

tion of a particular hour for adjournment will facilitate the transaction of business.

When it is known that the House will be in session until a certain hour and will adjourn at that time, it is believed that a better attendance of members will be secured than when the hour of adjournment is uncertain.

TAXATION FOR PAYMENT OF PENSIONS.

Mr. MORRISON. I present another privileged report from the Committee on Rules, and ask that the resolution and report be printed in the RECORD and lie over for the present.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The resolution submitted by Mr. MORRISON, and referred to the committee, is as follows:

Resolved, That it shall be in order when any general bill or proposition to increase the rates or amounts of pensions or to grant pensions to persons not previously entitled thereto by law is under consideration to amend the same so as to provide by taxation or otherwise for the payment thereof; but no such amendment shall be in order unless the net revenue provided for shall be thereby set apart for the sole purpose of paying such increased pensions.

The report is as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to which was referred a proposed amendment to the rules making it in order, when any general bill or proposition to increase the rates or amounts of pensions, or to grant pensions to persons not previously entitled thereto by law, is under consideration, to amend the same so as to provide by taxation or otherwise for the payment thereof, have had the same under consideration and report it back to the House without amendment, and recommend that it be inserted as clause 9 in Rule XXIII.

When it is proposed to permanently increase the annual expenditures of the Government for an unknown or indefinite period, it is the opinion of the committee that it should be in the power of the House to make provision at the same time for raising the necessary revenue to meet the obligations incurred. This is more especially required in the case of general laws granting pensions. General laws increasing pensions, or granting pensions to new classes of applicants, usually affect a very large number of persons who necessarily rely to a great extent upon the provision made by the Government for their support, and consequently a failure to meet such obligations at the times designated by the statutes would subject the pensioners to much inconvenience, and in many cases might cause actual suffering. The amendment to the rules, if adopted as recommended by the committee, will simply give the House the power to provide the means for the payment of such obligations in case it is found necessary to do so, and while such action may not be required in all cases, there may be instances in which laws passed for the benefit of the pensioners would become practically inoperative unless this power be possessed by the House.

REPRINTING OF REPORTS.

Mr. SPRINGER. Several members of the House have asked for the report of the Committee on Territories on the pending bill. The report is exhausted. I ask that it be reprinted.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. DUNN. I make the same request in regard to the report on the free-ship bill.

There was no objection, and the report was ordered to be reprinted.

Mr. KING. I move that the House adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 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. ATKINSON: Memorial of Grange No. 353, of Pennsylvania, praying for the suppression of imitation butter and dairy products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the same, protesting against the admission of foreign agricultural products free of duty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of Maria Gibson, asking compensation for property taken by the Federal Army during the late war—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARKSDALE: Papers relating to the claim of Wilkins M. Kirkpatrick, of Jackson, Miss.—to the same committee.

By Mr. BAYNE: Papers relating to House bill 8249, granting a pension to Mary P. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. W. W. BROWN: Papers in the claim of Robert A. McMurray—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUNNELL: Petition of dairymen and butter-makers, praying for the passage of the bill introduced by Mr. SCOTT, to place the manufacture and sale of imitation butter under the supervision of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue Department and tax it 10 cents per pound—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. J. M. CAMPBELL: Petition of Grange No. 737, of Pennsylvania, asking for such legislation as will suppress the manufacture and sale of all imitation dairy products—to the same committee.

Also, petition of same, asking that the proposed tariff bill be so amended as to afford to wool and other agricultural products the same protection that is accorded to other industries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGLEY: Statements relating to House bill 7716, granting a pension to Lizzie Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELDREDGE: Petition of Mrs. Lura D. Parsons and 6 other ladies of Ypsilanti, Mich., praying for a law to punish seduction of girls under eighteen years—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FLEGER: Memorial of Grange No. 570, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pennsylvania, for the passage of bill to protect the dairy interests of the country—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the same, protesting against all legislation favoring the admission to our ports, free of duty, of all agricultural raw materials, such as wool, hides, jute, raw sugars, tobacco, &c., and asking for agriculture the same protection that is accorded to other industries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLINGER: Memorial of Albert D. Spalter, of Rumney Depot, N. H., praying for a pension; also, letters from different parties urging the granting of a pension or gratuity to said Albert D. Spalter—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALL: Memorial of the General Assembly of Iowa, against the passage of an enactment canceling and changing the form of the indebtedness of the Union Pacific Railroad Company—to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

Also, memorial of the same, asking Congress to maintain the National Board of Health, and to furnish it with means to discharge its important duties—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LOVERING: Resolution of the Department Convention of the Grand Army of the Republic of Massachusetts, favoring an increase of pension to those who have lost a hand or a foot in the service of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Messrs. Utley and Boynton and 73 other business firms of Boston, Mass., engaged in the butter business, representing that a great fraud is being perpetrated by the sale of imitation butter, 80 or 90 per cent. going to consumers at the price of, and as, pure butter; and asking for the passage of the Scott or Miller bill, so called, to suppress the traffic—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MATSON: Petition of L. H. Gamble and 98 others, citizens of Morgan County, Iowa, for additional pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of Rebecca T. Bowen, of De Sota County, Mississippi, for reference of her case to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEAL: Petition of Andrew Wassum, of Rhea County, Tennessee, asking that his war claim be referred to the Court of Claims—to the same committee.

By Mr. NEECE: Petition of 100 citizens of Mercer County, Illinois, praying for the passage of a law embodying the recommendations of the national committee of the Grand Army of the Republic—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of Michael Beckner and others, asking for free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Petition of B. B. George and 28 citizens of Taylor County, Wisconsin, praying for the passage of a bill embodying the recommendations of the national pension committee, Grand Army of the Republic—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSHEND: Papers relating to the bill for increase of pension to Maj. Samuel Johnson, Twenty-second Illinois Infantry—to the same committee.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of T. C. Greenhill, of Franklin County, Alabama, asking that his claim be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. A. C. WHITE: Memorial of Grange No. 176, of Pennsylvania, in favor of a bill to prevent the sale, &c., of bogus dairy products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the same against the passage of the proposed tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILO WHITE: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Saint Paul, Minn., relating to interstate commerce—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, letter of the Commissioner of Agriculture—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. WILSON: Petition of George T. Williams, of Hardy County, West Virginia, praying that his claim may be investigated by the Court of Claims—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. SYMES: Of citizens of Pueblo and Modista, Colo.

SENATE.

MONDAY, May 3, 1886.

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

THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection the Journal will be approved as read.

Mr. DAWES. I think there is a mistake in the Journal. Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, the Journal says, was instructed by the Committee on

Claims to report certain bills. He may have been instructed by that committee, but he certainly was instructed by the Committee on Indian Affairs to report bills of those titles. He may have had the same bills before the Committee on Claims; I do not know how that was.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Journal will be corrected according to the fact.

Mr. DAWES. I am not certain what the facts are. The Senator from Arkansas is not in.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will find out.

Mr. HOAR. I think the bills came from the Committee on Claims that he reported.

Mr. DAWES. The Senator from Arkansas was instructed by the Committee on Indian Affairs to report bills of the titles which were read. I do not know but that there may have been the same bills before the Committee on Claims.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will ascertain what the fact is as to which committee the bills were reported from.

Mr. DAWES. Very well.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Supervising Architect in regard to increasing the limit of cost of the proposed public building at Wichita, Kans., to \$100,000, as contemplated by Senate bill 1387; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of February 15, 1886, a report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office as to the payment of cost of survey by land-grant railroad companies in the State of Nebraska; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, inclosing a letter from the surveyor-general of New Mexico requesting Congressional action looking to the adjustment of private land claims in that Territory; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a supplemental report by the surveyor-general of New Mexico on the alleged private land claim of Bernardo de Miera y Pacheco and Pedro Padilla; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY BUREAU.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioner of Agriculture; which was read, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1886.

SIR: A joint resolution approved July 5, 1884, directed the printing of 50,000 copies of the first annual report of the Bureau of Animal Industry; 10,000 copies of which were for the use of the Senate and 35,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

I am to-day informed that of its 10,000 copies the Senate has received (some time in 1885) only 2,000 copies, and of its 35,000 copies the House has received (some time in 1885) only 285 copies, and that no delivery has been made to either branch within about one year.

I deem it my duty to state these facts in order to relieve this Department of any responsibility for what seems to be an unreasonable and unwarranted delay in the delivery of a report which Congress provided for nearly two years ago.

The second annual report of the Animal Industry Bureau is also in type, and will, I am informed, soon be delivered. For the great bulk of the distribution of these two volumes, to be distributed simultaneously, or for the great bulk of the distribution of volume 2 to get out ahead of volume 1, places this Department in an embarrassing position and subjects it to a reflection which is unjust. I therefore bring the matter to your attention in order to protect myself as far as possible.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

NORMAN J. COLMAN,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

Addressed to—
PRESIDENT *pro tempore* Senate United States.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The communication will be referred to the Committee on Printing and printed.

Mr. ALLISON. I think the communication ought to go to the Committee on Appropriations. The reason why this printing has not been done is because there has been no appropriation made for it. The Public Printer has an appropriation made for the several Departments; of course he executes the most important work; and unless there is a special provision for this work, or unless the appropriations are added to, this work and other printing lies over from year to year.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator move that the communication be referred to the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. ALLISON. I think that would be the wisest course.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That reference will be made if there be no objection.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented resolutions adopted by the transportation committee of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Cincinnati, Ohio, in favor of the passage of the interstate-commerce bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair also presents a petition signed by 100 members of the United Labor League of America, asking that the preamble and resolutions of the United Labor League of America returning thanks to Mr. Gladstone for his home-rule measure for Ireland be reported back to the Senate, and that they be printed in the RECORD for the use and information of the Senate. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PLATT. I present the petition of Dr. Alexander Y. P. Garnett and others, a committee of the medical profession, representing that the International Medical Congress will hold its next session in Washington city in the month of September, 1887, and praying for an appropriation to enable them to be received and entertained. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON presented petitions of Granges No. 136, No. 89, No. 88, No. 735, No. 570, No. 114, No. 83, No. 1, No. 237, No. 25, No. 352, No. 606, No. 58, No. 326, No. 52, No. 737, No. 157, No. 297, No. 159, No. 693, No. 503, No. 715, No. 66, No. 608, No. 677, No. 101, No. 720, No. 782, No. 74, No. 122, No. 684, No. 620, No. 165, No. 153, No. 150, No. 271, No. 244, No. 442, No. 531, No. 41, No. 791, No. 108, No. 91, No. 63, No. 109, No. 96, No. 417, No. 200, No. 277, No. 215, No. 799, No. 67, No. 146, and No. 688, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pennsylvania, praying for the suppression of the manufacture and sale of all imitation dairy products; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Franklin, Pa., praying that an adequate appropriation be made for the erection of a public building at that place; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented two petitions of Patrons of Husbandry of Pennsylvania, praying for the suppression of the manufacture and sale of all imitation dairy products; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented three memorials of Patrons of Husbandry of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the admission free of duty of agricultural raw materials; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by a meeting of holders of trade-dollars recently held in Reading, Pa., favoring the early redemption of the trade-dollar; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Altoona, Pa., praying that increased appropriations be made for the National Board of Health; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a memorial of Knights of Labor of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of dairymen and butter-makers, citizens of South Montrose, Pa., and a petition of dairymen and butter-makers, citizens of North Jackson, and other places in Pennsylvania, praying for the imposition of a tax of 10 cents a pound on all imitations of butter; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented memorials of Granges No. 136, No. 89, No. 188, No. 1, No. 114, No. 735, No. 570, No. 237, No. 25, No. 606, No. 83, No. 58, No. 52, No. 352, No. 326, No. 157, No. 297, No. 693, No. 503, No. 715, No. 771, No. 608, No. 66, No. 677, No. 720, No. 74, No. 122, No. 101, No. 684, No. 185, No. 737, No. 620, No. 153, No. 150, No. 271, No. 277, No. 200, No. 417, No. 96, No. 109, No. 63, No. 91, No. 108, No. 791, No. 442, No. 41, No. 244, No. 531, No. 688, No. 215, No. 67, No. 799, and No. 146, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the admission free of duty of all agricultural raw materials; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of merchants and manufacturers of Boston, Mass., and other cities in the United States, praying for the passage of a bill regulating license fees upon commercial travelers; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of George W. Townsend, of Philadelphia, praying for the consideration of and adoption by Congress of a new educational system designed by him; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HOAR. I present the petition of Marcus Morton, chief-justice of Massachusetts; Egbert C. Smyth, John Putnam Gullion, Moses Foster, Edwards A. Park, Austin Phelps, Edward G. Coy, all doctors of divinity and instructors in the theological seminary at Andover, and a large number of other citizens of Andover, in the State of Massachusetts, praying that Congress will enact such laws as will enable the National Board of Health to employ all the power and resources of the Government in the prevention of epidemics, &c. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER presented a petition of the intendant, wardens, and

sundry citizens of the town of Mount Pleasant, S. C., praying that an appropriation be made to prevent the washing away of the shore in front of the town and the filling up of the channels connecting it with the city of Charleston; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SAWYER presented the memorial of Alexander Weill, by Messrs. Shellabarger & Wilson, of Washington, D. C., remonstrating against the forfeiture of certain lands granted the State of Oregon, and by that State to the Willamette Valley and Cascade Mountain Wagon Road Company; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CALL. I present a resolution of the Tampa Board of Trade, unanimously adopted at a regular meeting held April 28, as follows:

Whereas bills have been introduced in both Houses of Congress to forfeit the land grant of the Florida Railroad Company, now the Florida Railway and Navigation Company, made by the United States Congress in 1855, to aid in building the said South Florida Railroad from Fernandina on Amelia Island to the waters of Tampa Bay, with a branch to Cedar Keys; and

Whereas after so long a time of patient waiting and hopes deferred the people of Tampa and South Florida now have pledged which they consider reliable that such road will be speedily constructed to the terminus at Tampa, provided a short period of extension of time is granted to its present manager; and

Whereas the completion of this road to Tampa is of the utmost importance not only to Tampa and South Florida but to the people of the entire State of Florida: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Tampa Board of Trade, representing the business interests of Tampa and vicinity, does most respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to so amend such bills as to extend the time for the completion of the Florida Railway and Navigation system to Tampa to the 1st day of March, A. D. 1887.

I move the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CALL presented a petition of citizens of Cerro Gordo, Holmes County, Florida, praying for the forfeiture of the railroad land grant made to the State of Florida in 1856; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CALL. I present a letter, in the nature of a petition, from E. W. Perry, of Crystal River, Fla., stating that—

A company of land speculators, calling themselves the "Homosassie Syndicate," are surveying all the coast lands in this county, even measuring every field of land cultivated by the settlers, representing that they do so by authority of Government, and that they are authorized to take up all the lands they may want regardless of any settlement that may have been made upon them; at least this has been so represented to me, and is the belief of the settlers.

The survey as made by the Government is said to be imperfect, many of the lines not having been run out, which makes it difficult to ascertain the numbers of many subdivisions. This "syndicate" is composed of wealthy men from all parts of the country. The poor settler will stand a bad chance in a controversy with these men.

The letter also states that this land has been donated to the State of Florida and does not properly come under the designation of swamp and overflowed land. The writer prays that some action may be taken by Congress in reference to this subject. I move that the paper be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTHORNE presented a petition of the Merchants' Exchange of Memphis, Tenn., praying for the exercise of the powers of Congress, under the Constitution, in regard to the tax on commercial travelers by the several States; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HARRIS presented a petition of the Travelers' Protective Association of the United States, praying for the passage of a law relieving commercial travelers of all taxation on their occupation; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. ALLISON presented a resolution adopted by the Sioux City (Iowa) Jobbers and Manufacturers' Association, of that city, in favor of the passage of a law to tax the manufacture and sale of imitations of butter and cheese; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Sioux City (Iowa) Jobbers and Manufacturers' Association, in favor of the improvement of the Upper Missouri River, and strongly remonstrating against the reduction of the appropriation by the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors from \$160,000, as recommended by the Government engineers, to \$80,000; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SEWELL presented a memorial of Grange No. 88, Patrons of Husbandry, State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the admission free of duty of all agricultural raw materials; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Grange No. 88, Patrons of Husbandry, State of New Jersey, praying for the suppression of the manufacture and sale of all imitations of dairy product; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. VANCE presented two petitions of colored citizens of Buncombe County, North Carolina, praying for Governmental aid to enable them to emigrate to Liberia; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MILLER presented a petition of nearly 100 citizens of Mount Vision, N. Y., praying for the passage of the bill taxing all imitations of butter at 10 cents per pound; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce

of Minneapolis, in the State of Minnesota, in favor of steamship mail communication between the Mississippi Valley and the Central and South American states, and liberal appropriations for the same; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. I also present resolutions, in the nature of a memorial, of the Chamber of Commerce of Saint Paul, Minn., in favor of the establishment of additional hatcheries for restocking Lake Superior with trout and whitefish, in accordance with the recommendation of the letter of the president of the Minnesota State fish commission addressed to myself. I also present in this connection the letter referred to. I move that the papers be referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EVARTS presented a petition of the representative committee of the New York Yearly Meeting of the religious society of Friends, officially signed, praying for the faithful fulfillment of Indian treaties and for better legal protection of the landed interests of the Indian tribes; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present a resolution adopted by the State board of health of the State of Missouri, declaring in favor of liberal appropriations and the enactment of such additional legislation as may be necessary to place the National Board of Health in a position to enable it to promptly and effectively prevent, suppress, or control pestilential invasions or outbreaks among the people, and especially to contend against Asiatic cholera. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL, of Oregon, presented a petition of citizens of Jackson County, Oregon, praying that an appropriation of \$30,000 be applied in resurveying, shortening, and improving the military wagon road between Rogue River Valley and Fort Klamath by locating the same commencing at Gold Hill Station, on Rogue River, and extending up that river by way of Crater Lake to Fort Klamath; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of members of Post No. 6, Grand Army of the Republic, of Forest Grove, Oreg., praying Congress to pass a bill that will embody the recommendations of the national pension committee of the Grand Army of the Republic; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MITCHELL, of Oregon. I present a petition of the Board of Trade of Dalles City, Oreg., praying Congress to give all possible aid to bills which may properly come before it having for their object the completion of the canal and locks at the Cascades of the Columbia. The petition is signed by E. B. McFarland, president, and B. S. Huntington, secretary, and is a strong argument in favor of the early completion of this work. It states that for the year ending June 30, 1884, there was transported by boats on the Columbia and by the railroads along its banks merchandise amounting in value to \$5,669,865, and various other reasons are cited why this improvement should be speedily completed. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I am directed by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6637) relating to contested elections, to report it with amendments. As this bill is a matter which affects only the proceedings of the other House, I ask unanimous consent that it may be put on its passage at this time.

Mr. HALE. Let the bill be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read at length for information.

The Chief Clerk read the bill.

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

Mr. PLUMB. I object to the consideration of the measure.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Objection being made, it goes over under the rule.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I ask leave to withdraw the bill for the purpose of putting the amendments in proper shape.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the Senator from Delaware will have leave to withdraw the bill for the present.

Mr. HOAR. I am directed by the Committee on Privileges and Elections to report favorably the joint resolution (S. R. 55) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I should like to have the proposed article itself read.

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

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

ARTICLE XVI.

The term of office of the President and the second session of the Fiftieth Congress shall continue until the 30th day of April in the year 1889; and the 30th of April shall thereafter be substituted for the 4th of March as the commencement of the official term of the successive Presidents, Vice-Presidents, and Congresses of the United States.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to say that I was directed to report the joint resolution without amendment, but since the committee considered it, it has occurred to me that there should be one verbal amendment—that is, that instead of the phrase "the second session of the Fiftieth Congress" the words "the term of the Fiftieth Congress" should be

substituted, as there may be of course some extraordinary session, which would make three sessions of that Congress.

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

Mr. HOAR, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2) concerning Federal elections, moved its indefinite postponement, which was agreed to; and he reported a bill (S. 2297) concerning Federal elections; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4009) for the relief of Ann B. Hubbard, administratrix, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SPOONER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1990) to provide for the adjustment of matters connected with certain judicial proceedings in Pennsylvania in which the United States was a party, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 83) for the relief of R. G. Combs and others, moved its indefinite postponement; which was agreed to; and he submitted a report, accompanied by a bill (S. 2298) for the relief of R. G. Combs and others; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. PIKE, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the petition in the case of Thomas Hamilton, a seaman of the United States steamer Victoria during the late war, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs; which was agreed to.

Mr. DOLPH. By direction of the Committee on Public Lands I report an original bill, entitled a bill to repeal all laws providing for the pre-emption of the public lands, the laws allowing entries for timber culture, and for other purposes.

The bill (S. 2299) to repeal all laws providing for the pre-emption of the public lands, the laws allowing entries for timber culture, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

Mr. DOLPH. I will state that this bill covers the same ground and has the same title as a bill previously reported by the committee, and is intended to take the place of that bill. When that order of business is taken up I shall ask to substitute the bill now reported for the other measure.

The committee after receiving various suggestions in regard to the bill previously reported have reconsidered it and have made various slight amendments to the bill, and also some substantial amendments concerning the law known as the desert-land act, and instructed me to report a new bill.

I give notice that at an early day I shall ask the Senate to take up the bill for consideration, as it is an important measure and has been pending before Congress for many years.

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

FOURTH OF JULY CLAIMS.

Mr. PIKE submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4731) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury Department, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment adopted by the Senate and agree to the same.

AUSTIN F. PIKE,
GEO. F. HOAR,
JAMES K. JONES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
GEO. W. GEDDES,
JAMES D. RICHARDSON,
JAS. T. JOHNSTON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was concurred in.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CAMERON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2300) to provide for an American register for the steamer Manitoba; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2301) granting a pension to Lucy E. Anderson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2302) for the erection of a public building at Franklin, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2303) for the erection of a public building at Chester, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. BOWEN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2304) for the relief of the Kansas and New Mexico Land and Cattle Company, limited; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MITCHELL, of Oregon, introduced a bill (S. 2305) making an

appropriation for the resurvey and relocation, shortening, and improvement of the military wagon road between Rogue River Valley and Fort Klamath, Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2306) granting an increase of pension to Erastus N. Bates;
A bill (S. 2307) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Dunlap;
A bill (S. 2308) granting a pension to Henry Lafaur;
A bill (S. 2309) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Crites;
A bill (S. 2310) granting a pension to Hiram Morris;
A bill (S. 2311) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Berkeley; and

A bill (S. 2312) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Dixon.

Mr. EVARTS introduced a bill (S. 2313) defining the service of a stevedore as a maritime service, and creating a maritime lien in his favor therefor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2314) to provide for the construction of a steam cruising vessel of war, of 20 knots speed, by Charles G. Lundborg, of New York; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BECK introduced a bill (S. 2315) for the relief of T. J. Pitzer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 2316) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Tallahassee, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. COLQUITT (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2317) for the relief of Daniel S. Lamb, M. D.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ALDRICH introduced a bill (S. 2318) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus Roberts; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 2319) granting a pension to Mrs. Margaret B. Todd; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2320) for the relief of Cogswell & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2321) granting an increase of pension to Clara B. Davidson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 2322) concerning the reissues of patents; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. PLUMB introduced a bill (S. 2323) granting an increase of pension to John Wilson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2324) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Barton; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SAWYER introduced a bill (S. 2325) to grant a pension to Nancy Mason; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2326) granting a pension to John Parkinson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas (by request), introduced a bill (S. 2327) for the relief of Marian F. Haynie; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 2328) for the relief of the heirs of Henry Leef, deceased, owner of the bark Mary Teresa, illegally seized by Alexander H. Tyler, consul of the United States at Bahia, Brazil; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. VEST (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2329) to provide for collecting in suitable reservoirs and utilizing for the benefit of invalids all the water flowing from the Hot Springs, in the State of Arkansas, not now being used in any of the bath-houses in the town of Hot Springs for bathing and other sanitary purposes, and which is now running to waste unused; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MILLER introduced a bill (S. 2330) for the relief of Adam Eitapence; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 2331) to refer a claim of Samuel F. Rice, of Alabama, to just compensation for professional services in behalf of the United States, to the Court of Claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. DOLPH. I offer an amendment intended to be proposed to the House bill making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, and for the armament thereof, for the fiscal year ending June

30, 1887, and for other purposes. The amendment is in the following words:

For the construction of fortifications and other works of coast defense in accordance with the recommendations of the board of fortifications or other defenses, appointed by the President of the United States under the provisions of the act of Congress, approved March 3, 1885, \$10,000,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War.

It will be seen that this is an important amendment, and is intended to commit Congress to the recommendation of the board of fortifications and other defenses, and to make an appropriation for the commencement of the work.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed.

Mr. DOLPH. I wish it referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses for the recommendation of that committee first.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That reference will be made.

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BOWEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the amendment reported favorably to the Senate by the Committee on Indian Affairs to the bill (S. 1916) authorizing the removal of the Southern Ute Indians from the State of Colorado to the Territory of Utah; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 2812) to approve an act of the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of Arizona entitled "An act to establish, maintain, and provide for the government of an insane asylum," approved March 9, 1885;

A bill (H. R. 3760) to enlarge the jurisdiction of the probate courts in Wyoming Territory;

A bill (H. R. 5179) to prohibit the passage of local or special laws in the Territories of the United States;

A 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;

A bill (H. R. 5888) to legalize and validate the general laws of the Territory of Dakota for the incorporation of insurance companies, and for other purposes, and to authorize and empower the Legislative Assembly of said Territory to pass such general laws;

A bill (H. R. 6965) to authorize Columbia County, in Washington Territory, to issue bonds for the construction of a court-house; and

A bill (H. R. 6966) to change the time of the meeting of the Legislative Assembly of Washington Territory.

The message also announced that the House insisted on its amendments to the bill (S. 335) to provide for protecting the interests of the United States in the Potomac River flats in the District of Columbia, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. BARBOUR, Mr. REAGAN, and Mr. BUTTERWORTH managers at the conference on the part of the House.

SOUTH AMERICAN COMMISSION REPORTS.

Mr. ALDRICH submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 15,000 additional copies of the Reports of the South American Commission, Executive Document 226, Forty-eighth Congress, second session, and Executive Document 50, Forty-ninth Congress, first session; of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives.

UNITED STATES PRISON AT FORT SMITH.

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

Resolved, That the Attorney-General be directed to inform the Senate the condition of the jail used by the United States at Fort Smith, in the State of Arkansas, and especially with reference to the statements of Miss Anna L. Dawes, as contained in the circular issued under her signature from the Indian Rights Association in the month of February, 1886, annexed to this resolution.

INDIAN RIGHTS ASSOCIATION, OFFICE No. 1316 FILBERT STREET,
Philadelphia, February, 1886.

A UNITED STATES PRISON.

From "Lend a Hand" (Boston).

Prisons or jails belonging to the United States itself are comparatively rare. The census of 1880 mentions but four, and the last report of the Attorney-General submits statements from these four, one of them being the jail at Washington city. The country has a right to expect that these few prisons under the control of the Government itself, supported by the nation and supervised by its own officers, shall be model institutions. We look to them for concrete examples of the latest discoveries in this direction. Penology is an exact science by this time, and some of its brightest triumphs have been achieved in our own land while American adepts teach willing audiences from many countries. It is interesting, therefore, to see what the United States considers the best system. With all the resources of the nation behind her, and all the wisdom of her famous students of this awful science to guide her, we look anxiously for her conclusions. We ask what system has been adopted, what employment provided for her criminals, whether they work for the State or for contractors, how their day is arranged, what punishments are allowed.

Innumerable questions of interest to the student of social science immediately present themselves at the mention of a prison under the management and control of the United States Government.

In the western part of the State of Arkansas is located at the flourishing city of Fort Smith one of the few prisons belonging to the United States. This large and growing town, in the midst of a beautiful region bordered by the Arkansas River, believes itself to be a coming center of great industrial interests. Already famous as the terminus of one celebrated railroad, it expects soon to be the meeting-point of others, and to gather there much trade. And while it contains every facility for comfortable and luxurious living, and prides itself upon keeping abreast of the latest civilization. On the very borders of the Indian Territory, in its earlier days it was the depot for supplies for that vast reservation, and although its importance in that regard disappeared with the advent of the railroad which traverses the Territory itself, it still retains the United States court having jurisdiction over that region. Whatever crime against national law may be committed in a tract extending westward 150 miles and embracing a belt of country 200 miles wide is tried in this court, and accordingly whatever arrest is made by a United States officer among its 60,000 inhabitants, the criminal is brought to this place. It is easy to understand that the court is overloaded with business and its prison with criminals. The industries and painstaking judge who sits on this bench is occupied, according to a recent statement of Mr. Garland, two hundred and ninety-seven days in the year, but the cases brought before him must still wait weeks and months for trial, so overburdened is the court. The jail is as full as the docket. Technically this place of detention is a jail, but though not a penitentiary it partakes in some respects of the nature of a prison, as will be seen. Its population is most heterogeneous. Here come men of all ages, accused of the gravest crimes or of the most trifling offenses. Here they await trial, and here, in many cases, they suffer punishment; a difficult situation needing most careful attention and most skillful arrangement, it would be said. What, then, has the United States done to supply the need? How is the prison arranged and situated? What system is employed?

The student of prisons and criminals must be particularly interested in this prison, so exceptional in its necessities and so unlimited in the opportunity for the best appliances and regulations.

The United States prison at Fort Smith consists of two rooms in the cellar of the Government building, with no light except what comes from underground windows, and no outside ventilation. In these two rooms were confined during the month of June, in this year, one hundred and nine prisoners; nine of them accused of murder, and two already convicted of that crime. This is the whole of the prison.

A fuller description of this extraordinary place, this piece of mediæval barbarity, only makes the horror worse. The Government building is a relic of the old military post, occupied as such until within twenty years. It is a large, low Southern house, once the quarters of the commandant of the post, built of brick, with stone foundations, and surrounded by wide verandas. Its rooms are used by the court and for similar purposes, and its cellar is the United States jail. The brick partition which supports the upper stories is the sole and only division contained in this remarkable prison. Each of the rooms thus made, or cells as they are called, is 55 feet long and 29 feet broad. Their height from floor to ceiling is at the utmost 7 feet. The small windows which light this black hole are at each end underneath the wide verandas. At one end of the jail the guard-room is located in front of them, but these windows are larger than those at the opposite end in the other room, being fully 6 feet by 3. Of course the solid partition between the two rooms prevents any draught. The climate at Fort Smith is that of interior Arkansas, a long, hot, dry summer, with the close atmosphere of a valley among low hills, without the Gulf breezes and lacking the strong winds of the open prairie. In early June the days were already stifling with heat and the nights were only relieved by a warm breeze that blew off the river across the localities most favorably situated. The amount of such a breeze which would penetrate under the wide verandas of a Southern house into a crowded cellar can be easily reckoned. Hoping to make the air more bearable the flag-stones of the floor are constantly wet down and the noisome air is heavy with the rising steam and dampness.

Into these reeking holes are crowded criminals of every age and degree. The court has jurisdiction over all crimes committed between the white men on the reservation, against white men by Indians, against Indians by white men under certain conditions, and over all infringements of the United States laws. Its prisoners are some of them full-blooded Indians, wild with all their savage passions and filthy beyond any Eastern conception; some are border ruffians who have lost none of their villainy or their loathsomeness in losing the picturesqueness of a past day; some are the low-lived, mean, and sneaking population who hover on the borders of this neutral country; some are hardened criminals of the worst type who have fled from the law of the "States" to seek refuge in the wilds of the Indian country; some are innocent boys brought here for a trifling theft; young men who, in a moment's rage, have broken the public peace; respectable tradesmen who have unwittingly infringed some stringent United States regulation about arms or liquor; innocent citizens accused by some revengeful neighbor and awaiting trial; outcasts whose crimes are beyond the possibility of mention; murderers who have been caught, not in their first, but in their fifth or seventh murder. It is literally true that at Fort Smith all these persons are confined in the same room, the close, unventilated, wretched place already described. Nor are the prisoners limited to those awaiting trial. In the midst of the desperadoes, the villains and the murderers, are all those criminals already sentenced whose terms do not exceed a single year. Those sentenced to a longer term are sent to Michigan. Happy the convict whose crime is large in the Indian Territory, for worse is a single year of Fort Smith than a cycle of Detroit!

Men who have been already convicted of murder are confined with the rest. There is absolutely nothing to hinder their free communication with their fellows. Five men are hanged at once in Fort Smith sometimes. At present there are nine men accused of murder in these two rooms, free to influence their companions, and like all the rest of their associates without the slightest check upon their opportunity to teach their horrid lore to young and old. The laws of the United States in regard to Indian reservations are very strict. No liquors may be sold in them, for instance, or carried there for sale, or given away. The enormous profits resulting from such illicit trading, and often it happens that the man breaking this law is as young in years as in crime. Lads who have committed small thefts are also in this prison to-day, side by side with men under indictment for the most dastardly outrages known to justice. The average number in confinement is seventy-eight, and in June of this year, as has been said, the number had risen to one hundred and nine.

The only opportunity for washing given to this multitude of men is the single sink in each cell. There are no baths, only now and then some more fortunate prisoner is allowed the use of a coal-oil barrel sawed in two, this primitive wash-bucket being the best that is afforded by the Government to this institution. The perplexed officials have tried many expedients to relieve the foulness of the place. The single bucket which serves the convenience of this considerable population is placed in a closet in the chimney, that the odors may be carried off through the only method of ventilation known to this jail. The prisoners spend their time as suits themselves. No work is possible. To relieve the tedium of the slow days, a mock court is held and men are tried for such offenses as spitting upon the floor, and, on conviction, are sentenced to sweep it. Recently one poor wretch suffered such an accumulation of sentences of this nature that he appealed to the court upstairs! The wooden cots and blankets which constitute the beds are put one side during the day, or serve as seats. When feeding time comes the rations are pushed through a slide in the door, and one after an-

other these miserable beings retire to some corner like dogs to eat their portions. In the matter of exercise a regular routine is kept up. The prisoners divide themselves into squads, which march up and down the room at intervals; but by their stay there long or short, they see no ray of sunlight, they breathe no single breath of outside air.

This dark, crowded, underground hole is noisome with odors of every description, dirty beyond description, horrible with all horrors—a veritable hell upon earth. What must it be for the sick? Impossible as it seems to credit the fact, the sick and wounded must live in these same rooms? There is no other provision for them; there is no other place where they can be put. There is "no refuge from the wild and ungovernable men around them," no relief from the close air, the eating and drinking and sleeping. It completes the picture to remember that small-pox is a disease very common to the Indian.

It should be made evident that for this state of things the people of Fort Smith are in no way responsible. It is a United States prison, and they have no more control over it than they have over the Capitol at Washington. They would welcome any attempt on the part of the Government to remove this plague spot, and substitute a suitable and decent jail. Nor are the officers to be charged with neglect or blindness. They do all that in them lies to remedy the evils, they make the best of the matter with no little thought and labor and painstaking. But here are the prisoners and here are the accommodations provided for them by the United States Government.

There is no question, shameful though the conclusion be, where the blame lies. The worst fact in the whole disgraceful series, is the fact that the National Government knows all about this horror. It can not even plead ignorance, for the report of the United States marshal in October, 1884, to the Department of Justice* contains a full statement of the matter, with all the particulars, the statistics and a diagram of the prison. What was done about it? In June, 1885, nothing had been done about it. There was no lack of money in the United States Treasury, for we had changed administrations on the ground of a surplus, and at this very town, the Government was just then selling the 300 acres which surrounded the original fort. There was no lack of facilities, for Fort Smith is large and well-equipped and situated on a great railway, and the officers for its court are able and distinguished. There was no lack of knowledge on the subject in a country which possesses such experts as Brinkerhoff, and Brockway, and Wayland, and a score of others like them, and in which prison conferences are annual occurrences.

What excuse has the Government of the United States to offer for the existence and continuance of this scandal?

ANNA L. DAWES.

Mr. HOAR subsequently said: I rise to ask the reconsideration of the resolution adopted a minute or two ago calling upon the Attorney-General for information as to the condition of the jail at Fort Smith. As that has been very fully stated on the floor of the Senate, and as both Houses, I understand, have passed a bill for a new jail, it seems to me unnecessary to put the Attorney-General to that trouble. I should like to move to reconsider the vote passing the resolution.

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

Mr. HOAR. I move to take it up for consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The papers are not at the desk.

Mr. HOAR. Let the matter lie for the present.

Mr. INGALLS. As the Senator from New Hampshire, who offered the resolution, has left the Chamber, it may be that he would like to be heard, and I suggest that the resolution lie on the table for the present.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will lie on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*:

A bill (H. R. 1360) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at some accessible point within 10 miles below and 5 miles above the city of Kansas City, Mo.;

A bill (H. R. 2397) for the relief of Thomas F. Purnell;

A bill (H. R. 2410) for the addition of a third story to the public building in Dallas, Tex.;

A bill (H. R. 2993) to authorize the Chicago, Freeport and Saint Paul Railroad Company to construct a bridge across the Saint Croix River (or lake) at any accessible point between Prescott, Wis., and Stillwater, Minn.;

A bill (H. R. 3351) granting a pension to Mrs. Magdalena Rehkopf;

A bill (H. R. 3369) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Council Bluffs, Iowa, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 3371) authorizing the construction of bridges across the Illinois River in the State of Illinois and the Des Moines River in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 3370) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Keithsburg, in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes;

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 at Fort Wayne, Ind.;

A bill (H. R. 4569) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at a point to be selected either in the counties of Clay and Jackson, in the State of Missouri, or in the county of Clay or Platte in said State, and the county of Wyandotte, in the State of Kansas, and to make the same a post-route;

A bill (H. R. 5673) to authorize the construction of a railroad and wagon bridge across the Mississippi River from Winona, Minn., to the opposite shore in Wisconsin;

* Report, Attorney-General, 1884, page 143.

A bill (H. R. 5684) to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River at the most accessible point between the mouth of the Femme Osage Creek and a point 2 miles above the city of Saint Charles, in the county of Saint Charles, in the State of Missouri;

A bill (H. R. 5685) to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River at the most accessible point in Saline City or within 5 miles above or 5 miles below the same, in the county of Saline, in the State of Missouri;

A 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;

A bill (H. R. 6358) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Yellowstone River, in Montana;

A bill (H. R. 7651) to authorize the Chicago, Milwaukee and Saint Paul Railway Company to construct, operate, and maintain a bridge across the Missouri River near or in the vicinity of Chamberlain, in the Territory of Dakota;

A bill (H. R. 1397) to establish a port of delivery at Springfield, in the State of Massachusetts; and

A bill (S. 1013) providing for the establishment of a port of entry at Mount Desert Ferry, in the town of Hancock, in the State of Maine.

REPORT OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY BUREAU.

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

Resolved, That the Public Printer be, and he hereby is, directed to inform the Senate the cause of the delay in furnishing to Congress for distribution the 50,000 copies of the first annual report of the Bureau of Animal Industry as authorized by the joint resolution approved July 5, 1884.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will inform the Senator from Missouri that the Chair presented a letter to-day from the Commissioner of Agriculture explaining that matter.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then let the resolution lie on the table until I can see the report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will lie on the table for the present.

Mr. MANDERSON. I desire to call attention to the resolution introduced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL]. I think the Chair is perhaps under a misapprehension with reference to the communication received. I do not think there is any communication to the Senate from the Public Printer.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will inform the Senator from Nebraska that the communication he presented was from the Commissioner of Agriculture, and not from the Public Printer.

Mr. MANDERSON. It is upon that communication that the resolution of the Senator from Missouri is based. I hope the resolution will be entertained by the Senate and referred to the Committee on Printing, so that the matter may be investigated.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection the resolution offered by the Senator from Missouri will be again read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MANDERSON. In view of the fact that the Public Printer has already communicated to the Joint Committee on Printing his reasons for his action, I suggest that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Printing, and I think we can report almost at once concerning it.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have no objection to that reference.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

POTOMAC RIVER BRIDGE AT ANALOSTAN ISLAND.

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

Resolved, That the commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they hereby are, directed to ascertain, as nearly as may be, the cost of the construction of an iron bridge for passengers and vehicles from a point on the east bank of the Potomac River across the Analoatan Island to the west bank of said river, so as to connect the city of Washington with the Arlington estate; and also the cost and expense of converting the plateau belonging to the Arlington estate into a parade-ground; and transmit the same to the Senate with such suggestions and recommendations in regard to the same as may appear to said commissioners pertinent and proper.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. Mr. President, I ask leave to read a paragraph from a paper published in Washington called the Post, in order that I may make an emphatic denial of one of the statements which it contains. It is headed "The nomination of Mr. Matthews," and reads as follows:

The nomination of Mr. Matthews was yesterday discussed by the Senate Committee of the District of Columbia, but was not disposed of. Senator INGALLS, in the course of a conversation with Senator RIDDLEBERGER Thursday, requested the latter to be present at the committee's meeting yesterday to make up a quorum and consider the Matthews case. This the Virginia Senator emphatically declined to do, saying that he would never help put a colored man in office against the wishes of the people most interested and that the quorum would not be constituted by his presence.

I care nothing for what the article contains except the word "colored;" and I take occasion here and now to state that I have never

heard in committee or elsewhere any reference, nor have I myself made any reference, to race or color as a reason for or against the confirmation of Mr. Matthews. So the word "color" there was inserted for some other purpose than to state the position of any Senator relative to this confirmation.

As a rule of the Senate forbids me to state the reasons assigned and reasons still existing which occasion the delay of this confirmation, I will say that only time can develop the real reason. In the mean time I want it understood that I have never assigned such a reason as appears in this paragraph, nor have I heard any other Senator in committee do so.

Mr. INGALLS. As my name appears in the paragraph which the Senator has just read it is perhaps proper that I should say that this is the first time that I have ever heard of it, and it did not happen to attract my attention when the paper appeared. No such conversation as that narrated ever occurred between the Senator from Virginia and myself. I never had any conversation with any gentleman upon the subject, and so far as I am concerned the statement is an absolute emanation from the imagination.

ADDITIONAL LIFE-SAVING STATIONS.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. President—

Mr. CONGER. I ask the Senator from Kansas to yield to me.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. PLUMB. I yield for the Senator to make whatever motion he desires.

