

ner, deceased, and of Jesse Brammer, deceased, of Mercer County; of William R. Linsay, of Greenbrier County; of Henry Gunn, of Pocahontas County; of Sarah A. Busher, administrator of William B. Busher, deceased, asking that their war claims be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of J. D. Coleman, of Fayette County, West Virginia, praying that his war claim be referred to the Court of Claims—to the same committee.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of certain men employed in the Quartermaster's Department, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Petition of 14 citizens of Pittsville, Wood County, Wisconsin, favoring the continued coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, memorial from the village board of Baldwin, Wis., on the subject of interstate commerce—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. STORM: Papers in the case of La Grange Synodical College, of La Grange, Tenn., for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. M. TAYLOR: Memorial of C. M. Merwin, president, and John T. Stark, E. H. Keely, and Dr. T. J. Dupree, committee of the West Tennessee Horticultural Society, asking for reduced rates of postage on scions, plants, seeds, &c.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ZACH. TAYLOR: Petition of A. B. Rodgers, M. E. Gibson, A. L. Rodgers, heirs of James L. Rodgers, deceased, of Shelby County, Tennessee, asking that their war claim be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOOLE: Memorial of Knights of Labor of Garrison, Mont., asking liberal appropriations for internal improvements—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. TUCKER: Petition of citizens of Virginia for the increase of salaries of judges—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN SCHAICK: Petition of Joseph Case, with evidence supporting his application to be restored to the pension-rolls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of citizens of Milwaukee interested in the manufacture of window glass, protesting against any reduction of tariff rates—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VIELE: Petition and papers for the relief of Alexander Hamilton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. A. J. WARNER: Petition of Lewis C. Wescott and 43 others, citizens of Bellaire, Ohio, against reduction of duties on glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. J. B. WEAVER: Petition of Knights of Labor of Oskaloosa, Iowa, against the passage of the free-ship bill—to the Select Committee on American Ship-building and Ship-owning Interests.

Also, petition of Edward S. Cramp club of workingmen, of Philadelphia, against admitting foreign ships to registry—to the same committee.

Also, petition of M. C. Randleman, of Iowa, and 50 others, praying Congress to pass the bill paying Union soldiers the difference between gold and the depreciated currency they were paid in—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEBER: Petition of citizens of Erie and Wyoming Counties, New York, asking for legislation to protect the dairy interests against imitation and adulteration—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of Louisa Ladd, for the reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON: Petition of William R. Cook; of George W. Cockrell; of Coleman Brothers; of George Shaw; of Joseph L. Roberts; of Mildred W. Payne, of Jefferson County; of William C. Price, administrator of E. Butcher, deceased, of Randolph County; and of William H. Stingley, of Hardy County, West Virginia, praying that their claims be referred to the Court of Claims—to the same committee.

Also, papers relating to the claims of Daniel Coalman; of George W. Cockrell; of John Cook; of Joseph L. Roberts; of Isaac V. Burns, and of George Shaw, of Jefferson County, West Virginia—to the same committee.

By Mr. WOODBURN: Petition of real-estate owners and residents in the District of Columbia, in behalf of the passage of House bill 4694, incorporating the Washington Traction Railway Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of John B. Williams and 57 others, of Reno, Nev., for an amendment giving the right of suffrage to women—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The following petitions, praying Congress to place the coinage of silver upon an equality with gold; that there be issued coin certificates of one, two, and five dollars, the same being made a legal tender; that one and two dollar legal-tender notes be issued, and that the public debt be paid as rapidly as possible by applying for this purpose the idle surplus now in the Treasury, were presented and severally referred to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures:

By Mr. J. B. WEAVER: Of T. W. Stone and 150 others, of Kansas; and of J. F. Howman and 150 others, of Iowa.

The following petitions, praying Congress for the enactment of a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools of the

District of Columbia, in the Territories, and in the Military and Naval Academies, the Indian and colored schools supported wholly or in part by money from the national Treasury, were presented and severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. FORAN: Of O. D. Fisher and others, of Chagrin Falls, Ohio.  
By Mr. GOFF: Of Rev. L. L. Stewart and others, of Marshall and Brooke Counties, West Virginia.

By Mr. LAIRD: Of Rev. Mark Noble and 170 others, citizens of Fairbury, Kans.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 6, 1886.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

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

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 807) granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

HENRY O. HILL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 683) granting a pension to Henry O. Hill.

The amendment of the House of Representatives was, in line 5, after the word "New Hampshire," to insert the word "Cavalry;" so as to read: "First New Hampshire Cavalry Volunteers."

Mr. BLAIR. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The amendment was concurred in.

MRS. ADALINE M. PUTNAM.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 814) granting a pension to Mrs. Adaline M. Putnam.

The amendment of the House of Representatives was, in line 7, to strike out the word "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to read: "At the rate of \$30 per month."

Mr. BLAIR. I move that the Senate concur in that amendment.

The amendment was concurred in.

Mr. BLAIR. Does that pass the bill?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That passes the bill.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Interior relative to an appropriation for payment of damages to Chippewa Indians in Minnesota arising from the construction of reservoirs at the headwaters of the Mississippi River; which, with the accompanying papers, was, on motion of Mr. DAWES, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair presents the petition of Casper Kramer, late a private in Company D, Sixty-first New York Volunteers, written in German, accompanied by his original certificate of discharge, praying for \$200 bounty and land. If there be no objection the petition will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CAMERON presented a memorial of civilian clerks of the Quartermaster's Department of the Army at Saint Paul, Minn., remonstrating against the adoption of certain provisions in the Army appropriation bill reducing their pay; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the A. C. Harmer Club, of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the admission of foreign-built ships to American registry; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition signed on behalf of the Friends' temperance conference held at Kennett Square, Chester County, Pennsylvania, and 34 other citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the prohibition of the alcoholic liquor traffic in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition signed on behalf of the Friends' temperance conference held at Kennett Square, Chester County, Pennsylvania, and 24 other citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of a joint resolution proposing an amendment of the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the manufacture, importation, and sale of all alcoholic beverages throughout the national domain; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition signed on behalf of the Friends' temperance conference held at Kennett Square, Chester County, Pennsylvania, and 34 other citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the appointment of a commission of inquiry concerning the alcoholic liquor traffic; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. I present a resolution adopted by the Saint Paul (Minn.) Chamber of Commerce, commending the Cullom Senate bill to

regulate interstate commerce to the careful consideration of Congress as in nearly all respects preferable to the Reagan House bill. This resolution, though in the nature of a petition, is not addressed to the Senate and House of Representatives, but is evidently intended for the consideration of Congress. I therefore present it as a petition and move that it lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TELLER presented petitions of Knights of Labor of Stout and Williamsburg, in the State of Colorado, praying that liberal appropriations be made for works of internal improvement, and especially for the construction of the Henhepin Canal; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. JACKSON presented a memorial of Knights of Labor at Nashville, Tenn., remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. COCKRELL presented memorials of Knights of Labor of Saint Louis, Warrensburg, and Festus, in the State of Missouri, remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CAMDEN presented memorials of Knights of Labor of Cross and Elk Garden, in the State of West Virginia, and memorials of Knights of Labor of Marion and Brooke Counties, in the State of West Virginia, remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of Knights of Labor of Rockport, Mass., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a harbor of refuge at Sandy Bay, Rockport, Mass.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the State Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Massachusetts, representing 6,000 members, praying for appropriate legislation providing penalties for seduction in the District of Columbia and other localities; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. ALLISON presented memorials of Knights of Labor of Des Moines, Angus, Lehigh, Davenport, Oskaloosa, and Clarinda, in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, presented memorials of Knights of Labor of Cincinnati and Avery, in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BLAIR. I present a memorial prepared to represent the sentiments of a mass meeting of the women of Utah, assembled from all parts of the Territory, in which they set forth their grievances in the operation of some existing United States laws, and pray for redress. I find it difficult to epitomize the memorial, and, as it is of very general interest, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD. It is not of great length.

The memorial was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*To the honorable the President, the Senate, and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

GENTLEMEN: We, your memorialists, respectfully represent that at a mass meeting of the women of Utah, held in the theater, Salt Lake City, March 6, 1886, attended by over two thousand ladies, representing the wives, mothers, sisters, and daughters of the whole Territory, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Preamble and resolutions of the women of Utah in mass meeting assembled.

"Whereas the rights and liberties of women are placed in jeopardy by the present cruel and inhuman proceedings in the Utah courts, and in the contemplated measure in Congress to deprive the women voters in Utah of the elective franchise; and

"Whereas womanhood is outraged by the compulsion used in the courts of Utah to force mothers on pain of imprisonment to disclose their personal condition and that of their friends in relation to anticipated maternity, and to give information as to the fathers of their children; and

"Whereas these violations of decency have now reached the length of compelling legal wives to testify against their husbands without their consent, in violation both of written statutes and the provisions of the common law: Therefore,

"Be it resolved by the women of Utah in mass meeting assembled, That the suffrage, originally conferred upon us as a political privilege, has become a vested right by possession and usage for fifteen years, and that we protest against being deprived of that right without process of law, and for no other reason than that we do not vote to suit our political opponents.

"Resolved, That we emphatically deny the charge that we vote otherwise than according to our own free choice, and point to the fact that the ballot is absolutely secret in Utah as proof that we are protected in voting for whom and what we choose with perfect liberty.

"Resolved, That as no wife of a polygamist, legal or plural, is permitted to vote under the laws of the United States, to deprive non-polygamist women of the suffrage is high-handed oppression for which no valid excuse can be offered.

"Resolved, That the questions concerning their personal condition, the relationship they bear to men marked down as victims to special law, and the paternity of their born and unborn children, which have been put to women before grand juries and in open courts in Utah, are an insult to pure womanhood, an outrage upon the sensitive feelings of our sex, and a disgrace to officers and judges who have propounded and enforced them.

"Resolved, That we honor those noble women who, standing upon their rights and refusing to reply to improper and insulting questions such as no true man nor any court with any regard for propriety would compel them to answer, have gone to prison and suffered punishment, without crime, rather than betray the most sacred confidence and yield to the brutal mandates of a little brief authority.

"Resolved, That the action of the district attorney and the chief-justice of Utah in compelling a lawful wife to testify for the prosecution in a criminal case in-

volving the liberty of her husband, and in face of her own earnest protest, is a violation of laws which those officials have sworn to uphold, is contrary to precedent and usage for many centuries, and is an invasion of family rights and of that union between husband and wife which both law and religion have held sacred from time immemorial.

"Resolved, That we express our profound appreciation of the moral courage exhibited by Senators CALL, MORGAN, TELLER, BROWN, and others, and also by Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood, who, in the face of almost overwhelming prejudice, have defended the constitutional rights of the people of Utah.

"Resolved, That we extend our heartfelt thanks to the ladies of the Woman Suffrage Association assembled in Boston, and unite in praying that God may speed the day when both men and women shall shake from their shoulders the yoke of tyranny.

"Resolved, That we call upon the wives and mothers of the United States to come to our help in resisting these encroachments upon our liberties and these outrages upon our peaceful homes and family relations, and that a committee be appointed at this meeting to memorialize the President and Congress of the United States in relation to our wrongs, and to take all necessary measures to present our views and feelings to the country."

The following ladies were selected as a committee to draught and present a memorial to the President and Congress: Mrs. S. M. Kimball, Mrs. E. S. Taylor, Dr. R. B. Pratt, Mrs. M. I. Horne, Salt Lake City; Mrs. Mary John Provo; Mrs. Mary Pitchforth, Nephi; Mrs. H. C. Brown, Ogden; Miss Ida I. Cook, Logan; Miss Ida Coombs, Payson.

In pursuance of this appointment, we present the following in behalf of the women of Utah:

On the 23d of March, 1882, an act of Congress was passed which is now commonly known as the Edmunds law. It was generally understood to have been framed for the purpose of settling what is called the Utah question, by condoning plural marriages up to that date and preventing their occurrence in the future, and also to protect the homes, maintain the integrity of the family, and shield innocent women and children from the troubles that might arise from its enforcement. But instead of being administered and executed in this spirit, it has been made the means of inflicting upon the women of Utah immeasurable sorrow and unprecedented indignities, of disrupting families, of destroying homes, and of outraging the tenderest and finest feelings of human nature.

The law has been so construed by the courts as to bring its penalties to bear upon the innocent. Men who had honestly arranged with their families so as to keep within the limits of the law have been punished with the greatest possible severity, and their wives and children have been forced before courts and grand juries, and compelled to disclose the most secret and private relations which in all civilized countries are held sacred to the parties.

The meaning of the law has been changed so many times that no one can say definitely what is its signification. Those who have lived by the law, as interpreted in one case, find as soon as they are entrapped that a new rendering is constructed to make it applicable to their own. Under the latest ruling a man who has contracted plural marriages, no matter at how remote a date, must not only repudiate his families and cease all connection with them, but if he is known to associate with them in the most distant manner, support them and show any regard whatever for their welfare, the offense of unlawful cohabitation is considered to have been fully established, and he is liable to exorbitant fines and imprisonment for an indefinite period, one district judge holding that a separate indictment may be found for each day of such association and recognition. In the case of Solomon Edwards, recently accused of this offense, it was proven by the evidence for the prosecution that the defendant had lived with one wife only since the passage of the Edmunds act, but after having separated from his former plural wife he called with his legal wife at the former's residence to obtain a child, an agreement having been made that each party should have one of the two children, and the court ruled that this was unlawful cohabitation in the meaning of the law, and defendant was convicted.

In the case of Lorenzo Snow, now on appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, the evidence for the prosecution showed that the defendant had lived with only one wife since the passage of the Edmunds law; that he had not even visited other portions of his family, except to call for a few moments to speak to one of his sons; but because he supported his wives and children and did not utterly and entirely cast them off, under instructions of Judge Orlando W. Powers, he was convicted three times for the alleged offense, and sentenced in each case to the full penalties of the law, aggregating \$900 fine, besides costs, and eighteen months' imprisonment, the judge stating in his instructions to the jury, "It is not necessary that the evidence should show that the defendant and these women, or either of them, occupied the same bed, slept in the same room, or dwelt under the same roof. The offense of cohabitation is complete when a man, to all outward appearances, is living or associating with two or more women as his wives."

Thus women who are dependent upon the men whom they regard as their husbands, with whom they have lived, as they have regarded it, in honorable wedlock, must not only be separated from their society and protection, but must be treated as outcasts, and be driven forth with their children to shame and distress; for the bare "association" of friendship is counted a crime and punished with all the severity inflicted upon those who have not in any way severed their plural family relations.

In order to fasten the semblance of guilt upon men accused of this offense women are arrested and forcibly taken before sixteen men and pled with questions that no decent woman can hear without a blush. Little children are examined upon the secret relations of their parents, and wives in regard to their own condition and the doings of their husbands. If they decline to answer, they are imprisoned in the penitentiary as though they were criminals. A few instances we will cite for your consideration:

In the third district court, November 14, 1882, Annie Gallifant, having been asked by the grand jury a number of questions which she declined to answer, one of them being as to the name of the man to whom she was married, she was brought into court, and still declining, was sent to the penitentiary, where, although daily expecting to become a mother, she was kept until the grand jury was discharged. On the trial of John Connelly she was again brought into court and asked, "When did you first cohabit with your husband?" "How long after you commenced cohabiting with your husband was it that your child was born?"

Miss B. Harris was sentenced to fine and imprisonment in the second district court at Beaver, by Judge Twiss, because she declined to answer whether she was a married woman, and if so, who was her husband. She was taken to the penitentiary, a building used for the confinement of criminals of the most hideous types, with her babe in her arms and leaving one behind with her mother. When asked the questions mentioned by the grand jury she answered, "Gentlemen, you have no legal right to ask this question, and I decline to answer it."

The question was an insult and a vile insinuation of departed virtue; and yet were she a public prostitute no such question would ever be asked. She was fined \$25 and imprisoned three and a half months, when she was released by Judge Twiss. She is a lady, with strength of character, who was defending a principle; her right as a witness was as sacred as any rights recognized in courts. She was a martyr to personal right and in defense of a vital principle of freedom. The question was not directed to her knowledge of any crime, but to her social relation to another, she not being charged with any crime.

On May 22, 1884, in the same court, Nellie White, for refusing to answer personal questions in regard to her relations with Jared Roundy, was sent to the

penitentiary, under the same roof with murderers, burglars, and other convicts, and confined there until July 7, the grand jury being kept over and not discharged for the purpose of protracting her imprisonment until the beginning of a new term.

In the court of United States Commissioner McKay, June 20, 1885, Elizabeth Ann Starkey was brought in as a witness against Charles S. White. On refusing to answer the question, "Have you ever in this country, within the last two years, occupied the same bed with defendant?" she was sentenced to one day's imprisonment and a fine of \$50, and placed in the custody of the United States marshal until payment.

On June 22 she again declined to answer, and was fined \$100 and committed until payment.

On June 24 she refused to answer similar personal questions to the grand jury, and was committed to the penitentiary until August 21, but was again imprisoned and kept till October 6. While in prison she was approached and grossly insulted by an employé of the marshal.

On the 15th of September, 1885, Eliza Shafer was sent to the penitentiary for refusing to answer the question, "Have you, within three years last past, lived and cohabited with J. W. Snell as his wife?" The court ordered her imprisonment until the question was answered.

On February 15, 1886, Mrs. Martha J. Cannon was brought into the third district court, and the grand jury complained that she would not answer certain questions, among them the following: "Are you not now a pregnant woman?" "Are you not now with child by your husband, George Q. Cannon?" On still declining to answer the court adjudged her guilty of contempt, and pending sentence she was placed under bonds of \$2,500, which were subsequently raised to \$5,000.

On March 2, 1886, Miss Huldah Winters was arrested by Deputy Marshal Vandercook at her home in Pleasant Grove, 40 miles distant, no charge being preferred against her, but it was suspected that she was a plural wife of George Q. Cannon. She was brought to Salt Lake City and conducted to the court-house, where she was required to furnish bonds for \$5,000 for her appearance from time to time as she might be wanted.

Under the suspicion that any woman or young lady is some man's plural wife she is liable at any time to be arrested, not merely subpoenaed, but taken by force by deputy marshals and brought before a grand jury, and examined and browbeaten and insulted by the prosecuting attorney or his minions. But this is not all. In defiance of law and the usages of courts for ages, the legal wife is now compelled to submit to the same indignities.

On February 20, 1886, in the third district court, in the second trial of Isaac Langton, upon whom the prosecution had failed to fasten the slightest evidence of guilt, Prosecuting Attorney Dickson exclaimed, "If the court will allow me, I would like to call Mrs. Langton" (defendant's legal wife). After a strong protest from the attorneys for the defendant the court permitted the outrage, and against her and her husband's consent she was compelled to testify for the prosecution, the evidence, however, completely exonerating the husband, who was discharged.

But this has now been set up as a precedent, and within the past few days a legal wife has been taken before the grand jury, as many have been before, who refused to give evidence, but this time was compelled to answer the questions propounded by the public prosecutor against the lawful husband.

We also direct your attention to the outrages perpetrated by rough and brutal deputy marshals, who watch around our door-yards, peer into our bed-room windows, ply little children with questions about their parents, and, when hunting their human prey, burst into people's domiciles and terrorize the innocent.

On January 11, 1886, early in the morning, five deputy marshals appeared at the residence of William Grant, American Fork, forced the front door open, and while the inmates were still in bed made their way upstairs to their sleeping apartments. There they were met by one of the daughters of William Grant, who was aroused at the intrusion, and despite her protestations, without giving time for the object of their search to get up and dress himself, made their way into his bed-room, finding him still in bed, and his wife *en déshabillé* in the act of dressing herself.

Early on the morning of January 13, 1886, a company of deputies invaded the peaceful village of West Jordan, and, under pretense of searching for polygamists, committed a number of depredations. Among other acts of violence they intruded into the house of F. A. Cooper, arrested him, and subpoenaed his legal wife as a witness against him. This so shocked her that a premature birth occurred next day, and her system was so deranged by the disturbance that in a few days she was in her grave.

February 23, 1886, at about 11 o'clock at night, two deputy marshals visited the house of Solomon Edwards, about 7 miles from Eagle Rock, Idaho, and arrested Mrs. Edwards, his legal wife, after she had retired to bed, and required her to accompany them immediately to Eagle Rock. Knowing something of the character of one of the deputies, from his having visited the house before, when he indulged in a great deal of drinking, profanity, and abuse, she feared to accompany them without some protection, and requested a neighbor to go along on horseback while she rode in the buggy with the two deputies. On the way the buggy broke down, and she, with an infant in her arms, was compelled to walk the rest of the distance—between 2 and 3 miles.

They could have no reason for subpoenaing her in the night and compelling her to accompany them at such an untimely hour, except a fiendish malice and a determination to heap all the indignities possible upon her because she was a "Mormon" woman, for she never attempted to evade the serving of the warrant and was perfectly willing to report herself at Eagle Rock the next day. She was taken to Salt Lake City to testify against her husband.

On February 23, 1886, Deputy Marshals Gleason and Thompson went to Greenville, near Beaver, Utah. The story of their conduct is thus related by the ladies who were the subjects of their violence:

**Mrs. Easton's statement:**

About 7 a. m. deputies came to our house and demanded admittance. I asked them to wait until we got dressed and we would let them in. Deputy Gleason said he would not wait, and raised the window and got partly through by the time we opened the door, when he drew himself back and came in through the door. He then went into the bed-room; one of the young ladies had got under the bed, from which Gleason pulled the bedding and ordered the young lady to come out. This she did, and ran into the other room, where she was met by Thompson. I asked Gleason why he pulled the bedding from the bed, and he answered: "By G—d, I found Watson in the same kind of a place." He then said he thought Easton was concealed in a small compass, and that he expected to find him in a similar place, and was going to get him before he left.

**Miss Morris's statement:**

Deputy Gleason came to my bed and pulled the clothing off me, asking if there was any one in bed with me. He then went to the fire-place and pulled a sack of straw from there and looked up the chimney. One of them next pulled up a piece of carpet, when Gleason asked Thompson if he thought there was any one under there. Thompson said "No," and Gleason exclaimed, "G—d d—n it, we will look anyway!" They also looked in cupboards, boxes, trunks, &c., and a small tea-chest, but threw nothing out.

**William Thomas's statement:**

The deputies called at our place about daybreak, and came to my window and rapped. I asked who was there, but received no answer. They then tried to raise the window, when I called again, and they said they were officers. I asked

them to wait until I was dressed, but they said: "No; we will break in the door." I told them they had better let that alone, and they went around to mother's door, which was opened, and father was summoned. The deputies next went to the bed of Mrs. Elliotts and subpoenaed her. Gleason said, with a frightful oath, that he knew there was another woman in the house, and searched in boxes, trunks, &c.

These are a few instances of the course pursued toward defenseless women, who are not even charged with any offense against the law. We solemnly protest against these desecrations of our homes and invasions of our rights. We are contented with our lot when left unmolested, and would enjoy the peace of quiet homes, the society of our husbands and children, and the blessings that only belong to God-fearing families trained to habits of thrift, temperance, self-restraint, and mutual help, if it were not for these outrages which are committed in the name of law, under the false pretense of protecting home and preserving the family.

We learn that measures are in contemplation before your honorable bodies to still further harass and distress us. We protest against the movement to deprive us of the elective franchise, which we have exercised for over fifteen years. What have we done that we should thus be treated as felons? Our only crime is that we have not voted as our persecutors dictate. We sustain our friends, not our enemies, at the polls. We declare that in Utah the ballot is free. It is entirely secret. No one can know how we vote unless we choose to reveal it. We are not compelled by any men or society or influence to vote contrary to our own free convictions. No woman living with a bigamist, polygamist, or person cohabiting with more than one woman can now vote at any election in Utah. Why deprive those against whom nothing can be charged, even by implication, of a sacred right which has become their property?

We ask for justice. We appeal to you not to tighten the bonds which are now so tense that we can scarcely endure them. We ask that the laws may be fairly and impartially executed. We see good and noble men dragged to jail to linger among felons, while debauched and polluted men, some of them Federal officers who have been detected in the vilest kind of depravity, are protected by the same court and officers that turn all their energies and engines of power toward the ruin of our homes and the destruction of our dearest associations. We see pure women forced to disclose their conjugal relations or go to prison, while the wretched creatures who pander to men's basest passions are left free to ply their horrible trade, and may vote at the polls, while legal wives of men with plural families are disfranchised. We see the law made specially against our people so shamefully administered that every new case brings a new construction of its meaning, and no home is safe from instant intrusion by ruffians in the name of the law. And now we are threatened with entire deprivation of every right and privilege of citizenship to gratify a prejudice that is fed on ignorance and vitalized by bigotry.

We respectfully ask for a full investigation of Utah affairs. For many years our husbands, brothers, and sons have appealed for this in vain. We have been condemned almost unheard. Everything reported to our detriment is received; our cries to be heard have been rejected. We plead for suspension of all measures calculated to deprive us of our political rights and privileges, and to harass, annoy, and bring our people into bondage and distress, until a commission duly and specially authorized to make full inquiry into the affairs of this Territory have investigated and reported. And while the blessings of Him who will one day deal out even-handed justice to all shall rest upon your honorable bodies, your memorialists, as in duty bound, will ever pray, &c.

Sarah M. Kimball, M. Isabella Horne, Elmira S. Taylor, Romania B. Pratt, Salt Lake City; Mary Pitchforth, Nephi, Utah; Jane S. Richards, Ogden, Utah; May Johns, Provo City; Ida I. Cook, Logan City; Ida Coombs, Agnes Douglas, Payson; Mrs. Emily S. Richards, secretary committee.

Mr. PLUMB presented a petition of Knights of Labor of Cherokee, Kans., praying that liberal appropriations be made for works of internal improvement, and especially for the construction of the Hennepin Canal; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented memorials of Knights of Labor of Leon, Stockton, Ransomville, Arkansas City, Emporia, Scammonville, and Rosedale, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PLUMB. I present a petition signed by a large number of colored citizens of the State of Kansas, praying for assistance to enable them to go to Africa. I will venture to ask that the petition itself, with the names of the officers who subscribed it, not the individual subscribers, be read, as it is somewhat remarkable.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Kansas asks the consent of the Senate that the petition may be read. If there be no objection it will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

*To the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress:*

Whereas we, the negroes of the United States, were brought from Africa and sold as slaves in this country and served as such from 1620 to 1865; and

Whereas we were set free without a penny and left at the mercy of our late masters and their brothers, who owned all this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and who for over two hundred years had regarded us as inferiors and slaves; and

Whereas there are sixteen thousand of us who have already returned to Africa; and

Whereas there are thousands of us in humble circumstances who yet wish to return to Africa, and there try to build up a United States in Africa, modeled after this Government, and under the protecting care of the same, for the elevation of the African and for the perpetuity of our race, which is here losing its identity by intermixture with the white races, and other troubles, &c. Therefore,

We, the members of the African Emigration Association, and such citizens as are willing to aid and encourage us, ask you for an appropriation, to be disbursed through such a channel as in your judgment you may direct.

It is the purpose of this petition to help only those who wish to go to Africa, in whatever parts of the United States they may be found.

The head of this association is for the present situated at Topeka, Kans. It was established September 17, 1881, and approved by the association March 27, 1886.

Officials: George Charles, president; Antony Griffin, vice-president; John Smith, chaplain; W. Johnson, chaplain; Lewis Lee, treasurer; Charles Charles, secretary.

Mr. PLUMB. The petition, I think, perhaps should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am not particular about the reference which is had, but it comes to me accompanied by letters from prominent citizens of Topeka, where these people live, speaking of their character most favorably, and also of the very thorough determination that they have in this matter; and by reason of that sincerity and ear-

ness which they have manifested I hope that the petition, wherever it goes, will meet with consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Kansas moves that the petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY presented the petition of Mrs. Emily P. Collins and 78 other citizens of Hartford, Conn., praying for the passage of a joint resolution submitting to the several State Legislatures a proposition to so amend the Constitution as to give the right of suffrage to women; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Knights of Labor of Huntington and Derby, in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LOGAN presented memorials of Knights of Labor of Cartersville, Duquoin, Havana, Bloomington, Carbon Cliff, America, Sandoval, Peru, Chicago, New Burnside, and Staunton, in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of G. T. W. Froehlich, late surgeon Company G, Tenth Missouri Infantry, praying for the passage of a law authorizing the Adjutant-General to grant a discharge to all one-hundred-day soldiers who enlisted in response to the first call for seventy-five thousand men; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the State Grange of Illinois, favoring the enactment of a law making the Commissioner of Agriculture a member of the Cabinet; also favoring the coinage of the silver dollar, &c.; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. EVARTS presented memorials of Knights of Labor of Corning, Binghamton, Hudson, Coxsackie, Richburg, Buffalo, and Suspension Bridge, in the State of New York, remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SEWELL. I report from the Committee on Pensions a bill, as a substitute for the bill (S. 927), to extend the benefits of the act approved March 3, 1879, and the act of March 3, 1885, to certain pensioners whose disabilities are caused by amputation, and increasing the rate therefor, and for other purposes.

The bill (S. 2056) to amend the pension laws by increasing the pensions of soldiers and sailors who have lost an arm or leg in the service was read twice by its title.

Mr. SEWELL. This substitute increases the pension for the loss of an arm or a foot from \$24 to \$30 a month, and in the class above the elbow from \$30 to \$36, and loss at a shoulder-joint or a hip-joint from \$37.50 to \$45.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed upon the Calendar.

Mr. SEWELL. I report adversely and move the indefinite postponement of three bills relating to the same subject: The bill (S. 927) to extend the benefits of the act approved March 3, 1879, and the act of March 3, 1885, to certain pensioners whose disabilities are caused by amputation and increasing the rate therefor, and for other purposes; the bill (S. 1222) for the relief of soldiers and sailors having lost a leg above the knee or an arm above the elbow-joint; and the bill (S. 1978) to extend the benefits of the act approved March 3, 1885, to certain pensioners whose disabilities are caused by amputation of the right arm.

The motion was agreed to; and the bills were postponed indefinitely.

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

- A bill (H. R. 2196) granting a pension to Sarah A. Gettis;
- A bill (H. R. 553) granting a pension to William J. Suffall;
- A bill (H. R. 934) granting a pension to Charles W. Minnix;
- A bill (H. R. 1564) granting a pension to Phebe Saunders;
- A bill (H. R. 928) granting a pension to Lewis A. Thornbury;
- A bill (H. R. 936) granting a pension to James T. Caskey;
- A bill (H. R. 1988) granting a pension to Peter F. Saeman;
- A bill (H. R. 1742) for the relief of Thomas Askew;
- A bill (H. R. 1701) granting a pension to Anson B. Sams; and
- A bill (H. R. 2197) granting a pension to Fidelia A. Cheney.

Mr. SAWYER. I am instructed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 239) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Briggs, to report it adversely, and to ask that it be indefinitely postponed, as the case is covered by the general law.

The report was agreed to.

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

- A bill (S. 1248) granting a pension to John M. Young;
- A bill (S. 1836) for the relief of Libbie C. Montis;
- A bill (S. 850) granting a pension to Simpson S. Skirvin;
- A bill (S. 857) granting a pension to Dudley B. Branch;
- A bill (S. 1103) granting a pension to Caroline E. French;
- A bill (S. 977) granting a pension to Elizabeth Barker;

- A bill (H. R. 2689) granting a pension to Delilah Knill;
- A bill (H. R. 2805) granting a pension to Mary S. Douglas;
- A bill (H. R. 2804) granting a pension to Clayton E. Rogers;
- A bill (H. R. 2802) granting a pension to Sarah A. Lovel;
- A bill (H. R. 2798) granting a pension to Bruner D. Hyatt;
- A bill (H. R. 2797) granting a pension to John L. Hunter;
- A bill (H. R. 2791) granting an increase of pension to George Wells;
- A bill (H. R. 2755) granting a pension to Robert Monahan;
- A bill (H. R. 2753) for the relief of John W. Robson;
- A bill (H. R. 4346) granting a pension to Elijah W. Putney;
- A bill (H. R. 2793) granting a pension to Silas James; and
- A bill (H. R. 1273) for the relief of Samuel J. Brown.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1630) granting a pension to James C. Chandler, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2022) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. General Ward B. Burnett, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BLAIR. I am instructed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 358) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Emily M. Wyman, to report it without amendment, and submit a report thereon, on behalf of the chairman of the committee [Mr. MITCHELL], who is absent.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. BLAIR. I also report adversely from the Committee on Pensions, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MITCHELL], the bill (S. 1893) for increase of pension of E. M. Wyman, widow of Robert Harris Wyman, late a rear-admiral in the United States Navy, and I move the indefinite postponement of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLAIR. By direction of the Committee on Education and Labor, I report back the bill (H. R. 7479) to provide a method for settling controversies and differences between railroad corporations engaged in interstate and Territorial transportation of property or passengers and their employes. The bill is reported by direction of a majority of the committee without amendment, and I desire to say that I shall ask the attention of the Senate to the consideration and passage of the bill at the earliest opportunity.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1861) to provide for the sale of the site of Fort Omaha, Nebr., the sale or removal of the improvements thereof, and for a new site and the construction of suitable buildings thereon, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 784) granting a pension to William A. Griffin, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 777) granting a pension to Frederick Bottjer, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 854) granting a pension to Frederick Bottjer, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. CAMERON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 880) granting the right of way to the Schuylkill River East Side Railroad Company through the arsenal and Naval Asylum grounds at Philadelphia, Pa., reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CAMDEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 361) granting a pension to John L. Willhoite, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. WALTHALL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 518) for the relief of John Alexander, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 743) for the relief of Mrs. Martha Vaughn and the legal representatives of Mrs. Louisa Jackman, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely; and he submitted a report, accompanied by a bill (S. 2057), for the relief of Mrs. Louisa Jackman and the legal representatives of Mrs. Martha Vaughn; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 668) for the relief of Charles de Arnaud, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims; which was agreed to.

Mr. MAHONEY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1919) to authorize the purchase of additional ground adjoining the United States court-house and post-office building at Saint Paul, Minn., the erection of a bonded warehouse, and the repair of the existing United States building at said place, and appropriating money therefor, reported it without amendment.

Mr. HAWLEY. A letter from the Secretary of War concerning a

breakwater upon Lake Champlain was accidentally referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, though the printed indorsement thereon referred it to the Committee on Commerce. I ask that an order to direct the proper reference be made.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The letter will be referred to the Committee on Commerce if there be no objection.

#### PRINTING OF COMMITTEE REPORTS.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am instructed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 73) authorizing the printing of committee reports, to report it favorably without amendment; and I ask for its present consideration.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution. It provides that the reports of committees, the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof, printed by order of Congress, may be reprinted at the Public Printing Office, at the instance of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, upon payment in advance to the Public Printer of the cost thereof with 10 per cent. added, the same as if originally printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 44) providing for the erection of a public building at San Antonio, Tex., with amendments; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 1297) authorizing the construction of a building for the accommodation of the Congressional Library;

A bill (H. R. 1413) for the relief of settlers and purchasers of lands on the public domain in the States of Nebraska and Kansas;

A bill (H. R. 3775) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase an additional strip of ground on the east side of the United States court-house and post-office building at Fort Wayne, Ind., to be paid for out of the appropriation already made; and

A bill (H. R. 5550) to provide for the erection of a public building at Duluth, Minn.

#### CONGRESSIONAL LIBRARY BUILDING.

Mr. VOORHEES. I ask that the bill (H. R. 1297) authorizing the construction of a building for the accommodation of the Congressional Library, which has just been sent from the House of Representatives, be allowed to lie on the table. It is precisely the same bill which the Select Committee on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress has reported already to the Senate, and which is now on the Senate Calendar. There is no necessity therefore for its reference to the committee. I ask that it lie on the table, and give notice now that to-morrow, after the morning hour, I shall ask the Senate to take it up and pass it. It has already passed this body substantially three times in the last twelve or thirteen years. I do not suppose it will lead to any debate at all. At any rate, I shall ask the Senate to-morrow, after the morning hour, to consider it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will lay the bill before the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 1297) authorizing the construction of a building for the accommodation of the Congressional Library was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will lie upon the table.

