,500 each; twenty-two first assistant examiners, at \$1,800 each; twenty-two second assistant examiners, at \$1,600 each; twenty-two third assistant examiners, at \$1,400 each; one librarian, \$1,200; one machinist, \$1,000; five clerks of class four, (one of whom shall receive \$200 additional for services as financial clerk, and shall give bond in such amount as the Secretary of the Interior may determine;) five clerks of class three; twenty-one clerks of class two; and thirty-five clerks of class one; also for twenty-five permanent clerks, at \$1,000 each; for forty copyist clerks, at \$900 each; for three skilled draughtsmen, at \$1,200 each; for one messenger and purchasing clerk, \$1,000; for one skilled laborer, \$1,200; for six attendants in model-room, at \$1,000 each; for four attendants in model-room, at \$900 each; forty laborers, at \$720 each; for six laborers, at \$600 each; in all, \$384,900."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 805, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "eighty" and insert in lieu thereof "seventy;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 806, and agree to the text proposed to be stricken out, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "in the city of Washington" and insert "who shall receive competitive bids therefor;" and the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 808, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "thirty-five" and insert in lieu thereof "thirty;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 813, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "three" and insert in lieu thereof "one;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 814 to 825, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"For contingent expenses, namely: Stationery, \$1,500; cases for library, \$500; library, \$1,000; current educational periodicals, \$250; other current publications, \$225; completing valuable sets of periodicals and publications in the library, \$200; telegraphing and expressage, \$200; collecting statistics, and writing and compiling matter for annual and special reports, and editing and publishing circulars of information, \$8,000; fuel and lights, \$275; office-furniture, \$250; contingencies, \$500; in all, \$12,900."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 826, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "five" and insert in lieu thereof "three;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 827, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "five hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 828, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "eight thousand four" and insert in lieu thereof "five thousand five;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 829, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "six thousand" and insert in lieu thereof "four thousand;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 830, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "six thousand three" and insert in lieu thereof "three thousand six;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 831, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "six thousand three" and insert in lieu thereof "four thousand five;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 832, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "twenty" and insert in lieu thereof "twelve;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 833, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "four" and insert in lieu thereof "three;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 834, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "five thousand" and insert in lieu thereof "three thousand five hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 835, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "five thousand" and insert in lieu thereof "four thousand five hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 836, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "five thousand" and insert in lieu thereof "four thousand five hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 837, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "six thousand three" and insert in lieu thereof "three thousand six;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 838, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof "three;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 839, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "four thousand seven" and insert in lieu thereof "three thousand six;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 840, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "six thousand seven hundred" and insert in lieu thereof "four thousand;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 841, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "four thousand" and insert in lieu thereof "three thousand two hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 843 to 873, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:

"For compensation of the Postmaster-General, \$8,000; three Assistant Postmasters-General, at \$3,500 each; superintendent of money-order system, \$3,000; superintendent of foreign mails, \$3,000; topographer, \$2,500; chief of division of mail depredations, \$2,000; chief of division of dead letters, \$2,250; chief of division of postal stamps, \$2,250; superintendent of Post-Office building and disbursing officer, \$2,100; chief clerk to the Postmaster-General, \$2,200; three chief clerks to the Assistant Postmasters-General, at \$2,000 each; chief clerk to the superintendent of money-order system, \$2,000; chief clerk to the superintendent of foreign mails, \$1,800; chief of division of free delivery, \$2,100; superintendent of blank agency, \$1,800; assistant superintendent of blank agency, \$1,600; four assistants of blank agency, \$1,200 each; two assistants of blank agency, \$900 each; stenographer, \$1,800; seventeen clerks of class four; sixty-three clerks of class three; forty-eight clerks of class two; sixty-five clerks of class one; forty-seven female clerks, at \$900 each; one messenger to Postmaster-General, \$900; three messengers to Assistant Postmasters-General, \$840 each; seven assistant messengers, \$720 each; captain of

the watch, \$1,000; nine watchmen, at \$720 each; twenty-seven laborers, \$720 each; one engineer, \$1,400; one assistant engineer, \$1,000; one carpenter, \$1,200; one assistant carpenter, \$1,000; one fireman, who shall be a blacksmith, \$900; one fireman, who shall be a steam-fitter, \$900; one fireman, \$720; three female laborers, \$480 each; and for temporary clerks, \$10,000; making, in all, \$434,340."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 873 to 885, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended text substitute the following:
"For contingent expenses of the Post Office Department: For stationery, \$9,000; fuel for the General Post-Office building, including the Auditor's Office, \$7,400; for gas, \$5,000; plumbing and gas-fixture, \$3,000; telegraphing, \$3,000; painting, \$2,000; carpets, \$3,000; furniture, \$5,000; keeping of horses and repair of wagons and harness, \$1,200; hardware, \$1,300; and for rent of house numbered 915 E street northwest, \$1,500; and for miscellaneous items, \$8,000; in all, \$49,600."

And the Senate agree to the same.
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 886 to 910, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:
"For compensation of the Commissioner of Agriculture, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$1,800; entomologist, \$2,000; chemist, \$2,000; assistant chemist, \$1,400; superintendent of experimental gardens and grounds, \$1,600; statistician, \$1,800; disbursing clerk, \$1,600; superintendent of seed-room, \$1,600; librarian, \$1,400; botanist, \$1,800; microscopist, \$1,800; three clerks of class four; four clerks of class three; five clerks of class two; six clerks of class one; engineer, \$1,200; superintendent of folding-room, \$1,200; two copyists, at \$900 each; two attendants in the museum, \$1,000 each; one messenger, at \$840; two assistant messengers, at \$720 each; one carpenter, at \$960; two watchmen, and eight laborers; making in all \$64,700."

And the Senate agree to the same.
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 911, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out therefrom the word "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof "ten;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 916, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the paragraph substitute the following:
"For the purchase, by the Librarian of Congress, of new books of reference for the Supreme Court, to be a part of the Library of Congress, to be purchased under the direction of the Chief Justice, \$2,000; and the unexpended balance of \$1,000, appropriated by the act for sundry civil expenses for the fiscal year 1875, to enable the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress to procure plans for the accommodation of the Library, is hereby re-appropriated and made available for said purpose."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 923 to 935, both inclusive, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended paragraph substitute the following:
"Office of the Attorney-General.—For compensation of the Attorney-General, \$8,000; Solicitor-General, \$7,000; three Assistant Attorneys-General, at \$5,000 each; one Assistant Attorney-General of the Post-Office Department, \$4,000; Solicitor of Internal Revenue, \$4,500; examiner of claims, \$3,500; law-clerk and examiner of titles, \$2,700; chief clerk, \$2,200; stenographic clerk, \$1,800; one law-clerk, \$2,000; five clerks of class four; additional for disbursing clerk, \$200; one clerk of class two; one clerk of class one; five copyists; one telegraph operator, at \$1,000; one messenger; one assistant messenger; two laborers; and two watchmen; in all, \$72,440."

And the Senate agree to the same.
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 939, and agree to the same, with an amendment striking out the paragraph and inserting the following: "For rent of the four floors of the building occupied by the Department of Justice, \$14,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 943, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "four" and insert "three;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 945, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows: Strike out therefrom "twenty-eight thousand" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-four thousand eight hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 946, and agree to substitute for the same the following:

"SEC. 2. That the reduction in the numerical force of the officers, clerks, and employés in the several Executive Departments made necessary by the provisions of this act shall be carried into effect as follows: The number so reduced shall be discharged on the 10th day of October next, and the sum of money necessary for their compensation to the said date is hereby appropriated. And the amounts of money necessary to carry out the provisions of this act for which no specific appropriations are made are hereby appropriated; and the amounts heretofore appropriated for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses for this fiscal year, so far as the same were applicable to service which by the provisions of this act is discontinued, or to excess of compensation which by this act is reduced, shall not be deducted from the aggregate appropriations herein made for like purposes; and the sum of \$60,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated for temporary clerical service in the several Executive Departments, according to the exigencies of the public service, to be apportioned by the Secretary of the Treasury. And the President is authorized, during the present fiscal year, whenever the interests of the public service shall require it, to transfer any clerk or employé from one Department to service in another Department."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 947, 948, 949, 950, and 951, and agree to the following substitute for the section:

"SEC. 3. That whenever, in the judgment of the head of any Department, the duties assigned to a clerk of one class can be as well performed by a clerk of a lower class, or by a female clerk, it shall be lawful for him to diminish the number of clerks of the higher grade and increase the number of the clerks of the lower grade within the limit of the total appropriation for such clerical service: *Provided*, That in making any reduction of force in any of the Executive Departments, the head of such Department shall retain those persons who may be equally qualified who have been honorably discharged from the military or naval service of the United States, and the widows and orphans of deceased soldiers and sailors."

"SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to institute a careful scrutiny of the present condition and competence of the force employed in the collection of revenue from customs, with a view of reducing the number of the same."

And the Senate agree to the same.
That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 952, and agree to the text proposed to be stricken out, amended as follows: Strike out therefrom the following words: "except those for whom specific appropriations are made" and insert the following: "beyond provision made by law."

"SEC. —. That all executive officers or employés of the United States not appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, are prohibited from requesting, giving to, or receiving from any other officer or employé of the Government any money or property or other thing of value for political purposes; and any such officer or employé who shall offend against the provisions of this section shall be at once discharged from the service of the United States; and he shall also be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be fined in a sum not exceeding \$500."