Mr. CONGER. I gave notice the other day that I would call up this morning, with the leave of the Senate, the bill (H. R. 6975) to establish additional life-saving stations. The Senator from Kansas tells me that he is limited as to the length of time of the debate this morning, and would prefer to have all the time. I ask that to-morrow morning, after the morning business, by unanimous consent the life-saving-station bill be taken up.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Michigan asks the unanimous consent of the Senate that to-morrow after the regular morning business the bill to which he refers shall be taken up. Is there objection?

Mr. CONGER. It is a very brief bill, and I presume will not lead to any debate. There is a great reason why it should be considered.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLISON. I object.

Mr. PLATT. I should like to say a word upon the subject.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Iowa objects.

Mr. PLUMB. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill.

Mr. CONGER. The Senator from Connecticut says he does not rise to object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] objected.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PLUMB. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5887) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, the pending question being on the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations under the head of "Office of the Superintendent of Foreign Mails," after line 99, section 1, to insert:

For the transportation of foreign mails by American built and registered steamships, to secure the greater frequency and regularity in dispatch, and a greater speed in the carriage of such mails to Brazil; the Republics of Mexico, Central and South America; the Sandwich, West India, and Windward Islands; New Caledonia, New Zealand, and the Australian colonies; China and Japan, \$800,000; and the Postmaster-General is authorized to make, after due advertisement for proposals, such contract or contracts with such American steamships for a term of not less than five years, and at a rate of compensation not exceeding for each outward trip \$1 per nautical mile of the distance, in the most direct and feasible sailing course, between the terminal points, as shall be found expedient and desirable to secure the ends above set forth.

Mr. McPHERSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas a single question, as I was not present in the Senate when that part of the bill to which my question applies was passed over. I refer to the paragraph on page 3, between lines 46 and 57, inclusive. Unquestionably there is some object and purpose in the amendment in that paragraph. I am unable to understand its necessity or its object, and I should like to have the Senator explain it to me in order that I may comprehend it.

Mr. PLUMB. That, with the exception of the last part of the amendment, commencing in line 53 with the word "said," is the provision inserted in the bill of last year. It was supposed at the time that it was a continuing provision; it was the design of the committee to make it a continuing provision; but some doubt having arisen about it, it was deemed best to insert it again this year.

The purpose of it is to enable the Postmaster-General to make one contract for the transportation of the mails from Tampa in Florida to Havana in Cuba, a distance of about 320 miles, 95 miles of which lying between Key West and Havana is in foreign waters. Without a provision of this kind he would be obliged to make two contracts, one for

the coast line between Tampa and Key West and the other for the foreign service between Key West and Havana. It was designed to make a continuous service, one single contract, in order that there might be no delay and in order that the benefits to be derived from the special facilities of the service north of Tampa might be realized in the dispatch of mails to Cuba.

Mr. McPHERSON. The Senator's explanation, so far as it goes, is very satisfactory. I presume the intention is to give extra compensation for carrying the mails between Tampa, Fla., and Havana. Under the bill would it not be possible—in other words, would not the construction necessarily be put upon the bill to apply to the terminal points named? We will say that one terminal point is New York city and the other terminal point is Havana. A steamship leaving the port of New York, touching at different ports along the coast at Tampa as the last of our domestic ports, running from there to Havana, would it not be entitled under this provision to receive a compensation of 50 cents per mile all the way from New York to Havana and back again?

Mr. PLUMB. It would not be possible practically to put on a service of that kind. In order to render that service a steamer would have to round the whole peninsula of Florida and go up into the Gulf of Mexico about 200 miles. It would not be a continuous service; it would not be a useful service; and it is not the service contemplated by the bill at all. The Senator will see that this is limited to a service where the domestic office is not more than 200 miles distant from the foreign office between which there is not a service. The distance between Havana and Key West is 95 miles I understand, and it could not therefore apply to any other two points than Key West and Havana.

Mr. McPHERSON. Would it not be better to state in terms then exactly what the bill proposes to do in regard to the service between Tampa, Fla., and Havana?

Mr. PLUMB. There would be no objection to that except there is a line of railroad in progress between Jacksonville and Charlotte Harbor, a point still farther down the coast, and it might be that during the next fiscal year the Postmaster-General would have the opportunity to make a service between Charlotte Harbor via Key West and Havana which would be cheaper even than the service via Tampa.

The provision was inserted last year at the request of the Department with a view of making, as I said, one continuous service between the two points, and it is desired by the Department to be repeated this year, except that the Department have specially asked that the limitation at the rate of 50 cents a mile be stricken out as a rate which would probably be insufficient and would at all events be likely to embarrass the service.

Mr. President, when the Senate adjourned on Friday—

Mr. VEST. Does the Senator propose to close the debate now?

Mr. PLUMB. The only agreement there is about closing the debate is the one entered into on Friday.

Mr. VEST. I know; but, as a matter of parliamentary courtesy, the opposition ought to be heard before the debate is closed.

Mr. PLUMB. I do not desire to speak now if others will speak. If there is any one who desires to speak I should be glad to have him speak now, in order that I may close the debate at a later period, but I do not care to have the Senate detained for the purpose of waiting upon anybody.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to debate again all the propositions which are involved in the amendment submitted by the committee; and but for the fact that several Democratic Senators have expressed their intention to vote for this amendment, when I know that those Senators are opposed to recognizing in any way the propriety of the present navigation laws of the United States, which prohibit any American citizen from purchasing a foreign-built ship, I should not address the Senate at all. I do not arrogate to myself any superior discernment or any superior industry when I state that the amendment proposed by the committee is absolutely antagonistic to the doctrine of free ships. A very brief examination of the existing legislation on this subject in the United States and of the amendment will make good this assertion. The Statutes of the United States, as they now exist, provide as follows:

SEC. 4007. The Postmaster-General may, after advertising for proposals, enter into contract for the transportation of the mail between the United States and any foreign country whenever the public interests will thereby be promoted.

There is no limitation upon this clause. The Postmaster-General may enter into contracts with any American or foreign-built ship for the transportation of the mails of the United States abroad, and this provision now existing is identical with the laws of Great Britain in regard to the transportation of the mails.

We have heard a great deal said here about subsidies paid by Great Britain. Mr. President, I do not propose to make an assertion, without any sort of exception, that money should not be paid out of the Treasury of the United States to encourage private enterprise. I can readily conceive a case in which private capital and private enterprise is not sufficient to carry out some great public policy and purpose. If I could to-day build an interoceanic communication between the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific and the Atlantic, if I could aid any corporation to bring about that communication by a liberal advance of capital from the Treasury of the United States, by a guarantee on the part of the National

Government to private enterprise, I would willingly and readily, under proper restrictions, vote for such a bill. There are enterprises so gigantic and at the same time so necessary that the Government must use its vast capital and its unexampled resources in order to preserve the public interests, if not the public tranquillity. But this is not a case of that kind.

Much has been said of the course of England in paying subsidies to her great oceanic mail lines. Mr. President, I assert here, although it has been repeatedly stated to the contrary upon this floor and in the public press, that England has always advertised for contracts to transport her mails to all parts of the earth, open to all comers and without favoritism to her own people. But a few years ago a German company was the lowest responsible bidder for a British mail contract across the Atlantic Ocean to New York, and that company received it and carried the mails under that contract. To-day an American citizen can go to Great Britain and bid upon a mail contract, and if his bid is the lowest and he is entirely responsible the award will be given in his favor. Here in this legislation comes the same old question of confining the carriers to American steamships.

It is proposed now to change the existing statute of this country that permits a foreigner to bid here upon a mail contract, and substitute in its place that none but American steamships shall be permitted to carry the mails, and all competition is to be confined to American bidders. To-day we have but two routes on which there are two American lines, the one extending from San Francisco to the East, and the other from New York to Havana, so that no competition can come, except from those two lines, under the amendment now proposed.

I have read the provision of the Revised Statutes. That has no limitation. Now what is this amendment?

For the transportation of foreign mails by American built and registered steamships, to secure the greater frequency and regularity in dispatch, and a greater speed in the carriage of such mails to Brazil; the republics of Mexico, Central and South America; the Sandwich, West India, and Windward Islands; New Caledonia, New Zealand, and the Australian colonies; China and Japan, \$800,000; and the Postmaster-General is authorized to make, after due advertisement for proposals, such contract or contracts with such American steamships, for a term of not less than five years, and at a rate of compensation not exceeding for each outward trip \$1 per nautical mile of the distance, in the most direct and feasible sailing course, between the terminal points, as shall be found expedient and desirable to secure the ends above set forth.

Nobody can bid except an American. It is a repeal of the existing statute upon this subject, and it is the assertion of the old doctrine incorporated in 1790 in the navigation laws, a relic of barbarism, that unless an American can build a ship himself he shall not go upon the ocean he shall not go abroad and buy his ship where he can buy it cheapest, and sail it under the American flag. Why, Mr. President, from the statements that have been made upon this floor we should be led to believe that the Government of the United States had paid nothing in the past as mail pay to oceanic steamship lines. The Government of the United States paid from 1848 to 1885 mail pay amounting to \$32,184,950.57 to steamships for carrying oceanic mails, of which amount foreign vessels received \$7,123,117 and American vessels received \$25,061,832—nearly four times as much paid to the owners of American steamship lines as has been paid to foreign owners; and yet has that prevented our merchant marine from going down, until to-day it has reached a point of insignificance?

In 1855, 85 per cent. of the commerce of this country was carried abroad in American bottoms, and to-day 17 per cent. is carried in American vessels and the balance in ships belonging to foreign nations; and yet with a fatuity, with a blindness, with a recklessness that almost surpasses belief, the American Congress, under the leadership of the Republican party, have hung on to these obsolete and barbarous laws enacted in the infancy of our Republic, enacted at a time when they were in retaliation against the exclusive legislation of Great Britain; and day by day and hour by hour our ships and our flag have disappeared from the ocean. In the forest of masts to-day the American flag is not seen in the merchant marine and can not be discovered except floating from the masthead of some old wooden tug that would not last one minute before the armored vessels and the superior guns now manufactured for modern warfare.

Why, sir, our merchant marine and our Navy have gone down together. Look at the newspaper accounts the other day of our nautical drill off Pensacola. There were five old wooden hulks and a few torpedo-boats; and one of the vessels, the Brooklyn, took fire, and it took all the rest to put the fire out. When the torpedo-boats advanced upon the United States frigate, they actually had no electric light to illuminate the harbor for the purpose of protection, and they were forced to throw up the old bombs in order to give a light to the harbor and to the waves in order to see the attacking party. It was a roaring farce.

The Navy of the United States to-day amounts to nothing. We have no sailors. Hardly 5 per cent. of the sailors in the merchant marine are American citizens. From 1856 down to this time we have retrograded and gone back in the merchant marine and in the Navy. Since 1866 the Congress of the United States has appropriated \$385,000,000 for naval purposes. Think of it! Three hundred and eighty-five million dollars since the close of the war. And to-day we have got some old wooden hulks that would not last one-half hour before one single armored vessel of a second-class naval power. Chili to-day has got

superior war ships. Chili to-day has two vessels that could reduce to ashes every seaport city of the United States without receiving a single injury. Italy could send one war vessel here that could bombard our cities and destroy our Navy. And this is the result of \$385,000,000 appropriated by Congress since the close of the war for the pay of officers and seamen and the repair and construction of naval vessels.

Mr. HALE. This is an old subject. The Senator and I have repeatedly been in controversy upon it. I want to ask him if he means to convey the impression that since 1866, after the war ended, there have been \$385,000,000 appropriated that have gone into either the construction or repair of ships. Is it not the fact, as I stated the last time he made this speech, in answer to it, that nine-tenths of all that has gone into the regular maintenance of the naval establishment and has not gone into ships?

Mr. VEST. Oh, yes.

Mr. HALE. Well, state it that way.

Mr. VEST. I never said that all of it went into these old hulks. I never said it had been thrown away in the construction of vessels of green timber that warped inside of three months and caused them to be sold for firewood. I did say it had gone to the naval establishment, to the pay of officers and men that had no ships, to the support of the intellectual gentlemen—it is nothing to their discredit—who have been hanging about the city of Washington for twenty years, the ornaments of hops, and receptions, and routs, and assemblies, for they had no ships to go to, who could not find any place on ship's quarters under the flag—sailors without a ship, officers without anything but a flag on land; and I repeat again that under the control of the Republican party \$385,000,000 have gone and to-day we have got this show, this variety establishment that we exhibited the other day at Pensacola. With as gallant seamen, with as gallant officers as any nation in the world—because the coastwise trade does furnish gallant sailors who are willing to go into the naval service if there were opportunities—we have no ships.

This condition was not caused by the war and by the Alabama and by Captain Maffitt and by Admiral Semmes. It commenced in 1856. The decline of American shipping has a cause antecedent to the hostilities between the United and Confederate States. It is proposed now, as it always has been proposed, to avoid the real reason for this decline. We are asked now to increase the mail pay. We are asked to turn away to everything but the real cause. We can not build our ships, the ships that are fit for the ocean, as cheaply as it can be done abroad. It is impossible for us to do it. Mr. Roach has told us over and over again for twenty years that he could do it, and Mr. Roach has never been able to do it. To-day you can not build an armored or freight vessel for oceanic travel within 20 or 25 per cent. on the Delaware of what you can build it upon the Clyde; and here we shut our eyes; we are helpless under the present condition of things. We know that this thing exists. We admit that it exists. We sent a commission to South America. They come back and report to us the vast resources of those countries and Senators rise here and read statistics by the hour to show the vast trade with Brazil, and Chili, and Peru, and say we must have it; but you do not get it, and why do you not get it? You can not build the iron ships that will take it.

In 1876 a merchant of Boston built two vessels under the American flag at a cost of 25 per cent. more than he could have bought them for in England. He built them for the trade with Chili and Peru. He loaded them with Yankee notions, went down to those countries, and sold his outgoing cargo at a fine profit. He then undertook to load his vessels with the productions of Chili, and he found that he must load with either wool or copper. These were the great staple productions of Chili and Peru. He loaded with them because sailors say that a vessel which sails loaded only one way sails into bankruptcy. He was bound to have a return cargo, and he brought back that cargo to his own country. When he arrived on the coast of the United States he found that the tariff duties were such upon wool and copper that his profit would be entirely destroyed, and he sailed to England, sold his wool and sold his copper to the English manufacturers.

I made this statement here once before, and I very well remember that the junior Senator from Massachusetts said yes, but let the Senator from Missouri state whether or not that same American merchant could not have gone into the trade between foreign ports. Yes, Mr. President, he could have gone into the trade between Liverpool and Peru, he could have gone into the trade between Spain and England, but what we want is American builders to build ships for the American trade, not only on the principle of dollars and cents, not only to make money in the venture, not only to save one hundred and thirty or one hundred and forty million dollars that we pay annually on our commerce taken abroad, but in order to build up a navy, in order to have sailors under the American flag who are ready in the event of war to defend the honor of the country.

England, when she made the contract with the Cunard line of steamers and with the great Oriental line that has thirty-seven vessels, put into those contracts the provision that British naval officers should be carried upon those ships and should command the crews in order to establish out of the sixty-odd thousand sailors in the merchant marine of Great Britain a force of marines ready at any time to defend the British flag and to carry it in honor and safety over the world.

Now, Mr. President, I say deliberately that increased mail pay does not give us naval vessels, and I say this amendment is simply an assertion of the old spirit of the navigation laws which excludes the American citizen from the right to purchase a ship where he can purchase it cheapest.

I do not propose to discuss the tariff. I will dismiss it with one single remark. The whole principle of levying money upon any American citizen over and above the limitations of the necessities of the Government for revenue, is robbery under the form of law. If I am compelled to pay one dollar more for the coat upon my back to any tailor in any State or in any city of this Union than I would be compelled to pay to another, that being a contribution to the Government over and above my distributive share of the taxes necessary to support this Government, that law robs me of one day's labor; it takes one dollar's worth of bread and meat out of the mouths of my wife and children. I am compelled to bear my proportion of the public debt of this country. As an honest man and a loyal citizen, I am ready to pay it; but when the revenue of the country amounts to so much, let it be distributed fairly among the different States and sections of this great confederacy of States; but when any Congress or any party goes beyond the limits of the revenue necessities of the country and makes me give up my toil and my labor to protect any man, whether he be laborer or manufacturer, I say now and here it is robbery under the form of law.

The principle of incidental protection within the revenue limit is just. The high protective principle urged by the Republican party, and by some Democrats as well, I am sorry to say, on the people of the United States, is a proposition that I shall always denounce. Why should I pay John Roach or Mr. Harlan \$50,000 out of my pocket in order to build a ship under the American flag when I can go abroad and buy that ship and save that \$50,000 to myself and family? Mr. President, it has resulted in the destruction of the merchant marine of this country. Blind to the most ordinary common-sense principles that govern the ordinary men of the country, we go on blindfolded, as it were, to certain destruction of the American merchant marine and the American Navy.

Mr. President, what would be thought of a physician who continued to pour down the throat of an unwilling patient dose after dose of a certain medicine when he saw the vital energies wasting away under it day by day, and death with noiseless and inevitable step clutching the throat of his victim? What would be thought of the charlatan who persisted in a course that each day emaciated the patient and each day brought him nearer death? Would he not deserve execution as a public criminal? What are we doing and what have we done? We found out at least by 1866, after the close of the war, that we could not compete with Great Britain in iron ships. Did we pretend to take any other course than the old navigation laws of 1790? Did we propose to change the treatment? Did we saw away these old navigation laws and hunt for some new and appropriate remedy? Look at the difference between the statesmanship of Great Britain and the United States. It is not a question of what we want; it is a question of what we must do. It is not a question of the flag, and the star spangled banner, and the stripes that should float above every wave of the ocean. It ought to be presumed that every one of us wants it to float, wants equally to preserve the honor of this great country. It is a question of what is inevitable; it is a question of what we know; it is a question of necessity. The only thing presented to us now is, whether we shall learn from the past or whether we shall forget our folly in the future.

From 1840 to 1851 the United States steadily gained upon Great Britain as to the carrying trade and the merchant marine, and why? Because the constituents of my friend from Maine, with their immense forests of nautical timber could build a wooden vessel superior to any manufactured upon the face of the world. The Baltimore clipper ships dominated the ocean, and Great Britain year by year saw the scepter of the waves departing from her. In 1851 England came to the conclusion that the fight was against her, and even prior to that time, in 1849, England repealed her navigation laws similar to ours, which provided that every vessel that sailed under the British flag should be built by a British citizen, and should not be purchased abroad. England in 1849 repealed her navigation laws and said to her people, we can not compete with the Yankees in building wooden vessels; now go and buy their vessels from them; and we sold millions of dollars' worth of vessels, built in Maine, to the English merchants and ship-owners. What was the result? England still continued to press even a little ahead of the American merchant marine, and I desire to read from the best imaginable authority. I take it, with my friends on the other side, from no less a person than Mr. John Roach, who has been eulogized as the greatest and best of all the American citizens interested in this subject. I read from a pamphlet called *The American Carrying Trade*, by John Roach. Mr. Roach says:

1833 TO 1840.

Our commerce had grown in 1836 to \$480,000,000, doubling itself in twenty years. Our tonnage increased in still larger proportion. In 1840 it was over 2,500,000 tons. We had also sold over 400,000 tons of shipping abroad, by this means bringing to the country \$25,000,000 in gold, 90 per cent. of which was paid to American labor. Of our carrying trade at this period it has been well said "that its vast profits laid the foundation of the wealth of the country and built up its merchant marine with a rapidity unequalled in the history of the world."

By 1840 England's statesmen were alive to the danger of her position.

Despite all these efforts they saw that the United States had already grown to be the second carrying nation of the world, had the raw material, mechanical skill, and energy to spare, and promised to become the first.

In 1850 we had a tonnage of 3,335,454, an increase of over 200 per cent. since 1815. Our coasting trade, from which foreign ships were excluded, employed 1,900,000 tons of shipping, an increase of nearly 400 per cent. in the same period.

Now mark—

All this while England was paying \$4,000,000 a year to her fast steamships, which were intended to drive our clippers from the sea.

Four million dollars of increased mail pay, and yet during all this time the American flag was steadily gaining upon that of Great Britain; and if we come to details we shall find that in 1848—I ask the attention of Senators to find out whether this increased mail pay is the remedy—in 1848 the United States paid in bounty to vessels sailing under the American flag \$100,500, and England paid for ocean postal service the same year \$3,250,000. In 1849 the United States paid \$235,086 and England \$3,180,000. In 1850 the United States paid \$619,924 and England \$5,315,985. In 1851 the United States paid \$1,465,818 and England \$5,330,000. In 1852 the United States paid \$1,655,240 and England \$5,510,635.

And so on in the same proportion to 1858. Now, let me put a question to the advocates of this amendment. They say this is the remedy; they say that this opens up new avenues of trade, that with our present navigation laws unrepealed increased mail pay will bring back our flag within a limited degree to the ocean. I want to know why we had such an era of unexampled prosperity and advancement of the American flag up to 1858, when we gained upon Great Britain, when we paid no subsidy or increased mail pay, and England expended these vast amounts? If the argument be a correct one, and this is the remedy, why was it that, without paying a single dollar, almost each year we continued to gain upon the British in the struggle for maritime supremacy? We gained upon them in spite of our paying no subsidies. We gained upon them because we could build better ships under the existing condition of the world on the ocean at that time. We built better wooden ships than Great Britain could build, and she bought them from us.

In 1851, and even before that some years, Great Britain commenced the construction of iron ships, and Great Britain excels us as much to-day in iron ships as we excelled her up to that time in wooden vessels. But our statesmen refused to learn from the past. They refuse to-day to do what Great Britain did, permit the American citizen to buy what he can not build as cheaply as they can. Do you ask me the reason? For the purpose of this argument it makes no difference. The facts exist and you can not answer them. You can not build within 20 or 25 per cent. of what England can.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I have never claimed that subsidy alone revolutionized the commerce of the world, but I have claimed that every power that has sought to increase its commerce has resorted to subsidy. Does not the Senator know—and it is pertinent to what he was saying—fixing, as he does, the time when English commerce and her mercantile marine took a lurch ahead, that that immediately followed the large increase by the British Government of subsidies? Does he not know that the ascendancy of American trade and the comparative falling off of British commerce was what alarmed the British ministry of the time, and that in 1848 it began to increase subsidies and continued to so increase, and that, just as he says, in the years immediately succeeding, the commerce of Great Britain began to increase and that increase proceeded *pari passu* with the subsidies which she paid? If he does not know that, he has not looked at the figures, and it is precisely in the line of what he is saying, except that he does not give these facts which I now give. That is, when the ascendancy of the British mercantile marine began to be shown to all the world, following her system of subsidizing lines, not only the Cunarders to the Atlantic coast of the United States, but the other lines all over the waters of the globe, and Great Britain reaped her reward. I do not say that it was all from subsidies, but they were a part and parcel of the result.

Mr. VEST. Well, Mr. President, I have studied this question of the merchant marine and the reasons for its decline, and the remedy, if any exists; and I have never heard any such statement before as that made by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator deny it?

Mr. VEST. I do deny most emphatically.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator deny the statement?

Mr. VEST. I deny the fact. The Senator believes it, but it is not the fact.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator deny that in 1848 Great Britain began to increase subsidies, that she subsidized the Cunard line at the rate of \$400,000 a year, and from that increased her subsidies so that she was soon giving at the rate at one time of nearly \$6,000,000 a year; that her commerce increased during this time—does the Senator deny that?

Mr. VEST. I deny emphatically that the advantage which Great Britain has over us, commencing from 1851 or 1852, came from subsidy.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator deny the statement I have made that the subsidies were given as I stated, and that the increase of British commerce continued along with subsidy? He may draw one inference and I draw another, but the statement I have made can not be denied.

Mr. VEST. Great Britain had continued her subsidy system long before 1848.

Mr. HALE. Not to any great extent.

Mr. VEST. She commenced giving subsidies back in 1837 and gave sometimes greater and sometimes less; but the subsidy system has existed in Great Britain since 1836 or 1837. Mr. John Roach has stated it over and over again. Subsidies made no difference between the American and British merchant marine, as the figures show. It was the invention of iron ships by Great Britain which redeemed her from the disadvantage which had been placed upon her by the construction of wooden vessels in the American ship-yards; and when she commenced the construction of her iron merchant marine, from that very day, commencing, say, in 1854, England took away from us any chance of competing with her unless we had the same sort of facilities with which to meet her.

Mr. McPHERSON. I want to ask the Senator from Missouri one simple question. Do I understand him as confessing that the English, the German, and French Governments shall have all the commerce with the South American States?

Mr. VEST. I do not.

Mr. McPHERSON. Very well. The Senator has cited a case in which an American merchant built two American ships, took them to South American ports, and sold a cargo there, because I take it no government has an advantage in those markets. There are no reciprocity treaties with those governments. The Englishman, the Frenchman, the German, and the American stand on exactly the same terms at a South American port. But the Senator says the return cargo of the American merchant was forced to a British port for sale. Then as a matter of course upon that reasoning the Englishman has an advantage over us to-day in the South American trade.

Now, what else does Great Britain do to help that? Great Britain to-day subsidizes the royal steamship line, running between her ports and South America, to the extent of \$450,000. In addition to the advantage the Senator himself has cited as against American commerce, Great Britain gives a subsidy of \$450,000; and how does she collect it? She assesses it upon her colonies, upon Barbadoes, upon Bermuda and the other West India Islands; and the ship sailing from Southampton or Liverpool runs to the English colonies, discharges her cargo, takes the mail, runs down the coast to the River Plate; and what is she loaded with? She loads with British manufactured goods and with British products. She sells them in the South American market and she loads for our ports with goods admitted duty free here, say rubber and coffee. She goes to the port of New York and she takes a load of our goods from there to Liverpool. Thus there is a triangular line subsidized to the extent of \$450,000 in addition to the advantage which the Senator says exists against us.

Now I want to ask the Senator from Missouri just this one simple question. If there is anything the American people above all other things in this world want to-day, it is a market for their surplus products. Now pray tell me, confronted as we are by that condition of things, with the advantage, which I say is a great advantage in favor of the English commerce in South American ports, and in addition to that subsidies of \$450,000, the English Government last year made \$150,000 out of the line and then assessed her colonies along the South American coast to make it up. How are you going to get that trade? That is the question. I ask the Senator how are you going to get it?

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, we shall never get it under the present condition, and shall never get it by giving \$800,000 a year for mail aid. I can tell the Senator how I would get it if I could frame the legislation myself. In the first place, I would repeal these infamous navigation laws. I have heard a great deal about "the twin relics of barbarism—polygamy and slavery." Here is a triumvirate of barbarism—polygamy, slavery, and the navigation laws. They were born in sin and conceived in iniquity. These navigation laws were the result of the bargaining between South Carolina and Georgia on the one hand and the New England States upon the other, by which the slave trade was perpetuated until 1808, provided the South would agree to consent that it did not require two-thirds in Congress to enact the navigation laws. These navigation laws are to-day against the sentiment of the civilized world; and no other civilized nation to-day pretends to have them upon her statute-book.

In further answer to the Senator from New Jersey, I would not only repeal these laws and let an American citizen buy his ship where he could buy it cheapest, but I would try something else besides the medicine that has brought us nearer and nearer to the grave for thirty years. I would reform the tariff. I would let a man take his ship to Peru, load with copper and wool, bring that cargo under the American flag to an American port and put it into the hands of his own countrymen to manufacture. I would bring down this tariff to the revenue basis, and I would preserve the spirit of our institutions and of the Constitution, which says to every man, "All the Government proposes to do is

to give you an equal chance in the race of life, and not to handicap one man to the advantage of another, or one section to the advantage of another." To-day England obtains the trade of the world because she gives an equal chance to all her citizens, and because her laws are just and equitable and based upon a proper common-sense business principle. England has a vast colonial system, and is obliged to carry her mails to all portions of the world, and she gives increased mail pay in consideration of increased service.

I have never believed that that statute was just or equitable which forces an American ship to carry the mails for 4 or 5 cents a letter to any portion of the world or refuses her a clearance. I voted for the repeal of that law. I believe in honest mail service to-day, and I believe honest mail service can be maintained under existing legislation. What is this amendment? It is to retain the navigation laws by an insectivorous appropriation of \$800,000 to make up for the violation of a great principle, and a principle based upon sound common sense.

Mr. President, the leaders of the Republican party have recognized the necessity for a change of these laws, but so sensitive are our Republican friends as to the doctrine of protection that they are unwilling to break one single link in the chain that binds the union of American merchants, manufacturers, and ship-owners for fear that the whole fabric will tumble to pieces. I remember that for seven years since I have been in the Senate we have been told that if we reformed the navigation laws as to tonnage, as to the wages of seamen, as to pilotage, and as to the expenses of sailing a vessel, American enterprise, American capital would soon compete with England. Two years ago we repealed those portions of the laws, and one amendment which I had the honor to offer myself swept away a portion of this infamous navigation system which required an American vessel which shipped its crew in a foreign port to discharge that crew when it reached an American port and re-employ them, thereby putting money into the pockets of the shipping-commissioners and the boarding-house keepers. The superintendent of the International Navigation Company, Mr. Griscom, of Philadelphia, stated to us that if that single amendment were made it would go very far toward restoring or at least starting our merchant marine upon the ocean.

We did repeal them, and made all these other amendments that were demanded by the shipping interest of the United States; and what has been the result? In the last two years the decay in the American merchant marine has even been more rapid than in any two years before; and now, mark it! the International Navigation Company, known as the Red Star line, had ten American steamships put under the Belgian flag, and as they were built or bought with the money of citizens of Pennsylvania to the extent of \$5,000,000, and only one-fifteenth of the stock of the company was owned in Belgium, the ten steamships were put under the Belgian flag in order to avoid the result of the navigation laws of the United States, and Mr. Griscom—I read his letter, and I have it here—states that the difference between running one or those vessels under the American flag as the law stood a few years ago and under a foreign flag was \$15,000 a year upon each ship, making a difference to his line of \$150,000 a year of ten vessels.

We repealed these odious provisions as to tonnage and as to the fees of commissioners, but the decline has continued, and now, mark the sequel! Mr. Griscom comes now for the International Navigation Company and offers a bill to the Senate, which is pending, proposing to put his vessels back under the American flag provided—

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator, I think, does not exactly understand that those ten ships were built in the United States.

Mr. VEST. No; I say they were bought with capital of citizens of the United States.

Mr. MILLER. You said he came here asking to put them back under the American flag. Your first allusion to it was that he had put ten American ships under the Belgian flag.

Mr. VEST. I meant that they were bought and paid for with American money, the money of American citizens; that it was an American enterprise; that when they came to put a flag over the vessels they put a foreign flag on account of the difference in the cost of running the vessels. I have Mr. Griscom's letter here, and I feel like reading it. We offered to make up this difference; that is, to remove it, and I labored as earnestly as any member of the Senate to bring about that result, and what is the consequence? The merchant marine continues to decrease. Mr. Griscom comes now with a bill asking the privilege of putting these vessels under the American flag, and so far there could be no objection to it. No Senator here, no matter what his political preference, would for a minute pretend to say that these steamships should not be put under the American flag if possible.

But Mr. Griscom asks one other thing. He asks that if one of these vessels after being put under the American flag should become disabled or destroyed, either be sunk or be burned, then his company should have the privilege of buying another steamship wherever it could, upon the cheapest terms, and put that in the place of the one that had disappeared. That single section in that bill causes every manufacturer, every high-protective tariff man in Philadelphia to rise simultaneously

and protest against the passage of the bill. They were willing these vessels should come under the American flag—oh, yes—but they were unwilling that if one of them should be sunk or disabled, this company should be permitted to buy another steamship in the best market and for the lowest price. In other words, the men who remonstrated against this bill were determined that not one single iota, not one single letter of the high-protective tariff system of the United States should be touched either in manufacturing or shipping.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and his colleague now occupying the chair [Mr. FRYE] love the coastwise service of the United States. They say there is an example of the exclusive system and of the advantages of such system. Why, Mr. President, I believe the coastwise trade of the United States would flourish in a greater degree if the men who put ships into it were permitted to buy them where they could buy them cheapest. But it is not proposed now to touch that trade. We are talking simply of the foreign trade of the United States, which has fallen to 17 per cent., while our commerce has steadily increased.

But I was proceeding to say that the leaders of the Republican party recognized the difficulties in our way with the navigation laws remaining. Here is Mr. Blaine's panacea. In his letter to the merchants of New York in regard to the coastwise trade he says:

We can build wooden ships better than any other country, and we can build them as cheaply; but after they are launched and in trade they should not be worried, and harried, and burdened with every form of taxation, port-charge and quarantine exaction at home; and maltreated and oppressed, as they too often are, by our consuls in foreign ports. They should have every facility for supply in our ports that England gives to her ships."

We must have iron steamships besides, and with the start that other nations enjoy to-day we shall never compete with them, unless we use the same aids and the same instrumentalities that have built their steam fleets. And that aid I would give. And to give it effectively and wisely I would abandon all idea of granting subsidy to special lines as they apply to Congress for aid. That policy, however just and meritorious, will always be rendered abortive by prejudice, by jealousy, and by scandal, either actual or imputed. I would prefer a general law that should ignore individuals and enforce a policy. For instance, enact that any man, or company of men, that will build, in an American yard, with American material, by American mechanics, a steamship of 3,000 tons, and sail her from any port of the United States to any foreign port, he or they shall receive for a monthly line a mail allowance of \$25 per mile per annum for the sailing distance between the two ports; for a semi-monthly line, \$45 per mile; for a weekly line, \$75 per mile. Should the steamer exceed 3,000 tons, a small advance on these rates might be allowed; if less than 3,000 tons, a corresponding reduction; keeping 3,000 tons as the average and the standard. Provide that the steamships shall be thoroughly inspected by a competent commission, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Postmaster-General, and thus insure the very first class of construction for safety and for speed, both for passenger and cargo.

There Mr. Blaine does not recommend increased mail service or increased mail pay, but he recommends a subsidy based upon tonnage, such as the French have tried and in which the French have failed. Germany pays no subsidies, and yet the merchant marine of Germany is increasing from day to day in numbers and in efficiency. France has adopted the same system which Mr. Blaine recommends, and the result is that to-day France is making no progress in her merchant marine, notwithstanding the increase of her subsidy system. But I read again a recommendation made by the President *pro tempore* of the Senate, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], when he was Secretary of the Treasury, I believe in his last report while he held that office. Mr. Sherman said, in his report to Congress:

It has always been the policy of the law to restrict the privileges of American registry to vessels built in this country. The object was to further the ship-building and naval interests of the country, and this policy was so successful as to advance the United States to the second rank among nations as respects tonnage and the number of its ships. While wood was the article mainly used in the construction of ships, we had the advantage over foreign nations in the cost of material. Our ship-builders could not only supply vessels for domestic commerce, but could successfully compete in the carrying trade of the world. The use of iron in ship-building in place of wood is, however, steadily increasing, and in the cost of iron and in the price of labor other commercial nations have the advantage. It is a grave question of public policy whether the period has not arrived when the unlimited right of purchase, as under the English statutes, should be extended to vessels as well as to other commodities, and when admission to American registry upon the payment of duties should be allowed them upon importation. The recovery of our old position in the carrying trade will more than counterbalance any disadvantage likely to ensue from a modification of restrictions upon the right of purchase, while a moderate duty on ships imported will enable our ship-building to compete successfully in the construction of iron vessels of the largest class. The proper policy to be pursued is difficult to determine, but the great importance of considering the subject is respectfully submitted to the attention of Congress.

Mr. FRYE. I was in the chair when the Senator from Missouri made a statement that Germany paid no subsidy, as he called it. Germany has just appropriated \$1,100,000 to one line. A communication received from the State Department about ten days ago, referred to some committee, I have forgotten which, will give the information.

Mr. VEST. I know it to be a fact that after France had what is known as her subsidy law giving a certain amount of subsidy for tonnage, Bismarck recommended to the Reichstag that a similar law should be enacted by Germany, and the merchants of Hamburg and of the other cities engaged in shipping in Germany rose as one man and protested against it, and it did not receive a vote in the German Parliament or Reichstag—not one, and Bismarck withdrew it. And if any such subsidy has been granted within the last ten days, I have not heard of it, and it is beyond my belief. Of course the Senator is confident in his

statement that as Germany has increased her merchant marine without subsidy she should now proceed to that policy. France has gone back under it. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK] read the other day an official statement here showing that notwithstanding the subsidy system France has failed to build up her merchant marine.

Mr. FRYE. France has not given up her bounty system. I call the attention of the Senator to the distinction between the two. I call it mail pay where you pay a ratable price for carrying the mail. I regard the English price as reasonable. When I say Germany has subsidized I mean she has provided \$1,100,000 for carrying the mail by one line, and I think the Senator will find the contracts will be here before the discussion is over. France has not given up her mail-pay, not a dollar of it, nor declared it a failure; neither has she given up her bounty system, which is another thing entirely.

Mr. VEST. The law of France which pays a bounty to every citizen that builds a steamship, whether built at home or abroad, is yet upon her statute-book; but I assert here that it has not built up her merchant marine, and to-day she is behind Germany and immeasurably behind Great Britain. That is the assertion I make.

Mr. HALE. Does not the Senator know that from 1870 to 1883 the French commercial marine rose from 154,415 tons in the first year that I have named to 667,474 tons in 1883, and that the present year France is paying annually to the steamers which carry its mails \$4,600,000? She pays \$1,714,604 to the Japan, China, and India lines; \$728,000 to the South American lines; \$950,000 to the Mediterranean lines; \$790,000 to the Mexican and West Indian lines; and \$500,000 to the New York line, and other sums smaller to smaller lines. Yet the Senator says that her commerce has not increased, that she has abandoned subsidies!

Mr. EUSTIS. What is the Senator reading from?

Mr. HALE. The report of the Central and South American Commissioners, House of Representatives, Executive Document No. 226, Forty-eighth Congress, second session.

Mr. VEST. France has been paying that mail pay for years, and still falling behind with her merchant marine. This mail pay or subsidy as the English call it—for they call all mail pay subsidy—we attach an American meaning to the word as a bounty paid out of the Treasury to increase private enterprise, but they call all mail pay subsidy.

Mr. HALE. What does the Senator mean by saying that France has fallen behind in her mercantile marine in the face of this statement from official figures?

Mr. VEST. I mean to say that France has not increased in proportion with the other maritime nations of the world.

Mr. HALE. She has increased in larger proportion than any other European country, except possibly Germany. In these years I have given she almost quadrupled her mercantile marine.

Mr. VEST. I assert here that while France has increased her tonnage, her trade has fallen off; and if that be so, as it is, and if mail pay is the remedy, as my friend says, why to-day is it that she has adopted this bounty law, and in addition to this vast mail pay which he has read here is now paying a bounty on tonnage?

Mr. HALE. What does the Senator mean by her trade falling off? Even if now he is willing to admit that her commercial marine has increased, does he mean that her exports have fallen off, or her imports?

Mr. VEST. I mean that her commerce has fallen off?

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly France by a consistent course of protection has built up and stimulated and established home industries to such an extent that where she was obliged formerly to import from abroad, she has the products at home. That is true. But France has not gone on and built up a mercantile marine, quadrupling it in the time given in these few years, without something for that marine to do, and these statistics show that it has plenty to do.

Mr. VEST. I have the official statement; I ask my colleague to read this statement, which comes from the bureau here, to show what the condition of French trade and commerce is.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. Ford winds up in these words:

The bounties have succeeded in infusing life into neither ship-building nor ship navigation. France finds it cheaper to have her iron vessels built in Great Britain and a large share of her wooden ships in other countries. The lines of ships that were called into being through the liberal offers of the government are represented as being in a state of bankruptcy, and existing lines that participate in the bounties are either paying no dividends, or very small amounts. The exports of France, reflecting as they did the slight reaction which ensued in 1879, have since declined and are still declining in value, and the decrease can not be explained by a fall in the prices of commodities, but rather by an absolute decrease in the foreign commerce of the nation. In fact, it may be asserted that the bounty policy of France, intended to bridge over a temporary depression, has aggravated the situation, and has proved itself to be a source of mischief and not of cure.

Respectfully,

WORTHINGTON C. FORD,
Chief of Bureau.

BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Department of State, April 7, 1886.

Mr. HALE. Has the Senator got no figures? That is simply the report, the argument of a consul, without giving statistics, without referring to the figures, simply making his own conclusions. I do not deal with anything of that kind, and I fancy, as has been said to my right, it was a consul sent out for that very purpose; at any rate, he must be in sympathy with the purpose of the administration.

Mr. TELLER. I want to suggest to the Senator from Maine that

Mr. Ford's own statistics that he gives show that his conclusions are not correct.

Mr. HALE. Quite likely.

Mr. TELLER. If you look on page 10 of his report, it appears that the number and tonnage of French steam-vessels have increased very largely from 1873 up to 1884. The conclusions are not warranted by the facts he has himself stated in his report.

Mr. VEST. Now, Mr. President, Senators are not satisfied with the report of one of our own officers, and I take it for granted—I do not know—like all the rest of them (for not many have been removed) he is in favor of a high protective tariff. If not, I ask his pardon; but if anybody could throw a missile and strike one of these officers that was not sending reports here in favor of a high protective tariff for Cleveland's administration, I would give a premium for him as a natural curiosity. It seemed to be their business in life to furnish arguments for the high protectionists in the United States. I do not know Mr. Ford, but if the Senators are not satisfied with his report I will read now from some other authority.

On page 113 of the report of the joint committee on shipping will be found a table showing that France has bound herself by contracts made in 1854, 1861, and in 1865, to pay to various steamship lines for mail transportation the annual sum of \$4,677,778. Notwithstanding this, France found that she was fast dropping behind in the race for commercial supremacy, and so, in January, 1881, a law was enacted by the French Assembly giving large premiums upon both the construction and sailing of vessels under the French flag.

That is history; and if mail subsidies were a success, why was France driven to the law in regard to bounties? In 1850 the French tonnage amounted to 688,153 tons; in 1870 it had increased to 1,072,048 tons, but in the next decade up to 1880 it fell off to 919,298 tons, and that in spite of the enormous subsidies of over \$6,000,000 a year paid to steamship lines by the French Government. In his work on "Our Merchant Marine"—I do not know whether it is considered good here or not—Mr. David A. Wells says:

The results of the first year's experience of the French system, so far as reported, have not proved satisfactory. Bounties were granted for the encouragement of voyages between French ports, the French colonies, and countries out of Europe; but the returns for 1881 show a very marked decrease in the French tonnage engaged in her colonial trade as compared with 1880, when there were no bounties; while the French tonnage entries into French ports from foreign countries showed a decrease in 1881 as compared with 1880, with some marked gain in the same time in regard to clearances.

