

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the following changes of reference were made:

A bill (H. R. 8833) for the relief of the officers and crew of the North Pacific and Arctic exploring expedition in 1853, 1854, 1855, and 1856—Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 10524) granting a pension to John Winkler, late a private of Company H, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. FITHIAN: A bill (H. R. 10959) to remove the charge of desertion against Thilbaud Menny—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 10960) for the relief of Elizabeth Bringle, of Rowan County, North Carolina, widow of Christian Bringle, a soldier in the war of 1812—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE (by request): A bill (H. R. 10961) for the relief of Eliza S. Jones and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10962) to correct the military record of Joseph Grattis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10963) to grant arrears of pension to William H. Sutton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 10964) granting a pension to Maj. S. R. Coulter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 10965) granting a pension to Lydia F. Moyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 10966) for the relief of the heirs of John Black—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10967) for the relief of the heirs of Henry H. Hope—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10968) for the relief of W. W. Thompson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WICKHAM: A bill (H. R. 10969) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Philip Michael—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK, of Wisconsin: Petition of Hiram Smith, Henry Sherry, and others, of Neenah, Wis., asking for the perpetuation of the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CRAIG: Memorial of Grange No. 928, Ligonier, Pa., in favor of protection to agricultural products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE LANO: Petition requesting the retention of duty on sugar of milk at 10 cents per pound—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITHIAN: Petition of J. J. Sewell and others, for service-pension bill—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GIFFORD: Petition of 110 citizens of Charles Mix County, South Dakota, for a law prohibiting the importation of liquors into States adopting prohibition—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSBROUGH: Petition of citizens of Bellmont, Traill County, North Dakota, for the prompt passage of House bill 5978—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petitions of other citizens of same county, for same measure—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Dundee, Walsh County, North Dakota, for same measure—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition of other citizens of same county, for same measure—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Cavalier County, North Dakota, for same measure—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Des Lacs, N. Dak., for same measure—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of P. C. Hayle and 23 others, citizens of Iowa, for the passage of Wilson's original-package bill, or House bill 5978—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of S. K. Leacox and 98 others, citizens of Keota, Keokuk County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of George J. Williams and 15 others, citizens of Jasper County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of J. W. Alfree and 105 others, citizens of same county, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of S. V. Sampson and 24 others, citizens of Agency,

Wapello County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of John M. Fish and 43 others, citizens of same county, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of John Potter and 42 others, citizens of same county, for the same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Star Alliance, No. 1619, of same county, favoring the Butterworth option and the Conger lard bills—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEE (by request): Petition on claim of W. W. Goodrich—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), petition of trustees of the Mount Olivet Methodist Episcopal Protestant Church, Virginia, for passage of House bill 8552—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), petition from certain citizens of Virginia for Galveston Harbor improvement—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of citizens of New Jersey, favoring the Butterworth or option gambling bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition numerously signed by citizens of New Jersey, for a national Sunday-rest law—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of citizens of New Jersey, for perpetuation of the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Resolutions of Green Township Alliance, No. 15, of Noble County, Indiana, asking for the immediate passage of the Conger lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of same Alliance, for the immediate passage of the Butterworth option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OATES: Petition of the president and secretary of the Bureau of the Charity Organization Society of Newark, N. J., praying for the enactment of a law to regulate immigration on the basis therein named—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH, of Illinois: Resolutions from Farmers' Mutual Benefit Association Lodge, Attila, Ill., with reference to harbor at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions from William Lawrence Post, No. 538, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Illinois, for service pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMYSER: Petition of 92 persons of the Twentieth Congressional district of Ohio, for a national Sunday-rest law—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. STEWART, of Georgia: Petition of citizens of Georgia, for Galveston Harbor improvement—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of other citizens of same State, for same measure—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of other citizens of same State, for same measure—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Georgia, against the Conger lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of M. Y. Smith and 10 others, from Campbell County, Georgia, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. C. Lee and 58 others, of same county and State, for same purpose—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWENEY: Petition of 95 citizens of Hesper, Winneshiek County, Iowa, in favor of the passage of an act prohibiting the importation of intoxicating liquors into the State in contravention of the laws thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

MONDAY, June 16, 1890.

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

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

ALBERT H. EMERY.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the report of the committee of conference on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3538) for the relief of Albert H. Emery, and requesting a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

Mr. SPOONER. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendment to the bill and agree to the request of the House of Representatives for a further conference.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. SPOONER, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. WILSON of Maryland were appointed.

PUGET SOUND COLLECTION DISTRICT.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3163) to reorganize and establish the customs-collection district of Puget Sound.

Mr. ALLEN. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments made to the bill by the House of Representatives and request a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. DOLPH, Mr. CULLOM, and Mr. GORMAN were appointed.

TRUSTS AND COMBINATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the bill (S. 1) to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies; which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House disagree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.

Resolved, That the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and ask for a further conference, with instructions that the House conferees recede from the original amendment of the House.

Ordered, That Mr. E. B. TAYLOR, Mr. STEWART of Vermont, and Mr. CULBERSON of Texas be the managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendment to the House amendment and agree to the conference asked by the other House.

In making that motion I wish to say a word. It has been stated, and appears to have been believed in some quarters, that the Senate amendment to the House amendment had the effect to repeal or modify the provision of the interstate-commerce law prohibiting pooling. I wish to say (I think I may safely say it for all the members of the Committee on the Judiciary, certainly for myself) that the amendment as reported from the Committee on the Judiciary had no such effect whatever, and that it is impossible for anybody who looks at the whole section as it would read amended to imagine any such thing. I think it is due to the House of Representatives and the Senate to say that.

I have seen it stated, Mr. President, in a newspaper (and that is the only way I can allude to it, and that is all that I have a right to know about it) that the Senate amendment was got through the Senate by the influence of railways and corporations, and that the Senate was given to that sort of influence, and not much else could be expected from it in that behalf. I wish to recall to the attention of the Senate that every piece of important legislation in the last ten years or more that has affected great corporations and important interests has been the work, so far as I remember, in the outset, of the Senate of the United States. The bill which brought the Pacific railroads into some sort of obedience to the laws of the United States, and some sort of sense of their obligations in respect of what was due the United States, was the work of the Senate. The interstate-commerce bill was a Senate bill, although I believe the House had a bill of the same character as well. It is, therefore, entirely unjust for anybody to say anywhere (and perhaps I dignify it a little too much by alluding to it at all) that any act of the Senate or any act of any Senator can be referred to at any time which would justify what I have seen in the newspapers.

It may be further said, Mr. President, in respect of this very amendment of the Senate, which the House of Representatives has now disagreed to and proposes to recede entirely from its own amendment and leave the bill as it passed the Senate originally, that the very force, and the only force that I have known to be exerted—and I have known of it—has been a somewhat organized and persistent and powerful effort on the part of railroad and other corporations through well-known agents and influences (well known to me) to induce simple-minded persons somewhere—I am unable to say where, of course—to defeat the Senate amendment and to mislead those persons into opposition to it by betraying them into the false position that they were defending the people in defeating an amendment which the railroads did not want; and the railroads and other corporations appear to have accomplished their purpose.

Now, if the newspapers think they are doing any public good under such a state of things, which everybody outside of the newspapers knows perfectly well, by imputing to the Senate a subservience to railroad or corporate influence in respect to this amendment, or indeed any other, speaking particularly now of this which is up, and are not wise enough and bright enough to see that the scheme of these great corporations is brought to bear upon people who do not know any better, to fire them up with the idea that the railroads do want it and get them to vote against it, when, as I say, to my personal knowledge the exertion of very potent but ineffectual railway influence with me and with others that I know of has been tried, but it was to accomplish exactly the thing that the House of Representatives, not subservient I suppose to railroads, but hungry for the public good, has done.

I think myself that this amendment of the House was wholly unnecessary, but the original bill as it passed the Senate was adequate to cover every case over which Congress had power, and broad enough to include every case of wrongdoing of any kind of that nature. So if the House of Representatives, led or misled by railway influence, wishes to retreat from its position altogether, I do not know that I shall have

any objection; but I thought it due to the Senate and to the committee to say thus much.

Mr. PADDOCK. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont what section of the interstate-commerce act it is proposed by this bill to amend?

Mr. EDMUNDS. Not any section.

Mr. PADDOCK. Ah!

Mr. EDMUNDS. It was an effect, it was said.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, when the trust bill, as it is called, was pending before the Judiciary Committee prior to its being reported to the Senate, I was under the impression that the bill could have been made much more effective and valuable in the direction which all of us were pursuing if an additional section had been put to it specifically attacking the practice of destroying competition in the rates of transportation as to interstate commerce. A majority of my colleagues upon that committee were under the impression that the bill without that provision was sufficiently stringent, and I yielded my opinion to theirs upon that subject. The courts must at last construe this bill, because we are entering upon a new and untried field of legislation, and I was under the impression that the courts would construe the original bill as being sufficiently effective in prohibiting those pooling arrangements by which the prices of transportation to the people at large were kept up to ruinous and dangerous rates.

When the bill went to the House of Representatives a provision was put upon it, crudely drawn, imperfect in its language, but the object of which was to strike specifically at the evil; and when it came back to the Senate I was under the impression that with a modification of that provision as to its language and structure the amendment ought to be adopted. It could not possibly, in my judgment, have done any harm, and it might have done a vast amount of good. The Committee on the Judiciary came to the conclusion that the amendment of the House was unnecessary. I was appointed one of the conferees, but was unable to agree with the other two conferees on the part of the Senate in the conclusions which were reached. I am under the impression that the following provision, which I intended, if opportunity had come, to have offered in the Senate, would strengthen the bill:

Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy entered into for the purpose of preventing competition in the sale or purchase of any commodity while the subject of interstate commerce, or to prevent competition in the transportation of persons or property from any State or Territory to another, or from any State or Territory to the District of Columbia, or from the District of Columbia to any State or Territory, except such contracts or agreements in regard to transportation as may be approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, shall be deemed unlawful within the meaning of this act. Nothing herein shall be deemed or held to impair the powers of the several States in respect of any of the matters in this act mentioned.

If that amendment had been placed upon the bill, in my opinion it would have put the meaning of this legislation beyond any question. It would have made a salient issue between a great evil which now exists in this country and the Congress of the United States representing the people. It goes without saying, with our knowledge of the present transportation system of the United States, that railroad companies do by combination, unlawfully, in my opinion, fix the price of rates to suit themselves, without regard to the public at large or to the consumers of the country. If our bill with all its provisions be worth anything, it is to strike down that sort of unlawful conspiracy against the people of the United States. As I said before, sir, I hope that the courts will construe the original bill as sufficient to do away with this monstrous evil, but it is certainly to be desired that Congress should be so explicit on the subject as to their intent in this legislation that there can be no question in regard to their intent.

Now, Mr. President, in regard to what has been said in another part of this Capitol as to the influence of railroads upon our legislation, to which the Senator from Vermont, the chairman of our committee, has alluded, I have this to say: As a matter of course it would be undignified and unparliamentary to indulge in recrimination in reply to such statements as these, but I can not resist the temptation of saying that within my personal knowledge one bill has passed the Senate repeatedly, a bill which simply provided for the government of a public park belonging to the people of the United States, and when that bill has gone to the House of Representatives it has been repeatedly defeated because the Senate would not agree that a railroad corporation should be permitted to construct its railroad through that park. If railroad influences be potent in this Capitol, there is a glaring and conspicuous example of the iron hand of corporations grasping the legislation of this country for their own private purposes.

I was never approached about this subject except, after the amendment of the House had been adopted, by a friend connected with a large railroad system in the United States, who objected to that amendment because he said it would prevent railroads from making legitimate rates by agreement as between themselves. My reply to him then was, and my reply now is, that there never has been known a case in which railroads ever combined except for their own benefit. It is safe to assume, without making any attack upon them, that there are no interests in this country so well provided for by the exertions of their attorneys and the influence of their wealth, by their appeals to sectional and other interests, as the railroad companies in this country. It will always be so, and it is, in my judgment, impossible that the Congress of

the United States inside of the Constitution can go far enough to make any of their legislation immoderate or unjust when we are attempting to protect the interests of the people.

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. President, this is a very important bill, and I would inquire—

Mr. BLAIR. What is the question before the Senate? Upon a conference report?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Vermont that the Senate still further insist upon its amendment to the amendment of the House and agree to the request for a further conference thereon. It is a privileged question. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. REAGAN. I merely wanted to inquire if it would not be better to have the report printed. Then we can be able to see it. It is a very important matter, and I think we ought to be able to know what we are voting on, as certainly we do not now.

Mr. EDMUNDS. All we are voting on now is simply to agree to the request of the House of Representatives to have further conference on the subject.

Mr. REAGAN. Very well.

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

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the managers of the further conference on the part of the Senate, and Mr. EDMUNDS, Mr. HOAR, and Mr. VEST were appointed.

COURT OF CLAIMS REPORT.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings filed by that court in the case of E. N. Fish & Co. and other causes; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PIERCE presented a resolution of Farmers' Alliance No. 21, of Guelph, N. Dak., praying for the passage of the bill known as the Conger lard bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Farmers' Alliance No. 21, of Guelph, N. Dak., praying for the passage of what is known as the Butterworth option bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PIERCE. I present resolutions of the North Dakota Baptist Association, embracing 27 churches, convened at La Moure, N. Dak., in which they say that "we urge upon our Representatives in Congress to insist upon such Congressional enactments as will guaranty to the State of North Dakota, and every other State in the Union, the right to enforce a prohibitory law enacted by a majority vote of the people or by legislative enactment."

I move that the resolution lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of the Union Prohibitory League, the Christian Temperance League, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Chester County, Pennsylvania, praying for Federal legislation to protect State liquor laws; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TURPIE presented a petition of the Republican convention of the Ninth Congressional district of Indiana, praying for the erection of a monument to mark the site of the Tippecanoe battle-ground; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. CARLISLE presented the petition of Hosea W. Groome, of Des Moines, Iowa, praying to be allowed an increase of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented additional papers to accompany Senate bill 3977, granting a pension to Henry Cook; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAWES presented a petition of W. L. Rodman Post, No. 1, Grand Army of the Republic, of New Bedford, Mass., praying for the transfer of the revenue-cutter service to the Navy Department; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Retail Grocers' Association, of Boston, Mass., praying for the admission of free raw sugar up to No. 16 Dutch standard, with a protection to refiners on refined grades not exceeding 1 cent a pound, and a bounty to American sugar-growers not exceeding 2 cents a pound; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. VOORHEES presented a petition of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, signed by Maj. Gen. Lew Wallace, praying for a speedy, complete, and accurate publication of the Official War Records of the Rebellion; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented the memorial of Barton Sewell, president of the National Smelting and Refining Company, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the imposition of a tariff duty on lead ore; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Evansville, Ind., praying for the enactment of a law limiting the hours of labor of clerks and

others in first and second class post-offices to eight hours a day, with a full day's wages therefor; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of Farmers' Alliance No. 8, of Allen County, Indiana, remonstrating against the manufacture or sale of counterfeit or compound lard; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of Farmers' Alliance No. 8, of Allen County, Indiana, remonstrating against dealing and gambling in agricultural and farm products; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of the Indianapolis (Ind.) Brewing Company, remonstrating against an increase of tariff duties on hops; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REAGAN presented a petition of citizens of Marshall, Tex., praying that eight hours shall constitute a day's work for clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. SAWYER presented the petition of Robert Estabrook, of Fond du Lac, Wis., praying to be allowed a father's pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MOODY presented petitions of citizens of Hughes, Charles Mix, Hanson, Grant, and Codington Counties, in the State of South Dakota, praying for the passage of a law making it unlawful to import intoxicating liquors into any State or Territory contrary to the laws thereof; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DIXON presented the petition of Silas C. Weller and 68 others, citizens of Rhode Island, praying for the proposal of a constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture, importation, exportation, transportation, and sale of all alcoholic liquors as a beverage; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MANDERSON presented petitions of Farmers' Alliances of Birdwood, Lincoln County, Nebraska, of Phelps County, Nebraska, and of Sherman County, Nebraska, praying for the passage of the Conger lard bill; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of Farmers' Alliances of Birdwood, Lincoln County, Nebraska, and of Sherman County, Nebraska, praying for the passage of the Butterworth option bill; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SHERMAN presented the petition of M. Tiebig & Brother and 96 others, citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for a reduction in the tariff on tobacco from the rate proposed in the McKinley bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the members of the Congregational Church of Atwater, Ohio, praying for the enactment of laws to prevent the carrying through the mails of obscene literature; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. MORRILL. I present sundry petitions from Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and Vermont, praying that no duty shall be imposed upon tin. Some of these petitions do not indicate what place or State they come from. They all appear to have been sent out in obedience to the G. H. Grimm Manufacturing Company, of Hudson, Ohio. It calls the attention of maple-sugar makers, as follows:

Your interests are in danger. Will you submit to being pulled and plucked under the forms of law without uttering an earnest protest?

The petitions are sent out with printed envelopes; they are printed petitions, all alike; and returned alike.

I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EVARTS presented a petition of 75 citizens of the State of New York, praying for the passage of a national Sunday-rest law; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of 42 citizens of Horseheads, N. Y., praying for the passage of the pending tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, presented the petition of Messrs. Meyers & Ball, S. B. Carpenter, and other citizens of Helena, Ark., praying for certain legislation with regard to the duty on tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. VEST presented a petition of the Greeley Burnham Grocer Company and other grocery companies of St. Louis, Mo., praying for a rebate on all original packages of sugar in the hands of dealers; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PAYNE presented a petition of 157 citizens of the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of a national Sunday-rest law; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HALE presented resolutions of the Penobscot Conference of Congregational Churches in Maine, approving the enactment of a law permitting the States to control the sale of intoxicating liquors within their own borders; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of citizens of Lamar, Colo., and a petition of citizens of Piketon, Mo., praying for the free coinage of silver; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Yuma, Colo., praying for a complete system of levees on the Mississippi River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PLATT presented the petition of Comstock, Ferre & Co., and other firms of Milford, Conn., praying for an increase of duty on seeds; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PAYNE. I submit from the Committee on Foreign Relations a report on the joint resolution (S. R. 66) authorizing Commander Dennis W. Mullan, United States Navy, to accept the medal presented to him by the Chilean Government, which was under discussion on Saturday. I ask that the report and accompanying letters may be printed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report and accompanying papers will be printed, if there be no objection.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted a report to accompany the bill (S. 3991) for preventing adulteration and misbranding food and drugs, and for other purposes, heretofore reported by him.

Mr. EVARTS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3555) to increase the compensation of the assistants to the attorney of the United States for the District of Columbia, and to amend section 907 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to said District, reported in with an amendment.

Mr. TELLER, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the amendment offered by himself on March 24, intended to be proposed to the deficiency appropriation bill concerning payment to Robert Berry, of Leadville, Colo., reported it favorably and moved its reference to the Committee on Appropriations, and that it be printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. PLUMB, from the Committee on Public Lands, reported a bill (S. 4090) to relieve purchasers of and to indemnify certain States for swamp and overflowed lands disposed of, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. PLUMB. The adoption of this substitute by the committee renders unnecessary the further consideration of three Senate bills on the same subject, which I send to the desk, which the committee recommend be indefinitely postponed.

The following bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 673) for the relief of purchasers and other grantees of the United States of certain swamp and overflowed lands, and to reimburse and indemnify certain States;

A bill (S. 1018) for the relief of purchasers and other grantees of the United States of certain swamp and overflowed lands, and to reimburse and indemnify certain States; and

A bill (S. 1055) to relieve purchasers of and to indemnify certain States for swamp and overflowed lands disposed of, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPOONER, from the Committee on Claims, reported an amendment intended to be proposed to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PENSION AND CENSUS DEFICIENCIES.

Mr. HALE. From the Committee on Appropriations I report with amendments the bill (H. R. 10906) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the payment of pensions and for the expenses of the Eleventh Census for the fiscal year 1890, and for other purposes, which I ask may be now considered.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Will the Senator from Maine state whether any action is to be taken upon the various entries that are made on this bill? It seems to be written over and interlined.

Mr. HALE. The clerk of the Committee on Appropriations prepared the amendments. The first is a matter of form, making the language of an appropriation more definite. The clerks at the desk will readily see what the amendment is, I think.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The clerks may see, but the Chair can not. The Chief Clerk will report the amendment. [A pause.] The Chief Clerk announces that he can not.

Mr. HALE. Will the Chief Clerk please send the bill to me? [The bill was sent to Mr. HALE.]

Mr. HALE. The form is correct in the original House bill, I see. There is no necessity for any amendment.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. I thought there were some amendments to the bill that had been adopted in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HALE. On examining the bill I find the form of the House bill is correct with reference to the appropriations, and there are no amendments needed.

Mr. COCKRELL. Did the chairman of the subcommittee receive any information in regard to whether the amount here appropriated will be absolutely sufficient to meet the expenditures of the current year for pensions? There was a question as to whether the amount contained in this bill would cover all actual deficiencies.

Mr. HALE. I have the letter from the Commissioner of Pensions, which was written at my request, upon the suggestion of the committee,

asking that question. He states that the amount which is given here will cover all the payments that are needed for the year ending June 30, 1890, and gives the estimates and the manner in which they are arrived at.

Mr. COCKRELL. So that this will wind up the pension appropriations for the fiscal year 1890?

Mr. HALE. This will wind up the pension appropriations for the year.

Mr. COCKRELL. This being the second deficiency we have provided for, I was anxious to get the exact amount necessary to be appropriated and be done with it. Has the Senator the letter from the Commissioner of Pensions?

Mr. HALE. I have the letter.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to have it read.

Mr. HALE. I will have it inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from Maine inform us what the aggregate amount of the appropriations for this fiscal year will be on account of pensions when this deficiency bill is passed?

Mr. HALE. The regular annual appropriations for this fiscal year amount to \$98,427,461.

Mr. ALLISON. For next year, the Senator means.

Mr. HALE. For this year. In the urgent deficiency bill \$21,613,009 were appropriated. The present bill carries the amount stated, which the Secretary will be good enough to read.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is \$3,708,898.35.

Mr. HALE. Those together make the aggregate.

Mr. COCKRELL. Did I understand the Senator to say that the first appropriation was \$98,000,000 and then \$21,000,000, and then \$3,000,000?

Mr. HARRIS. That was the statement.

Mr. HALE. The first appropriation bill that was passed for the last year—I have the figures here—was \$81,758,700.

Mr. COCKRELL. That was the reason why I called the Senator's attention to it. He said it was \$98,000,000, which would make a vast addition.

Mr. HALE. That sum included other items. The original appropriation bill was \$81,758,700, and the second appropriation \$21,598,834, and the present bill \$3,708,898, making in all \$107,066,432 and odd cents.

Mr. HARRIS. What is the aggregate in millions?

Mr. HALE. It is \$107,066,432 and odd cents. The figures that I first gave, \$98,000,000, do not apply to this bill. The Senator from Iowa was right in that regard.

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

Mr. HALE. I ask that the letter of the Commissioner of Pensions to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That order will be made, in the absence of objection.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1890.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of even date relative to the deficiency now existing in the appropriation for the payment of pensions during the current fiscal year, and in response to hand you herewith a statement prepared in this bureau and showing by a close estimate that \$3,708,898.35 will be needed, and immediately, for the purpose stated. I am of opinion that said amount will be sufficient to meet the requirements in all cases issued, and in which vouchers shall be executed during the present month, the last of the present fiscal year.