#### PUBLIC BUILDING AT SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

Mr. COKE. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to take up the bill which has been received from the other House for a public building at San Antonio, Tex., with a view to asking non-concurrence in the House amendments and a committee of conference.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill referred to by the Senator from Texas. The bill will be read by its title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 44) providing for the erection of a public building at San Antonio, Tex.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendments of the House of Representatives will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The amendments of the House of Representatives are, in line 8, to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$150,000," and at the end of the bill to add:

Nor shall any site be purchased until estimates for the erection of a building which will furnish sufficient accommodation for the transaction of the public business, and which shall not exceed in cost the balance of the sum herein limited after the site shall have been purchased and paid for, shall have been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury; and no purchase of site nor plans for said building shall be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury involving an expenditure exceeding the said sum of \$150,000 for site and building.

Mr. COKE. I move that the Senate non-concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives, and ask for a committee of conference. The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent the President *pro tempore* was authorized to

appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. MAHONE, Mr. COKE, and Mr. SPOONER were appointed.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MAHONE introduced a bill (S. 2058) to complete the public building at Harrisonburg, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2059) for the relief of the estate of Mal-lity Rose; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAWES introduced a bill (S. 2060) to authorize the purchase of a tract of land near Salem, Oreg., for the use of the Indian training-school; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 2061) granting a pension to Johanna Sofia Enlind; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HALE. I wish to call the especial attention of the Committee on Pensions to this case. It is the case of the needy and infirm mother of a young Swede who entered our armies in the war of the rebellion and there laid down his life. It has gone through the Pension Office and failed because of the lack of technical proof showing that at the time of the death of the soldier he had contributed to the mother's support. The mother is old, growing blind, and is entirely dependent upon what she may get. It would be a generous thing in Congress to pass the bill. I have here a letter, making a brief statement of the case, from the Swedish minister, which I will send to the Committee on Pensions, and I hope that committee may see its way to reporting the bill favorably very soon.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRYE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2062) to increase the safety of passenger steamers in the domestic and foreign trade of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 2063) for the erection of a public building at Oil City, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. MAHONE introduced a bill (S. 2064) for the relief of Robert N. Blake; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 2065) to extend the act of June 15, 1880, to all homestead entries; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, introduced a bill (S. 2066) to amend section 3894 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the transmission through the mails of lottery, gift-enterprise, and other circulars; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 2067) for increase of pension to Zebulon S. Tompkins; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLUMB introduced a bill (S. 2068) for the relief of William H. Simmons; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

#### AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TELLER and Mr. STANFORD submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the Indian appropriation bill; which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. "Concurrent or other resolutions" are now in order.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. I presume under that order it is proper to ask to take up a resolution offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LOGAN] relating to the question of considering everything in open session except treaties, I believe. I do not think in making this motion that I am out of order in making one observation.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution to which the Senator from Virginia refers is on the table. After the ordinary morning business is called for and the introduction of "concurrent or other resolutions" is concluded it will be in order then to move to proceed to the consideration of that resolution.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. Would it be in order then for me to call up the resolution which was reported by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. INGALLS] relating to the same subject?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Not until the call for "concurrent or other resolutions."

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. I should like to call it up before we commence general debate this morning, for the reason, if the Chair will indulge me, that it is not understood that while these resolutions are pending we are going on with discussions in secret session and doing what we try to avoid in open sessions.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. "Concurrent or other resolutions" are now in order.

## \* REPORT OF LABOR COMMISSIONER.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask for the consideration of the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Interior be directed to transmit to the Senate the annual report of the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor recently transmitted to the Department of the Interior.

I ask this, because the act to establish the Bureau of Labor, approved June 27, 1884, only provides that "the Commissioner shall annually make a report in writing to the Secretary of the Interior of the information collected and collated by him, and containing such recommendations as he may deem calculated to promote the efficiency of the bureau;" but no provision is made for the Secretary of the Interior to transmit that report to Congress.

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

Mr. ALLISON. I do not object to the passage of the resolution, but it was understood and expected that the report of the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor would be transmitted to the Secretary of the Interior, as other reports of bureau officers are transmitted, and that it would be embodied in his general report.

Mr. COCKRELL. I understand, though, that this report was not made in time to be transmitted with the others.

Mr. ALLISON. So I understand, and that is the reason why it should now be called for.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection to the consideration of the resolution the question is on its adoption.

The resolution was agreed to.

## ALASKA LAND TITLES.

Mr. DOLPH. I offer the following resolution, and ask for its present consideration:

*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Territories be directed to examine into the propriety and necessity of providing by law for the acquisition of title to public lands in Alaska Territory, and report by bill or otherwise.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DOLPH. I should like to say a few words in connection with the resolution. There is no law in Alaska Territory by which title to public land can be acquired except the mining laws. There are at present in the Territory a number of towns, some two or three of them of considerable size. There are various enterprises being conducted in the Territory in which large amounts of capital are invested. One company is engaged in the manufacture of oil; others in fishing, and in trading. There ought to be some way provided by which persons engaged in such enterprises can acquire title to lands occupied by them and be secured in their investments.

Evidently the Committee on Territories suppose that in time the general laws relating to public lands will be extended over that Territory; but I desire to state that those laws never will be applicable to that Territory. It is not an agricultural country. The present system of surveys never can be extended over the Territory. I think that the town-site law might be so modified as to be adapted to the present District government, and extended to the Territory; and there ought also to be some provision made by which title to small portions of the public domain could be obtained by persons engaged in fishing, trade, and in other enterprises in the Territory.

I have received numerous letters from people who are interested there, and who are residents of the Territory, urging Congressional action upon this subject. I hope the Committee on Territories will give it attention and report a bill.

The act providing a District government for the Territory by the twelfth section provided for a commission to report upon this subject, at least to report what provision ought to be made for the protection of persons already in the Territory and having interests there when the general land laws are extended to the Territory; but I repeat that the present system of surveys never can be extended to the Territory. Surveys will have to be made of detached portions of the Territory from initial points established by astronomical observations and laws enacted adapted to the condition of the Territory, as the present land laws are not adapted to the wants of the Territory.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

## HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 1413) for the relief of settlers and purchasers of lands on the public domain in the States of Nebraska and Kansas was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (H. R. 3775) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase an additional strip of ground on the east side of the United States court-house and post-office building at Fort Wayne, Ind., to be paid for out of the appropriation already made; and

A bill (H. R. 5550) to provide for the erection of a public building at Duluth, Minn.

## CENTENNIAL CELEBRATIONS AT WASHINGTON.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate the resolution which comes over from yesterday, submitted by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN].

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That a joint select committee of three on the part of the Senate and five on the part of the House of Representatives be appointed to consider the subject of a celebration in 1889 at Washington of the centennial anniversary of the formation of the Government under the Constitution of the United States, and also of the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America in 1492, and to report what, if any, action by Congress is advisable in connection therewith.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. As the Senator from Maryland is not now present, the resolution will lie on the table.

## CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS IN OPEN SESSION.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. I move, if it is now in order, to take from the table the resolution offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LOGAN] providing for open sessions for the consideration of the confirmation or rejection of nominations. I ask pardon of the Senator for making this motion, because I know that the Senator who offers a resolution ought to have the control and management of it; but I can not close my eyes to the fact that while that resolution is lying on the table and these days are being consumed in debate executive sessions still recur from day to day, and we are not opening the doors to our debates or nominations. I am particularly not interested, but particularly disturbed, if I may so express it, that we can not have open doors while discussing such matters.

I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I am as much interested in the debate on the Army increase as any Senator on this floor, and, unless something shall be said to change my opinion, I expect to vote for it; but I think it is time, if we mean to open the doors, to open them. A resolution lying on the table accomplishes nothing. A resolution nominated here in this catalogue or calendar of business accomplishes nothing. If we intend to open the doors in these matters we must vote on the resolution; and I now move to take it from the table, and I beg pardon again of the Senator for asking that the yeas and nays shall be taken on it, for we agree so thoroughly on the matter.

Mr. LOGAN. I ask the Senator to withdraw that motion, and I will say to him that at the very first opportunity that can be afforded it will be called up. Indeed, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] has already given notice that he will to-morrow morning call up his resolution, which is of the same character, for the purpose of discussing it. I hope the Senator will withdraw his motion for the present until we get through with the Army bill to-day in some way or other, and then I will join him most readily in taking up and discussing the proposition and having a vote on it.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. Certainly. I did not understand that the Senator from Connecticut had given any notice.

Mr. LOGAN. Yes, he gave notice yesterday morning, and it will come up to-morrow, so I hope the Senator from Virginia will withdraw his motion now.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. I withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion is withdrawn.

## WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. BLAIR, it was

*Ordered*, That William Webster have leave to withdraw his papers from the files, there being no adverse report.

## PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, yesterday, approved and signed the act (S. 812) granting a pension to Mrs. E. A. Benham.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had insisted on its amendments to the bill (S. 44) providing for the erection of a public building at San Antonio, Tex., disagreed to by the Senate, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. DIBBLE, Mr. REESE, and Mr. WADE managers at the conference on its part.

## EFFICIENCY OF THE ARMY.

Mr. LOGAN. Is the morning business through?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there further morning business? If not, the Senate resumes the consideration of the bill which comes over from yesterday.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 777) to increase the efficiency of the Army of the United States, the pending question being on Mr. HALE'S motion to strike out section 2.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, I wish to say that I do hope this bill will be voted on to-day and that we may dispose of it in some way. But in order that we may have a clear understanding in reference to all the objections which have been made to it, and which I was at-

tempting to make answer to yesterday evening when the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business, I now for a very short time desire to draw the attention of the Senators to the same proposition that I was discussing last evening; and that is in relation to the recommendations made by those in authority, in reference to the increase of the Army and the reports and suggestions made by the same persons in regard to the necessity of this, for the purpose of increasing the efficiency of the service.

I was referring to the report of the Secretary of War in 1881 when I concluded yesterday. I now desire to draw the attention of the Senate to the report made in 1882, in order to keep up the connection, and show that this has been continuous for a great many years. You will find on page 4 of the report of the Secretary of War made in 1882 the following remarks:

The report of the General of the Army is very interesting. He urges strongly that the limit of the enlisted strength of the Army be fixed at thirty thousand men instead of twenty-five thousand men, as now established. No increase in the number of officers would be caused, and we would have at each of our numerous posts a force not only larger, but more efficient. Our soldiers are overworked, and the companies are too small for discipline or real economy. I again concur in his recommendation.

There was the concurrence of the Secretary of War in 1882 with the recommendation of the General of the Army, General Sherman, that the Army should be increased to thirty thousand private soldiers, and at the same time suggesting that that would not increase the officers of the Army. The proposition in this bill is precisely in accord with that recommendation of the General of the Army in 1882. The discussion that has occurred incidental to this bill in reference to the organization of twelve companies to the regiment grew out of an amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON], and is not the proposition that is contained in the bill as it now stands.

In 1883, on pages 4 and 5 of the report of the Secretary of War, you will find the following:

The report of the General of the Army has a special interest in being the last annual report that General Sherman will make. At his own request he has been relieved from the command of the Army, preparatory to his retirement from active service under the act of 1882. He has therefore thought it best to refrain from making any new recommendations in his report, leaving that duty to his successor in the command of the Army, Lieutenant-General Sheridan. He, however, calls attention to and renews a former recommendation that a new organization be adopted for the regiments of infantry so that each shall be composed of twelve companies, making three battalions of four companies each, each company having one hundred men; and that in time of peace two of these battalions shall be maintained on a perfect war footing, while the other battalion may be a mere skeleton, with its complement of officers, and be used as a nucleus for recruits. The great advantage of this change, as suggested by the General, is the important one of being able to put a large and effective force in the field upon short notice by merely enlisting a sufficient number of additional private soldiers, the officers and organization being always ready to receive them.

Passing from that to 1884, on page 6 of the report of the Secretary of War for 1884 you will find still further recommendations. He says:

The Lieutenant-General renews the recommendation of General Sherman that there should be made a uniform organization of the three arms of the service by adding two companies, with the corresponding majors, to each regiment of infantry. The reasons for this change were given at some length in my last report, and I concur in the recommendation of the Lieutenant-General.

In 1885, the report made by the present Secretary of War, on page 4 will be found this:

The Lieutenant-General commanding reports that the Army at the date of the last consolidated returns consists of twenty-one hundred and fifty-four officers and twenty-four thousand seven hundred and five enlisted men.

He goes on with that suggestion and then finally the Secretary of War says:

The Lieutenant-General commends to careful consideration the policy of concentrating troops and putting large garrisons in the vicinity of large cities as a measure of economy, the present railroad facilities being ample to transport them to the frontier speedily when needed; and also again recommends the addition of two companies and two majors to each regiment of infantry, and thus make the three arms of the service uniform. In both these recommendations I concur. The reasons for the last are given in the report of the Secretary of War for 1883, as follows.

Then he calls attention to the report of General Sherman made at that time, from which I have read.

Mr. President, I wish to pursue this a little further, although it will be taking the time of the Senate. On page 79 of the report that I alluded to last evening made by Senator Burnside when in the Senate, and signed by Senator PLUMB and Senator BUTLER, and three members of the House, with a bill introduced as I stated in connection with it, you will find that they report in reference to the reorganization of the Army and make the suggestion that I spoke of last evening. They embody in that report a letter of General Washington, to which I called attention this morning, from the fact that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] last evening spoke of the opposition of our great leading men to standing armies. In fact he spoke of our militia, for which I have great respect, and of our citizen soldiers, and therefore, he said we needed no army; and he referred to the cost of the army in 1800, 1810, 1820, 1850, and so on. He said that in 1810 the Army cost \$2,294,323.94. Is it fair or is it applicable to the condition of things now to say that the Army should be so reduced that we are to refer back to the cost of the Army in 1810? But suppose it is a fair argument. The answer to that argument is that soon after 1810, when war between Great Britain and this country occurred, with that small army it is well re-

membered that even the city of Washington was captured and your public records burned. Our armies were in such a condition then that when we were assailed property in our cities was destroyed; but we are told that we ought to return to those days of economy and decrease the numbers of our Army, that it is all that is necessary and all sufficient. But I desire to call the attention of the Senator and of the Senate to what George Washington said. He was authority in those days. In September, 1776, he said:

To place any dependence upon militia is assuredly resting upon a broken staff. Men just dragged from the tender scenes of domestic life, unaccustomed to the din of arms, totally unacquainted with every kind of military skill (which is followed by want of confidence in themselves when opposed to troops regularly trained, disciplined, and appointed, superior in knowledge and superior in arms), are timid and ready to fly from their own shadows. Besides, the sudden change in their manner of living, particularly in their lodging, brings on sickness in many, impatience in all, and such an unconquerable desire of returning to their respective homes, that it not only produces shameful and scandalous desertions among themselves, but infuses the like spirit into others. Again, men accustomed to unbounded freedom and no control can not brook the restraint which is indispensably necessary to the good order and government of the Army; without which, licentiousness and every kind of disorder triumphantly reign. To bring men to a proper degree of subordination is not the work of a day, a month, or even a year; and, unhappily for us and the cause we are engaged in, the little discipline I have been laboring to establish in the army under my immediate command is in a manner done away, by having such a mixture of troops as have been called together within these few months.

He was speaking of raw recruits without any training or discipline. His army became better as it endured hardships and had time for making them into good soldiers. Our militia would be better now because of more drill, experience, discipline, and being better provided for.

It will be seen that General Washington made this distinction between raw men called together unorganized and undisciplined and those men who were organized and were disciplined, and so would every other man who speaks fairly and justly in reference to this matter. Men who wish to inspire a different feeling eulogize those who need no eulogy, because their conduct in war is eulogy enough. It is well enough sometimes for such arguments to be made; but when men want to speak of facts as they are there is not a man of mature judgment who knows anything about military affairs but what knows on the spur of the moment that a regular force organized and well disciplined is better than an unorganized and irregular force for the time being. Washington proceeded:

The jealousy of a standing army and the evils to be apprehended from one are remote, and, in my judgment, situated and circumstanced as we are, not at all to be dreaded; but the consequence of wanting one, according to my ideas formed from the present view of things, is certain and inevitable ruin. For, if I was called upon to declare upon oath whether the militia have been most serviceable or hurtful upon the whole, I should subscribe to the latter. I do not mean by this, however, to arraign the conduct of Congress; in so doing I should equally condemn my own measures if I did not my judgment; but experience, which is the best criterion to work by, so fully, clearly, decisively reprobates the practice of trusting to militia, that no man who regards order, regularity, and economy, or who has any regard for his own honor, character, or peace of mind, will risk them upon this issue.

That is the language of George Washington, not my language but his, and I give it that the point may be considered to which he directed it; and that that was the immediate discipline and organization of an army for the benefit of the Government and the protection of the people.

Now, sir, I read and I desire to call the attention of Senators to what ex-President Garfield said in reference to the Army. He is more recent authority than that I have just read coming from the pen of George Washington, and under a different condition of things:

It is a significant fact that, while numerous petitions and remonstrances upon almost all subjects of legislation have been constantly pouring into Congress, yet during the last eight years not one petition has been addressed to either the Senate or the House praying for the decrease of our military establishment or for the reduction of the pay of its officers or enlisted men. Our people remember with gratitude the great captains who, in the late war, led their soldiers to victory to save the Republic from overthrow. They thoroughly learned the lesson that in times of extreme peril the preservation of liberty and peace depends upon the disciplined valor of the nation, and that the science and art of war can be acquired only by the thorough and patient study and practice of its elements. This work they expect of the Army; and the annual amount which they cheerfully pay for its support is the cost of national insurance against foes from without and anarchy within. They expect Congress and the Executive to make the Army worthy of a great nation; and this can be done only by the hearty co-operation of Congress with those eminent and patriotic soldiers who have devoted their lives to the study and practice of military science.

And, sir, you can not find a sentence emanating from any man who at least had great experience with large bodies of men, either as Secretary of War or General of the Army, to-day, that does not echo the very same sentiments in reference to our organization and our necessary force.

I read next from the Burnside report on page 145 from John C. Calhoun in a letter when he was Secretary of War. In 1820, the time that our friend from Missouri referred to when our expenditures were so small for the Army, Mr. Calhoun said:

However remote our policy, we are, notwithstanding, liable to be involved in war; and to resist with success its calamities and dangers a standing army in peace, in the present improved state of the military science, is an indispensable preparation. The opposite opinion can not be adopted without putting to hazard the independence and safety of the country.

So you will find coming from our great statesmen in this country and the great war leaders in this land, passed away, and those present now, as the heads of our armies and as war ministers, the same appeal to the peo-

ple of this country and the Congress of the land to give us an efficient standing army, to give us some force necessary to afford us some protection, and prepare us in time of peace for that which must come sooner or later to all nations.

In a letter from West Point by General Schofield, now the senior major-general of the Army, he says:

The President should be authorized by law to determine from time to time, according to the number of enlisted men authorized by Congress from year to year, the number of regiments and the number of battalions of each regiment to be kept organized for active service; provided, no regiment so organized should consist of less than two battalions, or eight companies, these companies to have an average strength of not less than ninety enlisted men for the cavalry, seventy-six for the infantry, and sixty for the artillery.

Further, he says:

As the organization now is, a reduction in the number of enlisted men reduces the effective strength in a far greater ratio.

When this reduction was going on his opinion of it was that the reduction in the strength of enlisted men in the Army reduced the Army's efficiency in a much greater ratio than the reduction itself.

Mr. HALE. What is the date of that?

Mr. LOGAN. July, 1878. General Sherman, in 1876, was asked to prepare a bill to be introduced in Congress for the reorganization of the Army. In his preparation of the bill he made each regiment of twelve companies, and in the cavalry, artillery, and infantry the same organization, and for the infantry he reported that there should not be less than fifty privates to a company, but that the President should have the right at all times to increase the number to one hundred.

So you find in every report and in every bill that has been introduced in Congress and asked for by any committee, by any commission, by any man who has known anything about the organization of the Army, that the report has been in accordance with the proposition made here by the Committee on Military Affairs.

On page 111 of the report are the views of General Hancock in 1876. General Hancock is referred to. In his report General Hancock says:

As a general proposition, it may be said that every arm of the service, in order that it may be a model for the national forces, ought to be large enough to give full development, at whatever cost of time and money, to its own specialty.

The committee say:

In discussing the condition of the infantry and cavalry, General Hancock calls attention to the fact that the number of enlisted men in each company had become too small for effective discipline and instruction, so that in late years it has not been practicable to carry military instruction beyond the school of the individual soldier, or rarely beyond the school of the company. To remedy this evil he recommends that the companies in these arms of the service be filled up to one hundred men each, and to prevent the aggregate increase of the Army which this would occasion, he recommends that the number of companies in each regiment be reduced to eight.

But he wants them to have one hundred men in each company.

Mr. HALE. Not so many of the companies in a regiment.

Mr. LOGAN. Not so many companies. General Hancock continues:

The question of any further reduction of these arms than that just suggested should, I think, be deferred a few years longer, until our Indian frontiers are in a more settled condition. If no other disturbances have arisen, I have no doubt that these arms could, with safety, be still further reduced, if then deemed advisable.

I give you the benefit of his opinion both ways. His idea was that there should be not less than one hundred men in each company. In pursuance of the judgment of these general officers they were asked to propose a bill, and on page 240 you will find the bill proposed by General Hancock. In the artillery he proposed that there be fifty-six privates to a company:

SEC. 7. That when not in service in the field, the batteries of light artillery, or so many of them as may be deemed available for that purpose, shall be concentrated at a military post for instruction in light-artillery tactics, under command of a field-officer of artillery.

SEC. 9. That the organization of each company of infantry shall be as follows:

Then he goes on with that organization—

Fifty-seven privates—

In each company, and in the cavalry and so on: Then on page 246 you will find the bill proposed by General Schofield that I read from a moment ago. On page 420 you will find from General Alfred H. Terry the following:

I will endeavor to indicate the difficulties which have arisen in my mind:

As a matter of course, the organization of such a force for active service in one body on a theater of war, characterized by no peculiarities demanding a special organization, is a very simple matter. Twenty-five thousand men would constitute a rather small army corps, of which from one-tenth to one-eighth, according to recent writers, should be cavalry, about eighteen hundred men should be artillerists, and of which the remainder, except perhaps a few engineer soldiers, should be infantry.

Any one at all versed in military matters could prepare almost mechanically a project for an organization of this kind. But it is perfectly apparent that such an organization would not be in any respect adapted to either the present actual or prospective and contingent needs of the country; that it would be utterly unsuited to the existing situation, or to any situation in which the country is likely to be placed. Leaving then such an organization out of consideration the question becomes, What organization is required by present needs, and what is necessary to give a reasonable protection against contingent dangers, and can these two requirements be reconciled within the limits proposed?

Broadly stated, our present need is a force properly organized and sufficiently strong to control the Indian tribes and protect the frontiers and routes of communication through the Indian country. Our prospective or contingent need

is a force organized for the protection of the country against invasion and the defense of our seacoast and maritime cities against naval attacks in the event of a foreign war. At least the nucleus of a force for this latter purpose must be maintained, and I assume that it is the purpose of Congress to so organize the Army, if it be possible within the limits prescribed, that it may answer both these ends.

I regret that I have not been able to devise any plan which would accomplish these objects, and that I can be of no service to the committee in this regard.

He says further:

Similar difficulties arise when the effort is made to determine the proportions which the cavalry and the infantry should bear to the whole force. But I will not weary you by discoursing them. I am unable to suggest any method of overcoming them. I am unable to reconcile within the limits prescribed provisions for what I conceive to be present pressing needs with what I believe the most ordinary prudence requires as preparation for the defense of the seaboard in case of a foreign war. Having thus failed to respond to the request of the committee, I do not know that it is proper for me to make any suggestions, but if it be, I would suggest that the present organization be maintained until such time as the restored prosperity of the country shall justify the Government in increasing the strength of the Army sufficiently to make the existing regiments efficient. Or that the plan of organization submitted to the committee by the General of the Army should, with some changes, be adopted.

On page 455 is the opinion of General McClellan. I will read a portion of what he says:

The permanent strength of the regular Army should be sufficient to enable it to perform with promptness, vigor, economy, and certainty all its ordinary duties; and its organization should be so elastic as to permit a rapid, economical, and efficient increase of its numbers. If an army is maintained at all, true economy requires that it should be thoroughly efficient in all respects and adequate to the work devolving upon it. Large posts, that is, posts with large garrisons, if well selected, promote discipline and economy and enable the troops to perform much more efficient and economical service than if scattered among a number of small posts.

The experience of our own and other countries proves that it is false economy to reduce the peace establishment of the Army unduly, for the reason that the employment of large masses of new troops upon the breaking out of war involves an immense expenditure out of all proportion with the savings resulting from reducing the peace establishment too much. For similar reasons it is wise and necessary to furnish in peace due supplies of all war materials not liable to deterioration.

Not only did the committee take the opinion of officers but of private soldiers. The opinions of enlisted soldiers in the Army I will read. I could read all day from the opinions of officers of the Army, and those who have always stood high in the estimation of the people, but I will not do so. I will read though what the private soldiers say. Here is a letter on page 487 of the Burnside report:

The undersigned, enlisted soldiers, desire to represent that the Army is now much too small to perform the services required of it, that it is not a "standing army," but a traveling, working, fighting, and suffering army; and that the pay is now certainly no more than a reasonable compensation for a soldier, and much less than would command men to perform our duties if they knew beforehand what they would encounter.

We first enlisted with the usual ideas of the life of a soldier; willing and anxious to brave its dangers, hardships, and fatigues, expecting a reasonable support and the prospect of change and adventure; but we find in service that we are obliged to perform all kinds of labor, such as all the operations of building quarters, stables, store-houses, bridges, roads, and telegraph lines, involving logging, lumbering, quarrying, adobe and brick making, lime-burning, masonry-work, plastering, carpentering, painting, &c. We are also put at teaming, repairing wagons, harness, &c., blacksmithing, and sometimes wood-chopping and hay-making.

This in addition to guard duty, care of horses, arms, and equipments, cooking, baking, police of quarters and stables, moving stores, &c., as well as drilling, and frequently to the exclusion of the latter.

Besides all this labor we have to go on campaigns and long marches and fight Indians, risking our lives and health from bullets, accident, malaria, exposure, and fatigue, and all for wages much less than those current in the regions where we serve for anything like the same labor; and in the performance of these duties there is no eight-hour law for us.

This is what the soldiers say to the Senate. The private soldiers tell you the amount of work they have to perform, and they answer the speech of some Senators here who say a soldier gets more pay than an ordinary laborer. The soldier tells you he is working for less and has no eight-hour law either. He is at work at blacksmithing, at ditching, at hay-making, at stable-building, besides all his other duties, and that he does it for much less pay than the ordinary laborer in the community from which he comes; and yet we are told that he is paid too much. What else do they say?

We desire to say that we are mostly laboring men, that we sympathize with them as a class, and that there is no danger of our being used to oppress them; but that we believe in the ballot-box for the righting of wrongs, are opposed to rioting and mob violence, and will be always ready and willing to put them down and to keep the peace between contending parties until reason can resume its sway.

If there has been a more intelligent letter written to this committee than was written by these poor private soldiers who receive \$13 per month I should like to read it. Yet we are robbing the country in increasing the pay of these men! I have also the statements of General Irvin McDowell, General Emery Upton, General George Crook, and General Joseph E. Johnston, who served on the other side, confirming every word that I have uttered in reference to this bill, but I will not take the time of the Senate to read them.

Now, sir, I propose for a few moments to touch some other points. Some of the Senators, as I said yesterday, were raiding on different parts of this bill, and we have been asked to bring forward the recommendations and show wherein these provisions have been indorsed by leading men. One of them is the proposition to give mileage over your land-grant railroads. It was asked, where do we get that provision? The Paymaster-General shows in his report that during the last year



his Department has duly accounted for \$15,180,160.86. I read from the report of the Secretary of War of 1884:

He again recommends—

This recommendation, as I have stated, has been made more than once—

He again recommends—

With the concurrence of the Secretary of War, and says:

the repeal of the law forbidding payment of mileage to officers for travel over land-grant roads.

Why?

As mileage is given to an officer not merely to pay his railroad fare but to cover other traveling expenses, and as officers of the Army are the only public officers against whom a discrimination is made in this regard, I recommend legislation to correct it.

The Senator from Kansas asked why did we not reduce this mileage so as to save the Government 1½ cents per mile that goes to the railroad. Will he vote for it if we do that? Does that make the bill satisfactory? If so, if that be the only objection, and if other Senators feel the same way, there would be no trouble in amending in that particular; but that is not right that officer should lose it. This applies to officers on particular duty, not traveling with their commands.

But let us go a little further and read what is said on the schools that we propose. Let me read from the report of the Secretary of War, and by continuing this discussion I could show reports recommending every material provision in this bill. The Secretary of War, in his report in 1882, used the following language:

Chaplain Mullins, the officer in charge of education in the Army, reports that considerable progress has been made in the work of organizing and establishing post schools and reading-rooms, and that a constantly growing interest in their success has been exhibited by both officers and enlisted men. The average attendance—

And I call the attention of Senators to this especially, to show how strange the statements are that have been made here in reference to the post schools in the Army—

The average attendance at post-schools of enlisted men during the year was 1,586, and of children—

Mark the language—

And of children of officers, enlisted men, and civilians, 1,769; an increase of 674 in the first of these classes, and of 379 in the latter class.

Does that not prove what I said, that these instructors were not for officers, as was said by certain Senators, but that there are children of soldiers, of teamsters that are called civilians, of blacksmiths and others that are employed at the post, who need education, and these poor people are not able to send their children to the States to educate them, and therefore we made this provision for their benefit, and yet we are told it is for the benefit of officers only. What else does the Secretary of War say in reference to this? He says:

The most pressing necessity for giving effect to a successful educational system in the Army is a supply of competent teachers, the experiment of detailing enlisted men for such duty having proved unsatisfactory and embarrassing. The recommendation made by me in my last annual report that statutory authority be given for the enlistment—

Mark how many—

for the enlistment of one hundred and fifty competent instructors, with the rank and pay of commissary sergeants, is renewed. Such a measure was favorably reported upon by the House Military Committee at the last session of Congress, which it is hoped may be enacted into a law at an early day.

The libraries and post reading-rooms have been kept well supplied, and their benefits fairly appreciated. The number of volumes in all the libraries is 45,709, an increase of 1,820 during the year.

There are the libraries that we furnish to the different posts. We furnish libraries but furnish no instructors. Is that the idea? Is that the economy or statesmanship of gentlemen who oppose the proposition in this bill? Libraries are to be permitted, but not the instructors to educate the child to read the books.

Now, I have gone through the objections made by Senators to this bill, and there is not a proposition in it but what has been based on recommendations made by officers of the Army, by Secretaries of War, and by the best instructed men whom we have in the country in reference to the organization of this force. To show that my statement was correct, if you will take the report of the present Secretary of War in reference to the first section of this bill, you will find the following language used:

There is now no provision of law whereby an enlisted man can be punished for any offense against good order and discipline except through the proceedings of a court-martial. It is well said by one general officer, in commenting on this subject, that "courts-martial, by becoming too common, lose their force and influence, and their tendency is continually to lessen an officer's sense of responsibility and the care that the subordinate should have for the authority of his commander."

It is worthy of consideration whether the officers in command of troops at military posts or the captains of companies should not be authorized to impose punishment for minor offenses. But in granting such authority it will be necessary to specify the extent and character of the punishment for each offense, otherwise there would be no uniform rule, nor would it be wise to repose so large a discretion upon a single officer. A statute might be framed—

He goes on to speak of framing a statute, and then says:

Upon an examination of the British military law on this subject it appears that a commanding officer of the rank of captain and above may administer summary punishment for drunkenness and absence without leave, confinement not to exceed twenty-eight days, and a fine, not to be imposed except in cases of drunkenness, and then not to exceed 10 shillings, with a right of appeal to a court-martial in case of a fine.

So the present Secretary of War recommends fully the provision of this bill in reference to the trial of minor offenses by an officer and having the finding approved by his superior commander.

It has been asserted by certain persons that the proposed increase of the Army of five thousand is a new idea. I have shown by reports from 1869 up to the present time the protests against the reduction in the Army. A bill introduced by myself in 1882 has the very same provision in it. Then take the bill of 1884, introduced by myself, and you find the same provision in that. Then take the bill introduced by me in 1886, the bill now before us. One of the bills introduced in the early part of this session of Congress was this present bill, which was introduced early in December, 1885. So the Military Committee have been for years, or at least a portion of it, presenting to the Senate of the United States this proposition for the increase of the Army.

But we are told there is no necessity for it, and honorable Senators who may perhaps have in charge another branch of the war power of this great nation of ours desire to decrease and render inefficient the Army, but they think other arms of the service of this great country must be rendered efficient. This character of legislation I can not understand. But let me read a report made to the Senate a few days ago, March 24, 1886:

Mr. EDMUNDS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted the following report:

"The Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred on the 16th of December last the petition of J. I. Rodriguez in behalf of Mr. Cirilo Poble, alleged to be a naturalized American citizen, and to be imprisoned by the Spanish authorities in the island of Cuba on the charge of treason, &c., respectfully reports:

"That it appears from the papers and correspondence in the Department of State that Poble went to Cuba some time in November, 1884, and was there immediately arrested and imprisoned on the charge before mentioned, or charges of that character, and that down to the latest reports, about December, 1885, his trial had not been had. The committee is satisfied that the Department of State and the consul-general of the United States at Havana have exercised every practicable diligence and exertion to bring the case of Poble to a speedy trial in conformity with the laws of Spain, and with the treaty stipulations between Spain and the United States existing on the subject, and that every effort has been made by the Department and consul-general to make the situation of the accused as comfortable as possible, and to give him every practicable assistance.

"The committee is of the opinion, therefore, that there is nothing that at present calls for any action on the part of the Senate or of Congress. If there should be much further delay in the trial of Poble, it will become a subject for very serious consideration on the part of the Government of the United States.

"At present the committee asks to be discharged from the further consideration of the petition."

Let me call the attention of the Senate to the fact that our citizens may be incarcerated in prison in the little island of Cuba, detained there for a year or more without trial, and our great nation has not force either on land or sea sufficient to demand from the old, rotten, tumbling power of Spain that our citizens shall be properly cared for and properly treated. Oh, honorable Senators say that it will cost something! Sir, if I had the power (which I have not, but it rests in the people), if I could wield that power, no American citizen would ever lie rotting in the dungeons of any foreign power without having the merits of his case examined and fairly treated. [Applause in the galleries.]

It may be said this would require a navy, that we are bordered by Mexico and Canada; nor could a navy alone reduce any power.

Sir, I would use the power of this people against Spain, England, or any other government, to protect the American citizen; and that is where this country is weak. England does it, and all other countries do it. It is a disgrace to the American nation that we can not. But when we appeal to the Congress of this country for a small pittance to increase the efficiency of our Army or our Navy, men rise in stately pride in these halls and their voices resound in favor of economy and lightening of the burdens of the people!

Sir, the American people are a proud people, but they are not proud of that economy which allows their citizens to be shut up in foreign prisons without the power to demand redress. They are not proud of that. No, sir; that is one of the things that now humbles their pride, and it ought to do so. But, forsooth, economy! I am as much for economy as any man in this Chamber, but I want that economy to be that just and correct principle as applicable to our nation which will not involve us in a condition of things making us powerless at all times to either assert or protect our rights or the rights of one of our citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHACE in the chair). The morning hour having expired, the Chair lays before the Senate the regular order, being the bill (S. 67) to provide for the formation and admission into the Union of the State of Washington, and for other purposes. The Chair understands that it is the agreement of the Senate that the special order shall be laid aside informally and Senate bill 777 continued under consideration.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, while on this question of economy let me read from one of the eminent men of this land who was a great leader of our friends on the other side of the Chamber. I read from John C. Calhoun:

Economy is certainly a very high political virtue, intimately connected with the power and public virtue of the community. In military operations, which under the best management are so expensive, it is of the utmost importance; but by no propriety of language can that arrangement be called economical which, in order that our military establishment in peace should be rather less expensive, would, regardless of the purposes for which it ought to be maintained, render it unfit to meet the dangers incident to a state of war.