"SEC. —. To enable the Secretary of the Interior to carry into effect the act of

March 3, 1875, to provide for the sale of the buildings and grounds known as the Detroit Arsenal, at Dearbornville, in the State of Michigan, by appraising and surveying the property and advertising its sale, \$1,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, postpone the time of sale to the time most advantageous to the United States.

"SEC. —. For the purpose of defraying the expenses of a survey of the Union Pacific and Central Pacific Railways between Council Bluffs, Iowa, and Sacramento, California, to be made in pursuance of the resolution of the House of Representatives passed the 12th day of July, 1876, \$10,000."

And the House agree to the same.

SAM. J. RANDALL,
W. R. MORRISON,
JOHN A. KASSON,
Managers on the part of the House.
WM. WINDOM,
W. B. ALLISON,
T. F. BAYARD,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. RANDALL. I demand the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. HOLMAN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. HOLMAN. If the House should reject this report, would it be in order for the House to concur in all the amendments to the pending bill agreed to by the conference committee except the amendments numbered 1, 2, 79, 80, and 744?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Indiana that the conference report must be agreed to as a whole. It cannot be divided.

Mr. HOLMAN. The Chair will hear me a moment. I know that this proposition cannot be submitted in the first instance. The House will have to reject the report to admit of such a proposition. That is often done. The report is rejected, and for the purpose of bringing the two Houses together it is moved to concur in all the other amendments excepting some which are specified.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The first question is of course on concurring in the report of the committee of conference.

Mr. RANDALL. On which I have demanded the previous question.

Mr. HOLMAN. If the House should not concur in this report, I give notice that I will then move concurrence in all the amendments to the bill agreed to by the conference committee, except the amendments numbered 1, 2, 79, 80, and 744.

Mr. FORT. There are others who are going to vote against the increase of salary.

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman from Indiana understands the rules, as he has been here for a long time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Indiana has the right to bring the question before the House.

Mr. RANDALL. I now insist on my demand for the previous question. If the House does not second the previous question, then I give notice I shall hand the charge of the bill over to the gentleman from Indiana.

The previous question was seconded and the main question ordered.

Mr. HOLMAN. I call for a division on concurring in the conference report.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 136, noes 15.

So the conference report was adopted.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that this question was submitted the other day to the House in the most distinct manner, and by the House the managers of the conference on the part of the House were instructed to take the action they have taken. I do not, any more than the gentleman from Indiana, consent to the amendments he has indicated, except under the instructions of the House to me as conferee.

Mr. HOLMAN. I was detained from the House on that occasion by illness. If I had been present I would have resisted the action then taken.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

COTTON CLAIMS.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I withdraw the motion to reconsider the vote by which the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury in answer to a resolution of the House calling for a list of the cotton claims was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department with accompanying statements and ordered to be printed. I have since ascertained by examination the objectionable matter was not there.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman has a right to withdraw the motion to reconsider.

NORMAN H. RYAN.

Mr. HENDERSON. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. No. 840) for the relief of Norman H. Ryan, in order that it may be put on its passage at the present time.

Mr. STONE. I object.

Mr. HENDERSON. I give notice that I shall object hereafter to all unanimous consents.

Mr. STONE. Objection was made to unanimous consent when I asked for it.

Mr. LANE. I ask unanimous consent to make a report from the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. STONE. I object.

Mr. ATKINS. I move the House adjourn.

Mr. RANDALL. I wish to modify that, so as to move that the House take a recess until Monday morning at ten o'clock. That will give six hours on Monday in case the Senate should concur in the resolution for final adjournment on that day. It is desirable to have those two hours before twelve o'clock for the purpose of enrollment.

Mr. PACKER. I hope we will take a recess until seven o'clock this evening. Many members desire to take up business and have it acted on.

Mr. ATKINS. I cannot withdraw my motion to adjourn for that purpose.

Mr. RUSK. I hope unanimous consent may be granted, so I may report another pension bill.

Mr. ATKINS. I withdraw my motion at the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. RANDALL,] and move that the House take a recess until ten o'clock Monday Morning.

Mr. PAGE. I move to amend by saying half past seven this evening.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question will be first put on the longest time.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 130, noes 11.

So the motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at five o'clock and twenty minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until Monday morning at ten o'clock a. m.

AFTER RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House re-assembled at ten o'clock a. m., (Monday, August 14.)

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. W. B. WILLIAMS, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD some remarks in relation to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing as a part of the proceedings of the House. [See Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of their clerks, informed the House that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate 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.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. No. 1594) making appropriations for the consular and diplomatic service of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. No. 1042) to provide for the publication of the report of the impeachment trial of William W. Belknap; and

A bill (S. No. 1044) making appropriations to pay judgments of the Court of Claims.

FLOYD C. BABCOCK.

Mr. STEVENSON. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table, that I may move concurrence, the bill (H. R. No. 516) for the relief of Floyd C. Babcock, with an amendment by the Senate.

There was no objection, and the bill was taken from the Speaker's table.

The amendment of the Senate was read, as follows:

In lines three and four strike out "\$556.55" and insert "\$332.65."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENSON moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senate was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

CAPTAIN W. L. FOULK.

Mr. JOHN REILLY, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back, with a favorable recommendation, the bill (H. R. No. 3862) for the relief of Captain W. L. Foulk; and the same was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

FORT HILL CEMETERY, AUBURN, NEW YORK.

Mr. JOHN REILLY also, by unanimous consent, from the same committee, reported back, with the recommendation that it do pass, the bill (H. R. No. 715) directing the Secretary of War to deliver to the Soldiers' Fort Hill cemetery, of Auburn, New York, condemned cannon and cannon-balls, to be used for monumental purposes; and the same was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

THEODORE F. HALLOCK.

Mr. JOHN REILLY also, by unanimous consent, from the same committee, reported a bill (H. R. No. 4091) for the relief of Theodore F. Hallock, late a private in Company G, Sixty-seventh Regiment Penn-

sylvania Volunteers; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. JOHN REILLY also, by unanimous consent, from the same committee, reported back adversely the following bills and executive document; and the same were severally laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed:

The bill (H. R. No. 1831) to authorize the Secretary of War to appropriate condemned ordnance for the erection of a monument to the memory of the soldiers and sailors of Orange County, New York, who fell during the late war;

Executive document, War Department, dated February 15, 1876, in relation to military bridge across the North Platte River at Fort Laramie; and

The bill (S. No. 443) for the relief of Alstorpeus Weininger.

LIZZIE IRONS.

Mr. JOHN REILLY. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table, that I may move concurrence, the bill (H. R. No. 2017) for the relief of Lizzie Irons, sister of Lieutenant Joseph F. Irons, late of the First United States Artillery, with an amendment by the Senate.

There was no objection, and the bill was taken from the Speaker's table.

The amendment of the Senate was read, as follows:

In line 5 strike out "\$512.50" and insert "\$350.50."

Mr. JOHN REILLY. The Senate has reduced the amount of the bill as passed by the House, and I move concurrence in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHN REILLY moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senate was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

JOHN J. ANDERSON.

Mr. STONE. I ask that by unanimous consent the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. No. 623) for the relief of John J. Anderson, surviving copartner of the firm of Anderson & White, and that it be brought before the House for consideration. And in making that request I ask one moment for an explanation.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection the gentleman from Missouri will be heard. The Chair hears none.

Mr. STONE. Five or six weeks ago when the House was in Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar this bill was reached, and I objected to its consideration at that time for the reason that I thought the claimant was the late John J. Anderson, of Missouri, who was engaged in the banking business and defrauded a large number of people. I have since learned from members of the Kentucky delegation that the claimant is an old farmer of Kentucky who is entitled to this relief, and that the bill is justified by the facts of the case. I therefore ask that the bill may be passed.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will read the bill.

Mr. MORRISON. I reserve my right to object.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will reserve for every gentleman the right to object until the bill is read.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill for the relief of John J. Anderson, surviving copartner of the firm of Anderson & White.

Be it enacted, &c., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John J. Anderson, surviving copartner of the firm of Anderson & White, the sum of \$2,537.83, in full of all claims of said Anderson & White, or either of them, against the Government of the United States, for cotton belonging to said firm, impressed for, and appropriated by, the authority of the Government of the United States to the defenses of Nashville in August and September, 1862, and for all damages in connection therewith.

Mr. SPRINGER. How much does this bill appropriate?

Mr. MORRISON. I must object to the present consideration of the bill. The chairman of the Committee on War Claims is not in his seat, and I must object until he is present.

Mr. STONE. I desire to have one moment to give an explanation.

Mr. MORRISON. I have no objection to that.

Mr. STONE. This bill was reported from the Committee on War Claims by the gentleman from Alabama, [Mr. CALDWELL,] and was the unanimous report of the committee. Senate bill No. 627, for the relief of Butler, Miller & Co., was predicated upon the evidence taken in the case of Mr. Anderson, and that bill has already passed the House. This bill, Senate bill No. 628, is accompanied by a long report from the Senate, No. 167. The claim has been before Congress for ten years, and from all the information I can get it is just and reasonable. The amount of this bill as originally reported was \$14,000, but it was amended by the Senate so as to reduce the amount to \$3,000. I think the bill should be passed.

Mr. MORRISON. I must continue my objection until the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. EDEN,] the chairman of the Committee on War Claims, is here.

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

SUSPENSION OF SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH JOINT RULES.

