

ing changes made by this bill in the existing law, especially in reference to the coinage. It would seem that all the small coinage of the country is intended to be recoined.

Mr. Hooper's attention was called especially to the coinage. Mr. HOLMAN also feared that all the small currency of the country was intended to be recoined, which would be a costly operation.

Mr. HOOPER, of Massachusetts. This bill makes no changes in the existing law in that regard. It does not require the recoinage of the small coins. On the contrary, I understand that the Secretary of the Treasury proposes to issue an order to stop the coinage of all the minor coins, as there is now a great abundance of them in the country. The salaries are not increased. They remain as they were.

That was satisfactory, and the bill, which was believed to be a substitute with all the objectionable features as to coinage and changes stricken out, was allowed to pass almost unanimously.

The record flatly contradicts Mr. SHERMAN'S assertion that the Hooper substitute, which passed, was ever discussed or considered, and proves my assertion that it was passed without members knowing what it contained. I might add that they were deceived in regard to its provisions.

On the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill the vote was 110 yeas to 13 nays. Not a word was said about striking down the silver dollar. Now, is it true that the bill finally passed, as stated the other day by the Senator from Ohio, because silver was worth 3½ per cent. more than gold, and therefore the silver dollar was sought to be reduced from 412½ grains to 383 grains? I have stated how the bill was passed, and nine-tenths of the members then in the House will prove what I say is true. Of course, the provision striking down the silver dollar and reducing its legal-tender quality was in it, but the members of the House, except a favored few, were kept in ignorance of the fact.

The bill went to the Senate, reaching there on the day of final adjournment for the session. I have the bill in my hand as it finally passed in conference. I received it this morning from the file clerk, together with the report of the committee of conference, with all the changes made after it reached the Senate, with marks showing what the conference agreed to. I do not care to read details. It would take too long. All the provisions of the House bill in regard to reducing the value of the silver dollar, because, as the Senator said, the old silver coin was worth 3 per cent. more than gold, which was the pretense on which he said they were acting, were stricken out, the old dollar was dropped, and a trade-dollar of 420 grains substituted.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will ask the Senator from Kentucky now to read in his speech the section of the bill in regard to coinage as it came from the House of Representatives, and then as it was proposed in the Senate. He has before him now the document which shows the proposition of the House of Representatives as it came to us. Let that be printed and then let the proposition of the Senator be printed side by side.

Mr. BECK. Here they are, sections 12, 14, and 15.

Mr. SHERMAN. I hope the Senator will have that done.

Mr. BECK. I will. With the consent of the Senate, I will have that done.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let them be read.

They are as follows:

The proposition in the House bill was:

"That the silver coins of the United States shall be a dollar, a half-dollar or fifty-cent piece, a quarter-dollar or twenty-five-cent piece, and a dime or ten-cent piece; and the weight of the dollar shall be 384 grains; the half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and the dime shall be, respectively, one-half, one-quarter, and one-tenth of the weight of said dollar; which coins shall be a legal tender, at their denominational value, for any amount not exceeding \$5 in any one payment."

The Senate substitute, which was adopted, reads:

"That the silver coins of the United States shall be a trade-dollar, a half-dollar or fifty-cent piece, a quarter-dollar or twenty-five-cent piece, a dime or ten-cent piece; and the weight of the trade-dollar shall be 420 grains troy, the weight of the half-dollar shall be 12½ grains; the quarter-dollar and the dime shall be, respectively, one-half and one-fifth of the weight of said half-dollar; and said coins shall be legal tender, at their nominal value, for any amount not exceeding \$5 in any one payment."

Then follows—

SEC. 18. *And be it further enacted*, That no coins, either of gold, silver, or minor coinage, shall hereafter be issued from the mint other than those of the denominations, standards, and weights herein set forth.

Mr. BECK. The final change was made from 383 grains, as the House bill proposed, to a trade dollar of 420 grains, which was 7½ grains more valuable than the original standard silver dollar, whose legal-tender quality they were so eager to destroy.

Mr. SHERMAN. In other words, the dollar, not the dollar of the fathers, not the dollar of 412½ grains, but the token dollar of 385 grains, was provided for in the House bill.

Mr. BECK. Provided for by Mr. Hooper and one or two other men who denied that they were providing for it. The House never knew anything about it. Mr. Blaine proved that; Mr. KELLEY has shown that; Mr. Garfield, over and over again, proved that; and the RECORD shows that he was present in the House and taking part in the proceedings when it was done. That provision was inserted reducing the silver dollar from 412½ to 383 grains by a few men who denied that they were doing it. That is what I contend, and I think I have proved it. Of course they got it in, else the scheme would have failed.

Mr. SHERMAN. But what I wish is to have the proposition of the House printed, and then side by side the proposition of the Senate, which lay upon our table more than two months, and has been read over and over again.

Mr. BECK. What I complain of, and what I think I have proved, is that the House never knew what was in that bill. The bill was offered as a substitute for all former bills, and it was vouched for by Mr. Hooper, who presented it, that it had nothing to do with coinage. It was upon the faith of that statement the House allowed it to pass, and the House was deceived.

The Senate amendment is a curious commentary on what the Senator from Ohio the other day said about the old silver dollar being deliberately demonetized because it was more valuable than gold. When the bill came into his hands, as chairman of the committee he struck out the provision which the House bill contained reducing the dollar because of its overvaluation; he left no such dollar in the bill, but inserted another dollar altogether; one of 420 grains, or 7½ grains more silver than the original 412½ grains, which he said was worth 3½ per cent. more than gold; and the bill was sent back to the House, and, so far as I can find by searching the RECORD, the House was never told of the change. What occurred when it got back to the House? It was sent at once to a committee of conference. I turn to the RECORD again, part 2, third session Forty-second Congress, page 1189, under the heading "Mint laws:"

Mr. HOOPER, of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of submitting a report of a committee of conference, which I ask the Clerk to read.

That was this report, which no man could by reading tell what it meant unless he had the bill carefully before him.

Signed by the conferees.

The report was adopted.

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

That is all the House ever did know. The House was never told, so far as the RECORD shows, that I can find, that the Senate had changed the bill from a bill reducing the value of a silver dollar to a bill creating a new dollar altogether, one of 420 grains instead of 383 grains.

When it came to the Senate the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] had charge of it, and it is headed again "Mint laws."

Mr. SHERMAN submitted the following report.

The report was concurred in, with not one word said about it, so that neither House had any opportunity, so far as these reports show, to know what they were doing.

I need not waste time in regard to what took place when the House bill reached the Senate. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] has shown very fully what took place there. If the Senator from Ohio is content with that statement I am. Mr. Casserly, of California, was in the Senate and other able and distinguished representatives of silver-producing States. Mr. Corbett, of Oregon, and others took part in the debate. Will any sane man believe that they deliberately consented to strike down silver coinage? Mr. SHERMAN says they all did. I do not believe him. When the House bill was brought up by Mr. SHERMAN the RECORD shows that he used this language:

Mr. SHERMAN. I rise for the purpose of moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Mint bill. I will state that this bill will not probably consume any more time than the time consumed in reading it. It passed the Senate two years ago after full debate. It was taken up again in the House during the present Congress, and passed there. It is a matter of vital interest to the Government, and I am informed by officers of the Government it is important it should pass promptly. The amendments reported by the Committee on Finance present the points of difference between the two Houses, and they can go to a committee of conference without having a controversy here in the Senate about them.

Again he said:

If the Senator will allow me, he will see that the preceding section provides for coin which is exactly interchangeable with the English shilling and the five-franc piece of France; that is, a five-franc piece of France will be the exact equivalent of a dollar of the United States in our silver coinage.

That was stricken out, and there was no such thing left in the bill.

And in order to show this wherever our silver coin shall float—and we are providing that it shall float all over the world—we propose to stamp upon it, instead of our eagle, which foreigners may not understand, and which they may not distinguish from a buzzard, or some other bird, the intrinsic fineness and weight of the coin. In this practical utilitarian age the officers of the Mint seemed to think it would be better to do that than to put the eagle on our silver coins. I must confess I do not think it is very important, but I think the Senator ought to be willing to defer in these matters to the practical knowledge of the officers who have charge of this branch of the Government service. I will say that Mr. Linderman, whom the Senator must know, has suggested this as being a convenient mode of promoting international coinage.

Did not every word of that indicate the continuance of silver coinage with full legal-tender quality as it had always had?

International coinage in a trade-dollar, with a legal-tender quality of only \$5, and even that poor quality was stricken out in 1875, so as to make it simply merchandise. That was the coin the Senator from Ohio said was to float, and they were providing it should float all over the world, wherever our flag floated, and that it should be international coinage equivalent to the coins of other nations. Little wonder the Senator from Nevada said to him, "Whatever may be your construction of the meaning now, the words used then induced me to vote with you, because you made me believe that you were sending out a bona

vide silver dollar as good as any in the world." The Senate so believed. The debate showed that Mr. Casserly announced that Nevada alone was then producing \$20,000,000 of silver, and the question was, as to whether silver owners should pay the coinage charge of half a quarter, or one-eighth per cent.; nothing was suggested anywhere that the silver dollar was to be stricken down. The Senator from Ohio was as silent as the grave on that subject.

But that was not all. To show that whenever things are not done as they ought to be the track can be followed, and it will be in the same direction, the Revised Statutes were adopted shortly afterwards. When it is said that we had coined no silver dollars, practically, up to that time, that is not the fact. We had coined in the month of January, 1873, and in the first twelve days of February, 1873, nearly two million standard silver dollars of 412½ grains, nearly one-fourth of all we ever had coined. By the way, if Senators will turn to Dr. Linderman's work on "Money and Legal-Tender," which you will find in the Library, you will see we never had coined a gold dollar from the foundation of the Government until long after the discovery of gold in California, and that we had up to 1848 about as much silver as we had gold coin of all sorts. At the time we fought the war of 1812 and the war with Mexico, and acquired Louisiana, we were upon a silver basis, if that is worth suggesting. All our acquisitions were obtained with silver coin, the Mexican dollar being the legal tender, as well as other foreign coins, most of the time. The table furnished by Dr. Linderman shows it all, and the fact is proved by his tables that we had coined nearly two million standard dollars in less than six weeks before this act of 1873 was passed.

I think I can guess the reason why the bankers of Europe were pushing the act of 1873. The Rothschilds, who held our bonds, and the great bankers of the Rhine, at Frankfurt and elsewhere, were, of course, all anxious for it to pass. Mr. Hooper and the other bankers knew why. How much the Senator from Ohio was allowed to know I can not state; but Dr. Linderman showed in November, 1872, that silver was falling, and falling rapidly; it had fallen from 3 per cent. premium down to par with gold when the act was passed demonetizing it, and that it was sure to fall still more rapidly. All their bonds were payable in it while it was being stricken down in their countries. Dr. Linderman tells the whole story in a report made the fall of 1872, after the bill had passed the House. He takes credit for the trade-dollar as having been first suggested in his report. He says we discovered very soon after the bill passed the House—as early as September or October, 1872—that Germany was going to sell her silver. The House had passed the bill, recollect, in May, 1872; it came to the Senate practically in December.

Dr. Linderman in his book states what he said in the fall of 1872:

The amount of silver bullion annually produced from the mines of the United States has been increased during the last three years, and now amounts to about \$20,000,000 per annum, exclusive of the gold it contains; and a further increase in this product being quite certain, the future value of silver as compared with gold is a matter of national importance.

The fluctuations in the relative value of gold and silver during the last hundred years have not been very great, but several causes are now at work, all tending to an excess of supply over demand for silver, and its consequent depreciation. Among these causes may be stated the increasing production, its demonetization by the German Empire, and continued disuse in this country, except to a limited extent, as a part of the circulating medium.

It has also been demonetized by Japan, while in some other countries silver coin has been wholly or partially expelled from circulation by paper money, the effect of which will be to bring to market as bullion large amounts hitherto used as coin. The amount of silver coin in the German Empire at the date of the enactment of the recent coinage law (December, 1871), which changed the standard from silver to gold, is estimated by competent authority at \$30,000,000, being equal to five years' total production of the globe.

Even if silver should be adopted by Germany for subsidiary coinage, not more than \$50,000,000 will be required for that purpose, which will leave \$30,000,000, or about 9,000 tons, to be disposed of as bullion. A market for this immense supply of silver can only be found in such of the European states as maintain the single standard of silver or the double standard of gold and silver, and in China and the Indies.

The facts above stated indicate the gradual but eventually certain adoption of the gold standard and consequent demonetization of silver by all commercial countries. Not only is the tendency to adopt gold as the sole standard and measure of value, but to use paper money redeemable in gold as the bulk of the circulating medium.

Then he proceeds to show that gold would necessarily appreciate, which he said meant the same thing as depreciation of property by reason of silver being stricken down. I may refer to his table giving the amount of silver and gold we had then coined and the relation they bore to each other in 1873, showing that the pretense that silver was demonetized because it was either not a coin that the people wanted or because it was more valuable than gold is not true. It was stricken down because the great gold brokers, foreign and domestic, saw that gold was becoming more and more valuable every day, and silver would necessarily fall because of the action of Germany. The production of gold had fallen off in this country from \$66,000,000 in 1856 to \$32,000,000 in 1873. Silver production had gone up from less than \$14,000,000 four years before to thirty-odd million dollars in 1873. That was the real cause of its being stricken down in the interest of the bondholders and the bankers and the usurers of Europe and America.

But I started to speak of the fraud—and I use the word deliberately—the fraud committed by somebody in the Revised Statutes in demonetizing the silver coin then in existence. Recollect the act of 1873 did not do that. It left whatever coin had been coined as a legal tender for all debts. It only provided for coins in the future. The fraud in

the Revised Statutes had to be perpetrated to consummate the act and to destroy the existing silver money. The Revised Statutes professed to be simply a compilation of existing laws, nothing more. They so state officially on their face. General Butler presented them. This is what he said, among other things:

I desire to premise here that your committee felt it their bounden duty not to allow, so far as they could ascertain, any change of the law. This embodies the law as it is. The temptation, of course, was very great, where a law seemed to be imperfect, to perfect it by the alteration of words or phrases or to make some change; but that temptation has, so far as I know and believe, been resisted. We have not attempted to change the law in a single word or letter so as to make a different reading or different sense. All that has been done is to strike out the obsolete parts and to condense and consolidate and bring together statutes *in pari materia*, so that you have here, except in so far as it is human to err, the laws of the United States under which we now live. And it will be necessary, if the bill passes Congress, that it shall pass without any one undertaking to amend the law as it stands in this revision, because once beginning to amend the revision by altering the law from what it is will lead into an infernal sea, in which we shall never find soundings and which will never find a shore. But if there be any omission of any provision of law the theory of this revision is that that shall be supplied; and to that the committee desire to call the attention of the House.

Judge Poland followed, who had charge of the bill, perhaps was chairman, and said:

As my friend from Massachusetts has said, the committee have endeavored to have this revision a perfect reflex of the existing national statutes. We felt aware that if anything was introduced by way of change into those statutes it would be impossible that the thing should ever be carried through the House. In the multitude of matters that come before Congress for consideration, if we undertake to perfect and amend the whole body of the national statutes there is an end of any expectation that the thing would ever be carried through either House of Congress, and therefore the committee have endeavored to eliminate from this everything that savors of change in the slightest degree of the existing statutes.

So the Revised Statutes were passed; and yet, coupling that with what was done in 1873 in regard to the silver dollar, is it strange that we find in those Revised Statutes all the silver coinage of the country that was a full legal tender for every dollar of debt, public and private, demonetized and not allowed to be a legal tender for more than \$5 under and by virtue of the Revised Statutes? Whoever did it committed a fraud, a palpable fraud upon the country. As I said and repeat, it required such a provision in the Revised Statutes to destroy the existing silver coinage of the country. Whoever inserted it did it in the interest of the bondholders, willfully and fraudulently. Passing from that, the Senator from Ohio, as the Senator from Kansas said in the speech from which I read, declared that the striking down of silver coinage and the substituting of the gold unit was an American idea. I deny it, as the Senator from Kansas did, as every Senator has who spoke upon this subject. I ask Senators to read the report of Mr. Hunter, from which I would like to quote, made in 1853. He there shows that silver and gold, acting side by side and treated both alike, was the American idea. Gold, and gold alone, was the idea of the Senator from Ohio, but not of any other Senator or any other leading American that I know of.

Why do I say it was his idea? Because he went to Paris in 1867. I do not know whether he wrote the letter while in Paris or not, but at an international convention to which Mr. Ruggles was the American delegate, appointed by Mr. Seward, in 1867, in making his report in regard to the question what should be the unit of value—a question never brought up before for action in the United States, so far as I know, but suggested in a convention of European nations—Mr. Ruggles reports to Mr. Seward as follows:

It was then stated to the Emperor that an eminent American statesman—Mr. SHERMAN, Senator from Ohio, chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate of the United States, and recently in Paris—had written an important and interesting letter, expressing his opinion that the gold dollar of the United States ought to be and readily might be reduced by Congress, in weight and value, to correspond with the gold five-franc piece of France; that the letter was now before the international committee, having the question of uniform coin under special examination, to which letter, as being one of the best interpretations of the views of the American people, the attention of the public authorities of France was respectfully invited.

Mr. SHERMAN's letter had not then been brought to the attention of the American people, so far as I know. I think he represented only himself.

The Emperor then closed the audience, by repeating the assurances of his gratification that the important international measure in question was likely to receive active support from the United States.

The letter of Mr. SHERMAN above referred to, dated the 18th of May, 1867, originally written in English, was presented in a French translation a few days after to the international committee in full session, when it was received with unusual interest and ordered by the committee to be printed in both languages. A copy is herewith transmitted for the information of the Department of State.

Further on, when they reached an agreement on the single gold unit, Mr. Ruggles took uncommon pleasure, he said, in giving great credit to his friend, the Senator from Ohio, as being the man chiefly instrumental in bringing about that result by the letter he had written and by the influence he had exerted. Mr. Ruggles says:

The establishment of the single standard exclusively of gold is in truth the cardinal if not the all-important feature of the plan proposed by the conference, relieving the whole subject by a single stroke of the pen from the perplexity, and indeed the impossibility, of permanently unifying the multiplicity of silver coins scattered through the various nations of Europe. It is a matter of world-wide congratulation that on this vital point the delegates from the nineteen nations represented in the conference were unanimous, not excepting France itself, so strongly wedded by the national traditions to a double standard.

Then he goes on to state the controversy they had among themselves and how they finally got together, Great Britain and Sweden standing out alone in favor of their own moneys. He adds:

On all these questions the interests of monetary unification were materially advanced by the publication at Paris of the concise but admirable letter from Hon. JOHN SHERMAN, Senator in Congress from the State of Ohio, a copy of which has been already communicated to the Department of State, but which for more convenient reference is now transmitted herewith in duplicate, with its French translation. His opinions are unmistakably expressed in the following extracts: "As the gold franc piece is now in use by over sixty millions of people of several different nationalities, and is of convenient form and size, it may well be adopted by other nations as the common standard of value, leaving to each nation to regulate the divisions of this unit in silver coin or tokens. If this is done, France will surely abandon the impossible effort of making two standards of value."

He was for the one standard and thought France could be brought into it.

Gold coins will answer all the purposes of European commerce. A common gold standard will regulate silver coinage. In England many persons of influence and different chambers are earnestly in favor of the proposed change in the coinage. The change is so slight with them that an enlightened self-interest will soon induce them to make it, especially if we make the greater change in our coinage. We can easily adjust the reduction with the public creditors in the payment or conversion of their securities, while private creditors might be authorized to recover upon the old standard.

When Mr. Ruggles's report was made Mr. SHERMAN took it up and sought to carry its recommendations through Congress, and no doubt this is one of the things that he thought attracted so much public attention. During the Fortieth Congress, June 9, 1868, Mr. SHERMAN made a report to the Senate in which he recommended a single standard exclusively of gold, and in that report used the language which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. INGALLS] quoted in the speech which he made:

The single standard of gold is an American idea, yielded reluctantly by France and other countries, where silver is the chief standard of value.

At the close of his report he said:

These reasons induce your committee to earnestly urge the adoption by the United States of the general plan of the French conference.

He attempted to show that the sole legal standard of gold was the one object most to be desired, while he insisted most urgently in regard to public debts that it was dishonest and dishonorable to require the holders to take pay in a coin less valuable than the coin of the contract. He said if we reduce the metal in our coin, as our public debt is very large, we shall have to pay our creditors \$90,000,000 in addition to the face of the bonds. That was a small matter, however, though he afterwards urged, as Secretary and Senator, earnestly and repeatedly, that the silver coin of the contract should be increased and paid to the bondholders. In his report he urged the gold unit, changing ours to the French standard, and providing for payment in addition to the bondholder. I will quote his language exactly:

As to public debts, the contract of loan is the only law that ought to affect the creditor until his debt is fully discharged.

Now, pay attention to this. I expect to read this again, because the act of July 14, 1870, made all public debts payable in the gold and silver coin of the standard value of that day, and every effort of Mr. SHERMAN or anybody else to increase the weight of the silver dollar, by any additional number of grains, simply seeks to impose a tax upon the people to the extent of the increase, in violation of the contract that he regarded as so sacred, when he sought to reduce gold. Perhaps poor debtors have not the same contract rights as rich creditors, especially when bondholders are the beneficiaries.

Mr. TELLER. What is the date of that?

Mr. BECK. June 9, 1868; it is Mr. SHERMAN's report from the Finance Committee, on the relation of the coinage of gold and silver:

Does not a different principle prevail as to public debts? As to public debts, the contract of loan is the only law that ought to affect the creditor until his debt is fully discharged.

Note that. It ought to apply to the debtor as well; he has rights in all contracts as well as the creditor, in my opinion at least.

Congress—

Says Mr. SHERMAN—

as the authorized agent of the American people, is one party to the contract, and it may no more vary the contract by subsequent acts than any other debtor may vary his contract. As to the public creditor, no legislative power stands between him and the exact performance of his contract. Public faith holds the scales between him and the United States, and the penalties for a breach of this faith are far more severe and disastrous to the nation than courts, constables, and sheriffs can be to the private debtor. These penalties are national dishonor and inability to borrow money in case of war or public distress, and the ultimate result is the sure and speedy decline of national power and prestige. When changes in our coin were made in 1834 and 1853, the United States had no public debt of any significance, and the precedents then made do not apply to the present time. Now the public debt is so large that a change of 31 per cent. in the value of our coin is a reduction of the public debt of \$90,000,000. So much of this debt as exists in the form of legal-tender notes will be received and disbursed as money, and as its value for some time will be less than the new coin, no provision need be made for it; but for so much of the debt as is payable, principal or interest, in coin of a specific weight and value, provision ought to be made for its exact discharge in that coin or its equivalent in the new. Your committee, therefore, propose an amendment to that effect.

That quotation may be useful in the further discussion of some other points made from time to time by that distinguished gentleman. His proposition met with no favor as far as the history of American legislation publicly shows. Even Mr. Morgan, of New York, who was sup-

posed to be the representative of Wall street, in every form opposed it, and made a minority report in which he said:

A change in our national coinage so grave as that proposed by the bill should be made only after the most mature deliberation. The circulating medium is a matter that directly concerns the affairs of every-day life, affecting not only the varied, intricate, and multifarious interests of the people at home to the minutest detail, but the relations of the nation with all other countries as well. The United States has a peculiar interest in such a question. It is a principal producer of the precious metals, and its geographical position, most favorable in view of impending commercial changes, renders it wise that we should be in no haste to fetter ourselves by any new international regulation based on an order of things belonging essentially to the past.

Again he says:

The movement proposed in the bill appears to be in the wrong direction. The standard value of gold coin should be increased—brought up to our own, rather than lowered.

He gives many reasons for that. Again he says:

These two streams of the precious metals, poured into the current of commerce in full volume, will produce perturbations marked and important. Other countries will be affected, but the United States will feel the effect first and more directly than any other.

The Pacific Railway will open to us the trade of China, Japan, India, and other oriental countries, of whose prepossessions we must not lose sight. For years silver, for reasons not fully understood, has been the object of unusual demand among these Asiatic nations, and now forms the almost universal medium of circulation, absorbing rapidly the silver of coinage. The enormous proportion fixed between silver and gold by France, and which we are asked to copy, is denuding that country of the former metal. Our own monetary system, though less faulty, is not suitably adjusted in this respect. The silver dollar, for instance, a favorite coin of the native Indian and distant Asiatic, has well-nigh disappeared from domestic circulation to reappear among the Eastern peoples, with whom we more than ever seek close intimacy. As they prefer this piece we would do well to increase rather than discontinue its coinage, for we must not deprive ourselves of the advantages which its agency will afford, and "it would be useless to send dollars to Asia inferior in weight and value to its well-known Spanish and Mexican prototype."

So when Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. Ruggles managed to agree in regard to the single gold unit, and when Mr. SHERMAN presented it before the American Congress, it was met by a minority report from Mr. MORGAN and then dropped, it became just and proper for the Senator from Kansas [Mr. INGALLS] to remark as he did in the speech I have just read:

In a report made to the Senate June 9, 1868, to accompany "A bill in relation to the coinage of gold and silver," Mr. Sherman, now Secretary of the Treasury, said:

"The single standard of gold is an American idea, yielded reluctantly by France and other countries where silver is the chief standard of value."

No statement emanating from authority so respectable could well be more devoid of truth. The original American idea was a single standard of silver. Gold was an innovation, and in my judgment a grave mistake. The assertion of Senator SHERMAN that the single gold standard was an "American idea" is so singularly incorrect that it seems almost like a premeditated preliminary to the fatal error of 1873.

It seems as though the only pressure for that action, so far as I know, from any of the public men of the country was from the Senator from Ohio himself. He confounds the American idea with his own and assumes that they mean the same thing. Mr. President, the truth is, and there is no use denying it, that from the beginning of the war till now the moneyed men of this country and Europe and their advocates in and out of Congress and their supporters everywhere have sought persistently to make money out of the distress of this country. They have attempted, and generally succeeded, at all hazards, by means foul and fair, lawful and unlawful, to make themselves rich at the expense of the great mass of this people. The demonization of our silver coin was but one step in that line, a step that was in perfect accord with all the other steps that had been taken and were afterwards taken, and the fraudulent act perpetrated in the Revised Statutes, whatever may be said of the motives of men, of the openness or secrecy of the act of 1873, consummating and making possible the benefits they expected to derive from the act of 1873, was another and the decisive step in the same direction. No man will ever avow that he knew who perpetrated the fraud in the Revised Statutes.

When legal-tender notes were first circulated war was made on them by all the bankers and money-changers from the beginning. That war was kept up, and kept up persistently, and by none more persistently than by the Senator from Ohio to the very end, and, indeed, to this day. When the greenback was first issued the combinations of bankers got together and determined that the greenback should be repudiated so far as they were concerned. They all agreed that it should be good enough for everybody but them; good enough for the soldiers, the sailors, the contractors, for everybody except the men who held the money-bags of the United States. That repudiation was consummated in the Senate of the United States—no doubt in the Finance Committee of the Senate of the United States, of which the Senator from Ohio was then a distinguished member. The gold interest on bonds paid for in greenbacks at par brought the first evils upon the country and placed and kept all the interests of the people under the money kings. For fear I may be charged with making statements that I can not substantiate I will read from a speech by Hon. WILLIAM D. KELLEY, quoting Mr. Stevens, who I suppose is at least respectable authority. Mr. KELLEY in his speech at Philadelphia said, speaking of the money that was issued when the Senate inserted the coin payment of interest on the bonds.

Mr. KELLEY said:

The House refused to concur, and appointed a committee of conference, with

Mr. Stevens as its chairman. They contested the matter until further contest was in vain. I remember the grand "Old Commoner"—

Said Mr. KELLEY—

with his hat in his hand and his cane under his arm, talking to myself and another, when he returned to the House after the final conference, and shedding bitter tears over the result. "Yes," said he, "we have had to yield; the Senate was stubborn. We did not yield until we found that the country must be lost or the banks be gratified, and we have sought to save the country in spite of the cupidity of its wealthier citizens." The bill went through, but not until he had expressed to the House and the country his fears.

That crime perpetrated by the Senate of the United States, or that blunder worse than a crime, has cost the American people more than all the war would have cost had the House bill been adopted as originally passed. That crime or blunder called into existence the gold room of New York; it invited from all the money centers of the world their most voracious vampires to come and fatten upon the life-blood of the American people. It converted commerce into a mere system of gambling, and made such creatures as Jay Gould and Jim Fisk possible in American history. Do I speak too severely? If I do, I will summon a voice from the grave to temper my severity. I have here the Congressional Globe, in which I find the following remarks, made February 20, 1862, by Thaddeus Stevens, chairman of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Treasury-note bill. In submitting the report he said:

"Mr. Speaker, I have a very few words to say. I approach the subject with more depression of spirits than I ever before approached any question. No personal motive or feeling influences me—I hope not, at least. I have a melancholy foreboding that we are about to consummate a cunningly-devised scheme which will carry great injury and great loss to all classes of the people throughout this Union, except one. With my colleague, I believe that no act of legislation of this Government was ever hailed with as much delight throughout the whole length and breadth of this Union, by every class of people, without any exception, as the bill which we passed and sent to the Senate. Congratulations from all classes—merchants, traders, manufacturers, mechanics, and laborers—poured in upon us from all quarters. The boards of trade from Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Louisville, St. Louis, Chicago, and Milwaukee approved its provisions and urged its passage as it was. I have a dispatch from the Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati, sent to the Secretary of the Treasury and by him to me, urging the speedy passage of the bill as it passed the House. It is true there was a doleful sound came up from the caverns of the bullion-brokers and from the saloons of the associated banks. Their cashiers and agents were soon on the ground, and persuaded the Senate, with but little deliberation to mangle and destroy what it had cost the House months to digest, consider, and pass. They fell upon the bill in hot haste, and so disfigured and deformed it that its very father would not know it. Instead of being a beneficent and invigorating measure, it is now positively mischievous. It has all the bad qualities which its enemies charged in the original bill, and none of its benefits. It now creates money, and by its very terms declares it a depreciated currency. It makes two classes of money—one for the banks and brokers, and another for the people. It discriminates between the rights of different classes of creditors, allowing the rich capitalists to demand gold, and compelling the ordinary lender of money on individual security to receive notes which the Government had purposely discredited."

Again, in still more emphatic terms, and almost in repetition, only stronger, he repeats that it was the conspiracy between European bankers and the rich men of America, through the Finance Committee of the Senate, which brought about that condition of things. They bankrupted the country and made themselves the richest men in the world.

What followed? I need not go over that history. You all know it. The usurers of the world bought the bonds of the United States with that very depreciated currency, averaging only about 50 cents to the dollar in gold, at the time. Of course they paid the greenbacks for them at par. One gold dollar bought two in paper; the paper dollar bought bonds at par, with 6 per cent. gold interest. Thus 12 per cent. was secured, and they called that patriotism! They next had all the currency of State banks legislated out of existence by a tax, so that their currency and theirs alone, as national bankers, should circulate over the land. The principal of their bonds was made expressly payable in greenbacks. Even Mr. SHERMAN admitted that in 1868, in a celebrated letter which has been read time and again, in which he denounced them as extortioners for claiming that the bonds should be paid in coin. Of course he was right, because each note had written on its back that "this note is a legal tender at its face value for all debts, public and private, except duties of imports and interest on the public debt." Yet in the face of that, when Congress met in March, 1869, it declared, and Mr. SHERMAN led the column in the assault on greenbacks, that the greenback should not be received in payment of the principal of the bonds, although it was written upon it that it should be, and that the bonds should all be paid in coin. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] very properly said the other day that the advantages the bondholders had received from Congressional legislation had added to their value 50 per cent. before the act of 1873 was passed.

To make a long story short, the advocates of the money power followed up and sought new advantages promptly. July 14, 1870, another act was passed, in which it was agreed that their bonds should be paid in gold and silver coin of the then standard value, which is the same as the standard silver dollar of to-day and the gold dollar of to-day. They required that stipulation to be inserted in face of all the contracts, and the bonds were exempted from all taxation, State, Federal, and municipal. No tax has since been paid by any holder of them to State, county, or city, or to the United States, no matter though the bondholder might be worth millions. Perhaps the Senator from Ohio was guarding his friends in that act from his proposed change in the gold unit. Ought they not to have stopped there? Had they not received benefactions enough to have satisfied any cormorant? They had degraded for their own benefit the currency issued by the Government to carry on the war and depreciated it for their own advantage, to the ruin of all others. They had become the sole bankers of the country that could furnish currency. They had declared that their

own bonds should be paid in gold and silver coin in the face of an obligation written on the greenbacks with which they had bought the bonds; and then they had their bonds exempted from all taxation, State, Federal, and municipal.

All this time the distinguished Senator from Ohio was chairman of the Committee on Finance, and every one of those acts met his cordial approval, so far as I know, even if he did write in 1868 the letter which I believe I will again reproduce for the edification of the people, in which he said they were extortionists if they demanded anything else than greenbacks.

He said to his friend:

DEAR SIR: I was pleased to receive your letter. My personal interests are the same as yours; but, like you, I do not intend to be influenced by them. My construction of the law is the result of careful examination, and I feel quite sure an impartial court would affirm it, if the case could be tried before a court. I send you my views as fully stated in a speech. Your idea is, that we propose to repudiate or violate a promise when we offer to redeem the "principal" in legal-tenders.

I think the bondholder violates his promise when he refuses to take the same kind of money he paid for the bonds. If the case is to be tested by law, I am right; if it is to be tested by Jay Cooke's advertisements, I am wrong. I hate repudiation, or anything like it, but we ought not to be deterred from doing what is right by fear of undeserved epithets.

If under the law as it stands the holders of the five-twenties can only be paid in gold, then we are repudiators if we propose to pay otherwise. If the bondholder can legally demand only the kind of money he paid, then he is a repudiator and an extortioner to demand money more valuable than he gave.

Truly yours,

JOHN SHERMAN.

But greed is never satisfied. Not content with all these extortions, they had the law of 1873 passed striking down the silver coin. Why? Because Germany had united with England in doing so after she had extorted a thousand millions from France as a war indemnity. Silver was coming into use rapidly by the increasing product of our own mines. Thus the people would be able to pay their debts and discharge the public obligations of the country with it more easily than they could with gold. But, if the money kings could strike down silver, which was one-half of the world's money, in conjunction with England and Germany, they knew this would make them the richest men in the world and impoverish everybody else. After securing the act of 1873 they changed the Revised Statutes, in the face of the solemn pledges given that there was no change in them, so as to destroy the legal-tender quality of what there was of silver coin at the time, and about \$2,000,000 of standard dollars had been coined in the six weeks preceding the passage of the act of 1873. Not content with that, it was not a year until we had a scramble in the other House, when the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] was chairman of the committee, and Black Friday came, as we remember, in New York. The greenbacks cut quite an important figure at that time. The Committee on Finance of the Senate reported against legalizing an increase of some \$5,000,000 or \$10,000,000. But Black Friday, as I said, came in the mean time and an increase was made by executive order. I may not give the exact figures, but the increase was from \$354,000,000 to \$382,000,000—some \$28,000,000 added to the greenback circulation by executive action. Several bills were introduced in the House of Representatives and the question was elaborately discussed as to how much should be allowed as the maximum of that currency. Mr. DAWES moved, as the RECORD will show, that the amount should be limited to \$356,000,000. Mr. Ellis H. Roberts, another member of the Committee on Finance, moved to make it \$382,000,000. I, then a member of the Committee on Finance, moved to make it \$400,000,000, and after a long debate in the House it was made \$400,000,000.

The bill came to the Senate, and was put into the hands of the Senator from Ohio. I think the committee reported \$382,000,000. It was made \$400,000,000 by a majority of the Senate, and it passed the Senate at \$400,000,000. It was sent to the President, and because there were some other banking privileges in it he vetoed it; but it had passed both Houses, and a few months afterwards an act was passed fixing the limit at \$382,000,000, and the President approved it.

Recollect they had silver quietly stricken down during this period. The Revised Statutes had been adjusted to that end fraudulently. No man will deny that the change in the compilation of the statutes was fraudulent; I repeat that with emphasis. The act of 1873 was, as I think I have shown, secret and unknown to a large majority of the Representatives of the States and people; the change in the Revised Statutes was a fraud, purposely committed to consummate the advantages the money power had gained by the other act. There is not a man in either House who will dare appear before the American people and say that he knew at the time that the Revised Statutes were altered so as to take away the legal-tender quality from the existing silver dollar. The Senator from Ohio will not admit that he knew anything about that. That change was secretly made, so secret that even the Senator from Ohio did not know it, I assume.

Yet it was done; and after it was done and the bankers and the money-changers were having everything their own way, the next great movement in their interest was to strike down the greenbacks, destroy their legal-tender quality; indeed, destroy them altogether. The Senator from Ohio labored in season and out of season to strike down everything but national-bank notes and gold. Silver had been effectually destroyed, as they assumed by prohibiting any more coinage, and no legal

tender beyond \$5; even the \$5 legal-tender quality was taken away from the trade-dollar; the national banks, through their currency, were sought to be made omnipotent over the land.

That was the next move of the Senator from Ohio as chairman of the Finance Committee. Recollect every national-bank note is a legal tender to you, and to me, and to every contractor, and to every soldier, and to every sailor, and for every obligation of the Government except interest on the public debt and customs dues. Their bank notes were redeemable in lawful money. The greenback was assumed to be lawful money, whether it had a legal-tender quality or not. The banks would not take their own notes in discharge of the obligations due to them by the Government; but you and I and everybody else had to take them. With gold, and gold alone, with the greenback destroyed, with silver out of the way, who could get a dollar to pay his debts with unless he went to a national bank and paid whatever premium they saw fit to ask him? Nobody. That was the next great move on the boards, and the Senator from Ohio was the leading player.

Under his management the banks were to be made masters; that was the great struggle the Senator from Ohio was making all the time. Take the act about which he and others have boasted so much, the resumption act. I hope Senators will read it carefully. You will find it in volume 18 of the Statutes at Large, page 296. The second section allows gold to be coined free of charge. That was another move. They had paid one-eighth of 1 per cent., or perhaps one-fourth of 1 per cent., before that time. This was in 1875 recollect, while silver was still demonetized. They were to have thereafter all their bullion coined free. England had, they said, done the same thing. England, of course, to carry out her policy, had done just what Mr. SHERMAN and his friends were doing here, making gold, and gold alone, the standard, and the bondholder or the holder of consols who controlled the gold, and he alone, was master of the situation. England had provided by statute that for every standard ounce of gold offered to the Bank of England the bank should pay in their own notes, which could be converted into gold in a minute, £3 17s. 9d. They had thus fixed the value for gold so that it could not fluctuate. This statute had ours coined free of charge, and in the same statute they provided that all limitations should be taken away from national-bank notes; they should issue just as many as they pleased, a thousand millions if they wanted to. Let me read:

That section 5177 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, limiting the aggregate amount of circulating notes of national banking associations, be, and is hereby, repealed; and each existing banking association may increase its circulating notes in accordance with existing law without respect to said aggregate limit; and new banking associations may be organized in accordance with existing law without respect to said aggregate limit; and the provisions of law for the withdrawal and redistribution of national bank currency among the several States and Territories are hereby repealed.

That was another of their schemes. When the original banking act was passed the provision was to divide the currency allowed, about \$350,000,000, among the States according to wealth and population. Kentucky had about the same population as Massachusetts, paying more taxes, not perhaps quite as rich in previously accumulated wealth according to the census, but needing money quite as much. Yet Massachusetts was allowed about \$60,000,000 of national currency and Kentucky was allowed \$7,000,000.

That same year I raised the question of a legal redistribution in the Ways and Means Committee. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] agreed that I was right. We forced a redistribution. Fifty-five million dollars was to be taken from those banks in the East which had received it in violation of law, and which Mr. Knox had favored because of their loyalty—for that seemed to be one of the things that was necessary for national banking under him—and Congress ordered a redistribution. Then came the panacea. They did not want to give up the money. They had all the bonds, they had all the circulation, they said, "Oh, no; make banking free, make the circulation without limit," and they did so in order to keep the \$55,000,000 that the law the year before had ordered them to give up. When they got that done, they said that the legal-tender notes should be reduced down to \$300,000,000 before resumption day, which was January 1, 1879, and after that day they were all to be destroyed.

The resumption act provides:

And to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare and provide for the redemption in this act authorized or required, he is authorized to use any surplus revenues, from time to time, in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and to issue, sell, and dispose of, at not less than par, in coin, either of the descriptions of bonds of the United States described in the act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," with like qualities, privileges, and exemptions, to the extent necessary to carry this act into full effect, and to use the proceeds thereof for the purposes aforesaid.

Every greenback was to be destroyed after January, 1879, and all but \$300,000,000 before that date, by the act which the Senator from Ohio had passed. He would not say so distinctly at the time, that the greenback was to be absolutely destroyed. He did not like to speak out. That was one of the things that he was very particular about, but that he did intend to destroy all the greenbacks absolutely I suppose he will hardly deny himself, although I believe he said he changed his mind afterwards. Mr. Bayard, then a Senator from Delaware, was making a speech in the Senate of the United States on the 27th of Jan-

uary, 1880, when the question came up whether this resumption act necessarily destroyed the greenbacks and authorized the sale of bonds at any rate of interest that the Secretary of the Treasury might see fit in order to get the money to do it with. Mr. Bayard said:

During the debate which attended the passage of the resumption act the present Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Sherman, who had charge of the bill in this body, was asked by several Senators, myself among the number, whether by the redemption of the United States notes under that act they were finally to be retired and destroyed, and he declined to give any construction whatever to the law on that point.

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask the Senator if in his mind there is any doubt at all as to what the construction of that act was?

Mr. BAYARD. I was unable to say what its construction was.

Mr. Bayard became quite complimentary to the Senator from Ohio, as he will observe.

I was unable to say what its construction was. I thought it was a double-faced juggler intended to catch the votes of contractionists in one direction and of inflationists in the other. I said so at the time, and I withheld my vote, for I thought it was not treating a great subject with proper respect to legislate upon it in such a way. I therefore came to no construction. I was disposed to believe that with a Secretary favoring one view it would be made a means of contraction; under the other view, which it seems has been adopted by many, it would become a means solely of inflation, because there was no limit put upon the notes to be issued by the Government to the national banks, and there was no security that the Treasury notes retired nominally in the course of redemption would not be reissued again by the Treasury; and when the author of the bill—no, I will not say the author of the bill, for I have understood he was not the author of the bill, but he was the gentleman in charge of the bill—declined to say what was intended by it, and what its effect would be, I believed then that there was some snare, and that it was an improper way of dealing with the subject, and hence the measure was not fit really to be before the legislative body.

Mr. EDMUNDS. My apology for interrupting my honorable friend, to all of whose very interesting and satisfactory speech I am sorry I have not been able to listen on account of an engagement elsewhere, is that I thought it right it should appear in that connection that I voted for the act of 1875, because, on a careful examination, it was to my mind perfectly clear, no matter what the present Secretary of the Treasury chose to think about it or chose not to say about it, but on the bill itself that I was voting for, it was perfectly clear that the redemption that that act provided for, both before the 1st of January, 1879, and afterward, was a redemption which took out in point of law from existence all the United States notes that should come in in the methods provided by that act. And I am inclined to think that if my honorable friend would now examine the statute he would not have any doubt upon it at all.

Therefore I am justified in assuming that to be the object and intent of the resumption act. They had destroyed silver, and they now passed an act to destroy the legal tender. Everything was working as they desired, when the representatives of the States and people began to realize what was going on, and they stepped in and prevented these things from being done, first by restoring silver as a legal tender, and by the act of 1878, forbidding the reduction of the greenbacks below \$346,000,000. Then the struggle began to take away their legal-tender quality; that was the next best thing for the bankers. Recollect, and I want Senators to examine for themselves, when the act rechartering the banks was passed all their notes were made redeemable in lawful money, not in legal-tender money. The word "legal tender" was never inserted once; it was kept out on purpose, so that the legal-tender quality should be stricken down from these very notes and yet be of sufficient quality to redeem the national-bank circulation.