And, sir, in the early days, as I said from Washington down, you

will fail to find an argument made by the great men of this land in favor of economy at the expense of the efficiency of the Army or Navy or any arm of this Government which is one of its arms of strength. This bill has been attacked on the ground of want of economy, and in the attacks which have been made upon it we have found in the argument against the bill men in this Chamber—I do not criticise them for that—who understand the cost of the Army, the expenses of regiments, and the cost per man more certainly than is that knowledge within the Secretary of War, the General of the Army, or the Paymaster-General.

In the last report of the Secretary of War I want to call the attention of the Senate to this one class of figures in regard to the expenses of the Army, which I referred to once before and desire to refer to again in this connection. It has been repeated over and over again that the Army costs \$40,000,000 a year. A statement of that kind ought not to be made. The Secretary of War, in his report, states the expense of the Army last year thus:

Military establishment—Army and Military Academy, \$25,754,425.49.

That includes salaries to officers, pay to the soldiers, and the expenses of the West Point Academy, the school at Fortress Monroe, the military school at Fort Leavenworth, and all the expenses of the War Department and everything incident to the Army.

Public works, including river and harbor improvements, \$13,164,394.60.

And that is counted as part of the expenses of the Army! So, too—

Miscellaneous objects, \$1,559,372.97.

Such as paying claims by the War Department included in that statement; and that is paraded before the Senate as part of the cost of the Army itself! The cost of the Army proper is not over \$15,000,000; the rest of the establishment makes up the balance. But, as I said, Senators claim that they understand the expense of these five thousand better than the Paymaster-General of the Army, the Secretary of War, or others connected with the Army. The Paymaster-General has estimated every dollar that is in this bill, the increased pay of the soldier, the extra pay to the detailed lieutenants when performing commissary or quartermaster duty, the pay for the five thousand enlisted men, their clothing, their subsistence, and all the expenses incident to their enlistment; and makes it:

Difference of pay to enlisted men (see statement herewith) section 3 \$870,244 00  
Pay of 5,000 additional privates, at \$16 per month, section 2..... 960,000 00

That is according to the pay they have in this bill if it should pass—  
Additional pay to 87 acting assistant quartermasters, at \$100 per year, section 8..... \$8,700 00  
150 instructors for post schools, at \$31 per month, section 13..... 61,200 00  
Total..... 1,900,184 00

But we struck the one hundred and fifty out after this estimate was made by the Paymaster-General, and left it discretionary with the Secretary of War as to the number of instructors that he should employ. So the table which was made by the Senator from Kansas yesterday, estimating hundreds of thousands of dollars for the extra pay that is enumerated here, is certainly without basis or foundation.

Now, Mr. President, without wearying the Senate much further, I desire to make this one assertion, that this increase of the Army is for no purpose except for the benefit of the Army and country, the increase of its efficiency for our own protection and that we have some respectable force. It will cost the country but a small amount, and will certainly put the country on a better basis and better footing for the preservation of its own peace and security. But it has been intimated that the Army will be used for other purposes. It can not be used now for other purposes, as the law does not permit it; but no such reason was found in the preparation of this bill.

Senators have made arguments which they say have offended me. If they were not trying to place me in a false position, it was no offense; if they were, and it did so seem to me, then I hope they will pardon any feeling I may have shown. Arguments made seemingly to me to have the country understand that this was a new proposition, when they ought to have known better, is not pleasant to any one. If I said anything in the heat of debate not warranted by insinuations against me I have not been able to find it in my remarks. I never dodge questions nor deal in innuendoes, but always fairly face the issue, let it come whence it may.

But if any Senator desires to put me in any position—I do not know that any one does so desire—I will say to him now, if that is what he wanted me to say, that I am no communist. I believe in every man owning and being entitled to what he labors for, and that he has a right to keep it, and I believe in justice, in law and order. I would protect every citizen in his right "to life, to liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," in his right to vote, in his right to property. I do not believe in murder, in house burnings, or the laying waste of cities. I believe in the power of protection to citizens in a lawful way at home and abroad. I am a friend to the man who labors for his living, honestly toils, and am in favor of his getting a fair reward for his labor. I am for that justice dealt out between man and man that will afford every man in this land the protection of the law and a guarantee for his just rights. I am in favor of the laboring man having just compensation for his labor; and I wish to God he could get more than he

does. I wish all had good homes. I wish they were all happy in good homes. That much I say. If that is what gentlemen were pressing for, they have it.

Sir, in conclusion I wish to repeat that if I had the power to induce the people of this country by anything I might say to prepare for protecting themselves, I would do it. I would build fortifications on the Pacific Ocean for the protection of the Golden Gate and San Francisco and that whole coast which would defy all the monitors of the world. Then I would make our Atlantic coast bristle at every prominent point, where there are large cities and large interests to be protected, with guns that would frown down the advance of any war ship or navy that rides the boisterous billows of that great ocean. I would do it for the future protection and preservation of this country. I would do it to let foreign countries know that a republic can defend itself as well as any other form of government and that a republic knows enough to prepare in time of peace for the great exigencies that may occur later on; and in doing that I would give labor to the unemployed men in assisting to build these fortifications.

I would increase our Army, and man the guns in these fortifications to notify people that we are ready. In increasing the Army I would give five thousand of the men who are out of employment to-day and starving a chance to make \$16 a month and their provisions and clothing. I would do that, and in that way I would help the poor man as best I could. I would aid him in giving him labor to help build the fortifications, and I would aid him by giving him a chance to enter the Army. I would do both. I would make the Army efficient and I would benefit labor at the same time. Yes, sir, I would do that.

And if gentlemen want to say that in a republic no standing army is necessary, that we must lie down and slumber beneath the stars in peace, that there is no danger to this great Government of ours, a Government which I claim to be the grandest there is, this Government where we claim men are equal, this Government where we claim men are entitled to the protection of the law, this Government where we claim that all men have a right to ascend the hill of fame if they have the ability and the energy to do it, this Government where no established aristocracy controls, where there have been given to us such liberties and such privileges as these we should be jealous of these privileges, we should be jealous of these rights, we should be jealous of the rights of our citizens at home and abroad, and we should be ready to protect those rights, and, in being ready to do it, we should agree as men, as Senators, and as statesmen, that we would not have an army or a navy that would be the laughing-stock of the world. No, sir, if there is any country that needs at least an army, as I said a few days ago, of respectability in numbers and efficiency, it is this country. If there is any government that needs a navy that can protect itself, it is this Government. Men may say what they please about republics falling because of armed forces. Ah, sir, republics fall from neglect; republics fall where corruption enters and the people forget their rights, and then other than the power of the people steps in and takes the control, but not till then; and if this Government ever does fall (which I hope to God it never may) it will not be from an army of thirty thousand men, it will not be from an army of fifty or a hundred thousand men, but it will be from the neglect of the people, from their forgetfulness of their rights; it will be at a time when they forget what they are, at a time when they are engaged in pursuits that carry them away and beyond looking after their own rights and the rights of the American people. In that moment of forgetfulness other power may usurp the rights of the people of this country, but only in that time, and for that time let this country prepare, and for that time let this country look. As all others have gone through the same course, let them look to the future, as we are not unlike others; we are perhaps no greater, perhaps no better.

We have the same interests, the same ambitions, the same desires for power and place, the same desires in reference to our influence as all other people have—no less, no more. This is an hour of peace and tranquillity. It was said by the Senator from Missouri that the time had now come when the people of this country, North, South, East, and West, felt more kindly toward one another than in all the history of this land before. I hope, sir, that is true and that it may continue to be true, for in my heart I have no bitterness against man or section, and I hope the same feeling may exist all over this land; and if so, while there is this good feeling, in God's name let us prepare so that we can have this condition continue.

Then, sir, in this era of good feeling let us prepare to repel all attacks and all assaults that may in future be made to mar these relations, from within or without. Let our country's pride be aroused that we may not only feel our own strength, but that other peoples may feel that we are prepared, so that none of our great cities on the seaboard may be forced to submit to a levy of contribution before troops could be raised to resist it. Sir, I feel that I have given a warning that may some day be remembered if not heeded now.

Mr. President, I have said all I desire to say. I am thankful to the Senate for having given me the time that they have in order to express my views in reference to the increase of the efficiency of the Army.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, this discussion has run on at great length, and I know that the feeling of the Senate is in favor of coming to a vote; so I shall not occupy much of its time.

With many of the general considerations presented by the Senator from Illinois in charge of the bill [Mr. LOGAN] I am in entire accord. I agree with him as to the necessity of this great Republic being watchful and vigilant for all signs of danger upon the sky at home or abroad. I agree fully with him that we ought to protect our people and their property by suitable fortifications and by a respectable naval establishment. I agree fully with him in all he has said about the duty of the American Government in protecting its citizens abroad and not letting them lie and rot in foreign dungeons. But, Mr. President, those things, while sounding pleasantly as they fall from the lips of the Senator from Illinois, have little or nothing to do with the real question before the Senate.

If any American administration ever finds itself confronted with delicate questions and complications with foreign powers, and feels itself called upon to exercise authority and power to maintain the dignity of the nation, the last thing that will be considered by that administration will be the question of the size of the regular Army of the United States. That will not enter into the question at all. If there is any cloud on the sky from abroad in any quarter of the globe, the present administration is not troubling itself with the question of the size of the regular Army of the United States, or feeling any hesitation in asserting our rights because the enlisted men in that Army are to-day limited by law to the number of twenty-five thousand.

In what I say I desire to confine myself entirely to the issue before the Senate, and that is upon my motion made when the bill was first laid before this body to strike out section 2, and that section which I seek to strike out reads as follows:

Sec. 2. That the number of enlisted men in the Army, including an engineer battalion of five hundred and twenty men, hospital stewards, and one thousand Indian scouts, be, and hereby is, established as a force not to exceed thirty thousand men.

And first, before I go on, as some question has been raised about existing law as touching this subject, let me state it in a few words. Under the Revised Statutes of the United States, adopted in 1873, there is this provision:

SEC. 1115. There shall not be in the Army at one time more than thirty thousand enlisted men.

So long as that provision remained untouched or unaffected or unreppealed the limitation of the Army was thirty thousand men. That is in no respect the case now. Immediately after the adoption of the Revised Statutes and the fixing of the limitation at thirty thousand men, as it was seen that the need of a regular army was decreasing, from time to time Congress took the whole subject up and considered it most elaborately by the investigations of committees of both Houses, and decided that twenty-five thousand enlisted men were all that were needed in the regular Army of the United States, and in 1876 and in the years following in the regular Army appropriation bill it was provided:

And no money appropriated by this act shall be paid for recruiting the Army beyond the number of twenty-five thousand enlisted men, including Indian scouts and hospital stewards.

Such a provision as that only ran for the year with the appropriation bill and did not repeal the section in the Revised Statutes which I have read. Under that legislation the law remained excepting for the year at thirty thousand, and this was continued until 1879 when Congress interfered still further and enacted a permanent law that applied to the future; and this is the language that was then adopted as the law:

And no money appropriated by this act shall be paid for recruiting the Army beyond the number of twenty-five thousand enlisted men, including Indian scouts and hospital stewards.

And then it goes on to the declaration:

And thereafter there shall be no more than twenty-five thousand enlisted men in the Army at any one time, unless otherwise authorized by law.

So that from the passage of the appropriation bill for the year ending June 30, 1880, passed in 1879, the statute which I have read was in effect repealed, and it requires to-day absolute affirmative legislation in order to authorize the Army to be raised from twenty-five thousand men to thirty thousand men, and the Senator from Illinois, who is as familiar with the legislation touching the Army as perhaps any man on this floor, must have realized this when he put into this bill the provision that the limit hereafter should be thirty thousand men. The law to-day, not simply running with appropriation bills but adopted upon an appropriation bill, fixes the limit for all time in the future until Congress changes it at twenty-five thousand men, and section 1115 of the Revised Statutes has become waste paper, is null and void, and of no force or effect whatever. That is the law on the subject.

Now we are asked to change the law; we are asked to go in the face of all that Congress has done since the investigation was made in 1875 and 1876, and now to increase the enlisted men, the rank and file of the regular Army. It is to that proposition that I propose to confine my remarks.

Mr. HAWLEY. I should like to ask a question for information. The Senator refers to the reduction from thirty thousand to twenty-five thousand. If I am not much mistaken in my recollection, I was then in the House and serving upon the Committee on Military Affairs, and it is my impression that there was nothing in the nature of an investigation that preceded this reduction. I very well remember that without the

advice or even the courtesy of a consultation with the Committee on Military Affairs a proviso in the appropriation bills championed by Mr. Wheeler, of New York, afterward Vice-President, summarily reduced the Army to twenty-five thousand. I am not aware that there was anything in the nature of an investigation or even the courtesy of a reference to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HALE. The whole subject was investigated by a joint committee of both Houses that came to the conclusion that twenty-five thousand men were enough in numbers, and all of the letters and reports that I alluded to when the debate was opened on this subject and that the Senator from Illinois has read from so fully this morning and at other times, are in reply to requests of that committee to give their views upon the subject and to submit bills based upon twenty-five thousand men as the rank and file of the Army.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the Senator kindly tell us what Congress and what session?

Mr. HALE. I can not now give the date, but the report referred to will show.

Mr. LOGAN. I will state, if I am allowed, that in 1875 General Burnside was chairman of the Military Committee of this body. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] was on the committee, and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] in the Senate. With them were joined three gentlemen of the House, all constituting a joint commission. They made a report and they asked for bills, and General Sherman sent one, General Hancock one, General Schofield, and so on. The bills all came to nothing. The Senate committee and the House committee made a report, and in that report the Senator will find that they recommended that each regiment should have sixteen companies of not less than seventy-five men. If he will make the calculation he will find that.

Mr. HALE. I am glad the Senator from Illinois, with his familiarity with dates, has answered the inquiry of the Senator from Connecticut. That investigation was what first called my attention to the necessity of opposing this provision. It was on the investigation then made that the present limit to the size of the Army was fixed.

Now, Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Illinois that my opposition to this part of his bill is in no degree dictated by hostility to the regular Army or by any lack of confidence in that branch of the service.

Mr. LOGAN. The Senator will allow me a word right there. In connection with the inquiry made by the Senator from Connecticut. As that Senator asked about the reference of this question to the Military Committee, I want him to understand, if I did not make the statement distinctly before, that this matter has never been referred to the Military Committee. All the reductions and changes in the Army from 1876 up to the present time have been done on appropriation bills by the Committee on Appropriations without any reference to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HALE. The old fashion, from which we have largely departed of late, was for a great part of the legislation of Congress on all branches of the service to be put upon appropriation bills; and the sentiment of Congress in 1875 and 1876 that the Army should be twenty-five thousand enlisted men took this form and became law upon an appropriation bill, undoubtedly because, as I have said, that was the practice then in this House and in the other; but none the less did that embody the conviction of Congress, none the less did it become the written and enacted law, none the less did it become a rule for subsequent Congresses until investigation and discussion should lead Congress to make a change.

I was going to say when interrupted by the Senator from Illinois, that my motion to strike out this section and my opposition to this part of the bill arise from no hostility to the regular Army and from no lack of confidence in it. I do not believe that there is any body of men in the world that will furnish, if need should come, the skeleton organization for a great and triumphant army that shall overcome all enemies that may arise equal to the regular Army of the United States. Its older officers trained in the war are as good as any that exist to-day on the face of the earth, and its younger officers who have come up since, receiving a complete military education at the Military Academy at West Point, will be found always, if an emergency arises, capable when the older officers have passed off the stage of taking their places and of keeping up the name and the illustrious record of the Army of the United States.

Neither—and I should like the Senator from Illinois to feel this—does my opposition come, it can not come, from any desire to interfere with a bill reported by him. That Senator is a great authority upon military matters in this body, and in many matters of detail, in questions involving the construction of regiments whether they shall have two or three battalions, whether legislation may be needed in order that one part of the Army may adapt itself to the uses of another part, I would yield much to the Senator from Illinois, but this provision to increase the rank and file of the standing Army in time of profound peace is a subject on which I may have as firm convictions as he, and upon which I may be as capable of investigating as he. It is a question upon which a civilian may have as clear a view and perhaps may be as right as a man who has had experience in the Army.

We do not leave other questions to be solved and considered solely by experts in the line upon which we are investigating. When the subject of the Navy is before the Senate we have no naval officers in this body, and we have to get along without them. The Senator would not have questions touching the currency submitted to committees consisting of directors of national banks. He would not have the great question of the control of corporations and monopolies left in the hands of directors and presidents of railway companies. These are all plain, every-day subjects; and the question whether now the rank and file, the enlisted men of the regular Army of the United States shall be increased in numbers, is a question upon which one Senator may have as much light as another.

Mr. LOGAN. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. HALE. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOGAN. It is true that all Senators may have the same light, and some more than others; whether one be a civilian or a military man makes no difference; but the Senator spoke of an inquiry in reference to the currency. I notice one thing, that all questions about the currency come from the Committee on Finance, and that committee has a good deal of influence in the Senate when it makes a report. All matters in reference to the Navy come from the Committee on Naval Affairs. The Senator has brought several measures relating to the Navy here, and I have always assisted him because I thought the Committee on Naval Affairs knew more about them than I did, and I have always deferred to that committee. It is usual for each man to have his opinions and sometimes his opinions are better than those of the committee who investigate the subject. I will admit that; but the occasions are rare, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. HALE. The Senator must know from his experience that time and again committees have reported bills and that they have gone to wreck under discussion.

One thing more I want to say. The Senator from Illinois in replying to some remarks submitted by me in the opening of this discussion made an allusion to outside influences that were working in opposition to this bill. I did not hear the Senator, and I am very glad that he has risen in his place and stated freely and frankly, and I accept it as entirely satisfactory, that he had no intention of alluding to any outside influence that was interfering with the passage of this bill.

Mr. LOGAN. I hope the Senator does not mean what he says. In the commencement of his statement he said that I alluded to an outside influence. I made no such allusion, either directly or indirectly.

Mr. HALE. I say the Senator made an allusion which was interpreted that way.

Mr. LOGAN. Oh!

Mr. HALE. I did not hear it, but it was so interpreted. I wish to say to the Senator that at the time when this bill was called up and when it was read at the Secretary's desk and I entered my motion to strike out section 2, which provides for this increase of the rank and file of the Army, I had received no intimation from anybody, either here or elsewhere, with reference to the bill, and I had no knowledge till that moment that it contained a provision for this increase. I did not know when I made the motion that a single Senator in this body would sustain me in that motion. In what I have said and in what I shall say I mean to confine myself strictly to the issue that is raised by my motion.

The twenty-five thousand limitation fixed by Congress in 1876 and maintained ever since is what to-day is the law under which the Army is maintained, and the numbers of enlisted men are now up very near to the limitation. The Secretary of War in his report on December last, referring to the Lieutenant-General of the Army, says:

The Lieutenant-General commanding reports that the Army at the date of the last consolidated returns consists of twenty-one hundred and fifty-four officers and twenty-four thousand seven hundred and five enlisted men.

Less than three hundred more would bring that up to the maximum fixed by the law; and should this measure as reported prevail and the second section not be stricken out, five thousand more men would be added, which would bring the Army nearly or quite within one year's time to thirty thousand enlisted men.

The discussion has shown that various considerations have been urged as a prop to this measure upon which to sustain it. The Senator from Nebraska and other Senators believe that the condition of our relations with the Indian tribes is such that the Army can be made more efficient and life and property upon the border can be better protected if this increase shall be given by Congress.

Since the debate opened I have looked somewhat into the record of the past upon Indian wars, and I have been surprised to find how Indian hostilities and Indian outbreaks have steadily dwindled in the last twenty years, so that one-half of the present Army would I believe be ample for every near or remote Indian danger.

I look back to the operations of the Army upon the frontier and with the Indian tribes as far as 1860, and I find in the report of the Secretary of War of that year a long discussion given to Indian warfare and as to the danger and as to the efficiency of the Army with reference to that subject. I shall read what the Secretary of War said in winding up the discussion, and I ask the attention of Senators to it, bearing in mind that this report was made when the Army of the United States

only had in it as enlisted men from fourteen thousand to fifteen thousand men instead of twenty-five thousand as at present.

Mr. LOGAN. Before the Senator proceeds on that point, I should like to have these things correct in the RECORD.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will wait until I finish this subject, I should like not to go back now while I am upon this matter.

Mr. LOGAN. I only wanted to call attention to the statutes reducing the Army. The Senator spoke of 1866. It was not done in 1866.

Mr. HALE. In 1876. The Senator is wrong: I made no allusion to 1866, but to 1876.

Mr. LOGAN. It was not done in 1876.

Mr. HALE. Yes; I read the clause. Here is what with an army of between fourteen thousand and fifteen thousand men, the Secretary of War said, instead of asking for more men or more money:

It should be borne in mind that, while appropriations have been made to sustain our Army upon a peace footing, it has been called upon to prosecute an active and sanguinary war, for a distance extending from the thirty-fifth to the forty-sixth degree of north latitude, with very numerous tribes of hardy and warlike Indians. It should be remembered, also, that the scenes of these operations have been over the wildest and most remote regions of our mountainous Territories lying between the plains on the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountain chain and the Pacific Ocean. Under these circumstances it has required the greatest watchfulness and care to keep the expenditures for the year within the appropriations for it.

There is no call for another man, there is no request that Congress shall give more money; and this was at a time when the spirit of the Indians was unbroken; it was at a time when the great Sioux tribe, or to speak more correctly when the different tribes and bands of the great Sioux Nation, occupied a good part of Minnesota, Dakota, Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming, and when they could bring into the field five thousand armed warriors at any one time. Yet with a war raging over eleven degrees of latitude, the Secretary of War with sixteen thousand men at his disposal only said that in consequence of these important campaigns and operations he had found it hard to keep within the limit of the appropriations which had been given by Congress. Nobody then introduced a bill providing for an additional increase of expenditures for the Army or for an increase of its enlisted men; but the Secretary of War said that he could get along very well with the money and the men he had.

So it has continued down to the present day; and this year, as a commentary upon this whole subject of the Indian situation, the Secretary of the Interior says in his annual report:

The Indian race is no longer a source of danger to the peace or security of this great Republic. Most of the reservations are encircled by powerful communities, and those upon the frontier are completely in the hands of our military forces. Nor is the Indian any longer an obstacle to our national progress or to our material development.

It is not, therefore, to protect the peace of the country, or the security of its frontiers from the danger of Indian war, or on account of their hindrance to our material progress, that all these efforts and expenditures are made in their behalf.

With this I leave this part of the subject, and I pass to other considerations. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] in his clear and forcible exposition of his side of this case called attention to other dangers. He says that we are a great nation, and that the Monroe doctrine ought to be enforced. Mr. President, I hope that the Monroe doctrine as it is considered and believed in under popular acceptance will never be abandoned and will be enforced; but as I said a little while ago in touching the question of the protection of American citizens, the size of the regular Army, the number of its enlisted men will never enter into the consideration of any Secretary of State or any President or any Cabinet conclave that considers the great question of the United States not permitting foreign nations, European powers, to get new foothold upon this continent. That question is not to be settled in any way by the regular Army.

The Senator from Connecticut says that the Northeast frontiers are open and that we need a larger regular Army. Does the Senator know that within the last few years the War Department has given up voluntarily every fort that it had upon the frontier in the Northeast and turned it over to the civil authority, because it believed there was no call for keeping it? And when he refers to the Southwestern frontier, along the Mexican line, does he not know that the last Indian hostilities have resulted in the surrender of the most mischievous of all the Indian fighters of to-day to our forces?

He says that he wants this country to be in a condition where the Government can assert itself in the protection of American citizens, as it did in the case of Martin Koszta, and therefore he wants the regular Army increased. Does the Senator know that on that bright August morning in 1853, in the harbor of Smyrna, when Captain Ingraham double-shotted the guns of the Saint Louis and compelled the Austrian Government to release Martin Koszta because he had filed an intention of citizenship here and had abandoned his allegiance to Austria, that the regular Army of the United States was only eleven thousand men, and that if it had been twenty thousand men Secretary Marcy would have been no firmer in his enunciation of the proposition that sustained the act of Captain Ingraham and Commodore Stringer?

But the Senator from Illinois in charge of this bill, with his accustomed frankness and intrepidity, which we all admire, has stated clearly what is the object of the bill. It is not the Indian dangers, it is not

foreign power, it is that he believes the Army as an organization will be better, will be stronger, will appear better, and will show better—I do not use the word show in an offensive way—that it will be a more complete organization. Although this has been read before, as it is in the line of what I am saying I shall read what the Senator said is the object as he understands it of the bill:

I want the Senator to understand that this proposition to increase the Army is not for any present needs; it is not because there is an Indian war; it is not because there is danger from Indians or danger from anywhere; it is not because I apprehend any danger from any source that I proposed this in the bill before the Military Committee, and that the Military Committee agreed to it, but it is that the Government of the United States may at least have an army that will have some respectability when it is called the Army of the United States, both at home and abroad.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL], in following his chief upon the committee, made the same argument, and said in terms that the companies in our regiments upon the frontier or elsewhere, when they come to "parade," and I use his word, make such a poor show that it is absolutely necessary that their ranks shall be fuller.

The main thought which I have in my mind in opposing the bill is that it departs entirely from what I understand to be the use of the standing Army of the United States. If there is any need of an increase of the efficiency of the Army, if there is any possible danger confronting us at home or abroad, then this proposition begins at the wrong end. The last place that we need, under any circumstances, to increase the regular Army is in its enlisted force. The whole theory of our standing Army is that it shall be a skeleton organization capable of expansion upon an emergency; and the history of the American people has always shown that when the emergency comes the rank and file will be furnished by the people. From year to year we graduate from West Point large classes of young men who enter the regular Army and take its lower ranks. Whenever an emergency arises these officers are available to command the countless legions of the American people who never fail to respond when the Government calls for their service in time of danger.

That is the theory of the standing Army of the United States. It is only because of this that the standing Army of the United States has not been subjected to the unpopularity which affects a standing army in other countries. The American citizen rarely sees the enlisted man in our regular Army, and the American people are glad to maintain this skeleton organization, this framework, in order that if need comes, as I have said, it may be filled up.

The whole theory upon which we maintain our military establishment is violated by this bill. Popular levies must fill up our armies whenever there is any occasion for a large military force. I have lately been looking through the War Department reports at the time when the great civil war fell upon the American people, when we were entering upon an experience such as our people never had before and I trust will never have again. What was the condition of our military establishment then and how was it treated? We had a regular army of sixteen thousand men, well officered by bright, superior men who had been mostly educated at West Point. Many of them had left the service and engaged in vocations outside which brought to them more pecuniary results, an easier life, and more freedom. When the war opened the regular Army, so far as its enlisted men, its rank and file, went, sank into absolute insignificance. In that Titanic conflict which shook a continent the regular Army of the United States, so far as its rank and file went, was leather and prunella. It went nearly out of sight a year after hostilities had broken out; the regular Army had only been increased to 20,334 men, while the volunteer force had run up to 640,637 men, commanded largely by the officers of the regular Army who had been educated by the Government for that very purpose.

It was this skeleton organization which we have maintained since, and which we ought to maintain now, which furnished most of the great commanders upon both sides. Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, Thomas, Meade, Howard, Schofield, McPherson, in our Army, and Lee, the Johnstons, Bragg, and the great commanders in the confederate army, were the result of this organization; and when war was entered upon by the two sections of the country these officers upon either side found the ranks filled up for their command, and the great war went on and neither side thought of a regular army.

I have had some inspiration communicated to me in reading the War Department reports of that time, showing the majestic uprising of the American people and their readiness to respond in time of danger, no matter what may be read by the Senator from Illinois to the contrary. Here is what the Secretary of War said in his report:

Congress, during its extra session, authorized the Army to be increased by the acceptance of a volunteer force of five hundred thousand men, and made an appropriation of \$500,000,000 for its support. A call for the troops was immediately made; but so numerous were the offers that it was found difficult to discriminate in the choice where the patriotism of the people demanded that there should be no restriction upon enlistments. Every portion of the loyal States desired to swell the Army, and every community was anxious that it should be represented in a cause that appealed to the noblest impulses of our people.

Elsewhere he says:

In the absence of any general system of organization, upward of seven hundred thousand men have already been brought into the field; and, in view of the alacrity and enthusiasm that have been displayed, I do not hesitate to express the belief that no combination of events can arise in which this country will not be able not only to protect itself, but, contrary to its policy, which is

peace with all the world, to enter upon aggressive operations against any power that may intermeddle with our domestic affairs.

That was our experience in our greatest danger, and we ought to learn a lesson from it. We ought to learn that if there is any need for fighting men to any great extent the American people will supply them. As they have done they will never fail to do.

The second section of the bill violates every tradition and every experience under our Government. It has never been attempted before in time of profound peace to increase the enlisted men of the Army, and that is the issue involved in my motion to strike out the section. It is not the question of organization, it is not the question which has been so much dwelt upon and so ably presented and argued by the Senator from Illinois as to the form of regiments, the number of officers, whether there shall be two or three battalions. That is not the question. Whenever that may be done, whenever any measure of that kind may be adopted, when the status of the Army as a framework, as a skeleton organization, shall have been fixed by Congress, then will be time enough to consider the increase of the enlisted men of the Army.

All that the Senator has read as to the recommendations of military authorities, the Secretaries of War and Generals of the Army, come to just this, as I stated in opening this debate: For years the distinctive proposition that five thousand more men ought to be added to the Army was presented with regular recurrence by Secretaries of War and Generals of the Army to Congress, and as repeatedly ignored and denied, until at last in 1881 that was given up, and from that day to this this distinctive proposition which I am now opposing has been abandoned by the War Department. The Department has from time to time, as the Senator has read, asked that new companies be added, that the organization of the regiments shall be changed, and that companies may be filled up; but the distinctive proposition that we shall add to the Army, to its enlisted men, a force of five thousand men was abandoned at that time and has not been submitted since, as I believe largely because the War Department and the Government saw that the need of a large army had decreased.

Mr. LOGAN. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him right there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRYE in the chair). Will the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HALE. Oh, yes.

Mr. LOGAN. Does the Senator not know that the present Secretary of War has recommended the same thing?

Mr. HALE. I do not know that the Secretary of War has asked for this increase of five thousand men to the enlisted force of the Army. No, sir; I do not know it.

Mr. LOGAN. Well, Mr. President—

Mr. HALE. I am familiar with the report of the Secretary of War, and it has already been read. I understand that; but the distinctive proposition of adding five thousand men to the rank and file of the Army of the United States was abandoned, as I have said, years ago.

Mr. LOGAN. That is dodging the question. The Secretary of War distinctly recommends, in his report this year to Congress, the adoption of the twelve-company measure recommended by General Sherman, to make the infantry, cavalry, and artillery alike in organization; and if you take the twelve-company recommendation and make the calculation, you will find that it just covers the five thousand additional men.

Mr. HALE. But it does not follow, if you change the form and make a regiment consist of three battalions of four companies each, that enlisted men are to be added. That does not follow by any means. I have letters now from officers of the Army saying that, while they sustain that proposition, and believe that it would be better in case of any emergency involving war that we should have a three-battalion organization in each regiment, and one of these battalions can remain entirely unfilled so far as enlisted men go, and that the officers attached to the third, the odd battalion, in time of peace can be sent to the various duties that now engross officers of the Army outside of duty in the field. So the proposition to change the form of the regiment does not by any means involve an increase in the enlisted force of the Army; and I am not prepared to say that when the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska shall be presented I will not be in favor of that, much as I am opposed to increasing the rank and file.

Mr. MANDERSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HALE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANDERSON. I interrupt the Senator from Maine without hesitation—

Mr. HALE. The Senator is entirely right.

Mr. MANDERSON. Because I believe in this matter he desires to be right according to the record. I call his attention to the fact that in 1883 the General of the Army, General Sherman, with the approval of the then Secretary of War, made a recommendation which forms the basis of all after recommendations of General Sheridan and the Secretary of War succeeding Mr. Lincoln.

It is true, as the Senator says, the General suggests that the three-battalion organization be adopted and that the third battalion be a

mere skeleton made up of officers without enlisted men, but he proposes that the regiments of infantry so organized shall consist in the two battalions of eight companies of one hundred men each, so that each regiment of infantry would be composed of eight hundred enlisted men. The number of enlisted men in the present organization of the infantry regiments is from three hundred and sixty to four hundred, under the ten-company organization. So I submit that even by permitting one battalion to remain a skeleton the increase of the infantry arm of the service would be really more than this bill provides for.

Mr. HALE. General Schofield struck this very subject and furnished the solution of it in a letter, part of which has already been quoted by the Senator from Illinois, in which he says that the organization of the Army must be subject to the number of enlisted men which Congress should give. He said in that letter to the committee:

The President should be authorized by law to determine from time to time, according to the number of enlisted men authorized by Congress from year to year, the number of regiments and the number of battalions of each regiment to be kept organized for active service.

That clear-sighted officer saw plainly and clearly that the essential limitation upon the Army must be what Congress declared should be the enlisted force, and he was in favor of lodging with the President the power, if you put up these regiments to eight hundred men of rank and file, to reduce the regiments. That is the inevitable conclusion. If Congress has determined that there shall be but twenty-five thousand enlisted men in the Army, and it is insisted that each regiment shall have full numbers and overflowing ranks, it may be the inevitable result will come, as General Schofield suggests, that the President will be authorized and empowered to reduce the number of regiments, and they will be sacrificed in numbers, and our whole theory of a large framework skeleton organization will disappear in obedience to the clamor that is raised for more enlisted men. I do not want to see that done. I want the Army to be just what General McClellan asked that it should be in a letter which has been quoted by the Senator, in which he said:

The permanent strength of the regular Army should be sufficient to enable it to perform with promptness, vigor, economy, and certainty all its ordinary duties; and its organization should be so elastic as to permit a rapid, economical, and efficient increase of its numbers.

Let any man delve in the military literature of this period, when this subject was investigated, and he will find that all these great officers of the Army recognized the essential point, that the organization of the Army should be elastic, so that it might be reasonably increased in time of danger. The one thing that to-day with the Army of the United States I think is the underlying belief is not that more enlisted men are needed but that the organization shall be kept up—that we may from year to year graduate large classes from West Point and put them in the Army, so that when an emergency comes we shall have those men to lead the armies of the United States.

Sir, I have no fear of our ever being embarrassed by the lack of an army under any conditions. Should war break out at any time, there never was a population in the history of the human race that would respond so quickly to a call by the Government for volunteer forces as the people of the United States on this very day upon which we live and breathe. Let any trouble arise from any foreign power and an army be needed to repel invasion, nay, to take the aggressive, as the Secretary of War says in his report in 1861, and the thousands and tens of thousands of the old soldiers of the Army of the Republic would respond upon an hour's notice. Nay, sir, not only the men of the armies of the Republic, but the men of the armies of the confederate government, who yielded up their cause at Appomattox, would respond as readily as would the Union soldiers of the Northern armies; and no President would need to wait for one sun to set before he would get the response to his telegraphic message to the country that the time of need had arisen.

For these reasons we do not need an increase in the regular Army. Some things we do need, and all the more because we need some things we ought not to expend a dollar in increasing the rank and file of the regular Army.

Let me make one suggestion to Senators upon this side of the Chamber. The administration of the Government passed from us more than a year ago. The responsibility is elsewhere. The guardianship of the interests of the American people, so far as the Executive goes, rests with the other side. Neither the President, and, as I have said, not to go into that question, nor his subordinate, the head of the War Department, has sent in a message to the American Congress asking that we increase the rank and file of the American Army five thousand men. The Commander-in-Chief of that Army has in no way intimated that we need this increase and the increased expenditure. Yet Senators are asked to push this measure and intrude it upon an administration which has not sought it.

Some things we need. Our whole line of coast, as the Senator from Illinois has said, on the Pacific and on the Atlantic and along the Gulf coast, lies absolutely open and unprotected. A third-class war ship of any naval power on the earth could thunder at the gates of every city upon our seaboard coast and levy contributions of millions and hundreds of millions of dollars, and we have nothing to prevent it. Yet instead of appropriating liberally for fortifications and for guns constructed under

modern art and experience we are asked to increase the rank and file of the regular Army of the United States. The Navy of the United States is dropping to pieces under the feet of the gallant men who man the ships. Every year wooden ships are going out and but little has been done in the way of replacing them. We have not a single ship that could compete with or oppose or drive away a second-class ship of any power of Europe, and yet we are asked to increase the enlisted force of the Army of the United States.