But what is most noticeable is that the entries and clearances of foreign tonnage (which of course receives no bounty) into French ports during 1881 showed a very large increase as compared with 1880, and was apparently in no way affected by the new and discriminating privileges extended French shipping in order to enable it to successfully compete for foreign business.

And that is the result of increased mail pay or subsidies and bounties put together. But we are not without experience ourselves. We paid to the Pacific Mail Steamship Company from 1867 to 1877, \$4,750,000, and \$1,812,000 to the line between the United States and Brazil. Has that built up our merchant marine?

My point is that this increase of mail pay, or subsidy, to use the English expression, is not the remedy for the condition of the merchant marine of the United States. The disease is more deadly. It is like applying cuticura to a man whose lungs are diseased. When the vast fountains of life have been attacked, how long can we go on? The patient is in a desperate condition. It is hardly necessary to repeat what is the condition of the merchant marine of the United States, and yet Senators year after year appear here and clamor for the existence of these navigation laws and say to those of us who ask that something else may be tried and some other remedy administered, "Oh, you are in the interest of Great Britain; you are seeking to attack this high protective tariff system;" and then when they can not say anything more these Senators appear before their admiring constituency and say that the free-trade men of the United States or the revenue-tariff men are in the interest of Great Britain and seeking to strike down American labor! Why, sir, I received this morning and have upon my desk the following as a specimen of the high tariff literature disseminated through this country to the workmen of America:

[Face.]

To the workmen of America. A few facts from United States official reports, compiled by a workman.

[Back.]

Fellow workmen are requested to watch closely the actions of their representatives in Congress. Any member of Congress voting for low-tariff measures is not "a workman's friend," and should be shelved at coming elections.

I would like to see that "workingman." If he has not got a three-story silk hat on his head, and diamond shirt studs in his bosom, and a pair of fancy kid boots, and does not board at the Fifth Avenue Hotel and have his board paid by the manufacturers and ship-builders of the United States, I will forfeit one year's salary in Congress. "Workingman!" Horny-handed son of toil! Why does he not sign his name as an honest workingman? Is he ashamed of it? He is a hired subsidy tool of those interests that intend to keep upon us this badge of inferiority that says to American citizens, "You shall not take your money and buy your ships where you can buy ships, but for fear that you will affect this sacred white elephant of the high protective tariff,

you shall not infringe upon the navigation laws, which are a portion of the protective system of the United States."

Mr. EUSTIS. Mr. President, I did not intend to speak upon this question; but the Senator from Missouri has indulged in such peculiar arguments, as I regard them, that being in favor of this amendment to the Post-Office appropriation bill, I desire briefly to explain the reasons for my vote.

I regret exceedingly that the Senator from Missouri did not give us a clear definition of what is a subsidy. For instance, the Senator from Missouri introduced a bill here the other day guaranteeing the payment of \$37,500,000 to a private company to enable that company to build a ship railway on foreign soil. That was a proposition to take the money of the people of the United States, to give that money to a private corporation, that corporation being engaged in a private enterprise. Now, Mr. President, I am not criticising that bill; I intend to vote for that bill; but why was it that that bill was introduced by a Senator who is so fierce and so vehement in his denunciation of what are called subsidies? Is it a consistent position for him to occupy that he introduced a bill for such a purpose and now earnestly opposes this amendment because this amendment is intended to establish a subsidy?

He gave as a reason in alluding to that ship-railway bill that there were certain enterprises of such a gigantic character that sometimes it became necessary for the Government of the United States to aid private capital in order to secure the accomplishment of such a great work. I beg to correct the honorable Senator's statement. Far greater enterprises than that proposed have been undertaken by private capitalists, and those great works have been accomplished without government aid or government assistance or government subsidies.

Such was the case with reference to the Suez Canal; such is the case now with reference to the Panama Canal; and therefore I do not admit that the reason which he gave why we should favor that subsidy is either very satisfactory or quite conclusive. But I take it that the real reason is that he approves of the policy which is declared in the bill which he proposes. I approve of that policy, and I think it is directly in the line of the policy declared in this amendment; and that is, that we shall have the aid of the Government to promote, encourage, develop, and build up our mercantile marine.

He says, but that is not the remedy; the remedy is free ships. Now, the Senator has no right to assume, as he did assume, that I as a friend of this measure am opposed to free ships, for such is not the case. I do not consider that there is any antagonism whatever between this amendment and free ships; and that is illustrated by the policy and the course of all the important governments to-day on the face of the earth.

France has free ships to-day, and yet France subsidizes steamship lines to the amount of \$5,124,000 a year. Germany has free ships to-day, and yet Germany subsidizes steamship lines. Italy has free ships to-day, and yet Italy subsidizes steamship lines. England has free ships to-day in every sense of the word, and yet England subsidizes steamship lines.

Therefore I maintain that there is no incompatibility between the two systems; that a government and an individual may be in favor of free ships, and at the same time in favor of subsidizing steamship lines. Hence the criticism that I would make upon the position of the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Missouri, living as they do in the far interior of our country, and of course being very well informed on maritime problems, better informed perhaps than those who live nearer the seacoast, is this: that you have been telling the American people and Congress for the last ten years, "Free ships is the remedy," but we have not got free ships, and we have not had free ships; and I ask you, can we continue to listen to that argument unless gentlemen are prepared to tell us when we are going to have free ships? Will they ask us to remain as we are and as we have been, for the next ten years, and occupy the same position that we have occupied for the last ten years; remain as a nation entirely bereft of all those advantages which we see are within our grasp; and are we to continue to remain satisfied in the future, as we have in the past, with very able speeches about free ships and free trade?

Compare the statistics of ten years ago with the exhibit that is made to-day. You will find that our trade relations with the Central and South American states, so far as progress, so far as increase, so far as development is concerned, are unchanged, scarcely disturbed, and on the other hand you will find that the trade relations of England, France, Germany, and Italy with those countries have vastly and incredibly increased; that to-day Italy, a nation that was born but yesterday, has closer trade relations with Brazil than the United States, at least so far as any advantages are concerned, and that to-day Italy has armored ships fit to be compared with the armored ships of England, has a navy compared with her population and resources equal to the navy of England, and has a maritime fleet that equals that of England when you consider the population and resources of the respective countries.

I saw last spring myself launched from one of her ship-yards a ship of 10,000 tons, a man-of-war, equipped, built, her armament constructed, everything the result of the industry and the skill of Italian mechanics; and, sir, that has been the ambition of every civilized country from the dawn of civilization to the time of the Romans and Carthaginians,

and coming down to the time of the Italian republics and the time that Spain reached the zenith of her power; and to-day the great question and the great problem is one of maritime supremacy, because that represents (although the Senator from Kentucky wanted us to believe that there is no difference between a ship and an ox-wagon) the power, the ambition, the wealth, the prestige, the prosperity, and the civilization of a nation.

It is not, Mr. President, a question of free-trade or of protection; it is, in my judgment, a very narrow-minded view of this great question of whether a nation shall have a mercantile marine to attempt to apply to that problem the general theories and general propositions that apply to the domestic manufactures of any particular article. It is a question far above the other in dignity, in importance, and in its results.

For one, sir, I may say it is a strong sentiment residing in the breast of every American citizen, that he would prefer to see the American flag instead of the flag of other nations floating at the masts of the hundreds and thousands of steamships that enter the ports of the civilized world. I say, sir, it is a matter of which we ought to be justly proud, for if we are not we shall be in the history of the rivalry of nations the only people on the face of the earth that have not been proud of maritime power and maritime supremacy.

We have before us a practical proposition, a practical question; that is, to give Government aid to steamship lines in order to develop and increase our trade relations and commercial intercourse with certain nations. What do the opponents of this amendment offer instead of it? Nothing but general propositions; nothing but theories. There is nothing practical in what they offer. On the other hand what do its advocates suggest? We find that there is a strong feeling, particularly in my section of the country, being awakened and aroused to the great importance of this question. Our citizens feel and believe that the American people are entitled to that commerce; they believe that it belongs to the American people; and they also believe that there must be some extraordinary impediment which prevents them from reaching out and clutching those golden prizes almost within our reach.

Therefore it can not be an unimportant question; it can not be a question of free trade, and if the honorable Senator from Missouri permitted a certain expression to escape his lips that this was a political question, I would remind him, and I know that he can not be unaware of the fact, that the largest subsidies that have ever been granted in the history of this Government were granted under Democratic administrations.

That law which he has denounced, that the mails of the citizens of the United States should be carried in American ships alone, which has encountered his fierce opposition, was passed under a Democratic administration, was afterward approved and indorsed by a Democratic President, and under his administration contracts were made by which steamship lines were not only subsidized, but more than that, Mr. President, by which in order to make the subsidies available that Democratic administration indorsed the proposition that an enormous advance should be made to the contractors in order to enable them to build American ships and avail themselves of the subsidy; and here is what Mr. Polk said in reference to that law in his first message to Congress:

Proper measures have been taken, in pursuance to the act of Congress of the 3d of March last, for the establishment of lines of mail steamers between this and foreign countries. The importance of this service commends itself strongly to favorable consideration.

Then for years an enormous subsidy was paid to various steamship lines. First, there was the Collins line; then there was the Sloo subsidy—subsidized steamships from New York to Havana, from Havana to New Orleans, and from New Orleans to Chagres. Then there was the Aspinwall subsidy from Panama to Astoria in Oregon. The Collins line received on an average every year \$858,000, the Aspinwall line received \$357,000 every year, and the Sloo line \$284,000 annually.

That law remained upon the statute-books during nearly all the Democratic administrations, and even to-day, if I have not misread the statutes, there is a decided discrimination in favor of sending mails by American steamers. Therefore, Mr. President, I have not appreciated that argument by which a mere prejudice has been sought to be created. I prefer to listen to serious arguments. It is a question on which there may be an honest difference of opinion.

It is not a new question, it is not a question whether at any antecedent time there has been any corruption or jobbery in connection with the subject. That seemed with the Senator from Kentucky to be a very strong argument against this amendment. I do not suppose that the honorable Senator would have it understood that he intended to intimate that because a certain amount of money is appropriated by Congress to be disposed of by the present Postmaster-General under certain limitations and conditions, therefore there is to be any corruption or jobbery in the discharge of that public duty by the present Postmaster-General.

I have utterly failed to hear a perfectly serious argument in opposition to this amendment. What we do know is this, that in the rivalry of governments to secure trade, and particularly the trade with South America, there has been a policy agreed upon. Those governments are not disposed to throw away millions of dollars; those gov-

ernments are economically and wisely administered; and yet we find that the four principal governments that have any seacoasts at all have agreed upon the policy that in order to establish trade with certain countries you must have certain regular and speedy communication. That is the system to-day.

Those who choose to adopt or to repudiate, to accept or to ignore that system, are at perfect liberty to do so; but I say there has been no explanation seriously attempted by those who have spoken against the amendment to explain to us why it is that the Government of France last year appropriated \$5,124,000 to subsidize steamship lines; why it is that England appropriated an equally large amount; why it is that Italy, a country that is to-day struggling under the burdens of excessive taxation, appropriated \$1,660,000 in order to sustain steamship lines so as to have speedy and certain communication with foreign countries.

I say that the argument of freeships does not touch the question, because all those Governments have free ships, and although they have free ships they find it necessary to subsidize steam lines. I say that the question of free-trade does not touch this question, because England is a free-trade country and England has been the parent of subsidies and her example has been imitated by other governments.

I say, Mr. President, that in my judgment the difference is because those governments have discovered and we have not discovered that trade to-day is operated upon certain conditions, and that you must have speed, regularity, and certainty by steam communication in order to secure the trade of a country. We are in some respects under more favorable conditions than other countries. We have the advantage of contiguity to the South American countries. They are our neighbors, anxious to trade with us, developing a marvelous commercial activity, having wonderful resources; countries which by reason of this very steam communication that they have had with other countries have developed an ambition to improve their condition, develop their great public works, and expand their commercial relations.

Mr. President, I did not intend to debate this question at length, but I desire to say that I shall always vote to develop and increase our trade with foreign nations. It adds to the aggregate wealth of the nation. It is a matter that I do not consider whether a particular section of our country is to be directly or immediately benefited by any such legislation. It is a matter in which I do not permit myself to consider whether a particular individual is to receive any benefit, for I know that the Government of the United States makes no contracts; it does not make a contract for carrying the mail on the Mississippi River or on the Kentucky River that some one is not already equipped and prepared to accept that contract to the exclusion of everybody else. I look upon this in a broader light, and for one I hope that the arguments which have been advanced against this amendment will be more serious arguments than I have heard addressed to the Senate in order to defeat its adoption.

Mr. INGALLS. Mr. President, the reason for the decay of American shipping in my judgment will be found in the fact that American capital can be more profitably employed in some other way than in building ships. I have heard much during the continuance of this argument of the advantages to result by the proposed appropriations, for which I intend to vote, to the restoration of the interests of American shipping; but I have listened in vain for some information as to the reason why the men of Maine and the men of Massachusetts do not now build ships if they want them. There is no reason why they should not build ships if they desire them. They have the yards and they have the forests and they have the mines and they have the skilled labor, and if ship-building was profitable, I venture to say that the capitalists of Maine and Massachusetts would build ships, and the reason why they have not done it is because they can make more money by building railroads, and by buying Western lands, and by lending on mortgage at 6 and 8 and 10 and 15 per cent. to Western borrowers.

I do not, therefore, Mr. President, feel that this appeal to a patriotic impulse to vote for a large appropriation out of the national Treasury for the purpose of restoring the decayed interests of American commerce has much weight. Very much the same argument applies to the carrying trade of this world. There has been a unanimity of lamentation upon both sides of this Chamber about the loss of the carrying trade by the United States, and we have been told of the disgrace and the shame that arises from the fact that the United States no longer has the carrying trade of the world. Mr. President, we did not lose the carrying trade of the world; we relinquished it. The reason why we have not the carrying trade of the world is because it is not profitable. Great Britain can afford to conduct the carrying trade of this world at a loss, as she does, because she has an insular position. There is not a point in Great Britain so remote from the seaboard that any product of her fields, that any product of her factories or her mines can not by her railway system be placed in fourteen hours in the dock ready for shipment to any portion of the world. Great Britain has an enormous excess of manufacturing facilities. She wants an enormous amount of free raw material. Therefore, Great Britain and the other continental nations so situated can afford to do what they are now doing, and that is to carry on what may be called the transfer, the transportation business of the world by water at a loss. There is to-day a million tons of English shipping that

can be bought for 50 per cent. of what it cost, if anybody wants to buy it. The best statisticians inform us that for the amount of capital employed in the carrying trade, Great Britain does not receive 1 per cent. per annum upon the capital invested.

Therefore the reason why the United States does not do the carrying business of the world is because she can do better. It does not sound reasonable or logical or sensible to rise here and declare that the reason we do not do the carrying trade of the world is because Congress does not vote subsidies for mail pay. Statistics show better; and whenever the carrying trade of the world can be conducted at a profit, the United States of America will have their share of it. But so long as American money can be more profitably employed in railroad transportation at home than it can in water transportation upon the deep, so long it will continue to be so employed, and the voting of \$100,000 or \$500,000 to one or more lines of steamships for service will not prevent it, and will not help it.

We have been told also that to the south of us there is a great commercial empire waiting for the invitation of American commerce. We have been appealed to to vote for this appropriation upon the ground that unless it is enacted by Congress that same balance of trade which the Senator from Maine depicted with so much vigor in his speech the other day would continue to be against us.

Mr. President, there is another reason why we have not got the trade of the South American republics, one that has not been mentioned here, one that deserves mention, because it is not becoming that Congress should be held up here and fustigated and castigated for unpatriotic frugality in failing to make the necessary appropriations, whereby we are unable to secure our share in the millions of South American commerce. The reason why we do not have South American commerce is because we do not attempt to sell them the things they want to buy. The reason why our merchants and our manufacturers find no market in South America is because the merchants and manufacturers of other countries can offer them a better article at a less price. There is no want of facility of communication; the testimony in the report of the commissioners shows that the means of communication are ample, but that in their dealings with American merchants and American manufacturers they have been flouted, they have been refused credit; they have not been offered the articles they wanted to buy, and when goods have been sold to them by sample they have proved to be entirely out of comparison with those samples both as to price and as to quality.

It will be interesting, inasmuch as this report of the commission has been so copiously quoted from, to hear a little what is said on this subject. In the first place, as to the facilities for the transaction of business, I read from page 31 of the general report dated the 1st of October, 1885, about the Central American trade. Says the commission:

As to Central America, on the west it is well served by the ships of the Pacific Mail.

Speaking about Venezuela they continue:

Our steamship connection with Venezuela is exceptionally favorable. It grows out of the fact that the large mercantile and commission firm in New York—

Giving their names—

have intimate relations with extensive houses in La Guayra, Caracas, Porto Cabello, and Maracaibo, and to do the business of these houses, as well as its own, it felt compelled to put on a semi-monthly line of steamers between New York and the ports we have mentioned. The headquarters of these houses are in Caracas, and the port of Maracaibo is connected with the line by a small light-draught steamer plying between it and the Dutch island of Curaçoa.

The entire commission unite also in the following statement, which will be found on page 61 of Executive Document No. 50, Forty-ninth Congress, first session:

As to other modes of increasing our trade with Venezuela, we hear here only repetitions of the same complaints, or suggestions, which have met us elsewhere, and which have been set forth in our first report. Our merchants and manufacturers, if they desire to compete with those of Great Britain, France, and Germany, for the trade of Spanish and Portuguese America, should not rely on any self-complacent assertion of our national superiority in skill and taste, especially if supported by agents who, in their ignorance, obtuseness, or natural coarseness, parade their fancy of superiority over the natives or residents of the country they visit. But they should rely on the truly American commercial and manufacturing enterprise and sagacity, which exhibit themselves in ascertaining the wants and even prejudices of the customers they seek to win, in supplying such goods as they are disposed to buy, and in avoiding all attempts to pass off inferior or damaged wares upon people who, although not as advanced in general material progress as ourselves, are noted for their perspicacity and individual independence.

It would appear, then, from the examination which these commissioners were able to give upon the subject of South American trade and the best method of increasing our commerce in that direction, that they discovered that the chief difficulty rested upon an assertion, which was unfounded, of our national superiority; that we made a great many self-complacent assertions and complained of the ignorance and coarseness and obtuseness of the merchants in that locality; and that instead of relying upon American commercial and manufacturing enterprise and sagacity we displayed our skill in passing off damaged and inferior goods upon them, refusing to supply them with the materials that they wanted, denying them credit, and in various ways showing an indisposition to deal with them in those particulars and upon those relations which are alone possible as the factors of commercial relationship between nations.

The report of the commissioners is sustained by the evidence of a

great many intelligent witnesses from which I will take but a very few extracts for the purpose of showing to the merchants and manufacturers of this country that it will not do for them to rely upon Congress for the purpose of building up South American trade; that primarily the fault is with them; and that before subsidies to steamship lines can afford any relief there must first be a disposition on the part of the manufacturing and commercial classes to send to those ports what the people want to buy, to treat them as if they were civilized beings, and to give them the same facilities that are afforded by the merchants of England, France, and Spain.

Mr. H. L. Boulton—I read now from page 69 of the report—who is an eminent merchant of that region, located at Caracas, speaking of the reason why the United States, nearer to Venezuela than Europe, does not get the business, says:

There would be no difficulty at all if they could produce as cheaply. Generally speaking, the American manufactured cotton goods and hardware are superior to the European article; very likely too good.

Mr. HALE. You have the wrong page.

Mr. INGALLS. No, I have not the wrong page. I propose to show from this statement that they do not want the best quality of goods. They are poor and unable to buy the best quality of goods; they want cheap goods; they want cotton cloths that are of an inferior quality; they complain that they should be from 1 to 2 inches narrower than our manufacturers make them, and that there ought to be 20 yards less in a piece than our manufacturers put them up, but that our manufacturers refuse to accede to that and persist in sending down to them a quality of goods which they can not afford to buy, and then complain of the want of traffic.

Q. The point is that our manufacturers do not adapt themselves to the tastes or the fashions, whatever it may be, of the consumers in Venezuela as well as the European?

A. Yes, sir; that in part, but it is not even that; it goes farther than that. The quality of American manufactures is superior to the general importation from Europe, as far as I understand, and consequently dearer.

Q. But they cost more?

A. Yes, of course.

Q. And if our dry goods manufacturers want this trade they must manufacture cheaper?

A. Not only that, but they must accommodate themselves to European ways.

Then he goes on to say what they are; that European merchants give them a credit of from six to nine months, and that the American merchants refuse to give them credit at all.

Q. Our people won't trust?

A. Well, they do not give such long credits as in Europe. Another thing is in manufacturing; as far as I understand, if you send for five hundred pieces of a certain class of goods to the United States, and you say those goods must weigh so much, and must be so many inches wide, if they have not got the looms they will say, "We can not do it." They do not put themselves out. If you send to Manchester for anything, they never say no; they make what you want.

Q. That is what we found elsewhere. Our people do not adapt themselves to the taste of the people?

A. They do not put themselves to the trouble of suiting the necessities of foreign trade in some things.

Mr. C. Röhl, upon page 77, was another witness. He is the consular agent of the United States stationed at that port. He says that most of the goods are obtained at that port from England and Germany.

What should our manufacturers do to obtain your trade here?

Asked the commission—

A. They should send out commercial travelers with samples, whose duty it would be to study the special requirements of the country; offer their goods and send their orders home.

The trade with the United States is gradually growing and increasing by its own efforts, and there is every reason to believe that it will further increase.

Q. Would increased steamship communication increase trade?

A. It seems to me that the steamship communication we have is quite sufficient. The owners of the "Red D" line do all in their power to meet every requirement. Their ships are first-rate vessels as regards speed, and in every other respect. Formerly we had two steamers a month; now we have three.

Mr. HALE. What country is that?

Mr. INGALLS. Venezuela.

Mr. HALE. That is the exceptional country?

Mr. INGALLS. Before I get through I shall show it is not an exceptional country, but even where the country is an exceptional one, where the means of transportation are ample, where there is no complaint, but, on the contrary, evidence that they have three steamships a month, even there traffic is practically destroyed, and simply because the merchants and manufacturers of the eastern seaboard refuse to adapt themselves to the requirements of the trade there.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator allow me a question there?

Mr. INGALLS. With pleasure.

Mr. HALE. I used the word just now "exceptional" because it had been used by the Senator himself in reading a statement of the condition of our trade with Venezuela. It is exceptional. The commerce between the United States and Venezuela is increasing, and one reason why it is increasing is that we have there steamship communication more direct, ready, regular, and to be depended upon than in any other countries.

Mr. INGALLS. Mr. Emerich Henry on page 83 says trade is not increasing. I do not know that he knows anything about other business, but his business is not much more since he started. He has been there for some time, how long he does not say.

Mr. ALLISON. The sewing-machine business is what he is engaged in.

Mr. INGALLS. On page 84 of the same report occurs the statement of another witness, E. Valiente, who is a citizen of the United States. He is asked what the Government could do to increase trade between the two countries, and he says:

Americans know very little and study very little and cater very little to our business. Our merchants in New York will not make prints, for example, of the width and size required, unless you give them an immense order. They won't touch it. Another thing is the packing. In the States they have the idea that we are fond of 1-inch planks, and we have to pay duty on the gross weight. That alone kills three-fourths of the business, because you have also the interior freight to pay.

He says there should be a difference in the packing; generally speaking, in everything:

The American houses advertise here—

That is in Venezuela, where the opportunities of transportation are so great—

but if you send an order they can't fill it; does not know the requirements of the custom-house, and the invoice is generally sent wrong, and therefore we have to deal with commission houses.

There is a singular uniformity in the testimony of all these witnesses in Venezuela as to the reasons why the trade with the United States is so defective and limited, all going to the general tenor that the fault is wholly with our merchants and manufacturers themselves and not with Congress, and not in the want of steamship facilities or mail accommodations.

As my colleague has the closing of the debate on this matter and the time is nearly approaching when the vote is to be taken, I do not desire to dwell further upon this subject. There is a great deal of exceedingly interesting detail in this testimony which I had marked to read on this occasion, both in the comments of the commission and in the testimony of the witnesses, all going to prove the same general statements I have made. My object in calling attention at this time to this feature of the report has been not to establish any argument whatever against the amendment offered by the Post-Office Committee, not to establish any ground whatever against the voting of necessary appropriations for mail pay for these steamship lines, but to show to the merchants and manufacturers of this country, and to call their attention to the fact in the most public way possible, that primarily the difficulties in our South American trade rest with them and not with Congress.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President—

Mr. MORGAN. Will the Senator from New York allow me to offer an amendment to the amendment of the committee? I offer the following amendment which I have written on a copy of the bill, and I will read it:

Strike out in lines 100 and 101 the words "American built and registered" and after the word "steamships" in line 101 insert "owned in whole or in part by citizens of the United States, whether built in America or in any foreign country;" so as to read:

For the transportation of foreign mails by steamships owned in whole or in part by citizens of the United States, whether built in America or in any foreign country.

And then at the end of the amendment, after line 114, to add:

And the ships so employed in such mail service shall be entitled to be registered under the laws of the United States, and shall be so registered and enrolled before the contract for carrying the mails on them shall become operative and effectual.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, for twenty years or more the American people have been calling upon Congress to take such action as would lead to the revival of our merchant marine; and through all those years discussions have gone on in every Congress which has assembled; but up to the present time we have not been able to agree upon any great measures of relief. In fact, the people as a whole have heretofore been divided in their opinions as to what action should be taken, and their representatives in the two Houses of Congress have been equally divided.

Two years ago, after an investigation by a joint committee of the two Houses, a small measure of relief was brought in and was enacted into a law. By it many of the small charges and burdens which were imposed upon American shipping were removed and much relief came to our merchant marine by the act of which I speak. But it was not such a measure of relief as would enable American shippers to enter successfully upon a contest with the great maritime powers of the world who for more than twenty-five years have been increasing their merchant marine, particularly England, Germany, France, and Italy, until today they are able to carry in round numbers three-quarters of the entire commerce of the world.

This contest was renewed again last year, and finally the two Houses of Congress, one Democratic and one Republican, united in appropriating \$400,000 to be used for mail pay to American steamship lines to carry our mails to foreign countries. It was distinctly understood by Congress when that appropriation was made that it was made expressly for the purpose of aiding our merchant marine, of encouraging the building of American steamships, and encouraging our people to sail them.

After a long debate in the two Houses that appropriation was made, and the people of our country looked to it for relief and for aid in this matter. But the administration charged with the conduct of public

affairs deliberately refused to expend that money at all. We were told in the public press at the time and in the reports which have been made that the law was so imperfect, so indefinite in its language, that the Postmaster-General could not carry it out; but the great leader of the Democratic party in this body in an attack upon the present amendment told the country that it was against the policy of this administration, that the President and the Postmaster-General had both protested against appropriations of this kind, for they were contrary to the principles which they desired to carry out in the conduct of public affairs.

We had been told before by the Executive himself that the office of President was an executive office; that it was one which had not to do with policies or plans of government, but that it was to execute the will of the people as expressed by the Congress of the United States. Now we are told by this leader that any appropriations for subsidizing American shipping is against the policy of the administration, and I presume, therefore, against the policy of the Democratic party. I discover, however, that the whole party is not united upon that policy even in this body. If it was united upon any policy, we should be glad to know what it is. If it be opposition to an increase of the American merchant marine, if it be against paying reasonable rates for carrying the foreign mails, we should be glad to know that. If they are absolutely united in favor of free ships and free trade, we should be glad to know that; for as a party of opposition it is somewhat difficult to know how to deal with a party in power controlling all the functions of this great Government when we find that party as represented in Congress united upon no single line of policy or upon no single proposition referring to government.

Therefore we must proceed to consider these questions outside of political lines, and upon lines of policy which have met with favor upon this side of the Chamber, and lines of policy which we believe here as Republicans, if carried into effect, will result in great good to all our people.

I do not care to go at length into the question of free ships or of a protective tariff, and had not those objects been brought in here by the two leaders of the party upon the other side who have opposed the amendment, had not these questions been brought forward here as the chief reason why we should not make this appropriation of \$800,000 for the carrying of the foreign mails, I should not care to refer to them at all.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK] seem to delight in telling the American people from this forum of the wretched condition of our Navy and of the more wretched condition of our merchant marine. They seem to delight to boast of the decline of both. But I have no desire to spread that record out here before the people. As an American citizen I am ashamed of both. As a representative in this body and in the other House of Congress I have been ever ready to vote liberal appropriations for the building up of a navy, and I have always voted for the most liberal appropriations which have been presented to this body for carrying the foreign mails, hoping thereby to improve and build up the American merchant marine.

I take no delight in talking of the decadence of our merchant marine. I find no delight in referring to the old hulls and useless ships of our Navy. For the last fifteen or twenty years the Republican party in control of this Government has sought frequently to add to our Navy by making appropriations for so doing, but almost without exception the effort has been met by the bitter, persistent, and undying opposition of the Democratic party. When a few years ago we did appropriate four or five million dollars to build some new cruisers and when they were finally started and nearly completed, the Democratic party coming into power struck down the builder and the interest which he represented by refusing, first, to receive a ship which had been accepted by the naval advisory board as having in every respect complied with the terms of the contract, and then when work had been stopped upon the other cruisers it finally completed its action by seizing the ships and the works of the contractor and thus destroying by one act one of the greatest ship-building yards in this country and a man who, starting in life as a poor mechanic, had achieved success equaled by no other American citizen in that line of industry.

But the record of this administration upon the building up of the Navy does not end there. We appropriated by the last Congress some three or four million dollars, I forget just how much, to go on with this good work which we had begun. We put it into the hands of this administration and called upon it to continue the work by devising plans for new and better ships and building them. A year and more has passed since that appropriation was made, but it has laid no new keel, it has started no new ships under it, and that money lies idle in the Treasury.

Mr. President, if the American Navy has declined since the war, the discredit lies not all at the door of the Republican party by any means; and if the American merchant marine has declined also, neither can it in my judgment be attributed to the policy of the Republican party in maintaining a protective tariff. Let us see. We are told by the Senators on the other side from Kentucky and Missouri that if we will repeal our obnoxious and barbarous navigation laws and admit foreign-built ships free to our registry and our flag we can then revive our

merchant marine, and not otherwise. But every Senator knows that any American citizen having the money can purchase a ship wherever he likes, and can run it in all the commerce of the world. Our laws only deny him an American registry and the right to float the American flag. Our policy has been from the beginning of the Government down to the present time that the ship which carries the flag of our Government and which represents our Government should be of American build and of American material. But suppose we were to repeal these laws and admit ships free, would that materially aid us in the contest which we desire to wage with the great powers of Europe in securing back our proper proportion of the carrying trade of the world? I think not at all.

The Senator from Missouri will bear me out in the statement, for he was a member of the joint committee of the two Houses together with myself who made the investigation some two or three years ago, in saying that all the ship-masters of the country whom we called before us agreed substantially that the cost of building an iron steamship in an American ship-yard was not more than from 10 to 15 per cent. higher than the cost of building it upon the Clyde. When the Senator from Kentucky said the other day that we compelled a man who desired to sail an iron steamship to pay \$300,000 for building it here in our yards when he could buy it for \$200,000 abroad he went very wide of the truth in this respect, not intentionally undoubtedly but the difference which he gave is 50 per cent. The actual difference to-day is probably not more than 12 per cent.

That committee had before it the president of the Pacific Mail line, a line which runs both American-built steamers and foreign-built steamers, and the president told the committee that after having procured proposals from English ship-builders and American ship-builders he found the difference in cost against the American ship-builder was only 12½ per cent. There it remains to-day, and any man who knows anything about the sailing of vessels or the transportation of commerce knows very well that a difference of only 10 or 12 per cent. in the original cost of the plant will go but a very short way toward equalizing the differences between the English commercial marine and the American commercial marine in the cost of the movement of the ships.

The same investigation brought out the fact that owing to the high rate of wages paid to American seamen and American officers upon the line of steamships running from Philadelphia to England, in which there are four American steamships, the difference in the wages paid to the American seamen and the American officers was equal to 4 per cent. upon the cost of the ships. How could we hope to succeed in so unequal a contest as this? I suppose, of course, that the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Missouri would answer, let us have free ships, manned by foreign officers and by foreign seamen at foreign rates of wages. While vessels of that kind might carry our produce and distribute it to the nations of the world, and might bring us back of the produce of the world what we wanted, it would not do very much toward restoring the American marine. No; if we were to have free ships it would go but a very little way toward equalizing the contest of which I have spoken.

The Senator from Kentucky tells us that we can not hope to sell our manufactured products abroad until we can produce them as cheaply as England, Germany, or France can produce them; and therefore we can not expect to have any of this trade. How does the Senator propose to reduce the cost of manufacturing in this country? We have the cheapest cotton in the world, because we produce it and furnish it to all the manufacturing countries of Europe. We have an abundance of cheap water-power, which furnishes the motive-power for our factories. Our local taxation is not greater than the taxation which bears upon the people of Europe. We have a higher rate of interest upon capital, we have a vastly higher rate of wages, and we can not upon the finer class of goods hope to compete with Europe in the trade of the world unless we have substantially the same rate of wages. But is the Senator from Kentucky or are any of the Senators upon that side of the Chamber willing to see the rate of labor in this country reduced to the rate of wages prevailing in Europe in order that we may thereby send a few more thousands of dollars' worth of manufactured goods to South America or to the Sandwich Islands or to the West India Islands or to China or Japan? I trust not, Mr. President. I hope the day is far distant when any such motive as that shall move the Congress of the United States to break down our protective-tariff laws.

What are the facts in regard to our manufacturing products in this country and our ability to furnish them in competition with the manufacturers of England and of Europe? We are able to manufacture and we are to-day manufacturing the cheaper and coarser kinds of cotton cloth as cheaply as they are made in Manchester or anywhere in Europe, notwithstanding we are paying a rate of wages to our operatives which is from 50 to 100 per cent. higher than is paid in those countries. We are producing and shipping these goods to nearly all portions of the globe in direct competition with England, Germany, and France. It is believed by the majority of the American people, certainly by those engaged in this industry, that if they had more rapid, regular, complete service with all South America and with the islands of the sea and with the Orient, we should be able in a very few years to double or quadruple the amount of coarse cotton goods shipped abroad.

Mr. BECK. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BECK. I only rose to say that the hour of 4 o'clock had arrived, and as the Senator from Kansas who has charge of the bill ought to be heard and there are other Senators who wish to be heard for a short time, I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended until 5 o'clock to allow that to be done, and not to interrupt the Senator from New York in his remarks.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the proposition of the Senator from Kentucky that the time for debate be extended until 5 o'clock?

Mr. PLUMB. I wish to say simply that under the circumstances, having opened the debate, I do not wish to have the time extended on my account. However, I understand that several other Senators wish to speak.

Mr. BECK. There are one or two Senators I know who desire to be heard, and I thought it would not take much time, and at 5 o'clock we might agree to take the vote.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection that proposition will be considered as agreed to. The Senator from New York will proceed.

Mr. MILLER. In the manufacture of farm implements and tools of trade of all kinds we have excelled all other peoples, and to-day the agricultural implements of the United States are to be found upon the farms of every civilized country of the world. We produce better plows, better shovels, better farming implements of all kinds than any other country, and in spite of the uncertain and imperfect connection with many portions of the globe these implements of trade are finding their way throughout the world. In the manufacture of sewing-machines and similar articles we also lead all other peoples. I make the statement that in the classes of goods which I have mentioned and in many others also we are ready and prepared to compete with England, Germany, or France, provided we may have proper means of commercial intercourse with the nations which desire to buy these goods. We do not expect to be able to put our manufactured products onto the continent of Europe and to compete with the manufacturers there to any extent; but over the whole of South America, in the West India Islands, and in the Orient, if we can reach them and have proper means of commercial intercourse, we can, in my judgment, secure the bulk of the trade in all the countries I have mentioned. An examination of the reports of our Government in regard to our trade with many of the South American countries will, I think, bear me out in the assertion which I have made.

In addition to the manufactured articles of which I have spoken, which are so well adapted to trade with the various countries I have mentioned, we have a large surplus of farm products seeking a foreign market. These farm products to-day form the bulk of all our exportations not only in our trade with Europe but in our trade with South America. It will be found that the flour and other farm products are the chief articles which we export there.

Last year we imported from Brazil in round numbers \$48,000,000 worth of products and we exported to Brazil seven and a quarter millions in value of our products. Still the Senator from Kentucky tells us we can not hope to have trade with that country or with the South American countries so long as we maintain our present tariff rates. Let us see. The reason given is that we can not hope to buy the products of Brazil because we impose a duty, he says, in round numbers of 46 per cent. upon the products of Brazil brought into this country. Of the \$48,000,000 worth of products of Brazil brought into this country last year, \$38,136,191 worth were upon the free-list, upon which not a dollar of duty was paid at all. They could be landed as cheaply in New York as in Liverpool, or Havre, or Bremen, or Hamburg, or any other port in the world. That \$38,000,000 worth was composed chiefly of coffee, raw hides, raw rubber, tropical woods, and dye-stuffs. In fact nearly all the natural products of Brazil come in under our present tariff without any duty at all. But in spite of that we sold her less than \$8,000,000 worth of products off the farm and from the loom and the machine-shop. About \$30,000,000 of the importations from Brazil last year consisted of coffee; some \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 consisted of raw rubber; and between \$1,000,000 and \$2,000,000 of raw hides, all of which were free of duty. We sent back in return coarse cotton goods, farm implements, and flour, and other produce of our farms.

So you may take all the countries of South America, and you will find that in nearly every case we bought much more than we sold, and that nearly all we bought from South America came in without paying a single farthing of duty. How, then, would the Senator from Kentucky hope to increase that line of trade if we were to abolish all our duties? Would he have us go to Brazil for our wool? Would he have us go to Chili for our copper?

The commerce of the world is not barter in any true sense of the word at all. Now that the whole globe has been circled by discovery and by investigation until we know what are the products of every clime and every country, commerce consists in each country drawing from every other country what it most needs, what it most desires, and in selling back to that other country what it may need or what we may be able

to persuade them to take. We do not grow coffee, and so we import \$30,000,000 worth of coffee from Brazil. We do not produce raw rubber at all, and so we import nearly \$4,000,000 worth of rubber from Brazil. We do not have the tropical woods and dyestuffs within the limits of the United States, and so we import them free from Brazil and from the Argentine Republic and from the whole of South America. Those countries desire certain manufactured goods, and they get them as they are brought to their shores by the vessels of other nations, having very few ships engaged in trade themselves. *

Thus it is that the trade of the countries of which I am now speaking is controlled almost entirely by those nations which have the largest commercial marine. The control of the commerce of any of those countries is absolutely in the hands of those nations which control the means of commerce, and the means of commerce are not only the ships themselves, but they are the financial resources also of commerce, they are the banking houses which give credit to the merchants, they are the commercial houses and great shipping merchants which collect together the products of a country and send them out for trade and for commerce.

So it happens that to-day, when we are seeking for the commerce of South America, we find that Great Britain alone sends quite as many ships into those ports as all the other nations of the world combined, and thus it is that she is enabled to control the commerce of those countries. Wherever the English steamship goes out laden with the manufactures of Great Britain she finds at the end of her journey an English commission house ready to take the goods and find a market among the people of the country. She finds there a banking-house ready to give credit to the merchants, ready to extend credits upon bills of lading, and thus enable the business to be done. It is by all these means which she holds in her hands that she is enabled to control and does to-day so largely control the commerce of South and Central America.

It is not true, as stated by the Senator from Kentucky, that Great Britain controls the commerce of those countries because she buys more largely of them than any other nation does, for she does not. England takes from Central and South America of their raw products simply what she needs for her own manufacturing establishments and no more. If you go over the reports you will find that Great Britain in her commerce with those countries sells to Brazil much more than she buys from her. Her importations from Brazil last year were in round numbers £4,700,000 sterling; her exports were £6,471,000, selling back to Brazil much more than she bought from her.

This is strikingly illustrated in the condition of trade with the Argentine Republic, from which Great Britain bought last year £1,158,000 in value and sold to the Argentine Republic £5,810,000 in value, proving conclusively, what I have before stated, that the old rule of barter no longer holds good, each nation buying from every other nation what she needs and desires, and selling in return what that nation may need or desire. Where two nations are seeking for the same trade or are seeking to supply the same people with the same manufactured articles or the same products, that nation which has in her hands and controls the means of intercommunication, which holds the sinews of commerce, which are finance, will undoubtedly chiefly control the trade of that country.

That is what England is doing. Having made of herself the manufacturing center of the world, the workshop of the world, she sends out to the other nations of the world and collects any such raw materials as she may need for her manufacturing industries, and sailing her own ships and maintaining rapid mail communication with all the nations of the earth she is thus enabled to control the commerce of those nations to a larger extent than either the United States or any other nation.

I fail then to see how free trade or a large reduction of our present protective duties would enable us to compete with England, Germany, or France in manufactures of the finer and higher grades. We can not yet hope to do that, but in the particular lines of which I have spoken I have no doubt whatever of our ability to successfully compete, and that to-day we only need with all the outlying countries of which I have spoken, regular, rapid, and frequent mail communication. Before commerce can do anything, before it can organize itself, there must be mail communication.

The Senator from Kentucky complained of the manufacturers of this country because they were not more vigilant in seeking a foreign market. It is not the manufacturer as a class who seeks the foreign market. The manufacturer of any one particular article can not afford to look for a distant market. That must be done by the middleman, by the shipping merchant, by the commission merchant, who, having his branch houses in all the great ports of those countries, shall gather up the orders for the goods which are desired, bringing them to our ports and there making his purchases and his collections and returning the goods which are wanted. It can be done in no other way. In our great cities they will not undertake the hazardous business of dealing in foreign markets unless they are sure of rapid communication by mail steamers.