Mr. RANDALL. I ask unanimous consent to submit for consideration at this time the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives, (the Senate concurring.) That the sixteenth and seventeenth joint rules be suspended for the remainder of the session.

Mr. RANDALL. These rules relate to the transmission during the last three days of the session of bills from one House to the other and to the President on the last day of the session.

Mr. MONROE. Let them be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

16. No bill that shall have passed one House shall be sent for concurrence to the other on either of the three last days of the session.

17. No bill or resolution that shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate shall be presented to the President of the United States for his approval on the last day of the session.

Mr. RANDALL. It has not been necessary heretofore during this session to suspend these rules, because the time for the adjournment of Congress has not been fixed. It has not yet been fixed, but it may be fixed to-day, and at a time when under these joint rules bills could not be sent from one House to the other or to the President. This resolution is right; I have examined the subject carefully, and no harm can be done by adopting it. This course is always taken at each session of Congress.

The resolution was adopted.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. COOK, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported the following adversely; and they were laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. No. 3604) for the relief of David Rea, late second lieutenant First Regiment Tennessee Light Artillery Volunteers;

The petition of John Edwards, jr., late captain Third United States Cavalry, for restoration to his former rank and position.

SETTLEMENT WITH RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. COOK also, by unanimous consent, from the same committee, reported as a substitute for House bill No. 3362 a bill (H. R. No. 4092) to provide for a settlement with certain railway companies; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and ordered to be printed.

PAY OF PAGES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. ATKINS, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was read, considered, and adopted:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be directed to pay the pages their entire salary for the full month of August, out of the contingent fund of the House.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT HARRISBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. PACKER. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table for consideration at this time Senate bill No. 1006, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to use the surplus of certain moneys heretofore appropriated for a site for public buildings at Harrisburgh, Pennsylvania. It is a local bill merely, and will not take long for its consideration.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read, after which it will be in order to object to its present consideration.

The bill directs the Secretary of the Treasury, after purchasing the site and obtaining a valid title to the land authorized to be purchased for public buildings at Harrisburgh, Pennsylvania, by the act of March 3, 1875, to use any moneys left of such appropriation for the improvement of the premises so purchased, with a view to the use of the same as a post-office and for Government offices, as named in said act.

Mr. RANDALL. I will reserve my right to object until I can hear the explanation of my colleague, [Mr. PACKER.]

Mr. PACKER. Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the provisions of the act of March 3, 1875, by which the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to purchase a suitable piece of ground in the city of Harrisburgh, Pennsylvania, for the erection thereon of a building for the accommodation of the post-office and other Government offices in that city, that officer, I am informed, has secured, or is about to secure, by purchase, in part at least, and possibly by condemnation in part, sufficient ground for the purpose indicated in the act.

Upon the premises thus selected, sir, there are buildings now erected which, with comparatively small expense, can be converted into offices, and as the total cost of the site will not, it is believed, exhaust the appropriation made for that purpose, it is proposed by this bill to authorize the application of the surplus to the improvement and alteration of the buildings, so that they may be used, for the present at least, as a post-office and for other Government offices, if necessary, as proposed by the act of Congress to which I have referred.

The Government at this time is renting buildings for post-office

purposes; and if the Secretary of the Treasury is permitted to use the surplus of this appropriation for the purpose of putting in proper condition and repair the buildings now on this site, they can be used for post-office purposes and the Government will save the rent it is now paying.

Mr. RANDALL. I desire to know whether this property now proposed to be occupied has passed to the ownership of the Government?

Mr. PACKER. Not yet: but the title is, I understand, about being perfected.

Mr. RANDALL. Now I want to know further whether any appraisalment has been made of that property and whether the price has been fixed?

Mr. PACKER. A portion of it, I am advised, has been fixed by agreement.

Mr. RANDALL. There is a dispute, if I understand the case, as to the amount to be paid by the Government for this property?

Mr. PACKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANDALL. This bill would seem to me to make absolute the purchase of that property from the private owners at the prices which they may have fixed.

Mr. PACKER. Not at all. The bill only provides for the use of such surplus as there may be. If there should be no surplus after the purchase or condemnation of the site then, as a matter of course, there will be no money to be used for the purpose of improving the property.

Mr. RANDALL. If my colleague will allow me to make a suggestion, I would rather provide in this bill that the post-office shall be removed absolutely into this building at once at a rental, and not fasten upon the Government this additional property at the prices which I fear it may have to pay.

Mr. PACKER. I would be willing to meet that view if it were practicable; but my colleague will observe that by the original act no power whatever was given to lease or rent a building, while a fixed sum was appropriated for the purpose solely and exclusively of purchasing the site; and that sum cannot be increased or exceeded by the Secretary of the Treasury. If the Government cannot get the property for that amount or less, it cannot get it at all. The purpose of this bill is that if the proceedings result in securing the title for the Government, it may be able to apply whatever surplus there may be, if any, to the improvement of the premises; and my colleague will of course see that unless the title be secured for a less amount than has already been appropriated, there will be no surplus.

Mr. RANDALL. But the amount appropriated was, I understand, altogether in excess of a fair price for the property.

Mr. PACKER. It is supposed that owing to the general depreciation in the value of real estate, or from other causes, the Government may be able to get the property now proposed to be taken for a smaller sum than was at first expected. I do not know whether such will certainly be the case or not.

Mr. RANDALL. I have been apprised that the Government is asked entirely too much for this property.

Mr. PACKER. So I am also informed as to a portion of the property included in the site proposed to be taken.

Mr. RANDALL. Now I want to protect the Government without interfering at all with the construction of this building. I desire that the Government shall have the advantage of any fall there may have been in the value of the property, shall have the advantage of an appraisalment at the present actual value.

Mr. PACKER. That will be secured. If my colleague will read the bill he will see that is just what it will necessarily accomplish. As to a part of the property I understand the price has been agreed upon; as to another there has not been an agreement; and it is possible that the Government may have to resort to proceedings in court to condemn this portion. But my colleague will see at once that unless the Government keeps within the appropriation, whether by condemnation or purchase, it will be utterly impossible for it to proceed at all.

Mr. RANDALL. But I do not want, and I do not believe that my colleague wants, to run up to the aggregate amount of the appropriation.

Mr. PACKER. O, no; and there is nothing in this bill which by any possibility can be construed as conferring authority upon any one to exceed, either by purchase or appraisalment, the true and actual value of the premises to be taken under the act of 1875, whether the site now selected shall be finally secured or some other location shall be ultimately adopted by the officers of the Government.

Mr. RANDALL. I do not make any objection to the bill; but I am glad this explanation has been made, because I apprehended that the Government of the United States might be made to pay an undue price for this site. When, however, my colleague states that the bill is right, I know from his character that it must be right.

Mr. PACKER. The bill is designed to accomplish, and I feel very confident it will secure, the object my colleague seems to have in view.

Mr. RANDALL. One further suggestion: If there should be a surplus after the purchase of the site, I think it should either be returned into the Treasury of the United States or should go toward commencing the building.

Mr. PACKER. That will necessarily be so.

There being no objection, the bill was taken from the Speaker's table, read three times, and passed.

ELIZA JANE BLUMER.

Mr. BAGBY. Mr. Speaker, early in this session a bill (H. R. No. 11) granting a pension to Eliza Jane Blumer was passed by this House and the Senate, but was vetoed by the President because it was discovered that the soldier was wrongly described as having belonged to Company A, instead of Company B. I ask unanimous consent to report from the Committee on Invalid Pensions and have passed a bill in which this error is corrected.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. No. 4093) granting a pension to Eliza Jane Blumer was reported, and read a first and second time.

The bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to place upon the pension-rolls, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Eliza Jane Blumer, widow of Henry A. Bloomer, a private of Company B, Forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers.

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

MARY MOORE.

Mr. BAGBY, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported a bill (H. R. No. 4094) for the relief of Mary Moore; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARY A. SECOR.

Mr. BAGBY also, by unanimous consent, from the same committee, reported back, with a favorable recommendation, the bill (H. R. No. 1419) granting a pension to Mary A. Secor; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

EMMA M. ASHENFELTER.

Mr. BAGBY also, by unanimous consent, from the same committee, submitted an adverse report on the bill (H. R. No. 2516) granting a pension and back pay to Emma M. Ashenfelter; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

NORMAN H. RYAN.

Mr. HENDERSON. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. No. 840) for the relief of Norman H. Ryan for the purpose of putting it on its passage.

The bill was read. It authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Norman H. Ryan the sum of \$736, in full for services as storekeeper of the bonded warehouse of E. W. Dutcher, at Amboy, Illinois, from the 18th day of April, 1868, to the 15th day of October, 1868.

Mr. COX. I object.

Mr. HENDERSON. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HOLMAN. It seems very proper that some disposition should be made of the bills on the Speaker's table, and this seems to be the most favorable moment. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bills on the Speaker's table be taken up and that those of them to which no objection is made be passed and that those to which objection is made shall either remain upon the table or be referred to committees.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. PAGE. I object.

Mr. RANDALL. I call for the regular order.

Mr. COX. I withdraw my objection to the bill of the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair understood that there were several objections to the proposition of the gentleman from Indiana. [Mr. HOLMAN;] but he will again submit it to the House. He asks unanimous consent at this time to go to the Speaker's table for the purpose of disposing of all of the business thereon, and that whatever business objection is made to shall either remain upon the Speaker's table or be referred to a committee.

Mr. PAGE. I object.

Mr. RANDALL. Then I call for the regular order.