Mr. LOGAN. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HALE. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOGAN. The Senator, I believe, agrees with me in desiring that fortifications should be built around the coast?

Mr. HALE. Yes; I am very much in favor of that.

Mr. LOGAN. Will you tell me what character of men you would use to man the guns in the fortifications?

Mr. HALE. Yes; I will tell the Senator exactly. You can not elaborate and establish a system of fortifications and build those fortifications with the labor of American workmen until a series of years have passed, and you no more need another enlisted man in any fortification that we shall build for two years to come than you need him on the top of the Washington Monument.

Mr. LOGAN. If the Senator will allow me, there is exactly one point on which he is mistaken. You can not take a man and train him to use guns in a fortification except in a series of years. You can not make a gunner out of a man in a day.

Mr. HALE. You can not make a gun in a day.

Mr. LOGAN. I understand that, but how will it be after the guns are made? Your fortifications to-day have no men in them. Your guns are rusting on the parapets.

Mr. HALE. They would be no use if they were not.

Mr. LOGAN. No use! There is no war and therefore no use, the Senator says. The necessity for keeping your war material in good condition is just as great in time of peace as in time of war, and greater too, because it requires more work on them. In time of war necessity forces them at all times to keep the guns in good condition, because they have to be then in use every day, but in time of peace the necessity is greater to keep them in perfect order and good condition, so that they may be used. You may build as many fortifications as you please around the country and recruit a few raw men and put them in them and without a year or two of experience you might as well have nobody. That is the fact about it. A gunner can not be trained in a short time.

Mr. HALE. Letting go the question of fortifications which has been touched upon, we can not get such a gun as would be efficient, as would be worth the having to man a fortification after it is built, or while it is being built, except by the expenditure of money, which we are willing to give, and of time, which we must expend. You can not do anything with the additional enlisted man either in the fortifications or upon the guns until the guns are made and the fortifications built, and he would be a useless appendage to the Army until that time.

I have failed to see in this discussion or in anything that has been urged here any direct statement anywhere of the real use that those five thousand men would be put to. Nobody has enlightened us on that point. It is not an actual need. It is not an actual service, as the Senator from Illinois has frankly admitted, and I thank him for it, but it is because it is believed that the Army will be more nearly complete and symmetrical as an existing organization if we fill up the ranks. So it would, and if we were a small power and had no people to resort to in emergencies, and had to maintain an army to do our fighting, as Frederick's armies did, as Gustavus's army did, then we should want just such an army as the Senator from Illinois, and the Senator from Connecticut, and the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from Nebraska want; but our conditions, as I have tried to explain, are so absolutely different that every consideration which applies to such a small people with the need of a military force for defense or aggression in no degree applies to us.

I have searched the records of the past, giving the history and course of the measures touching the Army of the United States, and I do not find until to-day that ever in a period of profound peace it was proposed to increase the regular Army of the United States. I find, on the contrary, a long line of precedents squarely and directly in the teeth of such a proposition. I find that always following every war or every threatened war the legislator in the American Congress appeared to deem it his first duty to reduce the standing Army, and all along from the day of the Revolution down to the present time that has been the accepted rule of the American people. It has become embodied as a tradition, and I for one object to its being departed from now. There are many things which make demands upon us that we ought to legislate upon, and one of the last things we should take upon us is to-day to increase the regular Army of the United States.

Mr. MANDERSON. Mr. President, I simply desire to supplement some of the quotations read by the Senator from Maine by giving some other matter to be found in the same reports from which he quoted which seem to me to be germane to this discussion. The Senator says that he has delved among the reports of the past in regard to some of the propositions involved, and takes us with him back to the days be-

fore the war, and reads from the report of the then Secretary of War, John B. Floyd, to show that at that time, according to the Secretary, the Army, much less in number than now, was sufficient for all the purposes for which it might be used, and especially sufficient for the protection of our borders against any threatening Indian difficulty. I take up the book where he left off and I read further. The Secretary of War said, after using the language quoted by the Senator:

I feel no hesitation now in bringing to the notice of Congress the importance of restoring to the War Department the superintendence and control of the Indians. It is quite impossible to impress upon these savages the idea of obedience by any other means than military power. They respect nothing but a strong military force, and its proximity to them is therefore essential.

I submit that the experience with the American Indian in the years which have elapsed since 1860 does not make that foolish to-day which was wisdom then. I might quote also from General Schofield, and show the Senator that in the opinion of that able officer the show of military force to-day upon the Northwestern frontier is of such a character that it simply excites the contempt of the Indian.

Let us look for a moment at the changed conditions in the Indian country from 1860 to the present time, changes referred to briefly by the Senator from Maine. In 1860 there was but a handful of men in the now great States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Kansas, Nebraska, and the Northwestern Territories. Now millions of men, women, and children occupy that broad domain. What has been the result upon the Indian himself? In 1860, and for many years after that time, he ranged unmolested over the thousands and thousands of miles of territory where he could pursue the game of that period. There was no contact or conflict between him and the white settler except on rare occasions. But now, as the Senator says, the Indians, instead of roaming over that vast territory, have been gathered year after year upon reservations; and that fact has produced many of the Indian wars of late years. The Sioux Nation, for instance, gathered in the south part of the Territory of Dakota, occupying 36,000 square miles of territory, numbering from twenty-five thousand to twenty-eight thousand people, and we have as a guard against any raid that they might make upon the Northwestern territory but the two posts which I referred to the other day, the post at Fort Robinson and the post at Fort Niobrara, consisting of less than five hundred enlisted men, who guard all that vast frontier against an attack that I say is imminent from five thousand to eight thousand Sioux warriors armed and equipped with the best implements of war.

There is a changed condition in respect to their ability to fight now and then. Ten or twenty years ago the Indian of the frontier had as his weapon of attack and his weapon of defense the bow and arrow, and perhaps a few shotguns or poor muskets; but to-day, as I suggested before to the Senator from Maine, every adult Indian of the tribes of the West is armed with the Winchester rifle, and is expert in its deadly use.

But the Senator from Maine says, and he quotes from the report of the Secretary of the Interior, that there is no danger that these Indians will commit any depredations or probably take the war-path. I submit as against that statement that it is not made by the Secretary of the Interior exactly as it is quoted by the Senator, because the Secretary of the Interior refers to the fact that these outbursts are to be prevented only by the military arm. I submit, as against the guess of the Senator from Maine, the letter I read a few days ago from the officer in command at Fort Niobrara, wherein he says that it is only a question of time, and probably a very short time, when there will be trouble with Red Cloud and his band at the Pine Ridge agency. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES], chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, introduced at this session of Congress a bill, which has passed the Senate, proposing to take from the great Sioux reservation about one-third of the present possessions of the Sioux Indians and open a way through the center of the nation.

Mr. DAWES. More.

Mr. MANDERSON. Nearly half of it, perhaps, in point of area. The proposition in that bill is that the law shall not be operative until a certain portion, perhaps a majority, of the Sioux braves shall consent to its provisions. I saw within a few days a letter from Dr. McGillycuddy, the efficient agent of the Sioux Indians who are gathered in the vicinity of the Pine Ridge agency, in which he said that the bill had excited considerable discussion and opposition around the Indian camp-fires in the vicinity of his and of the Rosebud agency, and it had been determined, if you please, by resolution considered and passed, that the first Indian who should sign an agreement that such a law should become operative by their consent should be killed by his brother-Indians. That is the fact, and it is one of the existing dangers from the Indians in that Territory.

Mr. DAWES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MANDERSON. Certainly.

Mr. DAWES. I dislike very much to have the Senator's statement go out without qualification. It is very true that Red Cloud, an exceedingly bold chief there, holds a fort near the Pine Ridge agency and plants the American flag over it, and considers himself in some sense

the President of the United States, and he has announced in a flourishing trumpet proclamation what he will do to any Indian who gives his assent to that bill; but he does not represent more than one hundred and fifty or two hundred, all told, of the twenty-eight thousand Indians about there.

While I agree with the Senator as to the propriety of passing this bill, I do protest against the idea of charging it to the Indians. There never was a day when the Indian needed the Army around him as little as he does to-day. There is, in my opinion, need of filling up the regiments, but not because of anything the Indian has done in the near past or that there is any idea of his doing in the future.

Mr. MANDERSON. I hope the sanguine view of the situation indulged in by the Senator from Massachusetts is the true one, and I hope I may be all wrong in my fear of trouble to the community in which I live, but it does not change my view of the situation, because, as I have heretofore suggested, my conclusion is reached after a most careful investigation made personally of the condition of affairs upon the Sioux reservation and an observation that has been made within a few months past. I do not want to appear in the light of an alarmist, but I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that there is threatening danger there. Red Cloud is a most aggressive, a most dangerous, and at the same time a most able Indian, and he has following him not only the handful of men who compose his band and the braves of the Northern Cheyennes, but there flock to his standard raised above the house built for him by the Government of the United States every discontented and troublesome Indian of the Sioux Nation. If there shall be outbreak there as the result of deliberation by those bands over what is known as the Dawes bill for dividing the Sioux reservation, I believe it will be trouble most grave in its character, that can not and will not be confined to the Indian bands nor limited to the Sioux reservation, but will extend with all the horrors of a conflict of that kind to the white men who have so lately made themselves homes in that vicinity. It means a great danger to every white settlement on that border.

The Senator from Maine quoted somewhat from General Schofield, and I desire to supplement what he read by reading another extract or two in addition to what I presented in the discussion the other day. He said:

The only course consistent with justice and humanity, and with the dignity of a great nation, is to hold savage tribes in subjection by a show of force which they dare not disregard, and then to teach them by all practicable means to prefer friendship and peace rather than enmity and war.

I will also quote from General Schofield, than whom no man is better informed about this whole question, a part of his report bearing upon the question of the increase of the Army of the United States. The Senator says that while General Schofield is in favor of the three-battalion organization he is in favor of reaching that result by decreasing the number of enlisted men in the infantry regiments of the Army of the United States. But not so, for General Schofield says in the report from which I read:

If such measures are promptly adopted, the wrongs and errors of the past may be largely atoned for, the savage tribes of the country may be rapidly civilized and finally incorporated into the great body of the people.

The military force now required for this service will be in training for the more important services which must ere long be required of it, unless the future history of this country is very different from its past history, and from that of all other civilized nations.

I respectfully submit that these subjects are worthy of the most serious consideration as well as, and in connection with, that of the national defense against possible foreign aggression. While the country is struggling under a great load of unemployed capital and labor, we are neglecting the ordinary prudential measures dictated by reason and experience, which teach that some part of this surplus of capital and labor should be employed to protect the accumulated wealth of the country and the lives of the people from destruction by domestic or foreign foes.

He says further:

I beg leave to submit that, in a country of fifty millions of people, fifty thousand men would be a small army to be maintained with sole reference to possible foreign wars. But when the country has constant daily use for nine-tenths of that force to protect its people and their property against destruction by savage tribes in their midst, it is extremely unwise to limit the Army to its present strength. As well might the great cities of the country limit their police force to one-half that which experience has shown to be necessary for daily service, with no reserve for great emergencies.

I submit that this language of General Schofield, not of ancient date but written as of yesterday, for it is his report of this year, is based upon an experience beyond that of any Senator upon this floor; that from the very nature of his position he has been so situated with regard to the Indian troubles, the domestic troubles that threaten the country, and with respect to the Army of the United States, that he knows whereof he speaks; and I submit that the Senator from Maine is woefully mistaken when he makes the statement that General Schofield is not in favor of an increase of the enlisted force of the Army.

Take some of the threatening dangers referred to by the Senator from Maine. As I understand him, we are in a condition that is almost defenseless upon our seacoast. He is the earnest, the eloquent, and the proper advocate of bettering the condition of affairs upon the coast by the building of modern fortifications and the casting of modern guns. He says he is in favor of building the fortifications and casting the guns, because we are entirely powerless against any attack that might be made upon us even by a third or fourth rate power. But he also says there is no necessity for an increase of the Army to protect the

coast; that it would take at least two years to build the fortifications and cast the guns which must be manned by the Army of the United States. I suggest to him that if there is the imminent danger he describes and it would take us two years to build the needed fortifications that will keep off invading fleets, the chances are that while we are getting ready for the defense of the character he speaks of a foreign army might invade this country, and a regular army even of thirty thousand men would be considered as of great importance for the purpose of protecting our industries and saving the country.

The Senator suggests that the regular Army of the United States when the war broke out in 1861 was of very little importance; that we would have been perhaps as well off if we had had no Army at all at that time and trusted entirely to volunteer organizations.

Mr. HALE. So far as the rank and file is concerned. That is my proposition.

Mr. MANDERSON. I understand.

Mr. HALE. But the number of enlisted men was not a matter of moment.

Mr. MANDERSON. That is to say, the enlisted men of the Army of the United States were not needed at all, and that all we needed were the officers of the Army. I do not know what the experience of the Senator from Maine may have been in the early part of the dark days of 1861, but I apprehend that during that time he probably visited some of the camps of the volunteer soldiers and saw some of the difficulties under which they labored. I remember that in April, 1861, I was one of several thousand men gathered in camp for the purpose of organization into regimental battalions to take the field, and of the thousands gathered in the camp of rendezvous there were very few able to instruct in the school of the battalion, the school of the company, or the manual of arms. I think perhaps five thousand men were gathered in the camp I refer to in the city of Cleveland, in 1861, and I venture the assertion that there were not one hundred men fitted to instruct that large body of men in any part of the duty of the soldier. The officers of the Army of the United States were not there in very large number. There were a few men who had served as private soldiers in the regular Army, and these became the efficient instructors of companies and battalions, took commissions in the volunteer army, and did most effective service.

Mr. President, I believe in making the Army of the United States an organization so efficient and of such character that it shall be the pride of the American citizen to enter into its ranks as a private soldier, and this bill is a step in that direction. I believe that by the increased pay proposed by this bill to the private soldier, by increased opportunities of instruction, not only in the mere school of the soldier, the manual of arms, and the drill of the company, but by instruction in the science of war, the intelligent private soldiers of the Army of the United States may become the officers who will lead the volunteer organizations in the wars of the future to conflict and to success.

But I submit, Mr. President, that the view taken of this matter by the Senator from Maine is not one that has been held by those who have been in position to know a great deal about the subject. I call his attention to but one authority, and it seems to me that it will be sufficient for the purpose. I will read from two different authorities. When John C. Calhoun was Secretary of War of the United States he was commenting upon the experience the country had in passing through in the war of 1812, and said:

The disadvantages of inexperience in the officers and men without the means of immediate instruction was the fatal error at the commencement of the late war that cost us so much treasure and blood. The peace establishment which preceded it was very imperfectly organized, and did not admit of the necessary augmentation.

Yet notwithstanding that experience we went on just as we are going on to-day until we reached the year 1846, and the Mexican war was upon us. Were we any better prepared? No; the economists in the Congress of the United States kept down the military organization and did everything apparently to make it inefficient rather than promote its efficiency, and the result is described by General McClellan in an article written by him in the year 1877:

When the Mexican war broke out the actual strength of the regular Army was about fifty-three hundred. The force with which General Taylor reached the Rio Grande was three thousand, and that with which he fought the battles of Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma only twenty-one hundred. There can be no doubt that if the strength of the Army had sufficed to enable him to move to the Rio Grande with ten thousand men the Mexicans would not have crossed the river and in all human probability the war would have been avoided. The cost of maintaining the seven thousand additional men during the whole period from the close of the war of 1812 to the commencement of the Mexican war would not have amounted to two-thirds of the direct expenses of the latter war, not taking into account the large cost of the Seminole and other Indian wars, or the heavy losses by disease and in battle, or the indirect losses inseparable from all wars.

Mr. HALE. What does General McClellan state there was the real actual force of the regular Army of the United States?

Mr. MANDERSON. The actual fighting strength of the regular Army was about five thousand three hundred men. We ran along after this experience in the war with Mexico and we reached the time to which the Senator from Maine has referred, and, as I understand him, he says all that was necessary to place this Government in the year

1861 in efficient position to quell the war of the rebellion was that we should have had a mere skeleton army, made up of officers without enlisted men. How you are to maintain such an organization I am somewhat at a loss to perceive. The officer who drills his battalion or the captain who drills his company receives instruction as well as gives it, and his experience would be worth but little if he was a mere book soldier. The ability to handle men in the field, so that they may be efficient and a fighting force, is based upon handling them in time of peace. A captain who should simply confine himself to his tactics in his room, and never go upon the drill-ground for the purpose of maneuvering his company and drilling them in the school of the company, would be of very little use when you placed him in command of one hundred men at the outbreak of a war. As the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LOGAN] suggests, he does not see what the officers could learn about the marching of troops, or the camp life, the care of men, and preparing them for battle.

During last summer when in the Territory of Utah I spent three days at what was called the summer camp of instruction, organized by General McCook, in command of Camp Douglas. Of his own regiment and another he had gathered fifteen companies of men, very few men to a company it is true, but still sufficient for the purposes of drill and sufficient for instruction in the practical, not theoretical, art of war. These officers and men under the direction of their efficient leader had gone somewhat into the actual requirements of war. I saw there for the first time since the close of the war of the rebellion earthworks constructed and the making of all the guards that are prepared for the purpose of making obstructions to an attack—gabions, fascines, abatis, &c.; and I submit to the Senator from Maine that those who received the most effectual good from this practice drill, which would have been impossible without the enlisted men, were the younger officers, who had seen nothing of war and were here putting in actual practice the theories that they had learned at West Point.

But I am digressing from the proposition. I proposed to show that the efficient commander of the Army of the Potomac differed somewhat from the Senator from Maine.

I remember a story of a glib young lawyer who advanced a remarkable legal proposition to the court, and was told by the judge: "My young friend I am very much surprised to hear you make a statement of that kind and claim it to be law;" and opening a volume of Blackstone said: "Blackstone says so and so—a proposition directly the reverse of that just stated."

The attorney was not at all embarrassed, and said: "Well, your honor, there is where Blackstone and I differ." I submit to the Senator from Maine that I will show wherein he and General McClellan differ as to what would have been the probable result if we had had an army of the character described by him and what would have resulted if we had had an efficient army of the character proposed by this bill. General McClellan says:

But the most instructive case of all is that of the civil war. We do not doubt that fifteen thousand regulars on the field of the first Manassas would have insured the complete rout of the raw confederates, and, in all probability, put an end to the war. They would certainly have enabled us to drive the confederate government out of Virginia and have cleared the eastern portion of the State as completely as the work was accomplished a little earlier in West Virginia.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator allow me to say a word?

Mr. MANDERSON. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator agree with General McClellan that a regular army of fifteen thousand men would have not only defeated the rebel forces, but would have ended the war?

Mr. MANDERSON. I think this is true beyond question, that if fifteen thousand regular troops had been upon the Union side at the battle of Manassas, the first Bull Run would not have been a sore defeat to the Union arms, but would have been a victory of such character that it might, and probably would, have induced a peace upon some terms.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator believe that no matter what might have been the result of the first battle of Bull Run, had our victory been as great as it could have been, it would have perceptibly shortened the war?

Mr. MANDERSON. I think it would most decidedly.

Mr. HALE. I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. MANDERSON. And do not agree either with General McClellan on that proposition.

Mr. HALE. There were several things with reference to the conduct of the war where I did not agree with General McClellan. I do not believe that great war could have been stopped by one battle.

Mr. MANDERSON. I think there will be no issue between the Senator from Maine and myself on the proposition that as an organizer of troops, a disciplinarian, and a man who had extraordinary military research, skill, and ability in that direction few men were higher than General McClellan. I have given his view of the matter.

Mr. HALE. Let me put a question. Supposing the United States at that time had had a regular Army of one hundred thousand men, does the Senator believe that that would have prevented the war of the rebellion and the settlement of the great issues involved in that war?

Mr. MANDERSON. I believe most firmly that if the United States



had had in April, 1861, an army of one hundred thousand, true to the cause of the Union—

Mr. HALE. That is another thing.

Mr. MANDERSON. True to the cause of the Union, there would have been no war.

Mr. HALE. That is another thing. Had the United States had an army of one hundred thousand men at that time, one-half of them in moral, effective, and physical force would have been directed against the life of the Government as it was.

Mr. HAWLEY. Pardon me just there. There is not on record the desertion of a company or a soldier from the regular Army.

Mr. MANDERSON. On the contrary—

Mr. HALE. I am not stating that. But as a military establishment under the control, under the political influence at the time, one hundred thousand men in the regular Army of the United States in 1861 would not have been of perceptible benefit to us in that great struggle.

Mr. MANDERSON. There is where the Senator and General McClellan differ.

Mr. HALE. I am obliged to differ with General McClellan.

Mr. MANDERSON. Let us read further what he says, and this was written in 1877, many years after the close of the war, when he had the benefit of not only his war experience, but the observation resulting from investigation after the war, of reports of different army leaders, &c.:

The cost of maintaining these fifteen thousand additional troops from the close of the Mexican war to the commencement of the war of secession would not have amounted to one-fiftieth part of the war debts of the General Government, the States, counties, and municipalities. Should we compare it with the total amount of direct and indirect expenditures by both parties to the war, the losses of the two sections in lives, in property destroyed, business ruined, and capital sunk, we should be at a loss to express the relation, so absurdly small would be the relative cost of those additional troops.

But, Mr. President, does it need quotation or argument that in time of peace we should prepare for war? There is no adage, it seems to me, that has in it more of wisdom, and I submit to the Senate another quotation somewhat *apropos* to the subject under consideration. De Tocqueville, in his celebrated work, says:

War is an occurrence to which all nations are subject, democratic nations as well as all others. Whatever taste they may have for peace, they must hold themselves in readiness to repel aggression.

That, I take it, is the wise position occupied by the Senator from Maine when he agrees that there are threatened dangers requiring an increase of the Navy of the United States, the building of war ships, the construction of fortifications, and the casting of guns. It seems to me that every reason which prompts him to this conclusion should prompt him also to the proposition that the regular Army of the United States should be made efficient.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, if I understand the argument of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON] it is based upon two theories: first, that we want an increase of the Army to suppress possible Indian outbreaks, and, second, we want it for fear there may be another rebellion. If there is anything at all in the discussion of the question as to what would have been the effect of a large army in 1861, it is on the hypothesis that we must keep a large standing army for the purpose of meeting just such emergencies as arose then. I do not suppose the Senator from Nebraska will claim that there is a possibility of such an occurrence again.

Mr. MANDERSON. Did the Senator understand me to say that I expected another rebellion?

Mr. TELLER. I did not understand the Senator so to say.

Mr. MANDERSON. I do not understand why the Senator from Colorado should make that remark.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator said that if we had had a large army in 1860 we should have avoided the rebellion; therefore we must now have a large standing army. Why? I simply say there is no force in the argument at all unless the Senator thinks there is danger of another rebellion, which I assume that he does not think will occur. We have now from the chairman and from everybody who has discussed the bill, with the exception of one Senator, the declaration that there is no danger of a war from any source, and that Senator is the Senator from Nebraska, who still insists, as he did the other day, that there is imminent danger of an Indian war; and as to that, and that only, I propose to say a few words, not to go at all into the other question or to attempt to answer what has been said on behalf of the bill by others.

The Senator from Nebraska says that in 1860 there was danger of war with the Indians, but that it is infinitely greater now. The Senator must have carelessly examined the condition of the Indian tribes in this country if he asserts that they are in any such condition to carry on a war as they were in 1860. He says, in the first place, that they were armed with bows and arrows. The Senator is certainly mistaken in that. More than twenty-five years ago I saw the warriors on the plains armed with the best weapons that were then in existence, and if they have got any better now it is simply because there has been an improvement in arms. Then they had a reservoir back of them of food, with a great country outlying with millions of cattle, estimated by Mr. Greeley to be equal to all the horned cattle in the United States, upon

which they could feed, with innumerable opportunities to escape from the troops on the frontier; but to-day there is not any frontier at all in the United States. The Indians, instead of being in a condition to carry on war as they were in 1860 when we had the magnificent army of twelve or fifteen thousand men, are in no condition to carry on war for the reason that I gave the other day, which is understood by the Indians as well as by any military man in the world, that they have no supplies upon which they can subsist. They can not go back into the interior and subsist themselves in peace to-day, as the Senator ought to know. Of that immense herd of buffaloes that Mr. Greeley declared was so great in numbers, there are not enough left to-day to keep the Indians a month if they had them all. It is physically impossible for any large number of Indians to go upon the war-path; and they are not only warriors but they are sensible in their methods. They understand very well that they can not be supported in arms against the Government by the Government. They understand that. With all the foolish things we have done in reference to them they do not expect us to feed them while they fight us; and they know better than to fight, unless it may be now and then a little party of thirty or forty men as went out from the Apache reservation last spring.

I have been looking over the correspondence between the War Department and General Crook, and I find that the general says he has all the troops he wants. General Crook telegraphed that he did not want any more troops and could not use them if he had them; and there is not any place where there is likely to be a foray made by Indians where there is not an abundance of troops to meet any such foray as they would make.

Mr. MANDERSON. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to say a word.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. MANDERSON. The Senator speaks of the fact that General Crook said that he desired no more troops because of the character of the country in which the Apaches under Geronimo were operating. It was not a numerous body of troops he desired, but men skilled in that sort of warfare; and therefore it was that he left his white cavalry in the rear and entered the mountains on the border of Mexico with Indian scouts, and not with white soldiers.

Mr. TELLER. It is perfectly immaterial why he did not want any more troops. It can not be said that he did not put down the outbreak of the Indians quicker because the Army was needed. He did call for two hundred scouts to be enlisted from the peaceable Indians of the Apache tribe, and he got them, and that is the force he wants to-day, and not United States troops except in a limited number, and he has, if his statement is correct, and I have no doubt about it, only thirty-four warriors to contend with at most.

The honorable Senator spoke of Red Cloud, and he said Red Cloud had with him a large force. The chairman of the committee stated the number in excess of what he really has got. It is less than two hundred people all told, men, women, and children, that he can depend upon to adhere to his standard; and contrary to the statement the Senator made that the Northern Cheyennes are with him, they have never been with Red Cloud in sympathy nor in fact.

Mr. DAWES. Will the Senator allow me to add that the force at the Pine Ridge agency is as well drilled as any cavalry in the United States, and I will call on the Senator from Illinois to certify as to who was able to command the whole of that reservation and keep the peace there. Dr. McGillicuddy, in the most extreme case of attempted outrage on the part of this man Red Cloud, held him in subjection, and he does to-day, and the peace of the whole reservation is maintained there by the efficiency and energy of Dr. McGillicuddy and the discipline of the Indian police, every one of them an Indian.

Mr. TELLER. The chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs has stated just what I was going to state, but very much better than I could.

Mr. DAWES. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. TELLER. The facts are exactly as he states. I was about to state that the present agent with his force was able and willing and at all times ready to cope with Mr. Red Cloud and his force whenever he threatened any disturbance. Now, instead of the Northern Cheyennes being in sympathy with Red Cloud they have been hostile to him, and a portion of the Northern Cheyennes at least are as harmless and as peaceable to-day as any Indians in the United States. They are scattered up and down the Tongue River for 10 to 150 miles—I do not remember the exact distance—in their cabins built by their own hands or with their own money that they have earned and living in a condition at least of semi-civilization a large number of them, and I do not think that there need be apprehended any danger from them for they have subsisted themselves by labor there for at least two years without making any trouble.

I do not want to go into any general discussion of this bill; but I insist that there never has been at any time in the history of our relations with the Indians, from the beginning of the settlements on the continent to the present day, when there was so little use for an army to hold the Indian in subjection as there is at this hour. It is absolute folly to talk about increasing the Army for that purpose. With a fourth of the Army you now have, you can hold the Indians in subjection, ex-

cept that occasionally some of them may break out and commit an individual depredation as white people do in every community in the land.

I said a moment ago that the frontier was abandoned. There is no place where the Indian can flee now that he does not find a settler and the settler pretty well able to protect himself, as I know from experience. I know that when the war was rank and when that great country back of the Missouri River was without a soldier and when the Indians had an abundance of food upon which they could fall back and when they made their raids, it was the settlers single-handed and alone who coped with them and held them at bay. It was not the Government of the United States, and it was not done with Government money. I recollect one Saturday the little community in which I lived were called upon to meet an attempted Indian attack; we had not heard from the States for six weeks; we did not know whether the Government of the United States was in existence or whether it had gone; it was in the midst of war. A community not consisting of over five thousand or eight thousand people at the most raised and put in the field, and had 40 miles from that place on the second day one hundred and ten mounted men armed and equipped who made their way down to the river and opened the telegraph and railroad lines without Government aid and without Government assistance and without ever having received to this day a dollar of Government pay. Everywhere that the Indian goes now he finds a settler and everywhere that he goes he finds a community ready to meet him half-way if he makes an attempt to outrage anybody in any community, and he knows that as well as the best military man in this country.

I repeat again that the use of the Army is not the method by which the Indians are to be brought into civilization, and I do not care whether it is General Schofield or any other man who insists that he wants the Army for the purpose of holding in subjection the Indian population of the United States; I say that hour has passed, and not only humanity but public policy requires that we should adopt another and a different method in dealing with the Indians. I do not believe there is an intelligent man on the frontier living by the side of the Indians who would approve of the increase of the Army to thirty thousand men upon the theory that they are needed for his protection from the Sioux or the Crows or any other of the Indians on the frontier.

Why, Mr. President, if you are to guard and watch these Indians you have not got men enough with thirty thousand troops in the Army; you must have a hundred thousand if you are to rely solely and entirely on watching and keeping as many soldiers in the community as you have Indians. You have got one hundred and sixty-five thousand wild Indians, and as the Senator from Nebraska truly said the other day, if it is a question of war it is almost the whole population you have to meet except the infants; it is the women; it is the boys of ten and twelve years who are to be met and treated as warriors if you treat them as warriors at all. If you talk about scattering troops all over the country to keep the Indians in subjection by force, of what more use will thirty thousand be than twenty-five thousand?

Mr. MANDERSON. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Colorado to one statement in the report of Dr. McGillicuddy, agent at the Pine Ridge agency. He is speaking of the Northern Cheyenne Indians. I understand the Senator from Colorado to say that they have progressed very far in civilization.

Mr. TELLER. I am speaking of those who went first, and not the last. I do not know anything about the last immigration. That is since I have had anything to do with Indian affairs.

Mr. MANDERSON. I call the Senator's attention to this comment of Dr. McGillicuddy on the Northern Cheyennes.

Mr. TELLER. Dr. McGillicuddy is not within a thousand miles of the Northern Cheyennes, the large portion of them. He may have some Northern Cheyennes at Pine Ridge.

Mr. MANDERSON. It was the Northern Cheyennes at Pine Ridge of whom I was talking. He says that the last remnant of them, about a thousand in number, joined the three hundred and sixty who are already upon this reservation, the Pine Ridge agency; that all the Northern Cheyennes are in sympathy with Red Cloud and his band, numbering one thousand three hundred and sixty, and he says further:

THE NORTHERN CHEYENNES.

These Indians remain in the non-progressive condition peculiar to them for several years past. They do not build or live in houses, farm, or send their children to school, considering themselves in their aboriginal egotism superior to the white man who works for a living. I have been associated with them more or less for the past eight years, and can observe no change in them since they surrendered from the war-path in 1877.

They were at Pine Ridge agency in 1884, and the band is there yet. I saw them last fall in about the condition described by Dr. McGillicuddy.

Mr. TELLER. I am aware that there are some Northern Cheyennes at McGillicuddy's agency. They went there late in the fall of 1884. I have never heard any complaint of them. I have not read McGillicuddy's report, but prior to that a large number of Northern Cheyennes, the most hostile, the wildest, the most vigorous of them all, fled on their own account from the Indian Territory and went up to Pine Ridge. Dissatisfied with Pine Ridge accommodations and treatment they went from there to Tongue River, in Montana, and they

are the Indians of whom I have spoken. I have yet to learn even from this report that there is any disposition on the part of the Northern Cheyennes at the Pine Ridge agency to affiliate with the hostile Indians of Red Cloud's band, if they can be called hostile at all, which I deny.

Mr. President, it is easy enough to get up a bugbear about Indian wars. I know exactly how sensitive the Western people are on that question. I know how ready they are to believe it. I have seen a whole community, composed of thousands of men, in a state of frenzy when the statement came that a little band of Indians were a few miles out. I have seen a whole community go practically wild after the Sioux war in Minnesota, and it is not strange that they should. But that time has passed, as everybody knows, and nobody knows it so well as the Indian, because he understands that he has not a place to flee to, and that he has not the opportunity of supporting himself in a conflict with the United States.

That is all I care to say as to the bill. The bill must be defended on some other ground than its necessity for the purpose of putting down the Indian population.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. CAMERON. I ask the Senator to give way for a moment to go into executive session.

Mr. HAWLEY. I am perfectly willing to go on now.

Mr. CAMERON. There are matters of importance in executive session to be attended to, and it is impossible to finish the bill to-night.

Mr. HAWLEY. I shall only speak fifteen minutes.

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

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania to withdraw that for a moment.

Mr. CAMERON. For what purpose?

Mr. CALL. I only wish to make an announcement.

Mr. CAMERON. Very well.

Mr. CALL. I give notice that to-morrow morning at the conclusion of the morning business I shall ask the Senate to take up the resolution relative to the forfeiture of Florida land grants in order that I may submit some few remarks to the Senate upon it.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

Mr. MAHONE. With the permission of the Senator from Pennsylvania—

Mr. HAWLEY. I believe I have the floor.

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

Mr. MAHONE. I ask leave to make a report from a conference committee.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That is a privileged matter. The Senator from Virginia submits a conference report, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 44) making appropriations for the erection of a public building at San Antonio, Tex., having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with the following amendment: Strike out the words "one hundred and fifty thousand dollars" and insert the words "so herein limited;" and that the House concur in the same.

WILLIAM MAHONE,  
RICHARD COKE,  
JOHN C. SPOONER,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*  
SAMUEL DIBBLE,  
SEABORN REESE,  
W. H. WADE,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*

The report was concurred in.

PAPERS WITHDRAWN AND REFERRED.

Mr. CAMERON. I now renew my motion.

Mr. FRYE. If the Senator will yield to me one moment I want to offer an order to get papers before the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CAMERON. Very well.

Mr. FRYE. I offer the following order:

*Ordered*, That the papers on file relating to the Harlem River Improvement be taken therefrom and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The order was agreed to.

EFFICIENCY OF THE ARMY.

Mr. LOGAN. Before the motion for an executive session is put I desire to have a time fixed to-morrow, if the other gentlemen who desire to be heard besides the Senator from Connecticut will agree, at which we shall take the vote on the bill to increase the efficiency of the Army, with all the amendments. I would suggest 3 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent of the Senate that 3 o'clock to-morrow be fixed as the time at which the vote shall be taken on the military bill.

Mr. LOGAN. If we can reach a vote sooner I will say I should not want to postpone a vote. I will say not later than 3 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

Mr. PLUMB. I object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Kansas objects. Mr. CULLOM. I hope my colleague will insist on sitting to-morrow until this bill is disposed of. There are many other measures here that ought to be considered, which are waiting.

Mr. LOGAN. I desire to be patient about it. Of course everybody so disposed has a right to make objection, but I do not see why there should not be an hour fixed for a vote. It is usual on all measures that come up, where they are discussed at length before the Senate; but if there is objection, of course I can not help it.

Mr. PLUMB. I have no objection to having the vote taken to-morrow; but after the motion of the Senator from Maine is disposed of there will be a number of other motions, going, probably, to every section of the bill. I do not want to embarrass the action of the Senate in regard to propositions of that sort. The pending question is one thing, and the several other parts of the bill are another.

Mr. LOGAN. It is understood always that fixing a time for the vote on a bill means that at that time we begin to vote on whatever amendments may be proposed to it. It does not mean that the final vote shall then be taken, so as to cut off amendments, but that we commence to vote at that time. That is the custom always in the Senate.

Mr. PLUMB. Then I withdraw the objection if it is understood that 3 o'clock to-morrow will be the time for voting on the pending proposition.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent of the Senate that at 3 o'clock to-morrow the Senate proceed to vote on the pending question.

Mr. LOGAN. Not later than 3 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Not later than 3. Is there objection?