It is for this purpose, and this purpose alone, that this amendment has been proposed and that it is sought to put it upon the bill. It is believed that if we can have weekly mails with the leading ports of

South America we shall be able thereby to a very large extent to control the trade of those countries, for wherever a vessel goes laden with our products she is sure to seek a return freight and thereby to increase the trade. Take the one line running from New York and from Newport News to Brazil. The owners of that line have become commission merchants of necessity. They can not afford to run their vessels without freight, and so they are constantly seeking among American manufacturers, and among American farmers, for a consignment of goods to be sent to South America. They are constantly looking out for trade, and when they have secured it and have carried it to South America they must of necessity attempt to dispose of it. Thus it is that the steamship company itself in cases where regular trade has not been established becomes both the transporter and the commission merchant, and that has been particularly true of all the lines of steamships which have run from our shores to South America either upon the eastern or the western coast of that great continent. They have been compelled to do very largely the business of the middleman.

It is believed that if we can increase this communication, if we can have two or three lines of steamers running where we now have one, we shall in that proportion increase the shipments of our produce to those countries, and to a certain extent increase our importations also; or at least if we do not increase our importations that we shall bring these importations to our own ports in our own ships and under our own flag rather than that they shall come to us in foreign bottoms and under foreign flags.

The Senator from Missouri spoke of the case of an American shipmaster who, sailing from New York with a cargo to Chili, and having disposed of it, loaded his vessel with wool and copper, and returning to New York found that he could not dispose of it to advantage because of the duty. I know nothing about that especial case; but if there is any American shipmaster sailing out of our ports who is so ignorant of our laws, who knows so little of our system of protection to our own products that he did not know that there was a duty upon copper and a duty upon wool, in my judgment he was not a fit man to send out with a ship to engage in a foreign commerce.

If he had desired that cargo he should have shipped it to Liverpool, as the Senator tells us he finally went to that port. There would have been nothing strange or nothing irregular in that, for how is the great bulk of the commerce of the United States carried on with Brazil to-day? How is it that the \$48,000,000 worth of the products of Brazil find their way into our ports to-day? Is it in American ships and under American flags? No; not 10 per cent. of it; but it comes to the port of New York in an English steamer, and when that English steamer unloads its cargo in New York it takes on board a cargo of wheat, or corn, or flour, and sails for Liverpool, because the shipmaster knows that that product can be disposed of there even if it has not been sold before he starts with it. Having unloaded his wheat in Liverpool, his ship again loads with the products of the loom and the machine-shop of England and goes back again to Brazil and there it loads with coffee, with rubber, with hides, which it brings to the United States.

That is the way the trade of England is carried on with Brazil, and if an American ship should engage in that triangular commerce I see no harm in it.

I do not understand or believe that the Senator from Missouri would desire to have the duty taken off copper or wool in order that we might go to Chili to get our supply of copper and wool there; neither do I suppose that his constituents in Missouri would care to have the duty taken off lead and zinc in order that we might go to some South American mine to get our lead and zinc, and that the lead and zinc mines in Missouri might be shut up and the miners turned out with nothing to do. If I remember the record of the Senator from Missouri upon that question, when the tariff bill was before this body three years since, he was found here advocating the highest rate of taxation with the highest tariff upon lead and zinc, because they were the products of Missouri. Put them on the free-list and perhaps you might settle the silver question, for a very large number of the silver mines of the West could not be carried on successfully to-day were it not for the profit arising from the lead found with the silver.

No, Mr. President, no country anywhere should buy natural raw products such as it can produce itself. The United States does not desire to go to Chili for copper, nor to any other country for lead or zinc or iron. Does Brazil, in order that she may have a better trade with Cuba, send to Cuba for her sugar or her coffee? That would be absurd. Brazil produces coffee for export, and she does not look for it anywhere else; neither should we in such a case. Whatever we can produce in this country we shall find it always to the best interests of all our people that it shall be produced here rather than that we shall go abroad for it. Shall we take the duty off wool in order that we may buy it in South Africa, or in Australia, or in Brazil, or in the Argentine Republic, or elsewhere, rather than that we shall grow it upon our great plains in the West, as we have been doing for the past twenty years? I think not. I do not believe that the American people are prepared for any such doctrine as that, and they are not yet ready to see any such principles carried into execution.

The Senator from Missouri objected to this proposition of voting \$800,000 as a subsidy for the reason that there was no free competition,

that it was confined to and would be expended only upon American-built vessels. He told us that Great Britain opened all her foreign-mail carrying to all flags; that her contracts were made with the lowest bidder without regard to the nationality of the bidder. I must take issue with the Senator upon that statement. He made the same statement here some two or three years ago and I controverted it at the time, and was able then to show that nearly all the moneys which England had ever paid out for the carrying of the mails to foreign countries had been paid to English ship-owners; that in one case she had made a contract with a German line of steamers and that the commotion raised in England and the opposition which her ship-owners and her people showed to it was such that the government rescinded it and gave it up. Nearly all of her contracts to-day for carrying mails are absolutely private contracts made by the board of admiralty without any public bidding, without any public notice whatever; and as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] tells me, one has just been made for twenty years.

England has governed herself wisely in this respect. She has sent out her consular agents all over the world and has discovered the wants and needs of every people. Where she has seen an opening for trade and commerce, there she has subsidized at once a steamship line to carry the mails and to carry her products, and when that was not sufficient she has not hesitated to bring on unjust and unrighteous wars with the weaker nations of the earth during the last thirty-five years for no other purpose whatever except that by so doing she might control the commerce and the trade of those countries. The wars of England for the past third of a century have not been wars for glory and supremacy over all lands, but they have been chiefly waged from the commercial standpoint and for the sole purpose of controlling the trade of the weaker nations. She has paid out vast sums of money for the transportation of her mails, and she has paid it almost exclusively to English subjects.

But let us see for a moment what another great nation is doing to-day, a nation which is striving to establish colonies and secure a portion of this valuable foreign trade. I read from a message of the President of the United States transmitting a report of the Secretary of State in relation to the mercantile marines of France, Germany, Great Britain, and Italy, sent here April 9, 1886, Executive Document No. 172. From the report of Consul Loening I read as follows:

The Imperial German Government has recently granted a subsidy to the North German Lloyd Steamship Company, of Bremen, for the establishment and maintenance of the following steamship lines:

One line for the trade with East Asia.

One line for the trade with Australia.

One branch (connecting) line from Trieste to Alexandria. For this the German Government pay the North German Lloyd Steamship Company 4,400,000 marks per year for a period of fifteen years.

Here is appended a translation of the contract entered into by the German chancellor with this steamship company. I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a few of its provisions. It is very long and very full. It gives the government complete control over vessels for inspection, &c. I read from page 85:

ART. 10. The steamers to be employed in these lines must be built at German ship-yards, and as much as possible of German material. The plans of construction are subject to the approval of the imperial chancellor.

The vessels must have the highest classification given by the Germanic Lloyd. The larger repairs to the steamers must also, as much as possible, be done on German ship-yards.

Thus you see that this contract provides that all these vessels under this subvention must be built in German ship-yards of German material as far as possible; that all their principal repairs must be made in German ship-yards. It is a very wise provision throughout, for the Government of Germany desires to encourage ship-building in order that she may be prepared with transports in case of war, and she desires to encourage her ship-builders in order that she may be able to build her own navy and thus protect herself. But it goes even further in this protection, and provides that—

The necessary supply of coals for the steamers to be employed in these lines, if received in German ports or in ports of call in the Netherlands or Belgium, according to article 1, must exclusively be German product. Changes are only allowed if the consent of the imperial chancellor is obtained.

There is a new subsidy just granted by Germany for encouraging this foreign trade in some of the countries to which we desire to extend ours. With her cheap labor in her manufactories in Germany, may it be possible for us to compete with her in the carrying trade with any of these countries if we leave our shipmasters without any protection, without any compensation whatever for the carrying of mails, giving them only the sea postage of 2 cents a letter, or even the sea and inland postage of 5 cents a letter? That is a contest which it would be worse than useless for our capitalists to undertake, and we can not hope to succeed in it.

I might go on and quote from this document. Of course the Senator from Kentucky and the other Senators will acknowledge its correctness, because it comes from the present administration, and the reports are almost entirely by the consular agents who have been sent out within the past year.

I do not care at any length to allude to the failure of the administration to carry out the law of the last Congress. That has been discussed in another body; it has been discussed by the public press; it has been discussed by the merchants and business men of our country. So far as I have been able to follow the discussion and the expressions of sentiment which have been made by our American shippers, it has been

only one of condemnation. A year ago our mails to the Sandwich Islands, to China, and to Japan were carried with a good degree of regularity and speed under the American flag. We thought to improve and accelerate that transportation by appropriating a reasonable sum of money to pay for having it done; but what has been the result? The administration refused to expend a dollar of it; it sought in every way possible to evade it. It sent our mails under every foreign flag and in every kind of ship that it could induce to take them, and what has been the result? Talk with any of the leading shippers of New York city, Baltimore, or New Orleans, or of any of our ports, and you will find that it has been greatly to the detriment of our business.

Our mails have been irregular, bills of lading sent out with shipments have reached their destination sometimes a week after the cargo had arrived, and the consignee could not avail himself of the shipment, could not pass it through the custom-house, could not put it upon the market because he lacked the invoice and the bill of lading. Our foreign trade and commerce has been greatly disorganized by the refusal of the administration to carry out the plain enactment of last year. Now we are told that we must not make this appropriation, that we must not make any appropriation of this kind because it will greatly embarrass the administration, and because the administration is opposed to this whole policy.

I send to the desk to have read a short passage which will show something as to how American mails have been treated during the past year.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, April 23.

The manner in which the United States mails are treated by English tramp-steamers, to which they are committed by Postmaster-General Vilas, is related in a recent number of the Daily News, an English paper published in Rio de Janeiro, which has just been received here. It appears that the Post-Office Department intrusted fifty-two bags of mail to an English tramp-steamer named Maranhese, and paid the captain of that steamer for the transportation of this mail to Rio de Janeiro. When the captain got to Pernambuco, which is only little more than half-way, he disposed of the cargo of flour that he was carrying on speculation, and having to go no further down the coast, he dumped the United States mail that he had contracted to carry to Rio upon the pier at Pernambuco, filled up his vessel with coffee, and started for England. When the steamer Finance, of the United States and Brazilian Mail Company, arrived in Pernambuco it found this large accumulation of mail that had been dropped there by the Maranhese. The American steamer was under no obligation to touch it, as the Post-Office Department had simply deprived the company sailing under the American flag of the transportation of this mail in order to give it to an English tramp; but the captain, as a matter of patriotism, took the mail on board, carried it to Rio, and not only did not receive one dollar's compensation for its transportation, but was fined by the Brazilian Government for not getting this mail there on time. An explanation was made, but the Brazilian authorities would not believe that the Government of the United States, having its own steamers sailing in that direction, would intrust its mail to irresponsible tramps, to be thrown overboard whenever they got tired of it.

Mr. MILLER. That is only one illustration out of many which I might present here. It admits of no excuse, no palliation, in my judgment. The appropriation made by Congress was absolute, and the debates in this body showed for what it was intended and the spirit in which it was made. It was understood by all that it was made in order that an incentive might be given to the running of American steamship lines to all the ports of which I have been speaking. The amendment which is now proposed increases the amount of money which is to be expended, and it attempts to make the law so plain and direct that even this administration can not fail to understand it and will have no possible excuse for violating it or neglecting to carry it out. But the simple remark of the Senator from Kentucky in my judgment gives us the key to the whole situation. For twenty years or more a few of the leaders of the Democratic party have persistently, "in season and out of season," labored against subsidies or liberal mail pay for the carrying of the mails. At last finding that a majority of Congress was against them, they seem to have been able to outwit the representatives of the people in their legislative capacity and to secure from the present administration a nullification of a law which they could not prevent the representatives of the people from passing.

I trust, Mr. President, that this proposition will carry and that it will be enacted in such plain and unmistakable terms that no one who is charged with the administration of public affairs will venture to violate it or evade it. I believe that if it is carried out faithfully and honestly, it will more than quadruple our exports to all the South American countries, to the leading islands of the West Indies, and to the Orient. I wish that the appropriation were larger and more specific in its terms. I believe it to be one of the most important appropriations proposed for the action of this body, and believing it to be so, I have supported it, and I shall hope to see it succeed.

Mr. COLQUITT. Mr. President, I shall abbreviate the remarks I intended to have made at an earlier stage of the debate. I recognize what is due the Senator from Kansas, that having charge of the bill he should have an ample opportunity to close the debate.

I am opposed to this amendment. I am opposed to it on general principles and for specific considerations. I shall not discuss them fully but present in as concise a way as I can the reasons which influence my own judgment.

Subsidies by the Government are in most instances invidious. The people are jealous of them. The inquiry is promptly made after every appeal for special favor, what special benefit will result to the public?

This we know, that the cost is a sure thing. We want to see, and very distinctly, what reciprocity is to follow the cost. Individuals have not, as a general thing, the courage necessary to bring them to Congress in the character of mendicants.

It takes rich corporations to enact this rôle of brazen importunity. The sets of men who band themselves together professing to be about to do great things for the country in making themselves rich can come here and demand protection and subsidies. The individual or the modest corporation must live without the bounty of the Government, and be content with paying tribute to others.

In the case before us there is a specious offer of reciprocal good resulting to the people from the gift of this large amount to some fortunate company of ship-owners. I say a gift, because it is not pretended that this sum is necessary to insure a safe and expeditious transmission of the mails. In my judgment, Mr. President, the absolute certainty of a fair return for this gratuity does not justify Congress in a step of such doubtful propriety and policy. This is only a case of favoritism and protection, and its disguise is too transparent to deceive any one. It is wrong in theory, wrong in effect. Wrong, because we are proceeding without unquestioned constitutional authority; wrong, because by this measure and cases like it we are educating our people to a dependence upon the help of the Government, instead of dependence on self-help. It is wrong, because it is in sympathy with monopoly, and discourages a healthy competition, which always evokes the best powers of practical intellect. Give favor and encouragement to such propositions as this, and you inevitably arouse a cupidity that is never satisfied, and you invite numberless appeals for just such subsidies. It is charged that, as a people, we are possessed of exaggerated self-esteem, and that we are given to boasting; but it can not be denied that we have an energy and enterprise which are invincible. We started the first steamboat without subsidy; we sent across the Atlantic, in spite of Doctor Lardner, and without subsidy, the very first steamship that ever accomplished the voyage.

We had at one time the second greatest commercial marine that was afloat, and acquired it without subsidy. We have just triumphed over the mistress of the seas by the victory of the Puritan; and so in every department of life and business we do what we are determined to do and nothing can stop us. But without a thought of what has been accomplished we are here to-day prescribing against this natural and sturdy self-reliance. We are preparing cradles and crutches in this Chamber for enterprise and business dash. Instead of teaching lessons of dauntless resolve and execution, we are training every business venture to reach out to the Government supplicating hands for help. A sound and expanding industry never needs a forcing, hot-bed process. If it has intrinsic virtue and vigor, it will grow in spite of discouragements; and if it has not, it will perish in spite of nursing.

I object to this amendment because the reasons assigned in support of it are so utterly unsatisfactory. With great emphasis Senators speak of the immense value of South and Central American trade and the contemptible share of it which falls to our lot. We get about one-seventh part of this trade which Great Britain has secured; she has more than seven times the postal communication with these people than we afford to our merchants, and, therefore, it is argued the difference in trade is to be accounted for by mail facilities. There never was a more palpable *non sequitur*. It is to my mind a clear case of mistaking an effect for a cause. How can correspondence and mail facilities create trade? These are certainly helps—necessary consequences and concomitants—but the sequence is, trade first and then your postal facilities. Well has it been remarked by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK] that there never was a valuable load that needed transportation that some vehicle was not ready to move it.

We want trade with South and Central America predicated upon the value and price of what we have to sell and what they have to give in exchange. Let me pause to qualify that assurance by saying, unless in future cases we exemplify the curious economy and statesmanship that has left us an insignificant part of the carrying trade to our shore; and here it is pertinent to ask, why does our trade with these states make so sorry a show by the side of the figures presented by far distant countries? Right at our doors, these people should have for us the partiality of friends and neighbors, and our propinquity should distance all competition in the trade with them.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the conclusion is inevitable that our present system of restriction by high tariffs is woefully defective or we have not given it a fair trial. I suspect the fair trial has been had. No Senator here raises his voice for a higher tariff than the one that now afflicts us. It seems we are to be left to repose quietly upon the present liberal average rate of 46 per cent., and then wait developments. The developments are here, and here with a vengeance; that system that was to make our charity begin and stay at home, that painted in such rosy colors the omnivorous capacity of our home market, and its voracity as well; that taught us to imitate the enlightened Chinese in secluding ourselves; that persuaded us to yield nothing to the catholic spirit of commerce, but to get all we can and keep it if we could, and above all, the competence it was to give to the dear workingman, lifting him up, insuring unrestricted comfort, and making him the dominating factor in our industrial enterprises.

Where are the evidences of the boasted power of this American system, so called? What is it doing for us to-day? Under its blight our carrying trade has diminished to such proportions as should startle the country. But for our conscious vitality we could but take the pitiable condition of that trade as a portent of speedy decadence. We feel, however, it is only malpractice, and not the natural decay of the subject that alarms us. Great as this interest is, and as necessary to our power as a people, we can bear its loss better than we can the loss of goodwill and fraternity between our laboring people and the men who employ them. The old-time cordiality between these classes must be restored or we can predict nothing good of our society. If our laboring fellow-citizens really have no grievances their minds should be disabused. If they have, the duty of Government is to rectify the wrong, where Government is at fault, and public opinion must bring its irresistible power to act on the injustice and oppression which are alleged.

It is a pity, Mr. President, that impartial justice must render a decree in so many cases against the misuse and abuse of the power and wealth which have been conferred by discriminating legislation. To listen to the debates in Congress and the endless dissertations of the press, one is led to believe that all the good that is looked for from our exacting tariff is that the wages of the poor workingman should be enhanced. In ten thousand phrases of speech and declamation we are told that American labor must be protected, that there is a dignity in labor we are bound to respect. In giving practical effect to this high-sounding profession we levy from everybody, the unprotected majority as well as the favored minority, countless millions every decade. All this eloquence, all this disinterested legislation so assiduously fostered by the rich manufacturer, does not prevent the importation of any man from Europe who can bring his arms and legs with him to help the bosses to regulate the scale of wages.

All this cant about labor, its rights and dignity, does not save this land of liberty, of free soil and cheap soil, from witnessing at this moment such scenes of tumult and such rabid demonstrations of rage on the part of the laboring classes as are enough to blanch the cheek and make the heart quail. As far as I know the capitalists who are complained against are doing very little to appease the bad spirit that is abroad. They close their royal establishments, retire to their palaces, and hugging our tariff of 25 and 100 per cent. to their bosoms, they challenge the grateful acknowledgments of their working people, turned adrift, for what they have done in behalf of a tariff for the protection of American industry and the poor laborer. For one, I regard these troubles as something more serious than an effervescence. They betoken strife and convulsion, and it behooves us to see to it if Government is in the wrong that we repair the wrong.

No man can convince the public mind that the widespread discontents of our people are merely sporadic, and that they are the result of natural causes. With no military proscription to rob families of their props, with lands held in fee-simple at one-sixth the cost of rents in other lands, and with unmatched energy and intelligence giving momentum to our industry, it is a marvel that the country is environed with such a multitude of troubles and perplexities.

Mr. President, we must retrace our steps and reform our measures. The insane idea of constructing a barrier all around our land to prevent intercourse with foreign powers must cease. The figment of the brain called home market and home consumption must be supplanted by the common sense of selling at the highest price and buying at the lowest. When you open our market to the world and put American labor on its mettle we will soon see that we will hold our own against all comers, and give the world many times again, as we have many times in the past, some valuable lessons in industrial science. A steady and equable income of fair profits to our mines and factories will keep the great masses of our laboring people quiet and hopeful, and give such returns to capital as shall be remunerative and at the same time free from all invidious quality.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair must remind the Senator from Georgia that the time has arrived at which it was agreed that the vote should be taken.

Mr. HARRIS. I rise to ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that the Senator from Georgia may be permitted to proceed to the conclusion of his remarks, and to ask in addition—knowing as I do that there are at least two Senators who desire briefly to be heard, I not being one of them, however, upon this question—hence I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that the general debate upon the bill may continue till 2 or 3 o'clock to-morrow, after which the Senator from Kansas shall have from 3 to 4 within which to conclude the debate upon the bill, when we shall come to a vote upon the amendments and the bill.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the debate will be concluded to-night. ["Oh, no!"] I think we ought to get to a conclusion, if we are going to do any business besides pass appropriation bills.

Mr. DAWES. I hope the Senator from Illinois will not object to the arrangement proposed.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Illinois will allow me to suggest to him that it will be some time after 5 when the Senator from Georgia concludes his remarks, and the Senator from Kansas is to close the debate.

Mr. COLQUITT. I shall not occupy over ten minutes longer.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Kansas in charge of the bill [Mr. PLUMB] should certainly have some time, after these days of discussion, within which to conclude the debate, and I should regret for one to have him forced to begin the conclusion of the debate at 5 or half past 5 o'clock in the evening.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no disposition to take any course that will result in depriving the Senator from Kansas of the power of controlling the debate. I understood from the Senator that he did not expect to make any further remarks; and that being the case, it seems to me that we ought to conclude this bill to-night. I, of course, do not wish to oppose the desire of the Senator in the premises; but there are other measures which have been waiting on this bill many days, when the discussion upon it was not expected to take more than one or two days, and I am very anxious that this bill should be concluded.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will submit the proposition of the Senator from Tennessee to the Senate.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not understand that the Senator from Illinois objects.

Mr. CULLOM. I will only say that if the Senate by a unanimous consent will allow the bill which was laid aside for the purpose of considering this bill to be taken up and considered from day to day immediately after the morning business until it is concluded, I will not make any objection now; but the experience we have had in reference to the consideration of general legislation here, considering it an hour or two to-day and then going on with something else, is throwing away time; and I should like for one to get at a bill that has something in it and stick to it until we get through.

Mr. HARRIS. I have no objection to the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois, with this qualification: The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. PIKE], whose health compels him to leave the city within a very few days, desires to occupy the attention of the Senate during the morning hour to-morrow after the routine business with the bills of the Committee on Claims. After to-morrow I have no objection whatever to the course proposed by the Senator from Illinois; but the Senator from New Hampshire being absent, and he having notified me of his object, it is proper that I should make the suggestion to the Senator from Illinois in connection with what he has stated.

Mr. CULLOM. Do I understand, then, that the proposition is to finish this bill to-morrow, and allow the Senator from New Hampshire to have the morning hour besides in which to get rid of his measures? I shall be very glad if we can do both.

Mr. HARRIS. I have no doubt we can.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will submit the proposition to the Senate. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] asks unanimous consent of the Senate that this bill be taken up at 2 o'clock to-morrow as the unfinished business and be continued until 3, when the general debate shall terminate and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] shall have the opportunity to close it within the next hour, and that then the vote shall be taken without further debate.

Several SENATORS. At 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. At 4 o'clock.

Mr. HOAR. On the whole bill?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. In connection with that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] asks unanimous consent of the Senate that after that what is called the interstate-commerce bill shall be taken up and be continued.

Mr. CULLOM. Immediately after the morning business on the following day.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to this proposition? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Georgia will proceed.

Mr. COLQUITT. Mr. President—

Mr. HOAR. I wish to inquire for information whether the unanimous consent thus agreed to covers the whole Post-Office appropriation bill, or merely the pending provision?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understood the whole debate on the Post-Office appropriation bill to be included, as this is the last amendment. The whole debate is to close at 4 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. COLQUITT. But, Mr. President, I distrust the reception which the majority of this body will give my prescription for our troubles. I rather incline to the belief that they will go on piling up a superfluous production of home manufacture and then making the vain attempt to force this vast mass down the throats of our home consumers. We have offered us, however, a nostrum in this subsidy of \$800,000. By this it is expected to accomplish the work of relief. The amount of trade which this subsidy is expected to create must be of very modest proportions. Eight hundred thousand dollars, it is true, should pay for a great deal of postage, and would if in the run of the luck of the experiment the postage should offer. We have heard of the Battle of the Books, but here to-day we are inaugurating the battle of the letters. England, so Senators allege, has secured almost a monopoly of South American trade because of her prodigal expenditure in subsidizing her mail ships.

We are advised to make this appropriation because the leading powers in Europe have expended great sums in fostering a splendid mail service

with the States whose trade it is so desirable to secure. It seems to be in the opinion of Senators a question of expenditure, a sharp contest in which the potency of subsidy is invoked. The more lavish the appropriations the greater the trade, seems to be about the proper statement of the case. What, sir, is to be the inevitable result of the policy which this sort of legislation is to fasten on us? This seemingly harmless sum of \$800,000 is to be the excuse and precedent for the granting of numberless millions. If it is true, as has been claimed, that because of England's great expenditure, because France and Germany have spared no expense for mail ships, that therefore they have superseded us in the markets we are so anxious to secure, what is the task we have set for ourselves in this mighty rivalry?

If money is to champion our ambition in this race, what a field are we contesting. England, Germany, and France, stimulated by rivalry and jealousy, would go on increasing their subsidies furnished out of resources almost fabulous. If we attempted to overmatch the outlay of these great powers their obvious resort would be to larger and still larger subsidies, and in this desperate conflict of interest and ambition unimagined millions would be lavished upon an enterprise which at last is one of individual concern and by which, let matters go as they might for our Government, capitalists and corporations would be enriched. If we begin this conflict, national pride may take us a long way beyond the bounds of prudence and the dictates of sterling business sense, and we shall find at last, after the loss of immense treasure, that we began wrong; that our diagnosis of our ailment was all at fault, and the last state of the patient was worse than the first.

But, sir, are we sure of the precedent so confidently relied on by Senators in their advocacy of the example of England? The principle and policy involved in her pursuit of commercial advantage by the means proposed in the amendment before us have been powerfully combated by some of England's ablest authorities. I will ask the Senate to hear the opinion of one of these in an address to the president of the board of trade:

It is not conceivable that the board of trade can be accessory to the proceedings of the post-office, admiralty, and treasury in regard to this monstrous modern parasitical system of ocean steam contracts, under shelter of which the regions of the seas are being successively parceled out and handed over to the scepters of intriguing companies. This system of endowing squadrons of mercantile steamers with enormous bounties or subsidies, under the *dodge of conveying mails*, vests in the steamers so endowed a virtual monopoly of the conveyance of all goods and passengers requiring dispatch to destinations within the circle of their operations; and while these subsidized steamers obtain exorbitant rates of freight for the limited quantity of goods and passengers which they carry. The public not only have to submit to their extortionate freights, but even at those high rates are deprived of adequate accommodation, because independent ship-owners are deterred in the face of the endowed monopoly from boldly entering the field and providing expanded means of transit. In short, these monopolies, supported by public bounties, are at variance with all sound commercial principles. It is the custom, whenever anything of this kind is mentioned as having an injurious effect on any branch of British industry, to treat such complaints with contempt and to invoke for consolation the cuckoo song of "British enterprise," "British science," "British genius," "British energy." That British enterprise, science, genius, and energy are indeed giants I entirely admit; and with a fair field and no favor, such as they enjoy in other branches of industry, and such as I hope you will obtain for them on the ocean, they are prepared to develop results in ocean steaming, both in quantity and quality, so much in advance of what the bulk of the public have a conception of as would be astounding; but it is possible for even giants to be made powerless if they whose duty it is to protect them permit them to be circumvented. I implore you, as president of the board of trade, to interpose and to insist that no subterfuge about the conveyance of letters shall any longer be permitted to deprive the community of the benefits which the art of steam navigation in its advancing state is, if unfettered, prepared to bestow.

I am aware that there is an impression somewhat prevalent that the modern contract system of ocean steamers is necessary toward keeping up existing communications, and also that the public are indebted to the system for the creation of the communication.

This I contend is an entire mistake, but vigorous private enterprise has been *hors de combat* for some time past, owing to the heavy blow and great discouragement which the wanton introduction of the contract system inflicted upon it. Although in unendowed services there have been immense improvements in steam navigation of late years, those transatlantic companies which have the chancellor of the exchequer at their back have scorned the adoption of any of them.

Mr. President, if objections which have already been adduced in the progress of this debate to this amendment needed support it would seem that they are powerfully re-enforced by this impressive statement.

In concluding what I have to say upon the question before us I would remark that it may prove fortunate that in this unexpected way admissions have been made of the business condition of this Union which call so loudly for grave consideration. The discussion of these admitted facts has come up collaterally, and yet our consideration of them was natural, and we might say inevitable. The reasons given by Senators for the subsidy asked for by implication at least supposed a state of things as regards our external trade which is lamentable indeed, and is to my mind the necessary outgrowth of our revenue system. It is useless for us to attempt by such expedients as the one we are now considering to redress the blunders we are committing by that system. These are only palliatives, if they may be called such, and can effect no radical or permanent redress of our troubles. There is but one way that mortals have ever yet thought of by which a living can be made. Work and economy is that way. Governments are not exempt from the inexorable decree any more than individuals. One thing is sure, and after a while the friends of subsidy and taxation will learn it perhaps, and that lesson is, that no people ever yet got rich and laid the

foundations of a solid prosperity by robbing one another. Another lesson, too, will follow, and that is, that sixty million of people have just so much capacity of consumption, and all the home markets that the protectionist can give them can not enlarge that capacity. Localizing trade, shifting purchasers from one point to another in our country do not increase the capacity to consume or the capacity to purchase. Independence and domestic comfort come to all, not born with the gold spoon in their mouths; by drops of sweat and many of them. Subsidy, partiality, and unjust shifting of burdens do not enrich men. They may enervate and debauch the true spirit of manhood, but they never yet achieved any solid or lasting good. Resist it as we may, the impregnable Democratic doctrine of a tariff for revenue, an honest and economical administration of the Government, and a fair chance, and that only, for every bread-winner in the land, will triumph at last, and assert itself as the only true "American system."

These considerations are conclusive with me, and I think they should be especially persuasive with the members of this body on this side of the House who have been placed in power upon platforms, speeches, and declarations at the polls of what they meant to procure by a Democratic administration, the object being retrenchment and reform.

Mr. BECK. Mr. President—

Mr. MORGAN. I ask the Senator from Kentucky to, allow me to offer formally an amendment that I suggested to-day and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama will be printed if there be no objection.

Mr. BECK. Mr. President, having occupied so much time heretofore, I do not propose to debate this question any further; but a statement was made by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] on Friday last that I am advised is incorrect, and I desire, if the Senate will allow me, to endeavor to correct it. The Senator said:

But there are two sides to that question. It is a grave question whether even at present, with the small facilities we have with certain American states, the mails could not be better carried in our ships than in what are called the "English tramps." I have just had an instance presented to me giving an account of one of these experiments of the Postmaster-General, as taken from an English paper published in Rio Janeiro. This is the story of a course pursued by the Postmaster-General in putting our mail into foreign vessels instead of taking our own lines or encouraging them. It seems that the Post-Office Department intrusted an English ship about departing for Rio Janeiro with fifty-two bags of mail which were put on board the English ship and refused to the American line. The English shipmaster had no responsibility to this Government after he had taken the mails, and when he reached Pernambuco, hundreds and hundreds of miles inside of his destination and of the destination of those fifty-two mail bags, he was able to sell his cargo there. Forthwith he dumped the United States mails on to the wharf at Pernambuco, filled up his ship with what freight he could get and sailed away for England, leaving the United States mail there upon the wharf.

What happened further? In a few days along came a ship of the American line which was sought to be encouraged and stimulated and helped by the act of last year, which Mr. Vilas disregarded, and although there was no obligation whatever, still with that feeling of loyalty and patriotism which the Senator from Kentucky says has nothing to do with this question, the captain of that steamship took the mail voluntarily on his ship and made his way to the port of Rio Janeiro, his destination as well as the destination of this large mail which the Post-Office Department had intrusted to the English tramp ship; and when he got there, actually because the mail was behind not only did he receive nothing from this Government, but he was fined by the Brazilian Government because the mails were late. When he undertook to expostulate and show the situation the Brazilian officials refused to believe that the American Government had adopted any such policy or had committed its mails to an outside ship in that way, when there was an American line running to the very port.

I thought that a very remarkable statement, and I inquired into it with some care this morning. The statement I have is from a very well-informed officer in the Post-Office Department, as follows:

The mail referred to by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] was conveyed by the Red Cross line of mail steamers, making regular trips from New York to Pernambuco. That line has been employed regularly by the Post-Office Department for the past ten years.

I have the advertisement of the Postmaster-General giving the list of steamers that he used. The Red Cross line from Para and Pernambuco, with mails for Brazil and for the Argentine Republic, Uruguay, and Paraguay, by way of Brazil, is one of the regular lines that has been used for ten years past and is being used now. The statement proceeds:

And the mails destined for Rio Janeiro have been sent regularly by this line to Pernambuco to connect with Brazilian steamers from there to the port of destination. The Red Cross and United States Brazilian line of steamers sail about fifteen days apart.

If the Senator from Maine had been informed as to the international Postal Union treaty, he would know that a steamer can not dump the mail on the wharf anywhere, but that the mail must be delivered to the office of exchange to which the mail is addressed. When foreign mails are exchanged between countries of the Postal Union, Brazil being one of them, they are delivered at an office of exchange of the country of destination. It becomes domestic mail of that country, and the country of origin is relieved of all control of it whatever. The Post-Office Department never has refused to give the mail to an American line.

In the international postal treaties made at Paris, Lisbon, and Berne, Brazil undertook whenever mail was delivered at any of her ports from any of the countries of the Postal Union to see to it that that mail was properly forwarded. Therefore it is safe to say that the information received by the Senator from Maine from the English papers or any other papers published in Rio de Janeiro in regard to the action taken by our Post-Office Department was as misleading as many of the other things that we find in the newspapers published nearer home.

Mr. HALE. Is the Senator through with that part of his remarks?

Mr. BECK. I am through with that part.

Mr. HALE. I wish to repeat here what I said the other day—

Mr. BECK. I desire to say to the Senator from Maine, if he will allow me, that before I yield the floor I wish to say something on another point.

Mr. HALE. I only asked the Senator if he was through with that part.

Mr. BECK. I am.

Mr. HALE. I said the other day in giving this remarkable story:

This is the story of the course pursued by the Postmaster-General in putting our mail into foreign vessels instead of taking our own lines or encouraging them.

And I said it was "taken from an English paper published in Rio de Janeiro." I was careful to give my authority. The account which is repeated in the correspondence of one of the New York papers is taken from the Daily News, an English paper published in Rio de Janeiro.

I have listened carefully to what the Senator from Kentucky has just said and what he has read in the communication made up at the Post-Office Department. Whether or not all that he has said and all that he has read may not be compatible with the fact that they are referring there to another incident I do not know. I do know, however, that the Postmaster-General intrusts American mails to foreign ships. That he does not deny, and all that is stated in this English newspaper, whether it be true or not, may be true, and the general assertions made by the Senator from Kentucky, or quoted or read by him, may also be true. I gave my authority the other day; it is copied in detail into one of the great New York papers, and that was my responsibility.

Mr. BECK. I did not rise to find fault with the Senator from Maine for making the statement, but to assure the Senator that this was a regular mail vessel, and it was not a tramp, that purported to go to Rio; it was a regular line of vessels used for the purpose of transporting the mail as a proper means of conveyance, going to Pernambuco, and there taken up by Brazil under treaty, and had been so used for ten years. Pernambuco was the regular port of landing where these ships delivered their mails in accordance with the postal-union treaty, of which Brazil was a part, she being a country that had her own steamers to take the mails up and carry them; and if any fault was to be found it was not to be found with the Government of the United States in its action with regard to the forwarding of the mails. It was impossible that Brazil could find fault with any action taken by the American Government in sending the mail to Pernambuco, where it was said to have been dumped on the wharf; that anything was done out of the regular order, for it was done in an effort to have the mail delivered in the promptest way possible. That I know to be true from careful examination. I saw the gentleman in the Department who knows more about it than anybody else, without, of course, including the Postmaster-General.

I have only one word or two more to say, and I am done with this debate. Reference has been made by several Senators, especially the Senator from New York [Mr. MILLER], to what I said in relation to the tariff and free-ship questions. I was complained of for going into these questions somewhat extensively the other day. I believe the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Kansas were quite as much to blame as I was for the length of my remarks.

All I desire to say now in answer to much that has been said by the Senator from New York and others is that I am opposed to protection for protection's sake, to subsidy for subsidy's sake, and to make any class of men pay anything to enrich another class, or to be taxed, except to furnish revenue to the Government, and then only to the extent that each citizen ought to be legitimately called on to furnish his part of the needed revenue. I deny the right of this Government to say to the man who ships his wheat from Dakota to Liverpool, and has to take as his portion of the foreign price only what remains after deducting all the charges of transportation from his home to the port where he is obliged to sell it, that he shall be taxed, except for the purposes of revenue, by not being allowed to buy what he needs with the money that he receives for the produce that he has raised.

When the Government of the United States undertakes to protect any class of men and to deny to any other class the right to buy what they want in the country where they have been obliged to sell in competition with the so-called paupers of the world in the foreign markets, to which they are compelled to go, and then say that they shall not buy what they need there because the Government proposes to protect other people in America, it is unjust to and discriminating against its own people. I insist that it is the duty of the Government of the United States to see to it that the money it collects shall be only what is required for its own purposes, and shall not be taken from one class to enrich another. In other words, if the man from Dakota sells wheat that he only realizes 60 cents a bushel for when sold in Liverpool, and receives a thousand dollars for it, and is offered for that thousand dollars clothes and blankets needed for himself and his family, things that he must have to keep his family warm in that rigorous climate, I insist that the men in New England shall not be allowed to compel him to pay \$2,000 for these things here; yet the Government of the

United States in order to enrich home manufacturers says to the exporter, "You shall not buy with the thousand dollars you get for your wheat what you are offered in the market where you are obliged to sell, but you shall bring your money home and you shall pay \$2,000 for those same things to New England or Pennsylvania manufacturers." I insist that is unjust, if revenue is not the object; and I insist that it is the duty of the United States, if it undertakes to interfere with the trade of its private citizens and to compel those who sell abroad to enrich New England or Pennsylvania manufacturers by our laws, to see to it that the people the Government professes to protect are protected; if we make ourselves the trustees we ought to carry out the trust to its legitimate consequence. Instead of that, under our present laws we deny the right to a man who sells his wheat in the cheapest market and in competition with the so-called paupers of the world to buy for a thousand dollars what is offered to him, and require him to pay \$2,000 for them in Pennsylvania or New England, and it all goes to men who have very likely bought machinery in England or Germany or France, men who send to Canada or to Italy or to Hungary or the other markets of the world and hire the cheapest labor they can get.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. BECK. Not now. I want to finish this statement. The Government gives that money to the men who buy foreign machinery; who hire the cheapest people, who import them from Hungary, Italy, Canada, anywhere. Men who come here with their cheap clothes on their backs, many of whom go to Canada as soon as they make money enough to go home. About three-fourths, as I think the records will show, of the operatives in factories in parts of New England, and especially in Rhode Island and Massachusetts, are Canadians and foreigners. I insist that the Government should not take the money from the men of the West and give it to these people. If we are going to make ourselves a trustee to dispense bounty or subsidy that has been thus procured from the men who sell their produce abroad, I insist we should go a step farther and say, "We will see to it that the manufacturers do not pocket all the bounty they receive. Their machines need no protection; they are slaves; they neither drink nor eat nor wear." The demand for protection admits that they do not intend to sell abroad; they intend only to sell to our own people and to those people who are compelled by our laws to buy from them, and that we by law compel to pay any price they see fit to ask them upon the ground that we are protecting American labor, whereas the laborers are, in a majority of cases, in protected factories, not Americans.

There is no protection to the American laborer. Any pauper can be brought here to compete with him; and when the manufacturers have made goods enough to supply the consumption for a year in six months, as they can, they close the factories, wait for higher prices, allow their laborers and their families to starve, and give them no protection at all. Carry the principle of bounty or subsidy or protection out. Let the Government be the trustee to divide up the subsidy that we demand by law for these people, and let us see to it that the laborer gets his share of the benefit. Let the Government send its officers into those great establishments and divide that money, thus extorted from others to protect manufacturers, between the laborer and the man who puts in his capital to buy machines on terms of equality; then there would be some show of fairness in the pretext that we are imposing taxes to protect American labor.

When the factory is closed waiting for higher prices, and the higher prices come when scarcity follows, does the laborer get a dollar? No; the manufacturer who owns the machinery gets it all, and the market is reduced by closed doors until he can get what he wants. The laborer who produced it, and his family, and for whose benefit all the pretense is made that this is done, are by their necessities driven away from the establishments to hunt up a living wherever they can make it.

A small part of the tax reaches the Treasury. Of course no man will buy an article that is imported unless it is cheaper than the man who makes the same article here is willing to sell his for. I repeat, no man here will buy the imported article, unless that article, after the 46 per cent. is paid and all the transportation is paid, is cheaper than the same article is offered him by the home manufacturer. Of course not. That proves that the home price is at least 46 per cent. above what he could buy it for abroad. None would be sold if that was not so.

Our people understand business. They buy the best article they can obtain for the least price. They do not care where it comes from, but every article made here must be sold here; and that is the meaning of protection, and that is all these gentlemen claim—to have a market for themselves, to make everything here and exclude everything else—sell it up to the highest point possible; and they have to sell it higher than the foreign price with the tariff and the transportation added, for nobody would buy the imported article unless it was cheaper than the article made at home. And yet, as I said the other day, only seven human beings are employed now where seventy were employed twenty years ago in our factories; the machine-owner is the only protected man; he is the lobbyist; he is the man who clamors around Congress; he is the man who pretends that he is paying his laborers higher wages, while he drives them into enforced idleness, and they are driven out, on the average, six months in the year while his factories are closed and his machines are greased, standing idle, waiting for the good days to bring

a higher price, and the laborer gets no part of the benefit of that increase.

If it is intended to protect the laboring man, the man who really produces the article, the man whose labor brought it into existence by the use of the machinery that the manufacturer has, the Government of the United States ought to see to it that in the distribution of the bounty which by law she has required every consumer of this country to contribute to these articles the laborer gets his share. That sort of division no manufacturer, no advocate of protection wants or would submit to. He will pretend that he is anxious to aid labor, yet he will hire the Chinaman, the Hungarian, the Italian, the Canadian, anybody who will work 5 cents cheaper than the American, and drive him from his factory, close the door, and give him not a dollar more than he can hire anybody else for.