Mr. COX. I desire to offer a resolution.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania insist upon the regular order as against the resolution of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. RANDALL. I ask for the regular order because this adjournment over until ten o'clock was to enable the gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. SINGLETON,] who was on the floor, to make his speech, and unless he takes the floor now he will lose his opportunity at this session of Congress.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order is consideration of the motion of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] to reconsider the vote by which the President's message in relation to the sundry civil appropriation bill was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Mississippi is on the floor.

Mr. SPRINGER. I did not know that, but I desire an opportunity to make that motion, as I think this question has been long enough before the House.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will recognize the gentleman when the gentleman from Mississippi has concluded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Mississippi to yield to me for one moment. I wish to say that on Wednesday last I voted for the joint resolution introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LORD] in relation to the protection of the rights of citizens, but was compelled to leave the House by severe sickness before the vote was taken on the preamble to that resolution; but if I had been present I would have voted for the preamble.

Mr. COX. I ask the gentleman from Mississippi to yield to me to offer a resolution.

[Cries of "Object!"]

Mr. SINGLETON. I will yield for that purpose.

CONSUL-GENERAL AT FRANKFORT-ON-THE-MAIN.

Mr. COX. I ask unanimous consent to offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs inquire into and report at the next session upon the conduct of Consul-General Webster, of Frankfort-on-the-Main, or minister to the German Empire, in refusing to receive and forward to this Government the address of the democratic association of the city of Frankfort-on-the-Main, congratulating our country on the centennial commemoration.

Mr. CONGER. I object; I think these committees of investigation ought to have time for a little rest.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman object to the reference of the resolution?

Mr. CONGER. I understand that it is a resolution directing an investigation.

Mr. COX. It is simply a resolution that the committee shall inquire into the conduct of this officer and report at the next session. If the gentleman knew the case he would not oppose it, out of respect to the German people.

Mr. CONGER. I want to give the investigating committees a little rest.

Mr. SPRINGER. The members of the committee are more desirous of it than you can be.

Mr. RANDALL. Those who are being investigated require rest the most.

Mr. KASSON. I object to the introduction of the resolution now; let it be introduced at the next session of Congress.

PRINTING OF IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. McMAHON. I ask the gentleman to yield to me to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. No. 1042) providing for the publication of the proceedings of the Belknap trial and to put it on its passage now. It is a report that is necessary in all the public libraries of the country and also in the libraries of the lawyers of the country as a precedent in future time.

Mr. PAGE. I am willing to withdraw my objection to go to the business on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is too late, the gentleman from Mississippi having the floor.

The Senate bill was read. It provides that 5,000 additional copies of the report of the impeachment trial of William W. Belknap be printed, of which 1,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 3,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 350 copies for the use of the managers, and 200 copies for the use of the respondent's counsel; and appropriates the sum of \$5,030, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the execution of the work.

No objection being made, the bill was taken from the Speaker's table, received its several readings, and was passed.

Mr. McMAHON 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.

SUNDRY CIVIL BILL.

The House then resumed the consideration of the special order, being the consideration of the message of the President of the United States in relation to the sundry civil appropriation bill; upon which Mr. SINGLETON was entitled to the floor.

Mr. SINGLETON. Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House for a short time that I may correct some errors and misstatements which have gone to the country in relation to the late election in the State of Mississippi.

What I shall have to say will be in a spirit of kindness, and honestly to vindicate the truth of history and not to stir up acrimonious debate or kindle anew the fires of discord.

By the rules of this House I am not permitted to refer to anything which has taken place in the other end of the Capitol. To these rules, which are founded in wisdom, I bow deferentially, and shall attempt no evasion of them. But as a part of the history of the times appearing in all the newspapers of the day, in reports made to this House and the Senate, in speeches on this floor, I claim the right, as it is my duty, to repel certain charges made against my immediate

constituents, affecting to some extent my own status as a member of this body, and to explain certain misrepresentations in regard to my State generally.

The charges in the indictment preferred are "fraud, violence, and intimidation," from which, it is alleged, resulted an undue increase of the vote of the State and the overthrow of the republican party. I may premise by saying that, while these charges came in a questionable shape, avouched by no responsible party, claiming no paternity beyond that of a certain disreputable dame called rumor, I felt inclined to let them pass unnoticed, and trust to the good sense of an intelligent public to judge of the motives of those who gave them currency, and to do justice to a deeply injured and much calumniated people. But slanders of this character, originating, as they now do, from high sources, often repeated and not contradicted, like plated wares, are apt to pass with the unsuspecting for that which is genuine.

To the first of these charges, "fraud," I interpose a general and emphatic denial, so far as my own party is concerned. The badges of fraud to which attention has been directed as tending to establish the charge are, first, the fact that the republican party in Mississippi has lost its usual majority of 25,000 and the democratic ticket was elected by 30,000.

From this it is argued that great wrongs were perpetrated upon the elective franchise, tending to destroy its sacredness and sap the foundation of our Government.

Was ever proposition so preposterous advanced before an intelligent public? Was ever a charge so grave sought to be bolstered up by evidence so unsatisfactory? Is it not a fact familiar to every mind that political mutations are often more sudden and astonishing than any in the experiences of life? Have we not seen individuals and parties swept along by the current of popular opinion just as the swollen stream bears upon its bosom the drift log, whirling and dancing, with no power to resist the impetus or give direction to its own course?

We need only recur to the history of the country for a few years past to find ample proof of the statement. What meant the "tidal wave" of 1840, which hurled the democrats from power and placed General Harrison in the presidential office?

What did the people mean, when again in 1848, determined to change their rulers, they gathered up that plain, unpretentious, but brave and patriotic old soldier, General Taylor, and by acclamation lifted him into the presidential chair? What meant the elections of 1874, which crushed out the hopes of many a Representative who figured in this forum and sent him to the shades of private life? What meant the late election in Alabama by which a State until last year republican now gives a democratic majority of 40,000?

Will any gentleman dare charge these results to fraud upon the part of the people? Did not each of these spontaneous uprisings spring out of a desire for a change of rulers? Under this Government of boasted free thought, free speech, and free suffrage, are the people to be held up by discarded office-holders and presidential aspirants as fools and corruptionists because they do not choose to retain in office imbecile stipendiaries, or favor the pretensions of ambitious demagogues, who court places they are totally unfit to fill?

If these revolutions, however sudden, are to be taken as evidences of corruption and to be regarded as subjects of investigation by congressional committees, then I submit we have entered upon a Herculean task, and we had better set to work at once to divide the Congress into such committees, invest them with power to send for "persons and papers," and with each report to bring the people to the bar of this House or of the Senate to be punished or reprimanded for their bad manners or treasonable conduct in changing their opinions without the consent of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the change in Mississippi politics is no grand phenomenon outside the regular order of things. The people of that State are much like people elsewhere. They are capable of suffering in body, mind, and estate. If you prick the body of one of them with a sharp instrument the blood will flow; if you offend his moral or intellectual sense he will rebel under it and give you to understand it is offensive to him; if you seek to plunder him of his estate, he will oppose such force to it as the law of society or natural right will justify. He has affections, hopes, aspirations as other people, and when wronged in any way he knows it and will seek redress. He lives under an organic law called a constitution and has a code of statute laws governing all the domestic relations of life.

Strange as it may appear to some very well educated people who do not seem to understand us, we have a good deal of human nature about us, and are amenable to the same laws that govern other mortals.

In connection with these facts I will state others which cannot be contradicted equally important to be remembered, and which must enter largely into a just estimate of the causes of this unexpected change in Mississippi politics.

For ten years our State has been scourged by a set of men who for the most part were the refuse of northern society, in many instances without education, destitute of principle, devoid of honor, with no social status, and bent upon the spoils of office, let it involve what sacrifice it might either of their own honor, dignity, or manhood, or the safety, lives, or property of the white or colored citizens.

These men, by constant association with the newly enfranchised population, by low cunning and unscrupulous falsehood, by constant

appeals to their worst passions, by playing upon their fears of a return to slavery, by continued assurances that in the event of a race conflict they would be backed up by United States troops, by inveigling them into secret oath-bound leagues, and by every other species of falsehood and treachery that human ingenuity could devise, have managed to manipulate and control the colored vote of the State up to the last election, and have kept themselves in office against the wishes and remonstrances of the respectable, intelligent, property-holders of the country.

Their extravagant promises to the deluded freedmen were never kept; they sought the offices for plunder; a good name to them was of no value, and their robberies were so exhausting and impoverishing to all classes that they could no longer be borne. To escape these vampires and save the country from utter bankruptcy, the voters of the State, white and colored, determined to overthrow their power and put the State upon a new line of policy. In proof of what I have said I will call the attention of the House for a moment to a few figures which will speak for themselves and cannot be contradicted.

For ten years preceding the war the average annual cost of the State government was \$325,000. For the last six years of republican rule the average has been \$1,431,407. For the last five years the excess of appropriations above receipts have been an annual average of \$573,214. This annual increase of the State debt was being heaped upon us while we were paying under their tax-laws, in 1874, \$14 on every one thousand dollars' worth of property, the county and corporation taxes more than doubling the sum. Under the rule of our citizens in 1866, 1867, 1868, and 1869 the State tax did not exceed at any time \$1.50 on the \$1,000; showing that it cost us from ten to fourteen times as much to run the State government under their rule as it did under ours.