Mr. PLUMB. On the pending question?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The pending motion. The Chair hears no objection, and that order is made by the unanimous agreement of the Senate.

#### IMMIGRATION OF CHINESE.

Mr. CAMERON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Before that is done the Chair desires to submit a message from the President of the United States.

The Secretary read the message, as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress, with a view to appropriate legislation in the premises, a report of the Secretary of State, with certain correspondence, touching the treaty right of Chinese subjects other than laborers "to go and come of their own free will and accord."

In my annual message of the 8th of December last I said:

"In the application of the acts lately passed to execute the treaty of 1880, restrictive of the immigration of Chinese laborers in the United States, individual cases of hardship have occurred beyond the power of the Executive to remedy, and calling for judicial determination."

These cases of individual hardship are due to the ambiguous and defective provisions of the acts of Congress approved respectively on the 6th May, 1882, and 5th July, 1884. The hardship has in some cases been remedied by the action of the courts. In other cases, however, where the phrasology of the statutes has appeared to be conclusive against any discretion on the part of the officers charged with the execution of the law, Chinese persons expressly entitled to free admission under the treaty have been refused a landing and sent back to the country whence they came, without being afforded any opportunity to show in the courts or otherwise their right to the privilege of free ingress and egress which it was the purpose of the treaty to secure.

In the language of one of the judicial determinations of the Supreme Court of the United States to which I have referred, "the supposition should not be indulged that Congress, while professing to faithfully execute the treaty stipulations, and recognizing the fact that they secure to a certain class the right to go from and come to the United States, intended to make its protection depend upon the performance of conditions which it was physically impossible to perform." (U. S. R. 112, p. 554, Chew Heong v. U. S.)

The act of July 5, 1884, imposes such an impossible condition in not providing for the admission, under proper certificate, of Chinese travelers of the exempted classes in the cases most likely to arise in ordinary commercial intercourse.

The treaty provisions governing the case are as follows:

"ARTICLE I. \* \* \* The limitation or suspension shall be reasonable, and shall apply only to Chinese who may go to the United States as laborers, other classes not being included in the limitations. \* \* \*

"ART. II. Chinese subjects, whether proceeding to the United States as teachers, students, merchants, or from curiosity, together with their body and household servants, \* \* \* shall be allowed to go and come of their own free will and accord, and shall be accorded all the rights, privileges, immunities, and exemptions which are accorded to the citizens and subjects of the most favored nation."

Section 6 of the amended Chinese immigration act of 1884 purports to secure this treaty right to the exempted classes named by means of prescribed certificates of their status, which certificates shall be the *prima facie* and the sole permissible evidence to establish a right of entry into the United States. But it provides in terms for the issuance of certificates in two cases only:

(a) Chinese subjects departing from a port of China; and

(b) Chinese persons (*i. e.*, of the Chinese race) who may at the time be subjects of some foreign government other than China, and who may depart for the United States from the ports of such other foreign government.

A statute is certainly most unusual which, purporting to execute the provisions of a treaty with China in respect of Chinese subjects, enacts strict formalities as regards the subjects of other governments than that of China.

It is sufficient that I should call the earnest attention of Congress to the circumstance that the statute makes no provision whatever for the somewhat numerous class of Chinese persons who, retaining their Chinese subjecthood in some countries other than China, desire to come from such countries to the United States.

Chinese merchants have trading operations of magnitude throughout the world. They do not become citizens or subjects of the country where they may temporarily reside and trade; they continue to be subjects of China, and to them the explicit exemption of the treaty applies. Yet, if such a Chinese subject, the head of a mercantile house at Hong-Kong or Yokohama or Honolulu or Havana

or Colon, desires to come from any of these places to the United States he is met with the requirement that he must produce a certificate, in prescribed form and in the English tongue, issued by the Chinese Government. If there be at the foreign place of his residence no representative of the Chinese Government competent to issue a certificate in the prescribed form, he can obtain none, and is under the provisions of the present law unjustly debarred from entry into the United States. His usual Chinese passport will not suffice, for it is not in the form which the act prescribes shall be the sole permissible evidence of his right to land. And he can obtain no such certificate from the government of his place of residence, because he is not a subject or citizen thereof, "at the time," or at any time.

There being, therefore, no statutory provision prescribing the terms upon which Chinese persons, resident in foreign countries but not subjects or citizens of such countries, may prove their status and rights as members of the exempted classes in the absence of a Chinese representative in such country, the Secretary of the Treasury, in whom the execution of the act of July 5, 1884, was vested, undertook to remedy the omission by directing the revenue officers to recognize as lawful certificates those issued in favor of Chinese subjects by the Chinese consular and diplomatic officers at the foreign port of departure, when visited by the United States representative thereat. This appears to be a just application of the spirit of the law, although enlarging its letter, and in adopting this rule he was controlled by the authority of high judicial decisions as to what evidence is necessary to establish the fact that an individual Chinaman belongs to the exempted class.

He, however, went beyond the spirit of the act, and the judicial decisions, by providing, in a circular dated January 14, 1885, for the original issuance of such a certificate by the United States consular officer at the port of departure, in the absence of a Chinese diplomatic or consular representative thereat. For it is clear that the act of Congress contemplated the intervention of the United States consul only in a supervisory capacity, his function being to check the proceeding and see that no abuse of the privilege followed. The power or duty of original certification is wholly distinct from that supervisory function. It either dispenses with the foreign certificate altogether, leaving the consular visa to stand alone and sufficient, or else it combines in one official act the distinct functions of certification and verification of the fact certified.

The official character attaching to the consular certification contemplated by the unamended circular of January 14, 1885, is to be borne in mind. It is not merely *prima facie* evidence of the status of the bearer, such as the courts may admit in their discretion; it was prescribed as an official attestation, on the strength of which the customs officers at the port of entry were to admit the bearer without further adjudication of his status unless question should arise as to the truth of the certificate itself.

It became, therefore, necessary to amend the circular of January 14, 1885, and this was done on the 13th of June following, by striking out the clause prescribing original certification of status by the United States consuls. The effect of this amendment is to deprive any certificate the United States consuls may issue, of the value it purported to possess, as sole permissible evidence under the statute when its issuance was prescribed by Treasury regulations. There is, however, nothing to prevent consuls giving certificates of facts within their knowledge, to be received as evidence in the absence of statutory authentication.

The complaint of the Chinese minister, in his note of March 24, 1886, is that the Chinese merchant, Lay Sang, of the house of King Lee & Co., of San Francisco, having arrived at San Francisco from Hong-Kong, and exhibited a certificate of the United States consul at Hong-Kong as to his status as a merchant and consequently exempt under the treaty, was refused permission to land, and was sent back to Hong-Kong by the steamer which brought him. While the certificate he bore was doubtless insufficient under the present law, it is to be remembered that there is at Hong-Kong no representative of the Government of China competent or authorized to issue the certificate required by the statute. The intent of Congress to legislate in execution of the treaty, is thus defeated by a prohibition directly contrary to the treaty; and conditions are exacted which, in the words of the Supreme Court hereinbefore quoted, "it was physically impossible to perform."

This anomalous feature of the act should be reformed as speedily as possible, in order that the occurrence of such cases may be avoided, and the imputation removed which would otherwise rest upon the good faith of the United States in the execution of their solemn treaty engagements.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, Washington, April 6, 1886.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The message, with the accompanying papers, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and be printed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CAMERON. I renew my motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Before putting the motion the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business, being the bill (S. 67) to provide for the formation and admission into the Union of the State of Washington, and for other purposes. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After thirty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned.

#### CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 6, 1886.

#### SECRETARY OF LEGATION AT PARIS.

Henri Vignaud, of Louisiana, formerly second secretary of the legation of the United States at Paris, to be secretary of the legation.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, April 6, 1886.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings. Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of so much of the Journal as relates to the introduction and reference of bills and joint resolutions.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly. The remainder of the Journal was read and approved.

## CORRECTION OF A REFERENCE.

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced a resolution calling for certain information from the Interior Department with reference to discriminations against the New Orleans, and Gulf, and other roads, which was referred to the Committee on Railways and Canals. I asked at the time that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce, where it properly belongs; but presume the request was not heard on account of the confusion prevailing in the Hall.

The SPEAKER. The reference was made by inadvertence, and the correction will be made. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

## REFERENCE OF SENATE RESOLUTIONS, ETC.

The SPEAKER laid before the House, under the rule, a joint resolution (H. Res. 18) for the further distribution of the report of the Public Lands Commission with Senate amendments, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate providing for the binding at the Government Printing Office of the schedules of the second, third, fourth, and tenth censuses; which were referred to the Committee on Printing.

## PAYMENT OF SILVER, BOSTON SUBTREASURY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the acting Secretary of the Treasury, stating, in response to a resolution of the House, that the payment of silver dollars is not refused at the sub-treasury at Boston; which was referred to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, and ordered to be printed.

## HUNTING ISLAND LIGHT-HOUSE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Light-House Board asking an appropriation for the purchase of a site and removal and erection of the Hunting Island light-house thereon; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

## PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY VS. UNITED STATES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the order and findings of fact of that court in the case of the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary and High School in Virginia against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

## INDIAN TREATY FUNDS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, with inclosures, a letter from the Secretary of the Interior concerning the loss of treaty funds by the Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole Indians, respectively, resulting from a compromise with the sureties of Lucius N. Robinson, late superintendent of Indian Affairs; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

## MEDICAL EXAMINERS, PENSION OFFICE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Interior in relation to an increase of the number and salaries of medical examiners in the Pension Office; which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, and ordered to be printed.

## IMPROVEMENT OF MISSOURI RIVER, FORT LEAVENWORTH.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report and map from the Chief of Engineers showing encroachments of the Missouri River opposite Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and asking an appropriation to protect the banks; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. NELSON for ten days, on account of important business, and to Mr. O'DONNELL, on account of sickness in his family.

## WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. LA FOLLETTE, by unanimous consent leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies of the same, papers filed in support of House bill 5636, first session of the Forty-eighth Congress, to pension Otto Leisring.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] introduced a resolution recently providing for the purchase of a certain digest of international law, which the Chair supposed at the time was a resolution to print, and it was referred accordingly to that committee. Upon an examination of the resolution the Chair thinks it should go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and if there be no objection the correction will be made.

There being no objection, the change of reference was ordered.

## LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. STORM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit a

resolution from the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, asking permission to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read, subject to objection. The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Select Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, charged with the investigation of matters connected with the appropriation of \$50,000 for certain improvements of the Ohio River near Jeffersonville, Ind., under a resolution of the House adopted March 16, 1886, be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and agreed to.

Mr. STORM 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.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5891, and put it upon its passage.

Mr. BLAND. We had better have the regular order if we are to have a contest over these requests.

Mr. RYAN. I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri that this will not provoke any debate. It is for the relief of an individual, and I do not think there will be any contest. I will assure my friend from Missouri that if it provokes any debate I will withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. The title of the bill will be read, after which objection will be asked for.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5891) to authorize a patent for the south half of the southeast quarter of section 34, in township 22, of range 15 east of the sixth principal meridian, to Elizur B. Hall, as administrator of the estate of William Frederick Schlagel.

Mr. RYAN. I ask that the bill be read. I do not believe there will be any objection.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. SPRINGER rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois object?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not desire to make any objection; but I wish to state on behalf of the Committee on Claims that I have an order to present for the action of the House which would set apart next Friday for considering cases of this kind on the Private Calendar, and which I think will meet the approval of the House. It will enable us to reach cases of this kind in the regular way.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. BEACH. I shall object, after hearing the statement of my friend from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I now offer the resolution I have indicated.

Mr. BLAND. I call for the regular order.

## RESTRICTIONS ON AMERICAN PORK.

Mr. PHELPS. I present a privileged report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I am instructed to report back with a favorable recommendation and to ask for the adoption of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit, if not incompatible with the public interest, copies of all correspondence between his Department and the representatives of France, Germany, Austria, and any other European country which has partially or entirely restricted the importation of American pork, referring to the facts of such exclusion or restriction and the reasons given therefor.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. PHELPS 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.

## CONSIDERATION OF PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] withdraws his objection to my resolution.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded by several gentlemen.

Mr. SPRINGER. If the House will allow this resolution to be read I think there will be no objection to it. It meets a want that has been pressing upon us for some time.

The SPEAKER. Is the demand for the regular order withdrawn? If there be no objection the resolution will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objections.

The resolution was read, as follows:

*Ordered*, That when the House on Friday next, April 9, resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar, it shall be in order to take up bills in their order, and, after five minutes' explanation, the question shall be put to the committee whether there is objection to the present consideration of the bill; and if five persons object to its consideration, such bill shall be passed over informally and the next bill shall be taken up for consideration in like manner. Bills to the consideration of which there are not five persons objecting shall be subject to ten minutes' debate, five minutes in favor of the bill and five minutes against it, when the question shall be put upon laying the bill aside to be reported to the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. I think there is nothing worse than passing bills after five or ten minutes' consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio objects. The resolution is not before the House.

#### AMENDMENT OF RULES.

Mr. MORRISON. I call up for present consideration the privileged report from the Committee on Rules submitted by me on yesterday, and which was laid over for one day under the rules. I move the previous question on the report.

Mr. COBB. I trust the gentleman from Illinois will withdraw the demand for the previous question and allow me to offer an amendment giving the Committee on the Public Lands an opportunity to call up for consideration bills forfeiting land grants. There has been a resolution pending for the last two weeks giving us that privilege. We have various bills ready to act upon if we shall only get the right of way for them. I trust the gentleman will allow me to offer that amendment.

Mr. MORRISON. This is a report from the Committee on Rules, and I am not authorized or permitted to allow any amendment to it. I have demanded the previous question.

Mr. COBB. I trust the House will vote down the demand for the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is not debatable.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 96, noes 17.

So (further count not being called for) the previous question was ordered.

Mr. COBB. Would it now be in order to move that the Committee on Rules be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution giving the right of way to the Public Lands Committee for land-forfeiture bills and that the House pass the resolution which I will send up?

The SPEAKER. That motion can only be made by unanimous consent.

Mr. COBB. I ask unanimous consent to make the motion now.

The SPEAKER. The House is considering another matter. The proposition of the gentleman from Indiana can not be injected into the consideration of the pending question.

Mr. COBB. Then I shall take another opportunity of offering it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the report of the Committee on Rules. Are separate votes demanded on the separate propositions?

Mr. HOLMAN. I think the last proposition had better be the subject of a separate vote; I mean that part of the report which refers to the taking of yeas and nays on appropriation bills.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the various propositions in the report except the last one.

The question being taken, the various propositions in the report except the last one were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read clause 6 of Rule XXI, which the Committee on Rules recommends to be repealed.

The Clerk read as follows:

Upon all general appropriation and revenue bills, and bills for the improvement of rivers and harbors, the yeas and nays shall be taken on the passage of such bills in the House and entered upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The recommendation of the committee is that this clause be stricken out from the rules. A separate vote was demanded by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question being taken, the recommendation of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. MORRISON moved to reconsider the votes by which the report of the Committee on Rules was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The regular order having been demanded, the Chair will proceed to call committees for reports.

#### ADMISSION OF ALTARS FREE OF DUTY.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 4007) to admit free of duty a certain set of altars for the Catholic church of St. John the Evangelist, in the parish of La Fayette, Louisiana; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### SUPREME COURT OF MONTANA TERRITORY, ETC.

Mr. ROGERS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 2880) relating to the supreme court of Montana Territory, and providing for the establishment of judicial districts therein; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### SMALL BILLS FOR CIRCULATION.

Mr. MILLER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 5788) to provide for the issue of small bills for circulation, and for other purposes; which was

referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### BRIDGE NEAR KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. WEAVER, of Nebraska, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 1360) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at some accessible point within ten miles below and five miles above the city of Kansas City, Mo.; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### BRIDGE NEAR ATCHISON, KANS.

Mr. WEAVER, of Nebraska, from the Committee on Commerce, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 6013) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at some accessible point within 2 miles north and 2 miles south of the city of Atchison, in the county of Atchison, in the State of Kansas; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### GULF AND CHICAGO AIR-LINE RAILROAD BRIDGES.

Mr. CRISP, from the Committee on Commerce, reported, as a substitute for H. R. 6376, a bill (H. R. 7626) to grant to the Gulf and Chicago Air-Line Railway Company the right to construct bridges over navigable water courses; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The original bill (H. R. 6376) was laid on the table.

#### LIGHT-HOUSE SUPPLY STEAMER.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Commerce, reported, as a substitute for H. R. 3483, a bill (H. R. 7627) providing for the construction of a light-house supply steamer for the Atlantic and Gulf coasts; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The original bill (H. R. 3483) was laid on the table.

#### LIGHT-HOUSE, CRABTREE'S LEDGE.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Commerce, also reported, as a substitute for H. R. 5279, a bill (H. R. 7628) for the establishment of a light-house on Crabtree's Ledge, in Frenchman's Bay, in Maine; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The original bill (H. R. 5279) was laid on the table.

#### LIGHT-HOUSE, DEER ISLAND, BOSTON HARBOR.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Commerce, also reported, as a substitute for H. R. 3482, a bill (H. R. 7629) authorizing the establishment of a light-house and fog-signal at Deer Island, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The original bill (H. R. 3482) was laid on the table.

#### LIGHT-HOUSE, LUBEC NARROWS, MAINE.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Commerce, also reported, as a substitute for H. R. 3445, a bill (H. R. 7630) for the erection of a light-house at Lubec Narrows, Maine; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The original bill (H. R. 3445) was laid on the table.

#### STEAM LIGHT-HOUSE TENDER.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Commerce, reported, as a substitute for H. R. 3485, a bill (H. R. 7631) authorizing the construction of a steam light-house tender for the use of the fourth light-house district; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The original bill (H. R. 3485) was laid on the table.

#### LIGHT-SHIP OFF ENTRANCE TO CHESAPEAKE BAY.

Mr. CLARDY, from the Committee on Commerce, reported, as a substitute for H. R. 6076, a bill (H. R. 7632) to establish a light-ship off the entrance to Chesapeake Bay; which was read a first and second time.

The SPEAKER. This bill will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLARDY. I ask its reference to the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the rule of the House on this subject.

The Clerk read clause 3 of Rule XXIII, as follows:

All motions or propositions involving a tax or charge upon the people; all proceedings touching appropriations of money, or bills making appropriations of money or property, or requiring such appropriation to be made, or authorizing payments out of appropriations already made, or releasing any liability to the United States for money or property, shall be first considered in a Committee of the Whole, and a point of order under this rule shall be good at any time before the consideration of a bill has commenced.

The SPEAKER. The bill just reported by the gentleman from Missouri provides that there be constructed and established a first-class light-ship with a steam fog-signal off Chesapeake Bay. It is very evi-

dent that the Secretary of the Treasury can not establish this light-ship without the expenditure of money. The rule requires that any bill requiring an appropriation to be made—that is, which can not be executed without the appropriation of money—shall have its first consideration in Committee of the Whole. This bill therefore will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, will be ordered to be printed.

House bill 6076 was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

#### AIDS TO NAVIGATION AT MOUTH OF MISSISSIPPI.

Mr. CLARDY, from the Committee on Commerce, also reported, as a substitute for H. R. 986, a bill (H. R. 7633) establishing additional aids to navigation at the mouth of the Mississippi River; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bill 986 was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS YOUNG'S BAY, OREGON.

Mr. BYNUM, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 4670) granting to the county of Clatsop, in the State of Oregon, the right to construct a bridge across Young's Bay, a navigable stream in said county and State; which was referred to the House Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### PAPERS IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT BY ERROR.

Mr. HITT, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported back favorably the joint resolution (H. Res. 118) relative to certain papers in the State Department by error; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### EFFICIENCY OF THE ARMY.

Mr. STEELE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported, as a substitute for sundry bills referred to that committee, a bill (H. R. 7634) to increase the efficiency of the line of the Army, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bills of the following titles were, by unanimous consent, laid on the table:

- A bill (H. R. 2109) to promote the efficiency of the Army;
- A bill (H. R. 719) to increase the efficiency of the Army;
- A bill (H. R. 1358) authorizing the assignment of retired officers of the United States Army to certain duties;
- A bill (H. R. 3901) to promote the efficiency of the artillery of the United States Army;
- A bill (H. R. 2474) to provide for examination of officers of the Army;
- A bill (H. R. 3278) to promote the efficiency of the Army of the United States;
- A bill (H. R. 1436) to increase the efficiency of infantry branch of the Army; and
- A bill (H. R. 468) to increase the efficiency of the infantry branch of the Army.

#### BUREAUS IN NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HERBERT, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported a bill (H. R. 7635) to consolidate certain bureaus of the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### INCREASE OF NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. HERBERT, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, also reported a resolution to fix a day to consider the bill (H. R. 6664) to increase the efficiency of the naval establishment; which was referred to the House Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### MISS ROSA WALLACE.

Mr. JONES, of Texas, from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, reported, as a substitute for H. R. 6677, a bill (H. R. 7636) for the relief of Miss Rosa Wallace; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

House bill 6677 was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

#### BUSINESS OF PUBLIC LANDS COMMITTEE.

Mr. COBB. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands to report to the House the resolution which I hold in my hand, and to ask that the Committee on Rules be discharged from the further consideration of the subject contained therein, and that the resolution pass.

The SPEAKER. The rules expressly provide what shall be done in this hour. No business is in order except the reporting of bills and resolutions to go to their appropriate Calendar.

Mr. COBB. I propose to press this resolution, in season and out of season, until it passes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not ask unanimous consent for its consideration in the hour set apart by the rules for the call of committees.

Mr. COBB. Very well. I repeat my statement that I shall insist on pressing this resolution, in season and out of season.

#### LABOR INVESTIGATION.

Mr. LAWLER, from the Committee on Labor, reported back the resolution submitted by himself March 29, 1886, with an amendment, to strike out, after the word "the," in the first line of the preamble, all of said preamble down to the word "raises," in the fifth line thereof, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Differences existing between certain railroad companies engaged in the transportation of property and passengers between two or more of the United States and the Territories and their employes.

So the amended preamble will read:

Therefore,  
Be it resolved, That the Committee on Labor be, and is hereby, directed to investigate into the underlying causes of the differences existing between employer and employes of railroad companies and other common carriers, and to that end may send for persons and papers, administer oaths and compel the attendance of witnesses, and employ a stenographer, who shall be paid such reasonable compensation as said committee may direct; and the said committee may sit during the sessions of the House, and report what legislation in their opinion is necessary to bring these troubles and differences to satisfactory conclusion. And the sum of \$5,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be expended from the contingent fund of the House for the purpose of this investigation, the accounts thereof to be approved by the chairman of the said committee.

#### WICHITA AND ARKANSAS VALLEY RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported, as a substitute for H. R. 769, a bill (H. R. 7637) to grant the right of way through the Indian Territory to the Wichita and Arkansas Valley Railroad Company, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bill 769 was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

#### ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. PEEL, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported back the bill (H. R. 113) to grant to the Pacific and Great Eastern Railway Company the right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; which was laid on the table.

#### PACIFIC AND GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. PEEL, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, also reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7638) to authorize the Pacific and Great Eastern Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### HIATT & CO.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 759) for the relief of Hiatt & Co.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, also reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 695) to provide for the sale of the lands belonging to the Prairie Band of Pottawatomie Indians of Kansas; which was laid on the table.

#### PRAIRIE BAND OF POTTAWATOMIE INDIANS.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, also reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7639) to provide for the sale of the lands belonging to the Prairie Band of Pottawatomie Indians in Kansas; which was read a first and second time, referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### PROHIBITING SPECIAL LAWS IN TERRITORIES.

Mr. SPRINGER, from the Committee on the Territories, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5179) to prohibit the passage of local and special laws in the Territories of the United States; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### JURISDICTION OF PROBATE COURTS IN ARIZONA.

Mr. SPRINGER, from the Committee on the Territories, also reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5496) to increase the jurisdiction of probate courts in Arizona and to repeal all acts of the Territorial Assembly creating county courts in said Territory; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. SADLER, from the Committee on the Territories, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 6939) to encourage the sinking of artesian wells west of the Mississippi River; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BUILDING AT HOULTON, ME.

Mr. WILKINS, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back with an amendment the bill (S. 185) to provide for the erection of a public building at the town of Houlton, Me.; which was re-

ferred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CARROLLTON AND LOCK NO. 1.

Mr. SNYDER, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4503) to authorize the Secretary of War to permit the Carrollton and Lock No. 1 Turnpike Road Company to locate and construct its road at lock No. 1, on the Kentucky River, in the State of Kentucky; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CATHARINE JOHNSON.

Mr. MATSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with an amendment the bill (H. R. 3906) for the relief of Catharine Johnson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. MATSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 3344) to grant a pension to Mary Kiser; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

JOHN W. FARRIS.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with an amendment the bill (H. R. 6136) granting a pension to John W. Farris; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

FREDERICK MARIM.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with an amendment the bill (H. R. 6147) granting a pension to Frederick Marim; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

TUNIS J. ROOSA.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with an amendment the bill (H. R. 715) granting a pension to Tunis J. Roosa; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JAMES B. WILDE.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 4999) to place the name of James B. Wilde on the pension-roll; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

NOAH NELSON.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with favorable recommendation the bill (S. 1125) granting a pension to Noah Nelson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with adverse recommendation bills of the following titles; which were ordered to be laid on the table, and the accompanying reports printed, namely:

A bill (H. R. 711) granting a pension to Francis O'Leary;  
A bill (H. R. 3943) to readjudicate the pension claim of Francis A. Liebscheets; and

A bill (H. R. 3534) granting a pension to Mary J. Taylor.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. MORRILL, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of bills which were referred, as follows:

The bill (H. R. 6726) granting a pension to Adam Stuber—to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 4088) for the relief of certain volunteer officers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

JENNETTE S. KENT.

Mr. LOVERING, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with favorable recommendation the bill (S. 231) granting a pension to Jennette S. Kent; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. LOVERING, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with adverse recommendation the bill (H. R. 1094) granting a pension to Ella E. Gibson; which was ordered to be laid on the table, and the accompanying report printed.

P. E. RAIGER.

Mr. SWOPE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back

with favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 5406) granting a pension to P. E. Raiger; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LOUIS WHORLEY.

Mr. SWOPE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 2963) granting a pension to Louis Whorley; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PHILIP ARNER.

Mr. SWOPE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 6266) granting a pension to Philip Arner; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARY KARSTETTER.

Mr. SWOPE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 2043) to place Mary Karstetter on the pension-roll; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARY KITZMILLER.

Mr. SWOPE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 4226) for the relief of Mary Kitzmiller; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CATHARINE WHITESSELL.

Mr. SWOPE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 6590) granting a pension to Catharine Whitesell; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARGARET J. REIGHTER.

Mr. SWOPE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 5761) granting a pension to Margaret J. Reighter; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

HENRY HIPPLE, JR.

Mr. SWOPE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 6897) granting a pension to Henry Hipple, jr., which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

AMOS C. WERTZ.

Mr. SWOPE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 5434) granting a pension to Amos C. Wertz; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. SWOPE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with adverse recommendations bills of the following titles; which were laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 4717) to place the name of George I. Langworthy on the pension-roll;

A bill (H. R. 2160) for the relief of D. S. Graves, for pension;

A bill (H. R. 4714) granting a pension to Hannah Dimond;

A bill (H. R. 5439) for the relief of William R. Thompson;

A bill (H. R. 5432) for the relief of Oliver Freet; and

A bill (H. R. 5763) for the relief of Christian Weber.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE.

Mr. SWOPE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back the bill (H. R. 2081) for the relief of the legal representatives of Peter Lyle, deceased; and moved that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the same, and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SWOPE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back the bill (H. R. 4702) amending sections 4756 and 4757 of the Revised Statutes relating to pensions to certain disabled persons who have served in the Navy or Marine Corps, and moved that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the same, and that it be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

FRANCIS DEMING.

Mr. WINANS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 2971) granting a pension to Francis Deming; which was referred to the Committee of the

Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ISAIAH H. MITCHELL.

Mr. WINANS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 3144) granting a pension to Isaiah H. Mitchell; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ANN E. COONEY.

Mr. WINANS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 4544) granting a pension to Ann E. Cooney; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ISAAC N. MINSHALL.

Mr. ELLSBERRY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (S. 283) granting a pension to Isaac N. Minshall; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JAMES WOLFE.

Mr. ELLSBERRY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 1768) granting a pension to James Wolfe; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. ELLSBERRY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back the bill (H. R. 2592) for the relief of William H. Deery, and moved that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the same, and that it be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. CONGER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported, as a substitute for H. R. 4902, a bill (H. R. 7640) to increase pensions in certain cases; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bill 4902 was laid on the table.

JANNET E. B. SMITH.

Mr. CONGER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with an amendment the bill (H. R. 607) granting a pension to Jannet E. B. Smith; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the amendment and accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM WEBSTER.

Mr. CONGER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (S. 761) granting a pension to William Webster; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CHARLES FOREMAN.

Mr. O'HARA, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 6193) granting a pension to Charles Foreman; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

EUGENIA A. SMALLEY.

Mr. O'HARA, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with an amendment the bill (H. R. 1252) granting a pension to Eugenia A. Smalley and her children; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the amendment and accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ANN BIRD.

Mr. O'HARA, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation, the bill (H. R. 1278) granting a pension to Ann Bird; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

FREDERICK KORTH.

Mr. O'HARA, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 4077) granting a pension to Frederick Korth; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. BARBARA FUCHS.

Mr. O'HARA, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 6489) granting a

pension to Mrs. Barbara Fuchs; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. MARIA HUNTER.

Mr. O'HARA, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 7167) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Hunter; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. O'HARA, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back adversely bills of the following titles; which were severally laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 1257) granting a pension to Mrs. Aslang O. Stugo; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed;

A bill (H. R. 4847) granting a pension to Stephen White; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed; and

A bill (H. R. 6485) relating to increase of pensions in certain cases.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. O'HARA, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of bills of the following titles; and they were referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (H. R. 4074) for the relief of Frederick Krause;

A bill (H. R. 1276) for the relief of John Waddams; and

A bill (H. R. 6194) granting a pension to Maggie E. Warner.

On motion of Mr. O'HARA, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4636) for the relief of John Reed; and the same was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

On motion of Mr. SAWYER, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5711) for the relief of Ellie McRoberts; and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

ANNIE BAGLEY.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 1627) granting a pension to Annie Bagley; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

BAILEY HASCALL.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 7118) for the relief of Bailey Hascall; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ANDREW J. WILSON.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 7108) granting a pension to Andrew J. Wilson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOSEPH TUTTLE.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 7109) granting a pension to Joseph Tuttle; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SOPHRONIA WITHAM.

Mr. HAYNES, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported a bill (H. R. 7641) granting a pension to Sophronia Witham; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

HENRY BROOKS.

Mr. HAYNES, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 5472) to increase the pension of Henry Brooks; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN F. CHASE.

Mr. HAYNES, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with an amendment the bill (H. R. 4382) to increase the pension of John F. Chase; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

THOMAS J. SLAYTON.

Mr. HAYNES, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with an amendment the bill (H. R. 5169) to increase the pension of Thomas J. Slayton; which was referred to the Committee of the



Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CHARLES F. HILDRETH.

Mr. HAYNES, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 4124) granting a pension to Charles F. Hildreth; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARGARET LUCAS.

Mr. HAYNES, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 6812) granting a pension to Margaret Lucas; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. HAYNES, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back adversely bills of the following titles; which were severally laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed: A bill (H. R. 6315) granting a pension to Helen M. Stickney; and A bill (H. R. 3541) to increase the pension of Florence Murray.

MARTHA DOWNS.

Mr. NEECE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 4462) granting a pension to Martha Downs; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

EUNICE E. CLARK.

Mr. NEECE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 6429) granting a pension to Eunice E. Clark; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN M. MATTINGLY.

Mr. NEECE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with an amendment the bill (H. R. 5951) granting a pension to John M. Mattingly; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SILAS CORZATT.

Mr. NEECE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 3287) for the relief of Silas Corzatt; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SARAH GREGG.

Mr. NEECE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 5937) granting a pension to Sarah Gregg; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. SPRINGER, the Committee on Claims was discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2921) for the relief of J. T. and C. T. Hewlett; and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

EDWIN T. PILKENTON.

Mr. TRIGG, from the Committee on Claims, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 2517) for the relief of the estate of Edwin T. Pilkenton, deceased; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM E. BOND.

Mr. TRIGG, from the Committee on Claims, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 1741) for the relief of William E. Bond; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JAMES M. GRIGSBY.

Mr. LANHAM, from the Committee on Claims, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 6312) for the relief of James M. Grigsby; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SARAH L. LARIMER.

Mr. LANHAM, from the Committee on Claims, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 6051) to compensate Mrs. Sarah L. Larimer for important services rendered the military authorities in 1864 at Deer Creek Station, Wyo., and for loss of property taken by Sioux Indians; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole

House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARY E. JOHNSON.

Mr. BUCHANAN, from the Committee on Claims, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 7397) for the relief of Mary E. Johnson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LOUISA H. HASELL.

Mr. DOUGHERTY, from the Committee on Claims, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 2223) for the relief of Mrs. Louisa H. Hasell; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. DOUGHERTY, from the Committee on Claims, also reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 1011) for the relief of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, of Canada; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

JOHN B. ROBERTS.

Mr. DOUGHERTY, from the Committee on Claims, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 251) for the relief of John B. Roberts; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

H. K. BELDING.

Mr. DOUGHERTY, from the Committee on Claims, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 1259) for the relief of H. K. Belding; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

BALLARD PAVEMENT COMPANY.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Claims, reported, as a substitute for H. R. 591, a bill (H. R. 7642) for the relief of the Ballard Pavement Company; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN H. M'CLINTOCK.

Mr. SHAW, from the Committee on Claims, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 1044) for the relief of John H. McClintock; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARGARET T. RYAN.

Mr. KLEINER, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 1249) for the relief of Margaret T. Ryan; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN BURKHART.

Mr. GEDDES, from the Committee on War Claims, reported, as a substitute for H. R. 446, a bill (H. R. 7643) for the relief of Capt. John Burkhardt; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARTHA J. RUMBAUGH.

Mr. GEDDES, from the Committee on War Claims, also reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 6336) for the relief of Martha J. Rumbaugh, administratrix of George H. Rumbaugh; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JAMES D. WOOD.

Mr. GEDDES, from the Committee on War Claims, also reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6337) for the relief of James D. Wood; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

BOXES DEPOSITED IN TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. PERRY, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 2239) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to deliver to the rightful owners the contents of certain boxes deposited in the Treasury Department by the Secretary of War; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

AGNES AND MARIA DE LEÓN.

Mr. PERRY, from the Committee on War Claims, also reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 3758) for the relief of Agnes and Maria De Leon, heirs at law of Rebecca L. De Leon, deceased; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

## REIMBURSEMENT TO STATES ON WAR LOANS.

Mr. PERRY, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 152) to reimburse the several States for interest paid on war loans, and for other purposes.

Mr. LYMAN. I am directed by a minority of the committee to ask that the bill just reported adversely be placed on the Calendar, and that they have leave to file their views, to be printed with the report of the majority.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

## ESTATE OF J. J. PULLIAM.

Mr. LYMAN, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back adversely the bill (S. 605) for the relief of the estate of J. J. Pulliam, deceased.

The SPEAKER. This bill will be laid on the table, if there be no objection.

Mr. LYMAN. At the request of the gentleman who has this bill in charge I ask that it be placed on the Calendar.

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

## HENRY RUBY.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back the bill (H. R. 5448) for the relief of Henry Ruby; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report was ordered to be printed.

## MOBILE AND GIRARD RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky (by Mr. RICHARDSON), from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4924) for the relief of the Mobile and Girard Railroad Company; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced the passage of a concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 5,000 additional copies of the revised list of papers touching unpaid claims on account of the French spoiliations prior to July 31, 1801, transmitted by the President of the United States on the 17th instant; of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 for the use of the House, and 2,000 for distribution by the Department of State; in which concurrence was requested.

It also announced the passage of joint resolution (H. Res. 73) authorizing the printing of committee reports.

It also announced agreement to the amendment of the House to bill (S. 814) granting a pension to Mrs. Adaline N. Putnam.