In view of what I read in regard to our solemn obligation to our public creditors in the report made by the Senator from Ohio, as to the public debt being such a sacred public obligation that the coin in which it was payable could not be changed, I wish to call attention to what he was told by the law officers of the Government when he insisted that the bonds should be paid in gold and in gold alone. He asked for an opinion from the then Attorney-General of the United States upon that subject, and he received it. April 27, 1877, Mr. SHERMAN wrote the following letter, which I have read before, asking Mr. Devens whether or not the bonds he was about to issue could be made payable in gold and gold alone, which he thought for many reasons might be desired:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1877.

SIR: I beg leave to call your attention to, and ask your opinion upon, the following questions growing out of the refunding act of July 14, 1870, to wit:

Can I stipulate in the body of the 4 per cent. bonds about to be issued that they shall be redeemable in coin of the present standard value; that is, the standard value at the date of their issue, or must it be the date of the law?

I submit a statement prepared by Hon. H. F. French, Assistant Secretary, having reference to the laws.

It may become important to the public interests to make the new bonds payable in coin of the present standard; that is, gold coin. Some doubts have been expressed upon whether previous bonds issued under acts passed prior to 1873 are not legally payable in silver coin. This question may become important, as any doubt upon the legal terms of a public security affects its value.

Very respectfully,

JOHN SHERMAN, Secretary.

HON. CHARLES DEVENS,  
Attorney-General.

Mr. Devens told him officially on the 26th of April, 1877, in answer to his question, that he regarded it as his bounden duty to recognize the fact that all obligations were payable in the coin of July 14, 1870, silver as well as gold, which every lawyer has recognized since, although it may be Jay Cooke's pronunciamientos and declarations have been paraded here once or twice and all sorts of sophistry flung in to make a show of equitable doubt. Mr. EDMUNDS, Mr. Matthews, Mr. Thurman, everybody, as well as Mr. Devens, has declared that the bonds of the United States can all be paid fairly, honorably, justly,

in the lawful money that existed July 14, 1870, of the then standard value. Mr. Devens's letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, April 26, 1877.

SIR: In answer to your letter of the 21st instant, requesting my opinion upon the following question growing out of the refunding act of July 14, 1870, to wit, "Can I stipulate in the body of the 4 per cent. bonds about to be issued that they shall be redeemable in coin of the present value, that is, the standard value at the date of their issue, or must it be the date of the law?" I have the honor to reply:

The act provides for the issue of bonds "redeemable in coin of the present standard value." The word "present" undoubtedly refers as a matter of date to the time when the act was passed, and not to the time when the bonds were thereafter issued. It contemplated that a long period would elapse before it would finally be carried into effect, and that changes in the coinage of the country might occur during that period.

Whatever changes in the coinage should occur, these bonds were, however, to be redeemed in coin of the standard value as it existed at the date of the act. By this provision the holder was guarded against any depreciation that might take place in the value of the coin, and the Government would not be compelled to pay the additional value should the coinage be depreciated. All the bonds issued under the act were to stand alike, no matter what was the date when such bonds were issued. Each was to be redeemable in coin which was included in the authorized coinage of the country at the date referred to, it being of the standard value as it then existed. Since the law was passed no change has taken place in the standard value of the coin. It is understood that there has been a certain change in the coinage of the country, and that silver dollars have now ceased to exist practically as coin.

It has been further provided by the statute of February 12, 1873 (Revised Statutes, sections 3585, 3586), that "the silver coins of the United States shall be a legal tender at their nominal value for any amount not exceeding \$5 in any one payment."

Notwithstanding this practical change in the coinage of the country and the passage of this act in regard to legal tenders, the form of bond to be issued by you should not be changed so far as the mode in which it is to be redeemed is concerned. It was not intended that this should be varied according to the changes which might be made in the coinage, because a definite rule was given by reference to the coin of a particular date. That which will pay the bonds heretofore issued under this act will pay the bonds which you may hereafter issue.

It can not be authoritatively said that the words "payable in coin" or "payable in gold" are equivalent to the words used by the statute. Even if this leaves open for discussion the question whether bonds issued under this act are or are not redeemable in silver coin of the character and standard which existed July 14, 1870, it is not a doubt which it is in your power to remedy by the use of words in the bond other than those which this statute provides.

While I comprehend the difficulty suggested in your letter and the convenience that there might be in removing any question upon this matter, I am, therefore, of opinion that it would not be safe to issue the bonds, except as redeemable in coin of the standard value of July 14, 1870.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

CHAS. DEVENS, Attorney-General.

HON. JOHN SHERMAN,  
Secretary of the Treasury.

Although Mr. Sherman had received that opinion from the Attorney-General, and although every bond that was issued had written upon its face that it was so payable, five months after that opinion was received by him, on the 3d day of December, 1877, that distinguished gentleman, as Secretary of the Treasury, with the opinion of the Attorney-General in his hand, wrote this to Congress:

If, therefore, the public interests demand the issue of silver dollars—a subject hereafter discussed—

This was in 1877, recollect, when he was resisting it with all his might—

it is respectfully submitted to Congress that an express exception be made requiring that gold coin alone shall be paid for principal or interest on bonds issued to public creditors since February 12, 1873, the amount of which is \$592,990,700. These bonds have entered into the markets of the world. If the market value of the silver in the new coin is less than the gold dollar, a forced payment in the new coin is a repudiation of a part of this debt.

That was his opinion and recommendation; that was what he desired to act upon in the face of an opinion from the Attorney-General, in the face of the written indorsement on the back of every bond that it was payable in coin of the standard value of July 14, 1870. Yet as Secretary of the Treasury he denounced the laws of his country, as construed by the Attorney-General, when they militated against the views that he entertained in the interest of the bondholders, and called the law repudiation of a part of the public debt; and he was so anxious to get clear of the silver dollar that in 1879, in his report as Secretary of the Treasury, he demanded that there should be no more than 50,000,000 silver dollars issued at the outside, saying that beyond that they could not be maintained. This is what he said; let me read it:

In the last annual report the Secretary stated—

He began very early—

"It would seem to be the best policy for the present to limit the aggregate issue of our silver dollars, based on the ratio of 16 to 1, to such sums as can clearly be maintained at par with gold, until the price of silver in the market shall assume a definite ratio to gold, when that ratio should be adopted and our coins made to conform to it; and the Secretary respectfully recommends that he be authorized to discontinue the coinage of the silver dollar when the amount outstanding shall exceed \$50,000,000."

That was in the report of 1878. I read from the report of 1879. After quoting the recommendation in his report of 1878, which I have just read, he says:

He again respectfully calls the attention of Congress to the importance of further limiting the coinage of the silver dollar.

He demanded payment in gold alone in the face, as I have said, of his own declaration demanding that we should pay \$90,000,000 to the public creditors because by the change of coin he proposed in 1868 the creditor would get over 3 per cent. less value. Now, in 1878 he wanted

to pay the creditor in gold, and gold alone, on the bonds that he had issued, and denounced payment in silver as repudiation because it had depreciated 10, 15, or 20 per cent. by his own bad legislation. He cared nothing for the tax-payers or their rights; his sympathies were only aroused when the money was to go into certain rich people's pockets. That is one reason why I said to the Senator from Ohio the other day that while he may be the President of these United States his conduct in regard to the act of 1873, with all his great financial ability, exercised as it has been always in the interest of the money power, will not be a record he will be proud of when he comes before the people for their votes. I am done with that matter, and think I have made my promise good. Now as to my coin-certificate bill. The silver dollar! Mr. President, war has been made upon the silver dollar ever since its recoinage was ordered in 1878. I have more than once shown how absurd and how untrue all the predictions about the silver dollar driving gold out of the country have proved, and I need not repeat my former statements.

Every Secretary of the Treasury, all the bondholders everywhere, all the men who wanted to depreciate the price of property (and they have the world over since 1873 reduced the value of all the property of the people 35 per cent. by striking down half of the world's coinage—that I will prove before I sit down—by reports made after careful investigation) predicted the dire effects of remonetizing silver. Yet I can show that when gold was abundant, coming from Australia and California from 1850 to 1873, and silver was an equal partner, the property of the world increased in value 40 per cent., while from 1873, after we struck down silver and put all the money of the country and power over the property and products of the country into the hands of a few men, property has gone down 35 per cent. by this reverse action; yet those men will tell you that we should stop silver coinage, because that is the way to force the European nations to agree to use it. "Do not coin any more," they say, and you will ultimately put up the value of silver. What keeps it at even the point where it is? Simply American coinage; simply its scanty use by this great leading country in spite of the combinations of Europe, in spite of the efforts made here in 1873, and maintained even now. The people rose in their might and overrode the veto dictated by the able Secretary of the Treasury at the time President Hayes vetoed the bill of 1878. The then Secretary of the Treasury, now Senator from Ohio, was no doubt the inspiring cause of that veto of Mr. Hayes; but the American people had found out what had been done. Their representatives promptly passed the bill for recoinage overwhelmingly over the veto, and the bondholders commenced clamoring from that day on that we ought to stop it.

Those who urge this course say they are the friends of silver. What does England want us to do? Stop coining silver, of course. What does Germany want us to do? Of course they want us to stop coining silver. We are the great silver-producers of the world; the moment we stop our silver coinage down silver goes; that is what England wants for India; that is what they all want for their own colonies. That is what they want us to do, and we are told that will make them, after we break down our silver coinage and all our silver industries, return to silver coinage. Who ever heard of an army surrendering to the enemy on the battle-field at discretion as the best means of gaining a victory? What kind of a friend would you regard him who advised such a course? That is what they want; all the advocates of gold, at home and abroad, advise us to do nothing more and nothing less than surrender at discretion. Advice of that sort is simply humbug, or the baldest hypocrisy. A few plain facts upset all their speculations and gloomy predictions. Here they are:

When the act of 1873 was passed there were only \$135,000,000 of gold in the United States. When the act of February 28, 1878, was passed there were \$213,000,000. This is from the official statements of the Secretary of the Treasury. On the 1st of July last, at the close of the last fiscal year, we had \$654,520,000 of gold; we had only coined \$268,000,000 of silver, all told, since 1878.

The amount of gold that was added to our stock was \$175,000,000 more of gold since 1878 than we have coined of silver since 1878. And yet we were told by the honorable Senator from Ohio, when Secretary of the Treasury, and it has been dinned into our ears ever since by all the doctrinaires that Gresham's law would make gold take wings and fly to more favored climes; that we would be on a silver basis every six months for the last eight years, and loss of credit at home and abroad would involve widespread ruin and national dishonor. I stand on the facts to disprove all their speculations; one fact is worth a thousand theories. One hundred and seventy-five million more of gold dollars have come to this country since we began to coin silver than we have coined of silver dollars, and in the year just closed the official report of the Director of the Mint shows that the surplus gold imported over gold exported was thirty-three and one-half millions.

The report further shows that the average annual product of gold in this country has been less than \$33,000,000 for the last ten years, and that nearly \$13,000,000 are used in the arts, in making watches, and the ten thousand things which it goes into leaving only \$20,000,000 per annum, or \$200,000,000 for the decade for use as coin, so that we have drawn from foreign countries under this system of silver coinage over \$200,000,000 of gold in excess of all produced in this country. Does

that look as though we are being ruined by silver or by Gresham's law? What else have we done? We have paid off every bond of the United States that can be paid. Since Cleveland's administration began we have reduced the national debt over \$250,000,000—I think nearly \$300,000,000, but certainly over \$250,000,000. We have paid off \$194,000,000 of 3 per cent. bonds. We have bought \$27,000,000 or \$28,000,000 of fours and four-and-a-halves, besides other things, until now there is over \$250,000,000 paid, and we have a surplus of over \$300,000,000 on hand; one of the last official reports shows the net gold in the Treasury to be: gold, \$202,000,000, supplemented by \$44,500,000 in silver and \$60,000,000 more of our money is deposited with the national banks to keep the money which the people have paid in needless taxes from being locked up in the Treasury.

Think of it! Over two hundred and fifty millions of debt have been paid off, over three hundred millions of surplus are on hand, two hundred and odd millions of gold, forty-four millions in silver, and sixty millions loaned out, and yet a struggle is being made every day to make the country believe that we are on the verge of ruin! We have only succeeded in keeping the bankers, and bondholders, and their representatives here from ruining the country. I have a paper in my hand showing that with all the pretense of England, of Germany, and of France, there is to-day more silver by twenty-five millions of dollars in the continental banks than they have gold. Here is a table showing what was in the Bank of France on the 9th of February, 1888, the banks of Austria, the banks of Germany, and the silver exceeds the gold in their banks alone, saying nothing of what is in the hands of the people, over £5,000,000 or \$25,000,000. The table is as follows:

Table indicating the amount of bullion in the principal European banks February 9, 1888.

Banks of—	Gold.	Silver.	Total.
England.....	£21,629,758		£21,629,758
France.....	44,350,768	£47,600,696	91,951,464
Germany.....	21,514,820	19,079,180	40,594,000
Austria-Hungary.....	6,910,000	14,578,000	21,488,000
Netherlands.....	4,300,000	8,200,000	12,500,000
National Belgium.....	2,783,000	1,392,000	4,175,000
National Italy.....	6,983,000	1,118,000	8,101,000
Total this week.....	108,471,346	91,967,876	200,439,222
Total previous week.....	107,410,104	91,541,213	198,951,317

Mr. President, I repeat that the bill which I introduced, and which was voted for by five out of the eleven members of the Finance Committee, to issue coin certificates instead of gold and silver certificates, is the first great step for this Congress to take in order to place the two metals in proper relation. Why should we have a silver certificate and a gold certificate except that the leading bankers of the country do not want to acknowledge that silver is equal to gold? Therefore, they want their own certificates in gold, and let others who are as subsidiary to them as they claim silver is to gold take silver certificates, so that a hue and cry can be raised whenever they choose to suggest that silver is to be merely a token metal and shall not have equal rights with their gold. This country will never assume the proper relation to its own money and its own coined metals until it does away with all discrimination between them. The national banks are forced to admit that they are failures now in furnishing currency for the use of the people. The country knows it. The whole system was wrong in principle from the beginning, and was gotten up for the purpose of making money for a few rich men. It worked well for a time in the way of safe and uniform circulation, but it never was run in the interest of the country.

The Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Texas will recollect—as they took active part in 1882 when we were rechartering those banks—that we by law forbade them from entering into any combination to discountenance or boycott silver certificates; we inserted a stringent provision in the law; yet they defied us, they formed alliances in defiance of us, and our own creatures, our fiscal agents, the national banking organizations, would not take silver or silver certificates over their counters, so that silver could not get into their clearing houses in any form. They overcertified checks to suit themselves, and laughed at us for thinking we could control them. Now they have contracted their currency about one hundred and sixty million in the last four years in the face of the growing wants of the country for more. When we have built 11,000 miles of railroad in the year just closed, when we needed \$160,000,000 more of circulation than we did four years ago, they contracted \$160,000,000 of theirs. Their excuse may be good, but what good does the excuse do the country. They say they did it because we required them to surrender the bonds which were the basis of their circulation; of course we did; we had to do so or allow the money to be locked up in the Treasury. Every 3 per cent. bond has been paid; twenty-seven or twenty-eight million of the fours and four-and-a-halves have been paid; and they say they can not afford to pay the premium now asked for other bonds and take out new circulation.

I hold in my hand a table showing what they had in November, 1883, what they had in February, 1888, which shows that the bonds

to secure circulation were reduced from \$362,000,000 to \$182,000,000, and there are \$102,000,000 of greenbacks now locked up in the Treasury in order to guard these outstanding notes on which the bonds have been withdrawn.

The Secretary of the Treasury has been compelled to put in the hands of national banks over \$60,000,000 for nothing, which is being loaned at interest to those from whom it was taken in order to keep the money from being locked up in the Treasury. In view of these facts I ask Senators what would have been the condition of this country if we had been left to the tender mercies and the policy of the Senator from Ohio and of the national bankers.

If the advice of men like the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] and his allies had been followed, and no resources to furnish currency had existed outside of the national bankers when they reduced their circulation one hundred and sixty million in the last four years, paying no attention to the wants of the people, I ask whether we would not have been bankrupt to-day? The despised silver dollar and the certificates based thereon has saved the country from ruin. When we treat silver and gold as equals before the law, as they should be treated, all will be well. The restoration of the legal-tender quality to the silver dollar was all there ever was of resumption, everything else was false pretense. Why should we be told now in the face of the movements of the world that we shall not put the two metals and the paper based on them on an equality? I have never believed that silver money has had fair play, but at the same time I have never believed that it ever had an enemy that has persistently done it as much harm as the distinguished Senator from Ohio. He has worked to degrade it from the time Mr. Ruggles made his report to Mr. Seward, and from the time that he sought to establish gold as the sole unit in 1868; from the time that he denounced all payments to bondholders except in gold as repudiation; from the persistent efforts he made everywhere to destroy all legal tender but gold. I do not say they were not honest efforts.

I have said often and I believe that he is, if not the ablest, one of the very ablest men whom I have ever seen in public life; and it is because of his great ability, differing as I do with him, that I regard his financial policy as dangerous, yes, ruinous to the best interests of the people of this country. I have made no charge against him of corruption or of anything wrong. I differ from him in policy and I oppose his measures, in defense of the best interests of the masses of the people as I understand them. I have no doubt that his great abilities have a powerful influence over masses of men in high places in this country, as they had in Paris when the gold unit was first sought to be established, and his known power aids strongly in keeping up and in giving encouragement to the movement that is now going on in Europe by the royal commission and otherwise to perpetuate the power of gold.

I have no doubt the present President of the United States, who had no means of knowing half as much about financial matters at home or abroad as the Senator from Ohio did, or as much as many people who have been in public life for a long while knew in regard to public matters, was alarmed when he came into the high position of Chief Magistrate of the Republic by the clamor that had been kept up through every administration and through every Secretary of the Treasury against silver, and that leading men of both parties in New York City endeavored to persuade him, and did convince him before he came here, that unless he did something promptly to stop the coinage of silver ruin would speedily follow. I have no doubt the President was alarmed; and I know that when he came here first he thought the advice so ably advanced by the Senator from Ohio and other Secretaries of the Treasury during former administrations was good. I made a speech at the first session under our Administration which gave positive offense to some distinguished gentlemen in New York and elsewhere. They regarded it as impertinence for an outside Western Senator to assume to dictate to Wall street. They thought it wonderful that any one should assume to know anything that they did not want to know. My speech was answered by many able men, and Mr. Horace White, of New York, was one of them. He admitted substantially that efforts were made to create a panic. This is what he said in a review he made of my speech. The same ideas were presented by Mr. Hewitt in a speech in the House of Representatives. I will read what Mr. Hewitt said first:

I have reason to know when the present Administration came into power its first and chiefest concern was to avoid the danger which had been predicted by the Republican Secretary in his official statement and in his private communications. The amount of gold in the Treasury on the 4th of March, 1885, was \$125,000,000. This was a much smaller sum than had usually been held in the Treasury in gold since the redemption of specie payment. It was steadily running down. The public confidence was gone. The hoarding of gold had begun—not by the mass of the people, not in stockings, not in secret hiding-places, but by the masters of finance, the men whose business it is to handle millions and to prevent deterioration; they began to prepare for the hour of danger and the collapse which they thought was impending.

I know three of the greatest institutions in the city of New York—I shall not name them, lest it might possibly bring down upon them the condemnation of those who are prejudiced against banks—but I know three institutions in the city of New York which had accumulated more than \$25,000,000 of gold as a preparation for the collapse they thought was coming.

Mr. Horace White, in reviewing my speech, said:

A sort of panic ensued in the money market, and it came to my knowledge that Governor Tilden was one of a considerable number of persons who, without any concert of action, had bought large amounts of sterling exchange in order to protect themselves against loss in case silver should become our mon-

etary standard. Sterling exchange means gold in London. Why was Governor Tilden buying sterling exchange? Because, happening to have on hand a certain number of dollars worth 100 cents each in gold and apprehending that if left in bank they would presently be worth only 90 or 80, or perhaps 75 cents each, he took the precaution to insure that they should continue to be worth 100 cents. He had only to write a few lines to his banker to insure this result. This was a typical case of the domineering "organizations of wealth" that Mr. Beck has conjured up.

Little wonder the President, then comparatively a new man in national politics, was staggered. These were the men, these were the organizations fortified in their assumption by all the predictions of the Senator from Ohio and other great leaders of both parties, that silver and silver alone would become our currency if we did not stop coining it, at once they urged it when we had less than \$100,000,000; now, in the face of their failure the result of the efforts they made and combined in making is still to prevent the people of this country from recognizing gold and silver both as part of the money of the country. They have at last to admit that the national banks are a failure. They are no longer of any value as the fiscal agents of the people. Still they are here keeping up their hostility, and they meet as usual in convention denouncing silver, and demanding that it be demonetized as loudly as if they were important factors in supplying currency to the country. The national boards of trade that meet here in Washington unite with them in denouncing silver, and even now insist that it shall be demonetized, just as earnestly as if national-bank notes were being issued fully up to the wants of the people. The banks have bills before Congress now asking us to give them the right to increase the issue of their currency from 90 up to 100 or par on their bonds, as though they were going to be of any use to the country in furnishing the currency of the people any longer.

They are simply asking us to make their bonds more valuable so that we will have to pay them that much more premium when we buy them, as we now must do, in open market. That is the only use their bonds now are to them, except for the present, till we reduce taxation, they can deposit them and get dollar for dollar of circulation already existing which belongs to the people and loan it to the tax-payers who furnished it at 6, 8, or 10 per cent. interest. That condition of things, the President says in his message, is indefensible, and ought promptly to be remedied by Congress. He was obliged to resort to it as the best he could do under the circumstances. Turning for a moment to Mr. Atkinson's report, I have only to say that all the agents who go to Europe go there, not to help us, as far as I am able to observe, but to give aid and comfort to the men who are seeking to break us down. I have great respect for Mr. Edward Atkinson as a gentleman, a man of learning and of high integrity and ability. Mr. Edward Atkinson has made a report which has been laid on our tables in which he does not even pretend to notice the fact that a great committee under Lord Idlesleigh have looked into the question of the demonetization of silver, and that they have reported evidence showing that the depression of the world's business, the depreciation of property, and the prostration of commerce grow out of what the witnesses call the great conspiracy of 1873 between England, Germany, and the United States. Lord Idlesleigh was then a member of Parliament. I have the report.

There is no indication—  
Says Mr. Atkinson—

that the subject of bimetalism has received any intelligent or serious consideration outside of a small circle in each country named, as a probable or possible remedy for the existing causes of alleged depression in trade.

When he said that he had before him the report of a commission which took volumes of testimony. It was perhaps the ablest committee that ever was raised in England. Its report was exhaustive upon all branches of business. That commission, which Mr. Atkinson does not deign to notice, made a report June 18, 1886, addressed to the Queen, saying, among other things:

In recent years the purchasing power of gold has increased, or, in other words, the prices of commodities in general, as measured by a gold standard, have fallen; and this appreciation of gold, taken in combination with other circumstances, has disturbed the relations between the two precious metals. An inconvenient depreciation of silver, as measured in gold, has for some time prevailed, and is still proceeding.

Without going into minute detail, we may point out that these changes result from a twofold set of causes. Not only has the supply of gold diminished, but the demand for it has increased. That is to say, the actual production of gold from the mines has declined, while the demand for it has been largely increased by its substitution for silver in the coinages of Germany and other countries; at the same time the supply of silver has been increased both by the somewhat larger produce of the mines and by the demonetized silver thrown on the market by Germany and Holland.

It seems unnecessary at this moment to refer in detail to the other changes in the monetary system of the world, such as the altered policy of the Latin Union, the resumption of cash payments on a gold basis by nations which had suspended them, and the increased absorption of gold in India. Questions may also arise as to the possibility of other circumstances having occurred which have affected the value of precious metals, such as, for example, any addition to or diminution of the quantities used for other than monetary purposes. All these subjects should have their proper weight given to them in the fuller and special inquiry which we recommend should be instituted.

Neither do we propose to enter upon the very important subject of the effect which the fluctuations in the value of the precious metals have upon the relations between the home and Indian governments in their large monetary transactions. That India has to receive her revenue in silver and to make her payments for a large portion of the interest on her debt, for the articles which she purchases, or for the services which she commands, in gold, and that a fall in the value of silver seriously disturbs her budget, is obvious and is not unnaturally disquieting. But it does not appear to us to be directly within the limits

of our inquiry, though indirectly it may have a bearing on the trade of India, and we may have occasion to recur to it.

We have not thought it desirable to take any oral evidence specially directed to this question; but we append a series of questions which we circulated among a limited number of gentlemen, who, either from their practical experience or from their researches in the subject, appeared likely to be able to afford useful information or to express opinions of value. Many of those to whom we applied have been unable from various causes to draw up answers to the questions. We annex those which we have received, and we venture to think that they will afford valuable material for prosecuting further inquiry into the subject.

We are strongly of opinion that the question deserves early and separate examination from other points of view than that of our commission, and that apart from its general connection with the depression of trade it should be treated with reference to our currency as a whole, and to our monetary system at home and to its relations to our colonies, to India, and to foreign countries; and we humbly submit to Your Majesty that from the general anxiety expressed on the subject the necessity for such an inquiry is urgent, and that it would both save time and facilitate investigation if a special inquiry into the group of questions which relate to the currency were set on foot and were intrusted to such persons as might seem to Your Majesty the most proper to conduct it under an order of reference carefully prepared and drawn so as to include all branches of the subject.

- All which we humbly submit for your Majesty's gracious consideration.
- |                    |                            |
|--------------------|----------------------------|
| IDDLESLEIGH.       | W. H. HOULDSWORTH.         |
| DUNRAVEN.          | W. L. JACKSON.             |
| G. SCLATER BOOTH.  | GEO. A. JAMIESON.          |
| JOHN AIRD.         | N. LUBBOCK.                |
| JAMES J. ALLPORT.  | P. ALBERT MUNTZ.           |
| THOS. BIRTWISTLE.  | R. H. I. PALGRAVE.         |
| LIONEL L. COHEN.   | CHAS. M. PALMER.           |
| JAMES P. CORRY.    | WM. PEARCE.                |
| DAVID DALE.        | B. PRICE.                  |
| C. J. DRUMMOND.    | SAMUEL STOREY.             |
| W. FARRER ECROYD.  | GEO. H. MURRAY, Secretary. |
| HENRY HUCKS GIBBS. |                            |

15TH JUNE, 1886.

Observe they call for a special committee on silver coinage. The royal commission was the result. And in the appendix which I have before me—I do not want to take time to read it; but I asked on one occasion that this testimony might be published and I borrowed from my friend, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], his copy, because I have cut off the testimony from my own copy which our minister to England was kind enough to send me—I have marked in red pencil so as not to swell the RECORD too much, but to give a clear idea of what all the gentlemen said that answered the questions propounded by Lord Idlesleigh's commission. Nine printed questions were put and were answered by twenty-seven leading men in England, presidents of banks, chambers of commerce, and with almost one accord they agreed that the restoration of silver to the coinage upon substantially the old basis was the only solution of the troubles now crushing the commerce of the world—there is no other—and they agree that it does not require an increase of value of metal in the silver coinage.

The restoration of it to a legal tender is all that is wanted. Some of them furnished valuable tables to show an average decline of 35 per cent. in values because of what they do not hesitate to call the great crime of the age when Germany and the United States in 1873 united with England to strike down legal-tender silver coins. They also show that up to that time as long as gold was being furnished in large amounts from Australia and California every business was prosperous and prosperity was the rule and not the exception, not only in England, France, and Germany, but in the United States, indeed all over the world, and that property values from 1850 to 1873 increased 40 per cent. in all civilized nations. There is so much of this testimony that ought to be scrutinized by Senators, of course I will not take time to read it, but I will ask leave to print what I have marked in red marks, and I shall upon some proper occasion ask the Senate to order the whole of it to be printed as a proper accompaniment to the views and opinions of Mr. Atkinson.

Mr. STEWART. Ask unanimous consent to print it.

Mr. BECK. There is too much of it to be made part of a speech [exhibiting]. I will insert as much of it as I think will illustrate and prove what I say about it.

APPENDIX C.

Questions on the subject of currency and prices, circulated by the royal commission on the depression of trade and industry.

1. Has there been, within a period which can be distinctly defined, a fall (i) in the gold prices, or (ii) in the silver prices, of commodities in countries where those metals are respectively the standards of value?
2. If so, has the fall extended uniformly to all commodities, or has it been confined to some particular class or classes of commodities?
3. Apart from any circumstances which have tended to lower the price of particular commodities, or of commodities generally, are there any circumstances which have enhanced the value of the metal used as the standard?
4. Have similar circumstances ever occurred before, and what results did they produce?
5. To what causes do you assign the fluctuations which have occurred in recent years in the ratio of the precious metals to one another?
6. Are there any indications that the development of the credit system, or other similar means of economizing the use of the precious metals, has tended to counteract or retard the fall of prices?
7. What circumstances, apart from an appreciation of the metal used as the standard, have tended to bring about a fall of prices generally?
8. How is trade affected by alterations (i) in the value of the metal used as the standard, and (ii) in the value of the precious metals *inter se*, especially in the case of trade between gold-using and silver-using countries?
9. What is the effect of the present relations of gold and silver upon the internal and external trade of India, and upon prices in that country?

LIST OF ANSWERS RECEIVED.

	Page.
I. Mr. Robert Barclay, 1 Dickinson street, Manchester.....	352
II. Mr. J. W. Birch, director of the Bank of England.....	398
III. Mr. Hammond Chubb, secretary to the Bank of England.....	394



	Page.
IV. Mr. M. W. Collet, deputy governor of the Bank of England.....	395
V. Mr. J. P. Currie, governor of the Bank of England.....	396
VI. Mr. A. Del Mar, mining engineer, London and San Francisco.....	396
VII. Mr. Clarmont J. Daniell, Bengal civil service.....	397
VIII. Mr. Moreton Frewen, 18 Chapel street, London.....	399
IX. Mr. H. R. Grenfell, director of the Bank of England.....	402
X. Mr. S. O. Gray, chief accountant of the Bank of England.....	403
XI. Glasgow Chamber of Commerce.....	404
XII. Mr. Luke Hansard, 68 Lombard street, London.....	405
XIII. Sir Hector Hay, Thortonorton avenue, London.....	414
XIV. Mr. W. Jackson, Chartered Mercantile Bank of India, London, and China.....	415
XV. Mr. J. N. Keynes, Cambridge.....	415
XVI. Mr. D. Larnach.....	417
XVII. Mr. Edward Langley, Charlcombe, Bath.....	417
XVIII. Rt. Hon. Sir Louis Mallet, C. B., late under secretary of state for India.....	419
XIX. Professor Marshall, Cambridge.....	421
XX. Mr. F. May, chief cashier Bank of England.....	424
XXI. Mr. Samuel Montague, M. P.....	424
XXII. Professor J. Shield Nicholson, Edinburgh.....	425
XXIII. Mr. J. H. Norman, 121 Highbury, New Park, N.....	426
XXIV. Mr. R. H. Patterson, Wingate Road, Hammersmith.....	427
XXV. Mr. Prideaux Selby, Bank of Australasia, Threadneedle street, E. C.....	427
XXVI. Mr. Samuel Smith, M. P., Delahay street, Westminster.....	428
XXVII. Mr. Paul F. Tidman, Leadenhall street, C. C.....	431

I. Mr. Robert Barclay says:

1 DICKINSON STREET, Manchester, May 5, 1888.

MY LORD: I have much pleasure in replying to the questions you have submitted on behalf of the royal commission on the repression of trade.

3. Yes. The closing of the mints of France and the Latin Union destroyed the par of value between gold and silver, which the free mintage of these metals at the fixed ratio of 15½ to 1 had maintained as long as these mints were open to silver as fully as gold, was practically international money; but since then gold has been regarded by all the European nations and also by America as the only standard of value for international purposes, and the increased work thus thrown upon it as a store of value has led to its enhancement.

Improved credit appliances facilitate the transference of value, but when property of any kind is parted with for money it is something that may, if wished, be a permanent possession that is sought, and credit as an aid to money in this sense can not be expanded, except in due proportion to the metallic money on which it is supposed to give an absolute lien, just as a banker's obligation must be in due proportion to his reserve.

7. Apart from monetary causes there have been many other things at work tending to cheapen production, say, new inventions, scientific discoveries, and new applications of chemistry, an increased use of labor-saving machines, and the higher speeding of machinery, rendered possible by the greater mathematical perfection and accuracy of its construction; but all these causes combined would not, I think, account for, perhaps, more than, say, a sixth or a fifth of the actual difference which is seen.

8. The appreciation in the value of the monetary metal, gold, upon which our English values are based, has had and can not but have, a most serious effect upon trade. It means declining prices for commodities, and when prices are continuously declining all enterprise is banished from trade. The trader must work with the barest possible stock, as everything held over becomes dear as compared with the price at which it could be replaced. The whole fabric of trade is built up on credit and time contracts, and stability of the money basis on which it rests is all-important. Transactions entered into in the hope of profit may result in loss if prices, from an appreciation of the monetary measure, fall before the transactions can be completed. An enterprise requiring the investment of capital may offer strong inducement for entering upon it; but when the question is considered, How will the property to be acquired be affected by the decline of prices going on? the risk of loss in this respect counterbalances the inducement.

The fact of India being upon a silver basis has, I think, so far been in many respects an advantage to her. Her internal trade has not suffered from the decline in prices which has been so disastrous in Europe, and the divergence of the relative value of gold and silver has had no practical effect upon the welfare of the great body of her people. The development of her external trade has also so far not been seriously impeded, rupee values of European articles laid down in India not having risen with the fall in silver, gold prices having conformed to the standard of India and not rupee prices to the gold standard of Europe. The lower European value of the rupee has also helped to stimulate her exports. On the other hand, the exchange difficulty makes it impossible for India to borrow in her own currency, and the disadvantage she suffers in this respect in very great not only as regards the carrying out of public works, but in many ways in which the outflow of British capital would both enrich India and benefit England.

III. Mr. Hammond Chubb said:

3. The circumstances which led to the enhancement of the value of the metal (gold) used as a standard were those connected with the substitution of gold for silver by Germany and other countries. To these must be added the increased use of gold in the United States, a diminution in its production, and the growing requirements due to increased population.

But if, as seems to be inferred by the question, it is admitted that a fall is due to the appreciation of gold—and I entirely concur in such an opinion—it is difficult to estimate what proportion of the fall is due to that cause. If it is admitted not only that gold has appreciated, but continues to appreciate, then prices not only have fallen, but continue to fall; and but for this permanent cause of depression it is possible that the other causes put forward to account for a fall in prices would have only a limited operation and take rank amongst the ever varying incidents of a healthy competition.

But the effect upon trade is, no doubt, that of a tendency to its contraction; and capital, which would have been used to stimulate trade, will, by preference, be invested in securities yielding a fixed interest in gold, though the payment of this interest be to the disadvantage of those, chiefly governments and other public bodies, who have contracted such arrangements.

The modes in which the results of falling prices due to an appreciating standard would be manifested would vary with the trades affected, but the operation of the principle would be continuous, and not the less hurtful that it is not generally apparent.

If it be the case that produce can be grown in India at the same cost in silver

as that which has long prevailed and be sold in England for gold, which, at present, commands more rupees than formerly, this would be to the advantage of India, and lead to increased exports.

And, again, if the cost of labor in India has not increased, it might lead, in certain cases where practicable, to the amount realized by such exports being used for the establishment of factories in India, rather than to the purchase here of manufactured goods. If the present relations of silver and gold were final, this condition would probably be modified in course of time as prices rose in India; but if the present ratio between the two metals widens more rapidly than prices rise in India, an advantage would continue to accrue to India, as against gold-using countries. This leaves out of view the loss by exchange incurred by the government of India through its indebtedness to England.

IV. Mr. M. W. Collet says:

3. This question I assume to mean whether the standard itself as a measure of value has altered, and, if so, what has caused the alteration? Whatever the answer, it does not admit of exact proof, but by inference it is to be assumed that the abstraction of gold in large quantities for coinage purposes by Germany, Italy, and other States and Treasury reserves in the United States, the increased application of it for ornamental and artistic purposes beyond former requirements, together with the simultaneous decrease in the annual production of this metal, must have rendered it relatively more valuable; and this view is consistent with the fall in prices noted in the answer to the first question.

VI. Mr. Alexander Del Mar says:

This fall of prices has been ascribed by some persons to "overproduction;" but apart from the consideration that if overproduction, including the precious metals, were general it could have no effect upon prices, and if not general it would rectify itself by the shifting of industries and avocations in a briefer space of time than thirteen years, it is to be remarked that previous to 1873, when the forces of production were as great and the actual production of commodities per capita of population was not less than it is now, there was no complaint or pretext of overproduction.

The true cause has been—here I speak as a practical miner and producer of gold, well acquainted with the conditions surrounding its production and use generally—the true cause has been the dwindling product of the gold placers of California and Australia, and the utter inability of quartz mining as a whole to put gold on the markets of the world at the lower equivalent, in commodities and services, at which it was previously put by the placer mining. This dwindling product of gold, suddenly and enormously aggravated by the demonization of silver in Germany and the subsequent suspension of free coinage for silver in France, the United States, and other countries, has been, in my opinion, the true cause of the recent fall in the prices of commodities.

Your commission asks if similar circumstances ever occurred before. Yes; they occurred after a similar failure of the Roman mines, an event which precipitated the disruption of the Western Empire, and was followed by the tremendous consequences so ably depicted in Sir Archibald Alison's "Essays;" they occurred after the dismemberment of Charlemagne's empire, an event which occasioned the secret hoarding of the vast quantities of gold and silver which that monarch had captured in Saxony and Hungary, and had made into money; and they occurred again during the eighteenth century, when the plunder of America and the Orient was quite over, and the metallic product of Spanish America, although it continually increased under the cruel stimulus of the lash, yet it failed to increase fast enough to supply a rapidly-growing Europe with the materials for money. In the latter instance the evil effects of diminishing moneys manifested themselves in every country of the European world, including America; in each of them it was due to the failure of the supplies of the precious metals to keep pace with loss, wear and tear, and increasing demand to sustain prices; in nearly all of them it was followed by similar consequences; a continued and uneven fall of prices, industrial distress, social disorders, turbulence, anarchy, revolution, wars, and the dissolution of empires.

From what I have seen of gold and silver mining during the past thirty years, I should say that in the long run it probably costs as much effort to find and bring to grass-roots a pound of silver as a pound of gold, and that in all newly-opened countries gold would even be cheaper than silver, because in such countries the former is always to be found on the surface, whilst the latter is hidden away in the uncertain convolutions of volcanic rocks.

Among those who admit the entire amenability of the ratio to legislation there are some who deem it necessary at the present time to procure an international concert of action on the subject. With the highest respect for those who advocate this policy, it seems to me unnecessarily cautious and timid. It did not require a concert of the nations to break down the ratio, and it needs no concert to restore it. Either one of the four leading nations can do it, for each of these has enough gold to exchange for all the silver that will probably be offered to its mints. But foremost among nations in its large control of the precious metals stands England, whose financial investments in foreign countries and whose widespread commerce have conferred upon her the hegemony of the commercial world. She can certainly afford to permit one-fourth of her £100,000,000 of gold to flow out in exchange for £25,000,000 of silver, which is far more than the combined world will be likely to offer to her mints during several years. This sum, coined upon the same terms as gold into full legal-tender money—first, and in order to discourage counterfeiting, at the so-called market ratio of 20, and afterwards recoined at the American ratio of 16 or the French and German ratio of 15½—would not only yield England a handsome profit, but, what is far more important, it would arrest the present depression of trade and avert from impending disaster England's commercial interests in India.

VII. Mr. Clarmont J. Daniell says:

The statistics of imports and exports of gold treasure which the government of India compiles show that in a little more than fifty years India has imported, and not re-exported, gold to the value of £127,000,000 sterling. To this must be added the gold treasure which India had continued to absorb during more than two thousand years, the amount of which may be inferred from historical records extending from very ancient times to the present century. I consider that I estimate the gold treasure existing in India in 1835 (when our statistics of imports and exports of treasure began to be compiled) at a low figure in putting it at £100,000,000 more.

It is sufficient to notice the extent of this absorption of gold by India since 1835 for the purposes of the question (£127,000,000).

This drain of the precious metals to India arises from peculiarities in the commercial productions of that country and in the condition and habits of the people. The country produces commodities which are to a great extent superfluous to the wants of the mass of its people, while at the same time these are readily sold to Western nations. This circumstance enables the people of India to export these commodities without any enhancement of the price of articles necessary to their own existence resulting from this exportation.

This is a condition of very great influence on the development of an export trade.

The simple habits of the people of India; immemorial custom which precludes them from the use of many commodities of secondary necessity, convenience,

or luxury; and the variety of the natural productions which the soil of the country supplies, exempt the people from the necessity of importing more than a limited number of commodities of foreign manufacture for their own use. Hence it follows that the exports of Indian productions generally exceed in value the imports of goods from foreign countries, and the balance has to be paid directly or indirectly in treasure.

I say so much, by way of explaining why I believe that this drain of treasure from the West into India is likely to continue—it has been going on for the last five years at the rate of £4,700,000 a year—and also in order to show that what has been going on in India has probably (I know no reason why I should not say certainly) been going on in other parts of Asia, *e. g.*, China, where similar climatic, industrial, and social conditions are found to exist. If this is the case, the appreciation of gold in the West must be largely due to this cause, and the proper remedy appears to me to consist in the remonetizing of gold in India, where the metal used from the most ancient times as money has, in British India at least, been discarded from that employment since 1835.

I assign the fluctuations which have occurred in recent years in the ratio of the precious metals to one another to the following causes: (1) The great yield of silver from the mines in North America between 1870 and 1880. (2) The partial disuse of silver as money by Germany, France, and the United States of America during the same period. (3) The drain of gold into India between 1870 and 1885. During those fifteen years India has withdrawn from use as money in the West a gold treasure valued at £38,250,000 and upwards, and has not used it as money herself.

Thus, while the supply of silver from the mines increased, the demand for it, owing to its exclusion from its proper field of employment as money, fell off, and measured by the gold standard its value necessarily declined. At the same time gold became appreciated both by reason of part of the supply being absorbed and rendered useless as money by India, and from the circumstance that upon the gold currencies of the West was thrown the work not only which they formerly carried on, but in addition a great part of the work which the silver currencies of the same regions had hitherto been used to transact.

The relation which one of the precious metals bears to the other as money is ascertained by the quantity of the same commodity which a given amount of each of them will suffice to buy in the same market. If gold and silver are coined and circulated without restriction of quantity in any country, and, say, an ounce of gold money will buy fifteen and one-half times as much of any commodity as an ounce of silver money, then the relation of gold to silver money in that country stands at 1 to 15½. But if, as has happened in Europe since 1870, restriction is placed on the free coinage and circulation of silver money, its real value in gold money can never be ascertained, because its purchasing power, in consequence of the restriction placed upon its use as money, is deprived of all freedom of action. Had gold and silver money been allowed to circulate freely throughout Europe and North America, and had India been using gold money since 1870, a fixation of value between gold and silver money exactly corresponding with that educed by the competitions of commerce would probably have been arrived at long since. As the case stands, the owners of silver, seeking every opportunity to sell their commodity at a profit, have been obliged to offer it for sale, sometimes at one price and sometimes at another, and the price of silver has necessarily been subject to similar fluctuations as against gold that other articles are liable to, which take their value from gold in a falling market.

The purchasing power of the standard money depends on the proportion which the quantity of it in circulation bears to the amount of the merchandises which it serves to exchange one kind with another kind.

This view of the case is not affected by the use of the credit contrivances (checks, promissory notes, etc.) with the view of minimising the employment of metallic money, because their efficiency ultimately rests upon the stock of metallic standard money in use in the country. If that stock increases while the commodities brought to market do not increase, prices will rise, and *vice versa*.