The demand of the protectionist is for protection to machinery, and at the same time free competition between all foreign and American labor in driving that machinery, and all the profit goes to the machine-owner, and all the want and all the starvation and all the trouble fall upon the man who performs the labor and who really gets no benefit from it, because these gentlemen refuse to compete with the world or with any other country outside under the plea that they are protecting American labor.

The laborers of this country are beginning to understand it and there will be before long in the great country west of the Mississippi River, and that producing people will thoroughly understand the false pretenses and the hypocrisy under which the Government of the United States is subsidizing a few men to make them millionaires and driving the great mass of the laborers into absolute poverty by contracting markets, curtailing manufactures, narrowing the field of labor and consumption, and making this whole people pay double what any other people pay for what they use, thus making their wages go only half as far as anybody else's wages, and forcing them to lie idle half the year, while the value of the products of the manufacturer is being doubled while their factories are closed, and all this by prohibitory laws called "protection to American industry." These are some of the reasons why I oppose the much-lauded system of protection. It protects the few who do not need it at the expense of the many whose interests the Government should guard.

Mr. HAWLEY rose.

Mr. PLUMB. I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment to the bill to have it printed. On behalf of the Committee on Appropriations I offer an amendment to the pending amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The proposed amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. HAWLEY. But a moment. I want to put in one little peg here after the most extraordinary remarks, and I venture to say ludicrous and monstrous perversions, of the Senator from Kentucky.

I understood him to say that three-fourths of the operatives of New England were imported Canadians who made some money and went back again to Canada. Again he used the fraction of nine-tenths, speaking in the same connection. I do not know what he means or where he got his figures—"figures of speech," the Senator from Vermont says. He proceeded to demand with a great deal of vehemence that the manufacturers, the capitalists of New England, should be compelled to divide their enormous profits with the operatives, intimating that they were poor people who come to our territory, there make a little money, and go away again, and that all our laboring population is oppressed.

I have but one single statistical statement to put in there and then I end, though there is great temptation to go in. In the down-trodden and oppressed State of Connecticut, that I have the honor in part to represent, there are about 640,000 people. These down-trodden and penniless people, ground into the dirt, have \$92,000,000 in the savings banks, put in by 222,000 people.

Mr. CAMERON. I move—

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania allow me to make one addition to the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. CAMERON. Can I have the floor immediately afterwards? I want an executive session. I make that motion.

Mr. HOAR. Will not the Senator allow me to make a statement?

Mr. CONGER. Pending that motion, I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. HOAR. Have I the floor or not?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Pennsylvania moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HOAR. I understood the Senator from Pennsylvania to yield to me.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair did not so understand.

Mr. CAMERON. I will yield.

Mr. HOAR. I merely wish to state, to supplement the statement of the Senator from Connecticut, that the operatives in Massachusetts, dwelling in Massachusetts, have \$270,000,000 in their savings banks, and more than 70 per cent. of that is the savings of the wage-earners in the factories; and the statements of the Senator from Kentucky are as ridiculous as can be described in parliamentary language, so far as they are applicable to them.

Mr. President, the manufacturers of the East as a rule are wage-earners who have learned their business from the bottom and who have risen to the position of masters and owners and directors of business establishments because they understand by actual experience every process. They understand the economies, the savings, the inventions which lie at the foundation of their business; and this attempt to raise a sectional cry by attacking one section of the country and by threatening that the West is to be aroused into an attack upon the East is, in my opinion, as unworthy of the Senate of the United States as it is of sound statesmanship.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had concurred in the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5543) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the year ending June 30, 1887, and for other purposes.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 30th of April approved and signed the act (S. 2239) extending the time for the completion of the records of the clerk of the Court of Commissioners of Alabama Claims and the transfer of the same to the Department of State.

The message also announced that the President had on the 1st of May approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

An act (S. 221) for the relief of Alexander Smiley;
An act (S. 2224) in aid of the national monument at Plymouth, Mass.;
An act (S. 1805) for the relief of Miss Rosa Wallace;
An act (S. 82) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1880;

An act (S. 481) authorizing the partition of certain land in Louisville, Ky., belonging jointly to John Echols and the Government of the United States;

An act (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.; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 10) to amend the statute in relation to the immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes, approved June 10, 1880, so that the provisions of the same shall be extended to the port of Key West, Fla., and the provisions of the seventh section of the statute be extended to the port of Tampa, Fla.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills from the House of Representatives were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Territories:

A bill (H. R. 2812) to approve an act of the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of Arizona entitled "An act to establish, maintain, and provide for the government of an insane asylum," approved March 9, 1885;

A bill (H. R. 3760) to enlarge the jurisdiction of the probate courts in Wyoming Territory;

A bill (H. R. 5179) to prohibit the passage of local or special laws in the Territories of the United States;

A 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;

A bill (H. R. 5888) to legalize and validate the general laws of the Territory of Dakota for the incorporation of insurance companies, and for other purposes, and to authorize and empower the Legislative Assembly of said Territory to pass such general laws;

A bill (H. R. 6965) to authorize Columbia County, in Washington Territory, to issue bonds for the construction of a court-house; and

A bill (H. R. 6966) to change the time of the meeting of the Legislative Assembly of Washington Territory.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

Mr. BECK. I desire only to say, if I may be allowed—

Mr. CONGER. I made a motion to adjourn when I had the floor. The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CAMERON. I do not. I insist on my motion.

Mr. BECK. All right. I shall answer the Senator from Massachusetts to-morrow.

Mr. CONGER. I move that the Senate do now adjourn; and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER (when Mr. HAMPTON'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. HAMPTON] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MAHONE]. My colleague is called away from the city by illness in his family.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. MANDERSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN].

Mr. VANCE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. PALMER].

The roll-call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 5, nays 35; as follows:

YEAS—5.			
Dawes, McMillan,	Mitchell of Oreg.,	Sherman,	Wilson of Iowa.
NAYS—35.			
Allison, Beck, Berry, Brown, Butler, Call, Cameron, Cockrell, Coke,	Conger, Cullom, Edmunds, Eustis, Gorman, Hale, Harris, Hawley, Hoar,	Ingalls, Logan, McPherson, Maxey, Miller, Morgan, Payne, Plumb, Pugh,	Ransom, Sawyer, Spooner, Teller, Vest, Walthall, Whitthorne, Wilson of Md.
ABSENT—36.			
Aldrich, Blackburn, Blair, Bowen, Camden, Chace, Colquitt, Dolph, Evarts,	Fair, Frye, George, Gibson, Gray, Hampton, Harrison, Hearst, Jones of Arkansas, Pike,	Jones of Florida, Jones of Nevada, Kenna, Mahone, Manderson, Mitchell of Pa., Morrill, Palmer, Pike,	Platt, Riddleberger, Sabin, Saulsbury, Stanford, Vance, Van Wyck, Voorhees.

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fourteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 4, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate the 3d day of May, 1886.

POSTMASTERS.

James S. Vedder, to be postmaster at Washington, Washington County, Kansas, *vice* Justus B. Besack, resigned.

Frank Brown, to be postmaster at Baltimore, Baltimore County, Maryland, *vice* I. Parker Veazey, resigned.

Anthony L. Underhill, to be postmaster at Bath, Steuben County, New York, *vice* De Witt C. Alden, commission expired.

Joseph C. Hendrix, to be postmaster at Brooklyn, Kings County, New York, *vice* James McLeer, commission expired.

J. A. C. McCum, to be postmaster at Shippensburg, Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, *vice* John Gish, commission expired.

William Lavies, to be postmaster at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara County, California, *vice* Peter J. Barber, whose commission expires May 8, 1886.

John Seeman, to be postmaster at Denison, Crawford County, Iowa, *vice* J. Fred. Meyers, commission expired.

J. H. Beidler, to be postmaster at Mount Pulaski, Logan County, Illinois, *vice* John W. Seyfer, whose commission expires May 16, 1886.

Joseph Hopkins, to be postmaster at Glen Allen, Henrico County, Virginia, whose commission expired May 1, 1886.

Promotion in the revenue-marine service.

First Lieut. Morton L. Phillips, to be a captain in the revenue-marine service of the United States, *vice* Slicer, deceased.

Second Lieut. Wm. S. Baldwin, to be a first lieutenant in the revenue-marine service of the United States, *vice* Phillips, promoted.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 28, 1886.

DEPUTY FIRST AUDITOR.

Ernest P. Baldwin, of Missouri, to be deputy first auditor of the Treasury.

MINISTER RESIDENT.

Bayless W. Hanna, of Crawfordsville, Ind., to be minister resident and consul-general of the United States to the Argentine Republic.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

H. Clay Armstrong, of Auburn, Ala., to be consul-general of the United States at Rio de Janeiro.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL.

John C. Thompson, of Harrodsburg, Ky., to be surveyor-general of Wyoming.

SPECIAL EXAMINER OF DRUGS.

Andrew H. Ward, of Massachusetts, to be special examiner of drugs,

medicines, and chemicals, in the district of Boston and Charlestown, in the State of Massachusetts.

ASSISTANT APPRAISERS OF MERCHANDISE.

Russell D. Woodman, of Maine, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of Portland and Falmouth, in the State of Maine.

James F. Griffen, of Louisiana, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana.

Oscar Valetton, of Louisiana, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Bion Bradbury, of Maine, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Portland, in the State of Maine.

NAVAL OFFICER.

Henry O. Kent, of New Hampshire, to be naval officer of customs in the district of Boston and Charlestown, in the State of Massachusetts.

PENSION AGENT.

Gilbert H. Barger, of Coshocton, Ohio, to be pension agent at Columbus, Ohio.

CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES.

James U. Childs, of Farmington, Me., to be consul of the United States at Guelph, Canada.

Theodore W. Downs, of Bridgeport, Conn., to be consul of the United States at Quebec.

Albert N. Hatheway, of Hartford, Conn., to be consul of the United States at Nice.

Darius H. Ingraham, of Portland, Me., to be consul of the United States at Cadiz.

Gustavus Lucke, of Walpole, N. H., to be consul of the United States at Sherbrooke, Canada.

Francis A. Underwood, of Boston, Mass., to be consul of the United States at Glasgow.

MARSHALS OF THE UNITED STATES.

James M. Liddell, of Mississippi, to be marshal of the United States for the northern district of Mississippi.

William L. Cabell, of Texas, to be marshal of the United States for the northern district of Texas.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Job H. Lippencott, of New Jersey, to be attorney of the United States for the district of New Jersey.

John D. Burnett, of Alabama, to be attorney of the United States for the southern district of Alabama.

Ernest Pillow, of Tennessee, to be attorney of the United States for the middle district of Tennessee.

Henry C. Allen, of Virginia, to be attorney of the United States for the western district of Virginia.

Charles B. Howry, of Mississippi, to be attorney of the United States for the northern district of Mississippi.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Richard F. Dodge, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Salem and Beverly, in the State of Massachusetts.

Charles H. Call, of Michigan, to be collector of customs for the district of Superior, in the State of Michigan.

Samuel J. Anderson, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Portland and Falmouth, in the State of Maine.

Erastus Redman, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Frenchman's Bay, in the State of Maine.

Leveritt Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Boston and Charlestown, in the State of Massachusetts.

John McWilliams, of Rhode Island, to be collector of customs for the district of Providence, in the State of Rhode Island.

Charles F. Bailey, of Texas, to be collector of customs for the district of Corpus Christi, in the State of Texas.

Dudley O. Watson, of Michigan, to be collector of customs for the district of Michigan, in the State of Michigan.

Joseph J. Cocks, of Texas, to be collector of customs for the district of Brazos de Santiago, in the State of Texas.

Joseph Magoffin, of Texas, to be collector of customs for the district of Paso del Norte, in the State of Texas.

Charles A. Spofford, to be collector of customs for the district of Cas-tine, in the State of Maine.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

John S. McFarland, of Chicago, Ill., to be register of the land office at Huron, Dak.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

John Montgomery of Blackfoot, Idaho, to be receiver of public moneys at Oxford, Idaho.

Wallace McLaurin of Brandon, Miss., to be receiver of public moneys at Jackson, Miss.

William T. Shaffer of Wyoming, to be receiver of public moneys at Evanston, Wyo.

Samuel J. Lurah, of Colorado, to be receiver of public moneys at Central City, Colo.

POSTMASTERS.

Samuel De Wolf, to be postmaster at Rochester, in the county of Olmstead and State of Minnesota.

John Crull to be postmaster at Marietta, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania.

C. A. Hartmann, to be postmaster at Collinsville, in the county of Madison and State of Illinois.

Andrew J. Reddick, to be postmaster at La Salle, in the county of La Salle and State of Illinois.

E. E. Waggoner, to be postmaster at Shelbyville, in the county of Shelby and State of Illinois.

Ward Gregory, to be postmaster at Ithaca, in the county of Tompkins and State of New York.

L. R. Erdice, to be postmaster at Brookville, in the county of Jefferson and State of Pennsylvania.

James G. Hasson, to be postmaster at Ebensburg, in the county of Cambria and State of Pennsylvania.

Elijah A. Parsons, to be postmaster at Towanda, in the county of Bradford and State of Pennsylvania.

Henry E. Slaymaker, to be postmaster at Lancaster, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania.

John Swan, to be postmaster at Allegheny, in the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania.

Edward C. Brownell, to be postmaster at Moodus, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut.

William W. Rankin, to be postmaster at Lock Haven, in the county of Clinton and State of Pennsylvania.

Thomas Hill, to be postmaster at Haddonfield, in the county of Camden and State of New Jersey.

M. Boland, to be postmaster at Auburn, in the county of De Kalb and State of Indiana.

O. S. Dale, to be postmaster at Monticello, in the county of White and State of Indiana.

James E. Kackley, to be postmaster at Vincennes, in the county of Knox and State of Indiana.

H. G. Ashmead, to be postmaster at Chester, in the county of Delaware and State of Pennsylvania.

J. K. Bogert, to be postmaster at Wilkes Barre, in the county of Luzerne and State of Pennsylvania.

G. A. Clark, to be postmaster at Bloomsburgh, in the county of Columbia and State of Pennsylvania.

Frank Harvey, to be postmaster at Renovo, in the county of Clinton and State of Pennsylvania.

Robert Y. Watson, to be postmaster at Milford, in the county of Kent and State of Delaware.

Edward Dolan, to be postmaster at Troy, Rensselaer County, New York.

George W. Langdon, to be postmaster at Saratoga Springs, Saratoga County, New York.

Philip B. Spence, to be postmaster at Newport, Ky.

Jacob P. Kerlin, to be postmaster at Warren, Ill.

Thomas N. Youngblood, to be postmaster at Chester Court House, Chester County, South Carolina.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Edmund W. Booker, of Alabama, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Alabama.

Isban Hess, of New York, to be collector of internal revenue for the fourteenth district of New York.

The above confirmation was accompanied by the following report from the Committee on Finance; which was ordered by the Senate to be printed in the RECORD:

The Committee on Finance have had under consideration the nomination (No. 861) of Isban Hess, of New York, to be collector of internal revenue for the fourteenth district of New York, in place of James W. Bentley, suspended, and, so far as they have been able to obtain information, they find that Mr. Hess is a fit and proper person to discharge the duties of the office, and that there are no charges or papers on file reflecting upon the character of Mr. Bentley, suspended, as will appear from the following letter of the Secretary of the Treasury:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, March 17, 1886.

SIR: Your communication on behalf of the Finance Committee of the Senate, dated March 16, 1886, asking whether or not "there are any charges on file against the official or moral character of James W. Bentley, late collector of internal revenue for the fourteenth district of New York, suspended," is received.

In reply thereto I have the honor to state that, so far as this inquiry relates to a suspension from office, I feel bound by the rules laid down in the President's recent message to the Senate upon the general subject of such suspensions.

By in order that I may surely act within the requirements of the statute relating to the furnishing by this Department of information to the Senate, I beg leave to remind the committee that the office referred to has no fixed term attached to it, and to further state that the President is satisfied that a change in the incumbency of said office will result in an improvement of the public service, and that the policy of the present administration will be better carried out by such change.

Except as the same may be involved in these considerations, no papers con-

taining charges reflecting upon the official or moral character of the suspended officer mentioned in your communication are in the custody of this Department.
Respectfully yours,

Hon. JUSTIN S. MORRILL,
Chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance.

D. MANNING, Secretary.

A resolution, as follows, was unanimously adopted by the Committee on Finance, April 6, 1886, in relation to this and all similar letters to the foregoing:
"Resolved, That the letters of the Secretary of the Treasury to the Committee on Finance, dated March 16, 1886, or subsequently, in relation to the suspension of collectors of internal revenue, should be received and held as honest declarations made in good faith that there are no charges or papers on file in the Department reflecting in any manner against their moral or official conduct or character."

Under this statement of facts, and the fact that there is no fixed term attached to the office of collector of internal revenue, the committee recommend the confirmation of Mr. Hess.

Charles H. Henshaw, of Rhode Island, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Rhode Island.

The above confirmation was accompanied by the following report from the Committee on Finance; which was ordered by the Senate to be printed in the RECORD:

The Committee on Finance have had under consideration the nomination (No. 870) of Charles H. Henshaw, of Rhode Island, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Rhode Island, in place of Elisha H. Rhodes, suspended, and, so far as they have been able to obtain the information, they find that Charles H. Henshaw is a fit and proper person to discharge the duties of the office, and that there are no charges or papers on file reflecting upon the character of Elisha H. Rhodes, suspended, as will appear from the following letter of the Secretary of the Treasury:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, March 18, 1886.

Sir: Your communication on behalf of the Finance Committee of the Senate, dated March 17, 1886, asking whether or not "there are any charges on file against the official or moral character of Elisha H. Rhodes, late collector of internal revenue for the district of Rhode Island, suspended," is received.

In reply thereto I have the honor to state that, so far as this inquiry relates to a suspension from office, I feel bound by the rules laid down in the President's recent message to the Senate upon the general subject of such suspension. But in order that I may surely act within the requirements of the statute relating to the furnishing by this Department of information to the Senate, I beg leave to remind the committee that the office referred to has no fixed term attached to it, and to further state that the President is satisfied that a change in the incumbency of said office will result in an improvement of the public service, and that the policy of the present administration will be better carried out by such change.

Except as the same may be involved in these considerations, no papers containing charges reflecting upon the official or moral character of the suspended officer mentioned in your communication are in the custody of this Department.
Respectfully yours,

Hon. JUSTIN S. MORRILL,
Chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance.

D. MANNING, Secretary.

A resolution, as follows, was unanimously adopted by the Committee on Finance, April 6, 1886, in relation to this and all similar letters to the foregoing:

"Resolved, That the letters of the Secretary of the Treasury to the Committee on Finance, dated March 16, 1886, or subsequently, in relation to the suspension of collectors of internal revenue, should be received and held as honest declarations made in good faith that there are no charges or papers on file in the Department reflecting in any manner against their moral or official conduct or character."

Under this statement of facts, and the fact that there is no fixed term attached to the office of collector of internal revenue, the committee recommend the confirmation of Mr. Henshaw.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 3, 1886.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Zephania T. Hill, of Colorado, to be marshal of the United States for the district of Colorado.

POSTMASTER.

William T. Dowdall, to be postmaster at Peoria, Peoria County, Illinois.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, May 3, 1886.

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

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

- To Mr. MCKINLEY, for ten days, on account of sickness.
- To Mr. BUNNELL, for one week, on account of important business.
- To Mr. FOENEY, for ten days, on account of important business.
- To Mr. GIBSON, of West Virginia, for one week.
- To Mr. SAWYER, indefinitely.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. BLANCHARD, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to print in the RECORD some remarks on the bill providing for the appointment of a yellow-fever investigating committee.

FRIDAY EVENING SESSIONS.

Mr. BRAGG. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, and ask its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objections.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the order of business for Friday evening sessions be enlarged

so as to include private bills from the Military Committee correcting the records of private soldiers, but not to include any bill for the restoration of an officer to the Army, or the giving any increased pay or rank to any officer in the Army or upon the retired-list.

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

Mr. ZACH. TAYLOR. I object.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I was about to suggest that the resolution should provide that no work shall be done on Friday evenings without a quorum.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made to the present consideration of the resolution.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WELLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a privileged report, the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The report will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5543) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1887, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 12, 13, 25, 44, and 53.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the amendments read by numbers are not intelligible, and I think it desirable that the House should have either an explanation of the changes or the amendments themselves read.

The SPEAKER. If any gentleman desires it and there be no objection the amendments will be read. The Clerk will continue the reading of the report.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ZACH. TAYLOR] withdraws his objection to the consideration of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BRAGG].

The SPEAKER. It is too late. Another matter, a privileged report, is now before the House.

Mr. WELLBORN. Mr. Speaker, in response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL], I desire to say that there is a full statement accompanying the report, which I desire to have read after the report.

The Clerk continued the reading of the report, as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 54, 56, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, and 76, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,523,900;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amended paragraph insert the following: "For support and civilization of the Navajo Indians, including pay of employes, \$7,500; for expenses of constructing ditches and reservoirs, \$7,500; in all, \$15,000, to be taken from the funds now in the Treasury belonging to said Indians."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$15,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$10,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$6,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$6,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$40,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$15,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$650,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$55,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$10,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$715,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Provided, That funds herein and heretofore appropriated for construction of ditches and other works for irrigating may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, be expended in open market: *Provided further*, That purchases in open market may be made from Indians, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to an amount not exceeding \$3,000." And the Senate agree to the same.

OLIN WELLBORN
S. W. PEEL,
B. W. PERKINS,
Managers on the part of the House.
H. L. DAWES,
P. B. PLUMB,
WILKINSON CALL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WELLBORN. I now ask that the statement accompanying the conference report be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H. R. 5543, making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1887, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the action recommended in the accompanying conference report:

On amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3: Restores the House provision for the Omaha and Winnebago agency and makes consequent correction in total for agents.

On amendments numbered 7 and 8: Leaves the appropriation for physician and teachers for Apaches, Kiowas, and Comanches in gross sum of \$2,500 as heretofore.

On amendments numbered 9, 10, and 11: Leaves the appropriation for physician and teacher for Cheyennes and Arapahoes in gross sum of \$2,000 as heretofore.

On amendments numbered 12 and 13: Restores the House provision for support of schools for Chippewas of the Mississippi, and makes necessary change in total.

On amendment numbered 14: Strikes out the provision for negotiations with the Chippewa Indians in Minnesota, the same being provided for in another part of the bill.

On amendments numbered 15 and 16: Appropriates \$60,000 for subsistence, &c., of the Crows, in lieu of \$70,000, as proposed by the House, and makes necessary change in total.

On amendments numbered 20, 21, and 22: Leaves the appropriation for salaries of matrons, teachers, farmer, carpenter, and millers for the Nez Percés in gross sum of \$3,500, as heretofore.

On amendments numbered 23 and 24: Reduces the appropriation for subsistence for the Poncas from \$18,000 to \$15,000, and makes necessary change in total.

On amendment numbered 25: Restores the appropriation made by the House for clothing, as per treaty, for Sioux of different tribes, to \$130,000.

On amendment numbered 26: Makes the appropriation in gross sum of \$10,400 for teachers, physician, carpenter, miller, engineer, farmers, and blacksmith for the Sioux of different tribes, as heretofore.

On amendments numbered 28 and 30: Reduces the appropriation for subsistence for Sioux of different tribes from \$1,250,000 to \$1,200,000, and makes necessary correction of total.

On amendment numbered 32: Reduces the appropriation for Shoshones and Bannocks, and other Indians of Fort Hall reservation, from \$18,000 to \$17,000.

On amendment numbered 33: Reduces the appropriation for Shoshones, Bannocks, and Sheepaters, and other Indians of the Lemhi agency, from \$16,800 to \$15,000.

On amendment numbered 36: Makes the appropriation for the Modoc Indians \$4,000 instead of \$5,000, as provided by House bill.

On amendment numbered 37: Reduces the appropriation for support and civilization of the Navajo Indians from \$20,000 to \$7,500, and makes an appropriation of \$7,500 for constructing ditches and reservoirs for their benefit.

On amendment numbered 39: Reduces the appropriation for the Shoshone Indians in Wyoming from \$19,000 to \$15,000.

On amendment numbered 40: Reduces the appropriation for the Shoshone Indians in Nevada from \$12,000 to \$10,000.

On amendment numbered 41: Reduces the appropriation for the Sioux of Lake Traverse from \$8,000 to \$6,000.

On amendment numbered 43: Reduces the appropriation for the Sioux of Devil's Lake from \$8,000 to \$6,000.

On amendment numbered 44: Restores the appropriation made by the House bill of \$8,000 for incidental expenses of Indian service in Dakota.

On amendment numbered 45: Restores the appropriation made by the House bill of \$5,000 for incidental expenses of Indian service in Montana.

On amendment numbered 46: Makes an appropriation for practical farmers to aid Indians in farming, of \$40,000 instead of \$35,000 as proposed by the House.

On amendment numbered 47: Reduces the appropriation for the Indian police from \$90,000 to \$85,000.

On amendment numbered 48: Appropriates \$2,000 for prevention of the illegal traffic in intoxicating liquors upon or near Indian reservations.

On amendments numbered 49 and 50: Substitutes Senate for House provision respecting surveys of Indian reservations and allotments in severalty.

On amendment numbered 51: Strikes out the provision for removal of upper and middle bands of Spokane Indians, the same being provided for in another portion of the bill.

On amendment numbered 52: Makes the following provision for negotiations with certain tribes and bands of Indians, viz:

"To enable the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with the several tribes and bands of Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota for such modification of existing treaties with said Indians and such change of their reservation as may be deemed desirable by said Indians and the Secretary of the Interior, and as to what sum shall be a just and equitable liquidation of all claims which any of said tribes now have upon the Government; and also to enable said Secretary to negotiate with the various bands or tribes of Indians in Northern Montana and at Fort Berthold, in Dakota, for a reduction of their respective reservations, or for removal therefrom to other reservations; and also to enable said Secretary to negotiate with the upper and middle bands of Spokane Indians and Pend d'Oreilles Indians, in Washington and Idaho Territories, for their removal to the Colville, Jocko, or Cœur d'Alene reservations, with the consent of the Indians on said reservations; and also to enable said Secretary to negotiate with said Indians for the cession of their lands to the United States; and also to enable said Secretary to negotiate with the Cœur d'Alene Indians for the cession of their lands outside the limits of the present Cœur d'Alene reservation to the United States \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available; but no agreement made shall take effect until ratified by Congress."

On amendment numbered 53: Strikes out the appropriation to pay the Delaware Indians \$14,729—the value of twenty-three sections of land.

On amendment numbered 54: Appropriates \$20,000 for continuing the investigation and examination of Indian predeceation claims.

On amendment numbered 55: Appropriates for support of Indian day and industrial schools \$650,000, in lieu of \$675,000 as proposed by the Senate amendment.

On amendment numbered 56: Strikes out the provision authorizing the purchase of school buildings.

On amendment numbered 57: Appropriates \$55,000 in lieu of \$40,000 for the construction and repair of school buildings.

On amendments numbered 58 and 59: Appropriates \$10,000 in lieu of \$25,000 for purchase of stock for schools, and makes necessary correction of total.

On amendments numbered 62 and 73: Transfers the appropriation for the Saint Ignatius mission school, in Montana, to another portion of the bill.

On amendments numbered 64, 65, and 66: Makes more specific the appropriations for the Chillicothe industrial school.

On amendment numbered 67: Increases the appropriation for educational purposes in Alaska from \$15,000 to \$20,000.

On amendments numbered 68 and 69: Authorizes an annual allowance of \$1,000 to Capt. R. H. Pratt, in charge of the Carlisle Indian industrial school, and makes necessary change in total.

On amendment numbered 71: Makes an appropriation of \$10,000 for repairs of building and construction of new buildings for the Genoa industrial school.

On amendment numbered 72: Makes an appropriation of \$58,000 for the completion of buildings and purchase of additional grounds for the Lawrence Indian school.

On amendment numbered 76: Authorizes the payment of \$735 out of the appropriation in the bill for transportation of Indian pupils to the Good Shepherd industrial school, of Denver, Colo., for transporting twenty-five Indian girls from Turtle Mountain, Dakota, to said school.

On amendment numbered 77: Authorizes the expenditure in open market of moneys herein and heretofore appropriated for construction of ditches and other works for irrigating, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, and provides that purchases may be made from Indians in open market to an amount not exceeding \$3,000.

The amount of bill as agreed to is \$5,546,262 84
Less than the estimates 528,997 80
Less than the act for the current fiscal year 216,249 80

OLIN WELLBORN,
S. W. PEEL,
B. W. PERKINS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WELLBORN. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the report just submitted I desire simply to say that the increases made to this bill by the Senate amendments amounted to \$231,720, while the reductions amounted to \$162,000. The conference committee has somewhat changed this result; and in the bill as finally agreed on in conference the Senate increases are \$113,000 for school purposes, sundries \$47,000, making \$160,000; while the decreases are \$110,800. The appropriations embraced in the bill, according to the report just submitted, are \$49,000 in excess of the bill as it passed the House. This is, I believe, the only statement I desire to make.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, if I caught correctly the reading of the report there is among the educational clauses of the bill an item of increase of \$58,000, or thereabouts, for the Haskell Institute in Kansas, that item making provision for increasing the number of pupils in the institution, which, by the way, is not on any reservation, from three hundred and fifty, the maximum heretofore, I believe, to five hundred. I should be glad if the gentleman from Texas would give us some reason for so large an increase. It may be all right, but still I think there ought to be some statement explanatory of the matter.

Mr. WELLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS], who will make a statement in reference to the increase in that item.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, this appropriation is for the purpose of completing the building of the Haskell Institute as originally designed. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] has suggested, the accommodations of that school at present are sufficient for only three hundred and fifty pupils, the number now there, but it was originally intended that the school should accommodate five hundred Indian children.

Last December there were in that institution three hundred and twenty-two children. Since that time the institution has been filled to its utmost capacity. The present superintendent, Mr. Grabowski, a very competent officer, who has had some experience, I think, in industrial schools in the gentleman's own State, was before our committee to represent the necessities of this institute. This appropriation was also recommended by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and by the Secretary of the Interior. The superintendent of Indian education says in his recent report that of all the industrial schools this, with proper accommodations, will be the most useful. Situated at Lawrence, Kans., it is only 150 miles from the Indian Territory. Within a radius of 40 miles there are to-day Indian reservations peopled by Indians who desire to avail themselves of the benefits of this school if the accommodations can be made sufficient. The superintendent assured our committee that without duress, without violence, without force, this school, if enlarged so as to provide for five hundred children, could readily be filled to the extent of its capacity from the Indian Territory and from the great reservations of the North and West.

The people of the city of Lawrence contributed for the purposes of this school, when it was located there by the Government, 320 acres of excellent land, land capable of a high state of cultivation, upon which

a large portion of the vegetables and produce used in the school can be raised. Building material and labor are cheap at Lawrence; and, in my judgment, at no point in the country could these accommodations be secured with less expenditure to the Government than they can be at Lawrence. Hence, as I have suggested, the Committee on Indian Affairs had recommended this very appropriation before it was inserted in the Indian appropriation bill. We had recommended it, however, as independent legislation. I ask that the report made by the committee, in connection with the bill which we reported providing for this expenditure, be read as part of my remarks.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, submitted the following report, to accompany bill H. R. 3388:

The Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3388) making an appropriation for the completion of Haskell Institute, an Indian school at Lawrence, Kans., submit the following report:

As originally designed, the Haskell Institute was intended to accommodate 500 Indian scholars. In its present and unfinished condition its maximum capacity is 350 scholars. On the 19th day of December last there were in attendance upon this school 322 Indian boys and girls, and since that time several have been admitted, so that it is now nearly or quite filled to its maximum capacity. The work of this school has commended it to all visitors and to all who interest themselves in the cause of Indian education and Indian civilization. It was opened to scholars less than two years ago, but its progress has been such that the urgent necessity for additional accommodations is apparent to all who have given the matter attention, and has the warm approval of the superintendent of Indian education, the honorable Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and the Secretary of the Interior.

The present superintendent of the school, Arthur Grabowskii, was before your committee and gave an interesting and detailed statement of its management and accomplishments, and, encouraged by the results, he earnestly urged upon the attention of the committee the necessity of this appropriation. The school is located on 320 acres of land adjoining the beautiful city of Lawrence, on the Kansas River, and has many advantages in its favor as an Indian industrial school. It is only 150 miles from the Indian Territory, and within 40 miles of it are Indian reservations, peopled by the wards of the Government, who should be qualified for the duties and responsibilities of citizenship, and the superintendent, Mr. Grabowskii, assured the committee that if the additional accommodations were provided he could, within a brief period, fill the school to its full capacity by Indian children, voluntarily offered him from the Indian Territory and the great reservations of the North and West. Situated as the school is in the great grain-producing and cattle and hog raising State of Kansas, supplies can be obtained for it at much less cost to the Government than in most sections of the country, and the 320 acres of land belonging to the school, and donated to the Government by the public-spirited citizens of Lawrence, in consequence of the location of this industrial institute at the gates of their city, is rich and productive and capable of a high state of cultivation, and from which very much can be raised, thus lessening the burdens to the Government in sustaining the institute.

The University of Kansas is also located at Lawrence, which will give to the ambitious Indian who is not content with his industrial education an opportunity of completing it in an institution of learning second to none in the land. Building material and labor are cheap at Lawrence, and we know of no place in the country where the Government can provide these needed additional educational advantages for the Indians for less money than at the site of this industrial school. In proof of this, special attention is called to the report of the board of visitors which accompanies this report, and in which the necessity of these additional accommodations is suggested and their character and estimated cost are given. In his last annual report the superintendent of Indian education has this to say of the Lawrence school:

"Haskell Institute, at Lawrence, Kans., was established in 1884. In September of that year it was opened with one hundred and twenty-five pupils. This school is in need of more buildings, and with adequate facilities may be made the most useful of all the training schools. There is every reason to believe that the present superintendent, Mr. Grabowskii, will manage it with much more than ordinary ability."

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior are of the opinion that the bill should be amended so as to authorize the purchase of additional land. In this opinion your committee concur, and recommend that the bill be so amended as to authorize, from the money appropriated, the purchase of 40 acres of additional land for the accommodation and use of the school. The letters of the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and copies of resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of the city of Lawrence, are attached hereto and made part of this report.

In this report your committee do not deem it necessary to enter into a discussion of the Indian educational system, but, believing that great good is being accomplished by this Lawrence school, the passage of the bill is recommended, with an amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. The communications which are attached are recommendations of the Commissioner and Secretary.

Mr. RANDALL. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Kansas to this point: The Committee on Indian Affairs seem to have introduced a separate bill for this object; and I presume under our rules it might be subject to the point of order in the House. We will have sooner or later to meet the issue whether the Senate has the power of introducing legislation upon appropriation bills, that body heretofore having resisted efforts on the part of the House to do the same thing. It will have to be determined whether the Senate can escape the responsibility in that particular. I do not know that it is desirable on our part to object in this instance, but it is necessary attention should be called to the fact while the House does not put legislation upon appropriation bills, yet there seems to be a way by which the Senate can put legislation upon appropriation bills.

Mr. PERKINS. I will say in answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania the House yielded in regard to this item because we had already considered the subject and recommended it separately to the House.

Mr. RANDALL. But in a separate bill.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, in a separate bill. And as we believed the appropriation was right and should be passed we yielded in this respect to the managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WELLBORN. I think it is just to the committee of conference

to say I do not think this amendment violates any rule of this House, because it is an appropriation in continuation of a public work already in operation.

Mr. RANDALL. My remarks were only intended for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that the Committee on Indian Affairs properly, as I think, wished to avoid any doubt on this subject, and therefore introduced an independent proposition to cover it.

Mr. WELLBORN. Allow me to make a suggestion. My recollection is—but the gentleman from Kansas can state more accurately—that this recommendation did not come from the Indian Office until after the committee had passed on the general appropriation bill.

Mr. PERKINS. That is so. The letter from the Indian Department was not received until after the Indian appropriation bill had been perfected.

Mr. RANDALL. Of course I raise no issue in reference to this matter, and my only object has been to call attention to the fact that sooner or later we will have to meet the issue which is presented in this case; and that is that while we have debarred ourselves from putting legislation on appropriation bills, the Senate seems to have a mode of doing it, as is evident in this instance.

Mr. WELLBORN. I move the adoption of the conference report. The report was adopted.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER.

Mr. CRISP submitted the following report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4765) to authorize the Red River Bridge Company of Texas to maintain a bridge across Red River, 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 disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

CHARLES F. CRISP,
W. D. BYNUM,
A. J. WEAVER,
Managers on the part of the House.
S. J. R. McMILLAN,
O. D. CONGER,
G. G. VEST,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The rule requires reports of conference committees shall be accompanied by statements showing the effect of their adoption, but if the point be not made, the question will be stated on the adoption of the report.

Mr. CRISP. The only amendment of the Senate to this bill is to strike out the words, "and customary in said locality;" so it will read:

Shall be permitted to charge and take such rates of toll for crossing said bridge as may be reasonable, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

The conference report was adopted.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS KANSAS RIVER.

Mr. CRISP submitted the following privileged report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3519) authorizing the Interstate Rapid Transit Railway Company to build a bridge across the Kansas River, 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 disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

CHARLES F. CRISP,
W. D. BYNUM,
A. J. WEAVER,
Managers on the part of the House.
S. J. R. McMILLAN,
O. D. CONGER,
G. G. VEST,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HOLMAN. Let the amendment be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, at the end of line 12, insert "for such reasonable rates of toll as may be approved from time to time by the Secretary of War."

The report was adopted.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIDGE OVER RED RIVER, TEXAS.

Mr. CRISP submitted the following privileged report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5786) granting to the Gainesville and Chickasaw Bridge Company the consent of the United States to construct and maintain a bridge over Red River at or near Brown's Ferry, in Cooke

County, Texas, having met, after full and free conference have recommended and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2, and agree to the same.

CHARLES F. CRISP,
W. D. BYNUM,
A. J. WEAVER,
Managers on the part of the House.
S. J. R. McMILLAN,
O. D. CONGER,
G. G. VEST,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The amendments of the Senate were read, as follows:

First amendment: Page 1, line 7, after the word "toll," insert "to be approved from time to time by the Secretary of War."

Second amendment: Page 2, at the end of line 1, insert the following:
"And that if at any time the navigation of the said river shall in any manner be obstructed or impaired by the said bridge, the Secretary of War shall have authority, and it shall be his duty, to require the said company to alter and change the said bridge, at its own expense, in such manner as may be proper to secure free and complete navigation without impediment; and if upon reasonable notice to said company to make such change or improvements and the said company fails to do so, the Secretary of War shall have authority to make the same at the expense of said company, and all rights conferred by this act shall be forfeited; and Congress shall have power to do any and all things necessary to secure the free navigation of the river."

The report was adopted.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI AT RED WING, MINN.

Mr. CRISP submitted the following privileged report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5677) to authorize the construction of a pile and ponton railway and wagon bridge across the Mississippi River from the city of Red Wing, Minn., to the opposite shore in the State of Wisconsin, having met, after a full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2, and agree to the same.

CHAS. F. CRISP,
W. D. BYNUM,
A. J. WEAVER,
Managers on the part of the House.
S. J. R. McMILLAN,
O. D. CONGER,
G. G. VEST,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the amendments will be read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the amendments will be read.

The amendments were read.

The conference report was concurred in.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS TENNESSEE RIVER.

Mr. CRISP submitted the following privileged report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2309) to give the assent of Congress to the construction of a bridge by the Nashville, Jackson and Memphis Railroad Company over the Tennessee River, 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 disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, and agree to the same.

CHAS. F. CRISP,
W. D. BYNUM,
A. J. WEAVER,
Managers on the part of the House.
S. J. R. McMILLAN,
O. D. CONGER,
G. G. VEST,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The amendments of the Senate were read.

The conference report was concurred in.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI AT PIERRE, DAK.

Mr. CRISP submitted the following privileged report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7646) to authorize the construction and maintenance of a bridge by the Dakota Central Railway Company across the Missouri River at Pierre, Dak., 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 disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, and agree to the same.

CHAS. F. CRISP,
W. D. BYNUM,
A. J. WEAVER,
Managers on the part of the House.
S. J. R. McMILLAN,
O. D. CONGER,
G. G. VEST,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the amendments will be read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the amendments will be read.

The amendments of the Senate were read.

The conference report was concurred in.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

FOURTH OF JULY CLAIMS.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a privileged report from the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4731) which I now send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The report will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill of the House (H. R. 4731) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury Department, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows, namely:
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment adopted by the Senate and agree to the same.

JAMES D. RICHARDSON,
JAMES T. JOHNSTON,
GEORGE W. GEDDES,
Managers on the part of the House.
AUSTIN F. PIKE,
GEO. F. HOAR,
JAMES K. JONES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the amendment will be reported.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection the amendment will be read.

There was no objection.

The amendment was read by the Clerk, as follows:

Page 66, after line 17, insert "Mississippi: To Catharine C. B. Merrill, executrix of the last will and testament of Ayres B. Merrill, from said State, \$67,726."

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope there will be some explanation of this action on the part of the conference.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a House bill making allowances for certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury Department, as indicated by its title. It was amended in the Senate by the adoption of the amendment which has just been reported, allowing to Catharine C. B. Merrill, executrix of Ayres B. Merrill, deceased, of Mississippi, the sum of \$67,726.

This claim, Mr. Speaker, was investigated by the Quartermaster-General under a special act of Congress, approved February 13, 1885. He made his report to Congress under that act during the present session, and recommended an allowance for quartermaster and commissary stores in favor of this claimant of \$50,382.50. The Committee on War Claims has investigated the report and the proof as submitted by the Quartermaster-General, and on the 15th day of April a report was submitted from that committee recommending the allowance of the amount reported by the Quartermaster-General; that is to say, \$50,382.50. It is proper for me to state, Mr. Speaker, that the agent of the Quartermaster-General, who was sent upon the premises to investigate this claim, reported that the claimant lost \$67,726; but the assistant quartermaster-general held that inasmuch as the claimant had submitted a statement of his account, showing the amount of the loss, about ten years subsequent to the war, and had only claimed a total amount of \$50,382.50, the Quartermaster-General did not feel that he was warranted in recommending an appropriation of a larger sum, notwithstanding the fact that the agent's report shows the loss of the larger sum, or \$67,726.