Very respectfully,

GREEN B. RAUM,
Commissioner of Pensions.

HON. EUGENE HALE,
United States Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. DAWES introduced a bill (S. 4091) authorizing the President to appoint and retire NATHANIEL P. BANKS as a major-general in the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DAWES. I ask leave out of order to introduce in connection with that bill a petition from members of the Massachusetts Legislature. It is signed by all the senators and nearly every one of the members of the house of representatives of the Massachusetts Legislature in aid of that bill. I move it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 4092) granting an increase of pension to William J. Gregory; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. POWER introduced a bill (S. 4093) to amend section 837 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 4094) for the relief of John Sachs and Frederick Rhine; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4095) for the relief of Samuel B. Kepner; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, introduced a bill (S. 4096) for the relief of William W. Burns; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DANIEL (for Mr. BARBOUR) introduced a bill (S. 4097) for the relief of Mrs. Agnes B. Jeter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BLAIR. I introduce a joint resolution requesting the President to invite an international conference to meet in Washington, with a view to the formation of an international alliance for the suppression of slavery and the slave trade, of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, fire-arms, and destructive substances with uncivilized peoples, and to promote the establishment of schools of common knowledge, art, and industry among them; also, to secure the disarmament of nations and the organization of international courts. I desire to address the Senate upon this joint resolution at a later time. If there be no objection, I will ask that the joint resolution be read in full and lie on the table for the present.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire introduces a joint resolution, which will be read at length the first time if there be no objection.

The joint resolution (S. R. 101) requesting the President to invite an international conference to meet in Washington, with a view to the formation of an international alliance for the suppression of slavery and the slave trade; of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, fire-arms, and destructive substances with uncivilized peoples, and to promote the establishment of schools of common knowledge, art, and industry among them; also, to secure the disarmament of nations and the organization of international courts, was read the first time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President be requested to invite all foreign powers with whom the United States maintains diplomatic relations to designate representatives to meet with those of the United States, not exceeding ten in number, to be appointed by the President, for the purpose of holding an international conference in the city of Washington on the first Monday of February, A. D. 1891, with a view to the formation of an international alliance which shall be valid and binding upon those powers who shall ratify and agree to the same, the objects of which alliance shall be:

First. To suppress the crime of kidnapping and the slave-trade within the limits of the continent of Africa, and to destroy the traffic in the liberty of human beings and the institution of slavery in all parts of the world.

Second. To regulate and suppress the traffic in intoxicating liquors and other noxious substances, and also in fire-arms, gunpowder, and the means of destruction between so-called civilized men and nations and other less civilized peoples, especially with the inhabitants of the continents of Africa, Asia, and the islands of the sea, and also to promote among them the establishment of schools of common knowledge of agricultural and mechanic industry and the arts of civilized life.

Third. To secure the reduction and, so far as possible, the disbandment of existing military and naval establishments, and to prevent the arming of nations and the waging of wars hereafter; also to promote the creation of tribunals for the trial and settlement of international controversies, and such other measures for the welfare of mankind as can be better secured by the joint efforts of nations.

Resolved further, That \$100,000 are hereby appropriated from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much thereof as may be necessary to be expended in carrying out the object of this resolution.

The joint resolution was read the second time by its title, and ordered to lie on the table.

REPRINTING OF A BILL.

Mr. PADDOCK. I ask an order for the reprinting of an important bill which has been exhausted, being the bill (S. 3991) for preventing adulteration and misbranding food and drugs, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be reprinted, if there be no objection.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. HARRIS, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. MITCHELL submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them respectively to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOLPH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3833) to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations; which was ordered to be printed.

CHEROKEE COMMISSION.

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

Resolved, That the President be requested to inform the Senate whether negotiations have not been concluded by the Cherokee Commission with certain Indian tribes for the cession of lands in the Indian Territory, whereby such lands may be opened for settlement by act of Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. MCPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the following bills of the Senate:

A bill (S. 595) for the erection of a public building at Salina, Kans.; and

A bill (S. 2403) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Beaver Falls, in the State of Pennsylvania.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had this day approved and signed the act (S. 2548) for the relief of the board of commissioners of the sinking fund of the city of Louisville, Ky.

JONATHAN DEAN.

Mr. SAWYER. I ask that Order of Business 1496, being the bill (H. R. 2418) granting a pension to Jonathan Dean, sr., be recommitted to the Committee on Pensions. There is an error about the report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there is no objection, the bill referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin will be recommitted to the Committee on Pensions. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

TREASURY NOTES AND SILVER BULLION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further morning business, that order is closed, and the Senate resumes the consideration of the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5381) directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The first amendment reported by the Committee on Finance will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 2, on page 2, line 8, after the word "notes" where it occurs the second time in the line, the Committee on Finance report to strike out "shall be a legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, and;" so as to read:

And such Treasury notes shall be receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues, and when so received may be reissued; and such notes when held by any national-banking association may be counted as a part of its lawful reserve.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] relinquished the floor when the bill was last under consideration for a motion to adjourn.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the question now before the Senate is whether or not we shall have silver bullion and a paper currency predicated thereon, or silver pure and simple "as money" as advocated by the Republican party in their Chicago platform.

Whether it shall be decided to have silver as the basis of a paper currency or silver as money in a direct form, this is a day of great victory and triumph for the representatives of Democracy in this country and for those who through good and through evil report have steadfastly maintained the money of the people. This is a day in which a compliment is paid to the legislation of 1878, known as the Bland act, greater than any that could be embodied in language. That act contained the provision that \$2,000,000 worth of silver should be coined per month and gave discretion to the Secretary of the Treasury to coin \$2,000,000 more, making an aggregate of four millions' worth per month.

To-day those who opposed that policy in the beginning and those who have continued in opposition thereto for many years come forward to pour their libations of praise upon the altars of the triumphant Democracy, which was the author of that bill and which has been its unyielding friend. That the world moves and that this is a land of progress was never better demonstrated than by the fact that the great leader of Republican financial policy in this country, who carried the single gold standard over two continents, should come forward in his speech to lay it down at the feet of the double standard, and to proclaim that he at last is the advocate of silver money.

Triumphant as would be the result of the policies which have been advocated by the Bland act, the Democratic Administration which retired to give way to that which is now in the ascendant receives also at the hands of the present Administration as high a compliment as could possibly be paid by one set of statesmen to another.

The Chicago platform of two years ago was an exceedingly discriminating and nicely drawn document. It proclaimed that the Republican party was in favor of the use of both gold and silver and added the words "as money," and then it added that it condemned the policy, not of the Democratic party, for it knew that the body of the Democracy could not be so condemned, but it condemned the policy of the Administration, meaning, of course, the Executive Administration, in its efforts to demonetize silver. Curiously enough, the political organization which thus denounced its rival for Executive honors stands now posing before the country in advocacy of measures of which it finds the prototype in the very recommendations of that Administration which it denounced.

SECRETARY FAIRCHILD'S RECOMMENDATION OF PAPER BASED ON BULLION.

I beg leave to read to the Senate from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury of 1887, when Hon. Mr. Fairchild was the occupant of that position. In that report, on page 41 of the message and documents of 1887-'88, abridgment, Secretary Fairchild has the following:

The law should be so amended as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue certificates against the coining value of the bullion bought and to coin only such number of dollars as he might deem expedient hereafter. This would not restrict in the least degree the use of the silver dollar as currency. The cer-

tificates would be equally secure whether representing coined dollars lying in vaults, or representing bullion also lying in vaults, and which would be coined into dollars. The bullion should be melted into the form of very heavy bars, which could not be easily stolen or lost. In this form the silver could be easily and quickly moved and counted.

The recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury of 1887 was repeated in somewhat different language in the succeeding report of 1888, and when the Republican party convened at Chicago with those recommendations of the bullion policy, so to describe it, fresh before the country, it turned its batteries of denunciation upon it and described it as efforts to demonetize silver, and, presto, change! while the statesmen of the Republican party all over the land are coming in and giving adhesion to those doctrines of which Democracy has been the leading spirit for twelve years after the re-enfranchisement of silver, the present Administration, not to be outdone in compliments to its adversary, takes up the recommendation of the antecedent Secretary and stands before the country holding up and defending for the salvation of the nation the policy which it denounced at Chicago as "efforts to demonetize silver." The handsome thing to do, Mr. President, although it might be very embarrassing to some of the present Administration, would be to resign and to ask the country to restore the authors of these suggestions to power, that they might carry them out according to the lines which they have indicated.

RICARDO'S VIEWS OF PAPER MONEY BASED ON BULLION.

But, Mr. President, this bullion policy did not originate either with the Cleveland Administration or with the Harrison Administration. It is an old thought among the financiers of the world that bullion may perhaps be made the subject of a better currency by being developed into its paper representative than by being coined into dollars. David Ricardo advocated such a doctrine as this as long ago as 1808, and I beg leave to read a little from the Currency Proposals of D. Ricardo as contained in a volume called *Silver in Europe*, by S. Dana Horton, page 285. Said Ricardo in this paper:

Let the Bank of England be required by Parliament to pay (if demanded) all notes above £20, and no other, at their option, either in specie, in gold standard bars, or in foreign coin (allowance being made for the difference in its purity) at the English mint value of gold bullion, namely, 31.17s. 10½d. per ounce, such payments to commence at the period recommended by the committee.

Without quoting his language in full he goes on to say that the advantage in utilizing the precious metals in bullion in this fashion would be to prevent the remelting down of coin for export to foreign nations, that unfavorable exchanges could be most speedily corrected by the transportation of bullion, that there would be no danger of abrasion of the metals by treating bullion as the basis and paper as the representative. He goes on to pay this compliment to silver:

And with a silver coinage on just such principles, we should possess the most economical and the most invariable currency in the world.

Then he adds with respect to silver as a standard of value:

The only objection to the use of silver as the standard is its bulk, which renders it unfit for the large payments required in a wealthy country; but this objection is entirely removed by the substituting of paper money as the general circulation medium of the country. Silver, too, is much more steady in its value, in consequence of its demand and supply being more regular; and as all foreign countries regulate the value of their money by the value of silver, there can be no doubt that, on the whole, silver is preferable to gold as a standard, and should be permanently adopted for that purpose.

In a note to his paper he adds:

I have already observed that silver appears to me to be the best adapted for the standard of our money. If it were made so by law, the bank should be obliged to buy or sell silver bullion only.

SILVER AND GOLD SHOULD BE TREATED ALIKE.

But there was this difference, Mr. President, in the plan recommended by Ricardo and that which is now proposed: Ricardo recommended the use of both metals alike, gold and silver, as the basis of paper currency which he suggested were alike to be treated. The trouble in this case is that you propose one system of currency by your gold and another system by your silver. You give gold the seat of honor by coining it into dollars and by permitting any particle of gold metal that comes to you from any part of the world to become a dollar. You further facilitate its use as money by permitting it to serve by certificate or paper representative.

As long as you treat one metal in that manner it is philosophical and logical and just to treat the other metal in the same manner, and it seems to be a disjointed and illogical system which will thus take one metal and place it upon a high plane of favor and then take the other metal and relegate it to a different system of finance and to one which is less calculated to appreciate that metal in value.

WAGES OF LABOR INCREASE WITH THE INCREASED PRICE OF ITS PRODUCTS.

In addition to the argument which has been made against the silver coinage, that we shall be in danger of losing gold, the only other argument which has been insisted upon in the debate—which seems to have some popular acceptance—is that contained in the queries which were put on Friday last to some of the speakers by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], and which have been repeated in various forms by other advocates of the degradation of our silver money.

They ask the question, with an obvious suggestion of argument beyond it: "If it be true, as you say, that this remonetization and expansion of the silver currency will increase prices, do you not perceive that it will increase the value of everything that the laborer is to buy, and therefore have a tendency to reduce the purchasing power of his wages?"

That is a suggestion which comes to us from the other side of the Chamber; and, to take a superficial view of the question, it would seem at first glance that if you are going to increase the price of the articles which the laboring men of the country must wear and must eat and must provide for the support of their families, you would be reducing the purchasing power of their wages, and therefore, perhaps, do them to some degree an injury instead of a benefit. But to take that view of the question, Mr. President, is thoroughly superficial. These productions which will rise in price—what are they? They are the products of that labor; and, as the result of his day's work, should the price of cotton and of manufactured fabrics rise, the laborer will find in his workshop or in his field as the result of his daily labor a larger addition to the wealth of the country. As these productions are the fruits of labor and will increase immensely in value by the expansion of your currency to meet the demands of the country, you are driven to the horns of this dilemma: Either you must contend that the enhancement of the prices of the fruits of labor does not increase wages, or you must acknowledge that with the rise of prices by the expansion of silver there will be a great addition to the fruits of labor, and a greater opportunity to reward labor out of them.

It is very curious, indeed, to see the leaders of a great political party changing front, turning coat, renouncing the doctrines upon which they proclaim for a protective tariff and apply the very opposite of the teachings which they have sought to impress upon the country to prevent the establishment of laws which will be for the benefit of the whole population. There is scarcely a Senator upon the other side of the Chamber who has not talked in his writings and in his speeches that just in proportion as you increase the price of the fruits of labor so you will increase the wages of labor. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] have been the champions of that doctrine. What do they mean when they change front and march to the rear and ask their Democratic colleagues the question, if they do not see that they are going to injure labor by increasing the price of its products?

Let it hurt whom it may, let it stand in the way of any doctrine which may be advocated, it must be evident that the increase in price of the products of labor does have a tendency at least to increase the wages of labor; and the opponents of a restrictive prohibitive high Chinese tariff do not oppose it upon the ground alone that there is no tendency from the increase of price to the increase of wages, but upon the proposition that this increase of price which you aim to protect by a Chinese tariff is first taken out of labor before it is given back to it. That does not apply in the case where you appreciate the prices of all the products of the land, not by giving a bonus to this man or a bonus to that one, but by that natural accretion of values which flows from the general health and prosperity of the whole country.

HOW OUR AMERICAN WHEAT MARKET HAS BEEN INJURED AND THE INDIA WHEAT MARKET BUILT UP.

I will illustrate this proposition by presenting to the Senate a table which was kindly prepared for me by a statistician of distinction. I refer to Mr. Ivan C. Michels, who has carefully stated in two tables which I shall insert in my remarks the production, the farm value, and the export value of wheat from India for a series of years, beginning in 1873 and winding up in 1889. The associated table which goes with this one is a like statement of the production, farm value, and export value of the wheat of the United States exported to foreign nations:

Production, farm value, exports, and value.

[By Ivan C. Michels.]

UNITED STATES.

Year.	Production.	Farm value and per bushel.	Exports.	Value and per bushel.
	<i>Bushels.</i>		<i>Bushels.</i>	
1873	281,254,700	\$323,594,805—\$1.015	39,204,285	\$51,452,254—\$1.314
1874	308,102,700	291,107,896— .944	71,039,928	101,421,459— 1.428
1875	292,136,000	294,580,990— 1.000	53,047,177	59,607,863— 1.124
1876	289,356,500	300,259,300— 1.037	55,073,122	68,382,899— 1.241
1877	364,194,146	394,695,779— 1.082	40,325,611	47,135,562— 1.169
1878	420,122,400	326,346,424— .777	72,404,961	96,872,016— 1.338
1879	448,756,630	497,030,142— 1.108	122,353,936	130,701,079— 1.068
1880	498,549,868	474,201,850— .951	153,252,795	190,546,305— 1.243
1881	383,280,090	456,880,427— 1.193	150,565,477	167,698,485— 1.118
1882	504,185,470	445,602,125— .884	95,271,802	112,929,718— 1.185
1883	421,086,160	383,649,282— .910	106,385,828	119,879,341— 1.126
1884	512,765,000	330,862,260— .650	70,349,012	75,026,678— 1.066
1885	357,112,000	275,320,890— .770	84,653,714	72,933,097— .862
1886	457,218,000	314,226,020— .687	57,759,209	50,262,715— .870
1887	456,329,000	310,612,960— .681	101,971,949	90,716,481— .890
1888	415,868,000	385,248,030— .927	65,789,261	56,241,468— .860
1889	490,560,000	342,491,707— .698	46,414,129	41,652,701— .897

Production, farm value, exports, and value—Continued.

INDIA.

Year.	Production.	Farm value and per bushel.	Exports.	Value and per bushel.
	<i>Bushels.</i>		<i>Bushels.</i>	
1873	142,216,030	\$139,904,319—\$0.98	735,485	\$816,063—\$1.11
1874	151,518,750	139,965,445—.92	3,277,781	4,027,545—1.23
1875	149,236,352	121,627,627—.82	2,004,156	2,391,646—1.19
1876	170,887,500	128,692,843—.75	4,686,767	4,410,690—.94
1877	195,504,400	188,661,746—.96	10,428,327	9,526,855—1.17
1878	172,947,882	212,725,894—1.23	11,896,580	13,985,177—1.28
1879	181,448,209	195,964,066—1.08	1,972,544	2,531,252—1.33
1880	182,730,213	197,348,630—1.08	4,109,495	5,471,245—1.15
1881	231,934,408	218,598,179—.94	13,896,167	15,952,105—1.16
1882	225,586,990	200,490,437—.88	37,148,543	43,163,723—1.12
1883	242,413,680	213,930,072—.88	26,495,024	29,631,213—1.10
1884	251,690,880	204,442,681—.81	39,202,636	43,291,464—1.04
1885	299,155,584	253,160,413—.84	29,588,311	30,736,902—.99
1886	258,585,947	235,714,839—.91	39,312,969	38,943,436—1.01
1887	238,585,632	220,393,768—.92	41,558,239	41,921,758—1.00
1888	266,882,645	242,863,195—.91	25,271,249	27,033,133—1.07
1889	243,076,549	226,061,190—.93	32,894,925	36,583,922—1.11

That table, Mr. President, tells its own story, and it serves as an illustration of the proposition which I have enunciated. In 1873, when silver was demonetized, India was producing 142,000,000 bushels of wheat, in round numbers, and exporting 735,000. In 1889 so greatly had the production of wheat in that country been stimulated by the degradation of our silver currency that India had added to her exports of wheat 100,000,000 bushels and it had grown to 243,000,000, an addition of 1,000,000, and the exports had risen to 42,000,000, while on the other hand you will perceive that just as India has gained in that race the United States have lost.

I have not time, for I do not wish to consume any greater length of time than is necessary, to comment upon all the totals of that paper, but any intelligent man can peruse its figures and see exactly where the fatal blow has been struck against the agricultural interests of this country. You will see also from that table that it is not overproduction that the United States is suffering from, if at all. We built up this Eastern market from India to England and to Europe. There was a market for our surplus. It is by destroying the market for our surplus and lowering the price, and not because that surplus ought not to have been produced, that the farming population of this country have suffered such great losses.

THE WINDOM PLAN.

Mr. President, there are several plans before the Senate for dealing with silver. The first plan is that suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury, of which I present a brief analysis:

1. Issue Treasury notes against deposits of silver bullion in the Government vaults.
2. At the market price of bullion when it is deposited.
3. Payable on demand in such quantity of silver bullion as will equal in value at the date of presentation the face value of the note at the price of silver then.
4. Or payable in gold at the option of the Government.
5. Or payable in silver dollars at the option of the holder.
6. Repeal the compulsory feature of the present coinage act.
7. The Secretary to have power to suspend temporarily the receipt of silver bullion for payment in Treasury notes.

THE SUBSTITUTE PRESENTED BY THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE FOR THE WINDOM PLAN.

A substitute was presented for that plan, which is known as the Jones bill, an analysis of which I also beg leave to present. This substitute treats gold and silver exactly alike, and provides for Treasury notes based upon the bullion which is hypothecated for their issue.

Its provisions are:

1. The Secretary of the Treasury to purchase \$4,500,000 worth of silver bullion per month.
2. At the price not exceeding \$1 for 371½ grains pure silver.
3. Also, to purchase gold bullion at not exceeding \$1 for 23.22 grains of pure gold.
4. Treasury notes to be issued on payment.
5. Treasury notes to be redeemable on demand, "in lawful money of the United States."
6. When redeemed the Treasury notes to be canceled.
7. The Treasury notes to be receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues, and when so received may be reissued.
8. The Treasury notes may be counted as part of the national-bank reserve.
9. Secretary to coin silver or gold bullion as may be necessary to redeem Treasury notes.
10. Act of February 28, 1878, is repealed.

This substitute does not make the Treasury notes legal tender.

THE HOUSE BILL 5381 NOW BEFORE THE SENATE.

The third plan is that which appears before us in House bill 5381. That provides for—

1. Purchase per month by the Secretary of the Treasury of \$4,500,000 worth of silver bullion at the market price.
 2. The price not to exceed \$1 for 371.25 grains pure silver.
 3. Treasury notes are to be issued in payment in denominations of not less than \$1 nor more than \$1,000.
 4. These notes are redeemable in coin.
 5. They may be reissued when redeemed.
 6. They are legal tender for all debts, public and private.
 7. They are receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues, and when so received may be reissued.
 8. They may be part of the national-bank reserve.
 9. The Secretary of the Treasury may exchange for such Treasury notes an amount of silver bullion equal in value at market price.
 10. The Secretary shall coin enough silver bullion to redeem the Treasury notes.
 11. When silver bullion reaches par it may be freely coined.
- The differences between this substitute and what is known as the Jones bill are that it makes the Treasury notes legal tender; that it authorizes the redemption of the Treasury notes in bullion instead of in silver dollars, and that it authorizes free silver coinage when silver shall come to par.

AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE TO HOUSE BILL.

The Senate Finance Committee has presented certain amendments to this House bill. It strikes out the provision in section 2 that Treasury notes shall be a legal tender. I had thought at first that it was necessary to have these notes as legal tender, but I do not see that it is at all indispensable that they should be, in the light of the fact that the dollar or its equivalent is in the Treasury, can be obtained on demand, and that it is a legal tender; still it is best to make them legal tender.

The Finance Committee also recommends the striking out of the bullion-redemption feature. That seems to me entirely wise, and, indeed, indispensable to the building up of the value of silver and to the establishment of a sound currency. It has been very well shown in one of the speeches made upon this subject that if you allow the bullion to be put in the Treasury, the Treasury notes issued for it, and then the Treasury notes to be carried back and bullion to be issued for them, the same quantity of bullion may flow to and fro for an indefinite time and extent, and that there will be no absolute assurance of the extension and expansion of your currency.

It also strikes out the free coinage of silver when silver shall come to par. It seems to me that this is a very unwise and unsuitable provision. It has always been contended that silver ought to be freely coined when it shall come to par, and it is curious that when we are taking measures to bring it to par a clause should be stricken out of the bill which authorizes free coinage when that "consummation, most devoutly to be wished," has been attained.

This bill also provides that at the end of five years its operations shall cease. I can not see any need at the present time for a provision that we shall at any particular future day reverse a policy which we are now inaugurating. It may be that at the end of five years such a thing would be wise, and it may be that it would not be wise, and how can we undertake at the present time to forecast so long a track of years, especially as the currents of our financial history have taken an erratic course unexpected by our finance ministers? Why should we undertake to anticipate so long a track of time and announce a policy which might then be unwise and fatal?