If the standard money of any nation or group of nations is required to do more work than it was required to do before, the effect on trade is the same as if the quantity of goods under exchange had increased while the amount of money available to effect the exchanges had remained stationary. Prices in that case would fall.

If, on the other hand, the State decides to use both kinds of money on equal terms, that is, so to regulate its currency system that the silver and gold coin in use shall always exchange at their natural value in one another, which would be the rate elicited by the competitions of commerce, the supply of coin of both kinds will exactly correspond with the requirements of commerce and always be fully sufficient for the exchanges of goods, however numerous they may be. The currency, whether of gold or silver, will always be kept at full supply, because no one will hesitate to put his gold or silver metal into circulation, under the conviction that neither can ever become undervalued and that he can in no circumstances lose by doing so.

9. The relation of value between gold and silver has altered in favor of gold by from 20 to 25 per cent. during the last fifteen years, and in India, where silver alone is used as legal-tender money, the value of silver money, as against commodities, has not depreciated to an extent at all approaching that figure. It follows that traders in gold-using countries can obtain in India, say, 20 per cent. more of the silver money of that country with a given value of gold than was possible fifteen years ago, and with it buy a correspondingly larger amount of the productions of India. This state of things provides a wide margin to cover the risks of trade and the chances of profit, and is one among other causes which accounts for the great increase in the export trade of India to gold-using countries which has occurred during the last few years.

This consideration must also not be lost sight of, that, as above stated, India has, during the last fifty years, absorbed gold treasure to the value of £127,000,000 sterling. This treasure can only have come into the country directly or indirectly as payment for the productions of India, whether sold in India or abroad; it has not gone into circulation as money, and its withdrawal from use as money has had an enormous influence in preventing that rise of prices which would have taken place in India if it had gone to swell the volume of the currency.

#### VIII. Mr. Moreton Frewen says:

Since 1873 (from which time Germany commenced to take great masses of gold to enable her to effect a change from a silver to a gold standard) there has been a general fall of prices, which Muhlhal estimates (*History of Prices*, page 1) at the amount of the difference between 185 and 84. The average of prices is lower now than in 1850, at which time Newmarch remarks that prices had been falling steadily since 1809 on account of an increasing scarcity in the supply of the precious metals. "Between 1809 and 1849 prices fell in the ratio of 100 to 41." (*Jevons*.)

I think it is safe to say that in gold-standard countries there has been a general average decline of prices since 1874 of 35 per cent. Now, as to silver-standard countries there is a valuable chapter (16) in Fawcett's *Political Econ-*

omy which appears to have been written within two years of the professor's death. The select committee on Indian finance which sat in 1874 established the fact that while for eight years previous to 1867 the net annual import of silver into India was at the rate of £15,000,000 sterling, the expansion of the currency there which resulted from this importation of £120,000,000 sterling of silver, had caused a rise of all prices, which rise was estimated to be from 30 to 40 per cent. Now, since 1873, when the (gold) price of silver began to fall rapidly, there has been no such rise of prices in India as we should have naturally looked for, but, on the contrary, the Economist has been at some pains to point out, while there has been a great fall of silver in terms of gold, there has also been even a slight rise in the value of silver measured by its power to purchase Eastern commodities.

This, it seems to me, is the great interest that England has in the "silver question." For it is clear that if silver in Asia is worth at the rate of 60s. an ounce to buy everything Indian, it is not coming to Manchester if it can help it, where it is only worth 46d. To recapitulate, it is interesting to observe that prices in India between 1860 and 1870 rose rapidly without the price of silver falling below 60s. the ounce, but whereas since 1873 silver has been continuously falling from 60s. to 46d., yet so far from silver losing its value at home, in the East it is slightly more valuable—will buy a little more wheat, cotton, or labor than before. If a man saw both sides of a balance scale go down at the same time he would hardly witness a more puzzling phenomenon.

There are a number of circumstances that have combined to enhance the value of gold; chief among these an enormous increase in demand, while *pari passu* a great diminution in supply. Increased demand may be classed under two heads: The increased demand in gold-standard countries, the result of increased population, and increased production of commodities; for example, the amount of gold and silver current in the United States is about £3 per head of population to measure an annual production of wealth estimated by Mr. Atkinson (*Distribution of Products*) at £2,000,000,000 sterling. The population of the United States is doubling every twenty-five years; hence the United States twenty-five years hence, her population and production doubled, will *exeteris paribus* require more currency. I will not hazard an opinion as to the amount of coin per capita needed to insure a healthy system of currency. France, however, with almost £9 per capita, showed by the rapidity of the payment of her war indemnity to Germany the benefit of a full and well distributed currency at a time of crisis.

But it is more important to draw attention to the increased area of the demand for gold.

Since 1873 Germany has taken over £80,000,000 sterling of gold. Since 1873 the United States has taken more than £80,000,000; Italy has taken £16,000,000 (Grenfell); besides which in the last ten years India has taken £40,000,000 of gold. These extraordinary demands have averaged more than £20,000,000 a year, or more than £1,000,000 more than the entire annual output of the earth; the while also that some £12,000,000 is being annually absorbed by the arts and manufactures (Soetbeer).

No wonder that since 1877 England has lost gold from currency to the amount of £25,000,000, or about one-quarter of her entire stock. In M. de Laveley's words, "Gold, like water, if spread over a larger surface lowers in level at its original basin."

4. Is it the intention of question 4 to discover what has been the result in times past of a diminished product of the precious metals? If so, it is of interest that Alison (*History of Europe*) says that the fall of the Roman Empire was brought about by a violent contraction of the circulating medium, resulting from the failure of the mines in Spain and in Greece, the burden of debt was increased and the general conditions of human industry paralyzed.

The two greatest events that have occurred in the history of mankind have been directly brought about by a successive contraction and expansion of the circulating medium of society. The fall of the Roman Empire, so long ascribed in ignorance to slavery, heathenism, and moral corruption, was in reality brought about by a decline in the silver and gold mines of Spain and Greece.

And as if Providence had intended to reveal in the clearest manner the influence of this mighty agent on human affairs, the resurrection of mankind from the ruin which those causes had produced was owing to a directly opposite set of agencies being put in operation. Columbus led the way in the career of renovation; when he spread his sails across the Atlantic he bore mankind and its fortunes in his bark. \* \* \* The annual supply of the precious metals for the use of the globe was tripled; before a century had expired the prices of every species of produce were quadrupled. The weight of debt and taxes insensibly wore off under the influence of that prodigious increase; in the renovation of industry the relations of society were changed, the weight of feudalism cast off, the rights of man established. Among the many concurring causes which conspired to bring about this mighty consummation, the most important, though hitherto the least observed, was the discovery of Mexico and Peru.

If the circulating medium of the globe had remained stationary or declining, as it was from 1815 to 1849, from the effect of South American revolution and English legislation, the necessary result must have been that it would have become altogether inadequate to the wants of man; and not only would industry have been everywhere cramped, but the price of produce would have universally and constantly fallen. Money would have every day become more valuable; all other articles measured in money less so; debt and taxes would have been constantly increasing in weight and oppression. The fate which crushed Rome in ancient, and has all but crushed Great Britain in modern times, would have been that of the whole family of mankind. All these evils have been entirely obviated, and the opposite set of blessings introduced by the opening of the great reserve treasures of nature in California and Australia. \* \* \* Before half a century has elapsed the prices of every article will be tripled, enterprise proportionally encouraged, industry vivified, debts and taxes lessened.—*Alison*.

After the fall of Rome no considerable mines were discovered and prices fell steadily for a thousand years, till Columbus sailed to America. From 1533 to 1850, for near three hundred years after the discovery of America had resulted in a tenfold increase in the annual output of gold and silver, prices rose steadily; then after 1816, silver having been demonetized and specie payments resumed in England, prices steadily fell till there was a price crisis like the present, which extended and intensified just as now, till the Californian discoveries in 1849. The effect of those great discoveries did not make any very considerable impression on the great volume of the precious metals till 1854, after which year prices rose steadily and every branch of industry was stimulated.

It is evident that "demand" created by legislation—in other words, the prerogative of "legal tender"—is the great factor in determining the value of the precious metals. This is particularly true of silver, because the percentage of the annual output of silver which is absorbed in the arts is quite inconsiderable. Thus the tax paid on manufactured silver in England in 1875 (I can not lay my hands on any later returns of silver consumed in the arts) showed that the entire home manufacture was less than £200,000.

It seems that legislation can fix and keep steady the ratio of one metal to the other, provided the area of operation be sufficiently wide. But if either metal be proscribed by legislation it is certain that their ratios must fluctuate wildly.

If legislation the world over decreed to-morrow that silver should be demonetized, and should be sold as mere merchandise for what it would fetch, it might be that area railings would be made of silver! Certainly the price would fall toward 1s. per ounce. The value of gold also would be enormously depressed if that metal were universally demonetized.

A fall of prices is itself a contraction of credit. To take a very simple instance, suppose I bought through a broker and on credit cotton futures, or wheat, or a railroad stock at 100, I should pay up a margin of 10, the broker or his banker lending me the other 90; now, if prices fell from 100 to 95, the broker would require a further margin; in other words, owing to the fall of prices my credit with my broker is contracted, and a further demand arises for sovereigns. If, on the contrary, the price instead of falling rose to 110, the broker would allow me to buy a second hundred shares of stock, and on account of the rise in the price of the first hundred he would not require me to advance the ten sovereigns margin on the second transaction. And this illustration holds good for all kinds of credit transactions, including the credit any wholesale dealer gives to any retail dealer.

Trade may be expected to stagnate when prices are declining, but to be brisk when prices are rising. Falling prices can not fail to check industry and enterprise; if a man with £10,000 to invest believes that because values are still falling he will be able to buy a farm, a ship, or a mill twelve months hence for much less gold than at the present time, he will prefer to leave this £10,000 at his bank idle, even though the bank rate is only 1 per cent. Suppose such a one had invested at the higher prices of 1874, if he sold out now he would find that his ten thousand had shrunk to £6,500 (assuming that the average fall of prices in twelve years has been 35 per cent.). And this seems to be the present position; intending investors are waiting year after year for the fall of prices to be complete. When, on the other hand, the tendency of prices is upwards, then enterprise and investment is brisk. The investor prefers to buy a farm to-day rather than to pay the higher price that he anticipates will be asked six months hence.

Until 1873 the 1 to 15½ "par of exchange" between the nations that used gold and that used silver had never been impaired; but in the last twelve years we have had perpetual fluctuations, and at the present moment no English merchant trading with the East has any idea when he makes a forward contract whether, owing to a further fall in the exchange rate of silver, the transaction may not involve him in heavy losses. Ask any Manchester merchant what would be the condition of his trade with his best customers, India and China, if silver suddenly fell 6d., and he will tell you that half the mills in Lancashire would be closed; and yet it has lately depended upon the mere accident of foreign legislation that this did not happen; if the clamor of the Eastern cities—in other words, of the creditor community—had prevailed and silver coinage had been suspended in the United States, then the silver ounce would have fallen at least 3d. It is, indeed, the opinion of those most competent to judge that this suggested suspension must inevitably have been followed by the demonetization of silver in the United States, and thereafter also in France.

Hence it happens that a wheat speculator who used to buy 10 rupees with his sovereign can now buy 13, and each of the 13 buys as much wheat (say a bushel) as did each of his previous 10 rupees. In other words, the fall of silver has brought about a decline in the price of wheat represented by the difference between 13 and 10. And if, owing to legislation in Washington or Paris, silver is to be still further depressed and the rupee falls to 1s., I see no reason why that rupee should at all depreciate in India, and if it does not, then the fall in wheat in Mark Lane will be represented by the difference between 20 and 10, because the sovereign will buy 20 rupees instead of as before 10. Keeping in view the fact that silver retains its value in the East, although it has by law been deprived of its value in the West, it follows that by reason of the absence of all tariff regulations in England our farmers are at the mercy of foreign monetary legislation at Washington or Berlin. If Sir James Caird can foretell what will be the price of the silver ounce in the twentieth century, he can tell approximately what will be the area of wheat cultivation in England, in Dakota, or the Punjab. With the rupee at 1s. no wheat could come forward from America or Russia, and we might expect a further fall in the prices of maize and raw cotton, and it has been this consideration that has influenced recent legislation at Washington.

#### IX. Mr. H. R. Grenfell says:

Trade is affected by alterations in the value of the "metal used as a standard" in proportion to the indebtedness of those carrying on various trades or callings connected with production. If no one was indebted in fixed sums of the standard metal it would not matter in the long run whether the counters were red counters with a 6 marked on them or blue counters with a 1; but where indebted producers have made specific contracts to pay in nothing but red counters the relation between these counters and productions is altered, and the debtors have to pay the result of perhaps two years' labor instead of one. Agricultural producers are indebted all over the world, and have always been so since the day when Adam brought a store of apples and damsons out of Paradise to keep him alive while he dug for the next year's crop, and they are being ruined by this alteration in the amount of existing counters.

#### X. Mr. S. O. Gray says:

1. It would appear that during the period since 1873 there has been a fall in the price of most commodities alike, but different in degree, in countries using gold or silver or both metals as a standard of value.

3. There has been an increased demand for gold for the purposes of coinage by countries, Germany, Italy, and others, that have during the period mentioned above adopted a gold standard, and simultaneously the production of the metal has fallen off. For silver, on the other hand, the demand for the purposes of coinage in Europe and for the manufacture of plate has materially diminished, while the available supply has been increased both by a larger production of fresh metal and by the demonetization and conversion into bullion of considerable amounts of previously existing silver coin.

XI. Glasgow Chamber of Commerce, by Mr. William H. Hill, secretary, says:

3. Since 1873 about two hundred millions of gold have been required to supply Germany, Italy, and the United States with a new gold currency. This absorption of the metal occurred concurrently with its lessened production. In 1851-52 the annual production throughout the world had risen to about thirty-six millions sterling, but it is now less than twenty millions. Assuming that ten millions are needed for the arts and manufactures, it follows that twenty years' net supply of the metal was absorbed by the two hundred millions, leaving nothing available for replenishing (repairing) the waste on a greatly enlarged currency, or for the purpose of meeting the wants of an increasing population, growing wealth, and consequent enlargement of business transactions.

4. The directors have no personal knowledge of the previous occurrence of such circumstances.

5. As respects silver, there has been an increased supply with a diminished use; as regards gold, there has been a diminished supply with an increased use. These results are due to the closure of the mints of the Latin Union for indiscriminate coinage of both metals at a fixed ratio; to the action of Germany in demonetizing her silver currency; and to the effect that the large stocks of silver held in America and Europe have on the market.

#### XII. Mr. Luke Hansard says:

It appears to me that "the value of the metal used as the standard" must necessarily be measured by "the prices of commodities generally." In this country the standard is gold, and the value of gold is what it will purchase in commodities generally. If a general fall of prices is admitted, it follows that there is an appreciation of the metal in which those prices are expressed. The expressions "fall in prices" and "appreciation of gold" are, in my opinion, synonymous, and it only leads to confusion of ideas in speaking of the two expressions as distinct and arising from separate causes. I have frequently heard it stated in discussions, and have read in print, that the "fall in prices" is caused "by an appreciation of gold." This appears to me an error, for the two phrases mean really one and the same thing. If you have a fall in prices you have an appreciation of gold, and if you have an appreciation of gold you have a fall in prices. In fact the two expressions are interchangeable terms for the purposes of the present subject.

#### XIII. Sir Hector Hay says:

The specious argument that it is for the advantage of the working classes that all their requirements should be as cheap as possible is misleading, because a universal cheapness implies that the article or commodity which gives the means of living to each class of workers is cheap also, the consequence of which must be low wages or less employment, generally the latter, as is shown by the present state of the labor market and the large number of the unemployed.

It is no benefit to a working man that all he wants is very cheap if he has no wages wherewith to purchase it, and for the community it is better that all should be employed at moderate wages than that some should receive higher wages and the rest none.

Low prices invariably bring depression of trade and lack of employment, and high prices prosperity to all classes with the exception of annuitants, who are after all but a comparatively small section of the people.

Another disastrous effect is that the Indian government, having to draw some fifteen millions per annum from India, have had to submit to an enormous loss by exchange, beginning in 1874 with about one million and increasing every year till it amounts now to nearly four millions a year. It has been said that this loss is only apparent, or, in other words, a mere matter of account, but this idea ignores the fact that this loss by exchange must be covered by increasing the amount of taxation in India, and therefore some thirty millions sterling have, during the last thirteen years, been wrung from the tax-payers more than would have been necessary had the rupee remained at its nominal value of about 1s. 10½d. Taking this into consideration it will be apparent that India has lost much more by taxation than she has gained by the low price of silver.

The whole question of the ratio between gold and silver lies in a nut-shell. In England, and practically in Europe generally, gold only is the measure of value; in the East silver is the measure. In order to enable trade between the East and West to be conducted with reasonable confidence there must be a standard of conversion, that is, a fixed ratio of gold to silver.

If this is admitted it is difficult to see how it can be denied that the most advantageous ratio would be 15½ to 1, simply for this reason, that it would cause less inconvenience than any other, for practically all the silver money existing in the world (except merely the subsidiary coins) has been coined on or close to that basis.

To adopt any other ratio would necessitate the recoinage of hundreds of millions or the circulation of the present coins at a changed valuation, whereas the restoration of the old bimetallic basis of 15½ to 1 would affect only the few millions of silver which remain at present in the shape of bars, and the future production, say eighteen to twenty millions a year.

Such a measure as this by agreement among the principal nations, most of whom are more than willing to adopt it, would most certainly restore to the trade of the world that elasticity which of late years it has entirely lost.

#### XIV. Mr. W. Jackson says:

Trade is affected by an appreciation of the metal used as the standard, by handicapping the producing classes to the benefit of the moneyed classes.

By rendering the trade between gold and silver using countries uncertain, and thus speculative.

The appreciation of gold in relation to silver has, in my opinion, tended to stimulate the exports of India, while the imports into India have also shown an increase, owing to the fall in prices in the gold countries. The internal trade of India has developed by the greater exports and imports, and industries have received an impetus which will probably lead to the establishment of manufactories on a large scale. Silver is, however, being imported into India in excess of the average of former years, and if this continues a rise in the prices of commodities in India seems inevitable, which must in time react prejudicially upon the export trade of India.

#### XV. Mr. J. N. Keynes says:

There has not, I believe, been a corresponding fall in silver prices in countries where silver is the standard of value. Still, notwithstanding the depreciation of silver, prices appear to have fallen rather than to have risen in India within the last ten or fifteen years. This points to the conclusion that the depreciation of silver is a depreciation relatively to gold only, and not relatively to commodities in general, but rather the reverse.

The point that remains to be mentioned is perhaps of greater importance than any of the preceding. Traders in a large way of business are accustomed to work to some extent with borrowed capital. Upon the sum borrowed interest has to be paid in money, and ultimately the capital itself may have to be refunded in money. It is clear that if money, measured in commodities, has an enhanced value, the burden of debts is increased, and with falling prices fixed preference charges mean diminished profits. Thus lenders gain at the expense of borrowers, and, what is pertinent to the present discussion, they gain at the expense of those who are taking an active part in trade, and upon whose individual effort the success of large enterprises frequently depends. Trade is the more depressed and demoralized because it is those who have the greatest business capacity who naturally employ, in addition to their own capital, the capital of others. Similar remarks apply to fixed charges of any kind.

The internal trade of a gold-using country is not sensibly affected by an alteration in the value of the precious metals *inter se*, but it is otherwise with trade between gold-using and silver-using countries. Frequent alterations in the gold price of silver obviously introduce an additional element of speculation into all dealings between such countries. If a trader in a gold-using country is selling

commodities in a silver-using country, his profits depend not merely on the silver price which his goods will fetch, but also on the gold price of silver when he receives payment. Fluctuations, therefore, in the relative value of the precious metals tend by their effect on the foreign exchanges to disorganize and render uncertain the trade between countries which have respectively a gold and a silver standard. A permanent alteration, however, when once established, will only affect the nominal exchanges between the countries.

XVI. Mr. D. Larnach says:

4. I recollect perfectly that prior to the discovery of gold in 1849-'50 in California, and in 1851 in Australia, trade was depressed all over the world. Those discoveries gave a wonderful impetus to trade, which would have been much more felt in England but for the Crimean war.

XVII. Mr. Edward Langley says:

Taking wheat as perhaps the best illustration of an article of universal production and universal consumption the facts are beyond dispute. Wheat has fallen to a price in gold-using countries that renders it barely remunerative, or even unremunerative. In India the fall is estimated by Mr. Prinsep at 17 per cent.

3. The following are some of the circumstances that have enhanced the value of gold:

Reduced production, which is a natural cause; increase of population, which is also a natural cause. But the circumstance that has caused the greatest enhancement in the value of gold is one that is not natural, but has been the attempt by Germany to convert her single silver currency to that of single gold, as by so doing Germany has stimulated other nations to do likewise; such, for instance, as France: who within the last twelve months alone has increased her stock of gold by £12,000,000 (increased since this was written to £16,000,000, or, say, to £56,000,000 in all from £46,000,000 twelve months ago, more than equal to the year's production). This action of France is still proceeding in full force, and can hardly fail to have a still further serious effect on the purchasing power of gold. Then the action of the United States in resuming specie payments mainly in gold. Also of Italy of the same character, as well as the continued absorption of gold by Germany, which is clearly still in operation, notwithstanding that she has suspended all sales of silver. Then again, India is a large absorber of gold, a circumstance that can not be looked upon except with anxiety, as indicating a preference for that metal rather than for silver, her standard of value. Australia and New Zealand also produce not only less gold, but practically absorb more, largely the result of their great borrowings in England, and indications are not wanting that those countries may draw gold from England, instances of which, though isolated, have actually occurred.

Then, again, the market which exists in London for the issue of foreign loans tends to enhance the value of gold, as such issues are generally followed by an export of gold to the countries issuing such loans.

Nothing can restore the profitable character of the enormous trade of England with silver-using countries but a restoration of the ratio that prevailed between 1803 and 1876, when the bimetallic law of France during all that time acted as a regulator to the mercantile machine that was working between England and her silver-using customers. Whatever the merits are that are claimed for the single gold standard, it is utterly unsuited to a manufacturing nation like England, whose existence depends very largely on the profitable trade she can carry on with nations that have a currency composed of a silver metal. This argument has been maintained by what is known as the bimetallic school, and ten years of experience only go to confirm their assertions. There is not an article that is produced in India, and that is also produced in England, the continent of Europe, and in the United States, that is not subject to a protection bonus in India in the shape of the extent of the variation of the ratio between the precious metals.

The effect of the cessation of a fixed ratio between gold and silver has been a continuance of the fall in the value of silver, measured in gold, until at the present moment a rupee, the intrinsic value of which at 5s. the ounce for silver is close on 1s. 6d. in gold, can now be bought at under 1s. 6d., or a fall in its value of more than 20 per cent., and therefore at the present moment 1s. 6d. will buy in India more wheat than 2s. could have bought before the demonetization of silver took place, or, say, about thirteen years ago. This gives the purchaser of Indian wheat an export bonus amounting to the reduced cost of the rupee, and thus enables Indian-grown wheat to compete with English wheat under a bonus of more than 20 per cent. over and above the cost of production. This is bad enough, but the position is made worse by the appreciation of the rupee in India itself.

This, of course, secures cheap food, but at the cost of the destruction of the agricultural interests not only in England but also in Europe and the United States. This is the reason why wheat is 30s. per quarter, with the prospect of a lower price should silver fall lower. The same argument applies to cotton in the United States, which is now selling at less than 5d. a pound, a price, I under stand, which in America it can not be produced to pay.

On the other hand, the same fall in the ratio of silver to gold operates in the opposite direction against Lancashire cotton manufacturers. Cotton goods may sell in India at the same prices as heretofore in rupees, but when a manufacturer proceeds to bring the proceeds of his goods back to England, in other words, so soon as he attempts to convert the rupees into gold, as he must do to complete the transaction, he is confronted by the same 20 per cent. depreciation in the price of silver as a charge against the operation. He is thus compelled either to ask a higher price, that is to say, more rupees in India, to counteract the 20 per cent. loss by the depreciation in silver, or he must reduce the cost of production in England by paying less wages and less cost for his cotton. Experience shows that he can not get higher prices for his goods in India, where this fact stimulates native manufacturers, and thus he is driven to reduce the cost of manufacture in England, and thus the reduction in the ratio of value between silver and gold falls directly on the English artisan and the American producer."

XXV. Mr. Prideaux Selby says:

In its relation to commodities, silver has changed much less than gold, as is proved by the comparative stability of prices in silver-standard countries, and by this stability has proved itself, for the time, the more reliable standard of value of the two.

The fall in prices has, I believe, been much retarded by developments of the credit system, and would be intensely accentuated by any check to credit.

From my point of view the phrases used are but different ways of expressing the same fact, "appreciation of the metal used as the standard" means simply, as shown above, "a fall of prices generally."

XXVI. Mr. Samuel Smith, M. P., says:

Speaking broadly, I believe the question to be this: Up till 1873 the gold and silver bullion produced in the world flowed into Europe and was coined equally into money and performed exactly the same functions; since 1873 silver has virtually been excluded from the mints of the great commercial nations of Europe, and the gold supply has also greatly fallen off. The necessary result is that in-

stead of that steady replenishment of the currencies which the growing needs of commerce require there is a diminution of supply, causing contraction and a fall of prices.

The result is analogous to that which took place after the resumption of specie payments was decided on in 1816, which produced many years of falling prices and great depression and suffering among the masses of the people.

Trade is very greatly and injuriously affected by a sudden alteration in the standard of value, especially when the alteration is, as now, towards increased value.

It arises in this way: Trade is largely carried on by borrowed capital, or, in other words, by the use of credit in some shape or another; the vast banking deposits are mostly lent to traders; a very great deal of the invested capital of this country is lent upon mortgage of trading property, such as ships, factories, warehouses, etc. A prudent trader usually considers it safe to trade considerably beyond his floating capital, and to borrow, say, 50 per cent., on the security of his plant or fixed capital. Now, the constant decline of prices the last few years has virtually swept away his own portion of the capital, and only left him enough to pay the loans and mortgages; for instance, a ship or a factory built at a cost of £20,000, of which £10,000 was borrowed, is now worth only £12,000, or 40 per cent. less, and so the mortgage now represents five-sixths of the value instead of half, the trader's interest having sunk to £2,000 in place of £10,000; probably, if trade is unprofitable, he fails to pay the interest, and the mortgage is foreclosed, and the property is forced off at just sufficient to cover the loan, and he is ruined.

I have no doubt that this process exactly describes the condition of vast numbers of the traders of this country, and of other countries having a gold standard. A great portion of the commercial capital of this country has silently passed into the hands of the mortgagees and bondholders who have neither "toiled nor spun"; the discouragement this state of things produces is intense; after it has gone on for several years a kind of hopelessness oppresses the commercial community, all enterprise comes to a standstill, many works are closed, labor is thrown out of employment, and great distress is felt both among laborers and the humbler middle class; indeed, it strikes higher than this, for multitudes of people who were once prosperous traders have now become dependent on charity. I know many such myself; indeed, but a small portion of those who were prosperous ten or fifteen years ago are well off now.

It is a foolish reply to this that the aggregate wealth of the nation is not changed because it is only a transfer from one class to another; one might as well say that the craft of the pick-pocket or card-sharpener is innocuous because it only transfers wealth from one pocket to another. The prosperity of the nation depends upon the just distribution of wealth and the security of industry; nothing affects it more vitally than unjust alienation.

One more point I would add. This appreciation of gold, with its corresponding decline of trade, throws the finances of all gold-using countries into confusion; it leads to deficits and increased duties, and makes foreign tariffs more and more protective. India suffers in a somewhat different way, for she has to remit £15,000,000 in gold to England annually and is now losing £4,000,000 a year in exchange, and may in course of time lose £5,000,000 or £6,000,000 and find it almost impossible to carry out the railway extensions resolved upon, owing to the danger of borrowing in gold and the impossibility of borrowing in silver.

These extracts illustrate the views of all, or nearly all, who testified. It is shown that there were meetings held in Liverpool, in Glasgow, in Manchester, and among the leading chambers of commerce, leading men everywhere taking part, and by large majorities reports were made favoring the restoration of silver to its old-time honored relation, yet our commissioner did not think it worth while to say anything about them. I was not astonished at it; they were not his productions, and of course he thought they were of no value. I insert some of them by way of illustration of the feeling existing in Europe in regard to silver.

Hon. George Walker, consul-general at Paris, sent to Secretary Bayard, August 20, 1885, a letter in regard to coinage, from which I read the following extract:

The parliamentary inquiry in England, which has just been initiated by the appointment of a royal commission, distinctly recognizes that the discord at present existing between the precious metals is one of the alleged causes of industrial and commercial distress. The appointment of Mr. Gibbs, one of the ablest English defenders of the bimetallic system, and of Sir Louis Mallet, who, with Lord Reay (now governor of Bombay), represented the Indian office in the international conference of 1881, to lead the inquiry on this subject, gives assurance that the investigation will be intelligent and thorough, and that all the facts which are believed to establish the impossibility of conducting the commerce of the world on a gold basis will be brought out in their true relations.

The chambers of commerce of Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool, and Glasgow, four of the largest towns in the United Kingdom, have adopted resolutions calling on their members in Parliament to support this branch of the general investigation; and it is very clearly indicated in the debates of the meetings at which these resolutions were passed, that an intelligent majority in those great commercial centers has reached the conclusion that the silver question is largely responsible for the existing distress, and I think I am justified in saying that they believe that bimetalism, to be established by international treaty, is the only sufficient monetary remedy.

With the adhesion of Great Britain, the adoption of international bimetalism would be very simple. Without that adhesion, it would be equally practicable, safe, and effective if the system were accepted by Germany. Of this there is much reason to hope, inasmuch as the prevailing sentiment of that country is unmistakably in favor of the restoration of silver to full monetary functions. In Germany the learned body has taken the lead in this direction, and it has been followed by all the industrial classes, agricultural and manufacturing, and by the leading commercial houses in Hamburg and elsewhere. It is also asserted that a majority of the national parliament has reached a similar conviction, and may, at an early day, be persuaded to act.

On the 8th day of July, 1886, the following is given of a meeting of the British and Colonial Chambers of Commerce, in which, by a majority of 28 to 15, they decided in favor of recoining their silver money:

The silver question—An animated discussion by English bankers in London—They resolve that to remonetize silver means greater prosperity.

LONDON, July 8.

An important meeting of the British and Colonial Chambers of Commerce was held yesterday, at which there was an animated discussion of the silver question and its bearings upon the commerce of India, Australia, and Great Britain. Mr. Henry H. Gibbs, ex-governor of the Bank of England, opened the proceedings

by a strong speech, showing the world-wide importance of restoring the monetary value of silver. Sir Robert W. Fowler, M. P., the London banker and ex-lord mayor, opposed the idea in a speech which was feeble in comparison with that of Mr. Gibbs, and was followed by two Indian members.

Both of these contended that the effect of the depreciation of silver must be finally the ruin of the wheat and cotton industries of America, and the development of India as the chief wheat and cotton exporter of the world. They, therefore, protested against England's aiding America to restore the value of silver at the expense of the interests of India.

Mr. Paul F. Irdman, an East India merchant, argued that England had other interests besides those of India, which stood sorely in need of the restoration of silver, and trusted that Mr. Gibbs's ideas would be adopted by the meeting.

Mr. Crump, of the London Times, denounced the agitation of the silver question as the work of the silver miners of Nevada, and their allies, the Washington ring.

Mr. Moreton Frewen opposed Mr. Crump in a strong speech in behalf of the farmers in the West and the planters in the South of America, and a resolution was passed by a vote, 23 to 15, amid great excitement, declaring that the remonetization of silver would relieve the depression under which trade is now staggering. The meeting is regarded as highly important, and its influence upon the coming silver demonstration in Lancashire must necessarily be very strong.

I may as well add:

A year ago last June at a meeting of the British and Colonial Chamber of Commerce held in London, Sir Robert Fowler, member of Parliament and ex-lord mayor, is reported to have said "that the effect of the depreciation of silver must finally be the ruin of the wheat and cotton industries of America, and be the development of India as the chief wheat and cotton exporter of the world.

And also a high authority at home:

In the report of our Silver Commission made in 1877, Governor Boutwell, late Secretary of the Treasury (volume 1, page 138), says:

"It is no doubt true that the demonetization of either metal adds to the purchasing power of the metal retained for use, by diminishing the price of every article of merchandise, while it increases the burden of debts both public and private."

The result of this mass of intelligent testimony may be stated briefly as proving that so long as England alone maintained gold as the single standard there was no contraction of the circulating medium in the world's commercial transactions, and consequently no depression in trade because of a contracted currency. France acted as the great clearing-house of the nations, but when the United States and Germany struck down their silver coinage in 1873 France, drained as she had been of \$1,000,000,000 of gold by Germany shortly before, could no longer maintain her gold and silver coins on equal terms with free coinage, and had to protect herself against the combined attack of England, Germany, and the United States as best she could.

It also proves that the result of the withdrawal of silver as an equal factor with gold has been to reduce the value of all the past accumulations and present products of labor from 30 to 35 per cent. since 1873, by appreciating the value or purchasing power of gold to that extent, as they all agree that the appreciation of gold and depreciation of property mean the same thing, being only a different way of stating the same proposition. They further agree that the annual product of gold is almost, if not entirely, absorbed in the arts and uses to which it is applied outside of coinage and by absorption in India and other silver-using countries, whose exports exceed their imports, and, when so absorbed, it never again appears as part of the world's coinage. They assume as a proposition too plain for argument, that the effort to destroy one-half of the world's circulating medium and force the remaining half to perform the functions of both metals largely increased the burden of all the obligations of the debtor class by requiring 35 per cent. more of the property they hold or labor to produce to be sold to pay their debts than was needed when gold and silver were both legal-tender money at fixed rates, as they were when most of the present large obligations were contracted.

It did not require any evidence to prove what they all assumed as a necessary sequence of the facts they furnished, that steadily-falling values contract trade and production of every description to the limits of absolute necessity, as no man can buy, borrow, or spend money to produce anything which he knows will be worth 10 per cent. less when his obligations mature than it is at the time he buys or produces it. Of course, money is apparently abundant. When these conditions exist nobody dares borrow it, no matter how low the rate of interest. Labor suffers perhaps more than all else by enforced idleness and inability to change as production dwindles.

India alone, of all the possessions of Great Britain, has, as a country, profited by the rapacity of the gold-worshippers. England, in 1835, prohibited the coinage of gold coin in that country, while she granted the colonial government the right to coin silver without limit. Since that time the official tables which I hold in my hand show that the silver coinage of India has amounted to over \$1,500,000,000.

As soon as the report and testimony taken by Lord Iddesleigh's committee appeared some very distinguished gentleman who did not sign his name, but his paper is evidently semi-official, took up the silver question in an elaborate article and with great ability he showed that all that was needed for England to crush out the export of agricultural products by the United States was to induce the United States to stop the coinage of silver to keep down the price of it, and that India would soon supply England with all the cotton goods, with all the hemp products, with all the wheat, with all the tobacco she wanted, and the United States would be broken down, but above all he pleaded that England must never consent to restore legal-tender silver to her own

coinage, as that would simply be building up the United States at the expense of England's leading colony.

One of the gentlemen who testified before Lord Iddesleigh's commission, Mr. Moreton Frewen, a very intelligent man, who I met once in the Northwest, sent me a copy of that pamphlet, which is entitled "The Silver Question, or Sacrifice of India," accompanied by a letter, in which he said, among other things:

A study of this pamphlet will, however, demonstrate the special difficulties by which England is beset. One part of the Empire, in which gold alone is legal tender, is evidently suffering severely from the rapid appreciation of the standard; another immense portion of the empire, in which the standard silver is depreciating, is as clearly gaining, and this gain, while partly at the expense of British agriculture, is more particularly at the expense of the United States.

If England now supports any legislation which restores to silver its old value and the old "par of exchange," then the wheat exports of British India will cease and also the cotton industry of India, now expanding so immensely, may be paralyzed. The sole object of the writer of the "Sacrifice of India" is to protest against any legislation in England which, by restoring to silver the prerogative of legal tender, may keep silver steady at its former price, and thus secure to the United States the control of the export trades in cotton and wheat, a control which now promises to pass to India.

In this pamphlet the writer goes on to show—and I may take the liberty to make some extracts from it—after showing the increase of India's trade in wheat and other things and the immense increase of her exports and imports, which I laid before the Senate the other day, and therefore need not repeat. He says:

I trust I have succeeded in making clear the effect of low exchange upon the Indian wheat export. Other articles of Indian produce which enter into competition with gold-using countries would similarly suffer by a rise in exchange and in the same proportion, for since that difference or loss could not be made up out of reductions in the cost of transport or out of traders' profits (these being already lowered to a minimum), it would have to come out of the pockets of the cultivators. With articles such as indigo, or jute, or shellac, which are comparative monopolies of Indian production, and tea, which is produced only in silver countries, the benefit derived from low exchange—

That is, cheap silver—

is in the cheapening of the selling cost, and the consequent extending of consumption. A return of exchange to the old ratio would increase the cost of tea in London by about 25 per cent. Thus consumption would be checked, and consequently also the production in India and China. The disturbance thus created would in course of time be adjusted by the ordinary law of supply and demand, but at the cost of the producing country.

Another important benefit conferred upon India by low exchange, but which is little noticed by the Government, is the encouragement to her local manufactures, of which the two most important, although there are many others, are the jute and cotton manufactures. In these, besides an enormously extended consumption of both these manufactures within the country itself, their exports have increased as follows:

Cotton yarn, 1880-'81, 26,901,346 pounds; 1885-'86, 78,238,471 pounds; cotton print goods, 1880-'81, 3,424,032 yards; 1885-'86, 51,574,372 yards; jute, 1880-'81, 45,354,044 bags; 1885-'86, 82,774,207 bags.

In these industries alone, as already noticed, about one hundred millions of rupees are invested, and many thousands of well-paid operatives are happily employed. The effect of raising exchange to the old ratio would be to interfere with these industries, but more particularly with the cotton.

Then he adds, in substance: "Take care how you restore this silver coinage and bring back our old rival, the United States, into this trade. You are not only protecting India, but you men in England are the principal beneficiaries. You have increased our taxes threefold, you are making us support the Indian army of the Queen, you have pensioned your hungry sons, otherwise unprovided for, upon us as a legacy of the old East India Company, and you are demanding all these tributes and subsidies in gold, so that while we have increased in prosperity very largely you are, in fact, getting the lion's share out of us at last." Therefore by every appeal, in every form, the effort is to get England to stand by her single gold standard. I have thought that the Royal Commission now in session will do it, although very many of the best men in that country desire that it shall be otherwise.

I hope the American Congress will show by equalizing our own coins and their uses that we do not intend to pander to them. The Director of the Mint, Mr. Kimball, sent me a letter the other day when he saw that I was looking into this subject. He said that the royal commission is being made to believe from the arguments before it that silver is produced so cheaply in this country that if its coinage is restored we can furnish it at less than 1s. 8d. (38 cents) to the dollar, their leading statistician is so declaring, and that the royal commission has in a preliminary report given great weight to it. Mr. Kimball says this in his letter:

Your remarks in the Senate on the report of the royal commission suggests sending you a copy of a blank recently prepared by me.

I did not know he was going to write to me.

I beg you to observe the note at the foot of the page. Mr. Atkinson told me that he found great disinclination toward any change in the status of silver in Great Britain on account of the prevalence of the idea that silver is, or can be, produced at about half of the present bullion value, and that indeed it would be "shoveled" out in unprecedented volume if the status be improved. This impression seems to mainly rest upon the preposterous estimates of Professor Austin, of the Royal Mint, whose testimony was taken by the commission, and with an exhibit of detailed statements, to be found in the appendix, which claims to be based on a technical analysis of industrial cost. Nothing could be more misleading. Yet I notice that more importance attaches to this testimony than to anything else brought forward during the whole proceedings. Several English writers have since based arguments upon it.

I may say that no American technical authority has ever ventured to put forth a general estimate of cost of production in the case of the precious metals, the truth being, as pointed out by me in my Report on Production, 1855, page 26, that their cost as well as the supply, is to be considered subsidiary to a large extent to the production and reduction of miscellaneous ores, their part in the value of which is none the less an integral one. A large part of the produce

of both metals corresponds to the aggregate of small products, which bear a small, but widely varying, proportion to their cost. Estimated as in the case of any other staple, the cost of silver is believed by most men acquainted with our mineral industries to be some multiple of its value.

While a few ventures yield a rich profit, a majority of gold and silver mining ventures fail to pay any interest on outlay, though in the aggregate contributing the larger part of the silver produced in the world. This is a curious fact, and due mainly to the fascination which the search for the precious metals has for a large class in all countries where a few examples of successful operations are to be found. I may take some occasion to follow out the methods of Professor Austen, whereby he has reached so false a conclusion. I allude to his assumptions of cost of production, to the arbitrary way in which he has excluded all but successful ventures. If the silver market had alone the product of these to depend upon, it would be in sad straits indeed.

Truly yours,

J. P. KIMBALL.

He furnishes the note which he is going to send out, and perhaps has sent out now, to leading men of the country to get information to contradict this report.

The note appended to the printed questions to which he calls my attention reads as follows:

The Director of the Mint hopes to be able to deduce some approximate estimate of the cost of producing silver under different circumstances, in order to meet certain obviously erroneous statements before the present "royal commission appointed to inquire into the recent changes in the relative values of the precious metals." (London.) This cost has been represented in testimony before that commission as low as 1s. 8d.

I referred a while ago to what the national banks were doing. I happen to have in my hand a letter, which I intended to read, and may perhaps as well do it now, from a very distinguished gentleman, Hon. Edwards Pierrepont, dated November 22, 1887, in which he calls my attention to the action of these gentlemen; and as he agrees precisely with my opinion about it, I will read what he says:

No. 103 FIFTH AVENUE, November 22, 1887.

Hon. JAMES B. BECK, United States Senator:

MY DEAR SIR: What your letter says about coin-notes I have read with interest; but judging from the report of the bankers' convention held at Pittsburgh last month, I think that you will see a renewed effort to suspend silver coinage indefinitely. On page 60 of the report is the following:

"The British Government has appointed a royal commission to investigate the silver question, which has made a preliminary report adverse to the double standard. As the assent of England has been recognized by the most eminent bimetallicists as essential to any effectual agreement upon the silver question, the committee recommend that this association delay action for the present, and await the final report of the royal commission to Parliament and the action of Parliament thereon. \* \* \* The committee further recommends that the coinage of silver dollars by the United States, under the act of February, 1878, be suspended until the points at issue of the silver question be settled by international agreement."

These distinguished bankers are waiting until they can get an adverse report from England, which they are encouraging by every means in their power. The moment they get it then the hue and cry will be raised again with redoubled energy that we are keeping dishonored money in circulation after the world has decided against it. When they have done all they can to bring about the result they will claim that we can do nothing. What Congress has to do to thwart their schemes is to take some honest step forward and show the world that we intend to hold on to what we have and to progress steadily and not retrograde at the dictation of any power, foreign or domestic. Mr. Pierrepont adds:

This means an indefinite suspension of silver coinage, and nothing else. It is well known that the "final," like the preliminary, report will be "adverse to the double standard." Many honest men have been duped into the belief that by suspending our silver coinage we can force England into an international agreement about silver.

The smiling contempt with which the ruling class in England receives this suggestion is not complimentary to our intelligence. The suspension of our silver coinage is exactly what they want. Such suspension, they imagine, would largely increase the purchasing power of their gold; however fallacious this view may prove in the long run, they now entertain it, and it will take many years to change them. It is well understood in Great Britain that if Congress will once suspend the coinage of silver, the gold forces of England and America combined can prevent its restoration.