The Committee on War Claims reported a bill recommending an allowance for the smaller sum, \$50,382.50. That bill has its proper place on the Calendar of the House. The Senate, however, having a bill before it also, examined the facts and the report of the Quartermaster-General, and they recommended the larger sum, \$67,726. They therefore amended the House bill by making the allowance which I have mentioned. The committee of conference, having discussed the matter fully, came to the conclusion they would concur with the Senate in recommending the adoption of the Senate amendment, and allowing the larger sum. Those are the facts.

The members of this body on the committee of conference the more readily assented to the report submitted because they are satisfied that the proof is ample to show the justice and correctness of the claim. They are opposed, however, to the policy of amending the bill, which is intended only to make an appropriation for the allowance of claims reported by the accounting officers of the Treasury. They thought, and still think, this bill should provide only for such claims. Rather than endanger the passage of this bill, however, which would inflict such great injury upon over one thousand small claimants therein provided for, they forego their opposition to the Senate amendment and recommend that the House recede from its disagreement thereto.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of Indiana. As there may be some misunderstanding about this matter, I wish to state the facts as I understand them. This claim was originally filed before Congress, and Congress passed a

special act authorizing the Quartermaster-General to inquire into the amount that was due. Mr. Merrill, some ten years after the war, while he was in New York, and in poor health, made out a memorandum of his losses, amounting to nearly \$51,000. A special act of Congress authorized the Quartermaster-General to investigate the amount of his losses. The Quartermaster's Department sent a special agent down there, who was a very efficient man, and he found \$67,000 due to Mr. Merrill under the act of Congress. When he made his report to the Quartermaster-General the Quartermaster-General held he was bound by the memorandum as made by Mr. Merrill, and not by the finding of the special agent. That report came before our committee, the Committee on War Claims of the House, and we followed the finding of the Quartermaster-General, and reported a bill to this House recommending payment to Mr. Merrill's executrix of a sum of nearly \$51,000—I forget the precise amount.

Now, the Senate amends this bill by putting in the whole amount, \$67,000, instead of \$51,000. The \$51,000 stand in the same condition as the rest of the 4th July claims do. Sixty-seven thousand dollars is proved just as conclusively as the \$51,000. And while the committee of conference can not say under the proof that the \$67,000 is not due, this state of facts was presented—that either we had to consent to allow the amendment of this bill by the insertion of what we all consider is a just claim, a claim that is amply proven—there is no question about the loyalty of the party—we had either to consent to that or jeopardize the whole bill and the allowances to eight hundred or a thousand loyal people for small sums.

The committee agree the whole amount was proven. The only reason why the War Claims Committee did not report in favor of the \$67,000 was because the Quartermaster-General had followed the memorandum as made by this party. The whole of this \$67,000 is as clearly proven as the \$51,000. I have no doubt in my mind about these parties being entitled to the \$67,000; but as I have said, we followed the finding of the Quartermaster-General in that respect.

The report of the committee of conference was agreed to.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

TAXATION FOR PAYMENT OF PENSIONS.

Mr. HISCOCK. On Saturday evening the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MORRISON], from the Committee on Rules, reported this resolution:

Resolved, That it shall be in order when any general bill or proposition to increase the rates or amounts of pensions or to grant pensions to persons not previously entitled thereto by law is under consideration to amend the same so as to provide by taxation or otherwise for the payment thereof; but no such amendment shall be in order unless the net revenue provided for shall be thereby set apart for the sole purpose of paying such increased pensions.

I desire to say that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] and myself, members of the Committee on Rules, dissent from that report for the reason that we believe it is a discrimination against one class of legislation which ought not to be tolerated and which is vicious in practice.

Mr. MORRISON. It is neither a discrimination against any class of legislation nor vicious in practice. It is worthy of general application whenever practicable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to call up this report, although it is privileged, in the absence of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED]. I may state, however, in further reply to the gentleman from New York, that the purpose of this resolution is to secure the payment of the very obligations which the gentleman professedly so much desires to have paid, and they can not be promptly paid without it.

Mr. HISCOCK. I have not attempted to debate the resolution.

Mr. MORRISON. Nor I.

Mr. HISCOCK. I simply stated the ground briefly for our dissent.

Mr. MORRISON. Exactly; and I gave my reason quite as briefly for our approval.

HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. MORRISON. I desire to call up the other resolution reported by me for the Committee on Rules in relation to the hour of meeting and adjournment.

The Clerk read the resolution offered by Mr. GIBSON, of West Virginia, and referred to the committee, as follows:

Resolved, That on and after Monday next the House of Representatives meet at 11 o'clock a. m. on each day.

The substitute reported by the committee was read, as follows:

Resolved, That on and after Monday, May 10, during the present session, the House shall meet each day at 11 a. m. and adjourn each day at 5 o'clock p. m.; but this resolution shall not interfere with any orders heretofore made for recess.

Mr. MORRISON. The substitute fixes a later day than the original resolution. It proposes a day on or about which it has been usual at former sessions to meet earlier than 12 o'clock. The committee for this purpose amended the resolution or provided by the substitute that this order shall take effect on the 10th of May, which is next Monday. There has been also added a provision to the effect that the hour of adjournment shall be fixed at 5 o'clock. This would give us a continu-

ous session of six hours each day, and with committee work and other duties this is quite long enough.

The members here can not fail to observe the difficulty we have in keeping a quorum present for the transaction of business, and it is believed that if the hour was fixed at which the House would certainly adjourn the gentlemen who now absent themselves would grace the House with their presence until that hour, and we would not be so often as we now are without a quorum. Of course it would be in the power of the House to extend the session. Unless some gentleman cares to discuss the matter, I will now move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will my colleague, before he makes that motion, allow me to say a word in regard to fixing the hour of daily adjournment?

Mr. MORRISON. Certainly.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the power of the House, or of any legislative body, to adjourn at any time is one of the most universally recognized rights that a parliamentary body has, and I think it would be without precedent and contrary to the spirit of the history of the House to fix arbitrarily by rule an hour at which we must adjourn every day. The House should always be permitted to control the time of its adjournment, and I think this rule, if adopted, would prove very inconvenient in practice. For instance, we might be considering an important bill and five minutes' additional time might be sufficient to complete its consideration, but if this rule were in operation we could not have a vote on the question of extending the session before the arrival of the time for adjournment, especially if there was a call for tellers.

Any form of filibustering begun just before 5 o'clock would prevent the extension of the time and would carry the business over to another day. I think that portion of the resolution which requires the House to adjourn at 5 o'clock (except on Fridays, when there is an order for an evening session) ought not to be adopted, and, if my colleague will permit, I will move to strike out that provision before the previous question is asked for.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, it was believed by the committee that a six-hour session daily was long enough, and, in fact, much longer than we have been able usually to get gentlemen to stay here and work, and we hoped that by adopting this rule gentlemen who now absent themselves would be induced to stay until the end of the daily session, when they knew just the hour at which the session would end.

I wish to say also to my colleague [Mr. SPRINGER] that in the earlier days of the Republic, to which he often refers as the better days of the Republic, this was the rule for thirty or forty years and the adjournment occurred at a fixed hour. I think the House had better try it, and if it does not work well it can be changed. I did not originate nor am I wedded to it, but certainly there ought to be something done to keep gentlemen in their places here so that the work of the session may go forward and the House not be compelled every day to spend part of the time in the endeavor to secure a quorum.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, a number of special orders have been made which give to certain committees certain days, and when a committee has had the day assigned to it, it cannot command any further time. Now if we were bound to adjourn at 5 o'clock, and the consideration of a bill was almost completed, we would be unable to stay here to complete the consideration of the bill, even though the majority might be so inclined, and it would pass into the catalogue as unfinished business.

Mr. MORRISON. There is a provision in the rule that it is not to interfere with prior orders.

Mr. HISCOCK. Mr. Speaker, whenever any order of business is under consideration which the House desires to continue after 5 o'clock I have no doubt that the House will take action in the direction of continuing it; but my experience has been, and I think the experience of every member of this House has been the same, that whenever we attempt to enforce the continuance of the daily session beyond the sentiment of the House, the good feeling of the House—whenever, if you please, we attempt to override the disposition to filibuster, we always lose time by it; and I heartily concur with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MORRISON] that if we come here at 11 o'clock in the morning and stay until 5 in the afternoon every day we will accomplish quite as much as we can accomplish by the adoption of any other rule.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it takes about forty minutes to call and verify the roll, and if this resolution be adopted fixing an arbitrary hour for the daily adjournment of the House, I very much fear that at about twenty minutes after 4 o'clock, or soon thereafter, a number of gentlemen here will come to the conclusion that it is too late in the day for another yea-and-nay vote and will take their hats and canes and walk leisurely home.

Mr. WILLIS. Will not the adoption of such an order, fixing definitely the hour of daily adjournment, present an invitation and a temptation for some one to filibuster almost every day?

Mr. MORRISON. There is nothing in the rule to prevent the House taking a recess to a later hour, and there is nothing to prevent the House adjourning earlier if it desires.

Mr. WEAVER, of Nebraska. Practically do we not adjourn now at 5 o'clock almost every day?

Mr. MORRISON. A number of gentlemen—many gentlemen—adjourn at 1 or 2 o'clock [laughter], and the object of this provision is to try to induce those who now adjourn so early to give us the benefit of their presence until 5 o'clock.

Mr. WEAVER, of Nebraska. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that that remark has no application to me. [Laughter].

Mr. MORRISON. No; nor to any other gentleman—personally we are all here.

The SPEAKER. What is the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER]?

Mr. SPRINGER. I move to strike out so much of the resolution as provides for the daily adjournment at 5 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] moves to amend the resolution by striking out the words "and adjourn each day at 5 o'clock p. m." The question is on the amendment.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURROWS. Under that rule, if adopted, when the hour of 5 o'clock arrived would the Speaker adjourn the House without a formal motion to that effect?

The SPEAKER. He would, just as the Chair now on Fridays announces the recess.

Mr. PETERS. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. Could the majority of the House, just prior to 5 o'clock, move to take recess for half an hour?

The SPEAKER. Undoubtedly; or to adjourn.

Mr. SPRINGER. But unless your recess was ordered before 5 o'clock arrived, the House would adjourn at 5.

The SPEAKER. If the hour of 5 o'clock arrived and no order had been made to the contrary, the Chair would of course declare the House adjourned.

Mr. SPRINGER. Pending the vote on the motion for a recess.

The question was taken on the amendment moved by Mr. SPRINGER; and there were—ayes 58, noes 88.

Mr. SKINNER and Mr. McMILLIN called for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER (having counted the affirmative vote). There are 28 in favor of ordering the yeas and nays—not one-fifth of the last vote.

Mr. McMILLIN. I call for tellers on ordering the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER (after a count). There are only 28 voting to order tellers—not one-fifth of a quorum.

Mr. BLAND and Mr. DIBBLE. Count the other side.

The SPEAKER. There is no count of "the other side" on this question. The rules require one-fifth of a quorum to order tellers. Is the other side desired on the question of ordering the yeas and nays?

Mr. DIBBLE. Yes, sir; I ask for a vote on the other side.

Mr. HISCOCK. It is too late.

The SPEAKER. It is too late if objection is made.

Several members demanded the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Tellers are refused, the yeas and nays are refused, and the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. MORRISON. I move the previous question.

Mr. McMILLIN. I move to amend the resolution by striking out "5 o'clock" and inserting "6 o'clock."

The SPEAKER. No further amendment is in order at present, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MORRISON] has demanded the previous question.

Mr. SPRINGER. I move to recommit the report to the Committee on Rules.

The motion of Mr. SPRINGER was not agreed to; there being—ayes 27, noes 123.

The SPEAKER. The question is now upon ordering the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. SPRINGER. Now, Mr. Speaker, is this open to debate?

The SPEAKER. The resolution has been debated.

Mr. SPRINGER. The amendment was debated, not the resolution.

The SPEAKER. That was debate on the resolution.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. MORRISON 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.

The SPEAKER. The original resolution, for which the resolution just adopted was reported as a substitute, will, if there be no objection, lie on the table.

There was no objection; and it was ordered accordingly.

Several members demanded the regular order.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will now proceed to call the States and Territories for the introduction of bills and resolutions, under which call memorials of State and Territorial Legislatures may be presented, and also resolutions of inquiry addressed to the heads of Departments.

BUSINESS OF COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. HERBERT introduced a resolution to fix a time for the consideration of business from the Committee on Naval Affairs; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

INCREASE OF NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. HERBERT also introduced a resolution to fix a day to consider House bill 6664, entitled "A bill to increase the naval establishment;" which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

RIGHT OF WAY IN ALABAMA.

Mr. WHEELER introduced a bill (H. R. 8348) to grant the right of way over the public lands in Alabama, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

EDUCATIONAL BILL.

Mr. WHEELER also submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That Tuesday, the 20th day of May, immediately after the second call of committees under clause 5, Rule XXIV, be set apart for the consideration of bill (S. 194) to aid in the establishment and temporary support of common schools, and that the consideration of the same be continued at the same time thereafter from day to day until finally disposed of, but not to interfere with revenue or appropriation bills; and that during the discussion of this bill a recess be had each night from 5 to 7.30 o'clock, except on Friday, and that the night sessions be devoted to the discussion of the educational bill.

MRS. ALMIRA AMBLER.

Mr. SEYMOUR introduced a bill (H. R. 8349) granting a pension to Mrs. Almira Ambler; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

PORT OF ENTRY, HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. BUCK introduced a bill (H. R. 8350) to amend sections 2533 and 2534 of the Revised Statutes, and making Hartford, in the State of Connecticut, a port of entry, in place of Middletown; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

EDWARD COLEMAN.

Mr. CANNON introduced a bill (H. R. 8351) for the relief of Edward Coleman; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

LEWIS A. CRONKHITE.

Mr. CANNON also introduced a bill (H. R. 8352) for the relief Lewis A. Cronkhit, late a private of Company E, Eightieth Regiment Indiana Volunteers; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JAMES JONES.

Mr. CANNON also introduced a bill (H. R. 8353) for the relief of James Jones, late a private in the United States Navy; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A. D. TOMLINSON.

Mr. TOWNSHEND introduced a bill (H. R. 8354) granting relief to A. D. Tomlinson; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

SARAH A. JONES.

Mr. TOWNSHEND also introduced a bill (H. R. 8355) for the relief of Sarah A. Jones; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

CALVIN M'BROOM.

Mr. TOWNSHEND also introduced a bill (H. R. 8356) for the relief of Calvin McBroom; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

L. L. NEWMAN.

Mr. TOWNSHEND also introduced a bill (H. R. 8357) for the relief of L. L. Newman; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

LOUIS COLE.

Mr. TOWNSHEND also introduced a bill (H. R. 8358) for the relief of Louis Cole; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JAMES M. SHAW.

Mr. TOWNSHEND also introduced a bill (H. R. 8359) for the relief of James M. Shaw; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM G. BURNETT.

Mr. TOWNSHEND also introduced a bill (H. R. 8360) for the relief of William G. Burnett; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

ELIJAH MARTIN.

Mr. TOWNSHEND also introduced a bill (H. R. 8361) for the relief

of Elijah Martin; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

SARAH C. SHINN.

Mr. TOWNSHEND also introduced a bill (H. R. 8362) for the relief of Sarah C. Shinn; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN COOK.

Mr. ROWELL introduced a bill (H. R. 8363) for the relief of John Cook; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JAMES GILLESPIE.

Mr. LANDES (by request) introduced a bill (H. R. 8364) granting a pension to James Gillespie; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JANE THOMPSON.

Mr. LANDES also introduced a bill (H. R. 8365) for the relief of Jane Thompson, late widow of Dr. F. B. Thompson, Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteers; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MRS. ELLEN KEHOE.

Mr. LAWLER introduced a bill (H. R. 8366) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Kehoe; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

WALTER BLANCHARD POST, G. A. R., NAPERVILLE, ILL.

Mr. PLUMB introduced a bill (H. R. 8367) granting condemned cannon and carriage to Walter Blanchard Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Naperville, Ill.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

JABEZ SMITH.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of Indiana, introduced a bill (H. R. 8368) granting an increase of pension to Jabez Smith; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

DAVID S. SHANNON.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of Indiana, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8369) granting a pension to David S. Shannon; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

THOMAS LANGWELL.

Mr. MATSON introduced a bill (H. R. 8370) granting a pension to Thomas Langwell; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

NOAH W. HALLEY.

Mr. WARD, of Indiana, submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Accounts:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Noah W. Halley \$712.50, being the difference between his pay as a folder at \$900 per annum and that of a messenger at \$1,200 per annum from December 16, 1883, to May 1, 1886, and the amount hereby authorized and directed shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, and be immediately available, subject to the Committee on Accounts.

ENSIGN GUY WARNER BROWN.

Mr. WARD, of Indiana, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8371) for the relief of Ensign Guy Warner Brown; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN E. DOGGETT.

Mr. WARD, of Indiana, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8372) granting a pension to John E. Doggett; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

GEORGE HARMAN.

Mr. CONGER introduced a bill (H. R. 8373) for the relief of George Harman; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MRS. MARY M. GILLHAM.

Mr. CONGER also introduced a bill (H. R. 8374) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary M. Gillham; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

INDEBTEDNESS UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD.

Mr. CONGER also submitted a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, protesting against the passage of an act providing for the cancellation of the present bonded indebtedness of the Union Pacific Railroad to substitute other obligations therefor, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

ALEXANDER J. COLLINGE.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa, introduced a bill (H. R. 8375) granting a pension to Alexander J. Collinge; which was read a first and second

time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. FULLER submitted a concurrent resolution of the Twenty-first General Assembly of Iowa, protesting against the enactment of an act providing for the cancellation of the present bonded indebtedness of the Union Pacific Railroad Company and the obligations to the Government; which was referred to the Committee on the Pacific Railroads.

WILLIAM ANDERSON.

Mr. LYMAN introduced a bill (H. R. 8376) for the relief of William Anderson; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REFUNDING UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD INDEBTEDNESS.

Mr. LYMAN also submitted a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa, instructing the Senators and requesting the Representatives from that State to vote against the bill to refund and extinguish the indebtedness of the Union Pacific Railroad Company; which was referred to the Committee on the Pacific Railroads.

JAMES R. CASSIDY.

Mr. HOLMES introduced a bill (H. R. 8377) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James R. Cassidy; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD.

Mr. MURPHY submitted a memorial of the general assembly of the Legislature of Iowa with reference to the Union Pacific Railroad; which was referred to the Committee on the Pacific Railroads.

FRANCIS F. CAREZ.

Mr. FUNSTON introduced a bill (H. R. 8378) for the relief of Francis F. Carez, Forty-fourth Missouri Infantry; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM N. MYERS.

Mr. FUNSTON also introduced a bill (H. R. 8379) for the relief of William N. Myers; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JAMES W. BLANDEN.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas, introduced a bill (H. R. 8380) granting a pension to James W. Blenden; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

A. B. VAN CLEVE.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (H. R. 8381) granting a pension to A. B. Van Cleve; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

ELIZABETH WARD.

Mr. PERKINS also introduced a bill (H. R. 8382) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ward; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

CAROLINE J. BYBEE.

Mr. HALSELL (by request) introduced a bill (H. R. 8383) for the benefit of Caroline J. Bybee; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MAHALA BROWN.

Mr. HALSELL also introduced a bill (H. R. 8384) for the benefit of Mahala Brown, dependent mother of Jabez W. Brown, late Company D, Thirty-second Regiment, Kentucky Infantry Volunteers; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

J. M. AND E. B. HARDIN.

Mr. HALSELL also introduced a bill (H. R. 8385) for the benefit of J. M. and E. B. Hardin; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

F. OVERSTREET.

Mr. HALSELL also introduced a bill (H. R. 8386) for the benefit of F. Overstreet; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

P. H. BRIDGEWATER.

Mr. WOLFORD introduced a bill (H. R. 8387) for the benefit of P. H. Bridgewater; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

DANIEL M. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WOLFORD also introduced a bill (H. R. 8388) for the benefit of Daniel M. Williams, of Green County, Kentucky; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

ORGANIZATION OF MILITIA, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky, introduced a bill (H. R. 8389)

to amend the act entitled "An act more effectually to provide for the organization of the militia of the District of Columbia," passed 3d of March, 1803; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Militia, and ordered to be printed.

THOMAS K. BALL.

Mr. WADSWORTH introduced a bill (H. R. 8390) for the benefit of Thomas K. Ball; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

HEIRS OF JAMES W. WILKINS.

Mr. LAFFOON introduced a bill (H. R. 8391) for the relief of the heirs of James W. Wilkins; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

BEN. HARRISON.

Mr. LAFFOON also introduced a bill (H. R. 8392) for the relief of Ben. Harrison; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN C. WHITLOCK.

Mr. LAFFOON also introduced a bill (H. R. 8393) for the relief of John C. Whitlock, administrator; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

J. ANN HOOD.

Mr. ROBERTSON introduced a bill (H. R. 8394) for the relief of J. Ann Hood, administratrix of Govey Hood, deceased; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

ANTHONY M'ELROY.

Mr. ROBERTSON also introduced a bill (H. R. 8395) for the benefit of Anthony McElroy, of Springfield, Washington County, Kentucky; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MARTIN M. BUSH.

Mr. ROBERTSON also introduced a bill (H. R. 8396) for the relief of Martin M. Bush, of Harden County, Kentucky; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN H. BAIZE.

Mr. ROBERTSON also introduced a bill (H. R. 8397) granting a pension to John H. Baize, of Ohio County, Kentucky; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

MRS. S. M. MATTINGLY.

Mr. ROBERTSON also introduced a bill (H. R. 8398) for the relief of Mrs. S. M. Mattingly, of Meade County, Kentucky; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

JAMES P. CARROLL.

Mr. ROBERTSON also introduced a bill (H. R. 8399) for the relief of James P. Carroll; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

JAMES B. HAGER.

Mr. ROBERTSON also introduced a bill (H. R. 8400) for the relief of James B. Hager; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM VEST.

Mr. TAULBEE introduced a bill (H. R. 8401) for the relief of William Vest; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM A. HERRIN.

Mr. McCREARY introduced a bill (H. R. 8402) for the relief of William A. Herrin, of Rockwell County, Kentucky; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

W. G. DUNN.

Mr. McCREARY also introduced a bill (H. R. 8403) for the relief of W. G. Dunn, administrator of Cooper Dunn, deceased; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

W. S. WARREN.

Mr. McCREARY also introduced a bill (H. R. 8404) for the benefit of W. S. Warren, of Lincoln County, Kentucky; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

LEMUEL MAIN.

Mr. McCREARY also introduced a bill (H. R. 8405) to place the name of Lemuel Main, of Laurel County, Kentucky, on the pension-roll; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

SARAH BROUGHTON'S HEIRS.

Mr. McCREARY also introduced a bill (H. R. 8406) for the benefit of Sarah Broughton's heirs; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

GEORGE TAIFE.

Mr. WILLIS introduced a bill (H. R. 8407) granting a pension to George Taife; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

MRS. CATHERINE SONNE.

Mr. WILLIS also introduced a bill (H. R. 8408) restoring the pension of Mrs. Catherine Sonne; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

MRS. ALDANA B. MONROE.

Mr. DINGLEY introduced a bill (H. R. 8409) granting a pension to Mrs. Aldana B. Monroe; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM G. MARTIN.

Mr. DINGLEY also introduced a bill (H. R. 8410) granting a pension to William G. Martin; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

REPEAL OF TAXES ON TOBACCO.

Mr. FINDLAY introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 164) repealing the taxes, special and otherwise, upon tobacco, and upon the sale and manufacture thereof; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed. The resolution was also read for information.

SECTION 3387 REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. FINDLAY also introduced a bill (H. R. 8411) to repeal section 3387 of the Revised Statutes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

SHIPLEY, SMITH & CO.

Mr. FINDLAY also introduced a bill (H. R. 8412) for the relief of Shipley, Smith & Co.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

SAMUEL H. TAGGART.

Mr. FINDLAY also introduced a bill (H. R. 8413) for the relief of Samuel H. Taggart; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

FRANCIS T. KING, EXECUTOR.

Mr. FINDLAY also introduced a bill (H. R. 8414) for the relief of Francis T. King, executor; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

GEORGE M. GILL, EXECUTOR, ETC.

Mr. FINDLAY also introduced a bill (H. R. 8415) for the relief of George M. Gill, executor, &c.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

ANDREW GILLAN.

Mr. HAYDEN (by request) introduced a bill (H. R. 8416) restoring to the pension-roll the name of Andrew Gillan; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

MONUMENT TO GENERAL JOSEPH WARREN.

Mr. RANNEY introduced a bill (H. R. 8417) in aid of the erection of a monument to the memory of General Joseph Warren, who fell at the battle of Bunker Hill; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

CONDEMNED CANNON FOR GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC.

Mr. ROCKWELL introduced a bill (H. R. 8418) granting condemned cannon and carriages to Lyon Post, No. 41, Grand Army of the Republic; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

CAPT. RODERICK M'INTOSH.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (H. R. 8419) to provide for the payment of the claim of Capt. Roderick McIntosh; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

AARON RING.

Mr. DAVIS also introduced a bill (H. R. 8420) granting arrears of pension to Aaron Ring; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

HEIRS OF JOHN B. FLOWER.

Mr. WHITING introduced a bill (H. R. 8421) for the relief of the heirs of John B. Flower; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

LYDIA A. NICHOLSON AND CHILDREN.

Mr. WHITING also introduced a bill (H. R. 8422) granting a pen-

sion to Lydia A. Nicholson and two minor children; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

MARY H. PHILLIPS.

Mr. LOVERING introduced a bill (H. R. 8423) granting a pension to Mary H. Phillips; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

FRANK B. GORMAN.

Mr. LOVERING (by request) also offered a resolution in favor of paying Frank B. Gorman; which was referred to the Committee on Accounts.

JAMES H. YOUNG.

Mr. LONG introduced a bill (H. R. 8424) granting a pension to James H. Young; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

LANDS, SAULT SAINTE MARIE.

Mr. MOFFATT introduced a bill (H. R. 8425) to confirm certain lands to the village of Sault Sainte Marie; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims, and ordered to be printed.

HIRAM CHILSON.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (H. R. 8426) for the relief of Hiram Chilson; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

CAROLINE DAWLEY.

Mr. BURROWS also introduced a bill (H. R. 8427) for the relief of Caroline Dawley; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

GEORGE BARTON.

Mr. BURROWS also introduced a bill (H. R. 8428) for the relief of George Barton; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

BRUCE LEWIS.

Mr. BURROWS also introduced a bill (H. R. 8429) for the relief of Bruce Lewis; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

RICHARD UNDERWOOD.

Mr. BURROWS also introduced a bill (H. R. 8430) for the relief of Richard Underwood; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

DAVID D. KNAPP.

Mr. BURROWS also introduced a bill (H. R. 8431) to increase the pension of David D. Knapp; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

ADAM G. YOUNGMAN.

Mr. BURROWS also introduced a bill (H. R. 8432) to increase the pension of Adam G. Youngman; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

BENJAMIN STELL.

Mr. BURROWS also introduced a bill (H. R. 8433) to increase the pension of Benjamin Stell; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

CHARLES E. YOUNG.

Mr. WAKEFIELD introduced a bill (H. R. 8434) to place the name of Charles E. Young upon the pension-roll; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

FRANK TRAYNOR.

Mr. DAVENPORT (by request) introduced a bill (H. R. 8435) granting a pension to Frank Traynor; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

WALTER H. WOOD.

Mr. DAVENPORT (by request) also introduced a bill (H. R. 8436) for the relief of Walter H. Wood; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

THOMAS WEEKLEY.

Mr. GILFILLAN introduced a bill (H. R. 8437) granting a pension to Thomas Weekley; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

MRS. P. L. DARTT.

Mr. WHITE, of Minnesota, introduced a bill (H. R. 8438) granting a pension to Mrs. P. L. Dartt; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a resolution of inquiry as to the cause of the delay in furnishing the first report of the Bureau of Animal Industry; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

AMENDMENT OF RULES.

Mr. BARKSDALE introduced a resolution to amend clause 49, Rule XI; which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

WILLIAM D. WALKER.

Mr. CATCHINGS introduced a bill (H. R. 8439) for the relief of William D. Walker, of Mississippi; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

HENRY DREHMAN'S HEIRS.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, introduced a bill (H. R. 8440) for the relief of Henry Drehman's heirs; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM FREUDENAN.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8441) for the relief of William Freudenan; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

FRANCIS M'GARRY.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8442) for the relief of Francis McGarry; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JULIUS SAUER.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8443) for the relief of Julius Sauer; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JOSEPH GERTHOF.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8444) for the relief of Joseph Gerthof; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

DAVID DONOVAN.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8445) for the relief of David Donovan; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

LABOR COMMITTEE.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, also submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Labor:

Resolved, That the — day of June be set apart for the consideration of bills reported from the Committee on Labor, to be continued from day to day until the business of said committee is disposed of.

CREW OF STEAMER JOHN D. PERRY.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8446) granting an honorable discharge to the officers and crew of the steamer John D. Perry and mustered into the United States service by General J. C. Frémont in 1861; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

GEORGE F. BANGS.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8447) for the relief of George F. Bangs; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

DERRETT H. BARCLAY.

Mr. HEARD introduced a bill (H. R. 8448) to restore the name of Derrett H. Barclay to the pension-roll; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

HOY COOPER.

Mr. HEARD also introduced a bill (H. R. 8449) granting a pension to Hoy Cooper; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM BORGETT.

Mr. GLOVER (by Mr. HEARD) introduced a bill (H. R. 8450) granting a pension to William Borgett; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

CLARA B. DAVIDSON.

Mr. CLARDY introduced a bill (H. R. 8451) granting an increase of pension to Clara B. Davidson, widow of General John W. Davidson, of the United States Army; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN M. GRIMES.

Mr. HUTTON introduced a bill (H. R. 8452) authorizing John M. Grimes, of Pike County, Missouri, to prosecute a suit in the Court of Claims against the United States for damages growing out of the improvement of the navigation of the Mississippi River; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

JAMES CANNON.

Mr. STONE, of Missouri, introduced a bill (H. R. 8453) for the relief of the legal representatives of James Cannon; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

ROBERT L. M'MURTRY.

Mr. STONE, of Missouri, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8454) to increase the pension of Robert L. McMurtry; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

POST-OFFICE SITE LINCOLN, NEBR.

Mr. WEAVER, of Nebraska, introduced a bill (H. R. 8455) authorizing the expenditure of \$2,500 for improving the post-office site and public grounds at Lincoln, Nebr.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

RICHARD F. BARRETT.

Mr. WEAVER, of Nebraska (by request), also introduced a bill (H. R. 8456) for the relief of Richard F. Barrett; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

FUNERAL OBSEQUIES.

Mr. WEAVER, of Nebraska, also submitted a resolution in relation to funeral obsequies; which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

VIRGIL A. JONES.

Mr. LAIRD introduced a bill (H. R. 8457) granting a pension to Virgil A. Jones; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

SETH RAYMOND.

Mr. LAIRD also introduced a bill (H. R. 8458) granting a pension to Seth Raymond; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM M. ORR.

Mr. LAIRD also introduced a bill (H. R. 8459) granting a pension to William M. Orr; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JONATHAN COPE.

Mr. LAIRD also introduced a bill (H. R. 8460) granting a pension to Jonathan Cope; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JOSIAH B. SEAVEY.

Mr. LAIRD also introduced a bill (H. R. 8461) granting a pension to Josiah B. Seavey; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

GEORGE MYERS.

Mr. LAIRD also introduced a bill (H. R. 8462) granting a pension to George Myers; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

ELIZABETH M. J. MEAGHER.

Mr. WOODBURN introduced a bill (H. R. 8463) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. J. Meagher, widow of Thomas Francis Meagher, late brigadier-general of United States volunteers; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

L. M. PEARLMAN.

Mr. WOODBURN also introduced a bill (H. R. 8464) for the relief of L. M. Pearlman; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

GEORGE DOHM.

Mr. GREEN, of New Jersey, introduced a bill (H. R. 8465) granting a pension to George Dohm; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

AUGUST OPPEL.

Mr. LEHLBACH introduced a bill (H. R. 8466) granting a pension to August Oppel; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

SUSAN C. MANDEVILLE.

Mr. LEHLBACH also introduced a bill (H. R. 8467) granting a pension to Susan C. Mandeville; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

MATHEW W. BERRYMAN.

Mr. LEHLBACH also introduced a bill (H. R. 8468) for the relief of Matthew W. Berryman; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN MORAN.

Mr. HEWITT introduced a bill (H. R. 8469) granting a pension to John Moran; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

EDWARD HARRIS.

Mr. STAHLNECKER introduced a bill (H. R. 8470) for the relief of Edward Harris; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

CANNON AND CANNON-BALLS FOR MONUMENTAL PURPOSES.

Mr. BEACH introduced a bill (H. R. 8471) to empower the Secretary of War to deliver condemned cannon and cannon-balls for monumental purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

DIVISION OF DAKOTA TERRITORY.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (H. R. 8472) dividing Dakota Territory, establishing the Territory of North Dakota, and providing a temporary government therefor; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Territories, and ordered to be printed.

PANAMA SHIP-CANAL.

Mr. JAMES submitted the following resolution; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be directed, if not incompatible with the public interests, to communicate to the House of Representatives the "special intelligence report on the progress of the Panama Canal during the year 1885," made to the Navy Department by Lieut. W. W. Kimball and Naval Cadet W. L. Capp, United States Navy.

FREDERICK W. AND CAROLINE D. G. GEISEKING.

Mr. MILLARD introduced a bill (H. R. 8473) for the relief of the heirs of Frederick W. and Caroline D. G. Geiseking, late of the District of Columbia, deceased; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

JAMES M'GLYNN.

Mr. SAWYER introduced a bill (H. R. 8474) granting a pension to James McGlynn; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM S. HALL.

Mr. WEST introduced a bill (H. R. 8475) granting a pension to William S. Hall; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

W. H. PLUMB.

Mr. BURLEIGH introduced a bill (H. R. 8476) granting a pension to W. H. Plumb; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

RICHARD BOTHWELL.

Mr. BURLEIGH also introduced a bill (H. R. 8477) granting a pension to Richard Bothwell; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

MRS. EMELINE RICE.

Mr. BURLEIGH also introduced a bill (H. R. 8478) granting a pension to Mrs. Emeline Rice; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

BETSY VAN BUREN.

Mr. PINDAR introduced a bill (H. R. 8479) granting a pension to Betsy Van Buren; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

LYDIA M. KENNEDY.

Mr. ARNOT introduced a bill (H. R. 8480) granting a pension to Lydia M. Kennedy; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

THOMAS WALSH.

Mr. ADAMS, of New York, introduced a bill (H. R. 8481) granting a pension to Thomas Walsh, Company F, Seventy-fourth New York Volunteers; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

INTERNAL-REVENUE TAXATION.

Mr. ADAMS, of New York, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8482) to amend an act to reduce internal-revenue taxation, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PATRICK M'GUIRE.

Mr. MERRIMAN introduced a bill (H. R. 8483) for the relief of Patrick McGuire; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

LIGHT-HOUSE OFF CAPE HATTERAS.

Mr. SKINNER introduced a bill (H. R. 8484) to erect a light-house on "Outer Shoal," off Cape Hatteras, on the coast of North Carolina; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

ISAAC ASKIE.

Mr. O'HARA introduced a bill (H. R. 8485) granting a pension to Isaac Askie; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

REBECCA MORRIS.

Mr. O'HARA also introduced a bill (H. R. 8486) granting a pension to Rebecca Morris; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

CONDEMNED CANNON.

Mr. LE FEVRE introduced a bill (H. R. 8487) granting a condemned cannon and carriage to Drury Post, No. 372, Grand Army of the Republic, of Neptune, Ohio; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

OBEDIAH A. BIGLEY.

Mr. SENEY introduced a bill (H. R. 8488) granting a pension to Obediah A. Bigley; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

MICHAEL GLEAKERT.

Mr. WILKINS introduced a bill (H. R. 8489) granting a pension to Michael Gleakert; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

LIEUT. GEORGE H. GUILD.

Mr. ELLSBERRY introduced a bill (H. R. 8490) for the relief of Lieut. George H. Guild; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM A. BINGAMON.

Mr. ELLSBERRY also introduced a bill (H. R. 8491) for the relief of William A. Bingamon; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

DANIEL WILLIAMS.

Mr. ELLSBERRY also introduced a bill (H. R. 8492) granting a pension to Daniel Williams; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JAMES E. PANGBURN.

Mr. ELLSBERRY also introduced a bill (H. R. 8493) granting a pension to James E. Pangburn; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN F. HOWELL.

Mr. ELLSBERRY also introduced a bill (H. R. 8494) granting a pension to John F. Howell; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JOSEPH MATHEWS.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR introduced a bill (H. R. 8495) granting a pension to Joseph Mathews; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

HEIRS OF CHRISTOPHER COTT.

Mr. GROSVENOR introduced a bill (H. R. 8496) for the relief of the heirs of Christopher Cott; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

CHRISTOPHER BILLINGS.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Ohio, introduced a bill (H. R. 8497) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Billings; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN HUGHES.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Ohio, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8498) granting a pension to John Hughes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

BURNHARD DEPPEN.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Ohio, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8499) for the removal of the mark of desertion from Burnhard Deppen; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

WILSON S. HORN.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Ohio, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8500) granting a pension to Wilson S. Horn; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JOSEPH WILLEY.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Ohio, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8501) granting a pension to Joseph Willey; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM YOUNG.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Ohio, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8502) granting a pension to William Young; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

HENRY HUNT.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Ohio, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8503) granting a pension to Henry Hunt; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

CONDEMNED CANNON FOR EATON, OHIO.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio, introduced a bill (H. R. 8504) granting condemned cannon for the soldiers' cemetery at Eaton, Ohio; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM R. FYFFE.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8505) for the relief of William R. Fyffe; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN ALLOWAYS.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8506) granting a pension to John Alloways; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

CONDEMNED CANNON FOR XENIA, OHIO.

Mr. LITTLE introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 165) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish condemned arms, &c., to Lewis Post, No. 347, Grand Army of the Republic, of Xenia, Ohio.

SUSAN A. CLARK.

Mr. ERMENTROUT introduced a bill (H. R. 8507) granting a pension to Susan A. Clark; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

SARAH A. PAFF.

Mr. ERMENTROUT also introduced a bill (H. R. 8508) granting a pension to Sarah A. Paff; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

EDWARD S. KAUNTNER.

Mr. ERMENTROUT also introduced a bill (H. R. 8509) granting a pension to Edward S. Kauntner; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

CHARLES HOLBROOK.

Mr. ERMENTROUT also offered a resolution for the payment of Charles Holbrook, by Clerk of the House, out of the contingent fund, at the rate of \$60 per month; which was referred to the Committee on Accounts.

DANIEL H. JOHNSON.

Mr. FLEEGER introduced a bill (H. R. 8510) to increase the pension of Daniel H. Johnson; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

NEW EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania (by request), introduced a bill (H. R. 8511) to authorize the adoption of the new educational system; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Education, and ordered to be printed.

HEIRS OF RICHARD W. MEADE.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania (by request), also introduced a bill (H. R. 8512) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Richard W. Meade; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

JOB P. WILSON.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8513) for the increase of the pension of Job P. Wilson, formerly of Company F, Third Delaware Regiment; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

Mr. HIESTAND introduced a resolution directing the Committee on Printing to inquire into the causes of the delay in the delivery of copies of the first annual report of the Bureau of Animal Industry; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

MICHAEL NAWGLE.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Pennsylvania, introduced a bill (H. R. 8514) for the relief of Michael Nawgle; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

JOSEPH H. ALLEN.

Mr. HARMER introduced a bill (H. R. 8515) granting a pension to Joseph H. Allen, late of the United States steam frigate *New Ironsides*, United States Navy; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

SARAH LOUISA WHEELER.

Mr. HARMER also introduced a bill (H. R. 8516) granting a pension to Sarah Louisa Wheeler, widow of Andrew J. Wheeler, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteers; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, CHESTER, PA.

Mr. EVERHART introduced a bill (H. R. 8517) for a public build-

ing in the city of Chester, Delaware County, Pennsylvania; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

TERESA CHARLES.

Mr. RANDALL introduced a bill (H. R. 8518) for the relief of Teresa Charles; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

MORGAN GORDON.

Mr. RANDALL also introduced a bill (H. R. 8519) granting a pension to Morgan Gordon; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

SECTION 1014 REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. HEMPHILL introduced a bill (H. R. 8520) to amend section 1014 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT COLUMBIA, TENN.

Mr. BALLENTINE introduced a bill (H. R. 8521) to appropriate \$50,000 to erect a public building at Columbia, Tenn.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

ESTATE OF DAVID COLEMAN, DECEASED.

Mr. JOHN M. TAYLOR introduced a bill (H. R. 8522) for the relief of the estate of David Coleman, deceased; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

ESTATE OF ISRAEL BARKER, DECEASED.

Mr. JOHN M. TAYLOR also introduced a bill (H. R. 8523) for the relief of the estate of Israel Barker, deceased, late of Carroll County, Tenn.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MRS. CAROLINE ROCHOW.

Mr. CRAIN (by Mr. REAGAN) introduced a bill (H. R. 8524) for the relief of Mrs. Caroline Rochow; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

ERRORS IN CONSULAR REPORTS.

Mr. REAGAN (by request) introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 166) authorizing the First Comptroller to correct certain errors of law in certain consular reports; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

ABRAHAM LEVI.

Mr. CRAIN (by Mr. LANHAM) also introduced a bill (H. R. 8525) for the relief of Abraham Levi; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN S. SPINKS AND OTHERS.

Mr. JONES, of Texas, introduced a bill (H. R. 8526) for the relief of John S. Spinks, James B. Spinks, and Annie D. Leverett, heirs of W. B. Spinks, deceased; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

EDUCATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MILLER introduced a bill (H. R. 8527) to incorporate and combine with the public-school system of the District of Columbia practical training and instruction in the mechanic arts, also for the establishment in said District of an agricultural school; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

ALEXANDRIA COUNTY, VIRGINIA.

Mr. BARBOUR introduced a bill (H. R. 8528) for the relief of Alexandria County, Virginia; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

J. E. HOZIER.

Mr. LIBBEY introduced a bill (H. R. 8529) for the relief of J. E. Hozier, of Norfolk County, Virginia; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

CORNELIA A. STANLEY.