RECENT MOVEMENTS OF GOLD.

Mr. President, I was asked the question on Friday afternoon by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] how the balances between our country and foreign nations were to be paid. The balances are paid in exchanges or in the movement of the metals. I have before me the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1889, in which will be found a trace of the amount of gold moving from this country to other nations. On page 123 of his last report it will be seen that when a little flurry took place in the movements of gold and \$61,000,000 of gold left this country for Europe in 1888, \$27,000,000 went to France, \$18,000,000 to England, and \$15,000,000 to Germany. This temporary flurry in the movement of our precious metals is, however, explained in large degree by the Secretary of the Treasury and in such a manner as to indicate that we should not apprehend any permanent current of gold to foreign nations.

As a matter of fact—

He says—

As a matter of fact, most of the gold which recently left this country went to France.

In addition to the amount directly consigned to France (\$27,692,855), it is well known that the Bank of France received, during this period, large sums of gold from the United States consigned to London.

So that to France, which uses both gold and silver, and not to Germany or England, did this movement of gold take place, and it is largely explained by the further remark of the Secretary of the Treasury:

It is estimated—

He says—

It is estimated that some 120,000 people from the United States visited Paris during the exposition, and nearly all of them have carried with them bills of

credit which necessitated settlement by New York bankers with their London and Paris correspondents.

So that this temporary shifting of the balance of trade against our country, this temporary movement of gold to Europe, seems to have been one of those transient things caused largely by the French Exposition and not arising from any derangement of our system or from any fixed tendency of American wealth to flow abroad; but now, as we stand on the eve of the great American Exposition of 1892, we are just at a time when this gold which went abroad then will be coming back to us, and in any forecast which we may make of the early future of our country there is nothing in the permanent condition of our affairs or in those temporary changes which may occur, from which we may anticipate anything but a continuous flow of immigration, wealth, and money to our country.

THE DUTY OF CONGRESS TO PROVIDE MONEY—HOW THE STATE BANKS CAME TO HELP THE COUNTRY.

Mr. President, there is a peculiar obligation upon the Congress of the United States to respond to the popular demand for the increase in the volume of currency, a peculiar obligation greater than that which existed in earlier periods of our country. In the year 1861, when this nation stood upon the eve of an appalling catastrophe, it was not gold, it was not the national banks, it was not your legal-tender currency, it was not any resource of the Federal Government, which came to the rescue of the imperiled institutions which, as you conceived, were then demanding defense. It was the State banks of this country, the local financial institutions which had sprung up in the bosoms of the people, and which had been so perfected as to respond to popular wants and meet popular necessities, that held out the first hand of salvation to a nation in sorest need.

Mr. President, at that time there were no less than \$238,000,000 of State-bank notes in circulation, an amount equal to two-thirds of what now constitutes your entire legal-tender paper currency. In other words, 30,000,000 people, without assistance from the Federal Government, had built up in their own midst institutions of finance which spread broadcast over this land \$238,000,000 of domestic money, and which carried the facilities of commerce and exchange as King Alfred carried justice to every man's door.

It became necessary according to the views of the financiers of this nation to strike down these domestic institutions, and they did it, and I do not propose now to criticize that action because that is not essential to the trend of the argument which I am making. They thought it necessary to destroy the State banking institutions in order to build up the great national banks.

HOW THE NATIONAL BANKS DESTROYED THE STATE BANKS.

Now, I have a table here which I take from a work called Gold and Debt, which gives the amount of national-bank and of State notes in circulation for a series of years, beginning in 1854 and winding up in 1876. I shall insert this table in my remarks, but without now reading every figure of it I beg leave to make this comment upon it.

Up to 1863 there were no national-bank notes, but there were, however, \$238,671,210 in State-bank notes. In 1863 the national-bank act passed. The next year there were \$66,769,375 in national-bank notes. In 1866 there were \$213,239,530 of national-bank notes, and so on up to 1873, at the time when silver was demonetized, there were then in circulation \$336,289,287 of national-bank notes, and the State banks, then in the very last gasp, had a circulation of \$1,511,396 alone left. I append a table showing the national and State bank notes in circulation during various years. The flickering taper was then totally extinguished in 1884 and your State institutions perished while the national bank took its great position in the financial concerns of our country.

Here is the table:

National and State bank notes in circulation.

Year.	National bank notes.	State-bank notes.
1854.....	None.....	\$204,689,000
1855.....	do.....	186,952,000
1856.....	do.....	195,738,000
1857.....	do.....	214,779,000
1858.....	do.....	155,208,000
1859.....	do.....	193,306,000
1860.....	do.....	207,102,000
1861.....	do.....	202,205,000
1862.....	do.....	183,794,000
1863.....	(*).....	238,671,210
1864.....	\$30,155.....	
1865.....	66,769,375.....	
1866.....	213,239,530.....	45,449,155
1867.....	291,093,294.....	6,962,499
1868.....	294,377,390.....	3,792,013
1869.....	294,476,702.....	2,734,669
1870.....	292,833,935.....	2,351,993
1871.....	302,028,626.....	2,035,800
1872.....	318,043,841.....	1,886,538
1873.....	336,289,287.....	1,511,396
1874.....	350,020,062.....	
1875.....	349,404,839.....	(f)
1876.....	330,809,136.....	

* National-bank act passed.

† No later report.

The mission of the national banks, as it seems to be generally thought and as the proposed legislation would indicate, is now about ended. The war is over; we are returning to normal conditions of peace, and we are seeking to lay the foundation of a financial system guarded on every hand, which shall attend this nation through a long period of time of peaceful prosperity.

AGRICULTURE SUSTAINS OUR FOREIGN COMMERCE AND HAS A RIGHT TO A CURRENCY THAT WILL SUSTAIN IT.

Now that this system which was built upon the ruins of the State banks is going out, and as a substitute which was adopted for them is passing from existence; now, too, that you have destroyed the sovereignty of the States with respect to their local currency, with redoubled force and emphasis is cast upon you the obligation to furnish to the people such medium of exchange as they demand and as their necessity calls for. There seems to pervade the halls of statesmanship, and especially the halls of great bankers, the idea that the people must not be trusted in their ideas of finance; that we must send for some accomplished experts of foreign nations or some scholars from the closet before we seek to do anything with financial concerns, and the hardy yeomanry of the country and their representatives who come to Congress are not to be listened to when they give their views as to what ought to be done about the policy of the country of which they are the supporters.

The apprehensions which have been put before the Senate that our farmers and laboring men will get a cheaper dollar are apprehensions which have never arisen in their minds, and for which they are indebted to that class which has no community of interest with them. If they are going to get a cheaper dollar by this policy and want the cheaper dollar, why shall they not have the right to it? They are the men who to-day are producing that portion of the wealth of this country which enables it to hold up its head amongst the nations of the earth. When you look to your balance of trade and your foreign exports, you find that the farmers of the West and of the South are contributing each year to the wealth of this nation by exporting \$532,000,000 of all that you export, the equal of 72 per cent., and you find that the manufacturers, whose representatives on the other hand are generally clamorous against this policy, only export to foreign nations 18 per cent.

If, then, it should be a cheaper dollar, why is it that those who will receive so little of it in proportion to what the others will receive should be the ones to make objection, while those who will receive it do not make the objection? It is because these same farmers and producers who are sustaining the balance of trade with foreign nations know that they are not going to get a cheaper dollar. They not only know that they are not going to get a cheaper dollar by the light of experience which falls upon this picture from twelve years of your history, but they also know that they are going to get more dollars, and therefore it is to-day that they stand here in almost solid phalanx, from the West and the South and from the agricultural regions of the North, asking you to expand their currency and allow them to have more money, and the representatives of other interests who do not sustain our balance of trade with foreign nations seem to be greatly alarmed with a foreign commerce in which they take proportionately so insignificant a part, and wish to impose their devices and their policy upon interests with which they do not develop any hearty sympathy and with which they have no immediate community.

Mr. President, I had intended to allude further to some circumstances in respect to the history of silver, but seeing that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] is not in his seat, as it relates to the remarks made by him, I shall omit that. On Friday afternoon I did make allusion to our financial history, expecting that probably the Senator from Ohio would come in on that afternoon, or at least that he would be here at some time before my remarks were closed. I do not deem it necessary, however, to repeat what has been so often shown respecting the history of the demonetization of silver and what may be said to have passed into the common and familiar history of our country. I will let that go, and simply conclude my remarks to-day by saying, as I began, that I believe the absolute free coinage of silver is the only safe and proper exit out of this problem, and that if it be not safe, that can only be shown by what is to a degree an experiment. But that experiment can be made without peril, as we should have ample time to correct any evil tendency, if it should be developed, before harm would happen, and it is an experiment necessitated by the demand of the times and by the disordered system of our finances into which the country has been thrown.

I shall not detain the Senate longer. So far as I am concerned, I leave the subject with these remarks.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The pending amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 2, on page 2, line 8, after the word "notes" where it occurs the second time, the Committee on Finance report to strike out the words "shall be a legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, and;" so as to make the clause read:

But no greater or less amount of such notes shall be outstanding at any time than the cost of the silver bullion then held in the Treasury purchased by such notes; and such Treasury notes shall be receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues, and when so received may be reissued.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, in section 2 the provision is:

But no greater or less amount of such notes shall be outstanding at any time than the cost of the silver bullion then held in the Treasury purchased by such notes.

If any considerable amount or if any amount is coined, which may be under this bill, there will be from Treasury notes by the amount of the coin—

Mr. EDMUNDS. It is only coin for redemption.

Mr. TELLER. It must be coined before it is redeemed.

Mr. EDMUNDS. But suppose they coin it and do not redeem?

Mr. TELLER. Then it should say "no greater or less amount of such notes shall be outstanding at any time than the cost of the silver bullion and coin then held, the result of the purchase by such notes."

Mr. ALDRICH. That would not do, for the reason that there might be a double set of notes out as against coin. Under the provisions of law certificates are issued against coin, and if notes were also issued you would have \$2 in paper outstanding as against \$1 of silver in the Treasury.

Mr. TELLER. Suppose they should issue \$10,000,000 of Treasury notes for that amount of bullion and then they should coin preparatory to the redemption (because they must have some coin on hand with which to redeem) a million, under the wording of this, there could be but \$9,000,000 of certificates out. It would be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury then to call in \$1,000,000. That is not what anybody wants. What is wanted is that there shall be no more certificates out than the bullion and coin made from the bullion purchased for those certificates. Therefore, if we should insert after the word "bullion," in line 7, section 2, the words "and coin," and after the word "Treasury," in the same line, insert "the result of the purchase by such notes," it would be just what I think everybody intends. Therefore I move, after the word "bullion," in line 7, to insert the words "and coin."

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, is it not the ordinary course to agree upon the committee amendments or disagree upon them first?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair was about to suggest to the Senator from Colorado that the customary method in these cases is to consider the committee amendments, which are open to amendment as they proceed, and after those have been considered and disposed of, to then move additional amendments to the bill.

Mr. TELLER. I have no objection to the Senate proceeding with the amendments proposed by the Finance Committee. I will move that amendment when the proper time comes.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, my occupations have been such for the last three weeks or a month that I have not been able to give close attention to the debate upon this bill; but inasmuch as we are about to vote on it and the amendments offered to it, I desire to make a few observations respecting the votes I shall give.

The House bill, which is now as I understand the pending measure, all other bills and amendments having passed away, is substantially the bill proposed by the Finance Committee when it made its report originally to the Senate, with the exception that the House of Representatives has added a provision redeeming in bullion and a provision relating to free coinage after it shall appear that the bullion price of the dollar is equal to 371½ grains of pure silver. These, as I understand, are the two vital amendments which have been made to the bill as originally proposed by the Committee on Finance.

Inasmuch as I assented to the original report, I desire to say in the beginning of my observations that I expect to support that report substantially, as I believe it is the wisest and, on the whole, the best present solution of this question; and I wish to say just at this moment, as I see the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] is giving me his attention, that one criticism made by him in the debate the other day, I think, is a proper criticism as respects the phraseology of one section of the bill. He stated that under it the Secretary of the Treasury might coin fractional silver. As the bill was originally reported from the Committee on Finance it not only included silver bullion but it also included gold bullion, and, therefore, the phraseology applied to both gold and silver, and under that phraseology nothing but standard legal-tender coin could be made. But now, inasmuch as by both the Senate bill and the House bill the provisions respecting gold have been eliminated, I believe with him that, in order to make it clear, we should incorporate in this bill the words "shall be coined into standard dollars."

This subject having been referred to the Committee on Finance for the second time, the committee report back two amendments to the House bill, one striking out section 6 of the bill, which relates to free coinage after a certain period, and one inserting at the end of the bill a provision requiring that the provisions of this act shall terminate at the expiration of ten years. I shall support the Senate committee provision respecting the sixth section, but I will not support the provision respecting the limitation. I regard that limitation as unnecessary and as impairing the efficiency of this bill. I do not believe that this bill will last ten years or anything approaching ten years.

I have agreed to this report upon two grounds: First, that it is necessary to increase the currency under the present exigency and situation. That necessity comes from the fact, first, that the United States

has taken entire hold and control of the paper money of our country by our legislation, and, I believe, by the accepted public policy of both political parties there is no disposition anywhere to allow to be relegated to the States the power to issue paper money. Therefore, having taken under our control and disposition the entire question of the paper money of our country, it is our duty as legislators to provide a reasonable supply of that currency. That supply was originally made in 1875 or 1876 by the absolute free banking system then proposed under our national banking laws. But by the payment of the public debt this national banking system is gradually fading away, and public opinion seems so strong against its reinstatement that bills introduced here and in the other Chamber looking to the re-establishment of the national banks upon a different security than United States bonds seem to have met no favor.

Then the question for us to consider is, what is it that we can safely substitute for this fast fading away currency? Evidently the public opinion of our country favors that the Government itself shall in some form issue its currency. There have been various projects respecting how that currency should be issued by the Government. One has been that it should be issued upon land, another upon mortgages, and various devices have been proposed; but the judgment of the Committee on Finance, and I believe the general judgment of the Senate, is that if we shall issue paper currency, we should issue it upon something that is in and of itself convertible into legal-tender money. Therefore it is that this bill proceeds upon the idea that whatever paper money shall be issued shall be issued upon silver bullion purchased by the Government in the markets of the world at the market price.

Now, why is it that silver bullion has been selected as the basis for this new paper money that we propose to issue? It is because the public mind rests in the belief that sooner or later this silver bullion will be coined into disks or dollars, and that they will become a part of the metallic money of our currency. It is upon that basis that I vote for this bill; it is upon that basis that I am willing that we shall cease the coinage of silver dollars as the law now provides for, and store this bullion, issuing upon it paper money in lieu of the certificates now issued upon the coined dollar.

One object of this bill, by its promoters I am sure, is to get rid of practically the compulsory feature of the present law. There are, as is well known, two or three varying opinions upon this subject. There are people who believe that these coined dollars are useless dollars in the Treasury, and that it is a wise public policy to cease their coinage. For one, I do not share that belief. I believe that it is just as well for us to continue the coinage of these dollars, and to continue them to the utmost limit of four millions a month under the existing law, as it is to have the bullion security as provided for in this bill.

But there is a large public opinion that is against this view, and therefore, for one, I consent that the bullion shall be left in the Treasury uncoined, and I do so the more readily for the reason that in my belief (though in this I may be mistaken, but I honestly entertain the belief) we shall sooner or later, and I think very soon, be compelled to change the number of grains of silver in our dollar; and therefore whatever we have coined now will be recoined again; and on that account I am willing that this bullion shall lie in the Treasury until we shall know whether or not we can secure a community of nations who are willing to coin silver at an agreed ratio.

It is true that this bill provides that the bullion in the Treasury may be coined for the redemption of the Treasury notes which are to be issued under it, and whatever the opinions of other Senators may be in respect to this, I do not labor under the delusion that in the near future, under the provisions of this House bill or of our Senate bill, any additional silver coin will be issued. There are over 300,000,000 of these coined dollars now in the Treasury. The Treasury has issued against them silver certificates, so that although these dollars belong practically to the holders of the certificates, they are payable for public dues, and when received into the Treasury they belong to the Government of the United States. So the Government of the United States will always have a working balance, in my belief, sufficient to redeem these Treasury notes, especially if they are made a legal tender, without the coining of a single dollar under this bill. Hence I am not deceived in this respect.

Sir, I believe that the only safe way to rehabilitate silver is to secure a concurrent agreement among the nations of Europe that they will open their mints concurrently to the free coinage of silver at an agreed ratio. So believing, I am willing to go on as we are going on now, tentatively as it were, with a provision for the use of silver pending negotiations which are or ought to be had for the restoration of silver upon some agreed ratio by the nations of the world.

Mr. President, in supporting this bill, I am supporting it upon the basic idea that this Government of ours will use its power, whatever it has, in endeavoring to secure an agreement whereby all the commercial nations of the world will use silver as they use gold, at a fixed ratio to be agreed upon. Therefore it is that I am quite willing that this bullion shall be held in the Treasury until such an agreement is made, because I believe that the large number of silver dollars which we have now, and the large amount of gold coin which is in our country, and which under this bill can not go out of the country and will not

go out of the country unless there is an unfavorable balance of trade—and, of course, when that goes, anything we have, whether it be gold or silver, will go; and if we had no silver at all, with an unfavorable balance of trade against us, the gold would go, but if we had a thousand millions of silver, that which would be most profitable would go, whether gold or silver, with an unfavorable balance of trade—

Mr. EDMUNDS. Which would be the most unprofitable?

Mr. ALLISON. That would depend upon circumstances. We export now more silver than we do gold. Therefore it is more profitable to export silver than gold, year by year.

Mr. EDMUNDS. But does the Senator think, if I do not interrupt him—

Mr. ALLISON. Not at all.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Does the Senator think that when the case came that he has mentioned of an unfavorable balance of trade according to what light he now has, silver would go and gold would stay, or gold go and silver stay?

Mr. ALLISON. "Under the light I have." Does the Senator mean under the legislation proposed?

Mr. EDMUNDS. No, but according to the opinion of the Senator, acquainted with public affairs and the operation of business all over the world?

Mr. ALLISON. I believe under the existing condition of things, in case of an unfavorable balance of trade, that as between gold and silver, such as we have in our country now, gold would go and silver would go. Gold being more desirable would go undoubtedly first, or perhaps in greater quantities, but if that balance of trade was against us in China or in India, the silver might go.

But that is apart from what I am arguing. I am making the statement that under the provisions of this bill we are in no more serious condition as respects the exportation of gold than we are now. That is the argument I make. I am not arguing the general question.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada. I ask if it is not true, now that we have the balance of trade in our favor with gold-using countries of at least \$200,000,000, and if we have not had the balance of trade with gold-using nations in our favor for a great many years, that our balance of trade is always against silver-using countries, and not gold-using countries.

Mr. ALLISON. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to that. Of course I did not intend to go into that detail. The balance of trade is in our favor in the gold-using countries.

Now, then, Mr. President, such being the situation, I regard this legislation as a practical continuance and enlargement of the legislation of 1878, and that is all it is. The Senators and the men who upheld that legislation of 1878 now come and say that they are willing not only to take the extreme limit then fixed, of \$4,000,000 a month, but they are willing to enlarge that to \$4,500,000 a month. Therefore, I regard this legislation and the unanimity with which it is proposed as a complete justification of the legislation of 1878, which contemplated a minimum coinage of 2,000,000 and a maximum coinage of 4,000,000 per month of silver dollars.

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

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. EUSTIS. I understand the Senator to give as one of the reasons why he supports this bill that it may lead to some international arrangements upon the question of silver. I ask him whether he thinks that the prospect of an international arrangement will be promoted by a law which he proposes to pass demonetizing silver?

Mr. ALLISON. Well, Mr. President—

Mr. EUSTIS. And in that connection will the Senator allow me to call his attention to the fact—

Mr. ALLISON. I want to be as brief as I can. Of course the Senator knows that we have an arrangement about taking the vote.

Mr. EUSTIS. It will not take me a minute to state my question. The view the Senator presents was the view which the Republican party took in its platform—

Mr. ALLISON. I can not go into the Republican platform now. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] exhausted that subject. I do not want to do that. The Senator from Louisiana will excuse me.

Mr. EUSTIS. That is what the party said.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator from Iowa will allow me to say a word—

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from Iowa seems to be under the impression that he has got to close his speech briefly, according to the arrangement which has been made. I do not think anybody is going to object to the extension of the time for taking the vote. There are at least two more speeches that I know of which are to be made. I am not going to make one myself, but there are two, and I think, perhaps, there is still another Senator who desires to speak before we shall be prepared to vote upon these amendments, and I think the Senator may as well go on with the feeling that we are going to extend the time.

Mr. ALLISON. Senators will see how difficult it is for me to subject myself to interruptions when, under the unanimous agreement of the Senate, I have only a few minutes remaining.

Mr. EUSTIS. With the consent of the Senator, I asked him a question to which I should like to have an answer.

Mr. ALLISON. Respecting demonetization?

Mr. EUSTIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLISON. There is no demonetization of silver in this bill as it stands. The relations as respects the coinage of silver are in this bill as they were in the bill of 1878, except that it is provided that a half million of bullion more shall be purchased monthly than under the law of 1878. Therefore, there is nothing that can be used abroad or anywhere to say that we are demonetizing silver; *per contra*, this very bill will disclose to foreign nations that we are holding silver bullion in increasing quantities, taking our share of that responsibility during the intervening years when we hope to secure the open mintage of silver as of gold. Therefore it is that we can say to foreign countries, "Under the provisions of this bill we have suspended practically the coinage of the dollar of 16 to 1 in order that we may agree with you as to the dollar which shall circulate throughout the commercial nations of the world."

That is my theory as respects this bill, that we are simply putting ourselves in the attitude of waiting to see whether or not we can secure the complete rehabilitation and restoration of silver. When I so act I feel that I am acting not only in the interest of silver, but that I am acting in the interest of all the people of the world who believe as I do, that the affairs of this world can not be conducted upon the single basis of gold; and the war and the contest to-day, as the Senator from Louisiana well knows, is between those who seek to destroy and outlaw silver and those who seek to place it upon an equality with gold. That is the contest; and I am for the full and complete restoration of silver as one of the coined metals of the world, and therefore I propose to do whatever I can do to promote that most desirable object.

Mr. EUSTIS. I understood the Senator to state distinctly that it was his belief that if this bill was passed not a dollar of silver money would be coined. Now, I ask him whether it is not the demonetization of silver to pass a law which does not require or necessitate the coinage of a silver dollar. If that is not demonetization of silver what is demonetization?

Mr. ALLISON. This bill expressly provides for the coinage of silver.

Mr. EUSTIS. But it repeals the only law which requires the coinage of the silver dollar.

Mr. ALLISON. I stated that I believed that for a few years under the operation of this bill, if it shall become a law, no silver will be coined.

Mr. STEWART. Then I should like to ask the Senator in what way we shall redeem the Treasury notes.

Mr. ALLISON. In gold or silver either. I do not choose to go into that subject now. That is a mere opinion of mine.