Some tell us that we ought to stop the coinage of silver, because they say that the intrinsic value of the silver dollar is worth less by 30 per cent. than the gold dollar. This is an entire mistake. In 1851 the silver dollar of the exact weight and fineness as now was at a premium of 3.42 per cent. above the gold dollar, and for a period of forty years next prior to 1873 it was continuously at a premium; and in 1851 the gold of the world, in proportion to silver, was far less than it is to-day.

Was the intrinsic value of 100 cents of silver in 1851 3.42 per cent. more than the intrinsic value of 100 cents of gold? The legal value of a five-pound Bank of England note is five gold sovereigns—the legal value of a ten-dollar greenback is a gold eagle. But the intrinsic value of the English bank-note and the American greenback together is nothing; their only value is a value imposed by law, a fiat value, there is nothing intrinsic about it. By far the chief value of all coins is fiat value.

All the gloomy predictions about the coinage of silver in our country have proved false. We need not distress ourselves about the royal commission or the action of the British Parliament on the silver question. If the continental governments which coined silver prior to 1873 would restore its coinage, there can be no reasonable doubt that the silver dollar would be quite equal to the gold dollar in the whole of continental Europe, as it now is in every corner of the United States.

But for the silver, what would have been our condition this last summer, with the national bank notes reduced from three hundred and fifty-six millions to one hundred and sixty-five millions, and one hundred and ninety-four millions locked in the Treasury? In any country whose currency is reduced to gold, it is always easy for a few rich operators to "corner" the currency, throw down the price of stocks, wheat, cotton, and other commodities, and force those who have bills falling due to sacrifice their property to escape bankruptcy. The member of Congress who shall vote to suspend the coinage and "await the report of the royal commission," will be a bold man or an idiot. Is it possible

that this great and powerful nation, quite the richest in the world, can not devise a financial system suited to its conditions, instead of waiting in dazed bewilderment for the action of a British Parliament?

I am, ever, faithfully yours,

EDWARDS PIERREPONT.

To show why I have no confidence in our late commissioner on the silver question, I will add that Mr. Atkinson is a *doctrinaire*; he is an able man and beyond doubt a man of integrity, but Mr. Atkinson is not the man whom anybody who knows him would select as a friend of silver money. He testified before the commission of which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES] was chairman.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Kentucky will permit me to say, as he has alluded to an eminent constituent of mine, that the present Administration did send him to Europe on precisely that errand.

Mr. BECK. I know it did, and that is what I do not like.

Mr. HOAR. I understood the Senator to say that nobody ever sent Mr. Atkinson on any such errand.

Mr. BECK. No. We have made blunders.

Mr. HOAR. You did say so.

Mr. BECK. I read the resolution some time ago—perhaps the Senator was not in—of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY], reciting that Mr. Atkinson had been sent, but that we do not propose to send him or any one else any more on such missions. I propose to favor that resolution mainly because we have not sent the kind of men who were likely to do the most good. There are gold worshippers in the Democratic party, I am sorry to say, as well as in the Republican party. We are not strictly divided as parties on that line, there are some Senators who stand by me very earnestly on this question on the other side of this Chamber in sustaining our silver coinage and in giving it equal rights, I am happy to say.

Mr. Atkinson was asked the following questions by the silver commission in 1876 and answered them in this way.

After insisting that there were causes which made silver no longer fit to be a legal tender, he said, in answer to questions:

Q. 7. Are these causes temporary or permanent?

A. No positive answer can be made to this question. It is certain that silver has been recently subject to such great fluctuations that it is for the time being a most unfit substance for a standard of value.

Q. 8. Would the relative value of gold and silver be affected by the remonetization of the latter in this country, coupled with the resumption of specie payments?

A. The temporary increase of demand for silver would, I doubt not, increase its value in relation to gold, but only temporarily, and its ultimate relation to gold would be determined by the cost of production and the general demand for it in the world. If the question implies the resumption of specie payments in silver, as a full legal tender, I think it implies an impossibility. The resumption of specie payments depends upon confidence being restored. To make an unlimited tender of this metal, at its old weight, would be so bad a breach of faith, and would imply such want of perception in regard to the needs of the time, as to destroy what little confidence there is now existing, and defeat the attempt itself.

Q. 9. Which standard, the single gold or the double standard of gold and silver, is best calculated to facilitate a return to specie payments?

A. I think resumption will be retarded and not facilitated by any present alteration in the relation of gold and silver coins to each other, and that the silver coinage should remain a token coinage, carefully restricted to the actual demands of the country for tokens, and be as strictly limited as was the amount of fractional paper currency.

Q. 10. If the double standard is adopted, what relation of value should be fixed between gold and silver?

A. That which is changing from week to week, or from day to day, can not be fixed by any statute. I think no change should be made at present in the relation of the weight in our coins, nor should any change be attempted until the value of silver is fixed more than it is now. Then there will be a basis for legislation as to the weight each coin should contain.

Q. 11. If the United States should establish the double standard, would it have a tendency to confirm France, Italy, and Belgium and the other nations of the Latin Union, Austria, Russia, Holland, Mexico, Asia, and South America in their present policy of employing silver as an unlimited legal tender?

A. I do not think the example of the United States will affect intelligent statesmen anywhere. I think we have blundered too much in the last ten years to have our example copied by any intelligent nation, until at least ten more years have expired, in which we have shown our fitness to teach.

If Senators will read the whole of the testimony of Mr. Atkinson, they will find that he was not only bitterly opposed to the restoration of silver to any position above mere subsidiary tokens, but he showed scant respect for the intelligence of those who differed from him. I confess, therefore, to being astonished at his selection as the agent of the United States by the Secretary of State to induce England and other nations to aid us in restoring gold and silver as joint factors or units of value; and I was not astonished that he ignored all the testimony taken before the Iddesleigh commission, which was in direct opposition to the views he has expressed before our Congressional joint committee.

That is not the kind of a man I should send to Europe to take care of silver. But waiving all that and believing that the first thing for Congress to do is to assert our own rights and to let England, France, and Germany, and the bondholders of America, the bankers, and everybody else know that when we put out our coin, or any paper based upon it, that it is as good as any other coin or any other paper, and that we have not one coin for the rich and another for the poor, that gold and silver recognized by us at the standard value of July 14, 1870, in which all bonds are payable, is good enough for anybody, and that we intend to stand upon it and maintain it with all our power, and as every prediction up to this time in regard to what would happen if we attempted to do so has been falsified, we have a right to assume that the

thirty-odd million dollars of gold coming in this year more than we exported, \$174,000,000 having come since we began coining silver more than we have coined of silver with the effort made in 1880 to deposit gold and get silver certificates, when men deposited \$80,000,000 of gold for them until they were stopped by the Treasury Department, if they do not deposit it now no harm can be done. They are not obliged to do it.

We have surplus enough belonging to the people on which we can issue coin certificates, backed by the coin in the Treasury, whenever we please, because the coin is in our own hands and will never be demanded if we have it on hand. I do not see how anybody can object to that, except those who want to keep up a distinction and make a discrimination between the two metals and hold out to England and her Royal Commission that we are still undetermined, and if they will only struggle a little longer to maintain her single standard that we will give way to her and abandon our silver coin as hopeless.

I have thus imperfectly stated the object of the bill. I shall endeavor to argue its merits more clearly and show our need for it when it comes up for a vote. I know I have to give way to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] to call up what is known as the undervaluation bill which has the right of way, but at some very early day I will call up this bill and I will try to press it to a vote, and I will see whether the Senate of the United States will agree with me in believing that it is a step in the right direction. Our present gold certificates are of no sort of use as circulation. More than half of them are in denominations of \$10,000 and over, so we are simply insurers of rich men's gold without pay; that of course they want, as they want all else. They are not currency in any sense.

In the mean time I will say now that I agree with the Senator from Delaware that there is no use in begging England, or Germany, or France, or any other country any more. We are able to stand by ourselves and maintain a policy of our own, and I am not sure, in view of what is going on in the world, that we ought not to coin silver up to the maximum limit instead of the minimum. That, however, is a question which may be discussed hereafter.

Gentlemen talk about compulsory coinage. Why, Mr. President, the present law is simply a limitation upon a pre-existing right that all men could avail themselves of until the limitation was put on it, and as all holders of gold bullion get gold coin now free of charge. We had to require that silver should be coined to the amount of at least \$2,000,000 per month, because if we had not required it it would not have been coined at all. How many dollars do you think would have been coined under the administration of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] if he had not been required by law to coin at least \$2,000,000 of silver per month? How many millions a month would have been coined under the administration of any Secretary of the Treasury from that day to this? Not a dollar. They have been begging us all the time to stop it, and then call silver coinage compulsory. There is free coinage of gold without a penny cost.

England by statute requires the Bank of England to pay for bullion, in bank notes which may be immediately exchanged for gold, £3 17s. 9d. for each standard ounce of gold that is offered, thus furnishing a market to everybody, we are inviting them all to coin their gold free. When men produce silver we call it repudiated, depreciated stuff, token money, and everything else that is vile. Unless we had required something to be done, nothing, I repeat, would have done, and yet that is charged as being compulsory coinage.

I am not sure that we can maintain free coinage of silver by ourselves. I am not clear about that. That is a question for discussion. But whatever we do put out as money we ought to maintain as equal to any money that we put out, and when we say that gold and silver shall stand upon an equality by our law, Congress having the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof, and the States having no right to make any thing a legal tender but gold and silver coin, either metal, coined by Congress the value of which has been thus regulated, when it is once in the hands of the people Congress must see that every particle of gold and silver is made equal for all uses; and if we treat it as such ourselves we shall maintain it against the world as we can do, and the moment we do that then the nations of Europe will follow our example.

I meant to read some other papers, but I have talked very much too long. I can show by official statistics that Austria can hardly keep her debts afloat; Russia is substantially bankrupt; Germany, with a great army, is staggering; France, perhaps, is more in debt than any of them. England confesses the depreciation of all values of 35 per cent. since 1873 until she, too, is staggering and her gold is leaving her. They are all using more silver to-day than gold in their ordinary transactions, and in spite of all their protests they will have to come back to it as a full legal tender; and when they do the double standard using both metals, will not be more than enough to meet the growing wants and needs of commerce and the growing wants of people whose needs are becoming greater as they are becoming richer and their commerce is becoming more extended.

I beg pardon of the Senate for having detained it so long.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, as a matter of course I shall not undertake to reply to the argument of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr.

BECK] upon the silver question, but I wish now, before the subject passes from the attention of the Senate, to briefly reply to one or two matters of a personal character which the Senator from Kentucky feels himself justified in lugging into this controversy. I say "lugging" because this debate is but an addendum to the debate had the other day when the Senator from Kentucky started off against a bill intended to grant pensions to certain disabled soldiers of the Union Army. He extended from that point until he got upon the tariff, very naturally, perhaps; he thinks so at least, because every road leads to the tariff with him. When the tariff got to be a little tiresome he commenced talking about trusts and said that the great trusts were caused by the tariff. I ventured in a mild-mannered way to suggest to him a doubt whether trusts were caused by the tariff; whether trusts did not exist in domestic as well as foreign productions, and he answered promptly that the tariff was the great cause of all. I named to him the whisky trust, the oil trust, the cotton-seed trust, and other trusts of that kind, and wanted to know how they grew out of the tariff. Thereupon the Senator changed his ground and got onto the silver question, and then he commenced assailing me for the coinage act, and said I had been responsible for the coinage act of 1873. He spoke of it as having been secretly passed, surreptitiously done, etc., that I did it, that I knew it.

I was very indifferent to the previous part of his speech, but I felt a little sensitive that I was charged with having the management or custody of any bill whatever that was not openly and manfully discussed, and, although my opinions often differ with those of the Senator from Kentucky, I believe that he is as sincere and honest in his opinions as I am in mine. When the heat was over he should have withdrawn his imputation. He will never find me dodging responsibility, or evading or concealing a measure, in whole or in part, as long as I live; and in reply, I think I convinced the Senate that I did not in this case. And now, Mr. President, his answer, nearly three hours long, is "lame and impotent" to the last degree. How does he answer? By going to the public records and showing by them whether or not the law was put through the Senate in a secret and suppressed and indefinite way? Not at all. The records are the evidence of our acts here; but instead of going to them, he quotes speeches which have been made on the stump, one by yourself, sir, [Mr. INGALLS in the chair], which he grossly misapplies. He cites what several gentlemen say they did not know.

He quotes from a speech made by Mr. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, and other members of the House of Representatives, and a speech made by my friend from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], not one of them bearing upon the question as to whether the bill under my charge was openly and manfully presented and discussed; and now, thank fortune, I am able from the original records of the Senate to show that that bill was more openly discussed, was more fully considered than any bill pending in Congress. It was submitted in every possible form to public opinion inside and outside of Congress, as is shown by the original records here upon my table.

What was the coinage act of 1873? Was it a bill of my devising? No, I never saw it until it was sent to me here, in a letter dated April 25, 1870, addressed to me as chairman of the Committee on Finance, from Mr. Boutwell, the Secretary of the Treasury. It was a long bill containing many sections that I had never before seen. With that bill came a history of the bill; that it had been prepared nearly a year before that time. At a time when we hopefully looked for the resumption of specie payments, then faintly in the glimmering distance, Mr. Linderman, not a man of my politics at all, but a leading Democrat, who had held for a long time the office of Superintendent of the Mint at Philadelphia, and Mr. Knox, Comptroller of the Currency, framed a bill to codify or include in one law all the coinage acts of the United States which were then in force. The bill was sent to us with a formal letter and it was printed. Here is the printed letter:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, April 25, 1870.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a bill revising the laws relative to the mint, assay offices, and coinage of the United States, and accompanying report. The bill has been prepared under the supervision of John Jay Knox, Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, and its passage is recommended in the form presented. It includes, in a condensed form, all the important legislation upon the coinage, not now obsolete, since the first Mint was established, in 1792; and the report gives a concise statement of the various amendments proposed to existing laws and the necessity for the change recommended. There has been no revision of the laws pertaining to the Mint and coinage since 1837, and it is believed that the passage of the inclosed bill will conduce greatly to the efficiency and economy of this important branch of the Government service.

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant.

GEO. S. BOUTWELL,  
Secretary of the Treasury.

The report and the bill were referred to the Committee on Finance April 28, 1870, and printed, and 500 additional copies printed for the use of the Treasury Department.

The report says:

The method adopted in the preparation of the bill was first to arrange in as concise a form as possible the laws now in existence upon these subjects, with such additional sections and suggestions as seemed valuable. Having accomplished this, the bill as thus prepared was printed upon paper with wide margin, and in this form transmitted to the different mints and assay offices, to the First Comptroller, the Treasurer, the Solicitor, the First Auditor, and to such other gentlemen as are known to be intelligent upon metallurgical and numismatic subjects, with the request that the printed bill should be returned with such notes and suggestions as experience and education should dictate. In

this way the views of more than thirty gentlemen who are conversant with the manipulation of metals, the manufacture of coinage, the execution of the present laws relative thereto, the method of keeping accounts, and of making returns to the Department, have been obtained with but little expense to the Department and little inconvenience to correspondents. Having received these suggestions, the present bill has been framed, and is believed to comprise within the compass of eight or ten pages of the Revised Statutes every important provision contained in more than sixty different enactments upon the Mint, assay offices, and coinage of the United States, which are the result of nearly eighty years of legislation upon these subjects.

The Senator says that the silver dollar was surreptitiously and secretly suppressed by the operation of this bill. It did not become a law until three years afterwards, and, as I will show; it was printed thirteen different times, over and over again debated, and the debates upon the bill in the Senate occupied sixty-eight columns of the Globe, and in the House seventy-eight columns of the Globe, probably ten times as many columns devoted to it as the Senator's speech will make, and that is a long standard for debate. It was debated day after day. The first proposition submitted to us was the discontinuing the coinage of the silver dollar. The report of Mr. Knox called special attention to the discontinuance of the silver dollar as a standard, as may be seen from the following paragraph on page 11:

SILVER DOLLAR—ITS DISCONTINUANCE AS A STANDARD.

The coinage of the silver-dollar piece, the history of which is here given, is discontinued in the proposed bill. It is by law the dollar unit, and, assuming the value of gold to be fifteen and one-half times that of silver, being about the mean ratio for the past six years, is worth in gold a premium of about 3 per cent. (its value being 103.12) and intrinsically more than 7 per cent. premium in our other silver coin, its value thus being 107.42. The present laws consequently authorize both a gold-dollar unit and a silver-dollar unit, differing from each other in intrinsic value. The present gold-dollar piece is made the dollar unit in the proposed bill, and the silver-dollar piece is discontinued. If, however, such a coin is authorized, it should be issued only as a commercial dollar, not as a standard unit of account, and of the exact value of the Mexican dollar, which is the favorite for circulation in China and Japan and other Oriental countries.

This original bill and report were sent, as I have stated, to all the leading specialists familiar with this subject, to the officers of the mints all over the country, to the leading bankers of the country, and to members of Congress, inviting their criticism. In the first bill that was thus sent there was this section, which I will read:

That of the silver coins the weight of the dollar shall be 384 grains (now 412½ grains), the weight of the half-dollar or piece of 50 cents shall be 192 grains; and that the quarter-dollar and dime and half-dime shall be, respectively, one-half and one-fifth and one-tenth of the weight of said half-dollar. That the silver coin issued in conformity with the above sections shall be a legal tender in any one payment of debts for all sums not exceeding \$5, except duties on imports.

That was substantially the form in which that section appeared in the last bill sent by the House here in the spring of 1872, two years afterwards, and that particular section which abolished, as you say, or dropped the silver dollar, was in the bill during all its history from the beginning to the end. The dollar proposed by Mr. Knox, instead of the old dollar of 412½ grains, was a dollar of 384 grains, or just the exact equivalent of two of the minor half-dollars, and reduced the dollar by their proposition to a minor, a subsidiary coin, and he specially called attention to this by saying the dollar was "now 412½ grains," and proposed to make the new coin a legal tender for only \$5. That was the proposition.

Mr. DAWES. Just what the fractional currency was.

Mr. SHERMAN. Just what the fractional currency was. So in the original bill the old dollar was displaced and in its place was put a minor coin equal to two half-dollars coined under the old act of 1834. That was the proposition, and it was sent to California and other gold and silver regions.

It was objected in California that the dollar proposed would not answer commercial exchanges, that they wanted a dollar even larger than the old silver dollar of 412½ grains, that they wanted a convenient coin into which silver, then being mined largely in that region of country, might be put for exportation. It was said if we would give them a coin of 420 grains, it would be worth about 3 grains more than the Mexican dollar, and that such a coin as that would fill the channels of commerce and enable them to export silver, at that time only valuable to be exported, not used by the people of our country, because we were then using paper and fractional currency entirely.

During this time the officers of the San Francisco branch mint made the following suggestion:

Would not the proposed change in the weight of the silver dollar disturb the relative value of all our coinage, affect our commercial conventions, and possibly impair the validity of contracts running through a long period? Might not the dollar be retained as a measure of value, but the coinage of the piece for circulation be discontinued?

Mr. E. B. Elliot, of the Treasury Department, gave a complete history of the silver dollar and suggested—

The issue of a commercial dollar of nine-tenths fineness, and containing of pure silver just 25 grams, in place of the then existing silver dollar of 412½ grains; the proposed silver dollar being almost the exact equivalent of the silver contained in the older Spanish-Mexican pillared dollar, established in 1704 by proclamation of Queen Anne as a legal tender of payment and accepted as par of exchange for the British colonies of North America at the rate of 54 pence sterling to the dollar, or four and four-ninths dollars to the pound sterling.

Mr. Robert Patterson, of Philadelphia, long an officer of the Mint and an expert, recommended that this dollar of 385 grains be stricken out, and there is here a petition from the California Legislature—I had it in my hand a few moments ago; it is on the Secretary's desk—in which

they ask Congress formally to raise the standard of silver and not to use this diminished dollar of 385 grains.

In consequence of this diversity of opinion among experts the Comptroller of the Currency dropped out the silver dollar entirely, said nothing about it, made no provision for it, but instead of that told us that if not omitted entirely a dollar ought to be inserted, as demanded by the Pacific Coast, for commercial purposes, containing 420 grains.

Mr. President, from the beginning, from April, 1870, until the passage of the law on February 27, 1873, the provision discontinuing the old silver dollar of 412½ grains stood in that proposed law, printed here over and over again by both Houses through nearly three sessions of Congress, and yet members of Congress are quoted, forsooth, as saying that they never saw it! Whose fault was it?

Why, Mr. President, I have here the last print of the bill. Here it is, with the old-time appearance of decayed bills, folded away for good. Here it is in the very last print of the bill. Look at the history of it, and see whether there was anything secret about it. Here is the bill:

May 29, 1872.—In the Senate of the United States.

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Finance.

December 16, 1872.—Reported by Mr. SHERMAN with amendments, namely: "Strike out the parts in brackets and insert the parts printed in italics."

Then follows:

January 7, 1873.—Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Finance, reported additional amendments; which were ordered to be printed with the bill.

Then, two or three weeks afterwards, I do not know exactly when, although the date can be easily had, I called up the bill for consideration. Here it was, printed in double-lead type.

I will read what I asked the Senator from Kentucky to put in his remarks, but I will put it in mine. Here is the proposition of the House. I have already read the proposition as it came to us originally. The proposition of the House was:

That the silver coins of the United States shall be a dollar, a half-dollar or fifty-cent piece, a quarter-dollar or twenty-five-cent piece, and a dime or ten-cent piece; and the weight of the dollar shall be 384 grains; the half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and the dime shall be, respectively, one-half, one-quarter, and one-tenth of the weight of said dollar; which coins shall be a legal tender, at their denominational value, for any amount not exceeding \$5 in any one payment.

That is substantially as it stood at the beginning of this controversy, and yet the Senator says it was secretly, surreptitiously inserted.

The Senate, on the other hand, in deference to the demands made from the Pacific Coast, where the great body of the silver bullion was produced, offered, instead of that, this proposition (and it is now the law), to strike out what I have read and insert:

That the silver coins of the United States shall be a trade-dollar, a half-dollar or fifty-cent piece, a quarter-dollar or twenty-five-cent piece, a dime or ten-cent piece; and the weight of the trade-dollar shall be 420 grains troy, the weight of the half-dollar shall be 12½ grains; the quarter-dollar and the dime shall be, respectively, one-half and one-fifth of the weight of said half-dollar; and said coins shall be legal tender, at their nominal value, for any amount not exceeding \$5 in any one payment.

The following section was contained in all the different bills and the coinage act of 1873:

SEC. 18. *And be it further enacted*, That no coins, either of gold, silver, or minor coinage, shall hereafter be issued from the Mint other than those of the denominations, standards, and weights herein set forth.

The amendment of the Senate converted the grains of the old half-dollar into the grams of the French. Instead of taking the diminished minor dollar proposed by the House, not the old dollar of the fathers that the Senator has been talking about, but the dollar of 384 grains, we struck that out and put in the trade-dollar of 420 grains, and then we adapted the minor coins exactly to the French gram, so that two half-dollars would be precisely equal to 5 francs in the French currency. That was done by common consent. It only amounted to a change of one-half of 1 per cent., 12½ grains being, I believe, the equivalent of about 193 instead of 192 grains. The precise fraction I will not pretend to state, but that was all.

Here was a proposition printed which lay upon that table for three months. Yes, the bill came over to us in the session before. It lay over through a vacation and was then taken up, and after some days, probably with considerable debate upon other questions, this proposition was put and carried almost *nem. con.*

Can any Senator say that he did not see this bill? No, Senators; no man would plead the baby act in that way. I never would. I did see it. I did see that the original proposition of the House was to convert the silver dollar into a minor coin, and I did not believe in that. I did believe that it was better to have a coin according to the desire of the California people; to give them a coin of commerce, a trade-dollar into which they might convert their silver bullion, mined from the American mines, to be exported in the best form for the Oriental markets.

That is what I thought; and every Senator and Member had the same opportunity to see it, and no doubt did see it. But there is one thing which, it seems, some did not see, and the Senator from Kentucky did not and does not seem to know, and that is, the difference between seeing what is past and what is to come in the future. We did not see into the future, and it is not given to man to see into the future. We did not know that while we were acting here upon the official statement that a silver dollar was worth over 3 per cent. more than a gold dollar, by changes of production and other causes that position



would be reversed. If any man had then said to me that within twenty years, yea, within fifteen years after that time the silver dollar would only be worth 70 cents on the dollar, I would have thought him crazy. All there is about it is that we did not foresee the great change in the value of silver bullion.

But when any one in the light of these facts will say of the members of that Senate or the members of that House, that they sought to do anything by indirection or by secrecy, he does injustice to himself; he can not do injustice to me, because the records are there, and the Senator has seen them.

Now, Mr. President, let us go a little further. I answered promptly to the Senator from Kentucky, and made this statement, not so clear as I have now made it, because I have the documents before me. He brings a collateral witness to prove that after all I was a secret conspirator, because at one time or another I proposed to make gold the single standard. There again he misrepresents my position. I did not make or propose to make it the single standard. I proposed to make gold an international coin, and to so change the coinage and the gold coins of all the peoples of the world that one would be easily converted into the other.

As these coins now exist, a franc is worth less than one-fifth of a dollar, and yet the dollar only passes for five francs, and the loss falls upon our people. So a pound sterling is not worth \$5, and yet in common account we call the pound sterling \$5. It has been the desire of scientists for more than a hundred years, commencing with Newton when he was director of the mint in England, that this difficulty of exchanges among peoples should be abolished, and it was the common sentiment of all the men who met in Paris, of all the nations, you may say, of Europe and Asia, that this difference should be in some way or other got rid of, so that the traveler might start in America and cross two oceans, traverse the world, with one American coin of unchangeable value.

What was the proposition? The proposition was that we should take the franc, which was the lowest standard or unit of value, as the unit, and then change our gold coins so as to make 5 francs of French coin exactly equal in size, in material, in shape, in form, to the five-franc gold piece. But as gold coins could not be readily issued in such small sums, it was proposed that we should take what is called the international, a gold coin of 25 francs, as a standard, and we recommended that the United States should make the half-eagle a coin of the exact commercial equivalent of 25 francs, and that England should make her pound sterling conform to this standard, so that 5 francs should be equal to \$1 and \$5 would be equal to £1. Austria, then greater even than Germany, was to make her 10 florins equal to 25 francs. So we should have an international coin of commerce which would go over the world.

Mr. President, that was the proposition. I was there, a citizen of the United States and a member of this body. I was not a member *per se* of what is called the Paris conference, but I was invited. I went there. They published what was said in different languages. They gave me no special compliment in publishing what I wrote in two languages as if it was an extraordinary thing. All the proceedings were published in two languages. I read them, and after reading them all and finding a concurring opinion that what they meant to do was a good thing to do, I wrote the letter, not one word of which I now withdraw; not one word of which, fairly interpreted under the circumstances which then surrounded me, would bear the meaning that is now suggested. The Senator from Kentucky uses this letter, which I will ask to have put in the RECORD. It is not very long, not one-half as long as some of the schedules attached to the speech of my friend from Kentucky.

What we intended to do is plain and manifest. The Senator introduces this to prove what? That I was wrong in seeking to get an international coin? No; that was not it, but in some way or other that I wanted to conspire against silver; that it was silver I was striking at. Why at that time the silver dollar was worth over 3 per cent. above par. It was shortly before that time that Chevalier proposed to demonetize gold, and take the better metal, as he called it, silver, as the single standard. It was because silver had been practically abandoned for circulation, and every country in modern Europe and our own had been compelled to lower the standard of our coins in silver in order to prevent their exportation.

Does the Senator from Kentucky know that Tom Benton and the men of 1834 and 1837 who met this difficulty in the first place demonetized silver, and from that time to this we have been practically upon the unit of gold coin? Although nominally in law the silver dollar stood as the unit of value, yet in fact and in practice gold was the only standard of value. But the silver was coined freely into what are called minor coins, 50 cents and 25 cents, and there was 7 per cent. less silver put in them, so that they would not be exported. The whole object of this demonetization of silver was to prevent the silver dollar from being exported, as it always was exported, because it was worth more in the mints of Europe than in our own.

One difficulty grew out of the difference between our ratio in this country and that in Europe. In France it was 15½ ounces of silver to one of gold. In our country it was 16 ounces of silver to one of gold. The result was, as we undervalued silver according to the market value,

our silver dollar, whenever coined, went abroad, and therefore for forty or fifty years there was none of it coined, although any man had a right to carry silver bullion to the Mint and have it coined. Therefore, so far from intending any reproach or dishonor or depreciation of silver, we were trying to meet a difficulty entirely outside of the scope of that controversy between the two ratios.

The Senator from Kentucky must take notice that I say this letter, which I will ask to have printed in this place in my remarks, expressed my opinion better and more carefully than I could do now in anything that I would say.

The letter referred to is as follows:

HOTEL JARDIN DES TUILERIES, May 18, 1867.

MY DEAR SIR: YOUR note of yesterday, inquiring whether Congress would probably in future coinage make our gold dollar conform in value to the gold five-franc piece, has been received.

There has been so little discussion in Congress upon the subject that I can not base my opinion upon anything said or done there.

The subject has, however, excited the attention of several important commercial bodies in the United States, and the time is now so favorable that I feel quite sure that Congress will adopt any practical measure that will secure to the commercial world a uniform standard of value and exchange.

The only question will be, how this can be accomplished. The treaty of December 23, 1865, between France, Italy, Belgium, and Switzerland, and the probable acquiescence in that treaty by Prussia, has laid the foundation for such a standard. If Great Britain will reduce the value of her sovereign two pence, and the United States will reduce the value of her dollar something over three cents, we then have a coinage in the franc, dollar, and sovereign, easily computed, and which will readily pass in all countries—the dollar as five francs, and the sovereign as twenty-five francs.

This will put an end to the loss and intricacies of exchange and discount. Our gold dollar is certainly as good a unit of value as the franc; and so the English think of their pound sterling. These coins are now exchangeable only at a considerable loss, and this exchange is a profit only to brokers and bankers. Surely each commercial nation should be willing to yield a little to secure a gold coin of equal value, weight, and diameter, from whatever mint it may have been issued.

As the gold five-franc piece is now in use by over sixty millions of people of several different nationalities, and is of convenient form and size, it may well be adopted by other nations as the common standard of value, leaving to each nation to regulate the divisions of this unit in silver coin or tokens.

If this is done, France will surely abandon the impossible effort of making two standards of value. Gold coins will answer all the purposes of European commerce. A common gold standard will regulate silver coinage, of which the United States will furnish the greater part, especially for the Chinese trade.

I have thought a good deal of how the object you propose may be most readily accomplished. It is clear that the United States can not become a party to the treaty referred to. They could not agree upon the silver standard; nor could we limit the amount of our coinage as proposed by the treaty. The United States is so large in extent, is so sparsely populated, and the price of labor is so much higher than in Europe, that we require more currency per capita. We now produce the larger part of the gold and silver of the world, and can not limit our coinage, except by the wants of our people and the demands of commerce.

Congress alone can change the value of our coin. I see no object in negotiating with other powers on the subject. As coin is not now in general circulation with us, we can readily fix by law the size, weight, and measure of future issues. It is not worth while to negotiate about that which we can do without negotiation, and we do not wish to limit ourselves by treaty restrictions.

In England many persons of influence and different chambers of commerce are earnestly in favor of the proposed change in their coinage. The change is so slight with them that an enlightened self-interest will soon induce them to make it, especially if we make the greater change in our coinage. We will have some difficulty in adjusting existing contracts with the new dollar; but as contracts are now based upon the fluctuating value of paper money, even the reduced dollar in coin will be of more purchasable value than our currency.

We can easily adjust the reduction with the public creditors in the payment or conversion of their securities, while private creditors might be authorized to recover upon the old standard. All these are matters of detail to which I hope the commission will direct their attention.

And now, my dear sir, allow me to say in conclusion, that I heartily sympathize with you and others in your efforts to secure the adoption of the metrical system of weights and measures.

The tendency of the age is to break down all needless restrictions upon social and commercial intercourse. Nations are now as much akin to each other as provinces were of old. Prejudices disappear by contact. People of different nations learn to respect each other as they find that their differences are the effect of social and local custom not founded upon good reasons. I trust that the industrial commission will enable the world to compute the value of all productions by the same standard, to measure by the same yard or meter, and weigh by the same scales.

Such a result would be of greater value than the usual employments of diplomats and statesmen.

I am, very truly, yours,

JOHN SHERMAN.

SAMUEL B. RUGGLES, Esq.

Mr. SHERMAN. There I stand, and would to God this day that a spirit might exist among the nations of the world that we should agree not only upon a ratio between silver and gold, but that we should agree upon a coin which, bearing the image of every nation according to its own devices, should be of equal and exact weight, value, and metal, travel over the world, and be the supreme standard of value among the nations.

The Senator from Kentucky says he does not know how the plan for an international coin was dropped out. He seems to think there was something suspicious about it. I can tell him. He need not have explored ancient history to have found it. It is true when this question came before the Committee on Finance we substantially agreed, with the single exception of Senator Morgan, of New York. He thought it might derange affairs in New York, the profits of exchange, the effect upon existing contracts, and perhaps it would; and he presented some difficulties in reducing our coins down to the standard proposed by the French ratio.

It would have created some trouble, but still the Senate would have passed it without much debate, and Senators around me were continu-

ally complaining of me for not bringing up that bill. The reason why it was not brought up was because Great Britain took ground against it, though her representatives had given a qualified assent. They said they would not change their pound sterling to conform to the proposed coin, because, in the first place, it was a matter of pride; in the next place, it would disturb the value of the shilling and farthing; that it would disturb the current of their money in the smaller payments of human life; that it would disturb to a slight degree the value of the farthing. When England had thus refused to enter into this international union, this international coin, as it may be called, it was found not to be feasible to proceed any further in the matter.

Then soon came on the war between France and Germany, and then these two nations were in no condition to negotiate with each other about coinage or anything else. This was the reason why this great effort at reform failed, for which Mr. Ruggles is fairly entitled to credit by the people of the United States. It was because England, from her exclusive pride and supreme selfishness, would not enter into this arrangement, and it fell dead. But I hope the time may come yet, in the lifetime of some of us at least, when this idea, so honorable to all the nations represented in that conference, so useful to mankind at large, so beneficial to every one who travels or trades, to every one who emigrates or migrates, will be finally adopted by the common consent of the great nations of the world. So much for that.

Now, what else is there that I care to answer in the speech of the Senator from Kentucky? He said we insisted upon paying our bonds in coin. So we did, and I thank God we did. If we had not paid our bonds in coin during the war, or promised to pay them in coin, what would have become of our credit? Even as it was, with the interest fairly secured by revenues collected in coin, our bonds went at one time in the markets of the world at about 40 cents on the dollar. Suppose we had not supported our credit, and maintained the standard that we had proclaimed, that we would not only pay the principal but the interest in gold? In the direst times of the war we bought coin and paid untold premiums almost to get it, in order to pay the public creditor. But that was to sustain the public credit and maintain the public faith.

The Senator said some harsh words—he will find them when he looks over his remarks, if he does so—about the men of business during the war, that they were grabbers, seeking something more than they deserved. My countrymen, it required patriotism, heroism, courage, and hope to take the bonds of the United States during that fearful war. All of you know how severely at times we were pressed, and how dangerously our credit was affected, and yet without that strong anchor of coin interest our bonds would have disappeared like the Confederate bonds into thin air, dishonored and unsung.

But, sir, thanks to the courage of the people of the United States, they stood by that policy, and by that means we are able now to legislate for a restored and advanced country of untarnished credit and to borrow money at a less rate than any country in the world.

Let us go a little further to illustrate the wisdom of the financial policy of the Senate. Senators may now be forgetful of one fact which I will state, not for the purpose of criticising any one—perhaps it may be new to the Senator from Kentucky, and yet he was here at the time it was done. When it became necessary to refund the public debt, after the first five-twenties had matured, everybody demanded a refunding act to lessen the burden of our debt. It was a very difficult thing to do. The Senate of the United States, after more care and deliberation than, so far as I know, it has ever bestowed on any bill, finally reported a bill to fund the public debt, to aid in the resumption of specie payments, and to advance the public credit.

On the 3d day of February, 1870, I was directed by the Committee on Finance to report Senate bill No. 380, "to authorize the refunding and consolidation of the national debt, to extend banking facilities, and to establish fixed specie payments." The Congressional Globe shows that this bill received the most careful consideration. Its first form is printed on page 1587, Congressional Globe, part 2, second session Forty-first Congress.

The first section authorizes the issue of four hundred million of bonds redeemable in coin at the pleasure of the United States at any time after ten years, bearing interest at 5 per cent.

The second section authorizes the issue of bonds to the amount of \$400,000,000, redeemable at the pleasure of the Government at any time after fifteen years, and bearing interest at 4½ per cent.

The third section authorizes the issue of \$400,000,000 of bonds, redeemable at any time after twenty years, and bearing interest at the rate of 4 per cent.

The proceeds of all these bonds were to be applied to the redemption of 5-20 and 10-40 bonds and other obligations of the United States then outstanding.

It will be perceived that this bill provided for the issue of securities all of which were redeemable within twenty years and two-thirds of which were redeemable within fifteen years; so that if the bill as reported by the Committee on Finance had become the law no such difficulty as we now labor under would exist, but four hundred millions of these bonds would be within reach of the Government at this moment, and the four hundred millions would be due within two years.

The bill passed the Senate in substantially the form reported from

the Committee on Finance by the large vote of 33 to 10, and was perhaps the most carefully prepared of any of the financial measures of the Government. In opening the debate I called the attention of the Senate to the great advantage the Government had derived from making its bonds redeemable at brief periods like the 5-20 bonds, the 10-40 bonds, and the Treasury notes. I also called attention to the fact that the same principle of maintaining the right to redeem had been ingrafted in the bill then before the Senate, that the duration of the bonds was divided into three periods of ten, fifteen, and twenty years, during which time, by the gradual application of the surplus revenue, the whole debt might be paid. This was the bill sent by the Senate to the House of Representatives, and if it had been adopted by the House there would be no trouble now about the application of the surplus revenue, but by common consent it would be used in the speedy extinction of the public debt.

The bill was sent to the House of Representatives on the 11th of March, 1870, and there seems to have slept for nearly three months without any action on the part of the House.

On the 6th day of June, 1870, the Committee on Ways and Means reported House bill 2167, covering the same subject-matters as were contained in the Senate bill. The consideration of this bill was commenced by sections on the 30th of June, 1870. The material part of the first section of this bill is as follows:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to issue, in a sum or sums not exceeding in the aggregate \$1,000,000,000 coupon or registered bonds of the United States, in such form as he may prescribe, and of denomination of \$50 or some multiple of that sum, redeemable in coin of the present standard value at the pleasure of the United States after thirty years from the date of their issue, and bearing interest payable semi-annually in such coin at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum.

Thus it will be perceived that instead of the three series of bonds provided by the Senate, the House proposed to authorize the issue of \$1,000,000,000, redeemable in coin after thirty years from the date of their issue, with 4 per cent.; and this difference in the description of the bonds was the chief difference between the proposition of the House and the Senate. To emphasize this difference I will read what was said by the chairman of the House committee reporting the bill:

It is a proposition to refund a portion of the public debt of the country at a very much lower rate of interest. It is a proposition that \$1,000,000,000 of that debt shall take the form of bonds, upon which the United States will agree to pay only 4 per cent. per annum. But in order to make those bonds acceptable to capitalists at home and abroad, further provision is made that the bonds themselves shall have a longer time to run, not merely for thirty years, but that they shall only be redeemable after thirty years; thus giving them, without the objections, the advantages which in a great degree attach to a perpetual loan.

This bill, with a very limited debate, passed the House on the 1st of July, 1870, and then immediately was offered as a substitute for the Senate bill and was adopted.

Those two rival propositions, differing mainly upon the question of the character of the bonds to be issued, were sent to a committee of conference composed on the part of the Senate of Messrs. SHERMAN, Sumner, and Davis. It appears that the chief controversy in the conference was as to the description of funding bonds to be provided for. After many meetings it was finally agreed that the bonds authorized should be \$200,000,000 5 per cent. bonds, \$300,000,000 4½ per cent. bonds of the character described in the Senate bill, and \$1,000,000,000 of 4 per cent. bonds, as described in the House bill. In other words, it was a compromise which, like many other compromises, was in its results an injury of great magnitude, but it was an honest difference of opinion between the Senate and the House, in which, tested by the march of time, the Senate was right and the House was wrong. But it is perfectly manifest that without this concession by the Senate to the House the bill could not have passed, and even with this concession the first report of the committee of conference was disagreed to by the House because of certain provisions requiring the national banks to provide the new bonds as the basis of banking, as circulation. This disagreement by the House compelled a second committee of conference, in which the contested banking section was stricken out and the bill agreed to as it now stands on the statute-books.

And thus thirty-year securities now at a premium of more than 25 per cent. were forced into the law by the determined action of the House. Where the Senator from Kentucky stood on this question, or other gentlemen who now make complaint, I have not stopped to inquire, because I wish to make no personal issue. No doubt the members were honest in their convictions that long 4 per cent. bonds were best for the Government, better than the issue of short bonds bearing 4½ or 5 per cent. interest, but certain it is that the then House of Representatives is responsible for the terms of these bonds, and that I at least am free from this blame, if there be any, and am rather entitled to the credit, whatever it may be, of forming a better estimate as to what was best for the interests of the people of the United States.

Every man now who can see backwards can see what a terrible mistake that was. It makes a difference of one or two hundred millions of dollars. But does any man reproach those in public life who honestly believed that the time would never come when the Government of the United States could borrow money at less than 4 per cent.? They thought so, and I never would reproach them. I do not mention a name; I will not quote their language, because they were as honest as I was in insisting on other terms and conditions.

Mr. President, these are the three things about which I have been arraigned, and a kind of personal attack has been made upon me. The Senator talked about resumption. I do not want to say anything about resumption. Who does not feel that that great work of courage, not only in Congress but in the Departments and among the people, was one of the proud triumphs of our age and generation? I have no apologies to make for it.

As to the silver question, I am perfectly willing to debate it. I am not opposed to silver. I wish to God I could add more than 30 per cent. to the value of every grain of silver in the mines and in the world. The interest of our country is to have both gold and silver. You never can keep them at the present ratio except by doing one of two things, and that the Senator from Kentucky wants to break down. You must maintain the silver dollar at the gold standard by receiving them as gold and hoarding them when they are not readily taken by the people. If you would force the silver dollars now in the Treasury out among the people, you would break down their credit so that they would fall more and more. You therefore have either to maintain them at the gold standard by redeeming them at par with gold or you have got to put more silver in them to make them equal in market value to gold. I do not want to precipitate this question, and do not care to discuss it. The arguments are old. I do not care to have them repeated and printed at every session.

Whenever I can see the way clear, by general consent of the people interested in this product, with the consent of Colorado and Nevada and California, to take any steps to deal with the silver question, I am willing to do it. I think the time may come when we can make the silver production in our country the basis for coin certificates; but then we must buy it at market value; we must not take it at an artificial value. But after all the efforts of our silver friends, by these fierce attempts to get their money into circulation, silver has gone down steadily under this process. I should like to see it advanced, and I believe I can see my way clear to measures which if agreed to by them—reasonable in their character—would bring up silver nearer to its old standard.

When finally a fair ratio is fixed by the commercial nations of the relative value of silver and gold in the world, all we can do is to adopt that ratio and base our action upon it. This Senate and this nation are powerful in many things, but they have not the power to fix the value in anything. You may hold a thing up to a standard of value by receiving it and redeeming it, but you can not make the value of a plate or a bar of iron or a grain of wheat. That is beyond the power of man. It must be fixed by the general market value among commercial nations. I do not intend to be led off into that discussion. Whenever the time comes when a bill of this kind, such as the Senator has introduced, shall be taken up and discussed in an orderly way, so that we can present our views to each other, not in the presence of a captivated audience, not for the purpose of filling the tomes of our RECORD, but for legitimate debate to convince each other as to what is best for our country, I shall be present with my friend from Kentucky prepared to consider the question.

#### ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PALMER. I desire to make a report out of order. I report amendments from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to the bill (S. 2083) to provide for the establishment of a Bureau of Animal Industry, and to facilitate the exportation of live-stock and their products, to extirpate contagious pleuro-pneumonia and other diseases among domestic animals, and for other purposes, and move that they be printed with the original bill. This will supersede the motion that I made yesterday, and I ask the reference of the motion to print the bill and amendments be made to the Committee on Printing.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so referred.

Mr. BLAIR. I present a report from the Committee on Pensions on the bill (S. 373) for the relief of women enrolled as Army nurses, etc., proposing an amendment to the bill, which is already on the Calendar. I ask the Secretary to note a correction in the Calendar entry. The bill is reported with an amendment and not "without amendment," as stated on the Calendar.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was referred the bill (S. 405) providing for the adjustment of accounts of laborers, workmen, and mechanics arising under the eight-hour law, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

#### REPORT OF CAPT. EUGENE GRIFFIN.

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

*Resolved*, That the commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and are hereby, directed to communicate to the Senate a copy of the report of Capt. Eugene Griffin to Maj. William Ludlow, late one of said commissioners, on the subject of electricity as a motor power for street cars, made in January last, and of all papers connected therewith.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 2017) to incorporate the Rock Creek Railway Company of the District of Columbia was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The bill (H. R. 5373) to change the location of a certain alley in the city of Washington was read twice by its title.

Mr. VANCE. I desire to have that bill lie on the table, with a view of substituting it for a bill already reported in this body.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If the Senator desires to substitute this for the bill on the Calendar, that can be done, and the Senate bill indefinitely postponed.

Mr. VANCE. The Senate bill is in precisely the same words as the House bill. It is the bill (S. 1519) to change the location of a certain alley in the city of Washington. I move that it be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The House bill 5373 having been read twice, will be substituted on the Calendar for the bill just disposed of.

The bill (H. R. 4601) to amend the naval record of Nicholas Leuschen, Peter Leuschen, and Loth Possum was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 5617) to provide for the leasing of premises for the Washington city post-office was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The bill (H. R. 6591) for the relief of S. Dillinger & Sons was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The bill (H. R. 8309) to secure for the District of Columbia a compilation of the laws of said District was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### VALUATION OF IMPORTED MERCHANDISE.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the regular order be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The unfinished business will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 977) to regulate the importation of foreign merchandise and to secure uniformity in the classification and valuation thereof, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to say one word respecting this bill. I give notice that to-morrow morning, after the morning business shall have been concluded, I will ask the Senate to proceed with the consideration of the pending bill, hoping that we may conclude its consideration to-morrow. I now move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 14, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, March 13, 1888.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by Rev. J. H. CUTHBERT D. D., of Washington, D. C.

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

#### SIGNAL CORPS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief Signal Officer, a draught and recommending the passage of a bill to make enlisted men of the Signal Corps responsible for public property; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

#### FORT MEADE, DAK.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Secretary of War of appropriation for purchase of land near Fort Meade, Dak., for the purpose of obtaining a water supply; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

#### HOT SPRINGS, ARK.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the joint resolution (H. Res. 117) to enable the Secretary of the Interior to utilize the hot water now running to waste on the permanent reservation at Hot Springs, Ark., and for other purposes, with Senate amendments; and a message from the Senate that it insisted upon its amendments to the joint resolution, agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. TELLER, Mr. PADDOCK, and Mr. WALTHALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MORGAN for ten days, on account of sickness in his family.

#### REPRINT OF BILL.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the following request:

Mr. STEELE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, states that the bill (H. R. 6106) for the relief of certain volunteer soldiers is exhausted, and to accommodate members asks that a reprint of said bill be ordered.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

#### WASHINGTON CITY POST-OFFICE.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous con-

sent that the Committee of the Whole be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5617) to provide for the lease of premises for the Washington city post-office, and that the bill be now put upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Postmaster-General be empowered to lease suitable premises in the city of Washington for the purposes of the Washington city post-office.

Mr. RANDALL. I think there ought to be some statement in reference to the necessity for that.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Illinois. Let the report be read.

The report (by Mr. ANDERSON, of Illinois) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads reports back the bill (H. R. 5617) to empower the Postmaster-General to lease suitable premises in the city of Washington for the purposes of the city post-office, and recommends its passage.

Under the present law buildings for post-offices of the first and second classes, except within the District of Columbia, can be leased by the Department in the name of the United States for such term of years as may be agreed upon. These leases are usually made for a term of five years, although the Department has no power to bind the United States for a longer term than the period of the appropriation.

Within the District of Columbia, however, the act of March 3, 1877, does not permit a contract to be made for the rental of any building to be used for the purposes of the Government until an appropriation therefor shall have been made in terms by Congress. The present bill simply brings the rental of buildings in the District of Columbia under the law applicable to leasing of buildings for post-offices. The present condition of the city post-office renders this necessary.

In the opinion of your committee the Washington city post-office, though conveniently located, is in a building insufficient and unsuitable for its proper requirements. The building is not owned by the Government and no continuing lease of it exists. Since the beginning of the present fiscal year the proprietor of this building has demanded double the rent previously paid. As the Department has no authority to lease suitable buildings, the post-office is continuing in this building under the demand for double the rent formerly paid, although the payment of the increase asked for has been refused.

To relieve the present embarrassment the committee recommends the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. PEEL. With the understanding that if the bill provokes discussion it shall be withdrawn, I will not object.

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

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on Appropriations was discharged from the further consideration of the communication from the Secretary of the Treasury in relation to hand and steam presses in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and it was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### FIRE-PROOF BUILDING AT SPRINGFIELD ARMORY.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5639) to provide for the erection of a fire-proof workshop at the Springfield Armory, and that it be now put upon its passage. Yesterday the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. STONE], through a misunderstanding, objected to the consideration of the bill, but he is now willing to withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BLAND. I shall not object to the consideration of the bill; but, as I said yesterday, if it is to be considered I want to debate it. I am not willing that these bills for the construction of public buildings shall pass without discussion.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

Mr. PEEL. If the bill is to be debated, I shall have to object.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I trust the gentleman will not object. Two bills from the other side of the House have been passed this morning, and there is no objection at all to this bill. It is not for the erection of a post-office or court building, and it will not take more than three minutes to dispose of it.

Mr. PEEL. I understand the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] to say that there will be discussion of the bill.

Mr. BLAND. I stated yesterday that I did not propose to stand here and object to every such bill, but I do intend that they shall not pass without discussion.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. PEEL. I object.

#### S. DILLINGER & SONS.

Mr. McCULLOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6591) for the relief of S. Dillinger & Sons.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to S. Dillinger & Sons, of Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the

sum of \$511.20; the same being money paid for stamps for distilled spirits on the 17th day of June, 1881, which said spirits were destroyed by fire on the same day before said stamps were received at the distillery.

The report (by Mr. McCULLOGH) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6591) for the relief of S. Dillinger & Sons, have had the same under consideration, and respectfully report as follows:

On the 16th day of June, 1881, S. Dillinger & Sons, then engaged in the business of distilling grain, purchased from the collector of internal revenue for the Twenty-second Pennsylvania district revenue stamps of the value of \$396.90 for eleven packages of distilled spirits. On the morning of the 17th, before these stamps were attached, the packages for which they were bought were destroyed by fire. Application was made to the Treasury Department for repayment of the money, and the purchased stamps were submitted with the other papers, and are now in the Department. To this application the Commissioner of Internal Revenue made the following response:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE,

"Washington, May 22, 1882.

"SIR: The claims of S. Dillinger & Sons, for the refunding of \$208.80 and \$188.10, respectively, taxes paid on spirits alleged to have been destroyed by fire, have been rejected by the honorable Secretary of the Treasury. The money in payment for the stamps was received by the collector June 16, 1881, and the spirits were destroyed June 17, 1881.

"The Secretary decides 'that under section 3295 (Rev. Stat.) payment for stamps is held \* \* \* to be a payment of the tax, and that section 3221 (Rev. Stat.) authorizes relief by abatement only in case of loss before payment, or by refunding only in case of the collection of the tax after the destruction, and this case does not come under either category.'

"The Secretary adds that 'the claimants must apply to Congress for relief, and can take their claims there with the emphatic recommendation of this Department.'

"Respectfully,

"GREEN B. RAUM, Commissioner."

In view of the facts stated, the committee recommend the passage of the bill, with an amendment, by striking out the words "five hundred and eleven dollars and twenty cents," in the sixth and seventh lines, and inserting "three hundred and ninety-six dollars and ninety cents." The amount stated in the bill includes interest. The amount proposed to be inserted is the actual sum paid for the stamps, without interest.

The amendment reported by the Committee on Claims was agreed to. There being no objection, the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### NICKOLAS LEUSCHEN AND OTHERS.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up and consider at this time the bill (H. R. 4601) to amend the naval record of Nickolas Leuschen, Peter Leuschen, etc. The bill involves no appropriation of money. It is simply designed to rectify the record of three enlisted men of the United States Navy during the war.

The bill was read, as follows:

Whereas Nickolas Leuschen, Peter Leuschen, and Loth Possum, citizens of the United States and residents of Erie, Pa., did, on the 13th day of July, A. D. 1864, enlist at Erie, Pa., as volunteers in the United States Navy for three years or during the war; and

Whereas they were taken to Buffalo, in the State of New York, and there, without their knowledge or consent, sold as substitutes, so that their names now appear on the records of the Bureau of Equipment and Recruiting as substitutes, credited as such to the Thirtieth Congressional district, in the State of New York, instead of as volunteers from the Twenty-seventh Congressional district, in the State of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas they were honorably discharged at the expiration of their three years of service: Therefore,

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause the names of Nickolas Leuschen, Peter Leuschen, and Loth Possum to be entered on the appropriate records of the Navy Department as volunteers, enlisted in the United States Navy July 13, 1864, at Erie, Pa., and to cause them to be credited to the Twenty-seventh Congressional district of the State of Pennsylvania.

SEC. 2. That they are hereby restored to the standing and to all the rights, privileges, advantages, immunities, and emoluments, past, present, and prospective now enjoyed or to be hereafter enjoyed by volunteer soldiers and sailors of the United States.

The report (by Mr. WISE) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4601) to correct the naval record of Nickolas Leuschen, Peter Leuschen, and Loth Possum, report as follows:

That the petition of Nickolas Leuschen, Peter Leuschen, and Loth Possum represents that they enlisted at Erie, Pa., on the 13th day of July, 1864, as volunteers in the United States Navy for three years or during the war. Several days after their enlistment they were examined by Inspecting Surgeon Charles Justice and mustered into the service by James Cummins, both of whom are now living at Erie, Pa. Subsequently they were put aboard the United States receiving-ship North Carolina, then lying at the Brooklyn navy-yard.

About the 20th of September of the same year they were transferred to the United States transport Kensington, when, for the first time, they discovered that they had been sold as substitutes, which deprived them of their rights and standing in the naval service of the United States as volunteers. They reported the discovery at once to the commander of the North Carolina, who advised them to do nothing and remain silent until the Kensington had reached her destination, when he assured them justice would be done them.

Since that time they have made repeated efforts to secure from the Government that recognition which they considered due to them as volunteers; but all their efforts have thus far failed. The Navy Department records show that they were enlisted as substitutes and not as volunteers, and the Department has no authority to correct those records.

The following is an extract from a letter from Hon. William C. Whitney, Secretary of the Navy, under date of February 14, 1883:

"In reply I have the honor to state that the records of the Bureau of Equipment and Recruiting show that Nickolas Leuschen, Peter Leuschen, and Loth Possum were enlisted in July, 1864, at Buffalo, N. Y., for three years, as substitutes, and that they were credited as such to the Thirtieth Congressional district of New York. The names of the persons for whom they became substi-

tutes were not reported to the bureau in connection with their enlistment, and no information appears upon the records of the Department in relation to the alleged deception practiced in their cases, whereby they were enlisted as substitutes instead of volunteers. \* \* \* That, as the names of the persons for whom they became substitutes were not reported to the Bureau of Equipment and Recruiting, the Department is inclined to give due weight to their statements concerning the manner in which their enlistment was procured, and to regard their claims as deserving of favorable consideration.

A number of citizens of Erie, Pa., where the brothers Leuschen reside, certify that they are personally acquainted with them and know them to be men of excellent character and undoubted integrity. Strong Vincent Post, No. 67, and Robert Wainwright Scott Post, No. 464, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, unite in asking that the records of their service be made to conform to the facts.

The statements contained in the petition have been corroborated by representations made by Hon. W. L. Scott, member of Congress from Erie (Pa.) district, who knows the parties named in the bill and was conversant with the facts at the time of their enlistment, and the injustice done them. He also knows them to be men of character and integrity.

With the petition, the substance of which has been given above, the affidavits of William Taylor and Charles Justice were filed. The former was the officer who enlisted Nickolas and Peter Leuschen and Loth Possum, and the latter was the inspecting surgeon who examined and passed them. Copies of these affidavits are appended.

The committee are satisfied that these men were the victims of a foul conspiracy, and recommend the passage of the bill.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, Erie County, ss:

Personally appeared before me, an alderman, *ex officio* justice of the peace in and for the city of Erie, Pa., Charles Justice, who, being duly sworn according to law, deposed and saith that his home is at Erie, Pa.; that he is personally acquainted with Nickolas and Peter Leuschen and Loth Possum, and that he knew them in 1864; that in July, 1864, he was inspecting surgeon at the naval rendezvous at Buffalo, N. Y.; that in that capacity he examined and passed Nickolas and Peter Leuschen and Loth Possum; that at that time he knew that said N. and P. Leuschen and L. Possum had enlisted in the United States naval service as volunteers, and that a fraud was being perpetrated upon them at Buffalo, N. Y., and that when he attempted to protest and expostulate he was commanded by his superiors to attend strictly to his own business.

CHARLES JUSTICE.

Sworn and subscribed to before me this 13th day of February, 1888.

[SEAL.]

DANIEL McMAHON, Alderman.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,

Erie County, ss:

Personally appeared before me, an alderman, *ex officio* justice of the peace in and for the city of Erie, Pa., William Taylor, who, being duly sworn according to law, deposed and saith that his home is at Erie, Pa.; that he is well acquainted with Nickolas and Peter Leuschen and Loth Possum, and that he knew them in the year 1864; that in the year 1864 he, said William Taylor, was the United States enlisting officer at Erie, Pa., and that in that capacity he enlisted Nickolas and Peter Leuschen and Loth Possum, in the month of July, 1864, as volunteers for the naval service of the United States.

WILLIAM TAYLOR.

Sworn and subscribed to before me this 13th day of February, 1888.

[SEAL.]

DANIEL McMAHON, Alderman.

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

Mr. PEEL. If it is understood that the bill will be withdrawn if it provokes discussion I shall not object.

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

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. PEEL. Regular order.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up and consider at this time the bill which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PEEL] demands the regular order.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. This bill will take but a moment. It simply grants a right of way through a military reservation. It will not lead to debate.

Mr. PEEL. It would take half an hour to read a right-of-way bill.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Oh, no.

Mr. PEEL. Mr. Speaker, I shall be compelled to demand the regular order. This day has been assigned for business reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, and if we let it be frittered away in this manner we shall not get anything done.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order is demanded. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

REGULAR MEETINGS OF CONGRESS.

Mr. OATES, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 1290) to fix the times for the regular meetings of Congress; which was referred to the House Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

Mr. OATES. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS] desires to file the views of a minority of the committee on this bill. I ask that leave be given for that purpose.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. In the absence of objection, that leave will be granted.

JOHN W. MEARS.

Mr. CASWELL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 3235) to restore to John W. Mears a fine improperly imposed on him; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MERCHANTS' NATIONAL BANK OF POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y.

Mr. BACON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported as a substitute for House bill 932 a bill (H. R. 8464) for the relief of the Merchants' National Bank of Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bill 932 was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

COINAGE OF DOUBLE EAGLES, ETC.

Mr. BLAND, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 7409) limiting the coinage of double eagles and discontinuing the coinage of certain United States coins; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC DEFENSE.

Mr. CUTCHEON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported, in lieu of House bills 1555 and 4297, a bill (H. R. 8465) to provide for the public defense; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. SAYERS. I desire to reserve all points of order on this bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That reservation will be noted.

House bills 1555 and 4297, in lieu of which House bill 8465 was reported, were, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

SALE OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Mr. MAISH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 6145) authorizing and directing the sale of certain property belonging to the United States situate in Pittsburgh, Pa.; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PAY OF ENSIGNS, UNITED STATES NAVY.

Mr. WISE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4465) to regulate the pay of ensigns of the United States Navy; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. HERBERT. I ask leave to file the views of a minority of the Committee on Naval Affairs upon this bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. In the absence of objection, leave will be granted.

SALE OF LAND IN HOUSTON, TEX.

Mr. LAFFOON, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5690) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell block of land 108 in the city of Houston, Tex.; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADMISSION OF NEW STATES.

Mr. SPRINGER, from the Committee on the Territories, reported back, in lieu of House bills 1276, 1955, 4430, and 4431, a bill (H. R. 8466) to enable the people of Dakota, Montana, Washington, and New Mexico to form constitutions and State governments, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

House bills 1276, 1955, 4430, and 4431 were, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to ask leave that a minority of the Committee on Territories may file, to be printed in connection with the report of the committee, their views on the bill just referred to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STRUBLE. I expect, on behalf of a minority of the committee, to file their views during the day.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. In the absence of objection, leave to file the views of the minority will be granted.

APPRAISER'S WAREHOUSE, CHICAGO.

Mr. DIBBLE, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported, in lieu of House bills 4938 and 4941, a bill (H. R. 8467) to further provide for an appraiser's warehouse at Chicago, Ill.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The bills H. R. 4938 and H. R. 4941 were ordered to be laid on the table.

PUBLIC BUILDING, FORT WORTH, TEX.

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 1875) for the erection of a public building at Fort Worth, Tex.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, GALESBURGH, ILL.

Mr. POST, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7038) for the erection of a pub-

lic building at the city of Galesburgh, Ill.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, DAVENPORT, IOWA.

Mr. POST also, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported, as a substitute for House bill 7044, a bill (H. R. 8468) for the erection of a public building at Davenport, Iowa; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The bill H. R. 7044 was ordered to be laid on the table.

CYRENIUS G. STRYKER.

Mr. PIDCOCK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5234) granting a pension to Cyrenius G. Stryker; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ALETTA V. QUICK.

Mr. PIDCOCK also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7181) granting a pension to Aletta V. Quick; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

GEORGE E. OLIPHANT.

Mr. MATSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 2167) for the relief of George E. Oliphant; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN E. SMITH.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 130) granting a pension to John E. Smith; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PETER CLARK, JR.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6971) to pension Peter Clark, jr.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

HANNAH VARQUISON.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 431) granting a pension to Hannah Varquison; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM J. MILLER.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 4519) to grant a pension to William J. Miller; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ISAAC DILLEY.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7171) to restore to the pension-roll the name of Isaac Dilley; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JULIET G. HOWE.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 8117) granting a pension to Mrs. Juliet G. Howe; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF THE PENSION LAWS.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 4953) to amend paragraph 3 of section 4693 of the Revised Statutes, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

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

A bill (H. R. 5950) to increase the pension of John Smith; and

A bill (H. R. 3184) granting a pension to John P. Schmitz.

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

A bill (H. R. 2415) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary A. Bailey; and

A bill (H. R. 4108) granting a pension to Lucinda Belcher.

NELLIE PALFREY GOODWIN.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 7913) granting a pension to Nellie Palfrey Goodwin; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ABBIE R. BROWN.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 7642) granting a pension to Abbie R. Brown; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

HANNAH H. GRANT.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 7466) granting a pension to Hannah H. Grant; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CHARLES F. WARD.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 6520) to increase the pension of Charles F. Ward; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the amendments and accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. MERCY KNIGHT.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 2413) granting a pension to Mrs. Mercy Knight; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

FRANK LEWIS.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 7574) granting a pension to Frank Lewis; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ALOURED H. GREGORY.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 5311) granting a pension to Aloured H. Gregory; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the amendments and accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ALPHEUS DYER.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 4891) granting a pension to Alpheus Dyer; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

EPHRAIM REYNOLDS.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 809) granting a pension to Ephraim Reynolds; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JESSE H. STRICKLAND.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendments the bill (S. 381) for the relief of Jesse H. Strickland; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the amendments and accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELIZABETH TWIGG.

Mr. SPOONER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 5847) granting a pension to Elizabeth Twigg; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

HENRY B. VERY.

Mr. SPOONER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (S. 173) granting a pension to Henry B. Very; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. ARABELLA CODDINGTON.

Mr. SPOONER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (S. 293) granting a pension to Mrs. Arabella Coddington; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## HENRY STAFFORD.

Mr. SPOONER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (S. 679) granting a pension to Henry Stafford; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## JAMES M. M'KUHAN.

Mr. HUNTER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 6576) for the relief of James M. McKuhan; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## JAMES L. ALSIP.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 6575) for the relief of James L. Alsip; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## JOHN WITHAM.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 6845) granting a pension to John Witham; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## MILTON JUDD.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 3712) increasing the pension of Milton Judd; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## MARY O'NEILL.

Mr. FRENCH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 3745) granting a pension to Mary O'Neill; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## ELIZABETH BURR.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 488) granting a pension to Elizabeth Burr; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## DOLLY BLAZER.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 3959) granting a pension to Dolly Blazer; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## LIZZIE WRIGHT OWEN.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (S. 42) granting a pension to Lizzie Wright Owen; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## JOHANNA LOEWINGER.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (S. 739) granting a pension to Johanna Loewinger; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## BERRY DAY.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (S. 737) granting a pension to Berry Day; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## ELIZA DOUGLASS.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (S. 339) granting a pension to Eliza Douglass; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## CHARLES F. ALLGOWER.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (S. 334) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Allgower; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## REUBEN BROWNMILLER.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (S. 333) granting a pension to Reuben Brownmiller; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## JOHN KALBFLEISCH.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (S. 331) granting a pension to John Kalbfleisch; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## C. R. THOMAS.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported with amendments the bill (S. 335) granting an increase of pension to C. R. Thomas; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## ENOS J. SEARLES.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported with an amendment the bill (S. 738) granting a pension to the guardian of Enos J. Searles, of Clermont, Ohio; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## MARY E. JOHNSON.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported with an amendment a bill (S. 337) granting a pension to Mary E. Johnson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## MANON VANGORDON.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with an amendment the bill (S. 330) granting a pension to Manon Vangordon; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## DEPENDENT PARENTS' PENSIONS.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with an amendment the bill (H. R. 1688) relating to claims for pensions by dependent parents; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## CLARISSA G. GREEN.

Mr. SAWYER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 8266) for the relief of Mrs. Clarissa G. Green; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## LYDIA A. HICKS.

Mr. SAWYER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 8260) granting a pension to Lydia A. Hicks; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. SAWYER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back adversely the bill (S. 824) granting a pension to John Geibel; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, with an adverse recommendation.

## CASPAR SEIBEL.

Mr. YODER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 3922) to place the name of Caspar Seibel on the pension-roll; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## JACOB BEHR.

Mr. YODER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4864) to place the name of Jacob Behr on the pension-roll; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## MARY M. SWEET.

Mr. YODER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 955) granting a pension to Mary M. Sweet; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## JAMES E. POETER.

Mr. YODER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6552) to increase the pension of James

R. Porter; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

REBECCA E. SHOEMAKER.

Mr. YODER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6990) to place the name of Rebecca E. Shoemaker on the pension-roll; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN GERMAN.

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 3504) for the relief of John German; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

DAVID JOHNSON.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5363) granting a pension to David Johnson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN E. LEWIS.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7665) granting a pension to John E. Lewis; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JULIA TRIGGS.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5752) for the relief of Julia Triggs; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARGARET M. HATCH.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5751) for the relief of Margaret M. Hatch; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARTHA GRAY.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 2071) for the relief of Martha Gray; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CYNTHIA J. LEROY.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7891) for the relief of Cynthia J. Leroy; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM RICHARDSON.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1638) granting a pension to William Richardson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARY H. NICHOLSON.

Mr. CHIPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 6317) for the relief of Mary H. Nicholson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

HENRY L. POTTER.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 7857) to increase the pension of Henry L. Potter; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN TAYLOR.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 2656) to increase the pension of John Taylor; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELISHA GRISWOLD.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 835) for the relief of Elisha Griswold; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHANNA ECKHARDT.

Mr. BLISS, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 2116) granting a pension to Johanna Eckhardt; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LEWIS DAVIS.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5903) for the relief of Lewis Davis, a soldier of the war of 1812; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back adversely the petition of Thomas Shackelford to be placed on the pension-roll; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

W. A. LEMASTER.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 647) for the relief of W. A. Lemaster; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

GEORGE KINCAID.

Mr. FINLEY, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7719) granting an increase of pension to George Kincaid; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM COMPTON.

Mr. FINLEY also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6574) for the relief of William Compton; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

M. M. GIBSON.

Mr. LANHAM, from the Committee on Claims, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 8012) for the relief of M. M. Gibson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN M. HIGGS.

Mr. LANHAM also, from the Committee on Claims, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 8102) for the relief of John M. Higgs; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

C. L. WILSON.

Mr. LANHAM also, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7232) for the relief of C. L. Wilson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

STATE NATIONAL BANK OF NEW ORLEANS.

Mr. SHAW, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 3715) for the relief of the State National Bank of New Orleans, formerly Louisiana State Bank; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

COMMISSIONS DUE OWNERS OF PRIVATE DIES.

Mr. SHAW also, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 1268) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury and the proper accounting officers to restate, settle, and pay to the owners of private dies the balance of commissions due them; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report ordered, to be printed.

M. C. MORDECAI.

Mr. SHAW also, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5405) for the relief of M. C. Mordecai; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN FINN.

Mr. MANSUR, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 2573) for the relief of John Finn; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES OF JAMES HALE.

Mr. MANSUR also, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7363) for the relief of the legal representatives of James Hale; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN T. JOHNSTON.

Mr. MANSUR also, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6298) for the relief of John T. Johnston; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MICHAEL PIGGOTT.

Mr. MANSUR also, from the Committee on Claims, reported back



adversely the bill (H. R. 5362) for the relief of Michael Piggott; which was laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, reported a bill (H. R. 8469) for the relief of Michael Piggott; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

NEWTON M'COY.

Mr. MANSUR also, from the Committee on Claims, reported a bill (H. R. 8470) for the relief of Newton McCoy; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JAMES OBRION.

Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6602) for the relief of James Obrion; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM DOLTON.

Mr. McCULLOGH, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 914) referring the claim of William Dolton to the Court of Claims; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

E. G. HUSTON & CO.

Mr. McCULLOGH also, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4702) for the relief of R. G. Huston & Co.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JACOB KERN.

Mr. McCULLOGH also, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7176) for the relief of Jacob Kern; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CAPT. J. W. KOUNTZ.

Mr. McCULLOGH also, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 2865) for the relief of Capt. J. W. Kountz; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CHARLES MURPHY.

Mr. McCULLOGH also, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 2042) for the relief of Charles Murphy; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

THOMAS P. MORGAN, JR.

Mr. BOWDEN, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill, H. R. 3743, for the relief of Thomas P. Morgan, jr.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The bill H. R. 3743 was ordered to be laid on the table.

JENNIE D. RICE.

Mr. LAIDLAW, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 3722) for the relief of Jennie D. Rice; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELIZABETH MULVEHILL.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8002) for the relief of Elizabeth Mulvehill; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM LAVERY.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 610) for the relief of William Lavery; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ST. JOSEPH'S COMMERCIAL COLLEGE, MISSOURI.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 5426) for the relief of St. Joseph's Commercial College, at St. Joseph, Mo.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

W. H. BOYD.

Mr. BROWER, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5888) for the relief of W. H. Boyd; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. A. SHIRLEY.

Mr. BROWER also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8133) for the relief of Mrs. A. Shirley; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOSEPH B. M'CLINTOCK.

Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8313) for the relief of Joseph B. McClintock; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SEVENTH REGIMENT TENNESSEE INFANTRY.

Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin, also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 1068) for the relief of the officers and soldiers of the Seventh Regiment Tennessee Infantry; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SAMUEL HOWARD.

Mr. WILKINSON, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7809) for the relief of Samuel Howard; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. CROUSE, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 455) for the relief of Albert D. Spalter; which was ordered to be laid on the table and the accompanying report printed.

SARAH M. LARIMER.

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 777) to compensate Mrs. Sarah M. Larimer for important services rendered the military authorities, in 1864, at Bear Creek Station, Wyoming, and for loss of property taken by Sioux Indians; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

EXTRA PAY TO CERTAIN VOLUNTEERS.

Mr. STEELE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 1398) allowing extra pay to certain volunteer officers of the late war; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MIAMI INDIANS, INDIANA.

Mr. COBB, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported back with adverse recommendation the bill (H. R. 2099) to reimburse the Miami Indians of Indiana for moneys improperly taken from them; which, with the adverse report, was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. NELSON asked and obtained leave to file the views of the minority, to accompany the report of the committee on said bill.

PUBLIC BUILDING, PUEBLO, COLO.

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 1264) for the erection of a public building at Pueblo, Colo.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LIFE-SAVING STATIONS.

Mr. TARSNEY, from the Committee on Commerce, reported, as a substitute for the bill (H. R. 6684) establishing additional life-saving stations on the Atlantic coast of the United States, a bill (H. R. 8505) establishing a life-saving station on the Atlantic coast, between Indian River Inlet, Delaware, and Ocean City, Md.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed. The bill H. R. 6684 was laid on the table.

SECTION 4414, REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. TARSNEY also, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 5640) to amend section 4414 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the amendments and accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ANDREW S. CORE.

Mr. BLISS, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 4148) for the relief of Andrew S. Core; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the amendments and accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

G. B. HORWITZ.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 2429) for the relief of G. B. Horwitz; which was referred to the Committee

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

#### SUBDIVISION OF LAND IN THE DISTRICT.

Mr. HEARD, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported back with a favorable recommendation of the bill (H. R. 3329) to regulate the subdivision of land within the District of Columbia; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### \* RECORDS OF THE REBELLION.

Mr. HOOKER. I am instructed by the unanimous action of the Committee on Military Affairs to report back with a favorable recommendation of the resolution which I send to the desk; and I ask for its present consideration.

The resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs on March 5, on motion of Mr. GROSVENOR, was read, as follows:

Whereas the House of Representatives did, on the 12th day of January, 1888, request the Secretary of War to inform the House whether, among other things, there had been any departure in the compilation of the Records of the War of the Rebellion as now carried on from the plan adopted when the work of compilation was in charge of the late Lieut. Col. R. N. Scott, "either in the arrangement or the subject-matter to be published;" to which, on February 14, 1888, the Secretary of War replied, upon the authority of the compiler, Lieut. Col. H. M. Lazelle, that there had been no change, but that in both the arrangement and the subject-matter to be published the former "instructions and requirements have been rigidly observed;" and

Whereas there is now good reason for the belief that unofficial matter, which contradicts the real official history of the transaction to which it relates, has been adopted as official and inserted in volume 20, part 2, of the Records of the War of the Rebellion: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be, and it is hereby, instructed to ascertain whether unofficial matter has been introduced into the said volume of the War Records; and if so introduced, under what circumstances and by whose authority it was done, and to report all the facts in the case to the House of Representatives.

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman from Mississippi give some explanation as to this?

Mr. HOOKER. This is a resolution which was introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR]. The committee can not make the investigation until the resolution is adopted, and that is the recommendation of the committee.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. HOOKER 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.

#### INVESTIGATION OF TRUSTS.

Mr. BUCHANAN. On behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Manufactures, who is necessarily absent, I desire to offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and which by the vote of the committee he was instructed to offer, and to ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures be authorized to have printed such documents and testimony taken before it as it may deem necessary in connection with the investigation ordered to be made by the said committee during the present Congress.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. BUCHANAN 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.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. COGSWELL, by unanimous consent, obtained indefinite leave of absence on account of sickness.

#### LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. LANDES, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to extend in the RECORD his remarks on Senate bill 418.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will now call the committees for one hour for the consideration of bills.

Mr. PEEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the consideration hour be dispensed with.

Mr. WILKINS. I object.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Objection is made. The hour begins at twenty minutes past 1 o'clock. The call rests with the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

Mr. WILKINS. I withdraw my objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. DINGLEY. I renew the objection.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] renews the objection. The call is with the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Pacific Railroads be passed for this day, with the privilege of taking up its business again when called.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

#### BUSINESS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR.

Mr. TARSNEY (when the Committee on Labor was called) submitted the following resolution:

Resolved, That Tuesday and Wednesday, March 20 and 21, immediately after the reading of the Journal, and also Wednesday, April 18, and Wednesday, May 16, be set apart for the consideration of labor bills, and that all speeches be limited to fifteen minutes; not to interfere with revenue or appropriation bills.

Mr. HOLMAN. I suppose this resolution is submitted for reference.

Mr. TARSNEY. I would be very glad to have it passed upon at this time; but if that can not be done, let it go to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. WILKINS. Let it be referred to the Committee on Rules.

There was no objection, and the resolution was so referred.

Mr. TARSNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask on behalf of the Committee on Labor that that committee be permitted to retain its place in the call. I make this request because the chairman of the committee is absent from the city—weather-bound in Philadelphia.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

#### MILITIA OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MCADOO (when the Committee on the Militia was called). Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the Militia, I call up for present consideration the bill (H. R. 4961) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the more effectual organization of the militia of the District of Columbia," passed March 3, 1803. The bill does not make any appropriation of money, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House under the five-minute rule.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4961) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the more effectual organization of the militia of the District of Columbia," passed March 3, 1803.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCADOO], that this bill be considered in the House under the five-minute rule?

Mr. PEEL. Regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. This is the regular order, in the opinion of the Chair, during this hour. Does the gentleman from Arkansas object to the mode of consideration proposed by the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. PEEL. No, sir.

There was no objection, and the request of Mr. MCADOO was agreed to.

Mr. MCADOO. I now move to dispense with the first reading of the bill. I will then make a brief statement of its provisions, and also ask to have the report read.

The motion to dispense with the first reading of the bill was agreed to.

The report (by Mr. MCADOO) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Militia, to whom was referred for consideration House bill 4961, to provide for the organization of the militia of the District of Columbia, having considered the same, beg leave to report as follows:

All measures relating to the militia are important. The militia are the popular and constitutional military defenders of the Republic. The founders of the Republic, jealous of a large standing army, made special constitutional provision for the militia. The citizen soldiery of the country have ever been on the side of liberty, and while defending just laws, preserving peace, and defending against foreign invasion, have never been the instruments of tyrants nor the destroyers of free States. This bill places the militia of the District of Columbia on the same footing as those of the several States.

The existing militia law for the District of Columbia was enacted in 1803. When that law was enacted the enrolled militia, which included every citizen between eighteen and forty-five years of age, was the essential and recognized military reserve of the country, and the law for the District of Columbia, like the laws of all the States, was framed with a view to instructing and utilizing it. As the population of the country increased, the necessity of requiring active duty from the whole body of the enrolled militia decreased and became well-nigh impracticable, and the States successively repealed the old militia laws and substituted laws recognizing and providing for volunteer militia. In the District of Columbia the old law still remains in existence, though its provisions have been utterly disregarded for many years, and the law has become not only obsolete, but impracticable.

It being an axiom, recognized in the Constitution of our country, that a well-regulated militia is necessary to the security of a republic, it would seem proper that at the capital of the Republic the militia should be made a model organization, and that the necessary legislation should be enacted to repeal these obsolete laws. The fact that the militia of the District of Columbia might be, in case of need, a protection for the enormous amount of public property accumulated here, and in any and every crisis the first defenders of the capital, makes it proper and desirable that the Government should extend to the militia of the District the same aid and encouragement that is extended by the States to their local organizations.

Although the proposed bill is long and apparently elaborate, it contains only the usual and necessary provisions that are included in the militia codes of nearly all the States. The bill carries with it no appropriation of money. Expenditures, other than issues from the regular stores of the Army, it is provided shall be estimated for in the annual estimate of appropriations for the District of Columbia, and thereby will be at all times within the control of Congress.

The bill has been examined and approved by the War Department, is urged by the existing militia organizations of the District, and the committee report back the bill with amendments, striking out section 53, adding a section to repeal the old law, and amending the title, and recommend that the bill as thus amended do pass.

Mr. MCADOO. Mr. Speaker, I will briefly explain the amendment. The sixty-third section of the bill excused from jury duty certain honorary members of the militia of the District of Columbia. It provided as follows:

That each company of the National Guard shall be entitled to enroll not exceeding twenty honorary members, who, upon the payment into the treasury

of said company of not less than \$25 annually, shall be exempt from active militia duty and jury duty, upon the exhibition of a receipt for such payment, for one year from the date thereof.

The committee thought this provision unwise, because we should have our very best citizens in the jury-box; and no one, by the simple payment of \$25 per annum, should secure exemption from the performance of this important function of a citizen.

I now reserve the residue of my time, and ask that the bill be read by paragraphs for amendment.

The Clerk, proceeding to read the bill by sections for amendment, read down to and including section 63, as follows:

*As it enacted, etc.* That every able-bodied male citizen resident within the District of Columbia, of the age of eighteen years and under the age of forty-five years, excepting persons exempted by section 2, and idiots, lunatics, common drunkards, vagabonds, paupers, and persons convicted of any infamous crime, shall be enrolled in the militia. Persons so convicted after enrollment shall forthwith be dis-enrolled; and in all cases of doubt respecting the age of a person enrolled, the burden of proof shall be upon him.

SEC. 2. That in addition to the persons exempted from enrollment in the militia by the general laws of the United States, the following persons shall also be exempted from enrollment in the militia of the District of Columbia, namely: Officers of the government of the District of Columbia; judges and officers of the courts of the District of Columbia; officers who have held commissions in the regular or volunteer Army or Navy of the United States; officers who have served for a period of five years in the militia of the District of Columbia or of any State of the United States; ministers of the gospel; practicing physicians; conductors and engine-drivers of railroad trains; members of the paid police and fire department.

SEC. 3. That the commissioners of the District of Columbia shall provide for the enrollment of the militia, and for this purpose may require the assessors of taxes, at the same time they are engaged in taking the assessment of valuation of real and personal property, to make a list of persons liable to enrollment; and such record shall be deemed a sufficient notification to all persons whose names are thus recorded that they have been enrolled in the militia. Immediately after the completion of each enrollment they shall furnish the commanding general of the militia with a copy of the same.

SEC. 4. That the enrolled militia shall not be subject to any duty except when called into the service of the United States, or to aid the civil authorities in the execution of the laws or suppression of riots.

SEC. 5. That whenever it shall be necessary to call out any portion of the enrolled militia the commander-in-chief shall order out, by draft or otherwise, or accept as volunteers as many as required. Every member of the enrolled militia who volunteers, or who is ordered out or drafted under the provisions of this act, who does not appear at the time and place designated, may be arrested by order of the commanding general and be tried and punished by a court-martial. The portion of the enrolled militia ordered out or accepted shall be mustered into service for such period as may be required, and the commanding general may assign them to existing organizations of the active militia, or may organize them as the exigencies of the occasion may require.

SEC. 6. That the President of the United States shall be the commander-in-chief of the militia of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 7. That there shall be appointed and commissioned by the President of the United States a commanding general of the militia of the District of Columbia, with the rank of brigadier-general, who shall hold office until his successor is appointed and qualified, but may be removed at any time by the President.

SEC. 8. That the staff of the militia of the District of Columbia shall be appointed and commissioned by the President, and hold office until their successors are appointed and qualified, but may be removed at any time by the President. It shall consist of one adjutant-general, with the rank of lieutenant-colonel; one inspector-general, one quartermaster-general, one commissary-general, one chief of ordnance, one chief engineer, one surgeon-general, one judge-advocate-general, and one inspector-general of rifle practice, each with the rank of major, and four aides-de-camp, each with the rank of captain. The commanding general may appoint a non-commissioned staff of the militia, to consist of one sergeant-major, one quartermaster-sergeant, one commissary-sergeant, one ordnance-sergeant, two staff-sergeants, one hospital-steward, one color-sergeant, and one sergeant-bugler.

SEC. 9. That the President may assign an officer of the Army to act as adjutant-general of the militia of the District of Columbia, who, while so assigned, shall be commissioned as such and be subject to the orders of the commanding general and the provisions of this act: *Provided, however,* That the officer so assigned shall receive no other pay or emolument than that to which his rank in the Army entitles him when on detached service.

#### THE ACTIVE MILITIA: ITS ORGANIZATION.

SEC. 10. That the active militia shall be composed of volunteers, and shall be designated the National Guard of the District of Columbia; and in case the militia of the District of Columbia are called into the service of the United States, or required for the suppression of riots, or to aid civil officers in the execution of the laws, shall be the first to be ordered into service.

SEC. 11. That in time of peace the National Guard shall consist of not more than thirty-six companies of infantry, which shall be arranged by the commanding general into such regiments, battalions, and unattached companies as he may deem expedient; one battery of light artillery; one troop of cavalry; one signal corps; one ambulance corps; one engineer corps; one band of music, and one corps of field musicians.

SEC. 12. That regiments of infantry shall consist of three battalions, and to each regiment there shall be one colonel and one lieutenant-colonel, and a staff to consist of one surgeon, one adjutant, one quartermaster, one inspector of rifle practice, and one chaplain, each with the rank of captain; and a non-commissioned staff, consisting of one sergeant-major, one quartermaster-sergeant, one commissary-sergeant, and one hospital-steward.

SEC. 13. That battalions of infantry shall consist of four companies; and to each battalion there shall be one major; and a staff consisting of one surgeon, one adjutant, one quartermaster, and one inspector of rifle practice, each with the rank of first lieutenant; and a non-commissioned staff, consisting of one sergeant-major, one quartermaster-sergeant, and one hospital-steward.

SEC. 14. That to each company of infantry there shall be one captain, one first lieutenant, one second lieutenant, one first sergeant, four sergeants, one corporal to each ten privates, and not more than eighty-seven privates; and the minimum number of enlisted men shall be forty.

SEC. 15. That to the troop of cavalry there shall be one captain, one first lieutenant, one second lieutenant, one first sergeant, one quartermaster-sergeant, five sergeants, eight corporals, two trumpeters, and not more than eighty-three privates; and the minimum number of enlisted men shall be forty.

SEC. 16. That the battery of light artillery shall have not less than four nor more than six guns. To four guns there shall be one captain, two first lieutenants, one second lieutenant, one first sergeant, one quartermaster-sergeant, five sergeants, eight corporals, two buglers, and not more than eighty-two privates; and the minimum number of enlisted men shall be fifty-seven. To more than four guns there shall be, for each additional gun, one sergeant, two corporals,

and not more than twenty nor less than ten privates; for two additional guns there shall be one additional second lieutenant.

SEC. 17. That to each signal corps, ambulance corps, and engineer corps there shall be one first lieutenant, two sergeants, two corporals, and not more than thirty-two nor less than fourteen privates.

SEC. 18. That the band of music shall consist of one chief musician, two sergeants, two corporals, and thirty-two privates; and the corps of field music, of one principal musician, two sergeants, two corporals, and thirty-two privates. The chief musician, principal musician, and other non-commissioned officers of the band and field music shall be appointed by the commanding general.

SEC. 19. That when any company of the National Guard shall, for a period of not less than ninety days, contain less than the minimum number of enlisted men prescribed by this act, or, upon a duly ordered inspection, shall be found to have fallen below a proper standard of efficiency, the commanding general may either disband such company or consolidate it with any other company of the National Guard, and grant an honorable discharge to the supernumerary officers and non-commissioned officers produced by such consolidation. Officers and enlisted men discharged by reason of such disbanding or consolidation and at any time thereafter re-entering the service shall have allowed to them, as part of their term of service, the time already served.