Again, under democratic rule lately inaugurated, notwithstanding our State debt, which had been largely increased by republican extravagance and must be met, the State taxes have been reduced more than one-third, although our taxable property in 1867 was assessed at \$550,000,000, whereas in 1875 it was so reduced in value by maladministration and by a forfeiture of lands to the State that the assessed value of property was reduced to \$155,000,000. The number of our circuit judges has been diminished and their salaries reduced; sinecure offices have been abolished; biennial sessions instead of annual of the State Legislature will hereafter be held; retrenchment has gone into every department of the State service; upon the public printing there will be a saving of \$52,000 at each session of the Legislature; the number of chancellors of the State has been reduced from twenty, receiving a salary of \$3,500 each, to ten with a salary of \$2,500 each, saving to the State thereby \$45,000, an amount sufficient to pay all the salaries of all other judicial officers of our State.

In addition to these facts, many others of like significance might be stated, but I will refer to only one which relates to public schools.

Under republican rule schools were required to be kept open four months in each year. By act of the late democratic Legislature the schools were required to be kept open five months, and ample means were provided for schooling all the children of the State, both white and colored.

Now, sir, are not facts like these calculated to inspire confidence in the wisdom and justice of our State officials? Is it a matter of surprise that the colored people are beginning to see where they should place their party allegiance? Can it be wonderful if further political changes occur in November next? They have occurred in our sister-State, Alabama, and you may confidently anticipate the same result in Mississippi.

But lest my statements as to the causes producing this change in Mississippi politics may be called in question, I shall introduce to this House a witness whose statements I presume will, or ought to be, satisfactory to those who are conducting this prosecution.

Senator ALCORN, a republican from Mississippi, in speaking of Governor Ames and Lieutenant-Governor Davis, of that State, as reported by the correspondent of the Chicago Times, holds the following language:

Ames's course in the State has been so obnoxious to the best people there that it has been made socially uncomfortable for the unworthy governor. He is absent from the State most of the time, and has left the local government in the hands of Davis, the black lieutenant-governor. With this man criminals have for a long time gone scot-free. Without the formality of trial, notorious murderers have been pardoned out of jail before ever being made to appear in a court of justice. One of the worst cases of this turning out of murderers upon society cited by Senator ALCORN is that of a man named Barryntine, living near the center of the State. * * * In Mississippi it is claimed that this pardon was purchased by the murderer's friends for the sum of \$800.

Senator ALCORN says that Ames obtains his control over the colored people by representing himself as the mouth-piece of General Grant. Ames has filled all the offices of the State with thieves and plunderers, so that the State that was once 30,000 republican, when it elected ALCORN governor, will in the opinion of the Senator give this fall a large democratic majority.

Here is a direct public charge of corruption preferred against the chief executive of the State and the lieutenant-governor of the same by a republican United States Senator, who understands too well the use of language and is too ready to respond to calls made upon him for words spoken to have used them lightly. I will now call to the stand the attorney-general of my State, George E. Harris, a republican of high repute in his party, elected at the same time and upon

the same ticket with Governor Ames, a strong supporter of the present Administration and fast friend of President Grant, to whom he addressed a long letter on the 24th of November, 1875, explaining the causes of the republican defeat in Mississippi at the last election. I quote largely from his letter, and ask republicans upon this floor who are fair minded and truth-loving to hear what he has to say. He is one of your own men, and not likely to state falsehoods or make untruthful admissions affecting his own party.

I have thought proper in this discussion to offer the statements of none but republicans, acknowledged to be of the highest respectability, and to introduce no democrat as a witness in support of any allegation I shall make. By this course I hope to reach the ear and heart of the unprejudiced at the North. If in this way they cannot be convinced, then would they not believe if one were to rise from the dead. But I will not despair. Already has truth found a lodgment in many a mind there, notwithstanding the persistent efforts of designing demagogues to prevent it.

But let Attorney-General Harris speak for himself. After premising with a few sentences, he says:

Governor Ames was inaugurated in January, 1874, under the most favorable auspices. His address promised economy and reform, and was well received by the whole country; even our political opponents, in a state of disruption, many of them having voted for him, expressed a willingness to support him in all that he had promised and advised; but instead of encouraging every indication of returning friendship, his cold indifference drove them at once into a direct antagonism. He seemed to contract his views and narrow his circle of friends to a few confidential advisers, as it were a close corporation of mercenary men, who knew but little of the wants of the people of the State and cared less; men who have no identity of interest or sympathy in common with the people of the State, and to deal plainly I must call names—such men as John B. Raymond, A. T. Morgan, A. R. Howe, and a few lesser lights, if possible. Raymond, the State printer, and chief clerk in the treasurer's office, lobbyist around the Legislature, especially on the printing bills, which pay him nearly \$30,000 per annum, when \$30,000 would be too much.

Morgan, who is a sheriff of Yazoo County, has long been a refugee from his county. Chairman of the late State convention and husband of a very respectable colored woman, (1) who, when a State senator, offered, in writing, to sell his vote for \$2,000 and Raymond refused to pay it, saying he had already paid him \$900 and that was enough for that vote. A. R. Howe, ex-county treasurer and ex-member of Congress, who took from the treasury of Panola County, through an ignorant colored board of supervisors and now unlawfully retains, the sum of \$5,125.97, (I have a certified transcript of the record,) and which he does not deny, but refuses to pay. This, in brief, is a small part of the record of three of the governor's confidential advisers, friends, and counselors, and he must have known their character all the while.

Through these and other friends he had full control of the Legislature and could procure almost any legislation that looked at all plausible, either for the good of the State, the good of the party, or for self-aggrandizement, and the sequel has shown how he has used that power. The first session of the Legislature passed with but little if any reform, and we felt sad. Under the constitution and laws of the State he was required to appoint twenty chancellors, with the advice and consent of the senate. This, of course, should have been done during the session of the senate; but for some reason best known to himself, he refused to do it, but waited until the adjournment and then made the appointments in vacation, and this was set aside by the supreme court, (see Brady vs. Howe, 50 Mississippi Reports, page 607,) the court holding that the appointments should have been made during the session of the senate. It was manifestly his duty to have made the appointments during the session of the senate and to have sent them in for confirmation, as the terms of office expired long before the next session. But the governor, in his desire to control the judiciary as well as the executive department of the State, resorted to the expediency of making the appointments in vacation and then holding the appointments over them *in terrore*, until the next session of the Legislature, and if they did not please him in their decrees, &c., he could withhold their names, (as he did in one case;) thus making the judiciary of the State subservient to the executive, in violation of the constitution, (see article 3, sections 1 and 2;) and he actually removed Drennan, as I believe, because in a case of *habeas corpus* he refused bail to the governor's friend Morgan, on a charge of the murder of one Hilliard.

In his selection of men to fill these important judicial positions he did not confine himself to the legal profession; made some good appointments, it is true, but in two or three instances he appointed men who had received a law license only a few days previous, for the purpose of being appointed, who had never had a case in court, were totally ignorant of the law and practice, and who did not know a plea in bar from a demurrer. In one case a man notoriously venal and corrupt, and in another case for the avowed purpose of giving strength to his friend Howe for Congress, and that chancellor, to secure the sending in of his name for confirmation, appointed Howe's brother clerk of the chancery court, and clerk of the board of supervisors of Panola County, for the express purpose of preventing an investigation of Howe's indebtedness to Panola County. In one case he appointed a Mr. Peyton, son of the chief justice, and then refused to send his name to the senate, because he decided a case contrary to the governor's wishes, and pending the trial of this case he sent for the chief justice and desired him to control the action of his son, the chancellor. This aroused the honest indignation of the chief justice and broke up the friendly relations between them.

The chief justice then dealt him a well-merited castigation, which resulted in the withholding of the name of young Mr. Peyton from the senate.

In December, 1874, troubles grew up in Vicksburg. Indictments were pending against two or three of the county officers; complaints were made as to the sheriff's bond as tax-collector; he was ill-treated and forced to resign. There was much confusion and anarchy. The sheriff fled to Jackson for advice and instructions, disregarding his resignation made under duress. I do not know all the advice the governor gave him, but the presumption is that he received advice, as he returned and acted; notified the colored people by circulars to come to Vicksburg armed on Monday morning, which they attempted to do, and nearly one hundred lives were lost in the fight. How far the governor is responsible for those lives, or whether responsible at all, I cannot say; but Colonel Wells has charged him in the papers with the use of language well calculated in its nature to produce riot and bloodshed, and he has never denied it, and I do not think he will.

Pointing out the means by which expenses could be cut off and the taxes reduced, I advised a reduction in the matter of public printing. The Legislature passed a bill and the governor vetoed it. (Raymond was State printer.)

I advised a reduction in the salary of county superintendents of education. The Legislature passed the bill and the governor vetoed it.

I advised a change in the constitution, so as to give us biennial sessions of the Legislature. (This would save nearly \$100,000 per annum.) We had pledged it in our platform; the governor had advised it in his first message. The resolution passed the lower house and went to the senate; there the governor actually lob-

bied the senate, and advised his friends to vote against it, and defeated it by one vote.

Again, in the face of the constitution, his adherents introduced a bill authorizing him to appoint the tax-collector for each county. They passed it after much canvassing in which *pistols* (I am informed by a member) were presented to force members to pledge their support to the bill. The governor approved it and acted under it in one or two cases, and the Supreme Court has set that law aside as unconstitutional. (See *L. French vs. The State*, MS. opinion.)

Thus it will be seen that the party in this State has been governed and controlled by a few men, not to exceed half a dozen, including the governor, who have persistently violated the Constitution and the most sacred pledges the party had made in its platform.