Now, Mr. President, these are the provisions which, as I understand, have been adopted by the Committee on Finance as respects this question. There is but one thing confronting us, as I understand, as an alternative proposition, and that is, that now, without delay and without circumspection and without limitation, we shall proceed to the free and unlimited coinage of silver. While I have sympathy with that idea, and whilst I would be glad to vote for the free and unlimited coinage of silver, entertaining the views that I do upon this subject I can not cast such a vote at this time or at any time in the near future in the interest of silver until we have exhausted every effort to secure the unlimited use of silver by the other commercial nations of the world.

Now, it is said by the promoters of free coinage that we can enter upon that alone without limitation, unaided by any other country in the world. If I so believed, I would vote for free coinage, but I think all history discloses the fallacy of that possibility. Nothing better discloses it than our own history of coinage, beginning in 1792.

It is a matter just as well known as the multiplication table that in 1834 we had no gold in this country. There was not a million dollars of gold coin in the United States when the statute of 1834 was passed. I have not freshened my memory on that question, but the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] the other day read an extract from a speech I made some years ago when I did examine the question. Yet we had free coinage of gold all the time at the ratio of 15 to 1.

Why was it that the gold went out of the country between 1792 and 1834? Why was it that we had an inundation of silver from every silver-producing country in the world between 1792 and 1834? It was because we had fixed a ratio as between gold and silver that was not the ratio fixed by the law of the commercial nations of the world, and therefore our gold went out and silver came in and remained here.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me to ask him how much silver was coined at that time, or how much we had coined when our mints were open to silver at 15 to 1?

Mr. ALLISON. I can not state it accurately, but it will be remembered that by the act of 1792 and the acts following it closely all the coinage of silver was a full legal tender for the payment of all debts, public and private. Therefore the half-dollars and the quarter-dollars were as much a legal tender for a million dollars as they were for five dollars; and although we suspended practically very soon the coinage of the dollar—that is to say, but very few dollars were coined—yet the half-dollars were coined by the million and the hundred million nearly, and those half-dollars were piled up in bank vaults as security for circulating notes. They were a full legal tender in the payment of debts,

and of these coins we coined between 1792 and 1834 more than \$140,000,000.

Mr. TELLER. If I may be allowed to interrupt the Senator, he does not answer my question. He says that we were inundated by silver from all parts of the world.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not mean to say that.

Mr. TELLER. I want to know whether we had a surplus of silver under the ratio of 1 to 15.

Mr. ALLISON. I see the point the Senator makes now. I used an unfortunate expression to the ear of the Senator when I said we were inundated. I withdraw it. I did not mean that. I meant to say that we not only coined a large amount of silver, but that silver came here from abroad and foreign silver coin was a full legal tender in payment of debts. So was gold, but gold did not come. We had no gold, practically, between 1792 and 1834.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me to ask him if I understood him aright as expressing the opinion that under the pending bill, if passed, no silver would be coined for the next few years; and if so, how he construes section 3 of the House bill, as reported by the Senate committee:

That the Secretary of the Treasury shall coin such portion of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of this act as may be necessary to provide for the redemption, etc.

Mr. ALLISON. Oh, undoubtedly.

Mr. HARRIS. Can it be possible that the Secretary under such an enactment would feel that no coinage would answer?

Mr. ALLISON. I thank the Senator for answering the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS], who said that we demonetized silver by this bill. That is a complete answer to that. The bill says it shall be coined.

Mr. President, why was it that the gold went out of the country? We had free coinage of gold. It went out because our ratio was not the right ratio. In 1834 we reversed the pendulum and swung the other way, and we changed our ratio from 15 to 1 to 16 to 1. What happened under that? Under that ratio, when 1853 came there was not a dollar, or a half-dollar, or a quarter-dollar of silver in the United States. Gold came in then, and gold was coined at our mints. We had reversed the pendulum and got silver because we overvalued gold. That was the situation in 1853.

I hear it said upon this floor that silver was practically disfranchised and outlawed by our own statutes in 1853. Why, sir, the history of that period discloses the very reverse to be true. The object and aim of the law of 1853 was to so coin fractional silver as to keep it here for the convenience of our people, and there was no expectation of outlawing silver.

Why was it that the silver went away? It was because we struck the wrong ratio in our legislation in 1834.

Eighteen hundred and seventy-three came. I agree that that was a most unfortunate act on the part of Congress by which the disfranchisement of silver occurred in 1873, but I have never taken much thought of it because at that time we had no silver or gold in the United States, practically. We were on a paper-currency basis, and not near a metallic basis in either of the precious metals. Therefore, it is true, as it was true in 1867, when the savants met in Paris and agreed that gold should be the universal standard of money; they did not discuss the silver question at that convention.

They discussed whether they could make a twenty-five-franc piece and a pound piece and a five-dollar gold piece upon an equality; and in that discussion they discovered that that could not be done as respects silver and gold unitedly, and therefore they said, "Inasmuch as we can not do it upon both metals without inconvenience, let us select one of them;" and the influences and the power there of those eminent men favored gold rather than silver. That is all there was in the action of 1867. Mr. Samuel B. Ruggles, of the United States, an eminent citizen of the State of New York, a member of that convention, had no more power to bind the people of the United States as respects its judgment upon this question than we have to bind the people to the adoption of the principles of the Koran. He knew nothing about the sentiments of the people of the United States upon this question of metallic money. There had been no expression of public sentiment either for or against silver or gold. They both stood in our coinage and mint acts as upon an equality at a ratio of 16 to 1. There had prior to that time been no public discussion in these halls or anywhere in the halls of legislation looking to the destruction and desecration and outlawry of silver.

But it was in pursuance of that action that in 1873 we fell in with what seemed to be the popular sentiment abroad in favor of disfranchising silver entirely. I say it was a mistake, but I want to call the attention of Senators to the fact that if that had not been done at that time, before we entered upon our specie resumption, if we had maintained the free coinage of silver we should have been obliged to have changed our ratio. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] shakes his head. That is also an opinion of mine only.

Mr. President, here are two illustrations showing that silver and gold must have a ratio that is agreeable to the principal nations of the world, or else that they will interchangeably flow from one country to another. We are to-day upon an absolute gold standard. Does anybody deny

that? The standard of everything we have, of everything we own or that is owing to us, is upon the basis of gold. Can there be any doubt about that? That being true, we are entering upon the free coinage and free mintage of silver, not for the purpose but which will have the effect, if the historical statement I have made be true, of banishing gold and bringing silver here. I do not say banishing gold immediately; I am not speaking of that now; but ours is a gold standard.

Is there any Senator here who has recently traveled through Mexico? If there is such a one, he knows that the moment the American traveler crosses the border of Mexico the money of the United States is at a premium of from 30 to 35 per cent. Why is it? The paper money and the gold coin, the greenbacks and the silver certificates, are at a premium. Mexico is upon a silver basis, with a silver coin containing three and a half more grains of standard silver than is contained in the coin of the United States. Yet a silver certificate of the United States crossing the borders of the States of Mexico will bring 30 per cent. premium. Why is that? It is because we are on a gold standard and they are on a silver standard.

Mr. TELLER. Does the Senator mean to say that a piece of paper payable in a silver dollar is a gold standard? I want to enter my protest by not sitting silent and admitting that we are on a gold standard.

Mr. ALLISON. Then I shall be glad to have the Senator explain why it is.

Mr. TELLER. I do not care about explaining it during the Senator's speech, but it certainly needs some explanation when the Senator says that a silver certificate is worth 35 per cent. premium in Mexico.

Mr. ALLISON. No, I do not say 35 per cent.

Mr. TELLER. Or 30 per cent.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not say that it is at any particular premium.

Mr. TELLER. Or 20 per cent. or any premium, because it is payable in silver. It is payable in a silver dollar less valuable, so far as the bullion is concerned, than the Mexican dollar.

Mr. ALLISON. That is just what I was saying. I was saying that there must be some reason for that. Now, what is the reason?

Mr. MORGAN. The convenience of exchanges of paper money.

Mr. ALLISON. Not convenience of exchanges, because exchange upon New York is at 30 per cent. premium in the city of Mexico. It is because they have a silver standard and we have a gold standard, and it is because, although we issue silver certificates payable in silver dollars, up to this moment, and I believe it would be so if we had \$700,000,000 of them, twice the amount we have now, our silver certificates are upon a par with the rest of the money in the United States. Therefore it is that these silver certificates, representing our silver dollars, are worth a great deal more than the Mexican silver dollar containing three and one-half grains more of silver.

I may be wrong, but I argue from this that there is a difference of from 25 to 20 per cent. between the ratios of our country and of England, and France, and Germany, as between these gold-standard countries and the silver countries. Now, it may be that Senators are right who believe that this bridge of 30 per cent. can be passed over in thirty days, or ninety days, or even in a year, so as not to disturb and destroy the existing conditions, and so believing they may be willing to enter at once upon the free coinage of silver; but I do not believe that it is practicable. The savants of France and the members of the Latin Union are certainly as wise as we are here, some of them at least. Now, although they have \$1,200,000,000 of silver at the ratio of 15½ to 1, they have not been willing to open their mints to the free coinage of silver without, not only the United States, but either Germany or England joining with them.

In other words, they believe that if they open their mints for the free coinage of silver there will be such a disparity between silver and gold as will reduce the standard.

That is my trouble as respects the free coinage of silver in this country. I do not believe we can enter upon it at this moment. We might by such legislation as we propose here enhance the value of silver gradually, and thus in a few years be ready to open our mints to the free coinage of silver; but we are not ready for that now. Whilst I would gladly join with every man who favors the free coinage of silver, I can not do it now, because I believe it would greatly disturb and perhaps destroy the business interests of our country.

I have here from the Comptroller of the Currency a statement of the amount of bank deposits in the United States—\$1,500,000,000 of saving deposits alone. I ask Senators in good faith respecting this, can we run the risk of bridging over this difference of 30 per cent., or 25 per cent., or whatever it is, and endanger the people who own these savings in savings-banks? Can we run the risk of disturbing property by a sudden change in the ratio, whether it be part up or part down, making it 15 per cent. by our legislation in a single day? I can not do it for myself. Therefore, I shall not vote for the free and unlimited coinage of silver if that amendment shall be offered here.

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator from Iowa explain to me one proposition that he has advanced? I understand him to state that even if our silver coinage were put up to \$700,000,000, which he states to be about twice the present amount, it would not affect the value of the coin certificates of silver relatively with gold?

Mr. ALLISON. Under the present plan of coinage.

Mr. VEST. Would free coinage have any other effect?

Mr. ALLISON. I think so. That is what I am trying to explain. I will give another reason why.

Mr. VEST. I do not see how.

Mr. ALLISON. It is perfectly plain to me that the silver bullion of the world must regulate itself and be substantially of the same value everywhere. Now, if we go to free coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1, what do we do? We say to the Latin Union states, "Unless you will recoin the \$1,200,000,000 that you now hold on a basis of 15½ to 1, you must either sell your silver and get gold or you must leave your mints closed forever." Can there be any doubt about that? I should be glad to have Senators explain to me how it will be possible for us to have free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16, and the nations of Europe to have this enormous hoard of silver at the ratio of 15½ to 1.

That situation will not last always. They will be obliged to sell their silver at a loss of 3 per cent., or else they will be obliged to hold to their present status and condition. I do not believe that they will retain their silver. I believe they will sell it at some time.

Mr. BUTLER. May I ask the Senator if in his judgment the time will ever arrive in this country when we can resort to free coinage of silver with our present ratio existing as the difficulty in the way?

Mr. ALLISON. If I were to vote for free coinage to-day I should vote for the ratio of 15½ to 1. I believe that that would come nearer securing a parity between the silver and gold of the world than the ratio of 16 to 1. But I do believe that by proper negotiations with other countries we can in the very near future secure an arrangement whereby we can open our mints to the free coinage of silver at a ratio to be agreed upon. I will say further to the Senator from South Carolina that I may at some time vote with him, if he and I are both here, when I will not say now, in favor of the free coinage of silver; but I cannot do so now for the reasons I have stated. When we do, we are either coming to the silver standard, or it may be a depressed standard, which I believe it will be for some time to come, or else we must come to it by an arrangement such as I have described. Now, that is all there is in this question.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator has not answered my interrogatory exactly. The point of my inquiry was whether the time for free coinage would ever arrive with the present ratio of 16 to 1 in this country and 15½ to 1 in the Latin Union.

Mr. ALLISON. It may arrive within six months.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask whether the time will ever arrive when we can safely resort to free coinage with that obstacle in the way which I understand the Senator to say is an insuperable one.

Mr. ALLISON. That is not what I say at all. I say until there is an agreed ratio. It may be that that agreed ratio will be 16 to 1. I hope it will be, because that will prevent us from being obliged to lower our \$300,000,000 of silver that we have now. But what I mean to say is that I do not think it is wise for us to open our mints to the free coinage of silver until we have exhausted at least an effort to secure an agreed ratio between ourselves and other states.

Mr. BUTLER. In view of the experience of this Government upon that subject it seems to me that we never shall get an international monetary arrangement. We have made two efforts already, and the Governments of Europe have declined, as I understand it.

Mr. ALLISON. The view of the experience of our Government has no influence upon me. Our Government has had no experience.

Mr. BUTLER. We have made several efforts to get an international monetary arrangement.

Mr. ALLISON. We have made two efforts, one in 1879 and one in 1881, and if they had been pursued, in my belief they would have been successful soon after. But since that time we have had nothing except statements to European powers that the people of the United States were in favor of the single standard of gold, and that they did not believe in silver at all.

Mr. EUSTIS. Do I understand the Senator when he speaks of an international arrangement to include England?

Mr. ALLISON. I either include it or exclude it.

Mr. EUSTIS. I ask the Senator whether he includes England?

Mr. ALLISON. I am not speaking of an international arrangement with any particular country.

Mr. EUSTIS. I ask the Senator whether in speaking of an international arrangement he includes England?

Mr. ALLISON. I answered the Senator that I did not include it or exclude it. I believe that the United States and the Latin Union states could, if they agreed upon a ratio, maintain silver at that ratio, but other people do not think so. Therefore it may be that England is necessary. I do not think it is. So I do not include it or exclude it.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. MORRILL. I wish to say that, as I happen to know, the Senator from Iowa has had no time to make any preparation for his speech to-day, and I hope therefore that he will not be further interrupted.

Mr. ALLISON. I thank the Senator from Vermont for that suggestion, although it does not disturb me especially to be interrupted,

except that it causes me to encroach upon time which belongs properly to others.

Mr. President, I want to say that in my view the free and unlimited coinage of silver at this moment will not result in placing silver at par with gold at the ratio of 16 to 1. I am not prepared to say what the proper dividing line would be. It would be somewhere between the dividing line of 25 and par. Hence I am not willing to enter upon an arrangement which will at once change the standard and thus change all relations in the United States, whether it be the wages of labor, the savings of the people, or the contracts that have been made. These are the reasons why I at this moment am not prepared to enter upon the free coinage of silver. I am prepared to enter upon a free coinage when this dividing line is lessened, as I am not sure it will be greatly by the bill which we propose here. This bill takes from out the markets of the world \$54,000,000 worth of silver per annum, and thereby places it in such relation to the other silver of the world as that it can be utilized hereafter in the coinage upon a relation that may be agreed upon.

Mr. DANIEL. If it will not interrupt the Senator from Iowa, will he allow me to ask him a question for information?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. ALLISON. I do with the understanding that it is not to be long.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to ask the Senator this question. He expresses the opinion, which is shared in by many, that it would be perhaps better, if we were to coin the silver dollar, to coin it at the ratio of 15½ to 1 rather than 15.98 or 16, as commonly called now, if we issue silver certificates or Treasury notes for bullion. Now, would it not be the same in effect as coining the silver dollars at a ratio of 15.98 or 16, as commonly called, to 1, in that we should be expected to redeem those representatives at that ratio?

Mr. ALLISON. There is no difficulty about that. These certificates are issued at the ratio of 15.98 to 1, but they are not coin, and they are redeemable now, and will be, not only in silver, but in gold. I trust that neither this Congress nor any other will ever propose a measure which will have the effect to separate one from the other. I know of but one instance where the public creditor suffered by a debasement of our coin, and that was in 1834 when 6½ per cent. was clipped from our gold coin by a change of ratio.

Mr. President, I do not like to go into the field of politics and I do not mean to do so; but we have for twelve years had the act of February 28, 1878, upon our statute-books. During four years of that period the control of this Government was in the hands of the Democratic party. The President of that party, before he was inaugurated, insisted that the coinage of silver under that act should stop before he took the oath of office. His Secretary of the Treasury, who came into power on the 4th of March, 1885, finding but \$2,000,000 a month had been coined under previous Secretaries, coined during the four years of his power only that minimum; and twice during his term, if I am not mistaken, he recommended the suspension of silver coinage absolutely. Although there was a majority during all this period in the House of Representatives of the Democratic party and a large and influential and able minority in this body during all those four years, ending only a year ago, there was not a voice raised in either House by the Democratic party in condemnation of the policy proposed.

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh, Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not make quite so broad a statement in regard to the action of the other House, because there were bills introduced and presented there and voted upon.

Mr. ALLISON. I am speaking now of action looking to the passage of bills. The House of Representatives passed no such bill from 1885 to 1889.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is true that the House passed no bills, but a bill was reported to the House by a Democratic member from Missouri and was voted down by the Republican minority and a few Democrats aiding them.

Mr. ALDRICH. A free-coinage bill was adversely reported from a Democratic committee in a Democratic House of Representatives, and it was voted down by a Democratic House of Representatives by a large majority.

Mr. MORGAN. They were not good Democrats; that is all.

Mr. REAGAN. But it was not voted down by a majority of Democrats.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, we sent from this Chamber an important liberalizing bill in 1887 as an amendment to the national banking act. It went to the House of Representatives and there went to "the tomb of the Capulets," and never was heard of during the whole of the Administration of President Cleveland.

Now, what I do not understand is the new-born zeal that comes from that side of the Chamber in favor of free and unlimited coinage of silver when they had four years of power and made no effort—when I say "no effort" I mean no such effort as they could have made—to establish this free coinage.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator certainly wants to be accurate—

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

Mr. ALLISON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator wants to be accurate. The movement for the free coinage of silver came from his side of the Chamber.

Mr. ALLISON. I am just giving a little bit of historical information, because I have been interrupted on account of my expressing hostility to free coinage, and that interruption has come largely from the other side of the Chamber, and I wondered why it was that that side of the Chamber had waked up so suddenly to the great wrong that was being inflicted now upon the American people because we do not before daylight to-morrow pass a bill for the free coinage of silver.

Mr. BUTLER. We are following the lead of the Senator's colleagues on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. ALLISON. I know you are.

Mr. BUTLER. Then I think that fact ought to be stated.

Mr. ALLISON. I only called attention to it.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. ALLISON. For one moment.

Mr. VEST. My friend expresses great zeal for historical accuracy. Will he permit me to read from the RECORD in regard to a measure in which he figured very conspicuously?

Mr. ALLISON. I know what that record is.

Mr. VEST. I know the Senator does.

Mr. ALLISON. I voted in 1879, or whatever the date, against the free coinage of silver, as I shall do now.

Mr. VEST. Exactly, and the Senator states now in the Senate of the United States that he is surprised at the new-born zeal of the Democratic party. I have the RECORD here where I myself introduced a resolution for free coinage.

Mr. ALLISON. When was that?

Mr. VEST. On June 30, 1879.

Mr. ALLISON. In 1879. Eleven long years have elapsed and passed into history.

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator permit me to supplement it by a statement of the resolution? It was—

Resolved, etc., That the complete remonetization of silver and its restoration to a perfect equality with gold, both as coin and bullion, are demanded alike by the dictates of justice and wise statesmanship.

It was known that the Finance Committee was "the tomb of the Capulets" for all silver legislation. The Senator was a conspicuous member of that committee then, as he is now. He is a Republican, and a test vote was had here, and not one single Republican failed to vote to send this resolution to that committee when he knew that was the death of it. They sent it there by 1 majority, on the Senator's motion, and every Democrat but 3 voted against sending it there. It was a test vote.

Mr. ALLISON. I agree to that, but that was in 1879.

Mr. VEST. Oh, yes.

Mr. ALLISON. Where was the Senator during the four years of President Cleveland's Administration that he was not introducing these resolutions in this Chamber and asking test votes?

Mr. VEST. I was fighting the Republican party, as usual, on this and every other question.

Mr. ALLISON. But not in the same way.

It sometimes occurs that such resolutions presented by the minority are put in for the purpose of annoying and embarrassing the majority. During the placid quiet and comfort of a Democratic Administration of four years, if I heard the voice of the Senator from Missouri in favor of the free coinage of silver it has passed from my memory; but now when we have both Houses and the President the situation is changed, and the demand is made upon us for free coinage.

Mr. President, I have made these observations without preparation, as I have had no time to make preparation upon the discussion of this bill, for the purpose of stating the reasons why I at this moment of time can not support the amendment that has been suggested upon both sides of the Chamber, by my friend from Colorado and by the Senator from Missouri, but will support what I regard as a safe, liberal, conservative measure, having in view, and clearly in sight, I hope, the free coinage of silver at no distant day upon a basis which will make that free coinage permanent, and enable silver and gold to travel hand in hand, as they did for nearly a century, at a ratio fixed by law with reference to their coinage.

Mr. EUSTIS. Mr. President, I desire to say only a word. In 1878 I heard pretty much the same speeches that are made to-day with regard to some international arrangement with foreign governments; and the people of the United States were told then to wait and that an international arrangement would be secured in the course of time. We are now advocating, many of us, the free coinage of silver, and we hear the same argument over and over again, "Wait, and we will secure some international arrangement." When shall we secure it?

I asked the Senator from Iowa whether he included England in any possible arrangement. He said he did not. I rather think that, certainly up to the time when I asked him the question, he thought that England was a necessary party, and if England be a necessary party we shall never pass a law till judgment day giving the American people free coinage of silver.

It is a little singular that the Senators on the other side, the Senator from Vermont, the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Iowa, Senators who may be called the Meccas of American finance, still use that argument, and no other argument, repudiating the Republican platform of 1888 and falling back and shielding themselves behind the platform of 1884. That was what the Republican party declared in favor of in 1884, an international arrangement; for the Republican party has been able from 1878 to 1884 to delude the American people by this specious argument and this impossible promise. This was the plank of the Republican platform of 1884—

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator let me interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. EUSTIS. Let me read this.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is the duty of the Chair to announce that the hour of 3 o'clock has arrived; at which time general debate was to cease and each Senator was to be permitted to speak but once only and for five minutes on any question. The Senator from Louisiana will proceed.

Mr. EUSTIS. This is the plank of the Republican platform of 1884:

We have always recommended the best money known to the civilized world, and we urge that an effort be made to unite all commercial nations in the establishment of an international standard which shall fix for all the relative value of gold and silver coinage.

That was the Republican platform of 1884, and that is the argument which we hear now from leading Republican Senators on the other side. The Republican platform of 1888 repudiated that idea. They did not then, in 1888, say a single word with reference to any international arrangement upon the silver question. They took an entirely new departure when they declared, as their plank reads, as follows:

The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Louisiana now be kind enough to read the Democratic platform for 1888?

Mr. EUSTIS. I have not got it with me. [Laughter.]

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if it is not in the same book he holds in his hand?