#### ELECTION, APPOINTMENT, AND DISCHARGE OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

SEC. 20. That all officers shall be commissioned by the President of the United States. In time of peace, or when not in the service of the United States, they shall previously be elected or appointed as herein provided. No person commissioned as an officer shall assume such rank, or enter upon the duties of the office to which he may be commissioned, until he has accepted such commission and taken such oath or affirmation as may be prescribed.

SEC. 21. That the staff officers of a regiment or battalion shall be appointed by the permanent commander thereof.

SEC. 22. That field officers of regiments or battalions shall be appointed by the commanding general. Captain and lieutenants of companies shall be elected by the written votes of the enlisted men of the respective companies.

SEC. 23. That elections of officers shall be ordered and held under such regulations as may be prescribed by the commanding general.

SEC. 24. That every person accepting an election or appointment as an officer shall appear before an examining board, to be appointed by the commanding general, which board shall examine said officer as to his military and other qualifications. If any officer shall fail to appear before the board of examination within thirty days after being notified, or shall fail to pass a satisfactory examination, the fact shall be certified by the board to the commanding general, who shall thereupon declare the election or appointment of such officer null and void. If in the opinion of the board such officer is competent, and otherwise qualified, they shall certify the fact to the commanding general, who shall thereupon recommend him to the President for commission.

SEC. 25. That a commissioned officer may be honorably discharged—

Upon tender of resignation;  
Upon disbandment of the organization to which he belongs;  
Upon report of a board of examination, or for failure to appear before such board when ordered.

He may be dismissed upon the sentence of a court-martial; conviction in a court of justice of an infamous offense.

#### THE APPOINTMENT AND REDUCTION OF NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

SEC. 26. That non-commissioned staff officers shall be appointed by the permanent commander of the organization to which they belong; and permanent commanders of battalions shall appoint the non-commissioned officers of companies, upon the written nomination of the respective captains; but they may withhold such appointment if, in their judgment, there be proper cause; non-commissioned officers of unattached companies shall be appointed by their respective captains. The permanent commander of any battalion or unattached company may reduce to the ranks any company non-commissioned officers of his command.

#### ENLISTMENT AND DISCHARGE OF SOLDIERS.

SEC. 27. Enlistment in the National Guard shall be for the term of three years; *Provided, however,* That any soldier who may have received an honorable discharge, by reason of the expiration of his term of service, may, within thirty days thereafter, re-enlist for a term of one, two, or three years, to date from the expiration of his previous term. All terms of service, except in case of re-enlistment, shall commence at noon on the day of enlistment, and expire at noon on the day of discharge.

SEC. 28. Every person enlisting in the National Guard shall sign an enlistment paper which shall contain an oath of allegiance to the United States. The requisites and regulations for enlistment and the form of enlistment paper and oath for enlisting men shall be prescribed by the commanding general.

SEC. 29. That no enlisted man shall be honorably discharged before the expiration of his term of service, except by order of the commanding general, and for the following reasons:

Upon his own application, approved by the commanding officer of his company, and by superior commanders;  
Upon removal from the District;  
Upon disability, established by certificate of a medical officer;  
To accept promotion by commission;  
Whenever, in the opinion of the commanding general, the interest of the service demands such discharge.

SEC. 30. That enlisted men shall be dishonorably discharged by order of the commanding general:

To carry out the sentence of a court-martial;  
Upon conviction of felony in a civil court;  
Upon expulsion from his company, in accordance with its by-laws or regulations;

Upon discovery of re-enlistment after previous dishonorable discharge.

SEC. 31. That every soldier discharged from the service of the District shall be furnished with a certificate of such discharge, which shall state clearly the reasons therefor. Dishonorable discharges will have the word "dishonorable" written or printed diagonally across their faces, in large characters, with red ink, and the re-enlistment clause will be erased by a line.

#### ARMS, UNIFORMS, AND EQUIPMENTS.

SEC. 32. That the uniforms, arms, and equipments of the National Guard shall be the same as prescribed and furnished to the Army of the United States. Every organization of the National Guard shall be provided with such ordnance and ordnance stores, clothing, camp and garrison equipage, quartermaster's stores, medical supplies, and other military stores as may be necessary for the proper training and instruction of the force and for the proper performance of the duties required under this act. Such property shall be issued from the stores and supplies appropriated for the use of the Army, upon the approval and by the direction of the Secretary of War, to the commanding general upon his requisitions for the same. The property so issued shall remain and continue to be the property of the United States and shall be accounted for by the commanding general at such times, in manner, and on such forms as the Secretary of War may require.

SEC. 33. That the commanding general may transfer all public property received by him for the use of the National Guard under the provisions of this act to the several departmental officers of the general staff, and may make and pre-

scribe regulations for its issue by them and for its care and preservation by the officers or soldiers to whom issued.

SEC. 34. That every officer receiving public property for military use shall be accountable for the articles so received by him, and shall make returns of such property at such times, in such manner, and on such forms as may be prescribed. He shall be liable to trial by court-martial for neglect of duty, and also to make good to the United States the value of all such property defaced, injured, destroyed, or lost, by any neglect or default on his part, to be recovered in an action of tort, or by any other action at law, to be instituted by the judge-advocate-general of the militia at the order of the commanding general. All money received on account of loss or damages shall be paid in the Treasury of the United States, and shall be accounted for by the commanding general in his returns to the Secretary of War.

SEC. 35. That any officer or soldier who shall sell, dispose of, pawn or pledge, willfully destroy or injure, or retain after proper demand made, any public property issued under the provisions of this act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be punished by imprisonment for not exceeding two months, or by a fine not exceeding \$100, or by both; and it is hereby made the duty of the judge of the police court of the District of Columbia, upon information filed or complaint made under oath, to issue process for the arrest of the offender, and to cause him to be brought before the police court to be dealt with according to the provisions of this section.

SEC. 36. That until an officer, or his legal representative, shall have received notice that the property accounts of such officer have been examined and found correct, the liability of such officer, or of his estate, for public property for which he is or may have been responsible shall be in no way affected by resignation, discharge, change in official position, or death. Upon the death or desertion of an officer responsible for public property his immediate commander shall at once cause the property for which such officer was responsible to be collected, and a correct inventory made by actual count and examination; which inventory shall be forwarded to the commanding general, in order that any deficiency may be made good from the estate of the deceased or deserting officer; compensation for such deficiency may be recovered in the manner provided in section 34.

SEC. 37. That property issued or provided under the provisions of this act which becomes unfit for use, and is condemned as unserviceable shall be reported by the commanding general to the Secretary of War, and shall be disposed of as may be directed by him.

SEC. 38. That any organization of the active militia may, with the approval of the commanding general, and at its own expense, adopt any other uniform than that issued to it; but such uniform shall not be worn when such organization is on duty under the orders of the commanding general except by his permission.

SEC. 39. That organizations of the National Guard shall have the right to own and keep personal property, which shall belong to and be under the control of the active members thereof; and the commanding officer of any organization may recover for its use any debts or effects belonging to it, or damages for injury to such property; action for such recovery to be brought, in the name of such commanding officer, before any justice of the peace, with the right of appeal to the supreme court of the District of Columbia, or before the supreme court of the District of Columbia; and no suit or complaint pending in his name shall be abated by his ceasing to be commanding officer of the organization; but, upon the motion of the commander succeeding him, such commander shall be admitted to prosecute the suit or complaint in like manner and with like effect as if it had been originally commenced by him.

SEC. 40. That the quartermaster-general of the militia shall provide, by rental or otherwise, such armories for the National Guard as may be allowed and directed by the commanding general. He shall also provide each organization with such lockers, closets, gun-racks, and cases or desks as may be necessary for the care, preservation, and safe-keeping of the arms, equipments, uniforms, records, and other military property in their possession. He shall also provide suitable rooms for the offices of the commanding general and staff, for the keeping of books, the transaction of business, and the instruction of officers, and also suitable places for the storage and safe-keeping of public property.

#### MILITARY DUTIES.

SEC. 41. That any drill, parade, encampment, or duty that is required, ordered, or authorized to be performed under the provisions of this act shall be deemed to be a military duty, and while on such duty every officer and enlisted man of the National Guard shall be subject to the lawful orders of his superior officers, and for any military offense may be put and kept under arrest or under guard for a time not extending beyond the term of service for which he is then ordered.

SEC. 42. That the commanding general shall prescribe such stated drills and parades as he may deem necessary for the instruction of the National Guard, and may order out any portion of the National Guard for such drills, inspections, parades, escort, or other duties, as he may deem proper. The commanding officer of any regiment, battalion, or company may also assemble his command, or any part thereof, in the evening for drill, instruction, or other business, as he may deem expedient; but no parade shall be performed by any regiment, battalion, company, or part thereof without the permission of the commanding general.

SEC. 43. That an annual inspection and muster of each organization of the National Guard, and an inspection of their armories and of public property in their possession, shall be made at such times and places as the commanding general may order and direct.

SEC. 44. That the National Guard shall perform not less than six consecutive days of camp duty in each year, at such time as may be ordered by the commanding general; and the quartermaster-general of the militia, subject to the approval of the commanding general, shall provide, by rental or otherwise, a suitable camp ground for the annual encampment of the militia, make the necessary provisions thereon for the encampment, and provide necessary transportation to and from the same for baggage and supplies.

SEC. 45. The National Guard shall have the use of the drill grounds and rifle-range at the Washington Barracks, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, and the commanding general of the militia shall provide such additional targets and accessories as may be necessary for the use of the militia.

SEC. 46. That when there is in the District of Columbia a tumult, riot, mob, or a body of men acting together by force with attempt to commit a felony or to offer violence to persons or property, or by force and violence to break and resist the laws, or when such tumult, riot, or mob is threatened, it shall be lawful for the commissioners of the District of Columbia, or for the United States marshal for the District of Columbia, to call on the commander-in-chief to aid them in suppressing such violence and enforcing the laws; the commander-in-chief shall thereupon order out so much and such portion of the militia as he may deem necessary to suppress the same, and no member thereof who shall be thus ordered out by proper authority for any such duty shall be liable to civil or criminal prosecution for any act done in the discharge of his military duty.

SEC. 47. That no officer or soldier of the National Guard, when ordered on duty to aid the civil authorities, or when ordered into the service of the United States, in obedience to the call or order of the President, shall be excused from such duty except upon the certificate of the surgeon of his command of physical disability, such certificate to be presented to the commanding general in case of an officer, or to his company commander in case of a soldier. If such officer or soldier fail to furnish such excuse he shall be tried and punished by a court-

martial. For absence from any other military duty required or ordered under the provisions of this act the penalty shall be such as may be prescribed by the commanding general, or the by-laws of the organization to which the officer or soldier belongs.

SEC. 48. That United States forces or troops, or any portion of the militia, parading, or performing any duty according to law, shall have the right of way in any street or highway through which they may pass: *Provided*, That the carriage of the United States mails, the legitimate functions of the police, and the progress and operations of fire-engines and fire departments shall not be interfered with thereby.

SEC. 49. That every commanding officer, when on duty, may ascertain and fix necessary bounds and limits to his parade or encampment. Whoever intrudes within the limits of the parade or encampment after being forbidden, or who ever shall interrupt, molest, or obstruct any officer or soldier while on duty, may be put and kept under guard until the parade, encampment, or duty be concluded; and the commanding officer may turn over such person to any police officer, and said police officer is required to detain him in custody for examination or trial before the police court, and the judge thereof may punish such offense by a fine not exceeding \$25.

SEC. 50. That all officers and employés of the United States and of the District of Columbia who are members of the National Guard shall be entitled to leave of absence from their respective duties, without loss of pay or time, on all days of any parade or encampment ordered or authorized under the provisions of this act.

#### MILITARY COURTS.

SEC. 51. Courts of inquiry, to consist of not more than three officers, may be ordered by the commanding general, for the purpose of investigating the conduct of any officer, either at his own request or on a complaint or charge of conduct unbecoming an officer. Such court of inquiry shall report the evidence adduced, a statement of facts, and an opinion thereon, when required, to the commanding general, who may, in his discretion, thereupon order a court-martial for the trial of the officer whose conduct has been inquired into.

SEC. 52. That general courts-martial for the trial of commissioned officers or enlisted men shall be ordered by the commanding general at such times as the interests of the service may require, and shall consist of not less than five nor more than thirteen officers, and a judge-advocate, none of whom shall be of less rank than the accused, when it can be avoided.

SEC. 53. That for the trial of enlisted men for all minor offenses the commanding officer of each battalion and unattached company shall, at such times as may be necessary, appoint courts-martial. Such battalion and company courts-martial shall consist, for a battalion, of one officer, whose rank is not below that of captain; and for a company, of a lieutenant. Such courts shall have power, subject to the approval of the officer ordering the court, to sentence to be reprimanded by said officer in battalion or company orders; or, in case of a company non-commissioned officer, to be reduced to the ranks, or to pay such fines as may be imposed and allowed by the regulations or by-laws of the organization to which the accused belongs; and such court may, with the approval of the commanding general, sentence to be reprimanded in general orders or to be dishonorably discharged.

SEC. 54. That the president of a general court-martial or court of inquiry, and the officer constituting a battalion or company court-martial, shall have power to administer the usual oath to witnesses, and may issue summons for all witnesses whose attendance at such court may, in his opinion, be necessary, and any officer or soldier failing to serve such summons, and any witness failing to appear and testify when so summoned, shall be liable to trial by court-martial.

SEC. 55. That in all courts-martial and courts of inquiry the arraignment of the accused, the proceedings, trial, and record shall in all respects conform as nearly as practicable to the regulations for the same in the Army of the United States.

#### EXPENSES AND ALLOWANCES.

SEC. 56. That there shall be allowed for the general expenses of the militia such sums as may be necessary for the rental and furnishing of offices for headquarters, stationery, postage, printing and issuing orders, advertising orders, providing necessary blanks for the use of the militia, the cost of storing, caring for, and issuing public property, and such other contingent expenses, not heretofore specially provided for, as may be estimated and appropriated for; the accounts for which shall be certified to by the officer receiving the service or property charged for, approved by the commanding general, and paid in the manner provided in section 60.

SEC. 57. That during the annual encampment, and on every duty or parade ordered by the commanding general, there shall be allowed and paid for each day of service: To each member of the regularly enlisted band, \$4; to each member of the regularly enlisted corps of field music, \$2; to the chief musician, \$8, and to the principal musician \$6. In event there is no enlisted band or field music, or not a sufficient number of either, the commanding general may authorize the employment of such as he may deem necessary for the occasion. The payments for bands of music and drum corps shall be made in the manner provided in section 60.

SEC. 58. That during the annual encampment, and on every duty or parade ordered by the commanding general, there may be employed such number of horses as the commanding general may authorize for the use of the battery of light artillery, the troop of cavalry, the ambulance corps, the signal corps, and the non-commissioned general staff, the cost of which shall be paid in the manner provided in section 60.

SEC. 59. That during the annual encampment, or when ordered on duty to aid the civil authorities, the National Guard shall be furnished with subsistence stores, of the kind, quality, and amount allowed and prescribed by the Army. Such stores shall be issued from the stores and supplies appropriated for the use of the Army, upon the approval and by the direction of the Secretary of War, to the commanding general upon his requisitions for the same.

SEC. 60. That the commanding general shall annually transmit to the commissioners of the District of Columbia an estimate of the amount of money required for the next ensuing fiscal year to pay the expenses authorized by this act, and the said commissioners shall include the same in their annual estimates of appropriations for the District; and all money appropriated to pay the expenses authorized by this act shall be disbursed by the commissioners of the District of Columbia, upon vouchers duly certified and approved by the commanding general, and accounted for by them in the same manner as all other moneys appropriated for the expenses of the District.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS.

SEC. 61. That companies, battalions, or regiments may adopt constitutional articles of agreement or by-laws, subject to the approval of the commander-in-chief, for the government of matters relating to the civic affairs of their respective organizations, the regulation of fines for non-performance of duty, and the determination of causes upon which excuses from fines may be based: *Provided, however*, That such articles or rules shall not be repugnant to law or the regulations for the government of the militia: *And provided further*, That the articles or rules adopted by any company or battalion shall not be repugnant to the articles or rules adopted for the general government of the regiment or battalion to which it belongs. Certified copies of such articles or rules, with like copies of all alterations, as finally approved by the commanding general, shall be deposited in the office of the Adjutant-General.

SEC. 62. That no officer shall be liable to jury duty; and any officer or soldier

who shall have served continuously and faithfully for nine years in the National Guard shall be exempt for life thereafter from jury duty.

SEC. 63. That each company of the National Guard shall be entitled to enroll not exceeding twenty honorary members, who, upon the payment into the treasury of such company of not less than \$25 annually, shall be exempted from active military duty and jury duty, upon the exhibition of a receipt for such payment, for one year from the date thereof.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. HOLMAN). To the section just read the committee report an amendment, which the Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the whole of section 63.

Mr. McADOO. I move concurrence in this amendment of the committee.

Mr. BLOUNT. I understand that this bill is now being read for the first time, for information only—not for the purpose of amendment.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is being read by sections for amendment.

Mr. BLOUNT. I did not so understand.

Mr. McADOO. The first reading was dispensed with by order of the House.

Mr. OATES. I would like to make an inquiry. If I understand correctly the bill as read, it proposes to exempt members of this militia force from jury duty.

Mr. McADOO. The bill, as the committee propose to amend it, will exempt from such duty the active members of this National Guard.

Mr. OATES. Does the gentleman think it a wise policy to excuse from jury duty some of our best citizens? I submit we ought to have the largest possible body of good citizens from whom to select juries.

Mr. McADOO. That was the idea of the committee in the amendment which has been read, and which proposes to strike out section 63. That section proposed to exempt from jury duty honorary members of this National Guard—men who may become honorary members by paying \$25 a year. The committee thought this provision should be struck out, adopting the view suggested by the gentleman that it is desirable to secure the services of our best citizens as jurors.

Mr. BLOUNT. I would like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey what duty the regular members of this National Guard perform. How much service is required of them that they should be exempt from jury duty?

Mr. McADOO. Well, it is the custom in all the States—

Mr. BLOUNT. Not all of them.

Mr. McADOO. So far as I know, it is the custom in most of the States to grant an exemption of this kind. The bill follows the usual course in this matter. In many of our cities volunteer firemen as well as volunteer members of the militia force are exempted from jury duty.

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not profess to be familiar with the legislation of all the States, but, taking this matter on its face, I can see no occasion for exempting these gentlemen from jury duty. They are required to go into encampment for six days in the year, but beyond that there is no requirement of service at all so far as I can see.

Mr. McADOO. We must offer some inducement to get men to enroll themselves in the active militia. Of course every citizen of the United States is theoretically a part of the militia; but as an inducement to active participation in militia duty something of this kind is required. These men do duties other than those performed by the ordinary citizen. They attend drills; they are liable to incur penalties for disobedience of orders; they give up a part of the privileges and liberties which the ordinary citizen enjoys, and it has been thought fair to give them, in compensation for this, an exemption from jury duty.

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not see that these men "give up" much of their "liberties."

Mr. McADOO. Well, if the gentleman wishes to offer an amendment, I do not know that I shall oppose it.

Mr. BLOUNT. I had supposed the bill was being read merely for information, and that it would afterward be taken up for consideration by paragraphs.

Mr. McADOO. The first reading of the bill, as I have stated, was dispensed with.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The pending section is open to amendment.

Mr. BLOUNT. Well, I move to amend by striking out section 62. The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That section has been passed, but if there be no objection the House will return to it.

Mr. McADOO. I offer no objection. I am willing to leave this question to the House.

Mr. BLOUNT. So far as I understand this bill from the reading (and I have been following it as read by the Clerk, although I supposed it would be again read for amendment), no duty is required of members of this National Guard except the election of a number of officers and service for six days each year in an encampment.

Mr. HOVEY. And that they should regard as an honor.

Mr. BLOUNT. As the gentleman suggests, they ought to regard that as an honor. I have no doubt that participation in these exercises is a great recreation to them; and I do not see why, because of six days' service annually in an encampment, these men, after a period of nine years, should be exempted from jury duty in the District. That is the effect of the provision; and I think it ought to be stricken out.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to consider this question deliberately before determining to strike out this entire paragraph. Perhaps it might be sufficient to modify it. We all know that General Ordway is making an effort to improve the militia system of this District. We all know that the general spirit of the people favors an improvement of the militia system of the whole country. New York, Pennsylvania, and many other States in the North, and nearly all of the States of the South, are bringing their volunteer soldiery up to a very high standard, and I for one am proud of it. The superior excellence in drill and discipline and the spirit displayed by the citizen soldiers of the country in this city last May must have been most gratifying to the patriotic pride of every American. It was certainly pleasing to Alabamians to see a company from their State bear off the honors awarded to them by impartial and able judges, who declared them to be superior to any other similar organization on the continent.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will the gentleman permit a remark? He suggests that the section may be modified. Now, a part of the section is in this language:

Any officer or soldier who shall have served continuously and faithfully for nine years in the National Guard shall be exempted for life thereafter from jury duty.

Does not the gentleman think it would be a sufficient concession if we strike out what I have just read and retain the first part of this section, which provides that—

No officer or soldier shall be liable to jury duty.

I have no objection to modifying my amendment so as to have that effect.

Mr. WHEELER. That would be better than to strike out the entire paragraph.

Mr. STEELE. That will be all right.

Mr. WHEELER. I think there ought to be some compensation for a long period of service in this militia, but I do not contend that being on the rolls for nine years should exempt a citizen of the District from jury duty for life. I think I am correct in stating that every State in the Union now exempts its volunteer soldiery from jury duty, and it is just and right that it should be done. They perform actual work, and must be devoted to the task of preparation to fit themselves for service in the field should the honor of the country be assailed.

Mr. BLOUNT. There is no service, except serving in the encampment for six days every year.

Mr. WHEELER. Why, sir, these men perform a great deal of service, such as attending at their armories and drilling night after night. The efforts of the officers in charge of this militia force should be regarded by the House with some consideration.

Mr. BLOUNT. We do not require any such duty as the gentleman has just referred to; it is a mere voluntary matter with these men.

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman should know that in order to have a respectable volunteer militia, it is necessary that the men be compelled to drill a great deal, and they actually do so. We could not have an efficient militia system without it.

There is no place more proper to commence the inauguration of a good militia system than the District of Columbia. It has been commenced, and it ought to be encouraged, and we should make some concession to men who serve for a long period. The bill says nine years. It might be twelve or fifteen, or more; but there should be some adequate recognition of a long period of service. That is all I have to say.

Mr. BLOUNT. So far as drilling is concerned, there is no trouble. If anything, they drill too much. This bill proposes, as I understand it, to prohibit drilling on the part of members of volunteer organizations in this District.

Mr. McADOO. I do not so understand. On the contrary, I understand the volunteer organizations in this District are in favor of it.

Mr. BLOUNT. That does not appear in the bill.

Mr. McADOO. It does not prohibit any one from drilling.

Mr. BLOUNT. The bill provides—

That it shall be a misdemeanor for any body of men, other than the regularly organized militia and the troops of the United States, except such independent military organizations as are now in existence, to associate themselves together as a military company or organization, or meet for drill with arms, or parade in public with arms, without the permission of the commanding general.

Mr. McADOO. This bill takes in every military organization in the District of Columbia and makes it a part of the militia.

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes, and you provide there shall be nothing else in the District but this militia.

Mr. McADOO. Volunteer organizations are all included.

Mr. BLOUNT. Perhaps their officers expect to get the offices provided for in this bill.

Mr. McADOO. If the gentleman wishes to modify the amendment, I accept it.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move to strike out in section 62, after the word "duty," the following words:

And any officer or soldier who shall have served continuously and faithfully for nine years in the National Guard shall be exempt for life thereafter from jury duty.

So it will read:

That no officer or soldier shall be liable to jury duty.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What is the amendment?

Mr. BLOUNT. It exempts them from jury duty while they are in active service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. HOLMAN in the chair). The morning hour has expired, and the bill goes over until the next morning hour.

GENERAL G. CLUSERÉT.

Mr. COX. I move, by unanimous consent, to call up for present consideration a bill (H. R. 474) for the relief of General G. Cluserét.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, upon vouchers duly approved by the Secretary of State, the sum of \$500, to be immediately available, to pay General G. Cluserét for services rendered to the Department of State in carrying out a circular instruction of that Department of May 23, 1880, relative to statistical information in the Turkish dominions.

Mr. STEELE. Let the report of the committee be read.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Let the gentleman from New York make a statement.

Mr. COX. It simply reimburses General Cluserét for money he actually expended.

Mr. STEELE. I will withdraw the demand for the reading of the report.

Mr. COX. It can be printed in the RECORD. The bill gives General Cluserét the money he expended under the orders of the consul-general at Constantinople or the State Department. The State Department recommends it. The late minister to Constantinople knows it is right. [Laughter and applause.]

The report of the committee is as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 474) for the relief of General G. Cluserét, make the following report, to wit:

In obedience to Department circular of May 23, 1880, to the United States consul-general at Constantinople, the claimant was employed by said consul-general for the collection of statistics and the making of a report on "cotton fabrics and yarns imported into Turkey."

These statistics, owing to the condition of Turkey at the time, were very difficult to procure.

The consul-general in his dispatch of August 24, 1880, acknowledges his obligation to the American Eastern Agency, represented by General Cluserét, who devoted much time and labor to the subject. The consul recognized the report to be as full and clear as possible.

Owing to the difficulty in obtaining the necessary data the fund at the command of the consul-general was not sufficient to meet the expenses incurred. No payment was ever made by Mr. Heap, nor by the Government, to General Cluserét for his work.

The report of General Cluserét is to be found in the Consular Report No. 12, for October, 1881, entitled "Cotton-Goods Trade of the World, and the share of the United States therein."

Although there was no special contract made with General Cluserét, the Department of State thinks that it would be hardly just that he should have incurred any expense in obtaining valuable information for an officer of the Government without having the amount thereof at least returned to him.

Owing to the failure of the Department to grant the consul-general permission to apply the fund to his credit for such work, General Cluserét failed to obtain any compensation.

Your committee think General Cluserét has an equitable claim upon the Government for a reasonable sum, and they report a bill for \$500, which is simply the amount he expended, not counting his time and labor in preparing the information.

This view of the case is taken by the Department of State in the paper hereto annexed.

Perhaps General Cluserét would not have made this request were he not impoverished at the end of a long and honorable career as a soldier, during which he served in our own Army. The committee also refer to the statements of General Cluserét for the details of his service.

Application was made by Hon. Horace Maynard, while minister to Turkey, for compensation, and also through Hon. Roscoe Conkling, Senator from New York, but nothing was ever done.

The value of this work will be appreciated when it is known that General Cluserét is an accomplished writer in many languages and has fully earned the small sum which, in his old age and indigence, has been appropriated by the bill.

The correspondence is hereto appended.

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE, Washington, December 13, 1887.

"MY DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of the 4th instant, touching the claim of General G. Cluserét, who rendered valuable assistance to Mr. Heap in connection with the Department's circular of May 23, 1880, I herewith transmit copies of the following correspondence upon the subject:

"1. Mr. Cox to Mr. Bayard, No. 105, January 19, 1886, with inclosure;

"2. Mr. Bayard to Mr. Cox, No. 85, of February 19, 1886; and

"3. Mr. Bayard to Mr. Belmont, February 19, 1886, with inclosure.

"Adding that the letter to Mr. Belmont covers a proposed bill appropriating \$500 for the relief of General Cluserét.

"I am, my dear sir, very respectfully yours,

"T. F. BAYARD.

"Hon. S. S. COX, M. C.,  
"House of Representatives."

"[Inclosure 105.]

"CONSTANTINOPLE, January 17, 1886.

"DEAR SIR: When Mr. Maynard was United States plenipotentiary minister here I forwarded, through Mr. Heap, a memoir and collection of samples of every cotton goods employed in the Turkish Empire.

"That work was very difficult, long, and expensive. I was obliged to correspond with every villager from Persia to Herzegovina, give bakshish for every information and pay for every sample, several hundred in number. You know that in this country nothing can be accomplished without bakshish. For each sample I was obliged to pay one yard and transportation.

"I completed three collections and memoirs, including every information not only on cotton trade but also its manufacturing. I added statistics of import and export, etc. One was directed to the State Department, one to the New York Chamber of Commerce, and the third to that of Boston or Philadelphia. I don't recollect exactly which one. These two last were delivered by our friend, Colonel Dugane, of New York.

"This work was undertaken in order to answer a questionnaire by the State Department to Mr. Heap, who did not think possible to give it a satisfactory solution. So in point of fact, having volunteered my services without them being requested officially, I have no legal right to claim from the Treasury the refunding of my expenses.

"Still I have spent, besides my time and labor, nearly \$500. Twice Mr. Maynard applied to the State Department for some compensation; so did R. Conkling, of New York, but to no purpose. If you, sir, through Congress, can obtain the refunding of a part, whatever it might be, of my disbursing, you will oblige me very much. Although perhaps not strictly correct in a financial point of view, I think that transaction perfectly equitable, for my work has been utilized not only by the State Department but by the chambers of commerce.

"Very respectfully,

"GENERAL G. CLUSERÉT.

"Hon. S. S. COX,

"Plenipotentiary Minister of the United States of America."

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE, Washington, February 19, 1886.

"SIR: I have received your No. 105 of the 19th ultimo, relative to the equitable claim of General G. Cluserét, in connection with his service to Mr. Heap, consul-general at Constantinople, in carrying out a circular instruction of this Department of May 23, 1880.

"At present I can only express the Department's regret that General Cluserét should not have been paid at the time, and that it has no appropriation available at this late date from which to recompense him for the valuable information furnished. In order, if possible, to compensate General Cluserét for his services, I have inclosed to Hon. Perry Belmont, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, a copy of your dispatch, with a letter of explanation, a copy of which I herewith transmit, recommending the appropriation of \$500, to be paid to General Cluserét.

"I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"T. F. BAYARD.

"SAMUEL S. COX,

"Constantinople."

"UNITED STATES LEGATION, Constantinople, January 19, 1886.

"SIR: I knew a soldier in our civil war named General Cluserét. He lives here now, after military service with the Turks. He is a writer and economist, as well as soldier. He is now old and destitute. I called to see him at his room in the suburbs of this city. I found him endeavoring to get some warmth over a *maragal*. His condition excited sympathy.

"He has an equitable claim for services rendered in the preparation of certain statistics, in response to a call of the Department. I requested him to put it on paper. I inclose you a reply of his letter, with a view to have you regard it, even at this late day, in a favorable light, and with the further object of an appropriation and payment, if you think it possible.

"I am endeavoring to aid him personally by purchasing some of his pictures, but he is, or should be, an object of justice, as well as benevolence.

"I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

"S. S. COX.

"Hon. T. F. BAYARD,

"Secretary of State, Washington, D. C."

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE, Washington, February 19, 1886.

"SIR: I have the honor to inclose for the consideration of your committee a copy of a dispatch from Mr. S. S. Cox, the minister of the United States at Constantinople, No. 105, of the 19th ultimo, relative to the petition of General G. Cluserét for relief in connection with his services to Mr. G. H. Heap, consul-general of the United States at Constantinople, in carrying out a circular instruction of this Department in 1880.

"General Cluserét's petition is correct as to the character of the information furnished, but I have been unable to find any record in the Department of his claim having been previously brought to its attention as he asserts.

"The facts appear to be these:

"Mr. Heap with his dispatch No. 96 of August 24, 1880, furnished a report on cotton fabrics and yarns imported into Turkey, in obedience to the Department's circular of May 23, 1880.

"A portion of his dispatch is as follows:

"For the information contained in this report I am chiefly indebted to the 'American Eastern Agency,' represented by General Cluserét, who has devoted much time and labor on the subject, and I believe that the answers to the subject will be found as full and clear as possible."

"Mr. Heap also asked permission to expend the fund at his command for obtaining information for consular reports to meet the expenses incurred in making this one after explaining how very difficult it was to obtain the necessary data. His dispatch does not say that he intended to recompense General Cluserét for his trouble, or give any idea of how the money was to be applied.

"At any rate, no special acknowledgment was ever made of Mr. Heap's dispatch, although the report, a very full and valuable one, was published in the consular report, No. 12, October, 1881, entitled 'Cotton-Goods Trade of the World, and the share of the United States therein.'

"It is apparent from his petition that General Cluserét did not, when furnishing the information, expect to be compensated. Even now he says, 'in point of fact, having volunteered my services without their being requested officially, I have no legal right to claim from the Treasury the refunding of my expenses.'

"It seems hardly just, however, that General Cluserét should have incurred any expenses in obtaining this valuable information for an officer of this Government without having the amount thereof at least returned to him. But the failure of the Department to grant Mr. Heap permission to apply the fund to his credit for such work to the best advantage necessarily prevented him from offering to compensate General Cluserét, even if it was his intention to do so.

"Under these circumstances the Department is disposed to agree with Mr. Cox that General Cluserét has an equitable claim upon this Government for the services rendered to it as explained, and entertains the hope that some measure for the petitioner's relief at this late date, to the extent at least of the \$500 which he expended, besides his time and labor in preparing the information, may find equal favor with your committee and secure its co-operation in obtaining the passage of the necessary bill for General Cluserét's relief.

"A draught of a bill to meet the case is herewith transmitted for the consideration of your committee, and it is respectfully suggested that you authorize some member thereof to introduce it in the House, should the judgment of the committee be favorably disposed in the premises.

"I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

"T. F. BAYARD.

"Hon. PERRY BELMONT,

"Chairman Committee on Foreign Affairs,  
"House of Representatives."

There was no objection, and the bill was taken up and ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

UNITED PEORIAS AND MIAMIES.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House resumes the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8074) providing for the allotment of land in severalty to United Peorias and Miamies in Indian Territory. At the adjournment on Saturday the question under consideration was the substitute for section 4 moved by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. As I said at the time, I moved that substitute at the request of the representatives of these Indians. At their request I again move to modify that substitute so as to insert, after the word "Indian," the words "not a member of the tribe;" so it will read:

Any adult members of the United Peoria and Miami tribes of Indians shall have authority, under the provisions of this act, to sell or dispose of, to any Indian not a member of the tribe, etc.

I also moved to modify it by striking out the word "become" and substituting the word "be;" so it will read:

Or forfeiture so long as the title to the same shall remain in the original patentee or be the property of any other Indians, etc.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection to the proposed modifications of the substitute.

Mr. HOLMAN. I think the word "purchase," where it is used in the first clause of the proposed amendment, is not properly there, and should be stricken out.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will read that provision of the amendment in connection with the remainder of it, he will agree that it is the proper word.

Mr. HOLMAN. I have no objection to the use of the word "inheritance" in that connection; but the word "purchase," as used in the substitute, should be omitted. I ask the Clerk to read that portion of the amendment again.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the lands so patented shall remain free from execution, levy, taxation, compulsory sale, or forfeiture so long as the title to the same shall remain in the original patentees or become the property of any other Indians by inheritance, purchase, or otherwise, etc.

Mr. HOLMAN. Now I hope the word "inheritance" will be allowed to remain, but the word "purchase" ought to be stricken out.

Mr. PERKINS. I think it should not be stricken out in consequence of what follows; and I believe that, in connection with the amendment I offered a short time ago, the gentleman will not object. I ask the Clerk to read the remainder of the proposed amendment.

The proposed substitute was read at length.

Mr. COBB. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend that amendment by striking out the words in the second line of the amendment, "in fee-simple," and in the third line the word "forever." I should like to be heard upon this amendment before a vote is taken upon it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Kansas has an amendment already pending to the amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. I think we had better have a vote first on the amendment suggested by myself. Let the gentleman's amendment be pending.

Mr. COBB. Before that I want to be heard for a moment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I think, rather than consume the time, I will accept the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama, so that we can get on with the bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the gentleman will not do that unless there is some explanation of the object to be accomplished by the amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Very well; then I shall wait to hear the reasons the gentleman may have for offering the amendment.

Mr. COBB. I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am opposed to the amendment offered by my colleague on the committee, and shall vote against it. I think that the original section of the bill for which the amendment is offered as a substitute is better. This original section conforms to the general policy of the Government with reference to the Indians, and especially the policy of the Government as declared in the act of 1887, approved February the 8th of that year. This policy is, that the Government of the United States shall hold lands for the Indians for a certain period of time, and then that the lands may go to them in severalty, they receiving a fee-simple title.

Pervading this policy is the expectation that the Indians will attain the qualifications necessary to enable them, properly, to be trusted with the lands in fee, and to enable them to reach that status which will make it safe for them to become citizens of the United States. I repeat and urge what I said on Saturday in regard to this matter.

The provisions of this amendment seek to force upon these people the rights and privileges and duties of citizenship without regard to their qualifications. Therefore, believing, as I do, that this is not a wise policy, although it may be recommended by the Indian Department, and although it may be urged by those who seem to have particular regard for the Indians, I can not give to it the assent of my judgment. I can not consent that it will be well for the Indians to withdraw from them the guardianship of the United States. This guardianship—this

superintending care—will be withdrawn whenever they are settled in severalty upon their lands and are made citizens of the United States. Such will be the necessary and inevitable result of such provisions as are contained in the proposed amendment.

Now, what will be the effect of this policy? These men are settled upon lands allotted to them, and are forced, we will assume, under the operation of this bill, to take them in severalty. Suppose the Indians do not care to take the lands in severalty—and this is no unreasonable supposition—and abandon them? They are then without support or guardianship, and what is to become of them? But my limited time will not permit me to press this point.

I have another objection to the amendment. I take it to be wise when we are legislating for these people that our legislation should be without doubt as to its meaning—that the terms in which it is framed should be clear and unambiguous.

Now, to any legal mind the inconsistencies contained in this amendment will readily appear. If the words "in fee-simple and forever" are not stricken out, the result is, you have a provision here under the operation of which—

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. NELSON. I rise to oppose the amendment and yield my time to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. COBB. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy. I was about to point out an inconsistency in the provisions of the amendment. If the words are left in the amendment providing that these lands shall be given in fee-simple to these several Indians, the result is a patent issuing from the Government of the United States which, as we all know, is simply equivalent to a deed, containing these provisions: first, a conveyance in fee-simple and forever of a tract of land. Following that, in the same deed, conditions and limitations and restrictions are imposed.

Now, what is the result? Let us consider for a moment what would be the result when the patent is presented for construction by the judicial department of the Government. One of these Indians with his patent in his hand makes a sale. There is an interference or an attempted interference with his vendee and he appeals to the courts. He says, "I have got a fee-simple title to this land; there is no restriction to the sale of the land on the part of these patentees." And why? Because of the operation of the provision of law that, where there are two inconsistent provisions in a deed the first holds and the latter is a nullity. The first provision in a deed, the last in a will—that is the universal rule.

Now here is a deed which says upon its face and in its first clause, that "the Government of the United States conveys in fee-simple forever a tract of land to the patentees." Following in the same instrument are restrictions and limitations, not upon the sale only—and I call the attention of the lawyers in the House to that—but restrictions and limitations upon the title itself.

Such is the deed, first, words of conveyance in fee-simple forever; then restrictions and limitations upon the title itself. Now, what is the result? The patentee has the absolute, unqualified, fee-simple title.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, it is not pretended that that is the policy to be pursued with regard to these Indians.

Upon both of these grounds I am opposed to this amendment. There are two classes of men who are operating with regard to these Indians, and who, unwittingly it may be, are driving them to their destruction. One class are the philanthropists, who believe they are doing wisely when they attempt to put the Indians on an equal footing as to the rights of property and the rights of citizenship with the civilized white man. The other class are those, in my opinion, who are not actuated by these philanthropic motives. They do not care what becomes of the Indian. They think that he is doomed, and the quicker he is extirpated from this continent the better. But seeing the operations and effect of the policy prescribed and urged by these men who are really seeking his benefit—

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. NELSON. I move to strike out the last word, and yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. COBB].

Mr. COBB. I do not want to take up too much of the time of the House.

Several MEMBERS. Go on.

I am, Mr. Speaker, pleading for the Indian; pleading for the adoption of the policy which will protect him; because I sincerely believe that this nation owes him a duty that it ought to fulfill.

Now, I say that these two classes of whom I am speaking, the one the honest philanthropic men—perhaps impractical—who are seeking to promote the welfare of the Indian, the other caring nothing for his destiny, or, it may be, believing it to be settled, but wise enough to see that the policy urged by the first will hasten his destruction, have joined in demanding the same course. We see both parties urging that the Indian be made a citizen and be assigned his land in severalty and given a fee-simple title.

Now, put him in that position and how long will he hold his land? How long will he hold his 160 or 240 acres of land if you give him a title in fee? The result will be that these adventurous and enterpris-

ing men of whom we have heard so much, and of whom my friend from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] spoke so eloquently on Saturday as pressing him on all sides, will speedily acquire his lands.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Is the Indian allowed to alienate it by this bill?

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir; that is my construction. The amendment, as I have attempted to show, is inconsistent in its provisions. The first provision gives him a title in fee. The other, as it appears to me, provides restrictions and limitations, which, however, will not take away the power of alienation; and when he alienates his title, where is he?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. He becomes a pauper and a little worse than that.

Mr. HOOKER. He comes back on the Government for support and the Government will have to sustain him.

Mr. COBB. One of two results will inevitably follow; either the Indian will become a pauper and die of starvation, or else he will put himself in a condition to demand of the Government a reversal of its policy. If he does not starve he will make himself so troublesome to the Government that a reversal of this policy will inevitably follow. And in thus pursuing a shifting policy the Government retards rather than advances the advancement of the Indian.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to explain briefly to the House what, in my judgment, is the effect of this substitute, and in that connection I shall give the House a little history in addition to what was given in the debate on Saturday. As I then explained, there are fifty-eight of these Miami Indians and one hundred and forty-four of the Peorias and those associated with them. They occupy a reservation in the Indian Territory of 50,300 acres. They have also some remaining lands in Kansas of those which have been given to them heretofore under treaty, which lands they are not occupying. There are some three or four or five sections, in the aggregate, scattered over two counties in my State, and by the provisions of this bill the Indians are authorized to sell those lands, as they are substantially authorized to do under existing law. But the Indians come to Congress, as they have come for years, asking that the lands which they occupy in the Indian Territory shall be given to them in severalty.

A division of the reservation will give to each man, woman, and child 220 acres and a trifle more. Now, they ask that, as to all of these lands given them in excess of the 160-acre allotments, they may be authorized to sell them to other Indians who are not so fortunately situated as themselves. That is all there is of this amendment. These Indians say that, as to the 160 acres each, they are willing that the usual condition shall be put into their patents, that the lands shall not be alienable for twenty-five years, and that they are to be exempt for that time. That is the effect of the general allotment bill; that is the effect of almost every allotment bill that Congress has given its attention to. They say that as to the 160 acres of land given to each of these men, these women, these children, they are willing that that condition shall be made; but as to the excess over and above the 160 acres, they ask that adult members of the tribe shall have the right, if they choose, to sell those lands to other Indians, with the consent and approval of the Secretary of the Interior. They say that some of them may not need 220 acres of land. They say there are other Indians in the country not so fortunately situated as they are, and they simply ask that, as adults, they may have the right given them to sell to other Indians the excess of these lands over 160 acres. That is all they ask. Now, is there anything unreasonable in that?

Should any man, actuated by sentiment or by a desire to promote the welfare and well-being of these Indians, stand upon this floor and oppose this substitute? These Indians, as I read from the report of the Indian agent on Saturday, are as competent to look after their own interests as any like number of men in any community in the country. They would like to have these lands given to them absolutely, without restriction; but knowing the sentiment of some members of Congress and the sentiment prevailing in many parts of the country, they are willing that the 160 acres allotted to each shall be subject to the usual condition in allotment bills making the land inalienable. As to the excess, however, they ask to be permitted to sell it to other Indians, and to Indians only, with the consent and approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

I move the previous question on the pending section and amendment.

Mr. BLOUNT. I hope the gentleman will not cut off debate in that way. This is the gentleman's own bill, which was referred to the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not know exactly; not long.

Mr. PERKINS. I will withdraw for the present the demand for the previous question. I did not know that there was any disposition to continue the discussion.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, the Government of the United States, whenever it suits its purposes, claims to be the especial guardian of the Indian. Treaty obligations are set aside, and the Government assumes paternal care of the Indian and undertakes to do what is best for him.