Mr. BRADY introduced a bill (H. R. 8530) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia A. Stanley, widow of Fabius Stanley, late a rear-admiral in the United States Navy; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

EDWIN C. ENGLE.

Mr. WILSON introduced a bill (H. R. 8531) for the relief of Edwin C. Engle; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

J. GREGG GIBSON.

Mr. WILSON also introduced a bill (H. R. 8532) for the relief of J. Gregg Gibson; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

POTOMAC AND CHESAPEAKE NAVIGATION COMPANY.

Mr. WILSON (by request) also introduced a bill (H. R. 8533) to incorporate the Potomac and Chesapeake Steam Navigation Company; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

DAVID DURER.

Mr. GIBSON, of West Virginia, introduced a bill (H. R. 8534) for the relief of David Durer, of Wirt County, West Virginia; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM CHURCH.

Mr. GIBSON, of West Virginia, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8535) for the relief of William Church; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

URIAS BUSKIRK.

Mr. SNYDER introduced a bill (H. R. 8536) for the relief of Urias Buskirk; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

IMPROVEMENT OF FOX AND WISCONSIN RIVERS.

Mr. GUENTHER introduced a bill (H. R. 8537) to pay the moneys due to the commissioners to examine and report on the damages against the Government by the erection of dams on the Fox and Wisconsin Rivers, in the State of Wisconsin; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

ELLA CARROLL.

Mr. BRAGG introduced a bill (H. R. 8538) for the relief of Ella Carroll; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

BUSINESS OF FRIDAY NIGHT SESSIONS.

Mr. BRAGG also introduced a resolution enlarging the order of business of Friday evening sessions so as to include certain bills from the Military Committee; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NELSON KENDALL.

Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin, introduced a bill (H. R. 8539) to grant a pension to Nelson Kendall; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

AUGUSTUS BARNES.

Mr. TIMOTHY J. CAMPBELL introduced a bill (H. R. 8540) for the relief of Augustus Barnes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

JOSEPH DEMARS.

Mr. STEPHENSON introduced a bill (H. R. 8541) for the relief of Joseph Demars; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

OLE STEENSLAND.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE introduced a bill (H. R. 8542) for the relief of Ole Steensland; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PHOENIX AND MARICOPA RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. BEAN introduced a bill (H. R. 8543) to grant to the Phoenix and Maricopa Railroad Company, of Arizona, the right of way through the Pima and Maricopa Indian reservation; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

C. P. DAKE.

Mr. BEAN also introduced a bill (H. R. 8544) for the adjustment and settlement of the accounts of C. P. Dake, United States marshal; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

APACHE CHIEF GERONIMO.

Mr. BEAN also introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 167) authorizing the President to offer a reward of \$25,000 for the killing or capturing of Geronimo, Apache chief; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

ARTESIAN WELLS, MONTANA TERRITORY.

Mr. TOOLE introduced a bill (H. R. 8545) to provide for the boring of artesian wells in the Territory of Montana; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed.

MAURICIO MIERA.

Mr. JOSEPH introduced a bill (H. R. 8546) for the relief of Mauricio Miera; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

RICARDO PINO.

Mr. JOSEPH also introduced a bill (H. R. 8547) for the relief of

Ricardo Pino; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

SANTIAGO M. MONTOYA.

Mr. JOSEPH also introduced a bill (H. R. 8548) for the relief of Santiago M. Montoya; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN RIES.

Mr. FORD (by request) introduced a bill (H. R. 8549) granting a pension to John Ries; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

MARY A. VAN HORN.

Mr. PEEL (by request) introduced a bill (H. R. 8550) for the relief of Mary A. Van Horn, widow of John Van Horn, deceased; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JOSEPH WILLETT.

Mr. PEEL also introduced a bill (H. R. 8551) to remove the charge of desertion against Joseph Willett; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC RAILROAD LAND GRANT.

Mr. PEEL also introduced a bill (H. R. 8552) to forfeit and restore to the public domain all the lands in township 13 north, range 32 west, in Arkansas, heretofore granted to the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

HOMESTEAD LAWS.

Mr. PEEL also introduced a bill (H. R. 8553) to equalize and amend the homestead laws of the United States, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

EEMELINE HERSER.

Mr. CARLETON introduced a bill (H. R. 8554) granting a pension to Emeline Herser; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

ROBERT M. HARDIN.

Mr. HEPBURN introduced a bill (H. R. 8555) granting a pension to Robert M. Hardin; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

ABRAHAM POINTS.

Mr. HEPBURN also introduced a bill (H. R. 8556) granting a pension to Abraham Points, of Allerton, Iowa; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

ALFRED C. LEE.

Mr. GIFFORD introduced a bill (H. R. 8557) granting a pension to Alfred C. Lee; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN R. PETRIE.

Mr. GIFFORD also introduced a bill (H. R. 8558) granting a pension to John R. Petrie; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

SILVER CERTIFICATES A LEGAL TENDER.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas, introduced a bill (H. R. 8559) making silver certificates a legal tender and regulating the issue thereof; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

NON-PAYING CUSTOMS DISTRICTS.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas, also submitted the following resolution of inquiry; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to inform the House of the number of custom-houses or ports of entry at which the expenses of the Government are greater than the amounts of revenue collected at said ports; and to state what reasons exist, if any, why said custom-houses should not be dispensed with and the officers now employed at said places discharged from the public service, with any other information in this direction that may tend to public economy.

J. L. WIKLE.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (H. R. 8560) granting a pension to J. L. Wikle; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

HENRY H. JOSLIN.

Mr. HITT introduced a bill (H. R. 8561) for the relief of Henry H. Joslin; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

GEORGE W. PECK.

Mr. SYMES introduced a bill (H. R. 8562) to remove the charge of desertion against George W. Peck; which was read a first and second

time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

ISAAC DAVISSON.

Mr. SYMES also introduced a bill (H. R. 8563) granting a pension to Isaac Davison; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF MINERAL LAND LAWS.

Mr. SYMES also introduced a bill (H. R. 8564) to amend section 2336 of the Revised Statutes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining, and ordered to be printed.

MRS. JAMES H. WELLS.

Mr. SYMES also introduced a bill (H. R. 8565) for the relief of Mrs. James H. Wells; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

FRANCIS A. LAND.

Mr. SYMES also introduced a bill (H. R. 8566) to remove the charge of desertion against Francis A. Land; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

CARRIE POWELL.

Mr. SYMES also introduced a bill (H. R. 8567) granting a pension to Carrie Powell; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

FREDERICK W. BECKER.

Mr. SYMES also introduced a bill (H. R. 8568) granting a pension to Frederick W. Becker; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

ISAIAH MITCHELL.

Mr. SYMES also introduced a bill (H. R. 8569) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Mitchell; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

DANIEL GOULD.

Mr. WORTHINGTON introduced a bill (H. R. 8570) to increase the pension of Daniel Gould; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

SARAH L. EVERSOL.

Mr. WADE introduced a bill (H. R. 8571) granting relief to Sarah L. Eversol; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

ALEXANDER THOMPSON.

Mr. WADE also introduced a bill (H. R. 8572) for the relief of Alexander Thompson; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

MRS. THOMAS KEATING.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, introduced a bill (H. R. 8573) for the relief of Mrs. Thomas Keating; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

THOMAS H. GRIFFIN.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8574) for the relief of Thomas H. Griffin; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN DONOHUE.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8575) for the relief of John Donohue; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

MARGARET B. DALTON.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8576) for the relief of Margaret B. Dalton, widow of Joseph M. Dalton; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JOSEPH KULAGE.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8577) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Kulage; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

HARRIET W. SHACKLETT.

Mr. ATKINSON introduced a bill (H. R. 8578) for the relief of Harriet W. Shacklett; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

COMMISSIONS TO REVENUE COLLECTORS.

Mr. MORRISON introduced a bill (H. R. 8579) to so further amend section 3314 of the Revised Statutes as amended as to strike out and repeal so much thereof as allows to collectors of internal revenue commissions on taxes collected on distilled spirits; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

PARMELA COOPER.

Mr. MORRISON also introduced a bill (H. R. 8580) granting a pen-

sion to Pamela Cooper; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

DAVID W. TETER.

Mr. MORRISON also introduced a bill (H. R. 8581) for increasing the pension of David W. Teter; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

F. W. BEINECKE.

Mr. MORRISON also introduced a bill (H. R. 8582) for the relief of F. W. Beinecke; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

CHRISTIAN BORDECKER.

Mr. MORRISON also introduced a bill (H. R. 8583) granting a pension to Christian Bordecker; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

HENRY YARDING.

Mr. MORRISON also introduced a bill (H. R. 8584) granting a pension to Henry Yarding; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

INSPECTION OF TOBACCO, ETC.

Mr. WISE introduced a bill (H. R. 8585) to provide for the inspection of tobacco, cigars, and snuff, and to repeal section 3151 of the Revised Statutes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas (by request), introduced a bill (H. R. 8586) to amend section 685 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

REESE PRITCHARD.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8587) for the relief of Reese Pritchard; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

ACT OF JUNE 20, 1878.

Mr. HOUK (by Mr. ZACH TAYLOR) introduced a bill (H. R. 8588) to amend the act of June 20, 1878; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

JAMES HUGHES.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, introduced a bill (H. R. 8589) for the relief of James Hughes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MARY LANE.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, also introduced a bill (H. R. 8590) for the relief of Mary Lane; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

LAND GRANTS IN KANSAS.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I move to suspend the rules and discharge the Committee on the Public Lands from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7021) to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads within the State of Kansas, and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes, and that the same be passed with the amendments recommended by the Committee on the Public Lands.

The SPEAKER. Is the bill still in the hands of the Committee on the Public Lands?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. It is. It was reported by the committee and recommitted.

The bill as proposed to be amended by the Committee on the Public Lands was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, &c., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to immediately adjust, or cause to be adjusted, each of the railroad land grants heretofore made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads within the State of Kansas.

Sec. 2. That if it shall appear upon the completion of such adjustments, respectively, that lands have been certified by the Secretary of the Interior to or for the benefit of either of said railroad companies in excess of the amount to which it was lawfully entitled, or that lands have been so certified which were reserved from the operations of said grants, or settled upon under the homestead, pre-emption, or timber-culture laws by *bona fide* settlers, within granted limits, prior to the definite location of said roads, or settled upon under the said homestead, pre-emption, or timber-culture laws by *bona fide* settlers, within the indemnity limits, prior to the selection of said lands by the railroad companies, or that lands not granted or lands not earned by said companies have been so certified, then and in that case it shall be the duty of the Attorney-General to commence and prosecute in the proper courts the necessary proceedings to cancel all patents, certifications, and evidence of title heretofore issued for such lands, and to restore the title thereof to the United States.

Sec. 3. That if, in the adjustment of said grants, or any other railroad, wagon-road, or canal grant, it shall appear that the homestead, pre-emption, or timber-culture claim or entry of any *bona fide* settler has heretofore been erroneously canceled or his application denied on account of any railroad grant or the withdrawal of public lands for railroad purposes, such settler, upon application, shall be reinstated in all his rights and allowed to perfect his entry and receive a patent from the United States for the tract so settled upon, by complying with

the public-land laws, where he has remained in possession of the land, claiming his right thereto under any claim under the general land laws of the United States: *Provided*, That such settler has not since located another claim or entry in lieu of the one so erroneously canceled: *And provided further*, That if any of said settlers shall have removed from said States, or do not renew their application to perfect their titles to said lands within a reasonable time, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, then such of said lands as remain shall be restored to the public domain and be disposed of under the public-land laws, and the *bona fide* settlers residing thereon shall have priority of right under said laws: *Provided also*, That this section shall not apply to any tract of land in possession of any party deriving title under any of said railroad grants, when such possession is in conflict with parties in possession, under claim under the general laws of the United States, as contemplated in the first clause of this section down to the first proviso.

Sec. 4. That all other of said lands which have been so wrongfully, and without authority of law, certified or patented to said railroad companies, and which have been sold by said companies, or either of them, prior to the date of the approval of this act, the party or person so purchasing shall have the right to the lands so purchased upon making proof of the fact of such purchase, at the proper local land office, within one year after the adjustment of said grants, respectively, and patents shall issue to the party entitled thereto; and the Secretary of the Interior, on behalf of the United States, shall demand payment from the railroad company or companies of an amount equal to \$2.50 per acre for all such lands so sold within the granted limits, and \$1.25 per acre for all such lands so sold within the indemnity limits of the grants respectively: *Provided*, That said lands shall have been sold by said company or companies for that or a greater price per acre; and if not so sold, then said companies, respectively, shall pay to the United States an amount equal to the price per acre so received by them from such sales; and in case of neglect or refusal of said company or companies to make payment as herein provided within one year after the demand shall have been made, the Attorney-General shall cause suit or suits to be brought against such company or companies for the amount claimed: *Provided*, That all lands so wrongfully certified or patented, and not sold by said companies, or either of them, shall be immediately restored to the public domain, to be disposed of under the public-land laws: *And provided further*, That any lands heretofore claimed by said companies, or either of them, under their respective grants, but not certified or patented, which, upon a proper adjustment, shall be found not to belong to said companies, shall be restored to the public domain under the public-land laws, and *bona fide* settlers residing thereon shall have priority of right under said laws.

Sec. 5. That no more lands shall be certified or conveyed to the State of Kansas, or to any corporation or individual, for the benefit of either of the railroad companies herein mentioned, by the Department of the Interior, until the said grants, respectively, shall have been adjusted as by this act required.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. VAN EATON. I demand a second.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I ask unanimous consent that the second may be considered as ordered.

Mr. VAN EATON. I object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as tellers the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANDERSON] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VAN EATON].

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 120, noes 9.

So a second was ordered.

The SPEAKER. There is a second ordered; and under the rules of the House thirty minutes are allowed for debate, fifteen minutes in support of the motion, and fifteen minutes in opposition. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANDERSON] to control the time in support of the motion, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VAN EATON] to control the time in opposition to it.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under the Pacific Railroad act of 1862, a large grant of land was made to the Kansas Pacific Railroad, and under the act of 1863 a very large grant was made to the State of Kansas for several roads, chief of which were the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fé; and the Missouri, Kansas and Texas; and the Leavenworth, Lawrence and Galveston roads. It was the practice of the Government to allow the companies, as a block of road was completed, to make selection of their lands, and it appears that under that practice there has been patented an excess of land to all these companies. This bill raises no question as to forfeiture because of non-completion of the roads in time. It provides for the final settlement of these grants. Where an excess of land is found to have been patented or certified it provides that such land shall be restored to the public domain, and it also protects the rights of homesteaders and *bona fide* purchasers. I shall content myself, Mr. Speaker, with this general statement as to the necessity for the bill, and will yield so much of my time as he may desire to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PAYSON], who will explain the legal bearing and effect of the provision of the bill.

Mr. PAYSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VAN EATON] has presented a minority report as to this bill, and I prefer to reserve the time that has been yielded to me by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANDERSON] until the gentleman from Mississippi shall have been heard.

Mr. VAN EATON. Mr. Speaker, so far as that is concerned there was no understanding between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PAYSON] and myself that I would follow the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANDERSON]; but that was on the assumption that the gentleman from Kansas was going to say something that I could follow. [Laughter.] As he has not done so, but has turned over the whole subject to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PAYSON], I think I have a perfect right to "go back" on that agreement, and wait until I hear something in favor of the bill, for I have not heard anything yet. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. PAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to consume any of the time of the House, and yet, because of the amount that is involved in this bill, and because several gentlemen sitting near have asked me what

it contains, I may perhaps ask the attention of the House for five minutes, in which time I think I can satisfy gentlemen that there ought not to be any hesitation about passing the bill. The facts upon which this bill is based are these: In 1863 an act of Congress was passed making a large donation of lands in the State of Kansas in aid of the construction of five different railroads, the principal of them being the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fé; the Leavenworth, Lawrence and Galveston; and the Missouri, Kansas and Texas.

The amount of acreage involved in relation to the Missouri, Kansas and Texas road was 1,520,000 acres; as to the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fé, 2,920,000, and as to the Leavenworth, Lawrence and Galveston, 840,000 acres. The act of Congress provided that all these roads should be constructed within ten years, and they were so constructed. They have earned whatever land they were entitled to under the law by the construction of their roads. But by lax administration in the Interior Department it turns out that a large acreage of land has been certified to these railroad companies in excess of the amount to which they were entitled. In advance of construction land was certified to the State—the State in this case acting as trustee for the railroad companies—and in 1873 it appeared upon the books of the Interior Department that large areas of land had been certified to the State of Kansas for the benefit of these roads in excess of that to which they were entitled. And yet the books of the Interior Department show that the grants have never yet been adjusted with reference to any one of these three roads. I hold in my hand an official letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, written in 1883, in which he shows, with reference to one of these roads, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fé, that an excess of something like 20,000 acres of land has been certified to that road.

Lands aggregating 73,351 acres have been certified to the other companies to which the Interior Department says they are not entitled, and to which the railway companies themselves concede that they are not entitled. Matters standing in this way, the Interior Department has requested these railway companies to reconvey the General Government such lands as have been improperly certified to them and to which they were not entitled. For some reason, best known to themselves, the railway companies have declined to do that, and of course, as every lawyer knows, the title having passed to the companies, the Government can only reassert itself by directing proceedings through the Attorney-General's Office for the cancellation of the patents on the certified lists which in some of these cases conveyed titles. These roads were completed in 1873. Thirteen years have elapsed since that time; and although in many cases these lands to which the railroad companies concede they have no title were certified years ago, they still retain control and possession of them. Hence the necessity for the passage of this bill.

Mr. LONG. Are they improving the lands?

Mr. PAYSON. No, sir. Some they have sold, some they simply hold.

The first section of the bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to complete the adjustment of these grants. In other words, it simply directs him to do what it is his duty to do without legislation; but in view of the fact that all these years have elapsed since the roads were constructed and nothing has been done with reference to determining what particular tracts of land to which the railroad companies were not entitled have been certified to them, the first section of the bill directs this adjustment.

The second section provides that where in any case parties have gone into possession of these lands as settlers under the general land laws—and when I say "these lands" I mean the lands to which the railroad companies are not entitled—and have remained in possession of the lands down to this time, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to recognize the claims of the settlers thus in possession. In addition to that it is provided that the Attorney-General shall begin suit to cancel such patents and certifications as the railroad companies were not entitled to under the granting act.

The third section provides that where parties are in possession as purchasers in good faith from the railroad companies, their title shall be validated upon proof of that fact; and also that where the lands have thus been sold to settlers who are now in possession, the railroad companies shall be responsible to the General Government for the amount of money which they have received from the settler, not exceeding \$2.50 per acre for land within the granted limits, and \$1.25 per acre for land within the indemnity limits; these being the prices fixed by the general land law in like cases.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Does the bill throw upon the purchaser from the railroad company the burden of showing his title?

Mr. PAYSON. It provides that the purchaser shall make proof at the nearest land office that he purchased in good faith and is still in possession; and upon presenting such proof he will receive a patent from the Government. The only onus thrown upon the settler is that he shall go to the nearest land office and make proof of the fact that he has purchased this land from the railroad company in good faith and is in possession thereof.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. Is there anything in the amendment of the bill that makes it apply to other States?

Mr. PAYSON. There is. It is provided that the Secretary of the Interior shall proceed as rapidly as may be to adjust land grants in other States.

Mr. LORE. If the railroad company received for any of these lands more than it is required to pay back to the Government, what becomes of the excess?

Mr. PAYSON. The railroad company keeps it. We do not attempt to get from the railroad company any more than the Government price for the lands.

Mr. CANNON. Suppose parties who purchased of the railroad company in good faith are not in actual possession?

Mr. PAYSON. It does not matter. If they have purchased in good faith from the railroad company they are protected.

Mr. STONE, of Massachusetts. Under this bill, how will the excess of lands certified to the railroad companies be determined?

Mr. PAYSON. The bill does not undertake to direct the Secretary of the Interior as to any method of adjustment. We could not do that if we so desired. We simply provide that he shall go on and make the adjustment.

I will reserve the remainder of my time, if I have said anything which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VAN EATON] deems worthy of answer.

Mr. VAN EATON. Mr. Speaker, my objections to this bill are manifold. In the first place, there is no necessity for it. The bill provides in effect that the Secretary of the Interior shall proceed to adjust these railroad grants, and that the Attorney-General shall then proceed to recover for the United States any excess. The bill, in other words, proposes to confer on these officers powers which have been conceded to them from the formation of the Government. I may be permitted to say that as a member of the Public Lands Committee I have not been able either in the last Congress or in this to see the slightest necessity for the passage of this bill. On the other hand, the evils which may result from its passage are manifold. I contend that no good can be accomplished by a measure which simply authorizes the law officer of the Government and the head of the proper Department to do that which it is their duty now to do. More than that, by this bill they are required to proceed to seek proof for the purpose of disarranging matters and unsettling titles which have been settled perhaps for more than a score of years. This is another objection which I have to the bill.

I have inquired of the gentleman from Kansas the author of the bill, and this at least is a bill which no one will dispute with him the honor of paternity, for it is certain no other man in this House could have draughted such a bill—I have inquired, I say, of that gentleman, the author of the bill, why the people of Kansas needed it; and never yet have I been able to get an answer from him to that question.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I will answer the gentleman now.

Mr. VAN EATON. Do so in your own time.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. And it is this: One million and a half of acres of land these railroads have acquired to which by law they are not entitled, and this bill is for the purpose of securing the restoration of those lands, amounting to one million and a half of acres, to the public domain. Secondly, settlers and *bona fide* purchasers without some such law could not complete their titles, and tens of thousands of acres in the hands of settlers would be left hung up.

Mr. VAN EATON. Why can that not be as well settled without it as with it?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. For the reason that a *bona fide* settler, under the operation of the law as it now stands, can not obtain a title.

Mr. VAN EATON. That brings me to one of the remarkable features of this bill. It provides, in case certain settlers are on land which shall turn out in the readjustment did not belong to the railroad company when it sold it to the settler, what shall be done. To my mind it is a most remarkable provision. It says, "We will give you the land, but make the railroad company pay the price." The trouble, to my mind, is just this: If the railroad sold that to which it had no title, as a matter of course the vendee has recourse on the warranty, but this bill attempts to make the railroad responsible to the United States. That is to say, if they sold land and gave no title they are not to account to the purchaser, they are not to account to the vendee, but the United States accounts to them or guarantees the title, and then turns upon the railroad and says, "You pay us. You do not pay the man whose title you guaranteed, but we will step in and fix that title, and then you will pay us." To my mind it is a novel proposition of law. As a matter of course, if the railroad sold without guarantee the purchasers in that case would be helpless.

I take it if such land grants were adjusted without intervention of law, and it should be found that a certain number of acres had been overcertified and the railroad had sold these lands to innocent purchasers, the railroad, as a matter of course, on final adjustment would lose the land, and the purchasers, in there in good faith, would have the right of possessing themselves of those lands.

Mr. Speaker, there is another objection to this bill. There are entirely too many matters involved in it to pass it under a suspension of the rules without careful consideration by the House.

I will call attention, for instance, to the third section of the bill, which provides:

That if, in the adjustment of said grants, or any other railroad, wagon-road, or canal grant, it shall appear that the homestead, pre-emption, or timber-culture claim or entry of any bona fide settler has heretofore been erroneously canceled or his application denied on account of any railroad grant or the withdrawal of public lands for railroad purposes, such settler, upon application, shall be reinstated in all his rights, and allowed to perfect his entry and receive a patent from the United States for the tract so settled upon, by complying with the public-land laws, where he has remained in possession of the land, claiming his right thereto under any claim under the general land laws of the United States.

They can under it cancel every railroad grant in the United States. At least it opens a field of litigation which no man can see the end of—that is, if that bill were to be passed by Congress. That is another reason why I object to it.

Mr. PAYSON. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. VAN EATON. Yes, sir.

Mr. PAYSON. Is it not a fact, instead of opening a field of litigation, it provides there shall be no litigation whatever, but the whole matter shall be settled in the Interior Department? I assert that to be the fact.

Mr. VAN EATON. What, then, has the Attorney-General to do?

Mr. PAYSON. You provide in the third section these erroneous entries are to be canceled.

Mr. VAN EATON. But suppose the Secretary of the Interior does not settle according to the belief of the parties interested?

Mr. PAYSON. But the section simply provides that if there has been an entry erroneously canceled, the Secretary of the Interior shall reinstate the settler; and hence this is for his protection, and without sending him to the courts, as the gentleman seems to apprehend.

Mr. VAN EATON. That may be all true; but I suppose the gentleman will not tell me that this does not apply to every other land-grant road in the United States?

Mr. PAYSON. Certainly it does; wherever there has been an over-certification. That was the intent of the committee.

Mr. BAYNE. It ought to apply to all.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. Why ought it not apply to all?

Mr. PAYSON. I am speaking now of what the bill contains, not of what it does not contain.

Mr. VAN EATON. There have been about 50,000,000 acres of land certified for railroads completed, confessedly completed in terms.

Now another evil of this bill, to which I wish to call attention, is that it proposes a readjustment by a different rule from any which has heretofore prevailed for the last forty years, a rule essentially at variance with any heretofore in force, by which the readjustments have been made, and settlers and purchasers might in good faith come into quiet and peaceable possession of their holdings, and it is this: that the granted limits shall be construed and computed according to the meandering lines of the road. That is the old rule; but the proposition now is to turn all of that over and run a straight line from the starting-point to the terminus and readjust every grant on that straight line. I understand that to be the proposition now pending in the Interior Department.

Mr. PAYSON. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. VAN EATON. Yes, sir.

Mr. PAYSON. Where do you find anything of that kind in this bill?

Mr. VAN EATON. It is not in the bill, and that is just what is the matter. If the gentleman wants to know about that he will find it in the report of the minority of the committee, which that committee made from the best information they could get about the construction of the law by the present Commissioner of the General Land Office.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this report is better than any speech I can make, and I will ask that it be read in my own time, as I would like to have it go into the RECORD.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. VAN EATON, from the Committee on the Public Lands, submitted the following views of the minority:

The undersigned fully concur in all measures which provide for the recovery by the United States of all lands heretofore granted for the construction of railroads which have not been heretofore earned by such construction. But they can not so concur in the majority report upon the present bill, because they are unable to discover any existing necessity for such proposed legislation.

Grants to aid in the construction of canals and railroads cover a period extending from 1828 to 1871. More than 50,000,000 acres of land have been conveyed to States and corporations in satisfaction of grants, wherein the condition of reasonable construction has been fully met. The principles of measurement and rules of construction applied in all such grants find their basis established at the very commencement of the system, and under such principles and rules these millions of acres have been conveyed. Many of the grants for the construction of railroads have been entirely adjusted in accordance with these long-established rules and principles, and it is very certain that the titles thus conveyed thereunder have passed into the hands of thousands of innocent purchasers for value, whose labor and investment have largely enhanced the value of such lands. Titles throughout the settled portions of the West rest largely upon the integrity of these ancient adjustments, which it is the declared purpose of this bill to now re-open and disturb.

Whatever changes in the construction of the law may have occurred in recent years, it is now proposed to apply to all railroad grants and to reopen as an original matter questions determined by the proper administrative officers of the Government many years since, and on the faith of which determination these titles have been created and put forth upon the world.

The assumed basis for this threatened destruction of property rights springs from the declaration of the present Commissioner of the General Land Office, who finds an established basis of measurement determining the lateral limits of these grants which has been in force for nearly forty years not in accord with his construction of the law, and who thereupon announces the determination to readjust all such grants, and, of necessity, to produce new results, regardless of all that has been hitherto done and in disregard of all its executed consequences. There has been no argument before nor consideration by the committee as to the soundness of this new method of measurement as matter of law, nor the propriety, from either a legal or equitable standpoint, of thus attempting to change the construction and practice of forty years in order to accomplish results which may disturb titles long since vested and which have become the basis of community property rights.

Titles to realty in all settled communities which have stood the test of time, and often of judicial scrutiny in controversies between private litigants, should not be clouded by attack through the judicial tribunals or otherwise. And certainly legislation which compels adjustment of these railroad grants where the titles have stood for many years unquestioned, and passed from hand to hand as the representatives of values, should not be had upon a mere assumption of error in the principles and practice of the administrative officers extending through so many years.

From the establishment of the Government to the present time the power and duty of the Attorney-General to invoke the aid of the courts in recovering lands assumed to have been erroneously conveyed by the Government has stood unquestioned. As matter of practical administration he acts daily in this direction upon the request of the officers of the Land Department, who are under the law directly charged with the duty of protecting the Government in this regard. But the performance of that duty does not need the incentive of legislation, nor should the will of Congress control the judgment of the highest law officer of the Government in determining the existence or non-existence of a remedy in favor of the United States, nor compel him to institute and carry forward litigation which, in his judgment, can not succeed upon either legal or equitable grounds.

The present bill makes it obligatory upon both the officers of the Land Department to adjust all grants however ancient and the Attorney-General to commence proceedings for recovery regardless of the justice, wisdom, or policy of such proceeding. While all of these grants have been adjusted in whole or in part by the officers of the Land Department, acting in accordance with settled precedent and long-established rules of measurement which the railroads did not inaugurate nor control, this bill seeks to punish the Government's grantees for the assumed mistakes of its own officers, and to put in litigation titles which were obtained without fraud and in accordance with such long-established precedents. Recognizing the existing fact that the lands so conveyed have in large part passed into the hands of innocent purchasers for value, the bill holds out to such purchasers the glittering promise of a new title by gift from the United States after their existing titles have been clouded for many years with litigation and finally set aside. As this promise is a mere gratuity upon the part of the Government, it can be rescinded at any future time. But assuming its integrity for the present, the bill then provides for suits against the railroad companies to recover the Government price per acre for all lands to which its purchasers may receive such gift of title from the Government. The utility of such legislation must be apparent to every legal mind. Upon the recovery of these titles by the Government the purchasers from the railroads stand without legal or equitable remedy against the United States thereon. The assumption of the obligation by the Government to make a new title to such purchasers can not create a legal or equitable obligation from the railroad companies to the Government in turn to recoup to it the value of such lands. The sole responsibility of the railroad companies would be upon the warranty of title, if any, given their purchasers. No obligation to the Government can be created beyond that point by legislation or otherwise.

And, finally, the minority protest that the only result of such legislation as this is to cloud and embarrass the titles of thousands of innocent men who, during the pendency of litigation which this bill directs, will find themselves unable to handle their property by sale, mortgage, or otherwise. The evil results flowing from such condition of affairs, whether of long or short duration, is so great that it manifestly can not justify Congress in thus legislating. It is precisely the case where under the existing circumstances it is far better to stop with ascertaining what the law has been construed to be and what forms of measurement have been adopted through so many years by the officers charged with the administration of these grants and bound by an official oath, than to seek to rescind what has thus been done in order to recover a few thousand acres of land at the end of long and widespread litigation, which must carry in its train all the evils which flow from the general upheaval of real titles in settled communities.

H. S. VAN EATON,
ISAAC STEPHENSON.

Before the conclusion of the reading of the report the hammer fell.

The SPEAKER. The time in opposition to the motion has expired.

Mr. VAN EATON. I ask consent that the remainder of the report be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. VAN EATON. Mr. Speaker, I only desire to say, in conclusion, that so far as the railroads are concerned, for all the purposes of this bill, I care nothing for them. It is the farmer and the settler for whom I speak, believing as I do its only tendency is to unrest and disquiet, to litigation and years of uncertainty concerning the titles of people, of all others, who can least afford the uncertainty, delay, and expense of lawsuits; besides, it is a bill of too much importance to be rushed through the House under suspension of the rules and without opportunity for examination and debate.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has four minutes in support of the motion.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I yield that time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PAYSON].

Mr. PAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I only desire to reply to the two points which have been suggested in opposition to this motion by the gentleman from Mississippi: First, that the tendency of this bill will be to unsettle titles as to lands which have been heretofore granted; and in response to that I wish to say that the direct converse of that proposition is the truth, and that the operation of this bill will be to settle instead of unsettle these titles. It does not presume to divest anybody, either a settler or a railway company, of any title to any land. It simply presupposes the fact that these companies entered and have had cer-

tified to them lands to which they are not entitled, and the document to which I called the attention of the House a few moments since in the course of my remarks shows that these three railroad companies have already had certified to them 73,351 acres of land in excess of what they were entitled to, which fact was admitted by the railroads themselves and is conceded on all hands. That being the condition of affairs, the question arises, what is to be done in the case? Upon these lands people have gone to settle either in one of two ways; either as purchasers from the railroad company, assuming that these lands having been certified to the railway company belonged to it, and therefore that it had the right to sell; or, second, they have gone upon the land as settlers under the general land laws of the country. As it turns out the railroad company had no right, and the bill protects both classes of settlers and without litigation in any way, by providing that when the readjustment is made the settler whose entry has been canceled or his application denied shall be reinstated in all his rights by being permitted to perfect his entry; or if he shall have purchased from said railroad company prior to the passage of this act, all that is necessary to complete his title is to make proof of the fact at the proper local land office within the time fixed in the act.

But perhaps I should state more explicitly what is meant by this readjustment, as several gentlemen around in my immediate vicinity here have asked the question, which I will try to answer to their satisfaction. An adjustment under the public land system is merely the fixing of the definite sections and quarter-sections by the Interior Department to determine what tracts of land the railroad company is entitled to. That is all there is of it—merely determining the specific tracts that the company should have.

The bill, as I have said, provides that where heretofore land has been erroneously certified to a company that was not entitled to it, if a man has bought from the railroad company his title is validated on making proof of that fact. Where is there unsettling of title by that? If a man had made an entry in good faith on the public lands, but by a mistaken construction in the Interior Department his entry was canceled or held for naught, this act provides, in the third section, that the canceled entry shall be reinstated, provided the party has remained in possession down to the present time. There is no unsettling of title, but a validation of title, and with no injury to anybody, and with no expense of litigation, except so far as the Department of Justice shall file a bill to cancel patents, &c., unlawfully issued.

Mr. MILLS. Have these lands been all surveyed?

Mr. PAYSON. They have all been surveyed, but the practice was in the Interior Department to certify *en masse*, and leave it to the future to determine the amount the company were entitled to and the specific tracts they should have.

The SPEAKER. The time allowed for debate on the bill has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANDERSON] to suspend the rules and pass the bill with the amendments reported by the committee.

Mr. MORRISON. I think we had better have the yeas and nays.

The question being taken on ordering the yeas and nays, there were yeas 34.

Mr. PERKINS. Count the other side.

The negative vote being taken, there were noes 95.

So (the affirmative being more than one-fifth of the whole vote) the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 214, nays 9, not voting 100; as follows:

YEAS—214.

Adams, G. E.	Cooper,	Hale,	Landes,
Allen, C. H.	Cox,	Hall,	Lanham,
Allen, J. M.	Crisp,	Halsell,	Lawler,
Anderson, J. A.	Cutcheon,	Hammond,	Lehlbach,
Arnot,	Dargan,	Harmer,	Lindsley,
Atkinson,	Davidson, R. H. M.	Harris,	Little,
Baker,	Davis,	Hatch,	Long,
Ballentine,	Dawson,	Heard,	Lovring,
Barksdale,	Dibble,	Hemphill,	Lowry,
Barnes,	Dingley,	Henderson, D. B.	Lyman,
Bayne,	Dockery,	Henderson, T. J.	Mahoney,
Beach,	Dunham,	Herbert,	Markham,
Blanchard,	Dunn,	Hewitt,	Martin,
Blair,	Eden,	Hiestand,	McAdoo,
Blount,	Eldredge,	Hill,	McComas,
Bound,	Ellsberry,	Hiscock,	McCreary,
Boyle,	Ely,	Hitt,	McKenna,
Brady,	Ermentrout,	Holman,	McMillin,
Breckinridge, WCP	Evans,	Holmes,	McRae,
Brown, C. E.	Everhart,	Hopkins,	Merriman,
Brown, W. W.	Farquhar,	Houk,	Millard,
Buck,	Felton,	Howard,	Miller,
Burleigh,	Fleeger,	Hudd,	Mills,
Burrows,	Foran,	Hutton,	Morrill,
Butterworth,	Ford,	Irion,	Morrison,
Bynum,	Frederick,	James,	Morrow,
Caldwell,	Fuller,	Johnston, J. T.	Muller,
Campbell, T. J.	Funston,	Jones, J. H.	Murphy,
Candler,	Gallinger,	Jones, J. T.	Neal,
Cannon,	Gay,	Kelley,	O'Hara,
Carleton,	Geddes,	Ketcham,	O'Neill, Charles
Clardy,	Goff,	King,	Osborne,
Clements,	Green, R. S.	Kleiner,	Owen,
Cobb,	Grosvenor,	Laffoon,	Payne,
Crostock,	Grount,	La Follette,	Payson,
Conger,	Guenther,	Laird,	Peel,

Perkins,	Rowell,	Strait,	Ward, T. B.
Perry,	Sadler,	Struble,	Warner, William
Peters,	Sayers,	Swinburne,	Weaver, A. J.
Phelps,	Scranton,	Symes,	Weaver, J. B.
Pindar,	Seney,	Tarsney,	Weber,
Plumb,	Sessions,	Taulbee,	Wheeler,
Price,	Seymour,	Taylor, J. M.	White, A. C.
Randall,	Shaw,	Taylor, Zach.	White, Milo
Ranney,	Smalls,	Thomas, O. B.	Whiting,
Reagan,	Snyder,	Thompson,	Wilkins,
Reese,	Sowden,	Tillman,	Willis,
Rice,	Springer,	Townshend,	Wilson,
Richardson,	Steele,	Trigg,	Winans,
Riggs,	Stewart, Charles	Turner,	Wise,
Robertson,	St. Martin,	Viele,	Wolford,
Rockwell,	Stone, E. F.	Wade,	Worthington.
Rogers,	Stone, W. J., Ky.	Wadsworth,	
Romeis,	Stone, W. J., Mo.	Ward, J. H.	

NAYS—9.

Bragg,	Dougherty,	Loce,	Singleton,
Catchings,	Henderson, J. S.	Morgan,	Van Eaton.
Cowles,			

NOT VOTING—100.

Adams, J. J.	Croton,	Johnson, F. A.	Reed, T. B.
Aiken,	Culberson,	Johnston, T. D.	Reid, J. W.
Anderson, C. M.	Curtin,	Le Fevre,	Ryan,
Barbour,	Daniel,	Libbey,	Sawyer,
Barry,	Davenport,	Louffit,	Scott,
Belmont,	Davidson, A. C.	Matson,	Skinner,
Bennett,	Dorsey,	Maybury,	Spooner,
Bingham,	Dowdney,	McKinley,	Springg,
Bliss,	Findlay,	Milliken,	Stahlnecker,
Boutelle,	Fisher,	Mitchell,	Stephenson,
Breckinridge, C. E.	Forney,	Moffatt,	Stewart, J. W.
Browne, T. M.	Gibson, C. H.	Necce,	Storm,
Brumm,	Gibson, Eustace	Negley,	Swope,
Buchanan,	Gilfillan,	Nelson,	Taylor, E. B.
Bunnell,	Glass,	Norwood,	Taylor, I. H.
Burnes,	Glover,	Oates,	Thomas, J. R.
Cabell,	Green, W. J.	O'Donnell,	Throckmorton,
Campbell, Felix	Hanback,	O'Ferrall,	Tucker,
Campbell, J. M.	Hayden,	O'Neill, J. J.	Van Schaick,
Campbell, J. E.	Haynes,	Outhwaite,	Wait,
Caswell,	Henley,	Parker,	Wakefield,
Cole,	Hepburn,	Pettibone,	Warner, A. J.
Collins,	Herman,	Pidcock,	Wellborn,
Compton,	Hires,	Pierce,	West,
Crain,	Jackson,	Pulitzer,	Woodburn.

So (two-thirds voting in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the names.

Objection was made.

The following-named members were announced as paired until further notice:

Mr. CULBERSON with Mr. MCKINLEY.

Mr. CABELL with Mr. CAMPBELL, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FORNEY with Mr. BUNNELL.

Mr. STORM with Mr. PETTIBONE.

Mr. BENNETT with Mr. O'DONNELL.

Mr. GREEN, of North Carolina, with Mr. WEST.

Mr. BURNES with Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. COLE with Mr. THOMAS, of Illinois.

Mr. THROCKMORTON with Mr. JACKSON.

Mr. OUTHWAITE with Mr. PARKER.

Mr. MAYBURY with Mr. RYAN.

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana, with Mr. FISHER.

Mr. CURTIN with Mr. NEGLEY.

Mr. CRAIN with Mr. STEWART, of Vermont.

Mr. ADAMS, of New York, with Mr. MARKHAM.

The following members were announced as paired for this day:

Mr. DANIEL with Mr. JOHNSON, of New York.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina, with Mr. HAYDEN.

Mr. GIBSON, of Maryland, with Mr. BRUMM.

Mr. SKINNER with Mr. HERMAN.

Mr. BLISS with Mr. HIRES.

Mr. GIBSON, of West Virginia, with Mr. GILFILLAN.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio, with Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. MATSON with Mr. HAYNES.

Mr. REID, of North Carolina, with Mr. SPOONER.

Mr. NORWOOD with Mr. PIRCE.

Mr. SCOTT with Mr. SAWYER.

Mr. O'FERRALL with Mr. HANBACK.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, with Mr. DAVENPORT.

Mr. DOWDNEY with Mr. LIBBEY.

Mr. CROXTON with Mr. DORSEY.

Mr. FELIX CAMPBELL with Mr. WAKEFIELD.

The result of the vote was then announced as above stated.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT HANNIBAL, MO.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be discharged from the further consideration of House bill No. 7735, which I send to the desk, that the rules be suspended and that the bill be passed with an amendment striking out "five hundred," so that it will read "\$37,000."

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objections.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, &c., That to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to complete the public building in course of erection at Hannibal, Mo., in accordance with the original plans of the Supervising Architect providing for a building three stories high, and to make the same fire-proof, the sum of \$37,500 is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MORRISON. I demand a second.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

Mr. MORRISON. I object.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 160, noes 6; so a second was ordered.