It also announced agreement to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 683) granting a pension to Henry C. Hill.

It also announced disagreement to the amendment to the bill (S. 44) providing for the erection of a public building at San Antonio, Tex.; asked a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and had appointed Mr. MAHONEY, Mr. COKE, and Mr. SPOONER as conferees on its part.

## JOHN H. JONES AND THOMAS D. HARRIS.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky (by Mr. RICHARDSON), from the Committee on War Claims, also reported back, as a substitute for H. R. 4216, a bill (H. R. 7644) for the relief of John H. Jones and Thomas D. Harris; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

By unanimous consent House bill 4216 was laid on the table.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The hour for the call of committees for reports has expired. The Chair, under the rule, will proceed to call committees for the consideration of bills.

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the second morning hour.

Mr. JAMES. I object.

The SPEAKER. The call rests with the Select Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Mr. COX. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to resume the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6855) to secure an equitable classification and compensation of certain officers of the United States. Pending that motion I move that all general debate in Committee of the Whole on this bill be closed in twenty minutes, to be divided equally between those in favor of the bill and those against it.

The question being taken on the motion to close general debate, it was agreed to.

The question recurring on the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, it was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair, and resumed

the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6855) to secure an equitable classification and compensation of certain officers of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate has been limited to twenty minutes. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COX] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. COX. Before proceeding with my remarks I would like to hear from any gentlemen who are opposed to this bill. If there are any who desire to be heard in opposition to it, I reserve my time.

Mr. REID, of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, is it in order at this time to offer a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. It may be offered and read for information in the time of the gentleman. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REID] now on the floor to control ten minutes in opposition to the bill; and his colleague, the chairman of the committee [Mr. COX], to control ten minutes in favor of the bill.

Mr. REID, of North Carolina. I ask that the proposed substitute which I send to the desk be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill to secure a speedy and economical classification and compensation of certain officers of the United States.

*Be it enacted, &c.* That from and after the passage of this act the head of each of the Executive Departments at Washington shall grade or classify the work performed or required to be performed in his respective Department, assigning to each desk therein its proper grade or classification, and shall regulate the salaries of the clerks who are or may be assigned to such desks in accordance with such grading or classification.

Sec. 2. That each of the present incumbents who has not heretofore been examined shall, as soon as practicable, be examined for the purpose of determining his or her fitness to perform the duties pertaining to the desk to which he or she has been or may be assigned.

Sec. 3. That whenever a vacancy shall occur, by death or otherwise, in any of the higher grades, and a clerk in one of the lower grades shall, after being examined and found qualified, be designated or assigned to perform the duties pertaining to such vacancy, such clerk shall receive the salary attached to the grade or class to which such duties shall have been assigned: *Provided*, That no person already in the service of the Government shall be assigned or appointed to any place in the classified service aforesaid without having first passed an examination as hereinbefore named.

Sec. 4. That for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into effect a board of examiners for each Department, to be composed of employees in said Department who shall be familiar with the practical business methods thereof, shall be detailed by the head of such Department, which board shall make the examination and classification required by this act, such examination in each bureau or office to be conducted by said board, one of whom shall belong to said bureau or office, shall be familiar with its duties and direct such examination.

Sec. 5. That the fourth paragraph of the second clause of section 2 of "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States," approved January 16, 1883, shall be amended so as to read as follows:

"Fourth. That there shall be a probationary period of not exceeding six months before any absolute appointment or employment as aforesaid; and every such person so appointed or employed shall hold his appointment or employment for the term of four years from the date thereof, unless sooner removed. At the end of any term such person may be reappointed for the same period."

Sec. 6. That no limitation as to age shall be prescribed by the civil-service rules for applicants for examination for admission to the classified departmental service of the Government.

Sec. 7. That paragraph 3 of clause 2 of section 2 of "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States," approved January 16, 1883, shall be amended by striking out all of said paragraph before the word "every" and inserting the following:

"Third. Appointments to the public service in the Departments at Washington shall be apportioned among the several Congressional districts and among the Territories and the District of Columbia upon the basis of population as ascertained at the last preceding census. On the 1st days of January and July in each year publication shall be made of the number and names of the persons chargeable to any such district or Territory employed in said service, with the salary and compensation payable to each person."

Mr. REID, of North Carolina, addressed the committee. [See Appendix.]

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Is it now in order to move to amend this first section of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not at this time.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the Chair be kind enough to indicate when the proper time comes, as I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. After the debate for twenty minutes it will then be in order to move amendments.

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, with the general object of the bill as reported from the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service I have full sympathy. I think the time has come when the House of Representatives and the Congress should take action touching the organization of the Departments of the Government here in Washington. I think also that this is an intelligent proposition to accomplish speedily that end, and in consequence it will receive my support.

Much has been said by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REID] who has just taken his seat that has my entire approval. There never should have been, in my judgment, a discrimination against those not holding office in reference to examination as a qualification for securing office that should not in like manner have been applied to those holding it, and for the reason that the drones in the Departments might have been weeded out under such procedure.

But I see the difficulties which present themselves in endeavoring to annex to this proposition anything which relates to disturbing the present civil-service law, and I therefore advise that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REID] should permit the proposition which he suggests to come in as a separate proposition and to stand upon its own merit, and

that we may proceed to take a step that nobody can contend against as proposed in the report of the committee having charge of this subject. At the proper time I may have occasion to say something as to the manner in which those who administer the civil-service law are exercising their power, and I want to say here that in the law and regulations thereunder which regulate the civil service I hope to see every distinction as to age done away with. The idea that a man of forty-five is disqualified from holding an office in this Government is repugnant to my feelings.

Mr. REED, of Maine. It is to the feeling of all of us who are over forty-five. [Laughter.]

Mr. RANDALL. And especially so when I view it in the light of the possibilities that I myself may have need to apply for a similar place in the future. [Laughter.] I want to linger around an age not debarred by statute, at least in spirit and physical condition.

Mr. REID, of North Carolina. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania permit me to state that the substitute provides no limitation as to age?

Mr. RANDALL. I am glad of that.

Mr. REID, of North Carolina. And that will let my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania in.

Mr. RANDALL. Moreover, there is another mode of administering this law which I think is not beneficial to the public service, nor just to those who are examined, and that is, that the names of all those, or a major part of those, who have passed these examinations are not given in to a head of a Department on application for names to select from for appointment.

Why not send up a list larger than four, or the entire number who have passed the examination for that description of service for which a vacancy exists? I can readily see how favoritism is, or may be, brought about by the existing mode of selection by the civil-service board.

I therefore think that those who object *in toto* to the civil-service law, and those who wish, as I do, to modify it in large degree, had better not entangle that question with the proposition of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COX] who has charge of this bill; and that we may be given hereafter on another bill an opportunity to express more fully our sentiments as to the manner in which the present civil-service law is administered.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question before he takes his seat.

Mr. COX. I can not yield a moment, the time for debate being limited.

I am in full accord with many things that have been said by my friend who has preceded me. But we have to deal with this matter practically. No one denies that these Departments should be kept into. But the question is, What bill can we pass? You can not pass a partisan bill. You might pass such a bill through this House, but you could not present one that would have any hope of ultimate success. Therefore, let us deal with this matter practically.

So far as the plan of classification spoken of by my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. REID] is concerned, past experience has shown it is wholly inexpedient. The civil service has grown so large in this country, numbering now a grand army of one hundred and fifteen thousand, or one to every five hundred inhabitants of this country, that it is impossible except by the aid of legislation, such legislation as may issue from this Congress, that a proper examination and classification should be made. The committee have considered these propositions. They have considered all of the propositions which have been discussed; and as soon as they find any of them to be practical they will bring them forward. But this is a measure of the highest importance, which must be non-partisan in its character.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. COX. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANDALL. I ask the gentleman whether the committee have considered the propriety of preventing any regulation setting up a restriction against age?

Mr. COX. By all means.

Mr. RANDALL. Has any action been taken by the committee in that direction?

Mr. COX. No action thus far.

There is not a proposition that has been suggested here to-day that the committee have not carefully considered, and they have bills before them relating to all those points. But we have to deal with a great evil. There is great injustice and inequality and there are great abuses existing in these Departments. There is in one of the Departments to-day a man drawing a salary of \$2,000 who is wholly incapable of discharging his duty on account of physical infirmity. My friend from Kentucky [Mr. TAUBEE] calls my attention to a case of a man on furlough for two years, who receives \$1,400, and pays his substitute \$700.

Mr. SKINNER. I ask the gentleman why that man has not been turned out?

Mr. COX. That is what we want to know. It becomes necessary to make these investigations and bring the results before this House in order that the condition of affairs may be fully understood. So far as the Treasury Department is concerned there are great financial problems that are demanding every moment of the time of those who have

charge of that Department. Every expression coming from that Department is watched, closely scrutinized, and telegraphed all over the world. There are in that Department twenty-five hundred employes. Now what we want is not simply that those in the Departments shall make the investigation; we want that those who represent the taxpayers and not the official class alone, shall make the investigation. Hence we consider this method of investigation as the only one practicable.

Talk of an investigation being made by the officers of those Departments! We have had an investigation hanging up in this House for two or three months in regard to our employes here; and what progress has been made? What right have we to scrutinize and blame the Departments when we have failed to do our own duty?

This is the only practical method which has suggested itself to the committee. We have unanimously reported it. Every branch of the civil service has been considered.

This is not connected with the administration of the civil-service law. Those questions to which my friend referred will come hereafter. The question of calling for an additional examiner is not before the House. My colleague is too previous in making his objections. I am satisfied his sympathies are with me. He is only afraid this bill does not go so far as he desires. His bill, I am satisfied, can not meet with the approbation of both branches of Congress. While I sympathize with many of the objections the gentleman has made, we consider this is the only measure which it is possible to pass.

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the House all general debate on the bill is exhausted. The bill will now be considered by sections for amendment. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REID] offers a substitute, which will be in order after the bill has been considered by sections.

The Clerk read the first section of the bill, as follows:

That the President is authorized to employ three persons not in the public service of the United States, and to designate two additional persons who are officers in such service at Washington, not more than three of whom shall be adherents of the same political party, which five persons shall constitute a commission for the purposes of this act; and the President may fill any vacancy therein.

Mr. STORM. I move to strike out the last word in the section.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has not the slightest connection with the so-called civil-service act. The present classification in the civil service of the Government was made more than thirty years before the civil-service law was enacted. Therefore this present bill and the inquiry which it proposes to institute have nothing to do with that act. As might have been expected, the mere suggestion that this measure came from the Select Committee on Reform in the Civil Service has drawn out various amendments, but, I repeat, they have nothing whatever to do with the present bill.

All that this bill provides for is a commission of five persons to investigate the number and compensation of employes in the classified service here, with a view to so harmonize that classification as to make it consistent and uniform. After the investigation is made intelligent legislation can be had.

It was stated before the committee by members of the Civil Service Commission that in the different Departments here there are men doing precisely similar service, but who in some instances receive \$720 a year, in others \$840, and in others \$900 a year, each Department having arranged a standard of its own by which the pay is fixed. The case is the same in the higher grade of offices. Men doing the same kind of service are receiving, respectively, \$1,200, \$1,600, or \$1,800 per annum.

Now, it is admitted by all that this is wrong. All compensation for service should be based upon the character of the labor performed. It is admitted by all, including the Civil-Service Commission itself, that under the existing classification all these principles are violated. The object of this bill is to give us a commission which shall report a uniform classification. The bill, I think, makes proper provision for this commission. It proposes that three of the number shall be selected outside of the Departments and two within.

A larger number from within the Departments would, I think, be dangerous, because there are old and long-standing abuses existing in the Departments which ought to be corrected. Among them is the matter referred to by the chairman of the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service—the practice by which an employe is furloughed and a substitute who never passed the civil-service examination provided for him or selected by himself, these two dividing the pay between them, so that if the salary is \$1,000 a year, each receives at the rate of \$500. This is an abuse which certainly ought to be abolished. There ought to be no opportunity, as there is under existing law, for such a state of things. This bill proposes, among other things, to regulate and remedy that abuse.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. STORM. Yes, if I have time.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this amendment. I agree that we should have a system of civil service, if it can be devised, which would take the minor offices out of politics. Nearly or quite forty years ago two of the great statesmen of this country, Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Webster, in very important speeches assumed the position that when

the time should come when there would be one hundred thousand appointees under the Federal administration popular liberty and our system of government would be in danger. We have reached and passed the limit at which they supposed this great danger would make itself felt. Now when elections for Congress, and especially elections for President and Vice-President, occur the contest is not a contest for principles upon which the Government shall be administered so much as it is a contest for the spoils of office.

We have, as the gentleman from North Carolina tells us, an army of one hundred and fifteen thousand employes whose places are to a greater or less extent dependent upon the result of the election. When this comes around, they, instead of devoting themselves to the discharge of their official duties, are engaged in furnishing their time, their money, and their efforts to elect somebody to office. Now, I think it would be of great advantage to the country if we could remove the minor offices of the country from political contests.

But while I so believe, I think the present civil-service law has features which are very objectionable. It seems to me it would have been much better to pass a law providing that removals from office should not be made except for incompetency or misconduct, and to have omitted the expensive, embarrassing, and it seems to me useless machinery under which appointments are now made.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state a single case which has come within my observation during this session. A lady from Kentucky, with whom I am acquainted, desired to be examined for appointment under this civil-service law. She wrote to me to that effect. I applied to the commission for permission for her examination and was advised that an examination would be had on the 11th of the current month—it was then the 1st of February—at Louisville, Ky., and that they would immediately inform her of the rules and regulations relating to the examination. Some six or seven days afterward I received a communication from them stating that they had forwarded to her the rules and regulations, and hoped to get her request to be examined in time to send it to Louisville. So they had first to send out the information that she had permission to apply to be examined; then she had to send from Kentucky her request to get another permission to be examined before the examining commissioners at Louisville were authorized to examine her. Such a proceeding is vexatious and ridiculous; it is pure nonsense.

Besides that, Mr. Chairman, the character of the examinations, as I understand, is such that while a professor of a college or a student fresh from school might stand the examination, I venture the statement there is not a Representative on this floor who could do so. What would we know about the geography of Africa or the distance from the moon to the sun? [Laughter.] These, I understand, are some of the questions which they ask. Why should the examiners indulge in that sort of nonsense, instead of looking for the qualities which make a man of business capacity and qualifications? Instead of this, the examination is confined to ascertaining whether the applicant has certain knowledge which can only be possessed by a student fresh from school.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. COX. I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR].

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraw his amendment?

Mr. STORM. Yes; I withdraw my *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. If it is in order I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send his amendment to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. BENNETT. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of State, of the Treasury, of the Interior, of War, of the Navy, the Attorney-General, and the Postmaster-General be directed to report to this House at the next session of Congress some plan for classifying the clerks in those Departments, for apportioning their salaries according to their services, and for equalizing the salaries of the clerks of the same grade in each of the Departments; and also some plan to provide for a fair and impartial examination of the qualifications of clerks, and for promoting them from one grade to another upon a due regard to qualifications and services.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this offered as a substitute for the first section?

Mr. BENNETT. It is; and on that amendment I desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. BENNETT addressed the committee. [See Appendix.]

Mr. COX. I will not attempt to follow my friend from North Carolina [Mr. BENNETT] in his political remarks, because this is simply a practical question. The gentleman has asked the question, Are not these gentlemen competent to make these reforms which are sought for in this bill? It is sufficient for us to know that in the last thirty years no classification has been made for us in the Departments of the Government. And it is sufficient for us to know that great abuses do exist.

I trust the gentlemen who oppose this measure will suggest some means more practical to accomplish the end than this. So far as the legislation my friend has spoken of is concerned, that occurred in 1853. I am fully aware of what was said on that occasion. Nevertheless, although examinations were provided for and those examinations were for the Treasury Department, the recommendations were not uniform and have not had a practical effect, and will not have at the present day.

We know the abuses exist. I make this proposition on behalf of the committee: If the Democratic side of the House are so anxious for the reforms they speak of let them support this measure. There is no other that can be supported. We must be practical in our dealings with public measures, and must consider what measure there is a possibility of passing through the Senate as well as through this House. If you throw a political element in, it is utterly useless to attempt to carry any measure having this object in view.

I move the committee rise for the purpose of limiting debate.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6855) to secure an equitable classification and compensation of certain officers of the United States, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. COX. I move that the House again resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union; and pending that, I move that in committee all debate on the first section of the pending bill and amendments thereto be limited to one minute.

The question being taken on the motion to limit debate, there were—ayes 72, noes 29.

Mr. BENNETT. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. A quorum not having voted, the Chair will appoint tellers, and appoints the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. BENNETT, and the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. COX.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 116, noes 37.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BENNETT] insist on the point as to a quorum?

Mr. BENNETT. I do.

The SPEAKER. The hour for the consideration of bills under the rule has expired.

Mr. COX. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. I ask the same privilege.

There was no objection.

#### FREE-SHIP BILL.

Mr. DUNN. I ask unanimous consent to make a report to go on the Calendar.

Mr. BEACH. I shall have to object. The report can be made in the morning. [After a pause.] I withdraw the objection, as I understand the gentleman is sick.

Mr. DUNN, from the Select Committee on American Ship-building and Ship-owning Interests, reported a resolution fixing a day for the assignment of business on the bill known as the free-ship bill (H. R. 1219); which was referred to the House Calendar.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BLAND. I call up the special order.

Mr. BLOUNT addressed the Chair.

Mr. JAMES. I call up the special order, the adverse report on the free-coinage bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] has already called up that order.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills, the object being to proceed with the further consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill. But pending that I desire to yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] to make a statement.

Mr. RANDALL. Is debate in order?

The SPEAKER. It is not, if objected to.

Mr. RANDALL. I object.

Mr. BLAND. I simply desire to make one suggestion.

Mr. BLOUNT. I suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that if he will allow the gentleman from Missouri to make a statement it will save time. I ask if the objection to the gentleman from Missouri making a statement is still insisted on?

Mr. RANDALL. I withdraw it.

Mr. BLAND. I wanted only a moment, and that was to state that so far as the special order is concerned it has never as yet been up for consideration properly before the House. It has only been discussed on Saturdays under the order for general debate; it has never been considered in full House for debate and amendment. I had hoped, inasmuch as the debate only comes up after the two morning hours, there would be no objection to the committee having the few hours left to-day for debate on the special order. But inasmuch as the time that might be devoted to considering and perhaps passing the Post-Office bill might be wasted in a contest over precedence, I have yielded to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT], and hope that the House will take no more time from us than is possible, and that to-morrow at least we may be able to proceed under the special order.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. On this afternoon, if the Post-Office bill is disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

Mr. DIBBLE. Pending the motion of the gentleman from Georgia I rise to a privileged question. I call up the message from the Senate disagreeing to the amendments to a Senate bill, and ask that the House insist on the amendments and that conferees be appointed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the message from the Senate. The Clerk read as follows:

Senate bill No. 44.

A bill to provide for the erection of a public building at San Antonio, Tex.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, April 6, 1886.

Resolved, That the Senate disagree to the amendment of the bill of the Senate No. 44, providing for the erection of a public building at San Antonio, Tex., and ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. MAHONEY, Mr. COKE, and Mr. SPOONER be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion of Mr. DIBBLE, that the House insist on its amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed Mr. DIBBLE, Mr. REESE, and Mr. WADE to act as conferees on the part of the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announcing that the President had approved bills of the following titles: An act (H. R. 81) granting a pension to Margaret B. Harwood; and An act (H. R. 1557) for the relief of David W. Jones.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The motion of Mr. BLOUNT that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills was then agreed to.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5887) making appropriation for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887. The Clerk will report the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 50, after the word "hundred," insert the words "and ninety;" after the word "thousand," in line 51, insert the words "two hundred."

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the committee to certain facts which ought to be considered in connection with this proposed amendment, because I think the difficulties and value of the services rendered by railway postal clerks were much exaggerated in the former debate upon this bill. For instance, we were told that they were employed more hours than the clerks in the Department, that the amount of their service was far greater, and that the danger of the railway postal service was an important element in estimating the compensation that these clerks should receive.

In matters of this kind there is nothing like official statements compiled from actual experience. An examination of the several divisions of the service shows that the average run per day is as follows: In the first division 106 miles, in the second 117 miles, in the third 111 miles, in the fourth 120 miles, in the fifth 119 miles, in the sixth 130 miles, in the eighth 127 miles, and in the ninth 133 miles. It will be seen, therefore, that the average run per day of the postal clerks throughout the country is only 120 miles. At 30 miles per hour the actual average employment of these clerks would seem to be about four hours per day.

We have heard here about the hours and days and nights of continuous service required of these clerks, but the figures I have presented are taken from the report of the Superintendent of Railway Mail transportation, and they show that the average number of hours per day that these clerks are employed is really very small. Again, we have been told of the great number of pieces of mail matter handled by them. We have heard that the number was perfectly marvelous, 3,400 pieces of mail matter handled by one clerk per day. That does seem marvelous to a person not accustomed to consider such matters, but if any gentleman will go into the Treasury Department he will see there clerks examining bills, having to read them, the names of the places where the banks are situated, and having to examine the bills to detect whether they are counterfeited or not, yet a single clerk there will handle 18,000 of those bills per day, nearly six times as many as the pieces of mail matter handled by the railway postal clerks. When you make this comparison the marvelousness of the work of the railway postal clerks disappears.

Now, as to casualties; out of 4,300 postal clerks running on the railroads in this country during the last fiscal year how many do you think were killed? Two. Why, you could not gather that number of carpenters together and let them go to work in any part of the country without there being more casualties among them merely from falling off buildings, &c. An examination of the figures will show that it is simply because the subject is forced upon our minds by occasional railway disasters that we pay so much attention to the dangers of travel by rail

and get into the habit of exaggerating them; and that is what has given rise to the fancy that the service of the postal clerks is very dangerous. It appears then, Mr. Chairman, from the figures I have presented, that the service of these clerks is only for about four hours per day, that their average daily run is short, that the number of pieces of mail matter handled by them daily is small in comparison with the amount of similar work done by clerks in the Treasury Department, and that of the casualties in the postal railway service are not greater than are likely to occur in other callings.

We are asked to increase the salaries of these clerks to what they were in 1876, and why? The reasons that have been given are dissipated by an examination of the official data. Why should we increase the pay for this kind of service? Does it require any extraordinary amount of ability? The Superintendent of Railway Mail transportation tells us that any man of ordinary English education is fully qualified for the work. It certainly requires no high order of culture.

The Government without difficulty always commands men at present rates to do this service. Why should the Government be compelled, simply because these are officials, to pay more for their service than the public is willing in private employment to pay for the same grade of service, as is evidenced by the fact that capable persons in every Congressional district are seeking places in this service.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. JOHN M. TAYLOR obtained the floor, and yielded his time to Mr. BLOUNT.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, why is it that this application for increased pay is pressed to-day with so much earnestness? From 1876 until the incoming of the present administration matters in this respect went along smoothly. In the mean time the Forty-seventh Congress has had its day. The Republican party have had the House, the Senate, and the Executive. Yet they have not found any occasion for a change in this respect. The responsibility for expenditure has now passed from the other side of the House to this; and it so happens that these fourth and fifth class clerkships are, with the assent of the administration, still held by persons in sympathy with the party in the minority.

With these same persons in office under a Republican administration things went along quietly, and there was no complaint from any branch of the Government. Now, when the responsibility for expenditures is on this side of the House, and these undertakes are in sympathy with the other side, why should this side undertake to make this increase of compensation? Are you asked to do it by the Postmaster-General or by anybody in sympathy with this administration? No. The gentlemen who have argued in favor of this increase have read the recommendations of superintendents of railway transportation of their own party, and we are invited to follow these recommendations when the administration, charged by law with making appointments for this service and recommendations in regard to it, have made no such proposition.

The Superintendent of the Railway Mail transportation has said himself that this service is in better condition as to employes than it has ever been before. As a basis for the increase asked he estimated for an increase of mileage in the construction of railroads during the fiscal year—an estimate which has not been adopted by any other branch of the postal service, and which is contradicted two to one by the estimates of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General. The committee, knowing the large sum that had been voted for this fiscal year, and being informed that the service was in perfect condition, felt they were justified in making a reasonable increase, though not adopting the florid statements of an increase of mileage to the extent of 10,000 miles in a single year as against five or six thousand estimated by other officials.

I trust that this House, especially after the experience we have had, will not make this increased expenditure on the invitation of the other side of the House, and on the recommendation of Republican superintendents of railway mail transportation, while our own executive officers withhold any recommendation for such increase.

Mr. PETERS. I move to amend the amendment by striking out the last word. I do not consider this a political question; and hence I have not discussed it from that standpoint. It is entirely immaterial to me whether a recommendation in relation to this service has been made by a Republican or a Democratic official. It is entirely immaterial to me that the Forty-seventh Congress entirely overlooked, as it did, the merits of these officials and the injustice which had been done to them. The party that is now in power has recognized the fact that this service is not a political service. It is a service that requires experience and skill, without which this branch of Government employment would suffer and the interests of the people who are concerned in the proper circulation and distribution of mail matter throughout the United States would be endangered. It is absolutely necessary that a person should have experience and skill in order to perform the duties of a postal clerk.

I know it is true, as a matter of computation, that these clerks run on the average only 120 miles for every day of the three hundred and sixty-five in the year. I stated the average at 110 miles. But the mistake of my friend from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] is in supposing that the entire labor of these clerks is during the time they are engaged on the running trains. It is true that on the average they run only four hours

per day. But every person familiar with the postal-car service knows that every postal clerk of the fourth and fifth classes must put in from three to four hours labor before his train starts in order to prepare the mails on his car for distribution along the route. Not only must he do this, but he must also give his time and attention to the study of the schedules and connections which are constantly being changed. So that it is not fair to state that these postal clerks are engaged only four hours per day during the entire year.

Mr. CURTIN. And they are not permitted to engage in any other occupation.

Mr. PETERS. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] so well suggests, the Government requires of these postal clerks their whole time. Even if they have any leisure they are not permitted to engage in any other occupation. It is contrary to the rules of the service. They can not even engage in the business of carrying articles along their routes. They must devote their entire time to the postal service. Besides that, they must be prepared at any moment when called on to pass an examination.

Mr. CURTIN. They are required to pass an examination every month.

Mr. PETERS. My friend from Georgia says that applications for these positions are numerous. I concede it. The applications for every Government position are numerous. I do not know a single office at the disposal of the administration for which there are not ten to fifty applicants. But is that any reason why those who have become proficient and skillful, and who are necessary for the purpose of carrying on the public service efficiently, should be discharged to make way for those who are inefficient?

Now, Mr. Chairman, while there are many applicants for these positions, still the fact is there are very few of these applicants who are successful in passing the necessary examinations. That there are so many applicants for these positions grows out of the fact, no doubt, of the ignorance among the people as to the requirements made necessary in this postal-car service.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. TAULBEE. Mr. Chairman, I think it is apparent, from the statistics submitted to this Committee of the Whole by the chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, that the amount of work to be done by these postal clerks has been very much overestimated by gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. While these clerks have been held up before the House as the most injured of all the incumbents of positions under the Federal Government, yet, when the facts are accurately ascertained, it is shown that they have been most wonderfully favored. It will be remembered, no doubt, by the gentleman who has just preceded me, that during his remarks on the subject a few days ago, when I asked him whether these gentlemen could procure better compensation for their services in other branches of business, he retorted by saying that my question had the effect to give labor a slap in the face.

Now, sir, what are the facts in reference to these appointees in the public service? They are held in power, kept in their places to the exclusion of more efficient men seeking to enter the service, simply because of the services they have rendered to a certain political party. I know this fact to be true so far as it affects my own immediate neighborhood. The present head of the Railway Mail Service is kept in office by a Democratic Postmaster-General, and that Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service, under a Democratic administration of the Government, is to-day carrying on the administration of his office under rules diametrically opposite to those he practiced when the Postmaster-General in charge of the Post-Office Department was of the same political faith to which he himself belongs. All over my own district men have been selected because of their political meanness, because of something they did at the polls in favor of a certain party. Men have been put into the postal railway service when their moral and intellectual incompetency was absolutely outrageous.

Mr. STRUBLE. I ask the gentleman from Kentucky to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. TAULBEE. I have only five minutes. If the committee will agree to give me five minutes more time in which to answer the gentleman's question I will be glad to yield to him.

Mr. STRUBLE. Does the gentleman from Kentucky mean to say the present head of the Railway Mail Service is making these appointments on the same basis as those to whom he has alluded; that is, those who are appointed are selected because of their political meanness?

Mr. TAULBEE. No, I do not. He adopts different tactics from those he practiced in putting them in. He keeps them in, while competent men are excluded from the service under his influence and present objectionable policy.

Mr. STRUBLE. Does the gentleman say that is a thing which is done now?

Mr. TAULBEE. Yes, it is done now.

Mr. STRUBLE. Under the present Democratic administration?

Mr. TAULBEE. Under the present Democratic administration.

Mr. STRUBLE. Does not the gentleman know the fact is that the Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service refers these questions of appointments to the Postmaster-General himself?

Mr. TAULBEE. Ostensibly, yes; but truly it is not so. I have heard the Postmaster-General say that he could not give the detail of this matter his personal attention, and that he held the Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service responsible for the detail of the affairs of his office.

Mr. STRUBLE. I hope the gentlemen from Kentucky will give us more light on this question. If this head of the Railway Mail Service ostensibly refers these matters to the decision of the Postmaster-General himself, but in fact does not do so, I should like to know how that sort of man is held in the service of a Democratic administration.

Mr. TAULBEE. It is because of the want of courage on the part of a Democratic Postmaster-General, I will answer the gentleman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in reference to the labor question, having spent the best years of my life as a wage-worker, I feel authorized to speak for the laborers of the country. I say in reference to the great questions which agitate the labor element that laboring men have the right to quit work simultaneously unless they are in the employment of the public; but I deny their right to say to anybody else that they shall not work. I deny the correctness of these strikes as they are carried on under the present system. It is an outrage upon the workers who do not belong to labor organizations, and I denounce it, and propose to abide the consequences.

Employés of railroads, corporations, or individuals have a perfect right to refuse to work for their employers whenever it suits their convenience to do so, but I deny their right to destroy the property of others or to obstruct transportation or other legitimate business, or to use force, violence, or other unlawful means to deprive other honest wage-workers of the privilege of competing with them in the matter of procuring work.

I am in full sympathy with every honest and honorable move having for its object the promotion of the honest, law-abiding laborers of our country, or the placing of proper restrictions on the powers and authorities usurped by the organized capitalists and monopolies of the country. My predilections are all on the side of the laboring man, but I am disgusted with the ridiculous spectacle which the recent strikes in the West present. There we have a few hundred railroad employés obstructing the transportation and embarrassing and prostrating the business of a vast section of country, and driving thousands of innocent women and children to abject penury and starvation.

I would encourage the organization of the labor interests of the country for union and concert of action in the employment of every honest means looking to a fair and equitable division of the profits of labor and capital combined, while I have nothing but contempt and indignant frowns and denunciations for the spirit of communism and nihilism which allows one in one hundred of the laboring men of the country, led by men who have no interest in common with labor except as that interest grows out of their connection with strikes and boycotts, to dictate to the remaining ninety-nine men when and on what terms they shall or shall not work. This state of affairs can only find its ultimate results in anarchy and the complete overthrow of our free institutions, which guarantees to every man personal liberty, enjoyment of his own property, and the legitimate pursuit of happiness.

I have said that private employés had a right to abandon work, but it is quite different with employés of the Government. When a man accepts an office at the hands of the public he becomes the servant of the public and the custodian of a public trust. No more has the sentinel a right to abandon his post of duty in the hour of danger than has the public officer to arbitrarily abandon his post of duty when that abandonment would prove detrimental to the public interests.

This amendment proposes to tax the people \$90,200 above the actual needs of the service as a matter of reward to the adherents of one political party when the burden and responsibility of the extravagance will rest on the other party.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the time has come when these jobs should cease.

The Postmaster-General claims that there is no politics in this particular branch of the public service, and that removals therefrom can not be had save for inefficiency or misconduct on the part of the incumbents.

Nothing could be plainer than that this line of policy is the result of the influence of a Republican superintendent of the railway postal service on a Democratic administration—a plain case of the tail wagging the dog. I will agree to the general proposition that there is not enough politics in the present administration to give it decent respectability; but I deny that this particular branch of the service is void of politics. If it is void of politics, why is it that Republican employés in this branch of the service boycott the few Democrats who have, by force of circumstances and the oversight of the Superintendent, found their way into the service? Why is it that four thousand clerks in the second, third, fifth, and sixth divisions have organized for a strike? I read from the Evening Star of March 10:

POSTAL CLERKS READY TO STRIKE—IRRITATED BY REMOVALS, THEY ORGANIZE FOR UNITED ACTION.

A dispatch from Pittsburgh to the New York Herald says: "On account of the dissatisfaction of the postal clerks with Postmaster-General Vilas's frequent removals of clerks in the fifth division, an organization has been formed to request him to observe the terms of his circular of June, 1885, relative to removals, or they

will quit work simultaneously in the fifth, sixth, second, and third divisions, taking in the Middle States, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and the Western States as far south as Missouri and Tennessee, and as far west as and including Wyoming and Dakota. The clerks who have organized thus far are in the cities of Saint Louis, Chicago, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Columbus, Nashville, Louisville, and many small cities. If the committee is promised that the clerks shall be disturbed no further, everything shall continue as at present; but if the answer be unsatisfactory, all will quit work upon notification. Nearly four thousand five hundred clerks are interested in the measure. A. Burt, superintendent of the fifth division, resigned because he refused to make one hundred changes demanded by Postmaster-General Vilas."

If there is no politics in this branch of the service, why is it that certain gentlemen on the opposite side of this House seek in every conceivable way through it to hold on to place and power?

The matter of favoritism has been carried so far as to lead to the introduction of a bill into the present Congress by the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HARMER] proposing to place on the pension-roll of the Government, at a rate equal to half the salary now received by them, all the employés of the postal service who have served therein for a period of twenty-five years, or who from any cause become in any way disqualified from the performance of official duty.

These facts indicate into what vortex of ruin we are rapidly drifting. The clerks in the Railway Mail Service work on an average, as shown by actual official data, four hours per day, and receive therefor salaries ranging from \$1,175 to \$1,400. This amount of compensation was found sufficient while the responsibility rested on the minority party; but when the burden of the expenditures are shifted the hue and cry is raised that these men are oppressed, and they are held up before the country in the light of injured innocence.

Every Democratic member of this House is pledged to economic administration. I for one propose to hold that pledge inviolate, though it be at the expense and risk of being termed a fanatic or being accused of disloyalty to the present administration. I can not for the sake of receiving the sickly smiles and empty plaudits of the heads of the Departments remain silent at the expense of the noble constituency which I have the honor to represent here, when I see their rights trampled on with impunity and the money wrung from their honest sweat and toil wasted in needless expenditures.

I am opposed to this amendment and all similar measures, be the beneficiaries thereof of whatever persuasion politically or otherwise. I oppose the principle of the amendment. I despise the sickly cant and transparent hypocrisy of members on this floor who discourage the investigation and exposure of the flagrant abuses rife in the public service lest the administration should be brought into discredit.

We had been taught by the leaders of the Democratic party that the Republican party had grown corrupt by their long continuance in power, and on investigation we find it to be true. The people gave expression of their disapproval of the methods of that party at the ballot-box in 1884, and the whole country had a right to hope that their verdict would be carried into execution; but, alas! the hickory broom has lost its significance, and we are called upon to contemplate the ridiculous spectacle of a Democratic administration being administered by Republicans, with the same system of pillage and plunder going on, modified somewhat it is true, but existing nevertheless. For example, one case illustrative of the many, an officer of the Government, subject neither to confirmation by the Senate nor to the piece of political hypocrisy and fraud known as the civil-service act, drawing a salary of \$2,500 per annum, who does nothing, absolutely nothing, held in the employ of the country because he is thought to be a clever man, to the exclusion of honest Democrats who are willing to perform honest work for reasonable pay. That theory is not in keeping with the sentiment of the Democrats of this country. They have been misled by false pretense, and will not be misunderstood in 1888. The surface of public sentiment is placid and still, but the fires of a tremendous volcano gather beneath, ready for the day of reckoning. I pity the man on whose political fortunes it finds vent.