Mr. FULLER. It does not always do it, though.

Mr. BLOUNT. My friend suggests that the Government does not always do it. I am surprised at him! [Laughter.] Then again, Mr.

Speaker, when measures come into the House purporting to be for the benefit of these wards of ours, we are gravely told by persons urging them that "the Indians want them." Now, sir, I have never been one of those who have inclined to the opinion that our policy should be to provide for the ownership of Indian lands in severalty.

Such, however, has come to be, with some qualification, the policy of the Government. I believe that up to this time alienation has not been allowed until the expiration of a period of twenty-five years. The proposition of my friend from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS] is now to limit this period to twenty years. It is proposed that the Indian may sell a part of his lands to any other Indian. With the assent of the Secretary of the Interior, an Indian receiving land under this allotment may convey a portion to any other Indian who is not so fortunately situated as himself. What sort of a title is there to be in such a case?

Mr. PERKINS. Perhaps the gentleman may not be aware that we have never passed an allotment bill allowing to an Indian so large a quantity of land in severalty as is proposed to be given by this bill, and that is one reason why the bill authorizes under certain conditions a sale of the excess over 160 acres.

Mr. BLOUNT. Under this bill as it came to the House with the recommendation of the Committee on Indian Affairs there were to be so many hundred acres allotted to these Indians; but before we have reached the conclusion of the bill the gentleman from Kansas comes in with a proposition that we take away one-half of this land, and he suggests that in doing this we do more for the Indians than we have ever done before. Sir, I wish to say we have done nothing for the Indians in reference to this matter, either in this bill or in any other. There has been on the part of some of our people a spirit of agrarianism with reference to the lands of the Indians. Wherever there have been valuable Indian lands there has been pressure in this House, pressure from the Departments, pressure everywhere, for treaty stipulations or for legislation, the effect of which has simply been to rob the Indians, and this proposition giving to them a certain amount of land in severalty does practically nothing for their benefit. The result of this measure, in my opinion, will be that these lands will be frittered away. It does not appear that even on the portion of lands now proposed to be allowed houses are to be constructed and supplies furnished for the purpose of enabling the Indians to carry on their farms. As to the sum of money for which an Indian may sell a portion of his land to some other Indian, that is likely to be frittered away.

The inducement held out for the passage of this bill is that the Indian wants it. Yes, the cupidity of the Indian destroys his judgment. Inspired by his cupidity, he is doubtless pleased with the provision of the bill allowing him to sell a portion of this land and devote the proceeds to any purpose, however silly.

Mr. HERBERT. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. BLOUNT. Certainly.

Mr. HERBERT. Is it not the opinion of the gentleman that the provision limiting the sale to another Indian would prove nugatory? Might not the Indian to whom the land would be transferred act as an agent for some other person? There is not even a limitation that the land shall be sold only to other Indians for the purpose of settlement and cultivation.

Mr. BLOUNT. I can come to no other conclusion than that which has been reached by my friend from Alabama [Mr. HERBERT].

Mr. HERBERT. The provision practically gives the Indian no protection at all.

Mr. BLOUNT. We are told that the Indian is in favor of this provision giving him a part of the land in absolute fee. Sir, any gentleman who has taken occasion to observe the course of affairs in reference to our Indian treaties—

Mr. PEEL. Mr. Speaker, are we not proceeding under the five-minute rule? The first reading of the bill, I believe, was dispensed with.

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] if he desires a little more time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. Cox). The gentleman from Kansas yields to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT].

Mr. BLOUNT. Any gentleman who has taken occasion to look into the expenditures for negotiating Indian treaties on the part of this great Government of the United States—any gentleman who calls to mind the various baubles which have been used to attract the Indian's fancy and to operate as an inducement for the negotiation of these treaties—ought to feel the blush of shame come to his cheek. I can not but think that the money which these Indians are expected to realize from the sale of a portion of these lands is operating upon the Indians as a temptation in the same way as did the baubles which have been used for the purpose of negotiating treaties.

If we are to give these allotment lands to the Indians, let us give them absolutely, without any division. Let us try the Indian for a time in this matter. Let us not be in great haste to exhaust what little treasure we have left him. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. PERKINS. I move the previous question on the section and pending amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE rose.



Mr. PERKINS. As the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who is a member of the committee and who has only come into the Hall within the last few minutes, would like to be heard, I will withdraw for the present the call for the previous question.

Mr. HOOKER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I understand we are considering this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole under the five-minute rule. If that is the fact, will it not be proper that the bill be considered afterward by the House itself?

Mr. PERKINS. This bill was not in the Committee of the Whole, but was on the House Calendar.

Mr. HOOKER. But it is now being considered, as I understand, in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PERKINS. Oh, no; this bill was not on the Union Calendar. It makes no appropriation. It was upon the House Calendar.

Mr. HOOKER. Was not the motion made to consider it in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. This bill was on the House Calendar; it makes no appropriation. The question now pending is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kansas to the substitute.

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. Does the Chair hold that a bill providing for parting with the title to Indian lands which are under the control of the Government does not require under the rules to be considered in the Committee of the Whole? I am quite sure it has been held otherwise frequently.

Mr. PEEL. This bill does not make any appropriation of Government property; it simply provides for the division of Indian lands among the Indians.

Mr. BLOUNT. But it provides for parting with the control of the Government over these lands; and it has always been held that the rules require such a bill to be considered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. NELSON. In reference to the point of order of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] allow me to say—

Mr. BLOUNT. I have not made a point of order, only a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. NELSON. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Georgia and to the Chair that whatever might have been the ruling in the first instance the point has been waived, because we have gone on and considered the bill in the House.

Mr. BLOUNT. So I understand, hence I did not raise a question of order, and I did not expect that any ruling now upon a case not actually presenting itself would be treated anything like a determined opinion of the Chair.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did not know, Mr. Speaker, that I would add anything to what I said the other day; but I do desire to emphasize my objection to this amendment.

It has been stated repeatedly on this floor that these Indians are quite as capable of holding property, and of managing it, as white people. If this be true, then there is no reason why any restriction should be put upon the fee which they take in their lands, or upon their right to control their allotments under the bill; but I doubt, as I have before intimated, whether it is safe to follow the advice and direction of those from whom this amendment emanates, although they claim to be delegates of the Indians interested. It seems to me it ought to be apparent to any gentleman reflecting on this subject for a moment, that there must be, from the very nature of things, a wide difference in the business capacity of the different members of these tribes, and in their ability to manage property. It may be that all these Indians are capable of looking after their own interests, but I do not believe they or any other Indians have at this time reached such a high state of development, attained such a degree of civilization as to make it safe to intrust them with the power to dispose of their land.

I believe the inevitable effect of this amendment will be that all the lands to which the members of the tribe are entitled over and above 160 acres, amounting to something over 100 acres each, will soon pass into the hands of the stronger, shrewder, more capable members of the tribe, who, like these delegates now here, have been sharpened by their intercourse with the world and who have a great advantage over other members of the tribe in their superior business knowledge.

I believe it to be entirely proper for me to say that I submitted this amendment, and especially this portion of the amendment, to the judgment of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs yesterday morning, and he expressed himself as being wholly and irreconcilably opposed to the proposition. He believed it to be entirely unsafe, and thought it ought not to be adopted as part of the bill.

With that statement I will leave the matter with the House. If they see fit to place in the hands of these Indians the entire control of the disposal of their lands, the responsibility will be with them and not with me.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin that since his interview with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs we have modified the amendment, at the request of the representatives of these Indians, to limit the excess of lands to be sold to other Indians

or to other tribes. That limitation was not in the amendment when the gentleman showed it to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. With that amendment it may have the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not see how that obviates the objection. They may dispose of their lands to other Indians or to Indians of other tribes.

Mr. HERBERT. That would not prevent these Indians selling their lands to Indians of other tribes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It seems to me the bill is absolutely worthless in that regard.

Mr. HOOKER. I see it is provided in section 11—

That it is distinctly understood that no person or persons who have heretofore been attached to either of said tribes, and who have withdrawn from either of said tribes and become citizens of the United States, and been paid their fair share of the funds set apart for them and their families, shall have, or be permitted to have, any part or interest in and to any portion of the land or money allotted or paid to the said Peoria or Miami Indians under the provisions of this act.

I see, too, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS] has introduced a bill—

To provide for a revision of a distribution of the "invested and other common property" of the Confederated Peoria, Kaskaskia, Wea, and Piankeshaw Indians, made under the treaty of 1867, and for other purposes.

Mr. PERKINS. I am going to offer that as an amendment.

Mr. HOOKER. What I wish to inquire about is this: How do you provide for the protection of these Indians who, under the treaty of 1867, became citizens of the United States?

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from Mississippi, I will say, is mistaken in one particular. The bill he has before him has not been reported by the committee, although it has been introduced and is before them. It has not received their favorable consideration yet. However, by consent of parties interested, I am going to move that bill as an amendment in the proper place to accomplish the objects sought to be accomplished therein.

Mr. HOOKER. To whom do you refer when you speak of "parties interested?"

Mr. PERKINS. The citizen Indians and the delegates here speaking for the Indians in the Indian Territory. By consent they have agreed upon that as an amendment and given it to me, which I will offer at the proper time.

I now demand the previous question upon the substitute and the pending amendments to this section.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendments to the proposed substitute were severally read and concurred in; there being, on a division—ayes 51, noes 34.

The question recurred upon the adoption of the substitute for the section as amended.

Mr. HOLMAN. Let the substitute be read now as it has been amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

That upon the approval of the allotments provided for in this act by the Secretary of the Interior he shall cause patents to issue therefor in the name of the allottees, their heirs and assigns. Said patents shall contain and recite the following exemption clause: "That the lands so patented shall remain free from execution, levy, taxation, sale, or forfeiture so long as the title shall remain in the original patentee or be the property of any other Indians by inheritance, purchase, or otherwise;" also, the following restricting clause: "That 160 acres of said lands so allotted shall remain inalienable for a period of twenty years from the date of patents;" and if any conveyance shall be made of lands herein made inalienable by this act, or any contract made touching the same before the expiration of the time mentioned and provided by this act, it shall be absolutely null and void. Any adult members of the United Peoria and Miami tribes of Indians shall have authority, under the provisions of this act, to sell or dispose of to any Indian not a member of the tribe any part or parcel of land for himself or herself of the amount over and above the 160 acres of the allotments as hereinbefore made by this act. That the sale of any part or parcel of said allotments of lands shall not be made for a less sum than \$1.25 per acre: *Provided*, That all sales of lands under this act made by the adult members of the said Peoria and Miami tribes of Indians while the Indian Territory remains under its present form of government shall be subject to approval by the Secretary of the Interior under and by the same rules and regulations governing the sales of Miami Indian allotted lands in Kansas, and the deed shall be recorded in the office of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and the deed after approval and recording shall be returned to the grantor named in the deed.

The question was taken on the adoption of the substitute; and on a division there were—ayes 41, noes 40.

Mr. BLOUNT. Let us have tellers.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman make the point that no quorum has voted?

Mr. BLOUNT. I do make it.

Mr. BLOUNT and Mr. PERKINS were appointed tellers.

Mr. NELSON. I hope the gentleman from Georgia will not insist upon that point, as we have quite an amount of business from the committee to get through with, and there are several other sections to this bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of gentlemen in charge of the Indian bills I withdraw the point of no quorum.

So (no further count being demanded) the substitute was adopted.

Section 5 of the bill was read.

The first paragraph of section 6 was read, as follows:

SEC. 6. That the unallotted lands of the Miami Indians in Kansas, including the school-sections, shall be disposed of in the following manner, to wit: That each bona fide settler occupying any portion of said lands at the date of

the passage of this act, and having made valuable improvements thereon, or the heirs-at-law of such, who is a citizen of the United States, or who has declared his intention to become such, shall be entitled, at any time within one year from the passage of this act, to purchase the land so occupied and improved by him, not to exceed 160 acres in each case, according to the Government survey, at the appraised value thereof, as heretofore ascertained by the Secretary of the Interior, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1873, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe. And such persons who are entitled to purchase said lands as aforesaid shall be permitted to make payment therefor in cash in three equal annual installments, the first installment to be payable on the day of the entry of the land, and the remaining two installments annually thereafter, with interest at the rate of 6 per cent. per annum from the date of entry.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman from Kansas when this appraisement was made?

Mr. PERKINS. Under the act of 1873.

Mr. HOLMAN. I know it was under that act, but I mean when was it made?

Mr. PERKINS. Soon after the passage of the act.

Mr. HOLMAN. I suggest to my friend from Kansas the propriety of striking out these words in the twelfth and thirteenth lines, "as heretofore ascertained," so that it will read:

According to the Government survey, at the appraised value thereof, etc.

Certainly these lands ought not to be sold now on an appraisement made as far back as 1873. They ought to be sold, of course, at their actual present value. I therefore think it would be wise to strike out these words and insert "to be ascertained by the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of the act of 1873."

Mr. PERKINS. I do not know that I have any objection to that amendment myself, only that I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Indiana the condition of these lands, and then if he desires to offer the amendment, of course it will be for the House to act upon it.

I will state to him that there are small quantities of these lands, little detached, jagged pieces, which have not been heretofore sold, possibly 20 acres in one place, 40 acres in another, and so on, in most cases very poor lands, lying along on the headwaters of the Marais de Cygnes River in my State; and, as a new appraisement would necessarily involve some expenditure and delay, they would like to avoid, not only the expense, but the circumlocution of the Interior Department that such an appraisement would involve. I thought that, as the lands had been appraised once and they were generally insignificant in value, there could be little question as to the interests of the present owners being guarded, and that they may be sold under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, the minimum price being fixed by the bill. Under these circumstances, I do not think the gentleman will insist upon the amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN. If we were disposing of lands under the legislation of a State for the benefit of white people, we would be careful to see that there was a just appraisement and not an appraisement made ten or twelve years previously. Manifestly a sale under such circumstances might be very unfair and unjust, and hence I offer the amendment I have suggested.

The Clerk read the proposed amendment, as follows:

Amend line 12 of section 6 by striking out the words "as heretofore" and inserting "to be hereafter;" making it read: "not to exceed 160 acres in each case, according to the Government survey, at the appraised value thereof, to be hereafter ascertained by the Secretary of the Interior."

The amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read the concluding paragraph of section 6, as follows:

And the net proceeds of the sales of said lands, after defraying the expenses of the sale, shall belong to said Miami Indians, and shall be disposed of as now provided by law.

Mr. HOOKER. I ask the gentleman who has charge of this bill what is the effect of these closing words of the section which the Clerk has just finished reading, what Miami Indians are referred to, and what provision of law? Do you include the citizens as well?

Mr. PERKINS. No, sir; but the citizens will be included by the amendments we will offer, to which I called attention a short time ago.

The Clerk read section 7, as follows:

SEC. 7. That the Peoria and Miami Indians shall be paid separately all such sums of money as may be due each of said tribes, in manner as hereinafter provided; and so much of that portion of the act of March 3, 1873, as relates to the consolidation of said tribal funds of said Peoria and Miami Indians is hereby repealed.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the gentleman from Kansas will inform the House as to the state of the funds of these consolidated tribes; how much money they have here in trust for them, and how much is paid them annually for interest.

Mr. PERKINS. The Peorias have about \$77,300 as a trust fund; in addition they have about \$20,000 as a school fund. The Miamies have not as much, but I have been unable to learn, without visiting the Indian Office, just how much. When the same question was asked me on Saturday I had intended to visit the Indian Office to get this information, but I have been so busy that I have not been able to do so; but the amount paid to the Miamies is much less than that paid to the Peorias.

Mr. HOLMAN. Then it may be assumed that about \$150,000 are held for the benefit of both tribes?

Mr. PERKINS. Substantially that.

Mr. HOLMAN. And except as to the \$20,000 of the school fund of the Peorias and whatever may be the amount of the school fund of the Miamies, it is proposed to distribute the balance among the tribe?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. The bill distributes the common fund so that they may use it for making their homes in the Territory and for their general good.

Mr. HOLMAN. I think many of those Indians would use that money prudently, but there are some of them who would not, and I should be very glad to inquire whether the tribes by any action of theirs or their council, as I believe they have a common council acting for both tribes, have expressed any wish that this fund should be distributed.

Mr. PERKINS. I will say that this provision has been in every bill which has been introduced at the instance and suggestion of these Indians. For several years they have approved every measure of this kind in their councils and by petitions to Congress, and they have sent delegation after delegation to urge on Congress the passage of the bill, and I will say in addition the Indian Office recommends the adoption of this section with others. I have a letter in my desk from the Indian Office approving it.

Mr. HOLMAN. These Indians have here representing them some intelligent men. I have seen two of them; one of them is a white man, I believe. The other tells me he is the great grandson of Richardville, who, I understand, was half Indian and half French. These Indians are getting remote from the original stock.

Mr. PERKINS. That is true of nearly all the tribes.

Mr. HOLMAN. Does my friend from Kansas believe it is safe policy to pay over to these two hundred Indians at least \$120,000 when they are getting along reasonably well as it is? Is it safe to put this money at peril in their hands? Does our experience in reference to these Indians justify that line of policy? Does the Commissioner of Indian Affairs recommend it?

Mr. PERKINS. He does. This entire bill was submitted to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, and every paragraph of it received the sanction of that Department. The committee amended the bill so as to conform to every suggestion of the Indian Office.

Mr. HOLMAN. I apprehend we are following a line of policy, and have done so ever since we commenced the allotment system, that will make the remnants of the aboriginal tribes landless and hopelessly impoverished.

Mr. PERKINS. As to the minors, that fund is not given to them; but guardians are to be appointed and bonds given, and they are to care for this fund as guardians for their wards, as is the case in most of our States. Then I will say the Committee on Indian Affairs in the preparation of the annual appropriation bill, upon the recommendation of the Indian Office, has provided for the distribution of trust funds in other cases to Indian tribes.

Mr. NELSON. I call the attention of the gentleman from Indiana to the proviso at the end of section 8:

Provided, That the shares of all minors entitled under this act shall be retained one year from the passage of this act, to purchase the land so occupied and improved by him.

In other words, it is held in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. HOLMAN. That is all safe enough as to the minors, but it is unsafe in my judgment as to a large proportion of those who are adults and who would receive this money. I think that two influences which have been mentioned by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. COBB] are working to the injury of the Indians; upon the one side the influence of mistaken humanitarians, people who believe that the Indians are to be benefited by being placed upon the same footing with white men, and who measure their capacity for managing their affairs by the intelligence of the white man; upon the other the everlastingly aggressive spirit of the white man, which impels him to reach out for as much all that he can fairly acquire.

These two forces are working together, and their influence produces a result which is very different from the former policy of our Government, and, Mr. Speaker, I can not but deplore the existence of this new Indian policy. I do not indulge the slightest hope that the Indian will be benefited by it. On the contrary, I think that our generation will have the misfortune of undoing what our fathers sought to do for the Indian. The messages of President Jackson and his predecessors breathe a very different spirit from the measures that are carried through Congress here year after year. Our fathers sought to save the remnants of these brave people, and they set apart for them reservations solemnly dedicated to their use forever, in language as strong as the human mind could express. But the present policy is to reach out and take possession of those Indian lands. Thirty-nine million acres of their lands have already been taken by bills which have passed this House within a brief period, and those lands are to be thrown open for settlement by white men.

We can not complain, perhaps, with regard to the lands that are situated away from the Indian Territory, because they are required for white occupation, and because the Indians are paid a reasonably fair price for them; but as to the lands in the Indian Territory I must protest against the policy which has been recently instituted, and which is pressed so urgently and aggressively upon the House, the policy of opening up that

Territory to white settlement in defiance of solemn treaties made with the Indians in former years. We commence in the northeastern corner of the Indian Territory with lands which we have declared shall not be subject to the legislation of any State or Territory. We commence legislating there by the terms of this bill. Bill after bill is pending in Congress for the purpose of reaching the other Indian lands, and they will be reached, and this policy is to be substituted for the benign, humane, honorable policy of our fathers which set apart a fine body of land for the purpose of colonizing those Indians who would consent to go there and build up a great Indian commonwealth. And, sir, our experience up to the present time has justified the hope of our fathers that a great Indian commonwealth might be built up there and that at least one State of this Union might be peopled by the descendants of the brave Indian tribes that once occupied and possessed this whole land.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] that there is nothing pending before the House. The gentleman from Indiana has not submitted any amendment.

Mr. WEAVER. Will the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HOLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. WEAVER. I wish to ask the gentleman whether he thinks from the current history of the Indian Territory that a very humane condition of affairs exists there?

Mr. HOLMAN. I think that in the main, everything considered, the Indian Territory is doing remarkably well. The claim has been made, and I have never heard it denied, that there was not a pauper among the five civilized tribes, and the same claim has been set up by the Sacs and Foxes.

Mr. PEEL. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to interrupt the gentleman, but—

Mr. WEAVER. The condition of the Indian Territory is that it is controlled by a few barons who are enslaving all the rest.

Mr. HOOKER. I wish to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill [Mr. PERKINS] what portion of the existing law section 7 proposes to repeal. I observe in that section this language:

And so much of that portion of the act of March 3, 1873, as relates to the consolidation of said tribal funds of said Peoria and Miami Indians is hereby repealed.

To what section of the act of March 3, 1873, does that refer?

Mr. PERKINS. To the provision which has created this consolidated fund.

Mr. HOOKER. And put it in trust?

Mr. PERKINS. And put it in trust.

Mr. HOOKER. Then this repeals that provision, and provides for the distribution of the fund.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, sir; we repeal that section of the act of 1873.

The Clerk read the next section, as follows:

SEC. 8. That within ninety days from and after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to pay over to the said Peoria, Wea, Kaskaskia, and Piankeshaw Indians, except as hereinafter provided, all money belonging to said Peoria, Wea, Kaskaskia, and Piankeshaw Indians, and heretofore invested by the United States for the benefit of said Indians, together with all money now in the custody of the United States and belonging to said Indians, and arising from any and all sources whatsoever, the same to be paid out under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior per capita to all of said Peoria, Wea, Kaskaskia, and Piankeshaw Indians: *Provided*, That the shares of all minors entitled under this act shall be retained in the Treasury of the United States until such minors shall arrive at full age; and such shares so remaining shall bear interest at the rate of 3 per cent. per annum.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, there are, as many members of this House may be aware, some citizen Indians who have heretofore belonged to these tribes. Under acts of Congress already passed their fund has been distributed, and the relations previously existing between the several members of the tribe have been adjusted. The citizen Indians, however, think that in this adjustment they did not get their full proportion of the trust fund; and they have a bill pending in the House, which has been referred to our committee, asking a readjustment of the matter and a redistribution of the fund. That is the bill to which my friend from Mississippi has referred. In order to give the Interior Department an opportunity to reinvestigate this matter and to do justice in the event that these Indians did not get their full share in the distribution already had, I move the following amendment:

In line 2 of section 8 strike out the words "passage of this act" and insert the following:

"Revision of a distribution of the invested and other common property of the Confederated Peoria, Kaskaskia, Wea, and Piankeshaw Indians, made under the treaty of 1867, as hereinafter provided."

Other amendments are to follow which will make the bill harmonious.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following:

SEC. 9. That within ninety days from and after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to pay over, except as hereinafter provided, to the said Miami Indians, all money belonging to said Indians, or that may be due to said Miami Indians from the United States, arising from any and all sources whatsoever, the same to be paid out, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, per capita to the members of the said Miami tribe of Indians. That all money received and now in the custody of the

United States, or that may be received up to the date of the passage of this act, arising from the sale of the unallotted lands in Kansas, including the school sections referred to in section 6 of this act, shall immediately be available after the passage of this act; and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to pay the same to said Miami Indians in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1873.

Mr. HOLMAN. I would be very glad to know whether the Commissioner of Indian Affairs recommends definitely this section and the two preceding sections. Has he given an expression of approval as to the general bill, or does he advise the distribution of this fund among the Peorias and other Indians?

Mr. PERKINS. As I stated a few minutes ago, this bill was submitted to the Indian Office and to the Secretary of the Interior, in order to obtain the views of the Office and the Department upon it. They interpolated in the bill as submitted to them such amendments as in their judgment were proper. The committee accepted every such amendment and suggestion, and reported the bill to the House as amended and approved by the Indian Office and the Secretary of the Interior. This bill confers upon these Indians the rights of citizenship substantially as the general allotment bill confers the right of citizenship upon the Indians to whom allotments are made.

Mr. HOLMAN. So that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, it is understood, actually recommended the policy of this bill.

Mr. PERKINS. He did, he indorsed every line of it as reported to the House.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope this is not a mistake, because it is a very serious matter to these unfortunate people. My belief is that within five years the body of these Indians will either be asking aid from this Government to support them on their lands, or else they will be outcasts and paupers.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. There is no amendment pending. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. That upon the completion of the allotments provided for in this act and the patenting of the lands to said allottees, each and every member of the united tribes to whom allotments have been made shall become and be a citizen of the United States entitled to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of such citizens.

Mr. COBB. I move to amend by striking out the section just read.

Mr. Speaker, while I am not opposed to the policy of allowing Indians to become citizens of the United States, I am unalterably opposed to the policy of thrusting citizenship upon them without reference to their qualifications to receive it. This bill proposes in the first place to divide the lands of these Indians in severalty; and the mere fact that the land is so divided is to make them citizens, so we are told, under the general laws of the United States. If that be true, then this section is not necessary. If it is not true, then I am opposed to the section, because I am opposed to having these Indians made citizens in the manner here provided.

It is well known that these Indians are not the most civilized of our Indian tribes. There are other Indians more advanced in civilization who have never yet received the privilege of citizenship. It is more than doubtful whether any of the Indians are prepared, as tribes or bands, to enjoy the rights and privileges and assume the duties and responsibilities of citizens. If we are to pursue the policy of making them citizens, why not do so under such regulations, limitations, and restrictions of law as will insure their fitness to exercise the rights of citizenship? Here is a whole tribe or band of Indians, not the most civilized in the Indian Territory, upon whom you propose to confer by a single enactment the rights and duties of citizenship. I think the policy is wrong, looking to the interests of the Government; and it is certainly wrong, in my judgment, so far as the Indian himself is concerned, as it will tend to drive him more speedily to his destruction.

Mr. NELSON. I beg to have read section 6 of the general allotment act passed at the last Congress. I want to have it read for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That upon the completion of said allotments and the patenting of the lands to said allottees, each and every member of the respective bands or tribes of Indians to whom allotments have been made shall have the benefit of and be subject to the laws, both civil and criminal, of the State or Territory in which they may reside; and no Territory shall pass or enforce any law denying any such Indian within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law. And every Indian born within the territorial limits of the United States to whom allotments shall have been made under the provisions of this act, or under any law or treaty, and every Indian born within the territorial limits of the United States who has voluntarily taken up, within said limits, his residence separate and apart from any tribe of Indians therein, and has adopted the habits of civilized life, is hereby declared to be a citizen of the United States, and is entitled to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of such citizens, whether said Indian has been or not, by birth or otherwise, a member of any tribe of Indians within the territorial limits of the United States without in any manner impairing or otherwise affecting the right of any such Indian to tribal or other property.

Mr. COBB. I ask the gentleman from Minnesota to have read at the same time section 8 of the same law.

Mr. PEEL. I must object to the time being taken up in these debates when there is no question pending before the House.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The gentleman from Minnesota is entitled to the floor.

Mr. NELSON. I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that the general law

which I have had read at the Clerk's desk goes further even than the proposition in this bill. Therefore whether we leave this in the pending bill or not these Indians will come in under the general allotment act.

Mr. PERKINS. These Indians were specially excepted from the general allotment act, and therefore if they are to become citizens of the United States it must be done affirmatively, because as the law now stands they are expressly excepted.

Mr. HOLMAN. Have these Indians applied for this legislation?

Mr. PERKINS. They have.

Mr. HOLMAN. The men who are here are white men—one is a white man and the other is a half-breed. I am not aware that they are here having any authority from these Indians to represent them.

Mr. COBB. I should like to have read section 8, to which I have referred, of the general allotment act.

Mr. PEEL. I do not wish to interfere with my colleague on the committee, but I should like to ask the Chair a parliamentary question: whether it is competent for gentlemen to discuss this bill except under the five-minute rule?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill is being discussed under the five-minute rule. The gentleman from Alabama who offered the amendment occupied but two minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota occupied less than three minutes.

Mr. PEEL. I am anxious to get along with this bill.

Mr. COBB. In addition to the statement made by the gentleman from Minnesota, I will say that section 8 does except these Indians from the operation of section 6, which was read on his request at the Clerk's desk.

I have but a word more to say. I am as anxious as my colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, to get along with the bill; but it strikes me it is not prudent and wise legislation to permit a bill to pass without fair consideration.

Mr. PERKINS. By express terms, it is provided in the general allotment act—

That the provision of this act shall not extend to the territory occupied by the Cherokees, Creeks, Choctaws, Chickasaws, Seminoles, and Osages, Miamies and Peorias, and Sacs and Foxes, in the Indian Territory.

It was expressly understood that these Indians were not to be embraced.

Mr. HOLMAN. In the treaties with the five civilized tribes of Indians in the Indian Territory it was expressly provided that they were not to be embarrassed by legislation in reference to the Indians who were allowed to be located in that Territory. Those Indians were to be under their own government. They sold to these Miamies and Peorias a small corner of land. I would inquire, therefore, whether this legislation is not almost a violation in terms of the treaty under which the Cherokees acquired these lands?

Mr. COBB. I have no knowledge about that; if I had time I would go more extensively into that question; and I hope to do so when the Indian appropriation bill comes up for consideration. We have not time now to go into these questions.

We are now speaking on the question of citizenship. I do not think this provision extending the right of citizenship to these Indians, before we are assured they are ready for it, should be in this bill; and it is against that provision I feel it to be my duty to object. I propose before this Congress adjourns to introduce a bill repealing the general law on this subject, because I think it is wrong in principle and destructive in its policy. I do not want this thing to extend further than it has already gone, and hence I am opposed to providing in this bill for the extension of citizenship to these Miamies and Peorias. It is violative, as my friend from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] has suggested, of our treaty stipulations.

I am opposed to the whole policy as to conferring citizenship covered by this bill. What inquiry is provided to be made into the qualifications these men have for the exercise of the right and the performance of the duties of citizenship? Since this Government was organized we have been liberal in our policy of granting citizenship, but it has always been connected with the inquiry as to the qualification of the person applying for it to discharge its duties and obligations.

Mr. PERKINS. I simply desire to say, in response to the gentleman from Alabama, that I have here a letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and this section 10 found in the bill is found in the language draughted and recommended by the Indian Office. I therefore ask a vote on the amendment.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the motion of the gentleman from Alabama is to strike out the tenth section upon the ground that it proposes to regard as citizens of the United States all the members of these two combined tribes of Miami and Peoria Indians immediately upon receiving their allotted lands. An amendment which was adopted at the instance of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS] this morning, or a few moments ago, contained the stipulation that these lands, when thus allotted to the Indians, should be inalienable except to Indians; that the title should be perpetually in the allottees, their heirs or assigns, provided they were Indians, and that the lands should be exempt from execution, levy, or sale under the ordinary forms of law as provided when lands are held by white men.

The singular aspect is thus presented of a proposition to create over a small portion of the Indian Territory—a little parallelogram along the northeastern portion of the Territory, as gentlemen will see by reference to the map which I hold in my hand—a different system, and establish there the two tribes of Indians which you propose to locate in that parallelogram under a system different from that which is in force over the remainder of the Territory inhabited by these various tribes. It is proposed here by legislative enactment to admit the combined tribes of Miamies and Peorias as citizens of this country, and settle them upon their own lands, coupled with the extraordinary condition, I might say one unparalleled in the history of any people over whom we propose to stretch our laws, that they shall be vested with all the rights and privileges of citizens of the United States and at the same time be entirely free from execution through the ordinary processes of law. Under what State are they placed? In what State would they be regarded as citizens? Under what law do they live? How would they be citizens of the United States? Under what territorial organization would they act? Where would they be triable for a violation of the law? Where would they be amenable to civil suits?

Under this law they could not be amenable at all, for their realty is free from all execution, from any judgments, which may be obtained against them, unlike any similar provision incorporated in the laws of any of the States of the Union affecting the property of the poorest man in the country. The strange policy would be presented here of carving out of the extreme northeastern portion of this Indian Territory this small parallelogram and clothing the combined tribes of the Miami and Peoria Indians, whom you propose to locate there, with the rights of citizenship under the laws of the United States, and yet under no State, in no State, having no laws applicable to them or over them, and under the control of no law whatever.

Mr. HOLMAN. Except their own.

Mr. HOOKER. Yes, except their own.

Now, it will be observed, and it is significant, that this little strip of land to which I have referred is close upon the State of Missouri, and on the northern boundary is the State of Kansas.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does not that arise from its geographical position? [Laughter.]

Mr. HOOKER. Undoubtedly from its geographical position, but most fortunately for Kansas and Missouri, however unfortunate it may be for the Indians themselves.

But, sir, I hold that the bill contains graver objections than the objections that have been so well stated by my friend from Alabama [Mr. COBB]. These people are in the midst of the five semi-civilized Indian tribes. These tribes are known to be bitterly opposed to the principle of allotment of their lands in severalty. They sold these lands to the Miami and Peoria Indians, under what particular terms of the treaty I have not now time to investigate, but sold them for the purpose of being occupied by Indians living under the same system of laws as themselves, wedded to the same line of policy as themselves. It is undoubtedly a violation of the terms and stipulations of the treaty under which the Cherokees held these lands to say that you will now change the conditions under which they are held and adopt a different system in relation to them from that applied to the other tribes. If you may do that you may change the laws applicable to the lands held by the Indians in any portion of the territory occupied by any of the Indians, and I prophesy, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is but the entering wedge for propositions that are now here, or shortly will come, submitting plans and methods to change the policy under which the Indians hold their lands.

Mr. PEEL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say for the benefit of my friend from Mississippi that, unless I am badly mistaken, under a general allotment bill the Quapaws and Pottawatomies and other Indian tribes have already had their lands allotted; and hence this is no anomaly. The world will go on all the same after it is done as it has been going on for some time.

Mr. HOOKER. It will be imitating a very bad example, if it has been set before. I understand that the Pottawatomies are situated in that way, and that amongst them that principle prevails. I do not think, however, it can be justified upon any ground unless you are going to change the whole Indian policy, and on the pretense that you understand their interests better than they do themselves.

Now, I assert that the five civilized tribes are amply capable of directing their own affairs. I had occasion to pass through that part of the country not very long since, and met with men of the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Creek, and Choctaw tribes, and know their feelings in reference to the matter. I have spoken heretofore of their capacity to manage their own affairs. And while they may have peculiar views of the obligations of contract, if there is one principle that is dearer to these Indians than another, and if there is one in which they show marked intelligence and unanimity, it is the pertinacity with which they insist on holding their lands in common. They say, "It is our right, and unless you were dealing with us when you donated these lands in exchange for this vast empire east of the Mississippi," to use their own figurative language, "with forked tongues, and your promise that we should enjoy the occupancy of these lands forever meant only that we might hold them until you wanted them for the white people, and would

then ruthlessly, under the pretended form of protection, take them away, you will leave us to determine for ourselves what are our best interests and not force upon us a condition not demanded by our condition or best interests and not warranted by your obligations to us."

We stand, sir, related to these Indians, not only by solemn treaties, but the patents of the Government have gone forth, the highest evidence of title. And if you may invade it in one small and insignificant corner of the Indian Territory you may invade it everywhere, and set it aside at your own will and pleasure whenever you want these rich lands.

Mr. WARNER. I desire to make a correction of a statement made a short time ago. It was stated that by the treaty with the Cherokees in 1866 it was provided that lands should be deeded to them as tribes. I beg to say it was left to the discretion of the General Government whether lands should be deeded to the tribes or to the Indians.

Mr. HOLMAN. The Government used that discretion and elected to give the lands to the tribes.

Mr. PERKINS. Let us get on with this bill, which has nothing to do with the Cherokees.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. COBB] to strike out the tenth section.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 33, noes 73.

So (further count not being called for) the motion to strike out the section was not agreed to.

The Clerk read section 11, as follows:

SEC. 11. That it is distinctly understood that no person or persons who have heretofore been attached to either of said tribes, and who have withdrawn from either of said tribes and become citizens of the United States, and been paid their fair share of the funds set apart for them and their families, shall have or be permitted to have any part or interest in and to any portion of the land or money allotted or paid to the said Peoria or Miami Indians under the provisions of this act. Where present members of either of said tribes shall have intermarried into each other's tribe, respectively, he or she shall not be barred from receiving his or her full share of all land and money divided per capita under this act among the tribe from which he or she originated.

Mr. PERKINS. I offer the amendments which I send to the desk. I think it will save time to take them together.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 2, strike out "either of said" and insert "the Western Miami." Strike out the letter "s" from "tribes" in line 3, and strike out in same line the words "either of."

In line 4, strike out "s" from the word "tribes."

In line 5, strike out the word "fair."

In line 8, strike out "Peoria or."

Strike out all after the word "act" in line 9.

Mr. HOOKER. Why in this section strike out the Peorias?

Mr. PERKINS. Because these provisions do not relate to them.

Mr. HOOKER. I understand the purport of the gentleman's amendment to be that none of those who have chosen to become citizens of the United States shall be entitled to any portion of this fund.

Mr. PERKINS. The object of our amendments is that they shall have whatever may be found to be their due, and that the Government shall be able to give it to them.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I wish to ask the gentleman from Kansas a question. He says, as I understand, that this bill has been submitted to and approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I wish to know whether the bill submitted to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs was the bill reported to the House or the bill as it is now being amended?

Mr. PERKINS. The bill reported to the House.

Mr. ADAMS. I suggest to the gentleman from Kansas another amendment to the eleventh section. I think it would be better if the words at the beginning of the section "that it is distinctly understood" should be stricken out.

Mr. PERKINS. I agree to that and accept it as part of my amendment. Let the section now be read as it is proposed to be amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 11. That no person or persons who have heretofore been attached to the western Miami tribe, and who have withdrawn from said tribe and become citizens of the United States, and been paid their share of the funds set apart for them and their families, shall have or be permitted to have any part or interest in and to any portion of the land or money allotted or paid to the said Miami Indians under the provisions of this act.

The question being put on the amendments of Mr. PERKINS as modified they were agreed to.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. In order that the bill may be made to conform entirely to what I suggested to the gentleman from Mississippi I move now the additional sections as an amendment pertaining to the same subject.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding sections 14 and 15, as follows:

"SEC. 14. That the Secretary of the Interior shall, immediately after the passage of this act, examine and revise the distribution heretofore made of the 'invested and other common property' of the tribe of Confederated Peoria, Kaskaskia, Wea, and Piankeshaw Indians, under the provisions of the treaty of 1867, between said Indians and the United States, and shall ascertain and determine the amount due the Indians of said tribe 'who remained and became citizens of the United States' under the provisions of said treaty at the date of the distribution aforesaid, and deduct therefrom the sum actually paid to said Indians

in said distribution heretofore made, and pay to said Indians of said tribe 'who remained and became citizens of the United States,' the survivors of them, their heirs or legal representatives, according to the laws of descent and distribution now in force in the State of Kansas, the difference between the revised amount in excess of the amount so distributed aforesaid, with interest thereon from the date of distribution aforesaid, and deduct the amount so found to be due to said Indians of said tribe 'who remained and became citizens of the United States,' with the interest thereon from such of the invested or other funds of said tribe of Confederated Peoria, Kaskaskia, Wea, and Piankeshaw Indians, or of such of the invested or other funds now held in trust for said confederated tribe. If it shall appear that any living persons who were members of said confederated tribe of Peorias, etc., as appear in the treaty of 1854 were not enrolled on the division rolls on which a distribution was made under the treaty of 1867, they shall be enrolled with the Indian class; and if any persons have been fraudulently or erroneously enrolled on either of said rolls they shall be stricken therefrom and the two rolls thus amended shall be the basis of the redistribution herein provided.

"SEC. 15. That in the revision and examination herein provided for said Indians 'who remained and became citizens of the United States' under said treaty of 1867, may be heard through counsel learned in the law, who shall have free access, for the purposes of this examination and revision, to all papers now on file in the Department of the Interior relating to or in any wise pertaining to said distribution or revision; and for the services of said counsel in this behalf a reasonable sum, to be fixed by contract between said Indians and their counsel, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, or in the absence of such contract in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, shall be retained out of the amount found to be due said Indians 'who remained and became citizens of the United States,' the survivors of them, their heirs or legal representatives, and be paid by the Secretary of the Interior to said counsel."

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask unanimous consent for the House to recur to sections 7 and 9. I made a statement to the House, which I find, on examination of the letter of the Indian Office, was not correct. I said every amendment suggested to the bill by the Indian Office had been incorporated and reported; but I find now the Department criticises section 7 and section 9, and doubts the propriety of dividing this investment fund among these Indians. I ask unanimous consent to reconsider these sections, so that the House may not be deceived by any statement I made in the matter.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to going back to the consideration of those sections?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMAN. I shall move to strike out those sections.

Mr. BLOUNT. Let them be read.

Section 7 was read, as follows:

SEC. 7. That the Peoria and Miami Indians shall be paid separately all such sums of money as may be due each of said tribes, in manner as hereinafter provided; and so much of that portion of the act of March 3, 1873, as relates to the consolidation of said tribal funds of said Peoria and Miami Indians is hereby repealed.

Mr. PERKINS. I desire to read from the letter of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mr. Atkins, in regard to those sections:

As to sections 7, 8, and 9, I quote from my report of April 16, 1886:

"Section 7 provides that the Peoria and Miami Indians shall be paid separately all such sums of money as may be due each of said tribes in manner as hereinafter provided, and repeals so much of the act of March 3, 1873, as relates to the consolidation of said tribal funds of said Peoria and Miami Indians, and section 8 provides that within ninety days from and after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to pay over to said Peoria, etc., Indians—with the exception of \$15,000, to be reserved as a school fund—all moneys belonging to said Indians heretofore invested or held in trust, and arising from any and all sources whatsoever.

"In regard to these two sections, I have to say that it is not deemed wise or prudent to pay to these tribes the whole amount of moneys due under treaties or held in trust for their benefit, but that under the twenty-fourth article of the treaty with the Peorias, etc., dated February 23, 1867 (Stats. 15, pages 519-520) the Secretary of the Interior has authority to grant relief from time to time by payment of a part of their funds, invested or otherwise, upon the application of the chiefs for the same.

"The same remarks will apply to section 9 regarding the payment in full to the Miamies of all moneys due, except as to the land moneys now on hand or hereafter to be placed to their credit on the books of the Treasury, which requires the consent of Congress before payment."

So that the Indian Commissioner does not suggest any amendment to the section, and, in consequence of that, no amendments were made by the committee; but the Indian Office doubts the propriety of the legislation proposed in that section.

The motion of Mr. HOLMAN to strike out section 7 was agreed to.

The Clerk read section 9, as follows:

SEC. 9. That within ninety days from and after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to pay over, except as hereinafter provided, to the said Miami Indians all money belonging to said Indians, or that may be due to said Miami Indians from the United States, arising from any and all sources whatsoever, the same to be paid out, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, per capita to the members of the said Miami tribe of Indians. That all money received and now in the custody of the United States, or that may be received up to the date of the passage of this act, arising from the sale of the unallotted lands in Kansas, including the school sections referred to in section 6 of this act, shall immediately be available after the passage of this act; and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to pay the same to said Miami Indians in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1873.

Mr. HOLMAN. I move to strike out the ninth section.

Mr. PERKINS. I hope that amendment will not prevail. This relates only to the money that is to be derived from the sale of their lands in Kansas, so I understand it from a hasty reading, and as to that, I think it should be the sense of the House that they should receive that money.