The SPEAKER. There is a second, and under the rules of the House thirty minutes are allowed for debate; fifteen minutes in support of the motion and fifteen minutes in opposition. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] to control the time in support of the motion, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MORRISON] to control the time in opposition to it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have read the letter of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury in relation to this building, transmitted to the Speaker of the House by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The letter was read, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SUPERVISING ARCHITECT,
Washington, March 17, 1886.

SIR: At the request of Hon. W. H. Hatch, I have the honor to call your attention to the advisability of an increased appropriation to complete the public building at Hannibal, Mo. (employing fire-proof construction), to accommodate the post-office, court-house, internal-revenue, and other officers of that place, in accordance with the original plans and specifications.

These plans provided for a building three stories high, photograph of which was published in my last annual report. The design contemplates the completion of the first story for the use and occupation of the Post-Office Department, and the dimensions of which are such as only to properly provide for the handling of the mails received at that place. The second story is required for the use and occupation of the internal-revenue officers of that district. The third story will be required for the use and occupation of United States circuit and district courts, with their necessary officers.

The economy of an increase of \$37,500 to construct an additional story at this time is manifest and essential, not only to afford proper accommodations for the officers, but to make the building harmonious in its architectural proportions. The expense of roofing in the third story of the building will be no more than that required for a two-story structure, and the additional accommodations provided justify the recommendation herewith submitted, that the above amount be appropriated so that work can proceed upon the building in its regular order.

Respectfully, yours,

M. E. BELL, Supervising Architect.

Hon. SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, the communication just read was sent to the Committee on Appropriations, and by that committee was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The matter has been acted upon by a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and by the full committee, and the chairman informed me this morning that the bill had been approved by the full committee unanimously, as I understand him to say. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EDEN. Have the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds made a report?

Mr. HATCH. The bill was approved by the full committee this morning. The report has not yet been made, but I state the fact that the committee have approved the bill and recommended its passage.

Mr. DUNHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] to the fact that this letter of the Supervising Architect refers to certain photographs. Is the gentleman prepared to show those photographs to the House? [Laughter.]

Mr. HATCH. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] tells us this bill has the approval of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. That is the only information we have of the fact. I do not, however, question it. The bill is to be considered without any report, on a motion to suspend the rules. The bill will pass, no doubt, not because of any merit it may have, but because other bills more or less meritorious are behind it and in league with it. In saying in league with it, I mean that these things—these public buildings, so called—naturally go together through this House. Several years ago, when this nice town or little city of Hannibal, Mo., had a population, as the census tells us, of 11,074 (it probably has a good many more now, for I believe it is a very flourishing little place), the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH], who is very able in legislation, and especially in all that relates to the management of legislation, secured the passage of a law here to build a house at Hannibal at a limited cost of \$75,000. That was understood to be the sum of entire cost, beyond which the Treasury was not to be depleted. So it was fixed by law.

And I am not talking now with any expectation of defeating this bill, but for the purpose of pointing out some of the abuses that go along with the construction of these public buildings. That appropriation, originally \$75,000, soon grew to \$93,000; just how, the gentleman from

Missouri may or may not know; and I undertake to say a close scrutiny would demonstrate that that increase was without any public necessity. Now \$37,000 more is asked because the Supervising Architect tells us that there is a photograph of the building somewhere [laughter] which shows the building as it ought to be, not as the law provided it should be, but according to some arrangement made by the officials having control of the building, not in accordance with the original provision of law.

This photograph gives information that the building "is required for the use and occupation of United States circuit and district courts with their necessary officers;" and that a thirty-seven-thousand-dollar addition is necessary to hold the court and court or other officials. There is no court at Hannibal. There has been an effort on the part of the Missouri delegation for two, three, or four years to remove a court or a part of the court from where it is now held to Hannibal, but it has not gone there yet. Probably the gentleman who wrote this letter for our information did not know anything about that. He saw the photograph [laughter] and then tells us that it is necessary to have this building \$37,000 more expensive for a court-room.

Mr. Speaker, I merely call attention to these things to show how these bills get through this House. I presume this bill is quite as meritorious as many others that are here enacted into laws because they are leagued one with another, a majority of them being without merit to secure favorable consideration but for such combination.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, it is only necessary for me to say that when I introduced a bill in the Forty-seventh Congress to provide for a public building at Hannibal, Mo., it was brought before this House upon its merits, and after a full and fair discussion of it and the presentation of all the facts it passed by a very decided majority. Now an increase in the appropriation is asked for to make this needed public building fire-proof in its construction, worthy of the Government and of the business of the Government at that point. And I wish to say further that I am as far as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MORRISON] can be from coming to this House and asking for anything in the way of an appropriation that I do not believe is justified by the needs of the public service.

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

So the rules were suspended; and the bill was passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT DES MOINES, IOWA.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I move to suspend the rules so as to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of House bill 5251 and pass the same.

The title of the bill was read, as follows:

A bill making an appropriation for the repairs and enlargement of the post-office and court-house at Des Moines, Iowa, and fixing a limit therefor.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is it in order to move that the House do now adjourn?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. SPRINGER. I make that motion.

Mr. HISCOCK. I suggest to the gentleman that this is not quite fair. There ought to be one motion on each side.

Mr. SPRINGER. There has already been one motion on each side.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. SPRINGER, it was not agreed to, there being—ayes 46, noes 97.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, &c., That \$153,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of completing the repairs and enlargement of the United States post-office and court-house at Des Moines, Iowa; and this amount shall be in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated for said purpose, and shall, together with said sum, be considered the limit of appropriations for such repairs and enlargement.

SEC. 2. That the officers of the United States Government having charge of the erection of public buildings are authorized and required to be governed by this limit in making contracts therefor.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded on the motion to suspend the rules?

Mr. SPRINGER. I demand a second.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

Mr. MORRISON. I object.

The SPEAKER appointed as tellers Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 151, noes 12.

So the motion to suspend the rules was seconded.

The SPEAKER. Debate is now in order for thirty minutes; fifteen minutes in favor of the motion, and fifteen against it. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] to control the time in support of the motion, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] to control the time in opposition.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes an appropriation for a building at Des Moines, the capital of the State of Iowa, in the district represented by my colleague [Mr. CONGER], to whom I yield so much time as he may desire.

Mr. CONGER. Mr. Speaker, an appropriation for the extension of

this building was made some three or four years ago and plans were prepared, but they have not yet been carried out. During this time the city and State have grown so rapidly that in order to accommodate the increasing business it is found necessary that the building should be enlarged. The amount now proposed to be appropriated is asked in order to construct a building of a size sufficient to accommodate the business which must be done there. In the first place, this building must accommodate the post-office, the gross receipts of which are nearly \$100,000 a year and the net receipts \$67,000, giving a larger percentage of net revenue to the Government than any other post-office in the United States except one, that at the town of Elgin, Ill. The city of Des Moines is practically in the center of the State. It is the commercial and the railroad center of the State, thirteen or fourteen railroads reaching therefrom into every part of our Commonwealth. The whole business of the State practically centers there. Consequently this city is doing the business of a population of nearly 2,000,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman state what other Government offices, besides the post-office, are to be accommodated in this building?

Mr. CONGER. The other offices to be accommodated are the United States circuit and district courts, the pension agency for the States of Nebraska, Iowa, and Minnesota, the internal-revenue collector's office for that district, and the two United States land offices.

Mr. Speaker, as I am not disposed to detain the House I will not occupy further time.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I reserve the balance of my time, simply stating for the information of the House that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds have unanimously reported in favor of this bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask that the report of the committee be read in my time.

The report (by Mr. HENLEY) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred House bill 5251, beg leave to report:

By act of May 7, 1882, provision was made for repairing and enlarging the post-office and court-house at Des Moines, Iowa; \$45,000 was appropriated to begin the work, and additional appropriations have since been made, making a total for said purpose of \$180,000. But the rapid growth of the city and State, and the great increase of public business that must be transacted there, have demonstrated the total inadequacy of the proposed enlargement for the present demand, much less the increased demand which must be provided for in the very near future.

The Government owns the ground, and it will be the part of true economy to extend the building at this time, in anticipation of the growing increase in the public business, and thus prevent another enlargement and rearrangement which must of necessity be made, at great expense, at an early date.

It was thought that the original building would answer the public demand for many years, but after an occupancy of only twelve years a considerable enlargement was found absolutely necessary. The per cent. of increase of both population and business is much greater now than then; hence the demand for more liberal accommodations for the future.

As showing the rapid growth of the city and the marvelous increase of business, the population of the city of Des Moines, Iowa, was, in 1860, 3,965; in 1870, 12,035; in 1880, 22,696; in 1885, 36,494.

Population of State in 1865, 754,699; in 1885, 1,753,980.

Miles of railroad in State in 1865, 1,000; miles of railroad in 1885, 7,000.

Des Moines is the capital, and is the commercial as well as the railroad center of the State. In 1865 the city had but one line of railroad; now thirteen lines radiate from here to every part of the State.

The volume of business in the city for 1885 was \$70,796,691. The permanent improvements made during the year were \$3,502,416.

It expended, in 1886, for paving, sewerage, and other public improvements, \$217,963. The State has just completed a capitol building there at the cost of \$3,000,000.

The internal revenue collected at Des Moines in 1885 was \$1,958,811.60. The total financial transactions of the Des Moines post-office were \$1,809,542.57; money-order business, \$1,720,923.99; stamps sold, \$88,618.

Gross receipts.....	\$93,308 83
Expenses.....	25,471 29

Net revenue.....	67,837 54
------------------	-----------

being a larger per cent. of net revenue than from any other first-class post-office save one in the United States. The pension-office here paid out during 1885, to 17,989 pensioners, \$1,958,811.60.

This public building must accommodate the post-office with over forty employes; the pension office with a very large clerical force; the United States courts with their various officers; the collector of internal revenue with necessary attendants, and the register and receiver of the United States land office with their cumbersome records. The space in the old building had proven grossly inadequate and the present plan for enlargement will very ill meet the demands for room.

In consequence of the repairs and extension ordered the offices are now all in rented quarters—none of them fire-proof—all of them very crowded, and for which the Government is paying an annual rental of \$6,148.

Des Moines is the largest and most rapidly growing city in the State, and the whole State is tributary to her. Judging from the past, her population will probably reach 75,000 at the end of the next ten years, with the public business increased in proportion. The Government ought, while enlarging this building, to make provisions for this increased business.

The Supervising Architect of the Treasury and the general superintendent of repairs of public buildings both recommend it in their annual report, and the Secretary of the Treasury advises it in a letter here subjoined.

The additional appropriation of \$153,000 asked for in this bill should be granted, to the end that safe, convenient, and comfortable accommodations for the transaction of the public business may be furnished to a community who are doing so much for the public improvement and contributing so largely to the public revenue. Your committee therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, Washington, March 13, 1886.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 26th ultimo in relation to extension of limit of cost of public building at Des Moines, Iowa, as proposed by pending bill No. 5251.

The following statement is submitted by the Supervising Architect of the

Treasury Department, and shows the amount of space which is now occupied by the several officers who are to be located in the building, and the space which can be allowed by the extension to the old building, as proposed in the bill above referred to:

	Space now occupied.	Space allowed by extension.
First floor:		
Post-office, working room.....	Feet, 4,400	Feet, 5,100
Post-office, working room.....	2,200	1,560
Postmaster.....	660	1,056
Stamp department.....		308
Money-order, &c.....		704
Assistant postmaster.....		352
	7,260	9,080
Second floor:		
Pension office.....	264	1,012
Pension office.....	756	1,144
Internal revenue.....	1,452	1,232
Internal revenue.....		338
Railway mail service.....	560	1,584
District attorney.....	486	1,088
District attorney.....	432	624
Master in chancery.....		1,224
Third floor:		
Circuit court.....	3,528	1,320
District court.....	1,404	1,224
Judges' rooms.....	280	704
Judges' rooms.....		704
Judges' rooms.....	513	484
Judges' rooms.....		336
Clerks of court rooms.....	405	704
Clerks of court rooms.....	486	1,088
Clerks of court rooms.....	540	288
Clerks of court rooms.....		338
Marshal.....	486	748
Marshal.....		352
Witness room.....		308
Fourth floor:		
Land office.....	1,760	484
Land office.....		748
Signal office.....	1,452	704
Grand jury.....	459	1,224
Petit jury.....	459	640
Petit jury.....		312
Petit jury.....		1,836
Custodian.....		704
Storage.....		1,320
Storage.....		352
Total.....	22,982	34,248

It will be observed that the extension will afford about one-half more floor space than the officers now occupy in rented buildings; and it is reported that the offices of the clerks of court, the marshal and the jury rooms are much crowded, and the post-office and pension departments are very badly crowded. As the alterations of the present building under the limit of cost heretofore fixed have been commenced, it would seem to be a measure of economy to make the proposed extension of the building large enough not only to afford the additional space, which is now very much needed, but to provide for the future increase of the public business. By this extension the accommodation for the post-office department is increased only from 7,260 feet to 9,080 square feet. The present building has been built about twelve years, and in that short space of time the accommodations afforded have been found entirely inadequate. With the exception of a tower, with clock, which it is estimated will cost \$12,240, there is no external ornamentation of note contemplated, as the design must necessarily be made to conform to that of the present building, which is a plain stone structure; that is, the outside walls are faced with limestone.

The estimated cost of the proposed enlargement, including the cost of an elevator, the approaches, and heating apparatus for the entire building, is \$155,000, and the limit should be extended from \$180,000 to \$335,000. The cost of heating apparatus, approaches, and elevator were not included in the original estimate.

Respectfully, yours,

DANIEL MANNING, Secretary.

Hon. SAMUEL DIBBLE,

Chairman Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds,
House of Representatives.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to call attention to the fact that this building has already cost, according to the report just read, \$180,000.

A MEMBER. Suppose it has.

Mr. SPRINGER. When the building was authorized to be constructed it was to cost \$135,000; and \$40,000 additional has since been appropriated to complete it. We are now asked for another appropriation to complete it—\$153,000.

A MEMBER. Making a total of what?

Mr. SPRINGER. A total of about \$330,000.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. SPRINGER. I will yield to the gentleman in one moment. I wish to call attention to the fact that, having authorized the construction of a building which was limited to cost \$135,000, we are required afterward to more than double that amount in order to complete the building according to plans drawn up in the Treasury Department. There is something wrong about this system. Either we should never begin the construction of a building until the plans have been adopted, estimates made, and the cost ascertained, or else we should leave the whole thing open, the appropriations to be made from time to time ac-

ording to the caprices of the Architect or the growing demands of those who may be asking for the erection of the building.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa, rose. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman from Illinois has yielded the floor to me to ask him a question.

Mr. SPRINGER. Certainly.

Mr. BLOUNT. Does the gentleman from Illinois mean to say the original plan for which the first appropriation was made is the same plan which now calls for \$300,000?

Mr. SPRINGER. No; I did not say that. I said we first appropriated \$135,000 to complete the building; that we afterward appropriated \$40,000 in addition to complete the building, and now it is not completed, and we are asked for \$153,000 more to make the building complete. After we have spent this much money on it we have no assurance in the report or anywhere else we will not be asked for still further appropriation to complete this building, so that it may amount to \$500,000 before it is completed.

I now reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I yield to my colleague from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER] for three minutes.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. I do not want so much time. I wish to say in reply to the gentleman from Illinois that the original plan, in the opinion of the present Secretary of the Treasury as well as the Architect, is wholly inadequate to meet the rising and growing wants of that city of Des Moines. So that this plan has not only the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury but of the Architect of the Treasury, and also the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. There is no city in the Northwest growing with more rapidity than the city of Des Moines.

Mr. STRUBLE. Except Sioux City, Iowa.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. And no city in which perhaps the net revenue is so great, in proportion to the expense of its collection, as in Des Moines. We want that building, and ought to have it.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I yield now for two minutes to my colleague [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. The plans under which the present building was constructed involved an expenditure of \$160,000, which was obtained by two separate appropriations. A third appropriation, and the one under which improvements and repairs are now being constructed, amounted to some \$50,000, making the amount referred to by the gentleman from Illinois. In the process of completing these repairs the building is now practically dismantled, so that it is scarcely capable of being used for more than one or two offices.

A MEMBER. It is not in use at all.

Mr. HALL. It was while the building was in this condition, while the Architect was proceeding to restore it, the necessity for its enlargement presented itself and that the business there required it. The business of the post-office has increased at a greater percentage than any other post-office in the United States. So, too, in reference to the business of the courts held there. The Architect began an investigation to ascertain what should be done to meet the actual necessities.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, there is more mail matter handled at Des Moines, containing a population of 36,000, than in any other city in this country inferior to Chicago. As has been explained, this building is necessary to accommodate the two United States courts, district and circuit, as well as the post-office, the land office, which contains large and voluminous records extending for fifty years and including all the land records of the State of Iowa, and the collector of internal revenue. Indeed there is not a more meritorious bill, or one for which there is greater necessity, than this one providing for the enlargement of the public building at Des Moines, Iowa.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I now ask for a vote.

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has remaining three minutes.

Mr. MCCREARY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to what has been said in behalf of this public building, but I am not in favor of allowing the increased amount asked for. As I understand this bill, they are now asking for \$153,000 more. In the first place \$135,000 was asked for this public building, and then \$45,000 more, and now we are asked for \$53,000 more.

It seems to me if the Government ought to furnish money to construct public buildings we ought to know in the beginning the amount intended for that purpose. As we are going along we ought to know how we are expending the public money. For one, I am for an economical administration of the Government. I find by examination this House has already appropriated, under the head of general bills, \$141,000,000.

Mr. WILKINS. Including the appropriation bills?

Mr. MCCREARY. Yes; this House has already passed bills under the head of general appropriation bills amounting to \$141,000,000. We have also appropriated \$92,580 for private pensions. For public buildings we have allowed the sum of \$1,884,525; we have already voted away \$664,750 for the construction of light-houses and light-ships; we have voted away \$550,656 to private claims; and under the head of miscellaneous expenditures we have appropriated \$69,431. That, Mr.

Speaker, is the record we are making at this session. We have already gone in the neighborhood of \$150,000,000 this session.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. How many public buildings has Kentucky asked for?

Mr. MCCREARY. I desire to make this statement in answer to the gentleman from Iowa, that the district I have the honor to represent upon this floor has never asked a dollar for a public building.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. But you are for a subtreasury at Louisville, I presume.

The SPEAKER. The time allowed for debate under the rule has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa, to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. COWLES. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered—13 members only voting therefor.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa, the House divided; and there were—ayes 128, noes 18.

Mr. EDEN. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. The point of order being made that no quorum has voted, the Chair will order tellers.

Mr. EDEN and Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa, were appointed tellers. The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 144, noes 18.

Mr. EDEN. I withdraw the point of no quorum.

So, no further count being demanded (two-thirds voting in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, each side seems to have had its share, and I move that the house do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 73, noes 75.

Mr. RANDALL. Since the vote is so close, with a view to find out when we may be allowed to adjourn I ask the yeas and nays on the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered, there being 33 members in support of and 93 in opposition to the demand.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 67, nays 105, not voting 151; as follows:

YEAS—67.

- | | | | |
|---------------------|------------------|-----------|----------------------|
| Adams, G. E. | Davidson, A. C. | Holman, | Richardson, |
| Arnot, | Dockery, | Kleiner, | Riggs, |
| Bingham, | Eden, | Landes, | Sadler, |
| Bland, | Ellsberry, | Lehbach, | Seney, |
| Blount, | Everhart, | Lore, | Seymour, |
| Boyle, | Ford, | Louttit, | Sowden, |
| Bragg, | Glover, | Lowry, | Springer, |
| Breckinridge, C. R. | Green, R. S. | Mahoney, | Stone, W. J., of Ky. |
| Breckinridge, W. C. | Halsell, | McAdoo, | Stone, W. J., of Mo. |
| Buck, | Hammond, | McComas, | Swope, |
| Candler, | Henderson, J. S. | MCCreary, | Taulbee, |
| Cannon, | Harris, | McMillin, | Townshend, |
| Caswell, | Henderson, T. J. | Merriman, | Turner, |
| Clements, | Herbert, | Neece, | West, |
| Cowles, | Hewitt, | Pindar, | White, Milo |
| Cox, | Hill, | Randall, | Wilson. |
| Crisp, | Hiscock, | Raney, | |

NAYS—105.

- | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Anderson, J. A. | Gallinger, | McKenna, | Stephenson, |
| Barksdale, | Gay, | McRae, | Struble, |
| Barnes, | Goff, | Miller, | Symes, |
| Barry, | Grosvenor, | Moffatt, | Taylor, J. M. |
| Bayne, | Grout, | Morgan, | Taylor, Zach. |
| Beach, | Hall, | Morrill, | Thomas, O. B. |
| Brown, W. W. | Hatch, | Murphy, | Thompson, |
| Burleigh, | Heard, | Neal, | Tillman, |
| Butterworth, | Hemphill, | Nelson, | Tucker, |
| Bynum, | Henderson, D. B. | O'Hara, | Van Eaton, |
| Caldwell, | Heppburn, | O'Neill, Charles | Van Schnack, |
| Catchings, | Hiestand, | O'Neill, J. J. | Viele, |
| Clardy, | Hitt, | Osborne, | Wade, |
| Conger, | Holmes, | Owen, | Wadsworth, |
| Cooper, | Houk, | Peel, | Wait, |
| Cutcheon, | James, | Perkins, | Warner, William |
| Dawson, | Johnston, J. T. | Perry, | Weaver, J. B. |
| Dibble, | Jones, J. H. | Peters, | Weber, |
| Dougherty, | King, | Plumb, | Wellborn, |
| Dunham, | La Follette, | Price, | Wheeler, |
| Ely, | Laird, | Reagan, | Wilkins, |
| Ermentrout, | Lanham, | Reese, | Willis, |
| Evans, | Lindsley, | Rockwell, | Wolford, |
| Farquhar, | Little, | Sayers, | Worthington. |
| Felton, | Lyman, | Sessions, | |
| Frederick, | Markham, | Smalls, | |
| Fuller, | Martin, | Steele, | |

NOT VOTING—151.

- | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------|
| Adams, J. J. | Boutelle, | Carleton, | Davis, |
| Aiken, | Brady, | Cobb, | Dingley, |
| Allen, C. H. | Browne, T. M. | Cole, | Dorsey, |
| Allen, J. M. | Brown, C. E. | Collins, | Dowdney, |
| Anderson, C. M. | Brumm, | Compton, | Dunn, |
| Atkinson, | Buchanan, | Comstock, | Eldredge, |
| Baker, | Bunnell, | Crain, | Findlay, |
| Ballentine, | Burnes, | Croxton, | Fisher, |
| Barbour, | Burrows, | Culbertson, | Fleeger, |
| Belmont, | Cabell, | Curtin, | Foran, |
| Bennett, | Campbell, Felix | Daniel, | Forney, |
| Blanchard, | Campbell, J. M. | Dargan, | Funston, |
| Bliss, | Campbell, J. E. | Davenport, | Geddes, |
| Bound, | Campbell, T. J. | Davidson, R. H. M. | Gibson, C. H. |

Gibson, Eustace	Laffoon,	Payson,	Stewart, Charles
Gillilan,	Lawler,	Pettibone,	Stewart, J. W.
Glass,	Le Fevre,	Phelps,	St. Martin,
Green, W. J.	Libbey,	Pidecock,	Stone, E. F.
Guenther,	Long,	Pirce,	Storm,
Hale,	Lovering,	Pulitzer,	Strait,
Hanback,	Matson,	Reed, T. B.	Swinburne,
Harmer,	Maybury,	Reid, J. W.	Tarsney,
Hayden,	McKinley,	Rice,	Taylor, E. B.
Haynes,	Millard,	Robertson,	Taylor, I. H.
Henley,	Milliken,	Rogers,	Thomas, J. R.
Herman,	Mills,	Romeis,	Throckmorton,
Hires,	Mitchell,	Rowell,	Trigg,
Hopkins,	Morrison,	Ryan,	Wakefield,
Howard,	Morrow,	Sawyer,	Ward, J. H.
Hudd,	Muller,	Scott,	Ward, T. B.
Hutton,	Negley,	Scranton,	Warner, A. J.
Irion,	Norwood,	Shaw,	Weaver, A. J.
Jackson,	Oates,	Singleton,	White, A. C.
Johnson, F. A.	O'Donnell,	Skinner,	Whiting,
Johnston, T. D.	O'Ferrall,	Snyder,	Winans,
Jones, J. T.	Outhwaite,	Spooner,	Wise,
Kelly,	Parker,	Spriggs,	Woodburn.
Ketcham,	Payne,	Stahlnecker,	

So the House refused to adjourn.

Mr. LANHAM. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the names.

Mr. BRAGG. I object. This is a matter of too much importance, and the names should be read.

The following additional pairs for the remainder of the day were announced:

Mr. HANBACK with Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. DAVIDSON, of Florida, with Mr. ALLEN, of Massachusetts.

Mr. ROBERTSON with Mr. ATKINSON.

Mr. LAFFOON with Mr. FUNSTON.

Mr. BALLENTINE with Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR.

The result of the vote was then announced as above stated.

FOURTH OF JULY CLAIMS.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of its clerks, informed the House that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments by the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4731) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury Department.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT EL PASO, TEX.

Mr. LANHAM. I move that the rules be suspended, that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6665) for the erection of a public building at El Paso, Tex., and that the same be passed.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, &c., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase or otherwise provide a site and cause to be erected thereon a substantial and commodious building, with fire-proof vaults, for the use and accommodation of the United States custom-house, post-office, and Federal courts, and for other Government uses, at El Paso, in the State of Texas. The site, and building thereon, when completed upon plans and specifications to be previously made and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall not exceed in cost the sum of \$150,000; nor shall any site be purchased until estimates for the erection of a building which will furnish sufficient accommodations 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 plan 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; and the site purchased shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire by an open space of at least 50 feet, including streets and alleys: *Provided*, That no part of said sum shall be expended until a valid title to the said site shall be vested in the United States, nor until the State of Texas shall cede to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the same, during the time the United States shall be or remain the owner thereof, for all purposes except the administration of the criminal laws of said State and the service of civil process therein.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. COWLES. I demand a second.

Mr. MCOMAS. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. LANHAM. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANHAM. If the House should now adjourn would I be recognized next suspension day?

The SPEAKER. On the next individual suspension day this bill would come up the first thing as the unfinished business under the rule.

The question being taken on the motion that the House adjourn, the Speaker stated that the "noes" seemed to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were not ordered; the affirmative vote being 19— not one-fifth of the last vote.

So the House refused to adjourn.

Mr. LANHAM. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

Mr. COWLES. I insist on the vote being by tellers.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 128, no 1.

Mr. COWLES. No quorum.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I move that there be a call of the House.

Mr. LANHAM. I hope that motion will not be insisted upon. It

is manifest there is not a quorum here. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I withdraw the motion for a call of the House. The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 6 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. ATKINSON: Memorial of Grange No. 352, of Pennsylvania, praying for the suppression of imitation butter and other dairy products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the same, protesting against the admission of foreign agricultural products free of duty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARKSDALE: Resolutions of a meeting of citizens of Jackson, Miss., for the bill authorizing the Illinois Central Railroad Company to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at Cairo—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BLANCHARD: Papers in the case of Thomas Hickman, executor of Mrs. E. Blanchard, of Grant Parish, Louisiana—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BLAND: Papers relative to the claims of Leah Roark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. W. W. BROWN: Memorial of Granges Nos. 1 and 365, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pennsylvania, urging protection to dairy products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the same, favoring protection to home industry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCK: Petition of the Woman's Indian Association of Connecticut, Sarah T. Kinney, president, and others, representing 4762 persons, favoring the passage of the Dawes bill (S. 52) for the protection of the rights of the Indians, &c.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BUTTERWORTH: Petition of O. Budenback & Co. and others, white-wine vinegar-makers, for the repeal of the vaporizing act of 1879, &c.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Ohio, opposing any interference with the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine and butterine—to the same committee.

Also, resolution of the Board of Trade and Transportation of Cincinnati, in favor of the Lowell bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Katharina Hoer, for relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of the transportation committees of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Cincinnati, in favor of Senate bill 1532 to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. J. M. CAMPBELL: Petition of Grange No. 531, of Pennsylvania, asking for such legislation as will suppress the manufacture and sale of all imitation dairy products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition for the relief of Edward Coleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COMPTON: Petition of James Trimble and Mary Blakely, executors of Joseph Trimble, deceased; of Lucinda Trimble, administratrix of William Trimble; of John Hoffman Smith; of Maj. Gen. O. O. Howard and ex-Senator S. C. Pomeroy, trustees; of J. J. Jarboe and J. K. Roberts, administrators of George R. W. Marshall, deceased; of Woodbury Wheeler, guardian of heirs of John R. Waring, deceased; of James W. Sears, representative of estate of James W. Sears, deceased; and of Catharine A. Talburt, administratrix of George W. Talburt, deceased, asking that their several claims be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COMSTOCK: Petition of physicians and leading citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., for the enactment of such laws and for such appropriations as will make effective the labors of the National Board of Health in preventing the spread of epidemics—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIN: Memorial of Granges Nos. 158, 159, 297, 326, 628, 715, 717, and 758, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pennsylvania, praying for such legislation as will prevent the manufacture and sale of imitation dairy products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the same granges, protesting against all legislation favoring the admission to our ports free of duty of all agricultural raw materials, such as wool, hides, jute, tobacco, raw sugars, rice, &c.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUTCHEON: Petition of General P. H. Sheridan, General H. J. Hunt, and officers and inmates of the National Soldiers' Home in the District of Columbia, in favor of the passage of a bill for the better protection of the inmates of the National Soldiers' Home in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, papers in case of Hiram D. Austin, relating to the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOCKERY: Petition of 145 citizens of Clinton County, Mis-

souri, asking for certain pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUNHAM: Papers relating to the claim of Leon Frank—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLSBERRY: Communication relative to House bill 5056 for the relief of George Lemon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELY: Petition of Utley & Boynton and others in favor of legislation to suppress unequal traffic in imitation butter—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ERMENTROUT: Memorial of the Dry Goods Chronicle, in favor of more liberal expenditures for ocean postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, for the passage of House bill 5013 and Senate bill 1158—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, memorial of Sarah A. Paff, widow of Henry Paff, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FINDLAY: Papers in the case of Levi Herzog, to accompany House bill 1048—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLEEGER: Petition of Daniel H. Johnson, late private Company I, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, for increase of pension; also, medical testimony in support of same—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOFF: Petition of Arthur Storm and 100 others, protesting against the passage of the Morrison bill and the further reduction of tariff duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Evidence to support the claim of Charles F. Shinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALSELL: Petition of J. M. Hurt and others, asking for a pension for Mahala Brown, dependent mother of John W. Brown, late of Company D, Thirty-second Regiment Kentucky Infantry Volunteers—to the same committee.

By Mr. HARRIS: Petition of the citizens of Harris County and of Chatahoochee County, Georgia, asking for the passage of the Blair educational bill, or some other bill of similar provisions—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Petition of Andrew Gillan, for restoration to the pension-roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. T. J. HENDERSON: Petition of George H. Sampson and 17 others, citizens of Bureau County, Illinois, for laws relating to the public health—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. D. B. HENDERSON: Petition of 87 citizens of Blackhawk County, Iowa, asking for an internal-revenue tax on bogus butter—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petition of certain citizens of Iowa, asking that a pension be granted Robert M. Hardin, of Moravia, and Abraham Points, of Allenton, Iowa—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIESTAND: Petition of citizens of Elizabethtown, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, in favor of granting additional pension to soldiers—to the same committee.

By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of J. D. Denison and 140 citizens of Iowa, praying for the passage of the bill introduced by Hon. W. L. Scott, of Pennsylvania, providing for the taxation of all imitation of butter as therein prayed—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOPKINS: Petition of ex soldiers and sailors and citizens of De Kalb County, Illinois, asking that all Union soldiers be pensioned—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUK: Petition of James Waterson; of Benjamin Armstrong; of Luretta Gillenwaters, and of Alfred Larkin, of Hawkins County, Tennessee, asking that their war claims be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, memorial of L. S. Casey, for relief—to the same committee.

By Mr. J. T. JOHNSTON: Petition of Jabez Smith, asking for an increase of pension, to accompany bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANDES: Petition of John Prince, late private Company I, Fifth Regiment Illinois Cavalry, for a pension—to the same committee.

By Mr. LOWRY: Concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Indiana in favor of pensioning prisoners of war confined in confederate prisons—to the same committee.

Also, appeal from the wage-workers of the United States for the unlimited coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. LYMAN: Petition and papers in the case of William Anderson, of Sidney, Fremont County, Iowa, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, resolution for an investigation and report upon the cause of the delay in printing the first annual report of the Bureau of Animal Industry—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. MCCOMAS: Papers in the claim of Michael H. Haller, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MCCREARY: Petition of W. A. Herrin and others, of Rockcastle County, Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McMILLIN: Petition of Drs. A. Y. P. Garnett, N. S. Lincoln, J. M. Toner, C. M. Hammitt, and others, for an appropriation to assist in defraying the expenses of the international medical congress to meet

in Washington, D. C., in 1887—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLARD: Petition of Le Roy Fairchild and others, to protect innocent purchasers of patent articles—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, affidavits in claim of Henry Merich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEAL: Petition of Francis M. Capps, asking that he be granted a pension as dependent father of James H. Capps, late a soldier in the United States Army, and who died while in service—to the same committee.

By Mr. CHARLES O'NEILL: Petition for increase of pension of Job P. Wilson, late of Company F, Third Regiment Delaware Volunteers—to the same committee.

Also, petition to the House of Representatives on the adoption of the new system of education—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. J. J. O'NEILL: Petition of William S. Pope and others, for compensation for vessels lost in the Mississippi River during the late war—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYSON: Petition of many merchants for the passage of House bill 1621—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE: Memorial of the committee of the New York yearly meeting of Friends, officially signed, asking for the faithful fulfillment of Indian treaties, and for better legal protection of the landed interests of the Indian tribes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROMEIS: Petition of J. M. Hopkins and others, citizens of Ohio and Michigan, asking that the manufacture and sale of imitation butter be placed under the control of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SENEY: Petition of James Hayes and 81 others, citizens of Wood County, Ohio, favoring the pension legislation recommended by the Grand Army of the Republic—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SESSIONS: Petition of 133 farmers and tax-payers of Harmony, N. Y., in favor of the passage of the law preventing fraud in butter and cheese—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHAW: Petition of James C. Crawford, of Maryland, asking for relief—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of C. L. Pyles, of Saint Albans; of Charles W. Collison, administrator of E. F. Collins; of Christopher Burns and of Allen J. Moses, and of James Knight, administrator of Francis H. Ludington, of Greenbrier County, and of Albert Huddleston, of Kanawha Falls; asking reference of their war claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of the Wholesale Liquor Dealers' Association of Chicago, in favor of House bill 1621—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Petition of Joseph Demars, for removal of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRAIT: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis, Minn., recommending that liberal subsidies be granted to certain steamship lines plying between the United States and Central and South America—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STRUBLE: Petition of J. H. Stearns and 20 others, citizens of Iowa, praying for the passage of a bill introduced by Mr. Scott placing the manufacture and sale of all imitations of butter under the control of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and tax it 10 cents per pound—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SYMES: Petition of Carrie Powell and of Frederick W. Becker, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of George W. Peak, for removal of charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Knights of Labor of Denver, Colo., in opposition to the free-ship bill—to the Select Committee on American Ship-building and Ship-owning Interests.

By Mr. E. B. TAYLOR: Petition of the president, faculty, and trustees of Hiram College, praying that certain documents, &c., be carried in United States mails at former rates—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ZACH. TAYLOR: Petition of W. H. Neel, of Shelby County, Tennessee, asking that his war claim be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSHEND: Petition in behalf of the bill for the relief of Louis Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers relating to bill for the relief of Sarah C. Shinn, and of Calvin McBroom—to the same committee.

Also, petition in behalf of bill for relief of Elijah Martin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Thomas W. Tansell, for a pension—to the same committee.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Resolutions submitted to Congress by the State and Territorial commissioners at the American Exposition at New Orleans—to the Select Committee on American Ship-building and Ship-owning Interests.

Also, petition of Thomas K. Ball, for pay for horses taken—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEST: Petition of William S. Hall, for invalid pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. A. C. WHITE: Memorial against the manufacture and sale of bogus dairy products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial against the proposed free-trade tariff tinkering—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. CUTCHEON: Of citizens of Manistee and Mecosta Counties, Michigan.

By Mr. DOCKERY: Of citizens of Harrison and Gentry Counties, Missouri.

By Mr. LAIRD: Of citizens of Clay and Franklin Counties, Nebraska.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, May 4, 1886.

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

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

OHIO SENATORIAL INVESTIGATION.

Mr. HOAR. I have received a letter from the secretary of the investigating committee of the house of representatives of the State of Ohio, calling attention to the fact that in printing the testimony laid before the Senate the other day forwarded by the house of representatives of the State of Ohio there was added some matter which did not belong to it. The letter is in the nature of a petition, though it is addressed to me. I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The communication will be read. The Chief Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 4, 1886.

DEAR SIR: Upon examining the Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 106, Forty-ninth Congress, first session, we find upon page 288 certain matter which was not included in the papers forwarded by the house of representatives of Ohio to the United States Senate.

This is a surreptitious interpolation or addendum, intended no doubt to reflect upon the good faith of the majority of the Ohio house committee, and mislead your committee.

We have examined the copy sent to the Superintendent of Public Printing, and find that the addendum complained of is written with pencil on soft paper and wholly disconnected with the official papers.

We respectfully call your attention to this matter, and trust that such inquiry may be instituted as will uncover the perpetrator of this falsification of a public record.

Very respectfully,

EMMETT TOMKINS,
Secretary of Ohio House Committee.

Hon. GEORGE F. HOAR,
Chairman Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the communication be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that the document referred to be ordered not to be further distributed, and that it be reprinted under the direction of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I will state that if the order is adopted I will show to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. PAYNE] the matter and learn from him whether it is properly a part of the document as he understands it. There will be no difficulty about it at all.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that the paper be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that that committee be directed to recall the document already printed and print it anew. If there be no objection that order will be made.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HARRISON. I present the petition of E. C. Newland Post, No. 247, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, praying for the passage of the bill pertaining to pensions, known as the bill recommended by the national pension committee of the Grand Army of the Republic. Some of the features of the recommendations of the committee referred to have been adopted by the Committee on Pensions in the bill which has been reported and is now upon the Calendar. Other features I think have not been acted upon, and I move the reference of this petition to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON presented the petition of Noah Wade, of Green County, Indiana, late a private in Company H, Thirty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteers, praying for the passage of a bill equalizing the bounties of soldiers who served in the late war; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a resolution adopted by the Mahoning Valley (Ohio) Wool-Growers' Association, remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on wool, and praying for a restoration of the tariff under the act of 1867; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, presented the petition of J. A. Carroll and

other citizens of Fonda, Iowa, praying for the passage of the bill introduced by Senator WARNER MILLER, of New York, placing the manufacture and sale of all imitations of butter under the control of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and imposing a tax of 10 cents a pound thereon; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented the petition of W. H. Neil and other citizens of Muscatine and Louisa Counties, Iowa, praying for the passage of a bill granting a pension to Rachel Price, of Lettsville, Louisa County, Iowa, mother of James S. Price, late a private in Company I, Eleventh Regiment Iowa Volunteers; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER presented memorials of Knights of Labor of Petersburg and Norfolk, in the State of Virginia, remonstrating against the passage of the free-ship bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PALMER. I present the petition of Lena Dolsen Parsons and 6 other citizens of Ypsilanti, Mich., praying for appropriate legislation for the protection of young girls in the District of Columbia and other localities within the jurisdiction of the United States. I move the reference of the petition to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Such petitions have been referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PALMER. But this petition refers to the District of Columbia and other localities under the jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. FRYE. My impression is that all memorials of that kind have gone to the Committee on the District of Columbia. I have presented two or three.

Mr. PALMER. It is immaterial to me to which committee it is referred, but the reference I suggested seemed to be the appropriate one.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It has been the usual course to refer similar petitions to the Committee on the District of Columbia. The petition will be so referred, if there be no objection.

Mr. HARRIS presented a petition of the Memphis (Tenn.) Merchants' Exchange, praying for the repeal of the tax on traveling salesmen; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PLATT presented a petition of citizens of Meriden and New Haven, in the State of Connecticut, praying for legislation increasing the powers of the National Board of Health; which was referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

Mr. PLATT. I present resolutions of the New Haven Colony Historical Society, relating to the efforts of Mr. B. F. Stevens, of London, to obtain the aid of the United States in copying and publishing documents of importance relating to the history of the States between 1772 and 1784. I move the reference of the resolutions to the Committee on the Library.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1615) to authorize the Secretary of War to credit the State of Kansas with certain sums for ordnance and ordnance stores issued to said State, and for other purposes, moved its indefinite postponement, which was agreed to; and he submitted a report accompanied by a bill (S. 2332) to authorize the Secretary of War to credit the State of Kansas with certain sums of money on its ordnance account with the General Government; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. SAWYER. I am instructed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1665) for the relief of Byron R. McIntyre, to report it back adversely because it is a duplicate of another bill. I move that it be indefinitely postponed.

The motion 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 (H. R. 5961) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Vigus;
A bill (H. R. 6126) granting a pension to Henry G. Ballenger;
A bill (H. R. 6688) for the relief of William Bishop;
A bill (H. R. 7298) for the relief of Charles Schuler;
A bill (H. R. 7300) for the relief of Randolph Seaman;
A bill (H. R. 6136) granting an increase of pension to John W. Far-

ris;
A bill (H. R. 6776) granting a pension to Catharine Thenn;
A bill (H. R. 550) to restore to the pension-roll the name of Adam Gaston;

A bill (H. R. 4976) for the relief of Tobias M. Coon;
A bill (H. R. 4631) granting a pension to Mary Merrill;
A bill (H. R. 1816) granting a pension to Mary Ann Miller;
A bill (H. R. 6780) granting a pension to Henry B. Havens;
A bill (H. R. 424) to pension Giles C. Hawley;
A bill (H. R. 6655) granting a pension to Stokely D. Dagley;
A bill (H. R. 3906) for the relief of Catharine Johnson;
A bill (H. R. 567) granting a pension to Mary A. Little;
A bill (H. R. 1576) granting an increase of pension to Thomas All-

cock;
A bill (H. R. 515) granting a pension to Althea A. Frasnier;