Mr. BURROWS was recognized and yielded his time to Mr. CANNON.

Mr. STRUBLE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky be allowed an extension of time for five minutes longer. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. TAULBEE. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry, or rather to ask for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TAULBEE. What is the status of the pending amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The debate upon the pending amendment has been exhausted; that is to say, the substantive amendment. Debate has also been exhausted upon the *pro forma* amendments.

Mr. PETERS. I withdraw the formal amendment which I offered.

Mr. CANNON. I renew it. I only want to say a word, Mr. Chairman, about these postal clerks. That they are hardworked, industrious, and skilled is true, otherwise they could not remain in the service. That they do more service for less pay than other employés of the Government is also true. Having said that much in reference to their compensation, I am entirely willing, so far as I am concerned, to leave the matter with the committee.

Now, sir, it is true, I understand, the masses of these postal clerks are Republican in politics. It is also true that if within the first month, or the third, or the sixth, or the twelfth month of this administration

the Postmaster-General had turned them all out and put others in their places the work of distributing the mails in the cars could not have been performed.

Furthermore it is true, as I am informed and believe, that just as fast as Democrats can be educated to do this work and take their places Republicans are removed.

Mr. BLOUNT. How does the gentleman get his information?

Mr. CANNON. From various letters written by competent clerks discharged. One case is that of Mr. Tooke, on the Indianapolis and Saint Louis route; another is that of a Mr. Coons that was cited the other day in debate at the other end of the Capitol, and to my personal knowledge one of the most efficient clerks I have ever known, who was discharged presumably, as stated, not from any failure to do his duty, but on political grounds.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I can name two or three instances myself.

Mr. ROGERS. Did not the gentleman join the Democratic party before they put him out?

Mr. CANNON. While he might not have had such ability as my friend from Arkansas, he has just as much politics and otherwise is my friend's peer.

Mr. Chairman, I was a little amused at the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. TAULBEE], and after all I do not want to complain about his attack, as he said, upon the Republican Superintendent of Railway Mail Service, a very competent man; and while I am not authorized to speak for him in any way, I have no doubt he has been and still is a Republican; I know he is a gentleman.

After all, would it not be better for my friend from Kentucky instead of striking at the branches, the subordinates, to level some of his heavy thunder at that self-confessed most candid Postmaster-General of yours who issued a circular—

Mr. TAULBEE. Let me ask you a question.

Mr. CANNON. Let me finish my sentence. Who issued a circular months ago giving all of these postal clerks notice that so long as they performed their duty they should remain in their places; but who, after he has obtained the praises of the political pharisees, as fast as he can dispense with the services of these skilled postal clerks, turns them out and puts in their places unskilled men; and this, too, while he professes to be living up to the statements in his circular.

Mr. Chairman, there is no service in the Government where unskilled men would injure the service so much and be felt so quickly by the people as in the railway mail service, and there is no place in the public service where there is so much need for the application of the civil-service rules. From the party standpoint Republicans could stand it if all these employés were turned out, and let the country see what would become of the service under exclusive Democratic manipulation.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. TAULBEE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has promised to recognize the gentleman from Missouri, a member of the committee [Mr. DOCKERY].

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section be limited to thirty minutes.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. Say to fifteen minutes.

Mr. BURROWS. I hope thirty minutes will be agreed upon.

Mr. GALLINGER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does that include any other amendments that gentlemen may wish to offer?

The CHAIRMAN. It includes all amendments to this paragraph of the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. At the proper time I desire to offer an additional amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It can be offered at any time, but the time for debate is proposed to be limited to thirty minutes; and of course amendments offered after that time, if they should be agreed to, must be voted upon without debate.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM addressed the Chair.

Mr. DOCKERY. I believe I am entitled to the recognition of the Chair; and if my friend from Pennsylvania desires to occupy the five minutes now, if some gentleman will return the same courtesy to me, I will give way to him.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to enter into a political discussion in connection with this bill. As to the amendment under consideration, since it is one that I submitted about a week ago, it may be proper that the intelligence of this side of the House should be informed exactly what that amendment amounts to. I have only one purpose in connection with this bill. As I have stated, I regard it as the best bill that has come before the House during my membership in connection with postal affairs. It is liberal, it is generous, and as such I give it my hearty support.

I believe, however, that a larger compensation than the regulations admit would give to your service a better character of men, and give to the men now in the service that compensation that the law awards them and as I think this bill should concede to them.

The Postmaster-General has asked for \$4,877,000 to pay this service

for the next fiscal year. The Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads give, under this bill, \$4,800,000—\$77,000 less than the Department has estimated for. My amendment adds to the bill \$90,200. For what purpose? For the simple purpose that the appropriation may be sufficiently large for the Postmaster-General to give to class 5 and to class 4 that which the law allows him to give—\$1,200 and \$1,400 per annum. He is giving to-day \$1,150 per annum in lieu of \$1,200, and \$1,300 in lieu of \$1,400.

If you adopt this amendment I have submitted you do not take from the Postmaster-General any of the discretion the law allows him, but you say to him, "If in your wisdom you think the exigencies of the service require it, Congress has appropriated an ample sum for the payment of this subordinate force, the full allowance of the law."

I am going into no discussion whether these men do great work or not. I think they do excellent work. I believe they are the hardest-worked men in the postal service. I believe there are required for clerks of classes 4 and 5 the highest conditions of intelligence, of education, and of experience. These men may be of my party. I am not arguing from that standpoint in this debate. I look upon them as experienced, trained, efficient postal servants. I believe they give to the public service that broad experience which can only come after training for long years in the service.

Therefore I make this appeal. Let us appropriate that which the law says these men should have. Then let the Postmaster-General exercise his discretion. My amendment simply appropriates that much.

The committee's bill appropriates or recommends \$77,000 less than the Postmaster-General had asked for. Carry my amendment, and he will exercise the same discretion, and will have an opportunity to pay these subordinates the full allowance of the law.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] is a proposition that looks to an increase of the salaries of twelve hundred and forty postal clerks of classes 4 and 5 at an annual cost to the Government of \$90,200. This extravagant measure is a legitimate and logical outgrowth of a vicious financial system, which has laid upon the people for twenty years the heavy hand of exorbitant and unnecessary taxation, piling up in the Treasury of the United States millions of dollars annually in excess of the actual needs of the Government.

Sir, the fiscal history of all nations attests the truth of the statement which I am about to make, and to which I invite the considerate attention of the House. Unnecessary taxation leads to surplus revenue, surplus revenue begets extravagance, and extravagance sooner or later is surely followed by corruption.

Mr. STRUBLE. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly.

Mr. STRUBLE. Will not this amendment, if it prevails, tend to reduce the surplus?

Mr. DOCKERY. That is very true. It does tend to reduce the surplus, but in an improper direction. I object to the rate of taxation which brings the surplus to the Treasury; but after it is there I want it disbursed for the general benefit of the whole country, and not the special use of privileged classes.

Mr. PETERS. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly.

Mr. PETERS. Does not the larger portion of the money that is paid for the carrying on of this service come from the voluntary contributions of those who purchase stamps, and not from taxation?

Mr. DOCKERY. I do not care whether you call it voluntary or involuntary taxation. The people pay the amount necessary to maintain the Government, and it goes into the Treasury of the United States. I would like to have time to discuss that phase of the question, but I have not on this occasion. What I contend for is that the rate of taxation should be cut down so that gentlemen will not have to stand here and antagonize extravagant propositions, because in such events they will not be offered.

Mr. PETERS. Is not the only way to reduce the surplus to expend it properly?

Mr. DOCKERY. It seems to be the idea of the Republican party that the way to reduce the surplus is to expend it extravagantly. The Democratic idea is to cut down taxation, and leave the money not necessary to support the Government in the pockets of the people.

Mr. PETERS. If that is the Democratic idea it is not being carried out.

Mr. DOCKERY. It will not be if this amendment prevails. [Laughter on Democratic side.]

During the ten years past these postal clerks have received the salaries as at present provided by postal regulations, and I am therefore unable to comprehend the exigency that calls so loudly for an increase the first year of a Democratic administration. If there be equities in their favor I imagine that they apply with equal force and effect to the clerks of classes 1, 2, and 3, and I am unwilling that the Republican leaders should "dump in" on the Democratic party the first year of its administration all the admitted legislative shortcomings of a quarter of a century.

Sir, if injustice has been done to these employes, why was not some

voice on the other side lifted up in their behalf during the Forty-seventh Congress, when the Republican party controlled not only the executive department but also the Senate and House? Why was not the wrong, if there be any, righted then?

Mr. Chairman, on many questions that are presented for consideration I realize that the methods and the practices of twenty-five years ago will not meet the demands of the present, and thus it is that as a rule my vote is recorded in favor of progressive measures; but, sir, all advancement is not real improvement or progress. In the matter of expending the people's money I would like to call the House back to the economic spirit that actuated our fathers and the leaders of the Democratic party during the long period that they controlled the Government and directed its fiscal affairs.

The Democratic party has always been an economic party. Before the war it enforced economy by fixing the scale of taxation so that it only yielded a revenue sufficient to meet the demands of the Government economically administered. Under this policy the Government exacted from the people a sum sufficient to supply its actual needs, and not a dollar in excess of that amount, and there was no enormous surplus withdrawn from the channels of trade and commerce to be piled up in the Treasury, constantly tempting to extravagance and its legitimate sequence, corruption.

I do not mean by this statement to intimate that the masses of the Democratic party are more honest than our friends on the other side, but I do say that our fiscal policy compels economy, while theirs lures in the broad way that leads to profligate expenditures.

The most commanding tribute that has yet been paid to our fiscal policy was recently penned by the brilliant and gifted leader of the Republican party, Hon. James G. Blaine. On page 46 of the first volume of his *Twenty Years of Congress*, when speaking of the Southern leaders who so long controlled the Democratic party, framed its appropriation bills, and formulated its policies, he says:

Their domestic relations imparted manners that were haughty and sometimes offensive; they were quick to take affront, and they not infrequently brought needless personal disputation into the discussion of public questions; but they were, almost without exception, men of high integrity, and they were especially and jealously careful of the public money. Too often ruinously lavish in their personal expenditures, they believed in an economical government, and, throughout the long period of their domination, they guarded the Treasury with rigid and unceasing vigilance against every attempt at extravagance and against every form of corruption.

Mr. Chairman, such was the financial record of the Democratic leaders and the Democratic party before the war, as conceded by the greatest of Republican leaders. Its history since that unfortunate period, so far as it has been permitted to make a history, has been equally creditable and economic. The first year of Democratic control of the House of Representatives after the war was signalized and marked by a reduction of expenditures to the extent of \$25,000,000, and in this connection I desire to give the total:

*Regular annual appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal years 1870 to 1886.*

1870 (Republican Congress)	\$147,499,278 23
1871 (Republican Congress)	169,166,387 73
1872 (Republican Congress)	166,887,212 53
1873 (Republican Congress)	181,682,274 94
1874 (Republican Congress)	193,025,793 04
1875 (Republican Congress)	183,685,002 16
1876 (Republican Congress)	179,166,833 90
1877 (Democratic House—Republican Senate)	154,553,639 64
1878 (Democratic House—Republican Senate)	144,392,149 23
1879 (Democratic House—Republican Senate)	171,187,349 68
1880 (Democratic House—Republican Senate)	192,870,137 17
1881 (Democratic Congress)	189,474,559 49
1882 (Democratic Congress)	218,358,057 25
1883 (Republican Congress)	297,561,602 29
1884 (Republican Congress)	231,993,647 63
1885 (Democratic House—Republican Senate)	195,710,588 09
1886 (Democratic House—Republican Senate)	219,595,283 18

I invite the attention of the House to the financial record of the two parties as presented in the above table of appropriations for the support of the Government, and also as bearing directly upon the pending proposition. A glance at the table reveals the fact that the Forty-seventh Congress, which was Republican in both branches, was the most extravagant known to the history of the Republic.

Will the gentlemen of the other side tell us why it was at this time, when your appropriations were lavish to an extent before unknown—why it was that you did not then provide for the postal clerks who now seek to have their salaries increased?

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this is not the hour to increase salaries. Thousands of laboring men who desire to work are to-day without employment "because no man hires them." These men and others who receive but limited compensation will not look with favor upon a measure that increases the salaries of six hundred and seventy-six clerks of class 4 from \$1,150 to \$1,200 per annum, and the salaries of five hundred and sixty-four clerks of class 5 from \$1,300 to \$1,400. Before we add to the salary account at any point let us at least await a return of prosperity to the business interests of the country. The people demand prudent economy in the expenditure of the moneys intrusted to our care, and to a performance of this duty they will and ought to hold us to a strict account. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]



Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The section under consideration contemplates an appropriation to pay railway postal clerks. I desire to call attention to one class of these clerks who receive compensation so inadequate that this Congress ought, in justice to them, to make provision for a higher rate of pay—I mean the chief clerks. I have in my mind a gentleman who served three or four years as a postal clerk, and who two years ago was promoted to be chief clerk. As chief clerk he performs, perhaps, twice as much labor as he did as a postal clerk. He has charge of twenty-three postal lines, scattered through three different States; he has charge of seventy-three postal clerks with fifty-three different distributions. As postal clerk he received a salary of \$1,400 a year, and as chief clerk he receives precisely the same salary, but as chief clerk he is obliged to travel a considerable portion of the time and pay his own expenses, so that his salary (and what is true of this man is true of every other chief clerk in the service) is reduced to perhaps \$1,000 or \$1,200, notwithstanding the fact that he performs much more labor now than he performed as a postal clerk. Two different Postmasters-General and the Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service on three different occasions have recommended that the pay of these chief clerks should be increased and that they should be allowed a sum not exceeding \$3 per day for expenses when traveling in the service of the Government.

I submit, sir, that these recommendations are entirely just and proper. These men, in the discharge of their duties, are required to have expert knowledge. In other branches of the public service men who travel on Government business have their expenses paid, and in view of the fact that the Postmaster-General and the Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service have recommended that these chief clerks should have an allowance for expenses at the rate of \$3 per day when traveling on postal business, I send to the Clerk's desk an amendment which will grant them that allowance. I am aware, sir, that a point of order can be made against the amendment; but in view of the fact that this allowance is just and proper, I trust that unanimous consent will be given and the amendment adopted.

Mr. BLOUNT. I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amend by adding to line 51 the words "and an allowance of \$3 per diem to chief clerks for traveling expenses when so engaged in the discharge of official duties."

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment proposes new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair decides that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. LORE. Mr. Chairman, I understand that by the law as it now stands on the statute-book fourth and fifth class postal clerks are entitled, respectively, to \$1,200 and \$1,400 per year. Since 1876 they have not received compensation at those rates, but have received only \$1,150 and \$1,300, respectively, because the appropriations have not been sufficient to pay in full. The Postmaster-General now asks for an appropriation \$77,000 in excess of that reported by the committee, and the pending amendment would increase the committee's report by \$90,000, based on a later calculation, which is only \$13,000 in excess of the Postmaster-General's estimate. I was in hopes that this amendment would have been accepted by the committee. This is not a political question; it is simply a question whether men doing fair and legitimate work shall receive just compensation for their labor. There is one consideration that I think has not been alluded to in the discussion of this question; that is, that from \$150 to \$200 of the compensation of these postal clerks every year is consumed in paying their board while they are away from home. Probably one-fourth of their time is spent at other people's tables at their own expense, which makes a considerable reduction in their salaries.

There is no class of Government employes who work so hard or who receive such meager compensation for their services. It is not just to say that these men are only four hours a day, on an average, on their run, when, as has been already stated, and as all of us who have looked into the question know, they are compelled to be in their places, many of them, at midnight to go out with their trains, and many of them are on the run from fifteen to sixteen hours a day. Then, too, they are away from home a great deal, and their labor is of the most exhausting character.

I need say nothing of the value of skilled labor in this business of the proper distribution of the mail. It goes to every man's home. The necessity of having competent men on our different lines of railway for the prompt and accurate distribution of the mail is universally conceded.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. Does my friend from Delaware state that these postal clerks are on duty sixteen hours a day each day in the week, or anything like it?

Mr. LORE. No, sir; but I say that on many of their runs they are on duty sixteen hours during the twenty-four. Of course they have their "off" periods; but their average time is more than any other

Government clerks of like pay, and when off duty they must study their routes and keep up with the constant changes. They work every day in the year; Sundays as well as week days—

A MEMBER. No.

Mr. LORE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. An account is kept of their time, and it is measured by the three hundred and sixty-five days of the year. Clerks of similar class doing work of the same grade in any of your Departments receive \$1,800 to \$2,000 a year, and they remain at home with their families and are not subjected to the same inconvenience and expense as these postal clerks.

Mr. DOCKERY. Is it not true that these postal clerks are off duty half the time, and that they have thirty days' leave of absence in every year with full pay?

Mr. LORE. Their privileges in that respect are certainly no greater than those of other clerks.

Mr. DOCKERY. But is not that true?

Mr. BINGHAM. They have no thirty days' leave of absence; they do not get a day.

Mr. DOCKERY. They are off half the time; there is no question about that.

Mr. LORE. If they are off any part of their time, it is because when on duty they work night and day, while other clerks, receiving more compensation, work only during the daytime. I submit that it is only reasonable and just that these men should receive the compensation proposed. If you wish to make reductions, let them fall upon those classes that are not doing full work and whose services are more adequately compensated.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, there is no politics in this proposition. It is a question of justice to these employes. Before and during 1876 these clerks of class 4 were paid \$1,200 and clerks of class 5 \$1,400 per annum. It is conceded that by an inadequate appropriation the amounts paid them were reduced to \$1,150 and \$1,200, at which rate their pay has continued ever since. This is not a proposition to increase their salaries, because the salary is fixed by law. When gentlemen say this is a proposition to increase salaries they state that which is not the fact. The question is simply whether we shall make an appropriation sufficient to pay to these men the salaries provided by law. That is all there is in the case.

In the last Congress the justice of this claim was recognized, and an appropriation was made, as I claim, with the view of paying these men their salaries of \$1,200 and \$1,400. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WARNER] said the other day, and other gentlemen have said, that the appropriation of \$81,300 added to the bill of last year was not for the compensation of these clerks; and they referred to a colloquy which occurred in this House between Mr. Horr, then a member from Michigan, and some other gentlemen, in which he said that the appropriation under consideration was not to increase the pay of clerks. That is all true. But if gentlemen will look at the colloquy they will find that it did not allude at all to the pay of postal clerks. An amendment appropriating \$81,300 was embraced in the bill as it came from the Committee on Appropriations. The Postmaster-General, in making his estimate of \$4,300,000 for the present year, said:

I estimate an increase of \$31,000, which would make \$4,601,000.

Then he said:

If you pay the postal clerks of classes 4 and 5 their salaries at \$1,200 and \$1,400 you must add \$81,300, which would make the sum total of \$4,682,300.

I hold in my hand the bill as it was reported from the Appropriations Committee, which appropriates \$4,482,300, showing that this additional pay for postal clerks was put on in the committee, and the amendment of Mr. Horr to increase the appropriation \$200,000 did not relate to the pay of postal clerks at all. He said it was for additional service, and in that view it was very proper.

Now, the simple question is whether you will do justice to these men. This appropriation has been recommended over and over again. I repeat, there is no politics in the proposition. After this House has spent three days declaring its regard and affection for the laboring men of this country it will not look well to refuse to appropriate what the law allows for the hardest-worked men under this Government; it will reflect badly upon its good faith if the American Congress should now cut down the salaries of these laboring men in the employ of the Government of the United States.

One other point. This appropriation has been recommended over and over again. I ask the Clerk to read from the report of a former Postmaster-General.

The Clerk read as follows:

I can but urge the justice of making the appropriation for this class of employes sufficient to enable the Department to restore them to the old rate of \$1,400 per annum for head clerks railway post-offices; \$1,200 per annum for clerks railway post-offices; and \$1,000 and less for assistant clerks, route agents, and mail-route messengers.

The employes of this service are required to be absent from their homes, on expense, on an average at least half the time. This, of course, lessens their salaries a proportionate amount. The responsibilities of a railway post-office clerk in charge of a car are greater than those of most employes of the Government at similar salaries. His duties require constant and unremitting attention and study. He is required in many cases to be on duty night and day. He is liable to, and is called upon at all hours, and can have no regular holidays. He is exposed to all the dangers incident to railroad life, and upon his fidelity and knowl-

edge of the service is dependent interests of unusual magnitude. He is deprived of the domestic privileges enjoyed by all other classes of governmental officers. His peculiar duties requiring him to remain on his feet when the train is in motion (the time when all classes of railroad employes, except, perhaps, conductors on local trains, can sit at ease), intensifies the physical strain attendant upon the jar and motion of the cars, and, in a few years, brings upon him diseases which necessitate his retirement from the service. This is becoming more apparent every year.

It would seem that all these considerations would warrant the strong recommendation that sufficient appropriation be made to enable the Department to restore former salaries.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, in quoting from the report of the Postmaster-General to show the amount of labor performed by these postal clerks, it seems to me I could have gone to no better place to get at the exact truth. The object of that official report is to display the condition of the service, the number of miles run, the number of pieces handled, &c. If a more favorable showing could have been made to Congress, it certainly would have been; for the object of the report is to give us information in reference to this and other postal matters. But we are so much in the habit of hearing unauthorized statements about public officials being overworked, that unconsciously these exaggerated statements become ingrained into us, and we are actually loth to substitute for them truths obtained from official sources.

My friend from Kansas [Mr. PETERS], when he finds these official statements in his way, undertakes to supplement them by saying, what I have no doubt he believes to be true, that these postal clerks while not on the trains are engaged many hours which the Department does not see fit to report. My own information is that as a general rule this report discloses almost the entire time devoted by these clerks to the service of the Government. No doubt it is a fact that oftentimes while the cars are waiting on the tracks the clerks spend some time there for the purpose of facilitating their business to avoid the pressure which they would otherwise experience in the handling of the mails. Now he calls attention again to the distribution of pieces as compared with the distribution of pieces in the Treasury Department, to which he makes allusion. He seems to think the work there was of a different character. The work is identical. In the first place the person making the count, if there is a mistake, is chargeable with the loss.

Mr. BINGHAM. Just let me interrupt the gentleman right there.

Mr. BLOUNT. No; I can not yield, as I have only five minutes. In the next place, the person chargeable with that bill as it passes through his hands must determine whether it is counterfeit or not. The person handling that bill must see it is distributed at the right place, and keep the schedule in his mind of the places of twenty-five hundred banks in the United States. The more you examine it the more close is the analogy and the greater, the more certain, is the demonstration made that these postal clerks are not doing half the work of similar employes in the Treasury service.

I think, therefore, it is quite clear there is an exaggerated estimate of the work done by these employes.

It is said we know that all these clerk's salaries have been reduced below \$1,400 per annum. Now, on page 315 of the Postmaster-General's report, if you will examine it, you will find that sixty-seven of these very clerks who are traveling about the country, to whom my friend's remarks refer, are paid the full sum of \$1,400 each per annum. So, therefore, his complaint is without foundation in actual experience.

Mr. BINGHAM. Let me ask the gentleman a question for the information of the House.

Mr. BLOUNT. I prefer to finish my own statement. The gentleman knows I have but five minutes.

Mr. PETERS. I wish to know why you have cut it down to \$77,000.

Mr. BINGHAM. My friend wants to know why we have cut it down to \$77,000.

Mr. BLOUNT. That is my point. It is because in the statement of the Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service, as an element upon which he makes that inquiry, not an increase of salaries of these clerks, but because the railway construction amounts to \$10,000 a year. But the committee said this is beyond the estimate of other persons, and that it would not do to make an extravagant increase. My own opinion is that the estimate made by the Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service includes the very thing my friend is contending for; that is, those higher rates.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is what it is intended to do.

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes; that is the gentleman's point. That is what he may have intended, but the Postmaster-General did not intend it, nor did the Committee on the Post-Office and Post Roads intend it. We did not intend, after working these men for ten years, just as soon as the administration fell out of your hands, to let you demand increased expenses and get wonderfully liberal compensation.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All informal amendments will be withdrawn by unanimous consent, and the question then will recur on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM].

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 64, noes 83.

Mr. BINGHAM demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. BLOUNT were appointed.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 54, noes 87.

So Mr. BINGHAM's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PETERS. I desire to offer an amendment, by inserting in the fiftieth line, between "hundred" and "thousand," the words "seventy-seven," so it will read "\$77,000."

This brings the amount up to the amount fixed by the Postmaster-General. [Cries of "Order!"]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is not in order.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 19, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of the Superintendent of Foreign Mails:  
For transportation of foreign mails, \$375,000.  
For balance due foreign countries, \$100,000.

Mr. BURROWS. In lines 81 and 82, I move to strike out "\$375,000" and insert "\$425,000."

Mr. Chairman, the Superintendent of Foreign Mails, in making the recommendations for the needs of this service, estimated the amount to be \$350,000. That \$350,000 is the sea postage. Of course it is understood by every member of the committee that by the law the Postmaster-General at present is authorized to pay for carrying our foreign mails to foreign lines and sailing vessels the sea postage on letters.

To the American lines he is authorized to pay the sea and inland postage. Up to the present time the Postmaster-General has seen fit to pay only the sea postage; and it is my information and understanding that the sea postage is all that has been paid. We paid to our American lines about \$48,000, which is the sea postage. This year in making the estimate of \$350,000 that estimate is based upon the sea postage alone.

Then the Postmaster-General, or the Superintendent of Foreign Mails, adds this:

If it is the will of Congress that the entire sea and inland postage shall be given to vessels of United States register for the conveyance of mails transported by them, the estimate of \$350,000 must be increased \$75,000, as you will observe by reference to the table herewith transmitted, which gives the weight of the mails conveyed by vessels of United States register for the fiscal year of 1885, and shows the total sea and inland postage thereon to be \$51,679.67.

Under the same percentage of increase in the weight of mails as estimated in this statement it will require \$75,000 in addition to the \$350,000, making a total of \$525,000, which includes \$100,000 for another purpose—for the foreign-mail service of this Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887.

My amendment, or that which I have proposed, is simply in accordance with the recommendation of the Superintendent of Foreign Mails. If it is the will of this Congress to pay no more to the American lines than the sea postage, although the law authorizes the payment of sea and inland postage, then the amount recommended in the bill is correct. But if the sea and inland postage is to be paid, and the recommendation of the Superintendent of Foreign Mails is reliable, then my amendment must be adopted.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I did not have an opportunity before this of presenting to my friend from Michigan a reduced estimate, made by the Post-Office Department, of the amount necessary for the compensation of vessels for carrying foreign mails—that is, for the purpose of paying the sea and inland postage. I have a communication from the Postmaster-General in which he states that the amount in the bill at this time is more than sufficient to pay the sea and inland postage on all the lines.

Mr. BURROWS. What is the date of that?

Mr. BLOUNT. It is dated March 22, and I have another of March 23. Now, sir, it is very difficult in five minutes' time to present the matter, but I shall ask to have the communications to which I have referred read from the desk, and if there is not sufficient time to read them will ask to have them printed.

In the first place, an error arose in making up the estimate of the steamers numbered on page 28. Fourteen are of foreign register, which is a miscalculation in that one item. In the next place, the service for the Cuban mail has been transferred to the appropriations for steam-boat service, making a saving there of \$20,000 as to this item.

Then by a contract with the Governments of New Zealand and New South Wales, which I shall ask to have printed, for carrying the mails, there is another saving of \$19,200, so that there is in all \$22,000 now needed for the purpose of paying the entire postage at sea and inland rates on American steamers employed by the Government. I repeat, I regret very much I could not have communicated these figures to my friend from Michigan before this time.

Mr. DINGLEY. What amount is stated by the gentleman from Georgia as being sufficient for the pay of American steamboats—\$22,000?

Mr. BLOUNT. Twenty-two thousand dollars additional. This sum is additional to what has been recommended by the Superintendent of the Foreign Mails for sea and inland postage, and a gross sum has been allowed.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask to have these communications read from the desk; I could not hear the statement here.

Mr. BLOUNT. I should be glad to do this if there is time. I will send them to the desk in a few moments.

On March 23 I have a communication of this character:

I bring to your notice the cost of the ocean service for the first half of the fiscal year 1885-'86, which amounts to \$171,733.37; this includes the Cuban service, the sea and inland postage to the steamship San Pablo of the Occidental and Oriental line from San Francisco to Japan, the United States and Brazil line from New York to Brazil, and the American line from Philadelphia to Great Britain. This would make the total service for the year amount to \$343,466.74.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan desires to have these papers read, and I send them to the desk for that purpose. If there is not time I shall ask to have them printed.

The Clerk proceeded to read the papers, but before concluding the hammer fell.

Mr. PETERS took the floor, and yielded the time to have them read. They are as follows:

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL,  
Washington, D. C., March 23, 1886.

DEAR SIR: I hand you a further statement of the actual cost of the foreign mails service for the first half of the current fiscal year, which may be of use to you in reference to the sufficiency of the proposed appropriation of \$375,000. It is a communication from Mr. Bell to me of this date, showing the cost for the half-year to be \$171,733.37, which includes sea and inland postage to one vessel between San Francisco and Japan, carrying a considerable portion of the mail, and the same to the United States and Brazil line and to the American line, and also the Cuban service which will not be embraced in the next appropriation. You will see that this will leave a considerable margin for the payment of sea and inland postage out of the \$375,000, and more than sufficient if the weights of mails during the next fiscal year do not considerably outstrip the weights of the present year.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, yours,  
WM. F. VILAS, Postmaster-General.

HON. J. H. BLOUNT,  
Chairman Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads,  
House of Representatives.

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF FOREIGN MAILS,  
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1886.

SIR: Referring to the statement made in my report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1885 (the last paragraph on page 825 in the appendix to your report to the President), to the effect that if the total sea and inland postage should be allowed to vessels of United States registry for conveying mails to foreign countries during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1887, the estimated cost of the sea-conveyance of said mails during that period (\$350,000) should be increased by \$75,000 and the total to \$425,000, I have to inform you that since my report was written I have obtained information which leads me to the conclusion that the full additional amount therein estimated as necessary (\$75,000) will be now unnecessary, and that a total of \$375,000 for the total cost of the service will be sufficient. My reasons for the conclusion now arrived at are as follows:

The estimate of \$75,000 additional was based upon the service rendered by United States steamship lines and vessels during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1885, as given in the table which is to be found on pages 822 and 823 of your report. This shows these steamers to have numbered seventy-eight, of which, however, fourteen are of foreign registry (not entitled to the sea and inland postage under section 4009 Revised Statutes), and should not, therefore, have been included in the estimate, but in fact were so included. Deducting for these fourteen vessels will reduce the sea and inland postage account by the sum of about \$13,500.

In addition there is now to be deducted the estimated cost of the conveyance of the mails by sea to Cuba and Mexico—\$20,000—which it has recently been determined to transfer to the appropriation for the transportation of domestic mails; and also a further amount of about \$19,500, saved by the arrangement which has been made with the Government of New Zealand for the carriage of the Australian mails.

To recapitulate:  
Increased amount estimated in my report..... \$75,000  
Deduct for 14 vessels of foreign registry..... \$13,500  
Deduct for service to Cuba and Mexico..... 20,000  
Deduct for cost of service to Australia..... 19,500

Which leaves a balance of..... 22,000

as the additional sum actually necessary to compensate all vessels of United States registry for services to be rendered in conveying mails to foreign countries during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1887, upon the basis of the whole sea and inland postage on the mails conveyed, and leaves a margin of \$9,000 for contingencies in my present estimate of \$375,000 for the whole cost of the service.

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,  
NICHOLAS M. BELL,  
Superintendent Foreign Mails.

HON. WILLIAM F. VILAS,  
Postmaster-General.

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF FOREIGN MAILS,  
Washington, D. C., March 23, 1886.

SIR: I bring to your notice the cost of the ocean service for the first half of the fiscal year 1885-'86, which amounts to \$171,733.37; this includes the Cuban service, the sea and inland postage, to the steamship San Pablo of the Occidental and Oriental line from San Francisco to Japan, the United States and Brazil line from New York to Brazil, and the American line from Philadelphia to Great Britain.

This would make the total service for the year amount to \$343,466.74. I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

NICHOLAS M. BELL,  
Superintendent Foreign Mails.

HON. WILLIAM F. VILAS,  
Postmaster-General.

Mr. BLOUNT. If there is no further debate on this amendment, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a contract with the colonies of New Zealand and New South Wales with reference to the carrying of the mails.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The communication is as follows:

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL,  
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1886.

DEAR SIR: I am informed by telegram from Mr. DOCKERY that a statement ought to be put in the hands of the committee in regard to the contract for the carriage of the mails between San Francisco and the Australian colonies, and I beg to give you a brief statement of facts for the use of the committee or the House, as you may find it proper.

On the 1st of August last, when the Pacific Mail Company withdrew a portion of its service, it was under a contract with the colonies of New Zealand and New South Wales requiring its steamers to carry the mails until about the 1st of November, the termination of the existing contract. That company gave general public notice in the press, not officially but it was reported as a matter of news, that it would not carry the mails after that contract ceased.

Meantime a new steamship company, known as the Union Steamship Company of New Zealand, limited, was formed and negotiated a contract with the Australian colonies. Pending that negotiation, and on the 24th of September last, I received a cablegram, of which the following is a copy, namely:

"WELLINGTON, September 23, 1885.

"To POSTMASTER-GENERAL OF UNITED STATES,

"Washington, D. C.:

"Negotiating for service, Sydney, Auckland, Honolulu, Frisco, connecting at Honolulu with Spreckel's steamers. Will you for three years undertake for thousand yearly in excess of present payments for carriage American mails? Reply immediate definitely, as continuance service probably depends on your decision.

"VOGEL, Postmaster-General."

You will observe the indefiniteness. It was understood to be for \$4,000 in excess of the amounts usually paid as sea postage, which would make about \$18,000.

The Department was not authorized under the acts of Congress to make such a contract for two reasons: the first, because it was for three years, and the act of May 17, 1878 (20 Statutes, page 62, section 5) forbids a contract for a longer period than two years unless otherwise ordered by Congress; and, the second, that a contract can only be made under section 4007 "after advertising for proposals," which had not been done. Being manifestly desirable, however, that such an arrangement should be made, especially in view of the threatened discontinuance of the service by the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, the following telegram was sent:

"SEPTEMBER 24, 1885.

"To POSTMASTER-GENERAL, Wellington:

"Such continuous contract not authorized. Will allow such sum while desirable unless Congress forbids,

"VILAS, Postmaster-General."

The Governments of New Zealand and New South Wales then entered into a contract with the Union Steamship Company for the carriage of the mails between Auckland, Sydney, Honolulu, and San Francisco for a period of three years from the 21st of November, and in that contract the following article is contained, namely:

"10. The payment for the service mentioned in this contract shall be £30,000 per annum, less the deduction next herein mentioned, namely: The Postmaster-General of the United States has agreed by cablegram to pay £4,000 toward the service herein provided unless Congress forbids, and, if such payment shall be made, two-thirds of the said sum of £4,000 shall be deducted from the total payment of £30,000. The contractor shall collect the said sum of £4,000 and account as aforesaid to the Postmaster-General for two-thirds of that sum, which two-thirds shall be equally divided between the postmasters-general. If the Postmaster-General of the United States is prevented by Congress from paying the £4,000 then the postmasters-general shall make up the payment of £30,000 in the proportion of £20,000 by the postmaster-general of New Zealand, and £10,000 by the postmaster-general of New South Wales.

"11. Ten thousand pounds of the total sum payable under this contract shall be paid by the postmaster-general of New South Wales, and £20,000 shall be paid by the postmaster-general of New Zealand; but from such payments there shall be deducted by each postmaster-general respectively an amount equal to one-third of the £4,000 agreed to be paid by the Postmaster-General of the United States as aforesaid."

A printed copy, unsigned, of the contract was received in this Department some time since. It contained the first intimation that there was some difference in the telegram from the postmaster-general of New Zealand as it was sent and as it was received. A communication has this day been received from the postal administration of New Zealand, transmitting a copy of their original telegram, in which \$20,000 is mentioned as the sum desired to be contributed by the United States. I have directed that administration to be advised that an absolute contract for three years can not be made by the Department for the reasons I have already given, but that the amount is within the limits of discretion reposed by Congress in this Department, and that it is not foreseen to be probable that Congress will forbid the payment of that amount for the service, or that it will cease to be desirable on the part of this Government.