Mr. EUSTIS. I expect it is.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Then the Senator has it with him and does not wish to read it. [Laughter.]

Mr. EUSTIS. I have not examined the book. Perhaps the Senator from Vermont knows what the book contains.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I rather think it is there.

Mr. EUSTIS. But we said nothing about it in 1888.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us see what it says. Let me take it. [The book was handed.]

Mr. EUSTIS. Mr. President, I wish simply to bring to the attention of the American people the fact that the argument which is used to-day against free coinage is the argument that we must still continue to wait until it suits the pleasure of England and Germany and other countries to come down on their knees and to ask us into some conference, or consultation, or combination, or convention in order to establish the ratio between gold and silver which will be agreeable to them (which is an impossibility, and every Senator ought to know it), and to say that if we propose to give the American people silver dollars we shall have to give them irrespective of the wishes, of the policy, or the intent or purposes of any foreign Government.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I simply wish to observe that silence is sometimes preferable to falsehood. If the Democratic party said nothing upon the question of silver in 1888, it was not because it receded from the position assumed always by a large majority of that party, but it was because (and I state it frankly) the President of the United States who had been elected by the Democratic party was an Eastern man, a New York man, who did not sympathize with the majority of his party upon this question. Mr. Cleveland came to the Presidency imbued with the prejudices of the New York bankers. He knew nothing about the West. He was in one sense, as to his opinion upon silver, a sectional man. He had been simply governor of the State of New York, and although he developed after he became President of the United States a degree of ability which his friends, even, never claimed for him, his information upon the silver question was defective. I have reason to believe that he is better informed now upon it, and more in sympathy with the people of the great West and with the immense majority of the Democratic party.

But the Senator from Iowa, who to-day arraigns the Democratic party in this Chamber, pleads the statute of limitations on his own action in 1879. He knew when he voted to send the resolution for free coinage to the Committee on Finance that he sent it to certain and absolute death. He knew that no silver tracks ever came out from that den. He knew that even the Democratic chairman of that committee was opposed to silver. I have the vote here, and in order to make the record absolutely correct I will read it. There were but four Democrats, I believe, who voted in favor of the reference of that resolution. The resolution, which I have read, declared for the complete remonetization of silver.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] moved to refer it to the Finance Committee on the 30th of June, 1879, and a reference to the RECORD will show that it was considered a test vote for and against the free coinage of silver. The yeas, to send it to the cave of death for the purpose of killing it, when they knew an echo would never be heard from it again, were—

Mr. MORRILL. Why does the Senator from Missouri say it was "the cave of death?"

Mr. VEST. It was known that a majority of the committee was against silver.

Mr. MORRILL. How did gentlemen know it? Was ever a bill of that character sent there which was reported adversely or was killed by suppression?

Mr. VEST. Well, Mr. President, nothing was ever heard of this resolution again. I have never heard of it from the day it entered the sacred precincts of that money committee. I knew then it was gone, and I bade it farewell—

Farewell, vain world, I'm going home.

It went there and it staid there; the chairman of that committee never reported upon it, and no action was taken, and it never was intended to be reported upon.

These yeas and nays show how the two parties stood. Now, I will read them. There is no escape. The yeas were Messrs. ALLISON, Anthony, Bayard, who was known to be an anti-silverman—

Mr. MORRILL. Let me ask the Senator from Missouri if Senator Bayard, a good Democrat, was not chairman of the committee at that time?

Mr. VEST. I will interrupt the reading of this roll simply to say that when the Senator from Delaware was made chairman of the Finance Committee, when the Democrats held control of the Senate, for the two years that we held it, he had measures sent to him in favor of the free coinage of silver and positively refused to report them, and when my Democratic colleagues and myself, those of us who were in the Senate, pressed him to report, he resigned rather than do it. Does the Senator want any more history?

Mr. EDMUNDS. Oh, yes.

Mr. VEST. Now, here are the yeas and nays. The yeas were:

Messrs. ALLISON, Anthony, Bayard, BLAIR, Burnside, Cameron of Wisconsin, Carpenter, CHANDLER, Conkling, Eaton, Ferry, Hill of Colorado, Kellogg, Kernan—

A New York man, a Democrat—

Kirkwood, Logan, MORRILL, PADDOCK, PLATT, Rollins, Saunders, Whyte—

A Democrat from Maryland—

and Windom—23—

who voted to put that resolution in the tomb.

The nays were:

Messrs. Beck, BUTLER, CALL, COCKRELL, COKE, Davis of Illinois, Garland, HARRIS, Hereford, Houston, Jones, Jones of Florida, Maxey, MORGAN, Pendleton, Saulsbury, Slater, VANCE, VEST, VOORHEES, Walker, and Williams—22.

Mr. EDMUNDS. What was the date of that?

Mr. VEST. June 30, 1879.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Just twenty-five days after the Democratic convention in St. Louis?

Mr. VEST. In 1879 I said.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Oh, in 1879. I thought the Senator said 1878.

Mr. TELLER. What is the date?

Mr. VEST. June 30, 1879.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri has spoken five minutes.

Mr. VEST. I ask the Senate to give me a few moments more, as I have not spoken upon this bill heretofore.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I hope the Senator will have leave to proceed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from Missouri will be allowed to proceed without limit of time.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Iowa wants to know why no voice on the Democratic side was raised against the position of Mr. Cleveland on silver. There was a Democratic voice raised, sir, in this Chamber, and raised within ten days after Congress met and after Mr. Cleveland had made known his anti-silver opinions. Before he had taken the oath of office an immense majority of Democrats of the House and Senate addressed him a written communication protesting against what were known to be, then, for the first time, his anti-silver opinions. He replied in that letter which has passed into history, in which he gave the reasons against silver coinage which were given to-day by the Senator from Iowa, that he believed silver would become the money of the country and gold would depart from it; that Europe would inundate us with its cheap silver, and so forth, and so on, *ad nauseam*.

Mr. ALLISON. I have made no such statement.

Mr. VEST. Well, Mr. President, the Senator wanted an international conference. I believe the Senator wants that.

Mr. ALLISON. I do.

Mr. VEST. I will amend then by saying that Mr. Cleveland wanted an international conference, which is absolutely impossible, and the Senator from Iowa must know it. England will never give up her

advantage upon this question by any international conference. England wants gold to be high and dear and silver to be cheap, because she can buy her silver at depreciated prices and use it in her dependency of India, whilst England itself remains the clearing-house of the world upon a gold basis. England is dictating the whole thing. England is responsible for the opinion of the world commercially to-day upon silver and gold.

The Republican party tell us they want an American system. They want to subsidize steam-ships so as to bring back our carrying trade under the American flag. They want to exclude foreign importations, so that we shall have our own American productions; but when we come to silver, the great American production of this continent, we must follow subserviently England and take the English system with gold as the standard of value and silver demonetized as one of the precious metals.

Mr. President, when Congress met after the election of Mr. Cleveland and after his views were known, there was one voice heard in Congress in a speech that reverberated from one end of this country to the other, a speech that brought to their feet the American people all over the West, a speech that had more effect upon public opinion than any which has been delivered since I have been a member of this body. That voice is now stilled in death. It was the voice of James B. Beck, of Kentucky, who in this hall, with the undivided attention of the whole Senate, attacked the views of the Democratic President and exposed their fallacy and the utter want of foundation upon which they could stand.

Yet the Senator from Iowa, who did not then say one word, who to-day stands as he did in 1879, opposed to the remonetization of silver, stands here and taunts the Democratic party with their record upon the silver question, and claims that the Republicans have been *par excellence* its friends!

In the Forty-ninth Congress, when the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures of the House of Representatives reported adversely a bill framed by my colleague [Mr. BLAND] in favor of the free coinage of silver, and it was brought into the House and voted upon, what was the proportion between the two parties on free coinage then? Ninety-six Democrats and thirty Republicans voted for free coinage, and the Republican party beat the measure. If one-half of them had voted with the Democrats the success of silver coinage would then, so far as the action of the House of Representatives was concerned, have been fully achieved.

That is not all, Mr. President. I have before me a remarkable record. When the Bland bill was passed in 1878 and the banks of New York precipitated a financial panic, it was only averted by the action of the Treasury of the United States. I have before me the record of the extraordinary proceedings then adopted against even the limited coinage of silver to \$2,000,000 a month and not exceeding \$4,000,000. I read from Weston on the Silver Question:

On the 8th instant, a committee of these banks had a conference at Washington with the Secretary of the Treasury, at which were present the Attorney-General and some minor officials. The result was a plan submitted to these banks on the 12th instant, and agreed to, only one bank representative (Mr. Colgate) objecting. The leading features of it are, first, that the banks will reject silver deposits, except as repayable only in kind; second, that silver shall not be allowed as clearing-house money except for small fractional sums not exceeding \$10; and, third, that in respect to all payments by Government drafts on the New York banks, or on the United States assistant treasurer at New York, they shall be cleared at the clearing-house in New York, at which a desk is to be assigned to a representative of the United States Treasury.

At the bank meeting on the 12th, Mr. Colgate objected to the plan, that it "could only mean to fly in the face of Congress and declare the silver dollar that had been declared a legal tender to be worthless." According to the report in the New York Times of the next day—

To this the reply was made that there was not the slightest disposition to depreciate the silver dollar, or to reflect upon the Government, and certainly if it had appeared that there was, the Secretary of the Treasury and the members of the Cabinet who approved of the plan would have detected it and sought to modify the policy to be adopted.

Such a reply made by, and in the presence of, the committee of bankers present at the conference of the 8th at Washington, is decisive as to what occurred there. Even more decisive, as far as the Secretary of the Treasury is concerned, is his subsequent engagement which makes a part of the bank proceedings on the 12th, that a Government representative shall take a seat in a clearing-house, in which silver is rejected as money, and where such a representative could not sit, except on the basis of a promise that the Government drafts on New York, being the bulk of all its drafts, shall be paid in gold, or paper convertible into gold. To do all this is to change the metallic standard of this country from coin to gold. The New York Tribune said, exultingly, on the 13th, that "practically the banks of the city of New York repeal the silver bill!"

That is true—

"practically the banks of the city of New York repeal the silver bill." It is as much mistaken as when it said last winter that "the capital of the country is organized at last and Congress dare not fly in its face."

Mr. President, that shows the animus of this attack upon silver. It was deliberately determined upon that the United States of America should abandon silver and put itself *en rapport* with the commercial world by adopting the gold standard exclusively. If there ever could have been a doubt on this subject it is removed by the fact that the banks in the city of New York, with the consent of the Treasury Department, were to virtually demonetize silver and bring the business of the great metropolis of the country exclusively to a gold basis.

It is true that in 1888 the Democratic party said nothing upon the subject of silver in its platform. It is an open secret known to the whole

world that Mr. Cleveland by his message upon the tariff question had put that issue exclusively of all others before the people of the United States, and the campaign in which he was our candidate the second time was fought upon that and that alone. It was the salient point. Whilst we reaffirmed the former platform of the party, I ask no advantage by reason of that. I stand here to avow that the last canvass was fought on the tariff.

I know that in my section of the country the people have never wavered in their devotion to silver. I know that as a public man I have never addressed them from the hustings without declaring for the free coinage of silver. But in the last canvass the tariff overshadowed every other issue, and it is unfair for the Senator from Iowa to say that because nothing was said in our platform distinctively on the subject of silver, therefore the Democratic party had receded from its former position.

Mr. President, I assert that the position of the large mass of the Democratic party has been unwavering in favor of the free coinage of silver; that they have never faltered in their devotion to it, and because one leader or ten leaders did not agree with the rank and file and web and woof of the party, that is no indication that our sentiment had changed upon this great question.

I am not here to attack national banks. I think that for some purposes it is the best banking system ever invented in this country. I have consistently and persistently, and expect to do it until my public career is closed, opposed that feature of the national-banking system which gives them the power to expand or contract the currency of this country at their own pleasure. The first address I ever delivered in this Senate Chamber was against that feature of the national-banking law. I would not give that power to any set of men that God ever created. I would much less give to the Secretary of the Treasury the power that is given to him in this House bill, to do with silver as he pleases. Both these features, the one in the banking law, to which I have alluded, and the one in the House bill in regard to silver, are equally objectionable.

But to show the animus of this attack, to show how this party of aristocratic gold, for it is the aristocratic money now of the world, have persistently and systematically attacked silver, I want to read a circular of the national banks which was published extensively through the country and appeared first in the St. Louis Christian Advocate, having been sent to that paper:

DEAR SIR: It is advisable to do all in your power to sustain such daily and prominent weekly newspapers, especially the agricultural and religious press, as will oppose the issuing of greenback paper money, and that you withhold patronage or favors from all applicants who are not willing to oppose the Government issue of money. Let the Government issue the coin and the banks issue the paper money of the country, for then we can better protect each other. To repeal the law creating national banks, or to restore to circulation the Government issue of money, will be to provide the people with money, and will seriously affect your individual profits as banker and lender. See your member of Congress at once, and engage him to support our interest, that we may control legislation.

(Signed by the secretary.)

JAS. BUELL.

Mr. Buell was the president of a national bank in the city of New York, dead, I believe, some four or five years ago.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the date?

Mr. VEST. There is no date given here, but this paper was published in 1889. It must have been issued some time before that. The date is not given, however; but that paper is an entirely responsible one and the circular has never been denied.

Mr. President, the animus of that circular indicates the spirit of all the bankers in the country without almost a single exception. It is that the money which is dearest and most valuable shall become the standard of value. It is that silver money, which is considered the cheap money of the country, the money of the people, shall be driven out of existence, directly or indirectly.

Mr. HOAR. Is there anything in the circular the Senator has read on the subject which he says indicates the animus of the bankers?

Mr. VEST. I leave the Senator from Massachusetts, who is exceedingly good at conclusions, to draw his own. I have read the circular for what it is worth. I say that the animus of that circular is that the banks should control the monetary system of the United States, and they are arrayed to-day, as their proceedings at Kansas City in national convention show, against silver almost to a man. If Senators will take the trouble to look at the proceeding of that convention they will find that when Mr. St. John undertook to advocate a limited coinage of silver on a bullion basis he was received almost with hisses, coldly, unsympathetically, and he saw that he had no support in that convention.

But when Mr. John Jay Knox, former Comptroller of the Currency under two Republican Administrations, now the president of a national bank in the city of New York, took the floor and declared against silver and for gold as the standard of value in the United States, enthusiasm was high; and when he reached the climax and said, "I stand here and avow that I am the author of the act of 1873 that demonetized the silver dollar," there was a roar of applause such as never was heard outside of a popular convention. Mr. Knox to-day holds it as the crown of his political and banking career that he is the author of the act of 1873 which struck the silver dollar from the coinage of the American

people, and he is the idol of the bankers of the United States because he did it.

It is useless for gentlemen to attempt to disguise this whole thing. There is but one safe ground for the friends of silver, and I announce it here to-day and propose that it shall be tested in the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote. There is no middle ground. Silver must be put on the same basis with gold. There never will be an equality between the metals as money metals so long as you limit the coinage of silver.

Sir, this idle fear that the nations of Europe will dump their silver upon the people of the United States if we have free coinage is a dream, an *ignis fatuus*. It is brought here in order to scare Senators and Representatives from the popular demand now made throughout the country except in a very few sections.

Men are governed by interest. We are sending abroad now—I do not care about statistics—say, \$17,000,000 in silver every year. Does any man believe that with this demand for silver abroad, with India as a dumping-ground and a sink for silver, where all they can get goes in and never a dollar comes out, they will lose 3 per cent. in the ratio of coinage and pay transportation for their silver here to be sold? But suppose they do, as the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] said pertinently the other day, is silver poison? Is silver deadly? Do you want to drive silver from you? What is there about it that would destroy the interests and welfare of the people of the United States?

Mr. President, these arguments seem to be based upon the idea that the United States of America is Roumania, or Mexico, or a South American state. Senators seem to forget the vast resources of this country. We are to-day the commanding people of the world except as to commerce. We are to-day able to make our own standard. We are able to say for ourselves what shall be the money of the people of the United States, and we are able to maintain it. But if the friends of silver run from the flag, if under the caucus whip or the Executive lash they go from their honest convictions and allow its enemies to trample it under foot here again by bullion or limited coinage, the day of its redemption will never come.

Sir, I have seen strange things in my brief political career, but in the last few days I have seen and heard things that went beyond my credulity. I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with great pleasure but a few days since an eloquent and impassioned address in favor of silver. Every argument of the gold men was refuted; every plea for silver was urged in language that burned, and yet at the conclusion of that oration the gentleman who delivered it announced that he would vote for the pending bill and against silver, in hopes that the thing could be amended in another part of the Capitol. Every conviction was given up, every argument went for nothing, and he announced as the Representative of a district of free people that he proposed to surrender his convictions and vote against silver, because, he said, there were no rules in the Senate limiting debate, and Senators could speak as long as they pleased and offer any amendments they wanted.

Mr. President, the whole issue is silver money or not. I want my friend from Nevada [Mr. JONES] to make no mistake. He understands this question. He knows that the very minute you put any limit on the coinage of silver you degrade it. I was astonished to hear the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] say in answer to a question of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] that four and a half million dollars' coinage a month would bring silver up to a parity with gold. In my judgment it will do no such thing. Nothing but equality by law will bring silver up.

The question between us is, shall we follow gold as the tail follows the kite, or shall we assert the true interests of this country and behind its vast resources, its illimitable energies, assert the American system as to an American production?

I happen to have before me, from a Republican and a national banker, a table—

Mr. EDMUNDS. Before the Senator goes on will he mind answering an inquiry?

Mr. VEST. Of course not.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The Senator has just spoken about bringing silver up to a parity with gold. Will he kindly tell us precisely what he means by a parity between the two metals?

Mr. VEST. Well, I mean that silver shall no longer be worth less than par value.

Mr. EDMUNDS. What is par?

Mr. VEST. Par value would be 100 cents in money of the United States.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is easy enough. That it is now. The law says so.

Mr. VEST. I understand it is that now, but simply by virtue of one provision of law, whereas if we allowed the country to have free coinage the result would be that gold, instead of increasing in value and silver diminishing, the silver would go up in value and there would be one dollar really in both, the ounce and the dollar itself.

Mr. EDMUNDS. But if my friend will pardon me—

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

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I am not quite able (undoubtedly it is my own

fault) to understand yet what the Senator's definition of a parity between the two metals is. Does he mean that what we call a dollar in silver will buy the same amount of wheat or of labor (which I think is the final test of all values everywhere in the world or in the United States alone) as compared with gold? He has now merely stated the proposition in another form, to my humble apprehension.

Mr. VEST. A dollar in silver now in the United States will buy just as much as a dollar in gold. What I mean by a parity is that instead of there being 28 cents difference in the bullion value of a gold dollar and a silver dollar under any standard one will be worth as much as the other in bullion, according to the ratio of 16 to 1.

Mr. EDMUNDS. How can there be that difference if each will buy the same thing? How can there be 28 cents difference?

Mr. VEST. I stated intrinsically or in the bullion.

Mr. EDMUNDS. What is the test, then, of the bullion?

Mr. VEST. The test is its value the whole world over, if the Senator will have it that way.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Has the value the whole world over anything to do with the question?

Mr. VEST. According to the argument that is made on the other side of the Chamber it has.

Mr. EDMUNDS. But according to my friend's argument?

Mr. VEST. I am now arguing against the proposition advanced here that we must put ourselves absolutely under the gold standard because the great nations of the world are on it except the United States.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I am not arguing the question; I am trying to get information. I want to know whether the Senator thinks that the difference between the bullion value, as we call it, of gold and silver has anything to do with the question.

Mr. VEST. I think that so long as we degrade silver by limiting the coinage it will never be worth, commercially or otherwise, as bullion, as much as gold.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Is that of any consequence so long as it is worth a dollar in gold when it is coined.

Mr. VEST. That, so far as this country is concerned, may be true, but we can not tell what changes may occur in the future. I understand that the arguments upon the other side are based distinctively on the assertion that silver is not intrinsically worth as much as gold.

Mr. EDMUNDS. But as I have not made any argument on the other side and am hunting for information, I want to know the Senator's view, as he is making a very powerful appeal to us, whether the foreign state of the case or the bullion state of the case is an element in the question. It is, I should be glad to have him solve it in some way. If it is not, if he will only say so, then I shall know where I am so far.

Mr. VEST. I have stated what I meant. I know the Senator from Vermont understands it, and I also know that he needs no information on the subject. I have stated as plainly as I could that until you give us free coinage the value of the gold and the silver bullion will never approximate to each other.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Why should they, if one dollar is just as good as the other?

Mr. VEST. For the simple reason that you degrade one as a money metal; you do not give it its full value as a money metal. You make it a commodity.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The Senator has repeated in answer to my question, and repeats it again, that the silver dollar is at this moment just as good as the gold dollar. What is the consequence, then, about the bullion value so far as the people are concerned who want the dollars to pay their debts with?

Mr. VEST. Oh, Mr. President, that is simply caviling. It is true that so far as the purchasing power of the silver dollar and the gold dollar to-day is concerned in the United States they are the same.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Where is the degradation, then?

Mr. VEST. But our friends upon the other side declare to us that if we continue the coinage of the silver dollar the time will come when it will drive gold out of the country and make silver the only standard. As the Senator from Iowa says, it will be a cheapened metal, it will be a cheap currency. I say if you want to bring silver up to gold, give it free coinage. You can not possibly help silver as long as you keep it a tail to the gold kite.

So long as we say to the whole world, "We recognize gold as a money metal, but when it comes to coinage we limit the supply of silver," just that long will we find that silver will be depreciated relatively to gold in this country and abroad also. If our friends want to avoid what they consider the great disaster of gold leaving the country and our coming to a silver basis, the sooner they give us free coinage and allow silver a fair and equal chance in the monetary marts of the world the sooner will they avert this disaster.

Mr. President, something has been said in this debate about the contraction of the currency. I did not intend to argue the question, but I happen to see in the RECORD before me, prepared by a distinguished Republican, and himself, I believe, a national banker, a statement of the circulation per capita in the United States from 1854 to 1890. In 1854 it was \$17.04; in 1856, \$15.68; in 1858, \$13.27, and so on.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Is that currency alone, or does it include the whole outstanding obligations of the United States?

Mr. VEST. It says "we had the largest amount of circulating medium." I suppose it means all.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Does the Senator suppose it means merely currency?

Mr. VEST. I do not know; it says "circulating medium," and that would include all of it, currency, gold, silver, etc.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I think it would.

Mr. VEST. In 1864 we had \$58.72; in 1866, \$52.01; in 1879, skipping from 1866 to 1879, we had \$17.02, and in 1890 we have \$21.66 per capita.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Now, if my friend will pardon me right there, he is perfectly aware that that includes undoubtedly, as it is obvious, although I have not seen it, every description of obligation of the United States that was outstanding except time bonds, and an enormous depreciation of paper money, gold and silver both, any kind of coin, being at an enormous appreciation above the currency; or to state it the ordinary way, paper of every kind was below the other.