A constitution and laws are of little value on paper unless they find a lodgment in the hearts of the people. We have a good constitution, but our legislation has been unwise and has given us much trouble.

And this is the point to which we have come: In the light of the experience of other southern States our party has rushed heedlessly into a shameful defeat.

I know the people of the State, having resided among them for the last thirty-three years. The Government appointees here, we think, are good men and true republicans. We need no changes made for political purposes and no troops.

This letter, though of some length, has given but a bare outline of the character and conduct of a few would-be leaders who have wrought our sad defeat; but should they choose to deny anything I have said of them I will not only prove it, but strike them at other points that are equally salient.

Your obedient servant,

G. E. HARRIS.

I now offer some extracts from a late letter of Ex-Senator Revels (colored) to His Excellency President Grant:

HOLLY SPRINGS, MISSISSIPPI, November 6, 1875.

MY DEAR SIR: In view of the results of the recent election in our State, I have determined to write you a letter canvassing the situation and giving you my views thereon. I will premise by saying that I am no politician, though having been honored by a seat in the United States Senate.

Since reconstruction, the masses of my people have been, as it were, enslaved in mind by unprincipled adventurers, who, caring nothing for country, were willing to stoop to anything, no matter how infamous, to secure power to themselves and perpetuate it. My people are naturally republicans, and always will be, but as they grow older in freedom so do they in wisdom. A great portion of them have learned that they were being used as mere tools, and, as in the late election, not being able to correct the existing evil among themselves, they determined by casting their ballots against these unprincipled adventurers to overthrow them.

My people have been told by these schemers when men were placed upon the ticket who were notoriously corrupt and dishonest, that they must vote for them; that the salvation of the party depended upon it; that the man who scratched a ticket was not a republican. This is only one of the many means these unprincipled demagogues have devised to perpetuate the intellectual bondage of my people. To defeat this policy, at the late election men irrespective of race, color, or party affiliation united and voted together against men known to be incompetent and dishonest.

We do not believe that republicanism means corruption, theft, and embezzlement. These three offenses have been prevalent among a great portion of our office-holders; to them must be attributed the defeat of the republican party in the State, if defeat there was, but I, with all the lights before me, look upon it as an uprising of the people, the whole people, to crush out corrupt rings and men from power.

The bitterness and hate created by the late civil strife has, in my opinion, been obliterated in this State, except perhaps in some localities, and would have long since been entirely obliterated were it not for some unprincipled men who would keep alive the bitterness of the past and inculcate a hatred between the races in order that they may aggrandize themselves by office and its emoluments to control my people, the effect of which is to degrade them. As an evidence that party lines in this State have been obliterated, men were supported without regard to their party affiliations, their birth, or their color by those who heretofore have acted with the democratic party, by this course giving an evidence of their sincerity that they have abandoned the political issues of the past and were only desirous of inaugurating an honest State government and restoring a mutual confidence between the races.

His Excellency U. S. GRANT,
President of the United States.

I have quoted thus largely from Ex-Senator Revels, always a staunch republican, because he is a representative man of his color, known to the country, and more especially to those who are attempting to malign my State and cast contempt upon her name.

Mr. Speaker, one or two extracts from the pen of Redfield, the able and, I may say for the most part, impartial correspondent of the Cincinnati Commercial, himself a republican, and I leave this head. These are his words:

From what I know of the candidates nominated by the whites, I have not the least doubt but that the coming Legislature will be the best one that has assembled in Mississippi since the war. The whites really made an honest effort to bring out their best men, discarding in many instances the old line of politicians, and putting forward men of capacity, worth, intelligence, and property. Really, there was no comparison between the nominees of the two parties.

There were a few good men among the republican nominees for the Legislature, but the most of them were a sorry lot, made up of plantation negroes, white carpet-baggers, without a dollar's interest in the State, and natives who became republican one day and candidates for office the next. It was such a slate of candidates as would be repudiated in Ohio by 575,000 majority, provided your vote was as full as at your last election.

The State government has been carried on at an expense of at least 40 per cent. more than necessary, and this extravagance will be checked. In six years in Mississippi taxation has increased 500 per cent., and property has depreciated 250 per cent.

To suppose that the property-holders would rest quietly under this sort of thing, year after year, was to suppose that they had less of human nature than we find in other parts of the world.

Another badge of fraud as charged is that there was a large accession to the vote of the State.

Unfortunately for the country those who talk most about Mississippi affairs seem to know least of them. Men who have remained all their lives at a profoundly respectful distance from her borders, whose feet have never pressed her soil, in their eagerness to win po-

litical preferment for themselves or to secure a party triumph, gather up a few statistics, procure false information through interested and corrupt sources, and thus panoplied make war upon an offending State and hurl at her a tirade of abuse, couched in the vocabulary of the fish-market. Her people are called "coiners of spurious votes," "ballot-box-stuffers," and other offensive names, only because they threw off their supineness, hurried to the ballot-box, thousands of them who had abstained from voting year after year because they supposed they were to be overwhelmed by numbers and could see no good to result from casting a ballot. Thus the vote of the State was largely increased.

It is also a fact known to the most casual observer that during the last two years large numbers of colored voters have come into the State from Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, and Kentucky, and have greatly increased our voting population, especially in the counties bordering on the Mississippi River. Take, if you please, the county of Washington, where two years ago the registration-books only showed a voting population of about four thousand, whereas at the registration last fall it amounted to more than six thousand, or an increase of one-third. In this county the colored vote is in the ratio of 5 to 1 of whites; and although there was a regular republican ticket there, opposed by a fusion ticket composed of democrats and republicans, the fusion ticket, upon which your humble speaker had no place, was elected by more than four hundred majority, and my majority was only a few votes short of it. In this county a very full vote was polled, as indeed was the case in almost every county in the State.

There is no difficulty then in accounting for the increased vote of the State upon rational principles without being subjected to the imputation of fraud and corruption.

As to the charges of "violence" and "intimidation," I interpose an equally unqualified negative, with this explanation: That in some localities where there was a great preponderance of colored population and where unscrupulous leaders had poisoned their minds against us, where threats were indulged and things assumed a warlike aspect, our citizens did purchase arms and ammunition, not secretly but openly, not for aggression but for defense, not to intimidate but to keep themselves ready for any emergency that might arise.

I deny that in Mississippi there have occurred more broils and disturbances than might be considered the legitimate fruit of the new and anomalous state of things; and I most emphatically deny that in even a majority of those which have occurred the whites have been to blame. Generally the outbreaks have been sudden and unpremeditated, as in case of the Clinton riot, where there was scarcely one white man present for every one hundred colored, and in the case of the Yazoo City riot, where there were only five southern whites present in a large room well filled with white and colored republicans. The statement of these facts, which are well known to my colleagues to be true, negatives the idea of premeditated attacks. I shall not go into the minutiae of these disturbances, as the facts were published at the time of the occurrences. I will only say that as to the Vicksburg and Friar's Point riots the blame has been entirely lifted from democratic shoulders by the testimony of distinguished republicans.

I observe that my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WELLS] is in his seat. I ask his attention and the attention of the House to the following statement which he is reported to have made.

The Clerk read as follows:

HERNANDO, August 7.

Colonel G. WILEY WELLS, United States district attorney and candidate for the republican nomination for Congress in this district, made a speech here-to-day. He declared that in the interview between Governor Ames, Sheriff Crosby, and Attorney-General Harris, at the time of the Vicksburg riot, the governor instructed Crosby to arm the blacks and march against Vicksburg. Attorney-General Harris protested against the advice, and urged a resort to the courts. Crosby left with these instructions from the governor, who, after his departure, turned to Attorney-General Harris and said that the blood of twenty-five or thirty negroes would benefit the republican party in the State.

Mr. WELLS, of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SINGLETON. Yes, sir.

Mr. WELLS, of Mississippi. In regard to the report which has just been read of my speech at Hernando I have simply to say that I made a speech at that time and did make about the remarks quoted. I stated, however, that I had been informed that this conversation had taken place between Ames and Attorney-General Harris and Crosby, and that I was in favor of peace, and was opposed to any person, whether democrat or republican, who would invite a conflict between the races; that I condemned this language, and that if he were truly reported, the governor ought to be condemned, and I did then condemn him.

Mr. SINGLETON. It has never been contradicted to this day that he did make that speech; that the governor told Sheriff Crosby to go to Vicksburg; to arm the colored people and march them against the city; and that he declared to Attorney-General Harris that the blood of twenty-five or thirty negroes would benefit the republican party in the State. The fault, therefore, of that riot is not with the democratic party. It was instigated by the governor of the State of Mississippi. The sheriff, acting upon his advice, did arm these men, and marched on the city of Vicksburg; and the citizens there, in defense of their rights, of their lives, of their families, and of all that they held sacred, did meet them, and after they tried in vain to in-

duce them to return to their homes a conflict ensued, in which about one hundred persons, as charged here, were killed.

Now as to the riot at Friar's Point, I find by the testimony of Governor Ames, given before the Mississippi investigating committee, that we are acquitted of the charge of inaugurating it. He says in answer to questions propounded:

It is believed that that conflict and those murders were due to the action of Senator ALCORN. The democracy of that section were allied to him and supported him.

Question. Allied to whom?

Answer. ALCORN—following him, as reported to me by the sheriff. It was Senator ALCORN who originated that trouble and gave it countenance and head.