You will perceive that the amount which it is thus required of this Government to pay, although less than one-half of the sea and inland postage which the Department would have been authorized to pay under the legislation as it stands, is the full sum which the governments of the two colonies proposed that the United States should contribute, and that it did not result from any negotiation of the nature of "dickering." The desirability to the governments of the colonies to establish and maintain a commercial line whereby they should secure the most convenient and speedy transit to the mother country is manifest, and its importance in that doubtless greatly outweighs either the value of the mail carriage to the colonies or to the United States. It may be justly supposed that these colonies considered this fact and its relative importance in proposing the sum of £4,000, or \$20,000, as the amount which this country should contribute for the mail carriage which it should be provided with.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, yours,

WILLIAM F. VILAS,  
Postmaster-General.

HON. J. H. BLOUNT,  
Chairman Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads,  
House of Representatives.

Mr. BURROWS. It is a little difficult to arrive at the points made by these letters of the reduction of the \$75,000 which the Superintendent of Foreign Mails said was necessary and must be had if you intend to pay the whole of the sea and inland postage. What has been stated by the chairman of the committee, and what appears in these communications, appears very briefly in a speech made the other day by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RIGGS], who accounts for this reduction of \$75,000 or \$50,000 by saying this:

At the time that estimate was made the service from Key West to Cuba was

conducted under the direction of the Bureau of Foreign Mails, and pay therefor was included in that estimate. Since then arrangements have been contemplated, and I am told at the Department will no doubt be carried out, to transfer that service for the next fiscal year to a division or bureau of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General's Office. In that event it will be paid for out of the appropriation for the steamboat service, and thereby this estimate of \$75,000 would be reduced by the sum of \$13,000, as I am told at the Department. I believe that is about correct.

In other words, the mails from Havana, which have been carried by the Cuban line, are not now carried. They are carried by rail from New York to Tampa, thence by steamboat to Key West, and thence to Havana. They contemplate that arrangement for the next year. But to show that that contemplated arrangement is looked upon with but little confidence by the Department, when we reach the estimate for the pay of steamboats we find there was no proposition made to increase that appropriation. If the mails are to be taken by these lines, conveyed by railway from New York to Tampa, why was not the appropriation for the Railway Mail Service increased by this bill? For that mail certainly can not be conveyed for nothing. More than that, if it is to be conveyed from Tampa to Key West and thence to Havana, why was not the appropriation for the steamboat service increased? And yet there is no proposition to increase that.

I think the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RIGGS] is entirely correct that this arrangement is contemplated, and that the Tampa arrangement is being used for the purpose of reducing the amount of the estimate made by the Postmaster-General.

Then, in the second place, here was a service of \$12,000 or more to New Zealand and Australia from San Francisco. The Postmaster-General tells us that instead of using that amount, the sea postage, he has made an arrangement with the New Zealand Government by which he pays that government for carrying the United States mail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOUNT was recognized, and yielded his time to Mr. BURROWS.

Mr. BURROWS. I would like to know—I have no pride or interest about it—but if the Postmaster-General has made arrangements with the New Zealand Government to carry our mails I would like to know by what authority of law he has done so. It appears that the New Zealand Government have contracted with some line to carry the mails to San Francisco and bring back the European mails to that country. And having made that arrangement, my understanding is, it is an arrangement by which they pay that line \$150,000 per annum. Having done that, I understand now the Postmaster-General makes an arrangement with New Zealand to carry our mails over the same line and pay that government \$20,000, thereby not paying our line anything, but paying it to that government.

Mr. STEWART, of Vermont. Is it true that arrangement has been made?

Mr. BURROWS. I understand that to be the arrangement. And I would like the chairman of the committee or the Postmaster-General to tell us by what law the Postmaster-General of the United States makes arrangements with New Zealand or any other foreign government to carry our mails.

Then, thirdly, there is no reduction, because they say in the estimate for sea and inland postage there were seventy-eight vessels included, and on careful examination fourteen of those are of foreign register, which under the law can not be paid the sea and inland postage; it is said they can be paid only the sea postage. That is entirely erroneous. There are not fourteen vessels of foreign register. It is not true. Why in the estimate of the Postmaster-General, if gentlemen will turn to page 822 of the report, they will find the Pacific mail line to New Zealand is put down as having two vessels of foreign register. That is true; but if we have just made a reduction of \$20,000 by the contract made with New Zealand, then no reduction should be made for those two vessels of foreign register.

The New York, Havana, and Mexican line have five vessels of foreign register; and the Postmaster-General says you must take that out. But you have just taken out the whole of that service. It is said in the Brazilian line there is one vessel of foreign register. That is not true; they have not a single vessel in their line of foreign register—not one. They chartered one last year in June for a single voyage, and they have not a single vessel of foreign register. Then it is said that in the Red D line there are two vessels of foreign register. They have not a single vessel of foreign register in that line. All the deduction that possibly can be made on the basis of these vessels of foreign register is \$2,041.75; and yet the deduction is made of several thousand dollars.

When the Postmaster-General or the Superintendent of Foreign Mails makes this deduction on the ground that it is for fourteen vessels of foreign register he falls into an error, and in some instances, as in the case of the New Zealand service, he takes out the amount twice for the purpose of reducing this estimate of \$75,000. Now, so far as I am concerned, I do not believe in the policy of hiring a foreign government to carry our mails, and if the Postmaster-General has made any such arrangement, I repeat I would like to know by what authority he has done it. This deduction on account of these vessels of foreign register is without foundation. As I said before, no more than \$2,000 can be deducted for that, and I submit that it is impossible for gentlemen to explain away what the Postmaster-General has said is necessary for this service, \$75,000 more to meet the sea and inland postage.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman seems to be very much disturbed because the estimate originally made is to be brought lower, and he complains of the modification made by the Postmaster-General. He wants to insist that the original estimate, which is the highest, is probably, therefore, the best. Now, sir, we know that there is nothing more common than for estimates in every branch of the public service to be made too high.

Not a single appropriation is considered here at any session of Congress in which gentlemen on either side do not find that to be the case. The Postmaster-General has seen fit to revise his estimate and to give his reasons for the revision. I frankly confess that when I saw the estimate as it was originally made by the Superintendent of Foreign Mails I thought it was too high. They have an old and well-established custom of adding a certain percentage for each year, and they have some high-sounding phrases about the "return of peace and prosperity," and upon that basis they make their estimates; so when I read this report of the Superintendent of Foreign Mails I saw that he had repeated the old formula, and I thought it quite likely that his estimate was too high. For this reason I am not surprised at the modification made by the Postmaster-General.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] says that the first statement that fourteen vessels that were calculated as being of American register are not of American register, is untrue. From what source does the gentleman get his information? The Post-Office Department speaks from the records of the Treasury Department, ascertains the facts officially, as it may, and it is upon that sort of information that the Postmaster-General makes this statement. If the Treasury Department misstated the facts, or if the Post-Office Department has not intelligence enough to make a correct statement of the information which it obtains from the Treasury Department, then I am at a loss to know what to do. But I am inclined to take the statements of these officials rather than the opinion of my friend from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], who has not had much to do with administration and therefore can not have the familiarity that these gentlemen presumably have with matters pertaining to their special duties. But the gentleman objects again to the second reason, in relation to the Cuban line.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] has expired.

Mr. BLANCHARD was recognized, and yielded to Mr. BLOUNT.

Mr. BLOUNT. My friend from Michigan has referred to the other factor in this reduction, the Cuban line.

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

Mr. BLOUNT. Certainly.

Mr. BURROWS. Do you think you ought to take out the two vessels indicated as of foreign register in the New Zealand service, when you have already taken some \$20,000 as the amount agreed upon to be paid to that government for the service? Do you want to take it out twice?

Mr. BLOUNT. There were not two vessels of foreign register in that line.

Mr. BURROWS. I beg pardon. It is so indicated in the report.

Mr. BLOUNT. It is not so stated by the Department.

Mr. BURROWS. It is so indicated.

Mr. BLOUNT. Oh, I know; but at this time there are three vessels, two of them of American register; only one is a foreign vessel.

Mr. BURROWS. But the Postmaster-General states otherwise.

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes; but a later examination has been made as to the vessels.

Mr. BURROWS. Very well. Then the deduction for fourteen vessels is erroneous.

Mr. BLOUNT. It may possibly be, sir, as to one single vessel alone.

Mr. BURROWS. Another question. You take off the Cuban service, which is five vessels of foreign register, and you deduct the sum of \$13,000 for that, and yet you deduct for the five vessels of foreign registry again. Upon what rule is that done?

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman seems to have analyzed the table to suit himself. I have taken this statement from the Post-Office Department as to the error in the calculation as to the fourteen vessels. I have not the tables themselves, and have not sought to examine them. When told by the officers of the Department that they have made inquiry at the Treasury Department and have ascertained that the previous statement was erroneous, I take it for granted that they understood what they were doing.

Mr. BURROWS. At page 822 of the report of the Postmaster-General there is a table which shows the fourteen vessels of foreign register. Five of those vessels belong to the New York, Havana and Mexican line. Now you say, "We must make a deduction for those five vessels because we can pay them only sea postage," and yet you have deducted the \$13,000, and you use that to reduce the \$75,000.

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not designate the vessels.

Mr. BURROWS. But you make a deduction for those vessels?

Mr. BLOUNT. I do, upon the statement of the Post-Office Department that there is an error in the original table.

Mr. BURROWS. All I desire to call attention to is, that you take out the \$13,000 for the transfer of the Cuban service and then deduct for the five vessels which belong to that line. I say that is erroneous.

Mr. BLOUNT. I repeat again that as to the tables the gentleman has before him I have not sought to examine them. I have taken the official statement of the Department. It may be that the gentleman is in error himself in his analysis of the tables, but I have not undertaken to analyze it.

The gentleman has referred to the Cuban service, and he says the Postmaster-General did what he did simply for the purpose of reducing that service.

I wish to say that by the aid of this coast line of railway the mail is now being carried to Cuba more frequently and in shorter time than it was carried by these steamers. There is no difficulty up to this time; none is anticipated. It is expected that the Department will be able for the estimated amounts to provide for the service from Tampa, via Key West, to Cuba. Now, my friend will see at once that when no contract has been made, when the matter is necessarily *in futuro*, for me to state on behalf of the Postmaster-General what amount is estimated for in the bill would not be consistent with the interests of the public service.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLOUNT obtained the floor and yielded to Mr. BLOUNT.

Mr. STEELE. I am sure my friend from Michigan, when he understands that this service is in contemplation, will not ask me to disclose the views and plans of the Post-Office Department, when that exposure might put the Department at the mercy of persons who are seeking to contract with it. Therefore I think I have said enough on this point.

In the RECORD of to-morrow morning the gentleman will find a document which I have asked to have printed showing the arrangement which has been made with New South Wales and New Zealand in reference to the carriage of that service. There is no contract. Two out of three of the vessels engaged are American. The Postmaster-General has simply stated that he is willing, if Congress permits, to allow them a sum less than one-half of the sea and inland postage for the transmission of that mail. He has reserved the right on the part of Congress to terminate the arrangement at any moment.

In fact he disclaims the existence of any contract. But so long as the American vessels engaged in the transportation of those mails are getting the sea and inland postage he will not interfere, and so long as the foreign vessels are getting the sea and inland postage he will not interfere, if Congress should not see fit to do so. He has simply made a large saving for the Government of the United States on the propositions of these governments, and that is the whole story. If any person, after an examination of this arrangement, can find complaint against the Postmaster-General for it—I mean any person outside the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, which seems to be hounding him to the extent of its power—then I would like to hear such complaint.

Mr. HEWITT. Do I understand the gentleman to say there is no complaint in regard to the action of the Postmaster-General?

Mr. BLOUNT. Oh, no; I refer particularly to that contract.

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who voted in the last Congress to authorize the Postmaster-General to give \$400,000 to American vessels for carrying foreign mails.

It was \$400,000; not much compared with the millions that England, France, and Germany gave, but more than Holland gave that year and much more than we gave the year before. Then it was \$50,000; \$50,000 to American ships and \$300,000 to English ships. So this was a gain. It was a step in the right direction. It inaugurated a new policy. It accomplished two purposes dear to the American heart: It fostered American manufacturers by getting them their share in the new markets of the world; and American shipping, by giving it protection against foreign competition. So we were glad to vote for it; the gladder, because it was about the only opportunity that Congress gave us to vote for anything the people wanted. It had 80 Democratic majority, but it gave us opportunity to provide for the Presidential succession, though only one life deferred a vacancy, for which no provision had been made; no opportunity, though the business world prayed for it, to free the hands of honest debtors and restore them to self-supporting activity; no opportunity to stop them, though our mints spawned a base coin which the people refused to take except on compulsion, and whose decreasing worth the markets of the world daily recorded. It gave us an opportunity to cut away 20 per cent. of the tariff, which protected American wages, that the party which had already clipped 20 per cent. from the poor man's dollar might boast that it had consistently clipped 20 per cent. from the poor man's pay. [Laughter.] But this effort to maim American industry was defeated by the Republican members, aided by a few Democratic members who preferred country to party; and this measure to aid American industries was passed by the same holy alliance, not without a struggle. The debate was the most spirited of the session, the discussion was renewed at every stage, and the objections, already heard three or four times, were most ably summed up by the great Indiana objector to all progress [laughter] on the last night of the session, when it passed.

And what good came of it all? English ships still carry our mails; English sailors still get our money. Why? Did the President veto the measure? Was the Treasury unable to furnish the money? No. One of his Secretaries repealed the provision. He pitied a Congress which

could not see the force of objections four times rehearsed to them, corrected their judgment, and overruled their decisions. And we are, alas! without consolation or redress.

We can not assume, as our friends on the other side try to, that the wisdom of the Postmaster-General, because it happened to be acquired without legislative experience, is greater than that of all Congress.

Nor can we blame ourselves that we used to the Postmaster-General language ordinarily used by Congress to convey its wishes to the head of a Department, and did not change the courtesy of permission and authorization to the vigor of a command. No one had told us the need of change. No one had told us that the policy of the mikado had entered the Cabinet, and that in the Post-Office Department we should find "the Poo-Bah of the administration;" and, in the same person, the Postmaster-General, the President of the United States, and its Congress; one who with triple assurances could as Postmaster-General refuse to execute any provision for our mails, or as President veto, or as Congress repeal it. [Applause.] I know well enough that the friends of American industry on the sea or land are, by reason of an ecclesiastical blunder for which they are not to blame, made powerless to do anything except to protest, and I only rise up in their name to protest against this irregular veto, which is in itself to the dignity of Congress as it is harmful to the business of the American people. [Laughter and applause.]

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

Mr. HOLMAN. For what purpose?

Mr. BLOUNT. To limit debate.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMMOND reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the Post-Office appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move that the House do now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill; and pending that, I move that all debate upon this paragraph, and all amendments thereto, be limited to five minutes.

Mr. HOLMAN. I trust my friend from Georgia will not limit debate.

Mr. BLOUNT. How much time does my friend want?

Mr. HOLMAN. I shall only desire to occupy five minutes myself, but I would suggest that the gentleman make it ten minutes at least.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then I move to limit debate to ten minutes.

Mr. HISCOCK. Mr. Speaker, how is this time proposed to be divided?

The SPEAKER. That, of course, is not for the Chair to determine.

Mr. HISCOCK. Then I ask the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BLOUNT. I suppose five minutes on each side.

Mr. HOLMAN. Then I trust the gentleman from Georgia will allow more time.

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentlemen on the other side have just occupied ten minutes.

Mr. HOLMAN. I move to amend by making it twenty minutes.

Mr. BLOUNT. I will accept the modification the gentleman suggests, and make it twenty minutes.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Ten minutes on each side.

The motion to limit debate to twenty minutes was agreed to.

The motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union was then agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. HAMMOND in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill, and by order of the House all debate in committee upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto is limited to twenty minutes.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the range of the debate has gone far beyond the original proposition. It is alleged that the Postmaster-General, in the exercise of the discretionary power conferred upon him by the legislation of the last Congress, arbitrarily refused to carry out the will of Congress touching the \$400,000 appropriated by the act of the 3d of March, 1885, to encourage and facilitate the carrying of the foreign mails in American vessels. It is charged that the Postmaster-General arbitrarily refused to expend this \$400,000.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PHELPS], in his elegant language, denounces this as an interference with the interests of labor in this country, and an effort to impair the interests of the American people involved in our foreign commerce.

The meaning of all this, Mr. Chairman, is that the Postmaster-General was directed by Congress to apply the \$400,000 referred to to encourage American shipping, which statement is of course without foundation. But what are the facts?

The terms of the act making this appropriation simply authorize the expenditure. "The Postmaster-General is hereby authorized," &c., are the terms of the law.

A discretion was vested in the Postmaster-General as to whether the money should be expended or not. The measure could not have passed this House, even at the late and pressing hour when it finally did pass,

had it not been for the assurance given by the gentleman having charge of the measure on that side of the House that it left the entire discretion with the Postmaster-General. I have before me the words uttered by Mr. Horr, of Michigan, who brought forward the proposition in the House and was its champion from the beginning.

Mr. Morse remarked:

Then it is entirely optional with the Postmaster-General to use the appropriation or not, as he may see proper?

To which Mr. Horr responded:

Every dollar of it is left to his judgment. If he does not think the service demands that the contract should be made with any vessel or any route, he need not make it.

And under this assurance, by 10 majority, the House agreed to the amendment.

The language of the appropriation confers in unequivocal terms that discretion on the Postmaster-General. The Postmaster-General refused to expend it. And, sir, the tone of public sentiment throughout this country has unquestionably sustained the Postmaster-General in refusing to expend that money. Who condemns the Postmaster-General? Who is the complaining party? The Pacific Mail Steamship Company and their attorneys have raised this clamor. They have spoken through portions of the public press. They speak in terms of unequivocal denunciation of the Postmaster-General for what they term the arbitrary exercise of power in refusing to expend the public moneys placed in his charge.

Is it for that company to stand in this House and arraign a public officer for default in his duty? Not long ago—so short a time since, indeed, that many of the gentlemen now on this floor remember the details of the event—a committee of this House reported, after a laborious investigation, that this same clamorous corporation now demanding a large portion of this \$400,000, had expended \$900,000 to carry through Congress the bill by which that company obtained a subsidy of \$500,000 a year from your Treasury for ten years. Nine hundred thousand dollars! For what purpose did they spend that large sum of money? To corrupt the legislative branch of your Government. And yet that company is permitted to have a voice here in demanding that the Postmaster-General shall be censured for not obeying its demands in the expenditure of public money, and that too where a discretion was vested in him whether it should be expended or not.

I do not hesitate to say that no public officer in the history of this country in performance of a public duty has acted more wisely, more in the public interest, than the Postmaster-General did in refusing to submit to the dictation of that corporation, which, with a record such as I have mentioned, still demands money from the public Treasury for a service which other companies more American than that corporation were rendering upon the old terms of the sea postage alone, and which in the judgment of the Postmaster-General in 1864, at the period of high prices, when the compulsory act so much complained of was passed, was ample compensation for the service rendered. The Postmaster-General wisely refused the demand of this corporation, and no public interest has suffered.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BURROWS. I only desire to say that the American Congress will beat any body on earth for discussing a question not before it. The matter discussed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] has not the slightest reference to the amendment I have proposed. My proposition is to increase the appropriation sufficiently to pay the sea and inland postage on American lines. That has nothing under the sun to do with the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, no more than with any other line.

Mr. HOLMAN. I was responding to the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PHELPS].

Mr. BURROWS. The sea and inland postage is not a subsidy. That is fixed by law. It is a statute to-day, and I am simply contending for the increase of this appropriation to the full amount of the sea and inland postage; and gentlemen, in reply, summon up the ghost of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company. That is childish.

The simple question is whether we shall pay the American lines or appropriate enough to pay the sea and inland postage, what the law allows, or whether we shall not. The Postmaster-General, in his report, said you must add to the \$350,000 \$75,000 more, making the appropriation \$425,000. That is my amendment. The bill appropriates but \$375,000—\$50,000 short of the estimate.

The chairman of the committee has tried to explain this reduction. His explanation is not satisfactory to me. I do not believe it is sound, and I want to say right here that there is no danger in appropriating too much. Let us appropriate the full amount of the sea and inland postage as estimated by the Postmaster-General. He is not compelled to use it. He has discretion in the matter; he may use the entire amount of the sea and inland postage, or if he sees fit he may use any amount less than either. So there is no danger in making the appropriation to the full amount of the sea and inland postage as estimated by him. That is precisely my amendment, and that is all there is of this question. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY].

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire simply to call the attention of the com-

mittee to one fact brought out by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] which illustrates the method in which we are treating American steamships. In the report of the Postmaster-General it was stated that sea and inland postage only, which is a very small and inadequate compensation, would give to the American-Australian line \$39,000 for mail service. It is now proposed in the statement that has been made as coming from the Postmaster-General to avoid the payment of even the sea and inland postage to the American-Australian line by making a private contract with the New Zealand Government, by which they allow us to put our mails into their bags and put them aboard American steamship lines and have them carried under a contract with the New Zealand Government. In other words, instead of paying the American-Australian steamship line \$39,000 for American service, as was proposed by the Postmaster-General even in his report, it has been discovered that an evasion may be made of that, and that by a private contract with the Government of New Zealand every dollar of that \$39,000 may be withheld from the American steamship line, and \$20,000 instead paid to the New Zealand Government.

I desire, Mr. Chairman, simply to call the attention of the committee to this, because it illustrates every step that has been taken in the progress of the present administration of the Post-Office in its treatment of American steamship lines. Instead of treating them liberally and generously even in the purview of law, there has been a disposition at every step to avoid giving them compensation whenever it could be done. I desire, Mr. Chairman, to call attention again to the fact that sea and inland postage to the Australian steamship line, which gives \$39,000, is compensation; but that compensation is arrived at under the law simply from the fact that the sea and inland postage to Australia and New Zealand is 12 cents instead of 5 cents, as it is to every other foreign country within the Postal Union. Therefore, if \$39,000 is appropriate compensation for the Australian line, as is admitted by the Postmaster-General, then sea and inland postage on every other route is inadequate compensation, because on every route to every other foreign country within the Postal Union the sea and inland postage is only 5 cents per letter. Another point: The suggestion is made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] that the repeal of the law providing that American steamships should be obliged to carry our mails at the rate that the Department might provide was obtained in an improper manner.

The gentleman said that the report of the committee of conference explaining the effect of the repeal of the compulsory law was not stated to the House. I desire to call his attention to the fact that that statement is demonstrated to be incorrect by a reference to page 5452 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it appears that General Slocum, who was chairman of the committee of conference, reported not only the exact terms of the compromise which had been agreed upon by the conference committee, but also a statement in detail showing the effect of it. I am satisfied that the gentleman [Mr. BLOUNT] did not intend to do injustice to that committee, but by reference to the page of the RECORD I have indicated he will find that he did.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] has expired. The committee will rise informally to receive a message from the Senate.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCook, its Secretary, 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 House of Representatives to the bill (S. 44) providing for the erection of a public building at San Antonio, Tex.

#### POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Committee of the Whole resumed its session.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I want only half a minute to emphasize some of the statements of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN]. The motive of the House that passed this appropriation which has been called in question was to leave the discretion with the Postmaster-General. The language of the law left it there, and the Postmaster-General exercised it wisely and in obedience, as I believe, to the will of a vast majority of the people of the United States. Therefore, in my judgment, it is becoming under the circumstances that men on all sides of this House should approve his conduct; but especially should gentlemen on this side of the House commend his action in this matter.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] has correctly stated that this debate has run away from the proposition contained in his amendment, and I concede that he is not responsible for it, and that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PHELPS] alone is responsible. His mind has recurred to a most disastrous Presidential campaign in which he figured as the chief leader of the Republican canvass, and, with that unpleasant recollection in his memory, instead of bearing the responsibility of the failure, he brings up a poor clergyman here before the American people and attempts to make him responsible.

Mr. REED, of Maine. And, thanks to the kindness of a Democratic politician, that "poor clergyman" is now a little better off than he was at the time to which the gentleman refers. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] does well

to come in to aid his friends. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any just cause of complaint about this matter. It is all right. We have a better administration of public affairs than we could possibly have hoped for had the result been otherwise.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. It was purely providential. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes, providential; and providential because it was right that it should take place.

But, Mr. Chairman, I will not occupy time in discussing this affair between my friend from New Jersey [Mr. PHELPS] and the clergyman. I invite the gentleman from New Jersey to resume the struggle with his clerical friend at some other place and time, and allow the public business here to go on. [Laughter.]

Now, during the discussion on this four-hundred-thousand-dollar clause, there was nothing more earnestly presented on the part of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] and other gentlemen; that side of the House than the proposition that this was not a subsidy; that the object was simply to give ample mail pay, and that the discretion was vested in the Postmaster-General as to how the fund should be used or whether it should be used.

Mr. DINGLEY. Discretion inside the law, not outside the law.

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman from Maine proclaimed that there was no subsidy in it, and asked the House to say that the four hundred and fourteen trips a year across the Atlantic should be reduced to a semi-weekly mail; that the money paid to the foreign steamships should be concentrated for the purpose of giving us a semi-weekly mail; that the commerce of the country should be embarrassed and the mails made less frequent, all for the purpose of giving \$270,000 to American steamships—and yet there was no subsidy!

Now I want to say to gentlemen on the other side of the House who have seen fit to oppose the Postmaster-General that not only is the Postmaster-General responsible, but the President and his Cabinet are responsible, and this side of the House proposes to be responsible in this matter before the American people.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That is what we want.

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes; and that is what you will get—not a subsidy. We will see to it that no House is coerced hereafter in voting an appropriation for the Pacific Mail Steamship Company or any other steamship company in the name of a subsidy and under the threat that there shall be no postal appropriations without it. Gentlemen here will find, I trust, ample will and ample capacity to take the responsibility of indorsing the Postmaster-General for exercising a wise discretion and saving to the American people the sum of \$400,000. We are willing to take that responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time to which debate on this paragraph was limited has expired. All formal amendments will be regarded as withdrawn. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], which the Clerk will again read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lines 81 and 82 strike out "\$375,000" and insert "\$425,000;" so that the paragraph will read:  
"For transportation of foreign mails \$425,000."

The question being taken on agreeing to the amendment, there were—ayes 82, noes 106.

Mr. BURROWS. I think we had better have tellers. It will take but a moment. I call for tellers.

The tellers were not ordered.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMMOND reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had, according to order, had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5887) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, and had directed him to report the same without amendment and with a recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. BLOUNT. I call for the previous question on the engrossing and third reading of the bill.

The previous question was ordered, and under the operation thereof the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. BLOUNT. I call the previous question on the passage of the bill.

The previous question was ordered; and under the operation thereof the bill was passed.

Mr. BLOUNT 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.

#### PUBLIC BUILDING AT SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

Mr. DIBBLE. I rise to a privileged question. I ask the Clerk to read the conference report which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 44) making appropriation for the erection of a public building at San Antonio, Tex., having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with the following amendment: Strike out the words "one hundred and fifty thousand dollars" and insert the words "so herein limited;" and that the House concur in the same.

SAMUEL DIBBLE,  
SEABORN REESE,  
W. H. WADE,

Managers on the part of the House.

WM. MAHONE,  
RICH'D COKE,  
JOHN C. SPOONER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The following statement accompanying the report was read:

The managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 44) for the erection of a public building at San Antonio, Tex., submit the following statement in explanation of the accompanying report:

The effect of the action of the conference committee is that the limit of cost of the public building at San Antonio, Tex., is fixed at \$200,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$150,000 as proposed by the House in its amendment numbered 1; and that the proviso inserted by the House precluding purchase of site until estimates show that the balance of the limit will suffice for erection of a suitable building to accommodate the needs of the Government, as proposed by the House in its amendment numbered 2, is retained in the bill.

SAMUEL DIBBLE,  
SEABORN REESE,  
W. H. WADE,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. REED, of Maine. I will ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DIBBLE] whether there was any considerable struggle in the conference committee to preserve the limit of \$150,000 which the House had put on this bill? [Laughter.] Did the House conferees exert themselves as they ought to have done?

Mr. DIBBLE. I will state that the managers on the part of the House took the matter into grave consideration; and the conference occupied about twenty minutes.

Mr. REED, of Maine. I only wanted to learn how far the spirit of economy actuated the conferees.

The question being taken on agreeing to the report,

The SPEAKER said: The noes seem to have it.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope we shall have some explanation of this report.

Mr. DIBBLE. The explanation is in the statement of the managers that the Senate sent over a bill limiting the cost of this building to \$200,000, the House amended it by fixing \$150,000 as the limit; and the House conferees, on the showing made at the conference, deemed it advisable to recede, in view of the guarantee of the second amendment that this amount would not be exceeded.

The question being again taken on agreeing to the report, there were—ayes 45, noes 37.

Mr. SPRINGER. I make the point that no quorum has voted; and pending that I move the House adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; there being ayes 76, noes not counted.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. TAULBEE and Mr. HOLMAN, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to extend in the RECORD their remarks on the Post-Office appropriation bill.

The result of the vote on the motion to adjourn was then announced; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BARNES: Petition of certain citizens of Richmond County, Georgia, for the passage of the Blair bill—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. BUTTERWORTH: Petition of W. C. Dodge and 50 others, praying for a provision in the appropriation bill requiring the commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct sewers in certain localities named in petition—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COLE: Petition of Knights of Labor of Baltimore against the passage of the free-ship bill—to the Select Committee on American Ship-building and Ship-owning Interests.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: Petition of Citizens of Bath, N. Y., for a tax on oleomargarine, &c.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNN: Petition of Margaret Ray and Joanna Summers, of Phillips County, Arkansas, for reference of their war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers relating to the claim of Margaret A. Ray and James Summers, of Phillips County, Arkansas—to the same committee.

By Mr. ELDREDGE: Petition of 58 citizens of Saline, Kans., for the passage of the bill granting a pension to the soldiers and sailors who served

in the war of the rebellion, and the widows and orphans as therein stated—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ERMENTROUT: Petition of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, urging the passage of the bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of clerks of the United States quartermaster's office at Saint Paul, Minn., against the passage of House bill 6395—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of clerks of the United States quartermaster's office at Santa Fé, N. Mex., against the same—to the same committee.

Also, memorial of John F. Donahauer, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISHER: Petition of Local Assembly No. 3237, Knights of Labor, of Au Sable, Mich., against free-ship bill—to the Select Committee on American Ship-building and Ship-owning Interests.

By Mr. FUNSTON: Remonstrance against the passage of the free-ship bill, from the Knights of Labor of Kansas City and of Armourdale, Kans.—to the same committee.

By Mr. GIFFORD: Petition of Mrs. J. C. McVay and other ladies of Yankton, Dak., praying for the passage of the Sioux reservation bill—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HIRE: Petition of many citizens of Millville, N. J., praying that no reduction be made in duties on glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of Knights of Labor, Local Assembly No. 4789, of Hudson, N. Y., against the free-ship bill—to the Select Committee on American Ship-building and Ship-owning Interests.

By Mr. LINDSLEY: Petition for taxing artificial butter—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition from the Knights of Labor, in opposition to free ships—to the same committee.

By Mr. LONG: Petition of Rebecca Wiswell, a nurse in the late war, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the American Local Science Association, for national aid to education of illiterates—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: Petition of Local Assembly No. 190, Knights of Labor, of Thomaston, Ohio, praying against the passage of the free-ship bill—to the Select Committee on American Ship-building and Ship-owning Interests.

Also, resolutions of the General Assembly of Ohio, insisting upon the restoration of tariff on imported wools as established in 1867—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of State encampment, Grand Army of the Republic, Columbus, Ohio, favoring amendment to section 1754, Revised Statutes—to the Select Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Edward Holden, of Mineral Point, Ohio, giving plan for the settlement of capital and labor troubles—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial concerning the abolition of the Presidency—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution favoring bill to require scientific study of the use of narcotics and stimulants, passed by the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Canton, Ohio—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. O'DONNELL: Petition of 8 ladies of Quincy, Mich., officers and members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, asking for an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'FERRALL: Petition of Benjamin Bowman, of Samuel Cline, of Rockingham County; of Thomas H. Rollins, of Rappahannock County; of Mrs. Elizabeth Richardson, of Warren County; and of Noah M. Funkhouser, of Shenandoah County, Virginia, asking that their war claims be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of Charlotte C. Bates and others, of Auburn, N. Y., for temperance text-books in schools of the District of Columbia, &c.—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of Local Assembly No. 2842, Knights of Labor, of Arkansas City, and of Local Assembly No. 535, Knights of Labor, of Scammonville, Kans., protesting against the passage of the free-ship bill—to the Select Committee on American Ship-building and Ship-owning Interests.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of Sarah Hayes, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. T. B. REED: Petition of Rufus Jay, for increase of pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of Mrs. M. R. Gannaway, of Bedford County, Tennessee, asking compensation for putting on the market certain inventions—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SCRANTON: Petition of Local Assembly No. 222, Knights of Labor, of Scranton, Pa., against the passage of the free-ship bill—to the Select Committee on American Ship-building and Ship-owning Interests.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of William Willard, of Charleston, W. Va., and of John S. Malcolm, of Nicholas, W. Va., for reference of their war claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. M. TAYLOR: Petition of William H. Jackson, of Madison County, and of estate of J. R. Alston, of Madison County, Tennessee—to the same committee.

By Mr. ZACH. TAYLOR: Petition of R. D. Jordan, guardian of minor children of Claiborne De Loach, deceased, of Shelby County, Tennessee, for relief—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WAIT: Papers in the pension case of Rufus D. Curtiss to go with House bill 6680—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of Joseph A. Clarke, asking that his war claim be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. A. C. WHITE: Petition of citizens of Indiana County, Pennsylvania, in support of the claim of John Montgomery—to the same committee.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of Bishop Halsey, of African Methodist Episcopal Church, and 175 others, praying for the passage of the educational bill—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. WILSON: Papers relating to the claim of Thomas H. Willis; of John J. H. Straith; of Francis Yates, of Jefferson County, West Virginia; of Robert Miller, of Augusta County, and of Eliza T. Pearce, of Fauquier County, Virginia—to the Committee on War Claims.

The following petitions, praying Congress for the enactment of a law requiring scientific temperance instruction in the public schools of the District of Columbia, in the Territories, and in the Military and Naval Academies, the Indian and colored schools supported wholly or in part by money from the national Treasury, were presented and severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. W. J. GREEN: Of Rev. Theodore Whitfield, S. H. Isler, and 84 others, citizens of Wayne County, North Carolina.

By Mr. LORE: Of Charles M. Curtis and others, of Wilmington, Del.

By Mr. NELSON: Of Rudolph Zimmerman and others, of Clay and Morrison Counties, Minnesota.

By Mr. SEYMOUR: Of E. P. Herrick and others, of Fairfield County, Connecticut.

By Mr. WAKEFIELD: Of H. A. Bushnell and others, of Blue Earth County, Minnesota.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, April 7, 1886.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

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

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a petition of citizens of Kootenai County, Idaho, praying for the passage of the bill to annex North Idaho to Washington Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a memorial of Knights of Labor of East Liverpool, Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BLAIR presented a petition of Knights of Labor of Salmon Falls, N. H., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a harbor of refuge at Sandy Bay, Rockport, Mass.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. INGALLS presented two petitions of citizens of Montgomery and Labette Counties, in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of the bill dividing the State of Kansas into two Federal judicial districts; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of Knights of Labor of Scammonville, Arkansas City, Parsons, and Armourdale, in the State of Kansas, and a memorial of Local Assembly No. 2005 of Knights of Labor of Kansas, remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HARRISON presented memorials of Knights of Labor of Frankfort and South Bend, in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MILLER presented a petition of merchants and importers of New York city, in favor of the passage of a bill to amend section 2805 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so as to allow oaths to be administered by notaries public in certain matters connected with the custom-house; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1204) for the relief of the children of the late Surgeon Alfred M. Owen and to increase their pensions, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DOLPH, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1311) for the relief of the administrators of the estate of Isaac P. Tice, deceased, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.