Now, then, I call my friend's attention (for I will not take up his time) to the fact that we have diminished down and down and down on that basis of circulation, without a disturbance to the prosperity of anybody, and with a continual lowering rate of interest to anybody who wished to borrow money and had anything to put up for it. If I go to a bank and have nothing to show, or to a private person, or to my friend, and wish to borrow a hundred dollars and have no security to put up, it is not easy to get it; but to anybody who has anything, be it land, or notes, or promises to pay of any kind, or suretyship, my friend perfectly well understands that through all that time of diminution of apparent circulation per capita, not only the public debt of the United States and the various States has gradually and steadily diminished, but the rate of interest has diminished also. Where, therefore, is the great difficulty about what is called the scarcity of money?

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I do not care to go into the statistics, and I do not propose to do so, as to the condition of certain interests in this country at the present time. I have read statements that the agricultural interests in the State of Vermont were not in a flourishing condition; that there were abandoned farms there; and that people were engaged now in an attempt to introduce immigrants for the purpose of taking up their abandoned agricultural lands. Speaking for my own section of country—and it is as prosperous as any other agricultural State in the Union—I simply desire to say that within my personal observation the agricultural interests of Missouri are to-day depressed out of all proportion to the other interests of the country.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Now, may I ask the Senator a question there?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I do not mean to take the Senator's time, but only to ask a question, and he has referred to the State of Vermont, also. I wish to ask him whether, according to his knowledge and information, the farmer in Vermont or Missouri can not borrow money on fair average security such as in all the history of this country has been considered good, as cheap, if not a great deal cheaper, in this present year than he could fifteen years ago.

Mr. VEST. I will make answer to that question in two ways. In the first place, a prosperous farmer owning his own land, unless there is something abnormally wrong in the administration of public affairs and the legislation of the country, ought not to be compelled to borrow at all. In the second place, the fact that money is abundant in the banks and in the hands of one section of the country to be loaned to the other is no argument against the one I am making, that there is an abnormal and extraordinary condition of affairs as to the agricultural interests of the United States.

All over my part of the country there is abundance of money. In the city in which I live there is one sign after another, street after street, "Money to lend by Eastern capitalists;" "Money at 8 percent, interest to be taken out in advance." It is so all over the West. But there is no farmer loaning money; and the farmer to-day who, although of good habits and a safe, sensible, prudent business man, who is educating his children, and with no mortgage on his farm, and coming out even year by year, is an exception to his class.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Yes; but I can not tell now which way my friend has explained the question, whether the farmer on the average and ordinary fair security of fifteen years ago and to-day can not borrow money cheaper to-day than he could then, if he needs to borrow it at all, as I hope he in general does not, but I am afraid he does.

Mr. VEST. I do not know that that is true. I hardly think it is true.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Oh my!

Mr. VEST. But I do not see that my answer to that would settle this question at all. I say here is a country with the greatest resources of any upon the face of the earth. We have a continent. We have the most remarkable people in the world, so far as energy and business talent are concerned. We have a diversity of climate and of production. We are to-day raising more agricultural products than we can consume at home. And yet the class that are producing really the substantial wealth of the country are complaining more than they have at any

time in the last quarter of a century. What is the reason of this? What is the cause of it? The conviction is settled with the people of the West (and I speak of my own section, with which I am acquainted) that the monetary system of the country is wrong; that there is a determined effort to bring this country to a gold standard in the interest of the money-lenders, the income-holders, and the bankers.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Would that compel the farmer in Missouri and Vermont to sell his butter or wheat at any less price for cash now on that account?

Mr. VEST. The trouble is he is bound to sell.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Yes, he is bound to sell.

Mr. VEST. If money is high and scarce, as a matter of course its purchasing power is increased.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is perfectly true.

Mr. VEST. And if he owes a debt it takes more of the commodities which he raises upon his farm to discharge that indebtedness.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is another thing altogether. Take the farmer the Senator is speaking of, who keeps mortgages off his farm and makes his ends meet somehow or other—

Mr. VEST. There are very few of them.

Mr. EDMUNDS. In Vermont a man has a thousand pounds of butter to sell and in Missouri another has a thousand bushels of wheat to sell for cash. Now, I should like to know, if money is so plentiful that it can be borrowed on good security for 5 or 6 per cent., as it can for less than 5 in Vermont, and probably 6 or 7 in Missouri—because always in some way or another the price of money is higher in the West than it is in the East—with the fear that gold is going to be the destroyer of all things and silver the panacea, how is it that he can not get the same price for his wheat in the one State, or his butter in the other, that he could if all this question were solved? That is what I wish to get at.

Mr. VEST. If the Senator from Vermont wants me to give him information as to the effect of a decrease of the currency of a country, his case is a hopeless one. I say that no proposition is or ever can be better established than that decreasing circulation produces hard times; and, when you strike out one-half the circulating medium of the country in the shape of silver money, as a matter of course you contract it to that extent and you increase the purchasing power of the other metal which is left. If that proposition is not a true one, I am at fault in regard to all my ideas about the money question.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Undoubtedly it is true that as you diminish a currency, the quantity of things to be had in the way of money, you increase its purchasing power and diminish the price of wheat in Missouri and the price of butter in Vermont. Now, I am talking about the cash coin; I am not talking about debtors at this moment.

Mr. VEST. I am talking about all of them.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The farmer in Missouri having sold a thousand bushels of wheat for 50 cents a bushel, instead of taking as his money in hand to buy his shoes and his wagons and the clothes for his family and to make his contributions to church and to do all the things that well regulated people do, is that money worth any more when he has got it than double the amount of it would be if he had got a dollar a bushel for his wheat? Not a bit. He has to submit to the same law after he has got his money that he does before, does he not?

Mr. VEST. If I owe a thousand dollars and I have a thousand bushels of wheat with which to pay it, and that wheat is worth a dollar a bushel, I can go and pay all that debt and discharge the obligation.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is not the point I am asking the Senator about now.

Mr. VEST. That is the point with the people of the West in whose behalf I am speaking, that under this system, which has gone on for years, the capital of the country is in one section. Why is it that in Vermont money is worth 2, 3, or 4 per cent. and in Missouri it is worth 8 or 10 per cent. per annum?

Mr. EDMUNDS. If my friend will pardon me (and I will not interrupt him any more, because I know all interruptions are tiresome, as they prolong debate), the topic that I was asking him a question about was in relation to that class of farmers whom he spoke of in Missouri and in Vermont, if he alluded to Vermont, who are not in debt, but who make their ends meet, though I admit it is hard enough. It is about them that I am asking the question. When we come to people who owe money, as I owe myself, if I can get something cheaper to pay it in it is for my personal interest to do it. That is quite another question. Whether wise or not, it is to be considered later on.

Mr. VEST. If the Senator confines his question to farmers who are out of debt and who are making both ends meet, to use that expression, there is almost an infinitesimal portion of that class.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It is not the case in Vermont.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, the question is not answered which I put to the Senator from Vermont, why is there the difference in interest?

Mr. EDMUNDS. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. VEST. I asked the Senator why it was that money in Vermont is 2, 4, or 5 per cent., while in Missouri it is worth 8 or 10 per cent.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is an extremely difficult question to answer, for the fact that there is a great disparity between new and growing

communities, where there is great speculation in lands, and booms, and all that, and people are willing to pay higher prices for money than people who had the same experience fifty or a hundred years ago and have gotten over it, is a very curious thing in the law of society, I admit, and it admits of no explanation that I know of except the foolishness of mankind, that money in a new, growing country will always command a greater price than in the other, although it circulates everywhere.

Mr. PLATT. It is worth more in the State of Washington than in Missouri.

Mr. EDMUNDS. My friend says it is worth more in Washington than in Missouri. It may be that it is on some real-estate booms around outside of the cities.

Mr. VEST. Who says it is worth more in Washington than in Missouri?

Mr. PLATT. In the State of Washington, I said.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It would be true here, I take it, if anybody wanted to loan money on operations outside of the city; it would be pretty high here. I think it is because the lender believes that the risk is greater in lending upon an uncultivated farm or a new town lot that only exists on a map than it is on a farm or town lot in a village that has been settled, whether in Kansas City or in Burlington, and values are fixed, and security is therefore better.

On the other hand, the hopeful and speculative man (I do not mean by speculator the man who is merely making a boom to cheat somebody else and to turn the thing over out of his hands, but the man who hopes he can build up a town and build up his house there and all that) is tempted to be willing—the population is to increase and everything is to rise—to pay more for everything than the man is in a more settled community. But it does not affect this question at all as it appears to me.

Mr. VEST. It makes no difference whether the cause is one or the other, the fact remains about which the Senator from Vermont and myself absolutely agree, and that is that one section of this country does not need money like the other. It may be because the West is a new country, but the fact remains that we do want money for legitimate purposes and that contraction has a peculiarly disastrous effect upon a people in our situation. It is true that in the newer regions of the country interest is higher because the country is being developed, there is more demand for money for improvements, the opening up of farms, making homes, establishing new plants; but the salient point of my argument is that the money is needed, and that is the reason why the whole West is in favor of the free coinage of silver.

We want more money. We are the sufferers if we do not get it. In an old established community like Vermont they do not need money except as a sort of daily medium for the small wants of life. The people are in grooves; the statute of limitations has run against a new enterprise; they are living as their fathers lived, and their children will live as they live. The country is finished, as the French say it is *un fait accompli*; it is the end of it so far as any development is concerned. That is true in ideas, in opinions, in physical life.

It is not so with us in the West. In the West we must have an increasing circulating medium because our country is increasing. The State in which I live is to-day the fifth State in the Union. But a few years ago it was a comparative wilderness.

Then look at the great imperial States to the west of Missouri. They want more money; they must have it. Yet it is proposed now to treat one part of this country like the other, and to bring us to a gold standard, for it is practically that, decreasing the currency of the country in the face of the absolute necessity for more money in certain sections.

I was astonished to hear in this debate, the other day, the Senator from New York say that there had been a surplus of production of agricultural products in this country, and that was the cause of depression. If I had time I should like to show that that is not true. I can show by the official reports that in years when the wheat crop was smaller than in others the scarcity or the diminished supply did not bring about higher prices, but on the contrary the depression continued.

The Senator alluded to one thing with which I happen to be familiar, and that is the cattle supply of the United States. The prices of cattle have been and are abnormally depressed. Cattle that were worth \$5 and \$6 a hundred have gone down to \$2 and \$3, until in my State the returns do not pay for the grass and labor that we put in cattle when sent to the Chicago market. We have heard this same story that there was an overproduction of cattle. The committee recently appointed to examine the meat product of the United States went to the bottom of that question, and they found out to an absolute mathematical certainty, if there is anything in the reports of living men, that there had not been an overproduction, but that population had increased in a larger ratio than the cattle supply of the United States.

Mr. BLAIR. May I make a suggestion to the Senator?

THE PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. BLAIR. All the statistics, the most reliable that are to be ob-

tained, fix as the minimum of the cost of the alcoholic-liquor trade of the country, \$900,000,000. Now, does not the Senator think that if this country would put that amount of money into the consumption of useful articles there would be an end to this growling about overproduction and underconsumption?

Mr. VEST. Well, Mr. President—

Mr. BLAIR. I should like the Senator's answer on that point. Would not \$900,000,000 of money, put into good, healthy, hearty food, proper clothing, and the real, actual necessities, rather than the poisons, of life, relieve this country of the difficulty about overproduction and underconsumption?

Mr. VEST. If my friend from New Hampshire could invent a law that would pump into every American citizen just what he considers healthy articles of food instead of whisky he could bring about the millennium he is talking about. My opinion is that they will have whisky, although wheat is worth \$5 a bushel and corn \$10, and you must eliminate the appetite for alcohol before you can do anything by sanitary legislation. I have some ideas on that matter, but I do not care about elucidating them just now.

Mr. BLAIR. May I make an observation, with the Senator's consent, out of his five minutes?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. BLAIR. Then I will just say, if they will drink whisky and poison themselves, why should they growl when they are poor?

Mr. VEST. I do not think the people of the West are ruining themselves drinking whisky.

Mr. BLAIR. But there is this \$900,000,000 going into poison, and the poison is getting into the people, and the people are growling about overproduction and underconsumption.

Mr. VEST. Seriously speaking, I believe there is a great deal of humbug about the amount of alcoholic stimulants consumed; but I believe there is a great deal more humbug in any attempt to rectify that thing by coercive legislation.

Mr. BLAIR. I was not talking of coercive legislation, but was just stating the fact.

Mr. VEST. If my friend from New Hampshire would construct some sort of an educational system that would teach people what he says, that whisky is a poison and they ought not to drink it, and make his education effective, it would be a great discovery.

Mr. BLAIR. I am trying to do that, and I began by trying to teach people to read and write, so that they might get this information, but the Senator from Missouri balked it off.

Mr. VEST. The trouble is—

Mr. BLAIR. Now, I hold the Senator to the point. Here are \$900,000,000, or, if you please, \$700,000,000 or \$500,000,000 of money, earnings of the people of this country, going into the alcoholic-liquor trade, which, to say the least, is not a necessary of life. It may be rather a necessary of death, which it seems to produce, but it is not a necessary of life. If this money, which these people thus consume, were put into healthy, legitimate commodities, would it not relieve the country of the difficulties under which it is now suffering in an industrial way?

Mr. VEST. I have no doubt that a donation of \$900,000,000 would help any sort of an institution, even the people of the United States.

Mr. BLAIR. A penny saved is a penny gained, the Senator will remember; and if we did not pay this sum out in this way we would save it to expend in some more useful method.

Mr. VEST. If I could do anything by vote or example to help the cause of temperance and prevent the disastrous use of alcoholic stimulants, I would do it. But, if I were disposed to argue the point seriously, I could call the Senator's attention to the enormous amount of money that is thrown away in this country upon fashion, upon luxuries, upon expensive equipages, upon houses, useless except for show and ornament, upon a hundred different things that are the inevitable results of a high degree of civilization. If we are to go into the homes of the people and take charge of their diet, and then of their raiment, and then of their mode of living, and regulate all these things we will have the most extensive statute-book on the face of the earth.

Mr. BLAIR. If the Senator will allow me, my question is not a suggestion that we do any of those forcible things as against the will of the people. This is a matter which they can regulate themselves. If they should see fit to economize in the way I have suggested, would they not be relieved so far as suffering for the actual necessities of life is concerned? I quite agree with the Senator that there is an immense waste in the direction of extravagance in all that appertains to fashion, in the dwellings of the country, and all that, which is equally reprehensible in my belief.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I do not care to follow the Senator into a discussion of that subject.

Mr. BLAIR. I thought this might be an agreeable episode.

Mr. VEST. But it is not pertinent. However, I have not the slightest objection to the Senator giving his views upon the subject and his arguments in favor of any legislation he deems proper.

What I was proceeding to say is this, that the reason why we want free coinage in the West is because we want no contraction of the circulating medium, but want an expansion of it. I read from a table

prepared by a Republican and a national banker to show the enormous decrease in the circulating medium of the United States per capita in a few years, a decrease from \$50 per capita to \$17 and \$18, and to-day \$21.

Now, what is the effect of contraction? I happen to have here, not for the purpose of this debate, but for another purpose, a compendium, which I think is correct, as to the effect of contraction in this country, which took place under the resumption act authorizing the sale of five-twenties to retire currency. I am not attacking the necessity for that contraction at the time, but I am simply showing the effect of it.

The failures in 1866 were 520; in 1867, under this contraction, 2,386, with a loss to creditors of \$86,218,000. In 1868 \$473,000,000 in currency was retired. The failures in that year were 2,608, with a loss to creditors of \$36,774,000. In 1869 there were \$500,000,000 retired; the failures were 2,790, and the loss to creditors was \$75,054,000. In 1870 \$67,000,000 of currency was retired; there were 2,915 failures, and the loss to creditors was \$88,242,000. In 1871 \$35,000,000 was retired; there were 2,915 failures, with a loss of \$85,250,000. In 1872 \$12,000,000 of currency was retired; there were 4,609 failures and a creditors' loss of \$121,058,000.

In 1873, the year of the panic, there was \$1,609,000 of currency retired; there were 5,783 failures, with a loss to creditors of \$228,499,000. In 1874 there were \$75,484,000 of legal-tender certificates retired, \$85,760,000 of Treasury notes, and \$3,000,000 of fractional currency. The failures were 5,832, with a creditors' loss of \$155,239,000. In 1875 the currency was contracted \$40,817,418; the failures were 7,740, with a loss to creditors of \$201,060,000. That was the price we paid for contraction.

Mr. HOAR. Has the Senator brought that table down to the present day?

Mr. VEST. No, sir; only to 1875.

Mr. HOAR. Let me look at it, please. [The table was handed.]

Mr. VEST. I copied it from statistics I believe to be reliable.

Mr. President, it has been stated here that the silver dollar was driven out of the currency by Mr. Jefferson, and there have been divers statements about it. Here is the letter which was written by the Secretary of State, May 1, 1806, to Robert Patterson, esq., Director of the Mint:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, May 1, 1806.

SIR: In consequence of a representation from the directors of the Bank of the United States that considerable purchases have been made of dollars coined at the Mint for the purpose of exporting them, and as it is probable further purchases and exportations will be made, the President directs that all silver to be coined at the Mint shall be of small denominations, so that the value of the largest pieces shall not exceed half a dollar.

I am, sir, etc.,

JAMES MADISON.

ROBERT PATTERSON, Esq.,
Director of the Mint.

The history of that transaction is very simple and well known.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator one question, if he will allow me, about the table which he is just passing from. There is either a mistake in the figures—

Mr. VEST. It is very probable. I copied it hurriedly.

Mr. HOAR. For the time of contraction is the time of the smallest number of failures.

Mr. VEST. That is very easily accounted for. If I had time I should have alluded to it. As a matter of course the amount of disaster that came from contraction was not in proportion to the amount retired for any one year.

Mr. HOAR. It seems very curiously to happen that in the period of the largest contraction there was the smallest amount of failures.

Mr. VEST. The effect of contraction would, as a matter of course, continue beyond the specific year. It is impossible to make any mathematical ratio as between the amount of contraction and the amount of failures.

Mr. HOAR. I also want to ask the attention of the Senator, if he will pardon me—I do not think I ought to interrupt him, speaking in a warm room so long—but in 1869 it appears, according to this table, \$500,000,000 of currency was withdrawn, and in 1868 \$473,000,000, making a diminution of our currency of \$1,000,000,000 in two years. Are those figures correct?

Mr. VEST. I do not pretend to say that the table is entirely accurate. I copied it from a statement in a monetary review, and compared it to some extent with official reports, but not altogether, for I did not have time to do it. Whether it be mathematically correct or not, I have simply to say that we know what was the effect of contraction. We know the effect of it upon the country during the number of years when it was carried on. We know that it produced disaster all over the land. I simply cite that to show that the inevitable effect of a contraction of the circulating medium of any country is to bring about commercial depression.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suppose the Senator must have had his attention called to the fact that this was before what he calls the demonetization of silver, and took place while silver was a full legal-tender money.

Mr. VEST. I beg the Senator's pardon; 1873 was the year when silver was demonetized.

Mr. ALDRICH. But 1868 and 1869, the years to which the Senator

from Massachusetts alluded, were three or four years before the silver demonetization, when the largest contraction took place.

Mr. VEST. I was unfortunate if I did state, but I certainly never did, that the demonetization of silver produced the contraction of the currency. The contraction commenced in 1866, when the resumption act was passed that authorized the sale of the five-twenties to retire the currency. That is the time contraction commenced in this country.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then it was not due to the demonetization of silver?

Mr. VEST. I never said the demonetization of silver precipitated the contraction of the currency.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. The transaction to which the Senator refers was simply the conversion of 7-30 bonds running for three years. They were called Treasury notes, but they were bearing interest at the highest rate ever paid by the Government since the beginning of the war. They were not in any sense a currency, although I believe the face of them was a legal tender to pay debts, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Yes, it was.

Mr. SHERMAN. At any rate they were money, but they were on interest and never circulated a day after they were issued. They were put in that form so that the people of the United States could get ready access to them, and partly under the administration of the Treasury Department by Mr. McCulloch and a part of the time under Mr. Fessenden they were refunded into the 5-20 bonds which have since been paid. They were not currency in any sense of the word.

Mr. VEST. The Senator may be right, but it has been my information that they did circulate.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am told never after the first day. A single day's interest would make them more valuable than money, and they would therefore be retired. I know the history of those 7-30 bonds. They were only running for three years, and I knew very well that after the war was over, as a matter of course, we would never pay such a rate of interest as 7.3 on bonds, with the right to redeem the bonds with five-twenties. The seven-thirties ran for only three years, and at the end of that time they were at once converted into 5-20 bonds, I think erroneously. In that particular I agree with the Senator. I think Secretary McCulloch did not fully appreciate the reviving credit of the people of the United States, and he ought not to have converted them into 5-20 bonds.

Mr. ALLISON. They were not convertible in terms?

Mr. SHERMAN. Not in terms. The seven-thirties were converted because there was a measure pending in 1866, on which I made, I know, quite a lengthy speech advising their conversion into what were called 10-40 bonds, which would be redeemable in ten years and bear only 5 per cent. interest.

Mr. EDMUNDS. What year were they issued?

Mr. SHERMAN. I think in 1864.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I take it for granted that whatever the details may be the fact remains that there was a contraction of the currency during those years.

The Senator from Rhode Island has alluded to the demonetization of the silver dollar in 1873. It is very true that under the order issued by Mr. Jefferson, and which I have read here, the silver dollar had not been in circulation practically to a very large amount in the United States for more than twenty odd years. That is true, but the fact still remains—and there is the salient point in this whole argument, and I want to use it to enforce what I said to my friends on the other side a few minutes ago—which is that just as soon as you put the brand upon silver that was put upon it by striking out the silver dollar, whether in circulation or not, you degraded it as a money metal; you put the badge of inferiority upon it, just as it is proposed now in this House bill, when you treat silver as a storage commodity.

The highest value of silver is its value as money, and when you say that there shall be a limited coinage of silver or when you say that it shall be deposited as bullion with the discretion in the Secretary of the Treasury and pay out any other thing than silver or gold, you put the badge of inferiority on it and say to the whole world, "We recognize the difference between gold and silver, and gold is the great standard and silver is not."

Mr. BLAIR. Does the Senator consider that the fall in the price of silver, which has taken place since 1873, is owing to the demonetization, as he calls it, by the United States?

Mr. VEST. I would not undertake to say that; but I have no sort of doubt that the demonetization of silver, as it is termed, the acts of 1873-'74, have resulted in the loss of millions upon millions of dollars to the American people. I have no doubt that it has caused a settled distrust in the country as to the monetary system.

I do not take issue with the Senator from Ohio as to the manner in which that was done. I never cared anything about it, whether it was done in one way or another. It was done, and when the people of the United States waked up four years afterwards to the fact that the silver dollar was struck out of the coinage, although there had been

very few of these dollars in circulation, there was a popular reaction in this country such as has never been seen on any financial question before or since.

It is a remarkable history. I make no charges; I take the record as it is; but I call attention to the fact that the striking out of the silver dollar was regarded by the people as a triumph of the moneyed interests of the country over the producers and the consumers. It was regarded as a part—no matter how effected—of the scheme of the national banks and money-lenders to bring us to the gold standard and make us subservient commercially to Great Britain.

I have spoken longer than I intended, and I apologize to the Senate for having done so.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not propose to prolong this debate, but the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] has made some statements which, I think, need a little attention.