It has been fully proven in the investigation which was had that the democrats had no part in getting up that riot; that it was not partisan in character and had no political significance whatever.

I assert fearlessly that no proof entitled to a moment's consideration can be made or ever will be made showing that arms were purchased or used in any other way than that I have indicated.

If from this state of facts any amount of intimidation was felt by their white leaders or by the colored people, it was only because their consciences made cowards of them, and not because of any threat or demonstration on the part of democratic voters.

That there was intimidation practiced in the late election, and in all the elections which have taken place for the last ten years in Mississippi, is a fact that no man who respects the truth will deny. This intimidation sprang from a spirit of intolerance manifested by the colored voters of the republican party toward any colored man who dared to side with the democrats. Social ostracism was the penalty. Speakers of this class were dragged from the stand; church members were excluded from the pews of the church; preachers of the gospel were driven from their pulpits and silenced in disgrace. Many were beaten unmercifully and not a few killed for opinion sake, and yet no cry of intimidation then went to the country. Why, sir, this persecution went to such an extent that we found it necessary both in our platforms and in our speeches to give solemn pledges to colored voters that if they desired to vote with us they should be fully protected in the exercise of this right; and on several occasions in carrying out these promises conflicts ensued between the races, for which we were not responsible, as they were the aggressors.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the very pertinent question arises, Why has it been thought proper by certain distinguished individuals to drag this Mississippi election into the political arena? Is there any individual upon trial for a violation of the election laws before either House of Congress? If so, how does the jurisdiction accrue to either of them? Is any member's seat being contested? If so, is there not in each branch of Congress a Committee on Elections which is charged with the duty of inquiring into the whole matter? Is the case of Mississippi so anomalous that all parliamentary rules shall be lost sight of and an investigating committee be required to try the slums and cess-pools of party politics, and pluck up by the locks some foul slander which may answer as political capital for a party hard pressed and perhaps secure its ascendancy for an hour? Is all this not a political maneuver, and nothing more?

Can any legitimate practical results flow from having sent a committee to Mississippi to inquire into her late election? Can the report, whatever may be its character, be used as evidence to affect the rights of any one? Is it not entirely *ex parte* in its character? Is there not a law governing committees as it governs courts, that every man whose rights of person, property, or franchise are to be determined shall have his day in court, shall be confronted with witnesses and shall be heard by himself or counsel, or both, in his defense. In this case upon whom has notice been served? What are the issues to be tried, and what the verdict to be rendered? Whose rights are to be affected by it?

But enough of this. The eyes of the country are open to the whole movement, and it will meet its merited reward. I can envy no man his characteristics who is incapable of generosity to a fallen foe or who delights in tearing the bandages from the wounds of his victim, that blood may flow afresh. Such a man has all the materials in him to make an improved and enlarged edition of Falstaff, and an opportunity presenting itself, would gather up the body of another Harry Percy, carry it to the feet of his party, and, brandishing his self-hacked sword, cry with stentorian voice, "*Eccce signum.*" Whatever laurels he can gather upon this field let him wear them complacently. I leave him "alone in his glory," believing that time will set all things even, and posterity will award his memory the scorn and contempt it so richly merits.

During the delivery of Mr. SINGLETON's remarks the following proceedings took place:

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. JONES, of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended.

Mr. PAGE. I object.

Mr. JONES, of Kentucky. The time of gentlemen on the other side of the House has been extended by unanimous consent.

Mr. LYNCH. The House had the courtesy to extend my time, and I hope the same courtesy will be extended to my colleague.

Mr. PAGE. I withdraw my objection. My only reason for making it was because the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SINGLETON] ob-

jected the other day to an extension of time to the gentleman from Maine, [Mr. HALE.]

Mr. SINGLETON. On all occasions when I have addressed the House I have yielded to every gentleman who asked me to do so. But the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] having refused to hear me at all, that was the ground on which I made an objection in his case.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. How much time does the gentleman from Mississippi desire?

Mr. SINGLETON. How much time have I occupied?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Half an hour.

Mr. SINGLETON. I would like half an hour more.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi will be extended one-half hour if there be no objection. The Chair hears none.

Mr. SINGLETON then resumed and concluded his remarks as given above.

Mr. WELLS, of Mississippi. I was not in the House when my colleague began his remarks, and I wish to ask him this question: Is it not a fact that nearly all the leading prominent republicans of the State of Mississippi denounced the acts that are charged by gentlemen here upon this floor and by my colleague himself to have been committed and used every means to reform those abuses?

Mr. SINGLETON. I will state that some of them did. How many I cannot say. But my colleague from Mississippi on the other side of the House [Mr. LYNCH] undertook the other day to defend Governor Ames and his administration, and charged upon the democratic party that we had acted in bad faith and had persecuted and turned gentlemen out of office without just cause. The gentleman must settle that difference between himself and his colleague.

Mr. WELLS, of Mississippi. I do not rise to make any question as to that fact; but I desire to say this: That I heartily concur in what my colleague [Mr. LYNCH] said in this particular, that if Governor Ames was guilty of the charges made against him he should have been tried and impeached, as well as every other officer against whom such charges are preferred; and I did object and do now object to the position taken by the Legislature in pensioning one of the judges of our supreme court and providing for his retirement without any constitutional power to do so or any appropriation to pay him, in order to secure the appointment of a democratic judge.

Mr. HOAR. What is the rate of taxation per thousand dollars in the State of Mississippi?

Mr. SINGLETON. The State and county taxes at present amount to nine mills on the dollar.

Mr. HOAR. Nine mills on the dollar! What a dreadfully overburdened State!

Mr. SINGLETON. That is the rate under the democratic rule. We have reduced it to that from fourteen mills. We have reduced it about one-third, notwithstanding the debt heaped upon the State by the republican party.

Mr. HOAR. I have paid \$17.50 on the thousand dollars in the city of Worcester for years, and am glad to pay it.

Mr. WELLS, of Mississippi. If it has been reduced one-third, it has been done by appropriating the amount raised for the school fund by the republican party, which I understand has been distributed *pro rata* to the counties, this fund amounting to over \$60,000, and by increasing the county taxes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of their clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Enrolled Bills of the House of Representatives to make certain corrections in the enrollment of the bill making appropriations for the consular and diplomatic service of the Government; also a concurrent resolution for the appointment of a joint committee to prepare a suitable form of government for the District of Columbia; in which resolutions he was directed to ask the concurrence of the House.

SUNDRY CIVIL BILL.

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield twelve minutes to the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. SCHLEICHER.]

DANIEL W. PERKINS.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Pending that motion I ask unanimous consent to report from the Committee on the Judiciary a substitute for the bill of the House (H. R. No. 2230) for the relief of Daniel W. Perkins, of East Saginaw County, Michigan.

There being no objection, Mr. LAWRENCE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported a bill (H. R. No. 4095) as a substitute for the bill (H. R. No. 2230) for the relief of Daniel W. Perkins, of East Saginaw County, Michigan; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and ordered to be printed.

CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT.

Mr. RANDALL. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution from the Senate allowing the Committee on Enrolled Bills of the House to make certain correction in the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill.

There was no objection, and the Senate resolution was taken up and concurred in, as follows:

Be it resolved by the Senate, (the House of Representatives concurring,) That the Committee on Enrolled Bills of the House of Representatives be authorized in the enrollment of House bill No. 1394, making appropriations for the consular and diplomatic service of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes, to insert in the amendment numbered 14, after the words "fifty-two," the words "one thousand," so that the amendment will read "\$52,500;" also to insert in the bill in the amendment numbered 114, after the word "nine," the word "thousand," so that the amendment will read "\$9,500."

MEMBER SWORN IN.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I desire to present the credentials of Hon. Mr. Watterson, a member-elect from the fifth congressional district of Kentucky, who is present and desires to be sworn; and I ask that the Clerk read the certificate.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF KENTUCKY, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Frankfort, August 11, 1876.

The undersigned, a board duly authorized by law to examine the returns of a special election held on the 7th day of August, 1876, for a Representative in Congress from the fifth congressional district, to fill a vacancy occasioned by the death of E. Y. Parsons, do certify that the whole number of votes cast at said election was 12,244, of which Henry Watterson received 11,567 and W. J. Heady received 677; and that Henry Watterson having received the highest number of votes is declared duly elected.

JAMES B. MCCREERY,
Governor of Kentucky.
THOS. E. MOSS,
Attorney-General.
JOHN STODDARD THOMPSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. WATTERSON appeared, and was duly qualified by taking the modified oath.

GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CRAPO. With the permission of the gentleman from Illinois I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table a concurrent resolution from the Senate which was sent over this morning providing for a commission to prepare a uniform government for the District of Columbia.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate, (the House of Representatives concurring,) That there be appointed a joint select committee of three members of the Senate, to be appointed by the presiding officer of the Senate, and three members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the presiding officer of the House of Representatives, to prepare a suitable form of government for the District of Columbia, and to report at the next session of Congress; that said committee be authorized to sit during the recess and to employ the necessary clerical force; that the expenses of said committee be paid one-half out of the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RANDALL. This is, I understand, a proposition to appoint a joint committee to provide a government for the District of Columbia.

Mr. CRAPO. It is similar to a bill which passed this House, with this exception, that the bill provided for a commission composed of two residents of the District of Columbia and one non-resident.

Mr. RANDALL. And this resolution proposes simply to appoint a committee of Senators and Representatives, and to give them power to meet during the recess?