Mr. HOLMAN. The gentleman is mistaken. If he will read the section he will see it provides that "the Secretary of the Interior shall pay over, except as is hereinafter provided, to the said Miami Indians

all money belonging to said Indians, or that may be due to said Miami Indians from the United States, arising from any and all sources whatsoever."

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, I see it contains that provision.

The motion of Mr. HOLMAN to strike out the section was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, the letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs makes the same objection to section 8 as it does to section 7, which has been stricken out on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN]. I therefore move that section 8 also be struck out from this bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the section. The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 8. That within ninety days from and after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to pay over to the said Peoria, Wea, Kaskaskia, and Piankeshaw Indians, except as hereinafter provided, all money belonging to said Peoria, Wea, Kaskaskia, and Piankeshaw Indians, and heretofore invested by the United States for the benefit of said Indians, together with all money now in the custody of the United States and belonging to said Indians, and arising from any and all sources whatsoever, the same to be paid out under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior per capita to all of said Peoria, Wea, Kaskaskia, and Piankeshaw Indians: *Provided*, That the shares of all minors entitled under this act shall be retained in the Treasury of the United States until such minors shall arrive at full age; and such shares so remaining shall bear interest at the rate of 3 per cent. per annum.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the House will remember that this section 8 was amended so as to make provision for the citizen Indians. In consequence of the amendment which was made in section 8 we incorporated in the bill sections 14 and 15 as additional provisions. Now, if it should be the sense of the House that section 8 should be stricken out, it would carry with it the amendments which were put on that section, and would make nugatory sections 14 and 15. I make this statement so that the House may understand the case. I do not know that I care particularly about it, only that I thought it would be right to give the Secretary of the Interior authority to reinvestigate this trust fund, so that if there had been any injustice done to any Indian, whether a citizen or a member of the tribe, it might be remedied. However, if section 8 is to go out, I shall move to strike out sections 14 and 15.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's explanation does not go to the objection made by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the section which I have moved to strike out. The Commissioner's objection is that it provides for paying over to these Indians the gross sum of their funds, and operates right in the line of objection raised by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN]. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs says:

In regard to these two sections, 7 and 8, I have to say that it is not deemed wise or prudent to pay to these tribes the whole amount of money due under treaties or held in trust for their benefit.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that these sections should both go out, because, no matter what amendments may have been made to them, there has been no amendment made providing that they shall not receive the whole sum of their fund under these sections.

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I do trust that the House will vote to strike out the eighth section with the amendments. I am very much impressed with the idea, sir, that we are engaged in a scheme of inconsiderate legislation. We are undertaking to confer some kind of immunity or citizenship upon these Indians—something which is not clearly defined. There is nothing definite as to how they shall hold their property, or as to how they shall exercise their right of suffrage or any rights of citizenship. The character of their citizenship is not defined by this bill; and I apprehend that no member on this floor clearly understands the exact character of the citizenship which we here propose to confer. The Indians affected by this bill are not made citizens of any State; they are not clothed with the power usually conferred by a Territorial government; and in addition to this, if we confer the right of citizenship upon them we take away this fund now set apart for their support. In one breath we say, "They are not capable of holding and controlling their own;" and in another we declare, "They are citizens." The very statement of the proposition ought to be sufficient to convince any fair mind that this is unwise legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there is another provision of this bill which, whether so intended or not, is most deceptive in its character. Here we are disposing of 50,300 acres of land, and we say that these people may hold for twenty-five years 160 acres of this land for each Indian, and we allow them to sell the remainder, about 23,000 acres, to other Indians. If I have a right to sell or convey land to an Indian, why can not he sell it to somebody else? In other words, we say that an Indian can sell his land to another Indian, as though by this we mean that the land should remain perpetually the property of the Indians. The result will be that so much land as the Indian is allowed to sell in fee under this bill will soon be frittered away in his well-known prodigality and improvidence. This bill places the Indian at the mercy of the greed and shrewdness of the white invader.

While I do not make any charge against any one, I apprehend that this scheme is an effort to dispose of 23,000 acres of land to the "poor Indians" in order that some white men, the next day after the bill takes effect, may own the land. I apprehend this is the purpose of the bill—not disclosed in terms, but a hidden purpose covered by artful verbal dissimulation.

It is said that the bill allows the Indian to sell his land only to some other Indian. Why not allow him to sell to any one? If our purpose is sincere and honest, why impose the restriction that the land shall be sold to Indians only? Why not allow it to be sold in open market?

I repeat that in my judgment this bill is an inconsiderate measure of legislation, hurried through this House without mature deliberation. What sort of citizenship will these Indians enjoy? What will be their rights as to the inheritance and transmission of title to property? No limitation or regulation in that respect is provided in the bill. It simply, by the adoption of certain platitudes, says that these Indians are, or may become, citizens, when in point of fact they are not citizens and they do not become such under the bill. I hope we shall strike out this eighth section, for in doing so we strike out the very heart of the bill; and then I hope we shall defeat the entire measure.

Mr. PERKINS. Let us vote.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question will now be taken on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], to strike out the eighth section.

Mr. PERKINS. I do not care particularly about this question. I am quite willing the section should be stricken out, as that action has been taken on sections 7 and 9, pertaining to the same subject.

The amendment of Mr. LA FOLLETTE was agreed to; there being—ayes 51, noes 21.

Mr. PERKINS. I now move the previous question on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman desire any action on sections 14 and 15?

Mr. PERKINS. No, sir; on mature reflection I believe they are complete in themselves.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I desire to make a motion to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That will be in order when the question is upon its passage.

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

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is now on the passage of the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 45, noes 75.

Mr. BLOUNT. I think we had better have the yeas and nays on this question. I call for them.

The yeas and nays were ordered, there being—ayes 25, noes 96 (more than one-fifth voting in the affirmative).

The question was taken; and it was decided in the negative—yeas 47, nays 135, not voting 142; as follows:

YEAS—47.

- |                        |                  |              |              |
|------------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Abbott,                | Clements,        | Hooker,      | Smith,       |
| Adams,                 | Cogswell,        | La Follette, | Sowden,      |
| Arnold,                | Elliott,         | Mahoney,     | Spooner,     |
| Bacon,                 | Felton,          | Mason,       | Stahlnecker, |
| Baker, Ill.            | Finley,          | McAdoo,      | Stephenson,  |
| Barnes,                | Fuller,          | McClammy,    | Stewart, Ga. |
| Blanchard,             | Greenman,        | McComas,     | Stone, Ky.   |
| Blount,                | Guenther,        | McCreary,    | Thomas, Ky.  |
| Bryce,                 | Hall,            | Pidcock,     | Tracey,      |
| Campbell, T. J., N. Y. | Haugen,          | Randall,     | Turner, Ga.  |
| Caswell,               | Henderson, N. C. | Rowlan,      | Whitthorne.  |
| Chipman,               | Holman,          | Seymour,     |              |

NAYS—135.

- |                       |                 |                |                |
|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Allen, Mich.          | Dingley,        | Lane,          | Sawyer,        |
| Allen, Miss.          | Dockery,        | Lanham,        | Sayers,        |
| Anderson, Miss.       | Dorsey,         | Lind,          | Shaw,          |
| Anderson, Ill.        | Dougherty,      | Long,          | Sherman,       |
| Anderson, Kans.       | Enloe,          | Macdonald,     | Shively,       |
| Belden,               | Flood,          | Mansur,        | Springer,      |
| Bland,                | Forney,         | Martin,        | Stewart, Tex.  |
| Bliss,                | French,         | McRae,         | Stockdale,     |
| Boothman,             | Gaines,         | Milliken,      | Stone, Mo.     |
| Boutelle,             | Gallinger,      | Mills,         | Struble,       |
| Breckinridge, Ark.    | Gear,           | Moffitt,       | Symes,         |
| Breckinridge, Ky.     | Gest,           | Montgomery,    | Tarsney,       |
| Brewer,               | Gibson,         | Morrill,       | Taulbee,       |
| Brower,               | Glass,          | Morrow,        | Thomas, Wis.   |
| Browne, T. H. B., Va. | Grosvenor,      | Neal,          | Thompson, Cal. |
| Browne, Ind.          | Hare,           | Nelson,        | Vance,         |
| Brown, Ohio           | Hatch,          | Newton,        | Wade,          |
| Burrows,              | Hayes,          | Nichols,       | Walker,        |
| Butler,               | Hemphill,       | Nutting,       | Warner,        |
| Butterworth,          | Henderson, Iowa | O'Donnell,     | Washington,    |
| Bynum,                | Hermann,        | O'Neill, Pa.   | Weaver,        |
| Cannon,               | Hires,          | Owen,          | Weber,         |
| Caruth,               | Hitt,           | Payson,        | West,          |
| Catchings,            | Hogg,           | Peel,          | Wheeler,       |
| Cheadle,              | Holmes,         | Pennington,    | White, N. Y.   |
| Clardy,               | Hopkins, Ill.   | Perkins,       | Whiting, Mich. |
| Cobb,                 | Hunter,         | Perry,         | Wickham,       |
| Cockran,              | Jackson,        | Peters,        | Wilkins,       |
| Conger,               | Kean,           | Post,          | Wilkinson,     |
| Cothran,              | Kerr,           | Rice,          | Wilson, W. Va. |
| Crouse,               | Ketcham,        | Richardson,    | Wise,          |
| Culberson,            | Kilgore,        | Rogers,        | Yoder,         |
| Cummings,             | Laidlaw,        | Russell, Conn. | Yost.          |
| Darlington,           | Landes,         | Ryan,          |                |

## NOT VOTING—142.

Allen, Mass.	Davidson, Ala.	Kelley,	Phelps,
Anderson, Iowa	Davidson, Fla.	Kennedy,	Plumb,
Atkinson,	Davis,	Laffoon,	Pugsley,
Baker, N. Y.	De Lano,	Lagan,	Rayner,
Bankhead,	Dibble,	Laird,	Reed,
Barry,	Dunham,	Latham,	Robertson,
Bayne,	Dunn,	Lawler,	Rockwell,
Belmont,	Ermentrout,	Lee,	Romeis,
Biggs,	Farquhar,	Lehbach,	Rowell,
Bingham,	Fisher,	Lodge,	Russell, Mass.
Bound,	Fitch,	Lyman,	Rusk,
Bowden,	Foran,	Lynch,	Scott,
Bowen,	Ford,	Maffett,	Scull,
Brown, J. R., Va.	Funston,	Maish,	Seney,
Brumm,	Gay,	Matson,	Simmons,
Buchanan,	Glover,	McCormick,	Spindler,
Buckalew,	Goff,	McCulloch,	Spinola,
Bunnell,	Granger,	McKenna,	Steele,
Burnes,	Grimes,	McKinley,	Stewart, Vt.
Burnett,	Grout,	McKinney,	Taylor, E. B., Ohio
Campbell, F., N. Y.	Harmer,	McMillin,	Taylor, J. D., Ohio
Campbell, Ohio	Hayden,	McShane,	Thomas, Ill.
Candler,	Heard,	Merriman,	Thompson, Ohio
Carlton,	Henderson, Ill.	Moore,	Tillman,
Clark,	Herbert,	Morgan,	Townsend,
Collins,	Hiestand,	Morse,	Turner, Kans.
Compton,	Hopkins, Va.	Norwood,	Vandever,
Cooper,	Hopkins, N. Y.	Oates,	White, Ind.
Cowles,	Houk,	O'Ferrall,	Whiting, Mass.
Cox,	Hovey,	O'Neill, Ind.	Wilber,
Crain,	Howard,	O'Neill, Mo.	Williams,
Crisp,	Hudd,	Osborne,	Wilson, Minn.
Cutcheon,	Hutton,	Outhwaite,	Woodburn,
Dalzell,	Johnston, Ind.	Parker,	Yardley.
Dargan,	Johnston, N. C.	Patton,	
Davenport,	Jones,	Phelan,	

So the motion to recommit was disagreed to.  
During the roll-call the following pairs were announced:  
On all political questions until further notice:

Mr. NORWOOD with Mr. DAVENPORT.  
Mr. LYNCH with Mr. HIESTAND.  
Mr. COWLES with Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio.  
Mr. JONES with Mr. PHELPS.  
Mr. GOFF with Mr. SNYDER.  
Mr. HOWARD with Mr. DE LANO.  
Mr. COLLINS with Mr. JOHN R. BROWN.  
Mr. TOWNSHEND with Mr. MAFFETT.  
Mr. MATSON with Mr. DUNHAM.  
Mr. HUDD with Mr. CLARK.  
Mr. PHELAN with Mr. BUTLER.  
Mr. MCSHANE with Mr. MCCULLOGH.  
Mr. SPINOLA with Mr. THOMAS, of Illinois.  
Mr. GRANGER with Mr. ROCKWELL.  
For this day on all political questions:  
Mr. OUTHWAITE with Mr. PUGSLEY.  
Mr. O'FERRALL with Mr. COOPER.  
Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio, with Mr. BAKER, of New York.  
Mr. SENEY with Mr. KENNEDY.  
Mr. CRAIN with Mr. ALLEN, of Massachusetts.  
Mr. HUTTON with Mr. BAYNE.  
Mr. DAVIDSON, of Florida, with Mr. ATKINSON.  
Mr. DIBBLE with Mr. LEHLBACH.  
Mr. LAWLER with Mr. HOPKINS.  
Mr. FORD with Mr. STEELE.  
Mr. BANKHEAD with Mr. COGSWELL.  
Mr. GRIMES with Mr. MCCORMICK.  
Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts, with Mr. FITCH.  
Mr. MOORE with Mr. DARLINGTON.  
Mr. HOGG with Mr. LAIRD.  
Mr. BURNETT with Mr. ROMEIS.  
Mr. DARLINGTON. I am paired on all political questions with Mr. MOORE, but not regarding this as such, I have voted in the negative.

The vote was then announced as above recorded.  
Mr. PERKINS demanded the previous question on the passage of the bill.

The previous question was ordered, and under the operation thereof the bill was passed.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

## CREDITORS OF POTTAWATOMIE INDIANS.

Mr. PEEL. I move that the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4487) to enable the Secretary of the Interior to pay certain creditors of the Pottawatomie Indians out of the funds of said Indians, and that it be put on its passage.

The motion was agreed to.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of moneys appropriated for the Pottawatomie Indians by the act of August 3, 1886, entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies," etc., a sum not exceeding \$3,175, being 10 per cent. of the amount or proportion of said appropriation due the Citizens' band of Pottawat-

omie Indians, to E. John Ellis, for professional service rendered said Citizens' band in the collection of said claim: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall first determine that the said services were rendered to said Indians by said Ellis, and were contracted for in good faith by persons authorized to represent said Indians.

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

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

## OLD SETTLER OR WESTERN CHEROKEE INDIANS.

Mr. PEEL. Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1407) to authorize the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render final judgment upon the claim of the Old Settler or Western Cherokee Indians, and put it upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the claim of that part of the Cherokee Indians, known as the Old Settlers or Western Cherokees, against the United States, which claim was set forth in the report of the Secretary of the Interior to Congress of February 3, 1883 (said report being made under act of Congress of August 7, 1882), and contained in Executive Document No. 60 of the second session of the Forty-seventh Congress, be, and the same hereby is, referred to the Court of Claims for adjudication; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred on said court to try said cause, and to determine what sum or sums of money, if any, are justly due from the United States to said Indians, arising from or growing out of treaty stipulations and acts of Congress relating thereto, after deducting all payments heretofore actually made to said Indians by the United States, either in money or property; and to try and determine all questions that may arise in such cause on behalf of either party thereto and render final judgment thereon; and the Attorney-General is hereby directed to appear in behalf of the Government; and if said court shall decide against the United States, the Attorney-General shall, within thirty days from the rendition of judgment, appeal the cause to the Supreme Court of the United States; and from any judgment that may be rendered the said Indians may also appeal to said Supreme Court: *Provided*, That the appeal of said Indians shall be taken within sixty days after the rendition of said judgment, and said courts shall give such cause precedence: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be accepted or construed as a confession that the Government of the United States is indebted to said Indians.

SEC. 2. That said action shall be commenced by a petition stating the facts on which said Indians claim to recover, and the amount of their claim; and said petition may be verified by the authorized agent or attorney of said Indians as to the existence of such facts, and no other statement need be contained in said petition or verification.

The committee recommend the adoption of the following amendment:

After the word "property," in line 19, of the first section, add: "and after deducting all offsets, counter-claims, and deductions of any and every kind and character which should be allowed to the United States under any valid provision or provisions in said treaties and laws contained, or to which the United States may be otherwise entitled, and after fully considering and determining whether or not the said Indians have heretofore adjusted and settled their said claim with the United States, it being the intention of this act to allow the said Court of Claims unrestricted latitude in adjusting and determining the said claim, so that the rights, legal and equitable, both of the United States and of said Indians may be fully considered and determined."

Mr. PEEL. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to call attention briefly to the objects of this bill. The branch of the Cherokee Indians known as the Old Settlers, or Western Cherokees, have been prosecuting a claim against the Government for over forty years, growing out of the stipulations of the treaty made with them in 1846.

In the Forty-seventh Congress the Senate, by a resolution, referred the claim to the Secretary of the Interior, with instructions and authority to have a special accountant examine the claim from its inception. The Secretary of the Interior employed a special accountant under the resolution, who found, after a laborious and thorough investigation, that the Government was indebted to these Indians in the sum of about \$400,000. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs made a separate report, corresponding with and corroborating that of the special accountant.

In the Forty-eighth Congress this came from the Department by way of an Executive document for the purpose of making an appropriation to meet the payment of the claim. It was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, of which I was a member, and to me as a subcommittee to examine and report upon it. I gave it a thorough examination and came to a different conclusion from that reached by the Department—that under the treaties we did not owe these Indians anything. That is still my opinion.

During that same session of Congress the Senate, however, referred it to the Court of Claims under the Bowman act. That court ascertained and reported that under one construction of the treaty the Government owed these Indians about \$4,000, and under another construction two hundred and sixty-odd thousand dollars. This bill is not for the purpose of appropriating the money. When I reported adversely upon it in the Forty-eighth Congress I held, as stated, the same opinion that I have now, and this bill is simply to refer it to the Court of Claims with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States.

The bill makes it imperative upon the part of the Attorney-General to appeal the case on behalf of the Government if the Court of Claims decides in favor of the Indians. I recommend this course from the fact—notwithstanding I came to the conclusion that we are not indebted to them—that this is a question involving a legal consideration growing out of the construction of the terms of the treaty with these Indians. I may be wrong in my construction of it; and while my honest judg-

ment is that we are not indebted to them, I prefer the judgment of another department which is equally interested. The Court of Claims holds, as I have said, that the treaty is susceptible of the two constructions, under one of which \$4,000 is due them, and under the other in the neighborhood of \$260,000; and the object of this bill is to bring the question before the proper tribunal, and eventually to the highest court of the land, to interpret and construe the treaties and ascertain whether or not we are indebted, and, if indebted, to what extent. That is all the bill asks.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will the gentleman from Arkansas allow me a moment?

Mr. PEEL. Certainly.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to know if the gentleman can inform me how many years this matter has been before Congress, and whether there have been any adverse reports?

Mr. PEEL. The adverse report that I made when it was before the Forty-eighth Congress is the only one that I have any knowledge of against it. There were two reports made in the Senate, one in the Forty-sixth and one in the Forty-seventh Congress, one of them submitted by Senator Logan and the other by Senator CAMERON, both in favor of it.

Mr. BLOUNT. Do I understand that from 1846 up to that time Congress took no notice of the claim, or that it was not pressed?

Mr. PEEL. Well, there was a time during the war that it was not pressed.

Mr. BLOUNT. I understand the gentleman to say that it grew out of the treaty of 1846.

Mr. PEEL. It did.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then Congress failed to recognize it at all until since the war?

Mr. PEEL. No; the gentleman is mistaken. I think there was an appropriation made in 1850, growing out of the treaty stipulation of 1846; but they received it under protest at that time.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then Congress in 1850 determined the question and appropriated the amount to pay it?

Mr. PEEL. They did, and gave the same construction to the treaty that I gave it in my adverse report. But the trouble is here: I do not think it is just to these people, or to any other people in the United States who have a claim against the Government for money growing out of the language of treaties, to refuse a hearing because I or any other man may come to the conclusion that it is not correct, and acting on that belief refuse to let them go to the court and have it passed upon by a proper judicial tribunal.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then why not have a general provision of law instead of making a special act in regard to this old claim?

Mr. PEEL. Because I suppose a general law is not asked for. I do not know of any other reason. This claim has been prosecuted earnestly, and the claimants believe that something is due them; and under the construction of the Court of Claims something appears to be due them.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Is your committee unanimous?

Mr. PEEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLOUNT. I hope, sir, we are not going to agree to this bill. My friend from Arkansas has just stated to the House that in 1850 this claim was presented to Congress. It was examined by both branches and they ascertained the amount believed to be due, passed a bill to that effect, and the Government paid the money over to the Indians.

Mr. WEAVER. Amounting to very nearly a million of dollars.

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes; amounting, as my friend from Iowa states, to nearly a million of dollars. That was in 1850. Now the claim is pressed again. It is like all those old claims, in which there is always somebody about this Capitol interested in some form or other.

My friend from Arkansas tells the House he examined this matter in the last Congress and came to the same conclusion that Congress did in 1850; that there was nothing at all in it. He states that the Court of Claims, having examined it, reports that there is one construction under which \$4,000 are due, and that something is due under another construction.

Mr. WEAVER. But under the construction which Congress puts upon the treaty nothing is due.

Mr. BLOUNT. So I understand. This claim was acted upon by Congress just as we have done with reference to other Indian matters. Congress in 1850 took the subject in hand and disposed of it as they saw fit; and I think that ought to be final. I therefore see no reason why this old claim should be revived when there are thousands of claims all over the country which are not to have the privilege of going to the Court of Claims.

We have many bills providing for the submission of claims to the Court of Claims, and I think if any of these applications should be declined this one ought to be. I think when claims come before us which have been disposed of by the Government in a solemn legislative form we will not, after the lapse of nearly half a century, proceed to make another examination of them.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Move to lay the bill on the table.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move to lay the bill on the table.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Arkansas is entitled to the floor.

Mr. PEEL. I am somewhat surprised at the attitude of my friend from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT], whose voice but a few moments ago was heard lifted up in protest against our robbing the Indians. And now he will not let them go to the Court of Claims to pass upon the justice of their claim. The gentleman professes to be a friend of the Indians, and yet when we ask on behalf of the old Cherokee Indians the simple right to go to the court and have the court adjudicate a claim which the Interior Department says we owe them and in regard to which the Court of Claims say something is due them under the treaty, the gentleman is opposed to that proposition, as if we should be afraid to trust a court of the United States to adjudicate a case and dispose of it finally.

I do not pretend I am perfect in all things. It may be that nothing is due those Indians. I made an investigation and came to that conclusion. But other gentlemen, equally able and perhaps more able than myself, say differently. The Court of Claims say in their investigation, under the Bowman act, that under one construction of the treaty we owed them \$4,000; under another construction, \$260,000. Is it right to deprive these people of a hearing in the court? Is it not right to allow them to go to court and present their claim to a court that has the power to construe the treaty and the law?

Mr. BLOUNT. What is meant by the term "Old Settlers?"

Mr. PEEL. These were a branch of the Cherokees who removed to the west of the Mississippi River, settled in Arkansas, and then went to the Indian Territory.

Mr. BLOUNT. How many of them are there?

Mr. PEEL. I can not give the exact number. About a third of the whole tribe belong to the Old Settlers. They have always been so denominated.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then this if paid would only go to a branch of the Cherokee Nation?

Mr. PEEL. Yes, sir. I do trust Congress will give them the chance of a hearing in the court.

Mr. ADAMS. I desire to ask the gentleman from Arkansas a question. I understand the gentleman to say that the only question remaining in this case is a question of law—a question of construction.

Mr. PEEL. A construction of the treaty.

Mr. ADAMS. I ask whether the report of the committee states what that question of law is. Is the report brief enough to have it read now?

Mr. PEEL. It is very brief, but I do not think it would enlighten the House upon that one subject.

Mr. ADAMS. The reason why I ask that question is that the main object of referring a case to the Court of Claims is to settle a disputed question of fact, and, although a question of law might be settled in that court, yet, after all, this House is entitled to its opinion on the construction of the law.

Mr. PEEL. If my friend will pardon me, this proposition is not only to send the case to the Court of Claims, but the object is to get it to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. ADAMS. But there would still be the question of appropriation, and that question can come up in this Congress, or in the next, and after all it will come to that, and therefore will not the determination of the question ultimately depend upon the construction which Congress puts upon the law?

Mr. PEEL. Not at all. When the Supreme Court renders its judgment.

Mr. BLOUNT. The bill provides that it shall be a final judgment, and when it comes here we have nothing to do but to appropriate the money.

Mr. ADAMS. Or to refuse to appropriate.

Mr. BLOUNT. You can not refuse to appropriate for a judgment.

Mr. ADAMS. Can we not neglect it? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House will be in order. The gentleman from Arkansas has not yielded the floor, except as he has indicated.

Mr. PEEL. I yield now to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I only want to say that I very much doubt the wisdom of legislating in a hurry on this matter and sending it, as is now proposed, to the Court of Claims. We have got to have various negotiations and settlements with the Cherokee Indians in the not distant future. We have had various negotiations and settlements with them, running back, as the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PEEL] says, to 1850, and even back of that. I understand the gentleman to say that in 1850 we settled this claim and paid them a round million of dollars. It will be recollected by the House that we bought some lands of these Indians, known as the Cherokee Strip, and from time to time we have paid them money upon those lands; but still they have possession of them, and are leasing them to other parties without authority.

Mr. PEEL. I am afraid, if the gentleman will allow me—

Mr. CANNON. I beg that the gentleman will allow me to go on for a moment. Now, Mr. Speaker, it may be that we owe these Indians this money; but I doubt it very much. I suspect that this claim hav-



ing been settled at one time and paid, and they having accepted the money, they are in point of fact estopped.

Mr. PEEL. That is all set out in the bill, and the court can consider it if they want to.

Mr. CANNON. Let that be as it may, I wish to remind the House also that we sent a Choctaw claim to the Court of Claims some time ago, and it came back here in the form of a judgment for nearly three millions of dollars, which so outraged the sense of the House, or at least of a majority of it, that, although the judgment has been at interest for a year and a half, no appropriation has ever been made for it.

Mr. WEAVER. I wish to ask the gentleman whether it is not true that this House had as good a right at that time to pass upon the legality of that claim as the court had?

Mr. CANNON. With all due regard to the views of my friend from Arkansas [Mr. PEEL], in whose judgment I have great confidence, I think we ought to be a little slow in sending this claim to the Court of Claims.

A MEMBER. Fifty years is moderately slow.

Mr. CANNON. For one, Mr. Speaker, I am not willing, without more light upon the subject, to vote to send this claim to the Court of Claims.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I think that the members are not prepared to vote on this question at this time, and I therefore move that the House adjourn.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PEEL] yield?

Mr. PEEL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL].

BILL H. R. 8383, TO REDUCE AND EQUALIZE DUTIES, ETC.

Mr. RANDALL, by unanimous consent, offered the following resolution; which was adopted:

*Resolved*, That the Public Printer be, and he is hereby, directed to print for the use of the House of Representatives 3,000 additional copies of the bill H. R. 8383, entitled "A bill to reduce and equalize duties on imports, to reduce internal-revenue taxes, and for other purposes."

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. PEEL. Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose the House cares to continue the discussion of this bill at length; but I now yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER], who desires to submit a few remarks at this time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] moves that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BLOUNT. I call for the regular order. If this bill is to be debated only on one side, I object.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair understood that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] had the floor by consent of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PEEL], to make the motion to adjourn, which is the pending motion before the House.

Mr. BLOUNT. I renew the motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Did the gentleman from Arkansas yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. PEEL. I did not. I move that the House do now adjourn.

#### CORRECTION.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Pending the motion to adjourn the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JACKSON] rises to a question of privilege.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, in the proceedings in the House on Friday last, on the consideration of House bill 2952, for the payment of certain claims, in the Journal I am reported as not voting.

I was present and voted "no," having previously voted in favor of taking the vote by yeas and nays. I ask to have the Journal corrected, to show me voting against the bill as it stood on its passage.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The correction will be made.

Pending the motion to adjourn, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency asks unanimous consent to take from the table House bill 1816 and re-refer it to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. What is the title of the bill?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk has not the bill at hand at this moment.

Mr. MILLS. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The request of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency will go over until to-morrow.

The motion to adjourn was agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills and joint resolutions of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. J. M. ALLEN (by request): A bill (H. R. 8471) for the relief of B. L. Owen—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ANDERSON, of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8472) for the relief of Charles C. Whiteside—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 8473) for the relief of Tarrell W. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COMPTON: A bill (H. R. 8474) for the payment of the claim of Columbus E. Robey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8475) for the relief of Mrs. Thomas S. Ferral—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 8476) granting a pension to Mortimer Hyatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8477) granting a pension to Philip Stull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8478) granting a pension to Charles Guest—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DORSEY: A bill (H. R. 8479) granting a pension to Elvira E. Fancher, widow of E. D. Fancher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISHER: A bill (H. R. 8480) granting a pension to James M. Camp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 8481) for the relief of the estate of Isham Combs, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FUNSTON: A bill (H. R. 8482) granting a pension to Mrs. Elvira Parish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES: A bill (H. R. 8483) for the relief of Mary E. Hamilton, administratrix, Cross County, Arkansas—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 8484) granting a pension to David E. Lawton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 8485) granting a pension to John Schebler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8486) for the relief of Thomas S. Brooke & Co.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HIRES: A bill (H. R. 8487) granting a pension to Samuel M. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 8488) for the relief of Josephine Dumbendorf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 8489) granting a pension to Abial S. Chamberlain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLAMMY: A bill (H. R. 8490) for the relief of W. P. Lane—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8491) for the relief of George E. Taylor—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8492) authorizing the construction of a bridge across Northeast River, Black River, and Cape Fear River, in the State of North Carolina—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MORRILL: A bill (H. R. 8493) granting an increase of a pension to George N. Faulcouer—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEAL: A bill (H. R. 8494) granting a pension to Gilbert Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 8495) granting a pension to Alva D. Tomlinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8496) to increase the pension of Albert E. Magoffin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8497) for the relief of G. F. Mecklen—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SYMES: A bill (H. R. 8498) granting a pension to Michael O'Loughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8499) to remove the charge of desertion against Alfred G. Romine—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8500) granting a pension to William E. Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALKER: A bill (H. R. 8501) granting a pension to Fridoline Glastetter—to the Committee on Invalid Pension.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8502) granting a pension to Edward Maag—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. E. B. TAYLOR: A bill (H. R. 8503) for the relief of Otis H. Gaylord—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8504) granting a pension to Lucinda Dunlap—to the Committee on Pensions.

Change in the reference of a bill improperly referred was made in the following case, namely:

A bill (H. R. 6036) to pay Waddy T. James and others for horses killed in the service of the United States—from the Committee on War Claims to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. J. M. ALLEN: Papers in the claim of Isaac Owen, administrator of F. Owen, of Lawrence County, Alabama—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BACON (by request): Petition of Patrick Morgan, Company H, One hundred and forty-third Regiment New York Volunteers, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), petition of Charles J. Dolson, Company G, Nine-

teenth Regiment New York State Militia Volunteers, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLISS: Petition of Mary F. Denby for relief—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. J. R. BROWN: Petition of Isaac M. Huff, of Virginia, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: Petition of 86 citizens of Philadelphia; and of 93 citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa.; of 154 citizens of Camden County, New Jersey; and of 164 citizens; of 112 citizens, and of 45 citizens, of Atlantic City, N. J., in favor of increase pay to keepers and surfmen in the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the New York Produce Exchange, in favor of pure-food legislation—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURROWS: Petition asking speedy action in protecting wool and woolen interests in the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Saginaw (Mich.) Board of Trade, protesting against the proposed legislation to put salt and lumber on the free-list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYNUM: Petition of citizens and business men of Indianapolis, Ind., to have tin-plate placed on the free-list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 20 manufacturers of tobacco, and of 25 laboring men of Indianapolis, Ind., against removal of the internal-revenue tax on cigars and cheroots—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Tippecanoe Club, of Indianapolis, Ind., for an appropriation of \$20,000 for the erection of a monument at the grave of General Harrison—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition and resolution of the Indianapolis Live Stock Exchange, against the sale of articles of food which have been compounded or adulterated without being labeled—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARUTH: Paper relating to the claim of Mrs. M. J. Walker, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of John C. McCarthy and 25 others, citizens of Camden County, and of James Pendleton and 45 others, citizens of Kinney County, Texas, for increase of tariff on wool and revision of the duty on worsteds—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAIN: Petition of citizens of Galveston, Tex., that the least per diem pay for laborers for the United States Government shall be \$2—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of Marshall Lodge, Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, with respect to a protective tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. R. H. M. DAVIDSON: Memorial of William D. Chipley, president of the provisional municipality of Pensacola, Fla.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ENLOE: Petition of P. E. Parker, administrator of J. C. Parker, of Tennessee, for reference of his case to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Eliza Bridges, of McNairy County, Tennessee, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of T. C. Bell, of Henderson County, Tennessee, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FISHER: Petition of James M. Camp, Company C, Seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Cavalry Volunteers, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FUNSTON: Petition of A. H. Tanner and others, to pension Mrs. Elvira Parish, mother of Cyrus O. Parish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES: Petition of the professional musicians of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOFF: Petition of Bridget Kearney, widow of Patrick Kearney, late private Company B, Third Virginia Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Memorial of professional musicians of the District of Columbia, protesting against interfering by law with the right of the Marine band to play on private engagements—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROUT: Memorial of Acting Assistant Surgeon O. P. Frick, of Fort Selden, N. Mex., in support of House bill 5023—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of John Schebler, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEMPHILL: Petition of Charles Brunger and others, and of George E. Kennedy and others, for improvement of certain streets represented by the North Capitol, Boundary, and other street associations—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. J. S. HENDERSON: Petition of 107 professional musicians of the District of Columbia, against the enactment of any law proposing to interfere with the liberty of the United States Marine band—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON: Petition of New Castle Lodge of Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, of New Castle, Pa., in relation to the tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCREARY: Paper to accompany bill for the relief of H. S. Powell—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers in the case of Estes and Warren—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, affidavit of T. T. Garrard, of Clay County, Kentucky, in support of the claim of the heirs of John Patton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: Papers in the claim of Paul Greory, of Erie County, New York—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEAL: Papers in the case of Gilbert Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN: Petition of D. J. Jones and others, for the passage of the wool-growers and woolen manufacturers' tariff schedule—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHELAN: Petition of W. H. Neel, of Shelby County, and of Hiram Howell, of Fayette County, Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers in the claim of William Goolsby, of Jasper County, and of Joseph B. Inabuct, of Hinds County, Mississippi—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Junction City, Kans., for an appropriation to continue the work at Fort Riley, Kans.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of citizens of Ryan County, Kansas, in favor of opening the Indian Territory to settlement—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, papers relating to the pension bill of Belinda J. McLelan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SENEY: Petition of John S. F. Ferguson, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEYMOUR: Petition of William Hooper and 69 others, miners and laborers, of Crystal Falls, Mich., protesting against the repeal or reduction of the duty on iron ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY SMITH: Protest of Joseph Hunter and 175 others, citizens of the Public Land Strip, against the passage of any measure attaching said territory to any State for judicial purposes only, and asking for local government as provided by House bill 1277—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. M. A. SMITH: Resolutions of the Arizona Department of the Grand Army of the Republic, for the disability pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. D. STEWART: Petition of Walter S. Wither, agent for Selana Coughlin; of Elizabeth Ray, widow of E. Ray, and of J. N. Wilkinson, heirs of J. Wilkinson, of Georgia, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SYMES: Petition for a pension to Michael O'Loughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. E. B. TAYLOR: Petition of farmers of Ashtabula County, Ohio, in favor of a tariff on wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOORHEES: Petition of 26 citizens, and of 27 citizens of Pacific County, Washington Territory, for an increase in the pay of surfmen in the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, papers in the claim of G. F. Joeknick—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILKINS: Petition of James W. Collins and 200 others, citizens of Newark, Ohio, protesting against removal of the duty on glass bottles—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOST: Petition of Josef Kasper and others, protesting against the enactment of a law tending to interfere with the liberty of members of the Marine band—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The following petitions for an increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters were severally referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:

By Mr. J. R. BROWN: Of R. B. Dawson and others, of Level Run, and of W. T. Mitchell and others, of Callands, Pittsylvania County, Virginia.

By Mr. T. H. B. BROWNE: Of A. B. Eskridge and others, citizens of Northumberland County, Virginia.

By Mr. TILLMAN: Of sundry citizens of Celestia, S. C.

The following petitions, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. A. R. ANDERSON: Of Grand Army of the Republic Post No. 251, of Leon, Iowa.

By Mr. BELDEN: Of soldiers in the vicinity of Cortland and of Willetts, N. Y.

By Mr. BREWER: Of William A. Linman and 45 others, ex-soldiers of Lusk Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Elsie, Mich.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: Of the per diem rated service-pension bill.

By Mr. HALL: Of soldiers and sailors of Butler County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Of George L. Wakefield and 75 others, ex-Union soldiers and sailors and citizens of Pepin County, Wisconsin.

By Mr. JACKSON: Of Union soldiers of West Alexander, Pa.

By Mr. O'DONNELL: Of 51 soldiers of Bellevue, Mich.

By Mr. SAWYER: Of 30 soldiers of Livingston County, New York.

By Mr. E. B. TAYLOR: Of ex-soldiers of Lordstown, of Fowler, and of Ashtabula County, Ohio.

By Mr. WEAVER: Of H. B. Moore, of Albin, Iowa, and 118 other ex-Union soldiers.

By Mr. YODER: Fifty-one petitions signed by 2,573 ex-Union soldiers and sailors of the Fourth district of Ohio.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. J. R. BROWN: Of W. M. Peyton, county superintendent of schools, and teachers of Henry County, Virginia.

By Mr. FLOOD: Of 121 citizens of Chemung County, New York.

By Mr. HALL: Of 435 citizens of Crawford County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. MANSUR: Of 114 citizens of Linn County, Missouri.

By Mr. SCOTT: Of 209 residents of Warren County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. WEAVER: Of J. M. Brown and other citizens, and of J. W. Young and others, citizens of Bloomfield, Iowa.

The following petition, asking for the passage of the bill prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and importation of all alcoholic beverages in the District of Columbia, was referred to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic:

By Mr. VANCE: Of 196 citizens of the First district of Connecticut.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, March 14, 1888.

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

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

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a petition of citizens of Montana, praying for the adoption of the schedule of duties agreed upon by the representatives of the Wool-Growers' and Wool Manufacturers' Association at Washington, January 14, 1888, and for the correction of the erroneous classification of worsteds; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented two petitions of citizens of Kansas, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I present the petition of a large number of highly respectable citizens of Vermont, ex-soldiers, in favor of what is called the rated pension bill, and also the petition of William B. Westervelt and 39 other surviving soldiers and sailors of the Union Army and Navy, in favor of the same bill. I move the reference of the petitions to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS presented the petition of R. A. Tilden and 46 other citizens of Norwich, Vt., praying for an increase of the duties on wool; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I present a resolution in the nature of a petition, and intended to be presented (although it is not strictly in the form that it ought to be, I ask leave to present it), of a body of farmers in Vermont on the subject of reducing the postage on agricultural and horticultural seeds, etc., which I ask may be referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the resolution will be received as a petition and so referred.

Mr. CAMERON presented the petition of I. M. Huston Post, No. 394, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Iowa, and a petition of surviving soldiers and sailors of the Union Army and Navy, citizens of Victor, Iowa, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of Beavertown (Pa.) Grange, No. 799, Patrons of Husbandry, praying for legislation granting protection to agricultural products; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHERMAN presented seven petitions, signed by 146 ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill, as follows:

A petition of citizens of Lordstown;

A petition of citizens of Ohio;

A petition of citizens of Fowler;

A petition of citizens of Mesopotamia;

A petition of citizens of Smithville;

A petition of citizens of Pitsburgh and Potsdam; and

A petition of citizens of Bristolville.

The petitions were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of 143 citizens of Ohio, praying for the protection of agricultural products; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Lucas and Clarke Counties, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation for the protection of the wool and woolen industries; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FRYE. I present a large number of petitions from soldiers of the State of Maine, praying for the equalization of the pay of soldiers of the late war, that is to say, to pay them the difference, as I understand it, between gold and currency, the petitions representing about 6,000 soldiers. I do not know whether the petitions should be referred to the Committee on Pensions or the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The petitions will be separately noted in the Journal and RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The petitions are as follows:

A petition of John C. Cobb and others, of Portland;

A petition of John L. Russell and others, of Dexter;

A petition of William K. Kimball Post, No. 148, Grand Army of the Republic, of South Paris;

A petition of Justus Webster and others, of Chesterville;

A petition of G. H. Ramsell and others, members of Post No. 33, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Maine;

A petition of N. H. Martin and others, of Fort Fairfield;

A petition of R. G. Smith and others, of Whitefield;

A petition of J. A. Stout and others, of Biddeford;

A petition of Thomas H. Marshall Post, No. 42, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Maine;

A petition of J. B. Currier and other citizens of Corinna;

A petition of S. G. Hunington and other citizens of Bridgewater;

A petition of John M. League and other citizens of Weld;

A petition of Jesse Pierce and other citizens of Booth Bay;

A petition of Mather Post, No. 111, Grand Army of the Republic, of Maine;

A petition of Enoch G. Mitchell and other citizens of Kennebunk;

A petition of George E. Elliott and other citizens of Lynchville;

A petition of William H. Leavitt and other citizens of Phillips;

A petition of Harry Rust Post, No. 54, Grand Army of the Republic, at Norway;

A petition of Kimball Post, No. 38, Grand Army of the Republic, at Livermore Mills;

A petition of F. J. Leavitt and other citizens of Buxton;

A petition of Russell Post, No. 96, Grand Army of the Republic, at Skowhegan;

A petition of Meade Post, No. 40, Grand Army of the Republic, at Eastport;

A petition of J. H. H. Hewitt and others, of Thomaston;

A petition of Edwin Hsley and others, of Limerick;

A petition of Theodore Shackford and others, of Gorham;

A petition of James McGlauffin and others, of Mapleton;

A petition of Charles O. Wadsworth and others, of Gardiner;

A petition of William H. Nevers and others, of Cornish;

A petition of Ruel Anners Post, No. 104, Grand Army of the Republic, of Sprague Mills;

A petition of A. A. Dwinall Post, No. 3, Grand Army of the Republic, of Mechanic's Falls;

A petition of Sedgwick Post, No. 6, Grand Army of the Republic, of Bath;

A petition of Ira P. Wing and others, of Monson;

A petition of James A. Garfield Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Bluehill;

A petition of George E. Hapgood and others, of North Anson;

A petition of Sergeant Wyman Post, No. 95, Grand Army of the Republic, of Oakland;

A petition of D. L. Weard Post, No. 89, Grand Army of the Republic, of East Sullivan;

A petition of George L. Marson and others, of Windsor;

A petition of F. M. Gilman and others, of Mount Vernon;

A petition of T. S. Keen and others, of Brooks;

A petition of Judson Hall and others, of South Gardiner;

A petition of Benjamin B. Mayberry and others, of South Windham;

A petition of Hiram E. Stellman, commander of Post 147, Grand Army of the Republic, of State of Maine, and members of said post;

A petition of John Renier and others, of Madison;

A petition of L. W. Elliot and others, of New Sharon;

A petition of E. H. Bryant and others, of Machias;

A petition of John Merrill Post, No. 137, of Richmond;

A petition of Burnside Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Auburn;

A petition of L. C. Morse and others, of Liberty;

A petition of Charles W. Cook and others, of Solon;

A petition of Wade Post, No. 123, Grand Army of the Republic, of Presque Isle; and

A petition of Levi W. Smith and others, of Maine.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the Bath (Me.) Board of Trade, praying for the repayment to ship-owners of the tonnage tax; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.