The Senator stated in general terms that because of the improper ratio between silver and gold in the earlier history of our country we had gone on to a silver basis, and that later, because of the improper ratio, we had gone on a gold basis. Now, Mr. President, the terms used by the Senator are calculated to mislead. There is a wide distinction between a country being on a gold basis and a country not having gold or silver in circulation.

The Senator repeated also what has been repeated before, that we are now on a gold basis. That I deny. We shall never be on a gold basis until by law we so declare; but we have never been on a gold basis, as I stated the other day, save in the time between 1873 and 1878, which I need not repeat in detail.

Mr. ALLISON. What I meant to say—I may have been unfortunate in my phraseology—was that during the period from 1792 to 1861 we passed from free coinage; that, although by law the mints were open to the free coinage of gold and silver all the time, by a mistake in the ratio during the first period gold was the standard and during the second period silver was the standard. I did not mean to say that we did not have a basis of both silver and gold by law, as we always have had. I expressly stated that we had, but that by an overvaluation of one or the other metal one vanished and the other came in.

Mr. TELLER. I understood perfectly what the Senator meant, and I have no idea that the Senator designed to make any improper impression, but this loose way of speaking on economic questions has led to a great many fallacies among the people.

When the Senator says we were on a gold basis he simply means that at one time we had more gold than we had silver. When he says we were on a silver basis he means that we had more silver than gold. And yet all the time the Mint was open to both metals. That kept the relation between them at least partially, if not completely. Whenever the silver was worth a little more in France than it was here, it went to France. When France had too much of it, if she ever had, she sent it somewhere else.

Mr. President, there is an error as to our condition, which has been repeated over and over again, that up to 1834 we did not have any gold. That is not true. There was no time between 1792 and 1804, when we changed our ratio, that we did not have a considerable amount of both gold and silver in circulation.

Mr. MORRILL. Foreign gold.

Mr. COCKRELL. It was legal tender, if it was foreign.

Mr. TELLER. We had foreign gold and we had American gold. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] shakes his head. I will show from the coinage tables that we had American gold.

There is not a Senator here who is as old as I am who does not remember when the English sovereign was in common circulation in this country. There is not a Senator here as old as I am, and there are several who are quite as old, who does not remember that we had all sorts of foreign gold in circulation, as I stated the other day, made legal tender by law.

I will take ten years before the change of ratio and show from the coinage tables of the United States Mint, that we coined, in 1822, \$88,980 of gold, and we coined of silver, in the same year, \$805,806.50. We coined a little less the next year of gold and a little more of silver. In 1825 we coined \$156,385 of gold, and we coined that year \$1,564,583 of silver. In 1829, we coined \$295,717.50 of gold, and the next year, \$643,105 of gold; the next year, \$714,270 of gold; the next year, \$798,435 of gold, and in 1833, \$978,550 of gold.

During all that time we had a considerable amount of gold in circulation. I do not pretend to speak of that time from memory, for I know nothing about it personally, but that is historical. We had considerable gold in circulation at that time.

Now, let us go back and see how much silver we coined during that time. We coined in 1825 \$1,564,583 of silver. I think I gave that before. The next year we coined \$2,002,090; the next, \$2,869,200; the following year, \$1,575,606; in 1829, \$1,994,578, and in 1830, \$2,495,400. The next year we coined \$3,175,600; the next, \$2,579,000; and in 1833, \$2,759,000.

The difference between gold and silver in circulation in those days was not sufficiently great to say that we were upon a silver basis in fact, as we were not in law. Then we changed the ratio the next year, 1834, and the mints commenced coining more gold, yet not any con-

siderable amount of gold was coined until up in the forties. In 1834 we coined \$3,954,270 in gold; the next year, 1835, we coined \$2,186,175 in gold; the next year, \$4,135,700; the next year, 1837, \$1,148,305; the next year, 1838, \$1,809,765; in 1839, \$1,376,847.50; in 1840, \$1,675,482.50 in gold.

In silver dollars during that time we coined in 1834 \$3,415,002; the next year, \$3,443,003, or more than was coined of gold. The next year we coined \$3,606,100; and the next year \$2,096,010; and then we began to run down a little. Then there was a time after 1845 when we coined more gold than silver, and after the discovery of gold in California there were many times more gold than silver coined, and, as suggested to me by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], the gold fields of Russia were opened in 1830, and we got a portion of that gold.

So the statement made so frequently, not merely by the Senator from Iowa, but by others here, is not correct. We were not absolutely on either a silver or a gold basis at any time in our history, except that it might be said we coined a large amount of gold during the war in proportion to the amount of silver we coined; but neither gold nor silver was in circulation during the war.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. I, of course, have not at hand the data which will prove the correctness of the statements I make, but I submit to the Senator from Colorado that the coinage of silver or the coinage of gold does not show the amount in circulation, because until 1873, when the new mint act which we had under discussion was passed, the coined gold and the coined silver were then not in circulation; so that as soon as the gold was coined at the mint it went out and the silver remained. It was overvalued, and since 1873 and up to this moment those who export gold prefer to export the twenty-dollar gold pieces rather than to export gold bars; so that although we may have an enormous coinage of gold here it goes out if it is preferable to the exportation of gold bars.

Mr. TELLER. The gold put in fine bars would be put in fine bars by the silversmiths of the country and sent across in that way, and the same is true of silver. There is no advantage in shipping coin abroad, but the fact is there is a disadvantage in shipping coin. If it is intended to be bullion, the man who ships it prefers bullion for two reasons: first, that it is safer to ship bullion than coin; it costs less to ship bullion from this country to any portion of the world than it does to ship coin, infinitely less, by freight; and, second, he has it in a shape to be presented to the mints in a foreign country to be coined without reference to the alloy, which in this country is of a different character from what it is in many other countries of the world.

Mr. PLATT. What does the Senator suppose became of the gold and silver coined during the war?

Mr. TELLER. The gold coined during the war was insignificant compared with the demands of commerce upon it.

Mr. PLATT. What became of it?

Mr. TELLER. It went first into the hands of the Government to pay duties on imports, and when it got there, by this very same system of finance, of which I have not time to speak to-night and no patience to speak of at any time, by which we repudiated our own paper, our own legal-tender money, and declined to give it legal-tender functions, and demanded gold for duties on imports, the Government sent it abroad to pay the interest on the bonds that were held abroad, and the Government was bound to pay it not in bullion, but in coin. That is why it went abroad.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The Government was bound to keep its obligations.

Mr. TELLER. Nobody objects to the Government keeping its obligations. Does the Senator mean to insinuate by his remark that anybody here does not want the Government obligations to be kept? If he does, I am quite ready to meet him on that.

Mr. EDMUNDS. No, Mr. President.

Mr. TELLER. The trouble is that the Senator and his friends did not keep the Government obligation.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, I did not mean to insinuate, if my friend will pardon me, anything at all, except, without insinuation, to express my opinion that my friend is laboring under an immeasurable and incurable delusion.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from Vermont and other Senators who agree with him think they can sneer down this question, and whenever it is presented they will put some supercilious inquiry that does not touch it, so that the public may think there is something back of it. The Senator stated that the Government kept its obligation or he used words to infer that somebody did not want that. In 1862 the House of Representatives sent to the Senate a legal-tender bill for what is called the greenback, with legal-tender quality for all purposes on the face of the earth. It was good for everything; it was good for the Government and good for private parties, and the Senate seized that and struck out of it the legal-tender clause and said it should be a legal tender for everything except that the Government would not take its own paper. That is why I said I had no patience with that kind of finance.

The Senator then thinks I wanted something, I suppose, to pay the

interest on the debt better or worse than that—something cheaper. The Government had agreed to pay its interest. How? In lawful money: its bonds in lawful money and its interest in coin, and that is the way it made the contract. It had to have coin, and if it had to have coin it could have bought coin as merchants bought coin. If it had received the greenbacks for import duties, the greenbacks, in my judgment, would never have parted with gold. If we had not issued more than \$400,000,000 we could have maintained the parity between greenbacks and gold, but when we made an artificial demand for gold and declined to receive our own paper, then, of course, there was a divergence between the greenback and the coin.

I will not speak of a later transaction when we changed the obligation to pay the bonds, which obligation was in paper, in greenbacks, so that that was to be paid in gold, thus increasing the demand for gold in this country, thus deferring indefinitely almost, as appeared at one time, the resumption of specie payments.

In 1868 we coined \$19,371,387.50 of gold and we coined \$1,074,343 of silver. We coined the next year \$1,266,143 of silver; the next year \$1,378,255.50, and the following year \$3,104,038.30; the next year \$2,504,488.50. We were coining largely at the time the demonetization of silver took place in this country. Whether we coined a dollar or not, every dollar that we produced in the mines went out into the commerce of the world and was put into coin and thus relieved the gold of the world from the obligation that it was under to do money duty.

So it does not make any difference whether the mints of this country were open or not—I mean practically open—when all other nations were coining it. Then it went into money and did money duty everywhere; and if we had had our mints open in 1873, when France felt that she could take German silver, she would have been willing (and that is the consensus of opinion upon that subject abroad) to join with us and take Germany's \$400,000,000 of silver, and we should have maintained the open mints of the world if we had not shut ours; but I do not care about pursuing this subject further.

The Senator from Iowa says we can not go to free coinage. So the Senator said in 1878, and so a great many other men said in 1878. I do not believe there is an intelligent political economist on the face of the earth who does not believe to-day that we could safely have gone to free coinage in 1878. I know an innumerable number of men who did not believe it then who say now we could have gone to free coinage.

The Senator says France will send us over \$700,000,000 of silver. What will France get in place of that \$700,000,000? Where will she get gold? They have ransacked the world for gold, and gold has appreciated 30 per cent. because of this struggle for it. Does the Senator suppose that France is going to sell her silver and do her monetary work with the gold alone that she has got? She has got to reach out to get gold. She can not get it without disturbing all the relations of commerce in the world, and she knows it, and so ought the Senator to know it. Everybody who has given attention to this subject ought to know it.

We have been told several times that Roumania is going to sell her silver. I was taken somewhat by surprise when Germany was brought in here and I was told that Roumania had twenty-five or thirty millions of silver. I do not believe it. Roumania has not got five millions of silver. Roumania is on a paper basis, and not on a silver basis in fact. She does propose, I understand, to dispose of what little silver she has got and not attempt to have any metallic money, but to go upon paper money without any metallic money back of it, and we are frightened and shiver when it is said that Roumania will send us five millions of silver. If she sent us a hundred millions it would not affect our market.

Mr. ALLISON. I am not frightened.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator says he is not frightened. I am glad to hear that, but some people seem to be frightened.

Then we were told that Belgium had five and a half millions. Why, Mr. President, for thirty-eight months we put out of our Treasury and we coined more than \$7,000,000 each month of silver, and for what we have coined and what we have accumulated we put into the markets of the world silver to that extent.

There is not any danger of Belgium's silver or Roumania's silver if it should come, admitting that it will come, and there is not any danger of France's silver coming, because the French are too good financiers; they know too well what is necessary for their commerce, a commerce that is extending and increasing every day of the year. They will not abandon silver, but should they attempt to abandon it they would find the disturbance so great that they would be compelled to do what Germany has been compelled to do: suspend the sale of silver because of the disturbance of her financial affairs.

Germany has suffered immeasurably more at the hands of the gold monometallists of Germany than she suffered at the hands of the French Government; and France will not make the mistake which her enemy made. There is no danger of it, not a particle.

The Senator speaks of Mexico. He says Mexico is on a silver basis. True, yet Mexico has had a period of prosperity for the last ten years that she never had before in her history. She has brought out and produced commerce that was never thought of. I commend to the Sen-

ator from Iowa and others who are talking about a silver basis and the prices we shall get when on a silver basis the statement made by Mr. Romero before the Pan-American Congress, which was in session here recently. He shows that the financial condition of that country is better now than it ever has been heretofore.

It is better under the silver basis than it would be under the gold basis, infinitely better.

The Senator calls attention to the fact that silver certificates were at a premium somewhere. The silver certificate is equal to gold. That is why it is at a premium. It is equal to gold because it will settle balances not only here, but anywhere in the world.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] the other day said that we could not use our silver coin; that it was not as valuable when it got abroad as bullion. That is not correct. A financial circular sent out from one of the great banks of New York the other day made the statement that the 83-cent dollar, as they call it, when it went abroad was not treated as money, but was treated as bullion. That statement is not true either. If any man on this floor or any bank official had a million silver dollars in London it would mean to him a million dollars in gold, less what it would cost to get it to New York. He would not take \$830,000 for that million. He would take and send it over and draw against it here. He can do that on a silver certificate; he can do that on any money that will circulate in this country.

I want to ask, because I do not wish to detain the Senate by reading it, that a portion of Mr. Romero's speech may be incorporated in the RECORD, and I want Senators to look at it and see whether it is such a frightful thing to get on a silver basis! They are infinitely better off in Mexico proportionately than we.

I only rose to correct some of what I thought were the points in the speech of the Senator from Iowa that were liable to be misunderstood; of course I knew the Senator from Iowa understood them. I am aware that he knew we had never been on a gold basis legally. I thought he was mistaken as to the circulation of silver and gold in this country before 1834 and subsequent thereto. If I have permission to insert this in the RECORD without reading it, I shall not read it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection.

The paper is as follows:

As the conference is aware, said Mr. Romero, Mexico has been the largest producer of silver in the world. Two-thirds of all the silver now existing has been produced by my country, and although in the last few years the annual production of that metal in the United States has exceeded that of Mexico, I have the conviction that when the Mexican mines attain their full development, which I believe will take place before long in view of the rapid manner in which railroads are being constructed there, our annual production of silver will exceed that of the United States. The production here has attained its largest development, while with us it is now only commencing to be developed. When our production is fully developed we will occupy again, as we did many years previously, the first rank in the world in the production of silver.

Notwithstanding its mining wealth, and very likely on account of it, Mexico has not suffered as much as might be expected from the depreciation in the value of silver. The Mexican monetary system is based upon silver coin; the wages, salaries, house rent, and the value of all services and productions in Mexico have not been subject to the fluctuations caused by the depreciation of silver. Foreign merchandise only has been affected by that. The enhanced value of real estate in some parts is due to the development of the country, and not to the depreciation of that metal. As Mexican mines are generally rich, the depreciation in the value of silver has reduced their profits more or less; but this is hardly perceptible in a business subject to so many contingencies as mining, and I have no information that a single Mexican mine has been abandoned on account of the low price of its productions caused by the depreciation in the value of silver.

For a Mexican who has never left his country or who is not aware of what takes place in the monetary centers of the world, silver has now the same value as it had twenty years ago; and if he could detect any difference at all it would only be in the lower price of foreign merchandise, which has almost been balanced with the price that they now command in comparison with what they had twenty years ago. The Mexican Government is the greatest sufferer on account of the payment in London of the interest of the Mexican foreign debt; but the elements of wealth of my country are so large that that difference is hardly perceptible, and to us it is equivalent to a higher rate of interest.

So far as Mexico is concerned there is no special interest, therefore, and much less an urgent one, which might induce it to take extreme measures to obtain an increase in the value of silver, although it is apparent that any increase in that value would be advantageous to us. The depreciation of silver has produced in Mexico a result which seems almost paradoxical, and notwithstanding it is a real one. It has established a bounty equal to the amount of depreciation in the value of silver, which is now about 23 per cent, in favor of the exportation of other Mexican products, and this cause has increased considerably the production and exportation of such other products.

For many years, and principally on account of the great expense of transportation on the Mexican roads, as a consequence of the uneven ground, and on account of our lack of large lakes and navigable rivers, the only Mexican products that could pay the expense of transportation were precious metals, because in small volume and weight they possess a greater value than other articles; and the Mexican exportations before the railroads were built consisted only of gold and silver. This condition of things prevented the development of the other sources of wealth of the country in whatever was not absolutely necessary for the local consumption, which was in itself quite small.

Before the depreciation of silver, which coincided with the beginning of the construction of railroads in Mexico, the exportation of Mexican products, besides precious metals, was really insignificant. That depreciation coincided—as it was natural, for the reasons stated—with the increase in the production of other articles for export, because these articles had a heavy bounty, equivalent to the amount of the depreciation in silver. If a Mexican merchant has to send \$1,000, for instance, to New York or London, he has to use 1,333 Mexican dollars in silver; while, if he sends coffee, vanilla, or any other articles of national production, as this is sold by gold in New York or London, he saves that loss. If the price, for instance, of coffee in New York or London is \$20 per 100 pounds, its price in Mexican national coin would be \$26.66, less freight, insurance, commission, and other small expenses.

With this view, it is therefore clear that the depreciation of silver has produced, in a great degree, a decided benefit for Mexico, because it has encouraged the

production of other articles of as much value as the precious metals, and for the production of which Mexico has great elements of wealth and very favorable conditions with which nature has bountifully supplied her.

This plain explanation of the actual condition of things in Mexico will show the conference that so far as my country is concerned there is not any great necessity, and much less an urgent one, to propose or adopt any extraordinary measures with the view to restoring the value of silver, and that we can wait as long as it may be necessary to see the old ratio of 1 to 15½ restored; and this, in my judgment, will take place before long.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President—

Mr. HALE. I rise to a question of order.

Mr. MORRILL. We have already passed beyond the point that was agreed upon when this bill was to be considered with the amendment, and debate confined to five minutes. I give notice now that I shall to-morrow, at the earliest moment I can after the morning business, insist upon the bill being completed to-morrow.

Mr. STEWART. Complete it to-night.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] rises to a question of order.

Mr. VEST. I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maine rises to a question of order. The Chair will first hear the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HALE. As I remember, by a fair and fully understood agreement, an hour was fixed, agreed to by everybody, when the bill was to be considered upon the amendments with five-minute speeches.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. At 3 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. HALE. I ask the Chair whether that rule is not now in force, unless in special cases it is waived?

Mr. SHERMAN. It ought to be general. It ought not to be waived.

Mr. HALE. I agree with the Senator. The Senator from Missouri appealed to the Senate that he had not spoken and asked permission for an extension of time, and that was given to him, and the Senator from Colorado then addressed the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. I did not speak five minutes.

Mr. HALE. The Senator spoke over five minutes. It seemed very short undoubtedly, but I think it was rather more than five minutes. I wish to give notice that from this time forward, if possible, debate shall be continued under the five-minute rule without exception. A great many Senators here have refrained from taking part in the discussion. It is not because they do not feel interested in this bill, but they feel that it has been thoroughly discussed up to the present time, and if the Senate is ever able to come to a conclusion now is the time; and it is not, so far as the voting is concerned, any harsh or arbitrary rule, but a fair and fully considered agreement, unanimously entered into by the Senate; and after the time comes that that agreement should be put in force it seems to me that it is not the fitting thing that more time should be asked than what has been agreed upon; and, for one, I give notice that I shall endeavor to have the rule enforced hereafter.

Mr. INGALLS (Mr. BERRY in the chair). The Senate knows I have been engaged for the last month in discharging the duties of the Chair, and I have therefore been unable to participate in this debate. I had intended to-day before 3 o'clock to ask the attention of the Senate for perhaps fifteen or twenty minutes, but the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] continued his remarks that were begun on Friday, and he was followed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], who spoke until almost 3 o'clock, after which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] took the floor, and continued for something over an hour. I respectfully ask that the rigor of the rule may be conditionally waived in my favor to-morrow, in case at any time between the close of the morning business and 2 o'clock I shall wish to ask the attention of the Senate for a brief space.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope permission will be granted to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. HALE. I should not propose to seek to enforce the rule in the case which has just arisen in the body. If the Presiding Officer, who has not spoken upon this subject, desires to speak as a Senator, I think all of us will agree that it is proper that he should have the opportunity of doing so.

Mr. HARRIS. Under the circumstances certainly nobody will object.

Mr. HALE rose.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator will allow me, when I addressed the Senate I supposed I would be within the five-minute rule. Of course, unless we are called down, we never know how long we speak.

My colleague [Mr. WOLCOTT], who is not present, desires to address the Senate, and would have done so to-day if he had seen any chance, for about fifteen or twenty minutes, and I shall bespeak for him, as he is a new Senator, that privilege. Aside from him, I do not know of anybody else who wishes to speak.

Mr. HALE. Let us consider the rule in force, and when individual cases arise the Senate can deal with them as they arise. Let it be understood in that way.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Maine that, while it is desirable that these agreements should be kept in the very strictest manner, there is no order made, and it can not be enforced, and, of course, it is left to every Senator whether he will speak or not, and if a Senator has not abused the privilege of speaking often

I do not think there ought to be an objection to allowing him to be heard if he did not get in his speech in the time limited.

Mr. HALE. The Senate, as everybody knows, is very generous about these things, but still the force of a fair agreement entered into unanimously and thoroughly understood at the time when it was agreed upon ought not to be lost to the Senate. We are not likely to make any error here in the Senate by not talking enough, and when such an agreement is made I believe it ought to be the spirit of the Senate to carry it out, except in cases, such as arise occasionally, where personal exceptions would be recognized.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I simply want to make a statement in justice to myself. I have never asked for an extension of time under any rule and would not have done so to-day, for I did not anticipate that I should say a word a minute before I spoke. I spoke in reply to some statement of the Senator from Iowa. But the other day the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES] having charge of the bill informed me that there would be no vote upon the bill or amendments until to-morrow at 3 o'clock, and I supposed that was the understanding on the majority side of the Chamber. Therefore, when I asked to proceed for a few minutes beyond the five minutes it was with the understanding that there had been a change of the rule by consent of the majority.

Mr. CULLOM. Do you mean to-morrow or to-day?

Mr. VEST. Tuesday. I was so informed by the Senator from Nevada having charge of the bill, or else I never would have asked for a minute. The Senate, I am certain, will acquit me of ever having infringed upon any rule or ever having asked any special favors.

Mr. DAWES. There never has been any agreement as to when the vote shall be taken, but only as to the manner of debating, that hereafter the debate shall be under the five-minute rule.

Mr. VEST. I only mean to say that the Senator from Nevada, when I asked him if we were certain to take up the bill and debate it under the five-minute rule, said, "No, not until Tuesday," that there were three or four Senators who wanted to speak upon the bill. That was my understanding, and that was the reason I went over the five minutes.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope, in view of what has been said on the floor, that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. INGALLS], the Presiding Officer, will have an opportunity of speaking to-morrow at such length as he desires, and also the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], who is absent, and that at some time to be named now, I do not care whether it is 3 o'clock or 4 o'clock—

Mr. SHERMAN. Say 2 o'clock.

Mr. ALLISON. That we shall agree to go on with this bill and vote upon the amendments, debating them under the five-minute rule, of course, and complete this bill to-morrow.

Mr. HARRIS. You can not get an agreement such as that.

Mr. COCKRELL. You could not read the amendments and make a five-minute speech on each one in that time.

Mr. ALLISON. The firmness with which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] makes his statement admonishes me that it is not possible to secure any agreement of the kind I intimated.

Mr. HALE. Why not let us go on under the present agreement? All that is needed is to insist upon the rule, and nobody will object to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. INGALLS] and the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] addressing the Senate, and I think the Presiding Officer will enforce the rule.