Mr. HOAR. I would like to inquire what has become of the report which was made by a similar committee to this House?

Mr. CRAPO. That was made to the last Congress, and not to this.

Mr. HOAR. What has become of it?

Mr. CRAPO. It never was presented to this Congress.

Mr. HOAR. My colleague will permit me to say that the last Congress appointed a committee like this, consisting of the present Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Mitchell of Wisconsin, (one of the ablest members on the democratic side of the House,) and two other members. They made a very thorough and exhaustive examination and discussion of this matter, and their report seems to solve the problem both in the matter of the proportion of taxation and the form of government, and it would have been satisfactory to the country if Congress had taken it up and discussed it; but they had never done anything about it.

Mr. SPRINGER. I only yielded to the gentleman from Massachusetts on the condition that this matter should not give rise to debate.

No objection being made, the resolution of the Senate was taken from the Speaker's table and concurred in.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

SUNDRY CIVIL BILL.

The House resumed the consideration of the motion made by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] to reconsider the vote by which the President's message in reference to the sundry civil appropriation bill was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, upon which Mr. SCHLEICHER was entitled to the floor.

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. TOWNSEND,] in taking ground against the silver bill now before the House, has argued against the use of silver as money altogether. I believe this is changing the argument to a wrong position, as in my opinion this present bill does not present the issue of the double and single standard at all. This shifting of the argument might have the

injurious effect to cause the friends of honest silver money who disagree with the gentleman to look with favor upon this present measure. Indeed, we have seen this effect already. I would like to warn gentlemen who, like myself, are opposed to the policy of demonetizing silver, that there is great danger in linking their cause with any proposition which, like the present one, has so many other objectionable features. Most of the arguments of the opponents of silver, like the able argument of Mr. HEWITT, delivered in this House several months ago, can be completely met by a re-adjustment of the ratio between gold and silver at the proper time. The history of silver as money does not present a history of frequent fluctuations, but of a few violent temporary fluctuations, followed by long periods of stability. Since the discovery of the South American silver mines, which created in the European money market convulsions like the present, there have been no violent fluctuations until quite lately. The present feeling is much in the nature of a panic. There was nearly as much of causeless fear for gold after the Californian and Australian diggings were found as there is now for silver; but many of the ephemeral writings of that period are now forgotten, and people seem to think that gold was always the same. An occasional re-adjustment of the ratio, happening perhaps once in a hundred years, is all the drawback that may be feared in retaining both metals as money.

I am in favor of a double standard. I think it is the true American policy to sustain the value of the silver which is produced by American mines. But I am in favor of giving a dollar's worth of silver for a dollar and have it coined into a dollar, and not eighty cents' worth. Gold and silver have been money as long as we have a history of civilized nations. They both have the requisite qualities for money. But we know that from time to time it has been necessary to adjust their relative ratio, as one or the other would fluctuate. Before the discovery of the South American silver mines the proportion of value in Europe was 11 to 1. It changed to 14 to 1, to 15 to 1, and in 1824 the United States made it 16 to 1, which proved to be too much and drove the silver dollars out of circulation.

There was no change since until lately through various causes silver has lost in value until the weight of silver in the dollar in 1834 would now only be worth about eighty cents and less. A change of standard is evidently again required, but it would be altogether hazardous and guess-work to attempt to establish that new standard in the midst of the present violent fluctuations. We are fortunately situated in not being now affected by these changes of value like the English in India and like the double-standard countries, and we can well afford to wait until the new ratio can be more definitely ascertained.

In my opinion it should be the work of an international commission in which all the governments participate who recognize silver as money.

But the idea of now declaring eighty cents' worth of silver a legal tender for a dollar is contrary to every dictate of strict honesty and of prudence. Why it is not honest it is not necessary now to argue. That it is imprudent and instead of alleviating the burdens of our taxpayers will increase them is the main and only practical argument now. If we had the money to pay off the principal of our bonds or any considerable part of them at eighty cents on the dollar, as this bill declares we have the right to do, then there might be an argument about the prudence of doing so, although the honesty would be very questionable; but when we have nothing to pay off our public debt or any respectable portion of it, even at such a discount, the only possible result of the present agitation is the proclamation of our bad faith and consequently a lowering of our credit. We say to our creditors: "We would cheat you now if we could pay you off, but as we have no money to do that, we must continue to ask you to extend credit to us and bide our time." Glorious way that of reducing the interest on our public debt. It seems to me that ordinary prudence would dictate that as long as we have nothing to pay with, it is useless to threaten what we would do if we could, and that we should rather feign the virtue honesty, even if we do not possess it, so as to obtain good credit, which means low interest.

If we had continually expressed ourselves in favor of strict honesty and a compliance with all obligations—which would have cost us nothing—our credit might be now so that we could fund our debt at 4 per cent. interest instead of 6. England pays 3 per cent.; we pay 6 only because we have a worse credit. Had we succeeded in inspiring the world with a belief in our honesty we might now save at least thirty millions a year in the gold interest on our bonds. But when one day this Congress votes to investigate the validity of the act of 1869, upon which our present credit rests, and if on another day it votes to declare that we have a right to pay our debt with eighty cents' worth of silver to the dollar, how can we expect to retain even our present credit, let alone improving it?

Gentlemen may say we need no credit now. What fallacy! I have said we might, if we had had statesmanship enough to improve our credit, save at least thirty millions per annum by refunding at a lower interest. But apart from that, do gentlemen reflect that only five years hence the principal of the twenty-year bonds of 1862 will begin to fall due? How shall we pay? We can only pay by selling new issues of bonds. What interest we shall have to pay for them depends solely upon what credit we establish in the mean time.

With prudence and honesty we might get it down to 4 per cent. at least, but with such proceedings as these we may have to pay 10 or 12 per cent.

Is this the way the champions of the tax-payers are going to lighten our burdens? To increase the annual interest of our public debt instead of reducing it?

The great and central heresy around which cluster all minor errors is the idea that government can create values by law. We must get clear of that before we can ever act understandingly.

When James II was expelled from England and established himself in Ireland he coined money of brass and made it a legal tender. He tried to extricate himself from his financial troubles, as Macaulay says, "by calling a farthing a shilling." I refer to Macaulay's pages for a description of the results. "Of all the plagues of that time," he says, "none made a deeper or more lasting impression than the plague of the brass money."

I confess my inability to perceive the difference in the principle of the acts of James and the schemes of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDERS] or the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. KELLEY.] The difference is in degree only. To call a lump of brass a dollar and stamp it so, or to call a promise to pay on a piece of paper a dollar and stamp it so, or to call seventy or eighty cents' worth of silver a dollar and force people to take either of the articles so stamped at their nominal value in exchange for real values, is all the same in principle and differs only in degree.

The arbitrary power which in any country can enforce and impose worthless paper or debased metal or an insufficient quantity of valuable metal on its own people under the fiction that the coinage or inscription gives it value ceases at once when it crosses its own border and is forced to fair dealing. But in modern times it has been considered shameful for a government to practice such impositions on its own people simply because it has the power, or on its creditors because by trusting in its honesty they have placed themselves in its power. Enlightened governments deal as fairly with their own people as they have to deal with strangers, and the stamp on a gold or silver coin should be a certificate of its weight and fineness, no more; not making the value nor adding to the value, but a ready proof of the value only. I am opposed to stamping a false certificate of value on our silver coins.

Bad faith in a government is a poison that tends to corrupt the whole body-politic, destroys confidence, and thereby paralyzes all the recuperative energies of the people.

I have a few moments left and will yield them to the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. BANKS.]

Mr. MORRISON. I move that the House adjourn.

Mr. BANKS. The gentleman from Illinois wishes to make that motion; I do not object, and will yield the floor for that purpose.

The question was taken on Mr. MORRISON'S motion, and it was agreed to; and accordingly (at eleven o'clock and fifty-five minutes a. m.) the House adjourned.

IN SENATE.

MONDAY, August 14, 1876.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. BYRON SUNDERLAND, D. D.

On motion of Mr. SPENCER, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was dispensed with.

COAST SURVEY REPORTS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives, (the Senate concurring.) That 1,000 extra copies of the report of the Superintendent of the Coast Survey for the year ending June 30, 1874, and that the same number of copies of his report for the year ending June 30, 1875, be printed for distribution by the Superintendent of the Coast Survey.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented the petition of J. W. Carhart, mayor of the city of Hot Springs, Arkansas, in the name of four thousand citizens living upon the Hot Springs reservation, praying for the passage of the joint resolution introduced by Senator DORSEY in relation to the collection of water and house rent by the United States thereon; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CORRECTION OF ERRORS IN ENROLLMENT.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask once more that the House bill in relation to the pavement of Pennsylvania avenue be taken up for consideration.

Mr. SARGENT. I want to present a concurrent resolution in the nature of a report from the Committee on Appropriations. The passage of a concurrent resolution is necessary in order to correct the enrollment of the consular bill, and it ought to be passed at once.

Mr. MORRILL. Very well.

Mr. SARGENT. I submit the following resolution:

Resolved by the Senate, (the House of Representatives concurring.) That the Committee on Enrolled Bills of the House of Representatives be authorized in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. No. 1594) making appropriations for the consular and diplomatic service of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes, to insert in the bill, in the amendment numbered 14, after the words "fifty-two" the word "thousand," so that the amendment will read "\$52,500;" also, to insert in the bill, in the amendment numbered 114, after the word "nine," the word "thousand," so that the amendment will read "\$9,500."