Mr. SPOONER. The agreement, as I understand it, is that all Senators shall be confined to five minutes, except those who desire to speak longer. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I think we shall have no difficulty about making an arrangement in respect of this matter, whereby, say at 3 o'clock to-morrow, the debate shall be confined to five minutes on the part of each Senator.

Mr. HARRIS. I think that is the standing agreement, except so far as the Senate has within the last few moments made exceptions to it.

While I am referring to that particular phase of the question, I do not quite agree with utterances on the floor and I think once from the present occupant of the chair and from the Chair that one of those consent agreements is not within the power of the Chair to enforce. I think that one of these agreements, made by unanimous consent of the Senate, is within the power of the Chair to enforce, and I think it is his duty to enforce it, except so far as the Senate may make exceptions to the consent rule by its consent action.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It never has been so held.

Mr. COCKRELL. I differ materially with my distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS]. I do not think that the Senate or the Presiding Officer has any such power.

Mr. HARRIS. We adopt rules by a majority of the Senate, the standing rules of the Senate, which the Chair does enforce; and, now, when every member of the Senate consents to a rule that shall apply to a particular case, I can not quite see why it is not within the power of the Chair and the duty of the Chair to enforce that rule; but I simply give that as my own opinion.

Mr. HOAR. Is it not a mere question as to the form of doing it? I suppose nobody questions that what is known as the eighth rule is en-

forced by the Chair, although that is a rule for a Senator speaking five minutes only; and I suppose it can be enforced in a matter of this kind, when it is in the form of an order of the Senate, and then the Chair would enforce it; but when it is put like this, merely in the form of an understanding by members, and so announced by the Chair himself, it is not the custom of the Senate, so far as I am aware, to treat it as an arrangement which the Chair can enforce.

Mr. ALLISON. I shall endeavor to confine my observations to five minutes. I wish merely to say a word in reply to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER].

In the observations I submitted a while ago, which I agree with the Senator from Colorado were rather loosely made, for the reason that, owing to the pressure of the committee business in which I have been engaged, I have not had the opportunity which other Senators have had to prepare with great accuracy statements to be submitted to this Senate, I meant to say, and did say, that although silver and gold from 1792 to 1873 were upon a par as respects their coinage in our mints, because of a mistaken ratio, the gold gradually passed out of our country until 1834, when there was practically no gold in it.

I shall be able, if it is necessary, to bring to the attention of the Senate information which will show, from the best statements of those who get statistical information in their minds, that at the time when the act of 1834 passed there was practically no gold in the United States.

Now, it is perfectly well known that after the passage of the act of 1834 silver gradually passed out of the United States, and the act of 1853 was made necessary because of the gradual passing away of silver and in order that we might have fractional silver here with which to conduct our business.

I made no comment as respects Mexico. I say this in justice to myself, because it might be inferred from what the Senator from Colorado said that I was depreciating the prosperity of Mexico. I made no comment upon that subject; neither did I make any comment upon what would be the condition of our own country if we had all silver rather than all gold or rather than both silver and gold. I made no allusion to either of those topics. My allusion to Mexico was simply to show that we were here upon the basis of gold as distinguished from silver in our daily transactions, although we have a limited coinage of silver, and that Mexico on the contrary had a silver standard exclusively, and that there was now a difference between the paper and coin money of the two countries varying from 25 to 28 per cent. I only alluded to that for the purpose of showing that if we open our mints to the free coinage of silver it will, in my belief, be necessary to bridge over that chasm of 25 or 28 per cent., and I expressed a fear that the free coinage of silver would not accomplish that result, and I do not believe it will.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, I was about to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator yield to me to present a conference report?

Mr. VEST. I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry about the pending bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. VEST. I should like to know the exact status of the question now before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and the question is upon the first amendment reported by the Committee on Finance, which will now be stated by the Chief Clerk.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 2, line 8, after the word "notes" where it occurs the second time, it is proposed to strike out "shall be a legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, and."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senate by a previous order agreed that the bill of the House of Representatives should be substituted for and take the place of the Senate bill.

Mr. VEST. Is it in order now to move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert a substitute?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Not until after the amendments proposed by the committee have been considered.

Mr. STEWART. I ask for the yeas and nays upon the pending amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Nevada asks for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PLUMB. I should like to ask if there is not an amendment which I offered to this bill now pending.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senate bill has been laid upon the table.

Mr. PLUMB. I offered it to the House bill as reported to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment is not yet in order, because the amendments proposed by the Committee on Finance have not been acted upon.

Mr. PLUMB. The amendment is pending to the House bill reported by the committee.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be in order whenever the proper parliamentary stage arises.

Mr. FRYE. I renew my motion.

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

Mr. FRYE. I do not.

Mr. SPOONER. I will withhold my report until to-morrow.

Mr. VANCE. I offer an amendment to the pending bill and ask that it lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be received and ordered to be printed, in the absence of objection.

Mr. BLAIR. I offer certain amendments to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB], and also an amendment to the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that these amendments be printed in the RECORD as well as printed separately.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendments will lie on the table and be printed, and also printed in the RECORD, if there be no objection. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. VANCE's amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after enacting clause and insert:

That so much of the act approved February 28, 1878, as provides for the limitation of the coinage of silver bullion to \$2,000,000 worth per month is hereby repealed.

Mr. BLAIR's amendments are as follows:

Amend the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. PLUMB by adding at the end of the first section the following:

And after the 1st day of January, A. D. 1900, there shall be no legal-tender in the United States except gold and silver coin.

Also add at the end of the second section the following:

Nor shall the amount of silver coined and issued from the mints of the United States be more than four and one-half millions of dollars for each calendar month.

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

From and after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase and coin, in execution of the provisions of the act of February 28, 1878, silver bullion at the market price thereof worth \$4,000,000 monthly.

Mr. FRYE. I renew my motion.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After one hour and four minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 17, 1890, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate the 16th day of June, 1890.

UNITED STATES CONSUL.

Joseph Edward Hayden, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Breslau, to fill a vacancy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Ordinance Department.

First Lieut. Henry D. Borup, to be captain, June 15, 1890.

First Lieut. Lawrence L. Bruff, to be captain, June 15, 1890.

First Lieut. Charles H. Clark, to be captain, June 15, 1890.

First Lieut. William Crozier, to be captain, June 15, 1890.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, June 16, 1890.

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

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

RELIEF AND CIVILIZATION OF THE CHIPPEWA INDIANS.

Mr. COMSTOCK. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9952) to enable the Secretary of the Interior to carry out an act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota."

The bill was read at length for information.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which the Clerk has read. Is there objection?

Mr. PEEL. I do not see the chairman of our committee present.

Mr. COMSTOCK. I will state to the gentleman this is the bill that was recommended by the committee the other day.

Mr. PEEL. I simply want to ask the gentleman who calls the bill up if my recollection of the bill is right that it was all stricken out and that an item provides that the amount appropriated is to be reimbursed to the Government.

Mr. COMSTOCK. It was all stricken out and an amendment was reported by the committee, and I ask the passage of the bill as amended.

Mr. PEEL. I think the bill ought to pass. I do not see any objection to it.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I shall object until we know something about it.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order so that the gentleman who called it up may explain the bill for which he asks the consideration of the House.

Mr. COMSTOCK. I will explain, Mr. Speaker, to the House that the Fiftyeth Congress passed a bill entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota." Under the provisions of that bill and by virtue of a treaty with these Indians, they have ceded 4,000,000 acres of land to the Government. This bill provides for an appropriation for surveying and an allotment to Indians who take some of the land in severalty, and for the removal of the Indians to two of the reservations—Red Lake reduced and White Earth.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Does this bill involve an appropriation?

Mr. CRISP. May I ask my friend why was this not provided for in an appropriation bill?

Mr. COMSTOCK. This bill was introduced and sent to the Committee on Indian Affairs, who recommend its passage unanimously, and every dollar of this money appropriated for this purpose is to be refunded by the sale of the lands. The lands are to be surveyed and opened for settlement. This is a loan, and not an appropriation really, because the money is to be refunded to the Government.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. If it is a loan by the Government, it seems to me it ought to be carefully considered in Committee of the Whole, and I make objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa objects.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I have two conference reports which I desire to offer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine has conference reports which will take precedence of the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT BEAVER FALLS, PA.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2403) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Beaver Falls, in the State of Pennsylvania, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment, namely: Strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a site, and cause to be erected thereon a suitable building, including fire-proof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches, for the use of the United States post-office and Government offices, in the borough of Beaver Falls and State of Pennsylvania, the cost of such site and building, complete, not to exceed the sum of \$50,000.

"Proposals for the sale of land suitable for said site shall be invited by public advertisement in one or more of the newspapers of said borough of largest circulation for at least twenty days prior to the day specified in said advertisement for the opening of said proposals.

"Proposals made in response to said advertisement shall be mailed and addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall then cause the said proposed sites, and such others as he may think proper to designate, to be examined in person by an agent of the Treasury Department, who shall make written report to said Secretary of the results of such examination, and of his recommendation thereon, and the reasons therefor, which shall be accompanied by the original proposals and all maps, plats, and statements which shall have come into his possession relating to the said proposed sites.

"If, upon consideration of said report and accompanying papers, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem further investigation necessary, he may appoint a commission of not more than three persons, to be composed of an officer of the Treasury Department and two other persons, which commission shall also examine the said proposed sites, and such others as the Secretary of the Treasury may designate, and grant such hearings in relation thereto as they shall deem necessary; and said commission shall, within thirty days after such examination, make to the Secretary of the Treasury written report of their conclusion in the premises, accompanied by any statement, maps, plats, or documents taken by or submitted to them, in like manner as hereinbefore provided in regard to the proceedings of said agent of the Treasury Department; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon finally determine the location of the building to be erected. The compensation of said commissioners shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, but shall not exceed \$6 per day and actual traveling expenses: *Provided, however*, That the member of said commission appointed from the Treasury Department shall be paid only his actual traveling expenses.

"No money shall be used or applied when appropriated for the purposes mentioned until a valid title to the site for said building shall be vested in the United States, nor until the State of Pennsylvania shall have ceded to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the same, during the time the United States shall be or remain the owner thereof, for all purposes except the administration of the criminal laws of said State and the service of civil process therein.

"The building herein provided for shall be unexposed to danger from fire by an open space of at least 40 feet on each side, including streets and alleys."

And the House agree to the same.

S. L. MILLIKEN,
DANIEL KERR,
THOS. J. CLUNIE,
Managers on the part of the House.
M. S. QUAY,
G. G. VEST,
JOHN C. SPOONER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

During the reading of the report,

Mr. MILLIKEN said: I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the formal part of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to dispensing with the reading of the formal part of the report? The Chair hears none.

The statement of the House conferees was read, as follows:

The effect of the report is to strike out the appropriating clause and conform its form to that hitherto adopted by committees of conference on bills from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The report was adopted.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT SALINA, KANS.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I present the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 595) for the erection of a public building at Salina, Kans.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 595) for the erection of a public building at Salina, Kans., having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a site, and cause to be erected thereon a suitable building, including fire-proof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches, for the use and accommodation of the United States post-office and other Government offices, in the city of Salina and State of Kansas, the cost of said site and building, including said vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches, complete, not to exceed the sum of \$75,000.

"Proposals for the sale of land suitable for said site shall be invited by public advertisement in one or more of the newspapers of said city of largest circulation for at least twenty days prior to the date specified in said advertisement for the opening of said proposals.

"Proposals made in response to said advertisement shall be addressed and mailed to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall then cause the said proposed sites, and such others as he may think proper to designate, to be examined in person by an agent of the Treasury Department, who shall make written report to said Secretary of the results of said examination, and of his recommendation thereon, and the reasons therefor, which shall be accompanied by the original proposals and all maps, plans, and statements which shall have come into his possession relating to the said proposed sites.

"If, upon consideration of said report and accompanying papers, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem further investigation necessary, he may appoint a commission of not more than three persons, one of whom shall be an officer of the Treasury Department, which commission shall also examine the said proposed sites, and such others as the Secretary of the Treasury may designate, and grant such hearings in relation thereto as they shall deem necessary, and said commission shall, within thirty days after such examination, make to the Secretary of the Treasury written report of their conclusion in the premises, accompanied by all statements, maps, plans, or documents taken by or submitted to them, in like manner as hereinbefore provided in regard to the proceedings of said agent of the Treasury Department, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon finally determine the location of the building to be erected.

"The compensation of said commissioners shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, but the same shall not exceed \$5 per day and actual traveling expenses: *Provided, however,* That the member of said commission appointed from the Treasury Department shall be paid only his actual traveling expenses.

"No money shall be used for the purpose mentioned until a valid title to the site for said building shall be vested in the United States, nor until the State of Kansas shall have ceded to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the same, during the time the United States shall be or remain the owner thereof, for all purposes except the administration of the criminal laws of said State and the service of civil process therein.

"The building shall be unexposed to danger from fire by an open space of at least 40 feet on each side, including streets and alleys."

And that the House agree to the same.

S. L. MILLIKEN,
HERMAN LEHLBACH,
Managers on the part of the House.
JOHN C. SPOONER,
JUSTIN S. MORRILL,
G. G. VEST,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

During the reading of the above report,

Mr. MILLIKEN said: I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the formal part of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine? The Chair hears none.

The statement of the House conferees was read, as follows:

The effect of the report is to reduce the limitation of expenditure from one hundred and fifty thousand to seventy-five thousand dollars, to strike out the appropriation clause in the bill, and to conform the form of the bill to that adopted by conference committees of the Senate and House from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The report of the committee of conference was adopted.

Mr. MILLIKEN moved to reconsider the votes by which the reports of the committees of conference were adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 856) to amend section 1 and section 9 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the Denison and Washita Valley Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1886;

A bill (H. R. 7619) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 6845) directing the issue of a duplicate of a lost check drawn by O. M. Carter, Lieutenant United States Engineer Corps, in favor of Charles C. Ely;

A bill (H. R. 445) for the erection of a shop at the National Armory, Springfield, Mass.; and

A bill (H. R. 8235) to prevent desertion from the Army, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCook, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 75) to fix the regular terms of circuit and district courts for the district of Alabama;

A bill (H. R. 10906) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the payment of pensions and for the expenses of the Eleventh Census for the fiscal year 1890, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 7856) granting the right of way to the Duluth and Manitoba Railroad Company across the Fort Pembina reservation, in North Dakota;

A bill (H. R. 1404) granting a pension to Mary Ann Lang;

A bill (H. R. 1884) granting a pension to George F. White;

A bill (H. R. 2424) granting a pension to Mary W. Smalley;

A bill (H. R. 4036) for the relief of Christian Kunze;

A bill (H. R. 4967) granting a pension to Mrs. Catharine Reed;

A bill (H. R. 5118) granting a pension to Amanda J. Delap;

A bill (H. R. 6280) granting a pension to Lawrence Dougherty;

A bill (H. R. 6601) granting a pension to Archibald F. Coon;

A bill (H. R. 6831) granting a pension to Norman Cleveland;

A bill (H. R. 6913) granting a pension to Alexander G. Davis;

A bill (H. R. 7529) granting a pension to Belle Morrison, of Dillsborough, Ind.;

A bill (H. R. 7958) granting a pension to Christopher C. Funk;

A bill (H. R. 8560) granting a pension to Mrs. Sallie H. Wilson;

A bill (H. R. 8910) granting an increase of pension to Clinton Spencer;

A bill (H. R. 9359) to increase the pension of B. F. Hilliker; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 37) providing for donation of certain personal property of the United States to South Dakota and North Dakota.

The message further announced that the Senate disagreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3163) to reorganize and establish the customs-collection district of Puget Sound, asked a conference with the House thereon, and had appointed Mr. DOLPH, Mr. CULLOM, and Mr. GORMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message further announced that the Senate further insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 3538) for the relief of Albert H. Emery, disagreed to by the House; agreed to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SPOONER, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. WILSON of Maryland conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message further announced that the Senate disagreed to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 461) making an appropriation for a new light-house tender for use in the thirteenth light-house district, with headquarters at Portland, Oregon, requested a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CULLOM, Mr. GORMAN, and Mr. MITCHELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message further announced that the Senate further insisted upon its amendments to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies, agreed to the request for a further conference with the House thereon, and had appointed Mr. EDMUNDS, Mr. HOAR, and Mr. VEST conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles, asked a conference with the House on the said bills and amendments, and had appointed conferees on the part of the Senate as respectively indicated:

A bill (H. R. 8247) to authorize entry of the public lands by incorporated cities and towns for cemetery and park purposes—Mr. PLUMB, Mr. TELLER, and Mr. WALTHALL.

A bill (H. R. 1452) for the relief of Christopher C. Andrews—Mr. DOLPH, Mr. PADDOCK, and Mr. WALTHALL.

A bill (H. R. 188) for the erection of a public building at Columbus, Ga.—Mr. SPOONER, Mr. SQUIRE, and Mr. PASCO.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which concurrence was requested, bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 344) to grant the right of way to the Pittsburgh, Columbus and Fort Smith Railway Company through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 1110) granting a pension to William J. Bryan;

A bill (H. R. 1405) granting a pension to Betsy Cole;

A bill (H. R. 1783) granting a pension to Mrs. Alice A. Cunningham; and

A bill (H. R. 7263) to increase the pension of Henry L. Potter.

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

A bill (S. 662) for the better protection of hotel-keepers and innkeepers, lodging-house keepers, and boarding-house keepers of the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1244) for the relief of the sureties of Dennis Murphy;

A bill (S. 1418) for the relief of Dwight Hall;

A bill (S. 1759) for the relief of Maj. Joseph W. Wham, paymaster United States Army;

A bill (S. 1971) for the relief of William Clawson;

A bill (S. 1992) relating to the execution of custom-house bonds;

A bill (S. 2184) granting a pension to Sarah L. Knight;

A bill (S. 2310) for the relief of M. A. Fulton, Silas Staples, and the other sureties upon the official bond of James D. Reymert, executed to the United States on the 7th of February, 1860, as receiver of public moneys;

A bill (S. 2750) to remove the charge of desertion against Almon R. Tobey;

A bill (S. 2782) to provide for the reduction of the Round Valley Indian reservation in the State of California, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 2783) for the relief of the Mission Indians in the State of California;

A bill (S. 2865) granting to the Jacksonville, St. Augustine and Halifax River Railway Company a right of way across the United States military reservation at St. Augustine, Fla.;

A bill (S. 3052) for the relief of the Michigan Military Academy;

A bill (S. 3078) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James H. Dennis;

A bill (S. 3134) to perfect the military record of Henry C. Barney, of Pella, Tex.;

A bill (S. 3494) to establish a light-station at or near Page's Rock, in York River, Virginia;

A bill (S. 3562) authorizing additional compensation to the assistant commissioners to the industrial exhibition held at Melbourne, Australia;

A bill (S. 3716) to provide for the examination of certain officers of the Army and to regulate promotions therein;

A bill (S. 3723) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Shaw; and

A bill (S. 3740) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between the city of Pierre, in Hughes County, and Fort Pierre, in Stanley County, in the State of South Dakota.

CONFEDERATE AND OTHER FLAGS.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio, obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following memorial, without the names; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

HEADQUARTERS OLD GUARD POST, No. 23,
GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC,
Dayton, Ohio, May 30, 1890.

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

The undersigned, ex-soldiers and sailors, would respectfully call your attention to the propriety of enacting a law that will prohibit the use, sale, manufacture, and importation of any banner or flag purporting to be, or resembling in any way, the so-called "confederate flag" or the red flag of the anarchist, or any other so-called flag or banner of any society or class of people whose principles are at variance with the Constitution or laws of this country. Also to prevent the sending of matter through the United States mails the wrappers or outside covering of which shall contain any such representation, device, or emblem.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. BURROWS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee resumes consideration of the appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the Pacific Branch, at Santa Monica, Cal.: For maintenance of six hundred members, at \$150 per annum each, \$90,000.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Page 84, after line 23, insert: "For farm, including same objects specified under this head for the Central Branch, \$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For laundry, \$7,500; in all, \$222,500.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent that that paragraph be amended by striking out on page 85, line 5, the word "twenty-two" and inserting "thirty-two."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the Marion Branch, at Marion, Ind.: For maintenance of six hundred members, at \$150 per annum each, \$90,000.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend by inserting in line 7, page 85, the word "eight" in lieu of the word "six," and by inserting the words "one hundred and twenty" in lieu of the word "ninety" in line 8, so as to make the paragraph read: "For the maintenance of eight hundred members, at \$150 per annum each, \$120,000."

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, although I may in part repeat on the separate amendments I intend to offer to this bill, I desire to now submit some remarks generally on the appropriations for the Marion Soldiers' Home.

On June 5, 1888, during the first session of the Fiftieth Congress, the House of Representatives passed the bill (H. R. 8391) introduced by my distinguished predecessor, Hon. George W. Steele, establishing a branch of the National Soldiers' Home at the city of Marion, in Grant County, in the State of Indiana. That bill was passed without a dissenting vote; and, by that action, not only the then Representative of the Eleventh Congressional district of Indiana, but also that House, earned and received the hearty gratitude of the citizens of that locality.

When later, during the same session of that Congress, that bill passed the Senate of the United States and received the approval of President Cleveland, both the Fiftieth Congress and the President earned an enduring place in the memories of the people of that district.

No people ever felt a greater degree of pride in any trust than do the people of the district I represent in this splendid public institution, known as the "Marion Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers." I am voicing the sentiments of my constituents when I declare that we do not want the Marion Home in any way belittled or limited.

We want it made a home indeed for the gallant veterans who seek its benefits in their declining years. These veterans come from far and near. This Marion Branch is not a mere local affair, but is a national institution in which the pride and interest of the whole nation mingle.

The board of managers, of which that gallant hero, General William B. Franklin, of Connecticut, is president, has taken great interest in this new branch, and has made a recommendation as to its absolute needs, which I desire to now incorporate in my remarks at this point, and which is as follows, to wit:

Marion Branch (800 members).

Maintenance	\$120,000
Hospital	50,000
Mess-hall and kitchen	30,000
Commissary and quartermaster's store-room	20,000
Officers' quarters	16,000
Headquarters	10,000
Laundry	7,500
Two additional barracks	46,000
Pumping station	4,000
Chapel	7,500
Total	\$311,000

This board of managers has had great experience in the control and management of the different branches of the National Home, and their recommendations ought to have great weight.

The bill under consideration reduces some of the amounts recommended by the national board of managers and omits some entirely, as will be seen by that part of the bill which I here incorporate in my remarks, and is as follows, to wit:

At the Marion Branch, at Marion, Ind.:

For maintenance of six hundred members, at \$150 per annum each, \$90,000.

For hospital, \$30,000.

For mess-hall and kitchen, \$15,000.

For company and quartermaster's store-rooms, \$10,000.

For laundry, \$7,500.

For two additional barracks, \$46,000.

For pumping station, \$4,000; in all, \$202,500.

Mr. Chairman, this Marion Branch is located in one of the finest sections of the United States, upon a splendid and fertile farm of 211 acres, with good railway facilities, abundant good water and pure air, and in the midst of an intelligent, high-minded people, who are very proud of the home and want this institution provided for as liberally as any other branch.

In addition to what I have already said as to the natural and other advantages surrounding the Marion Branch, it is important to remember that the farm I have mentioned not only belongs to the United States and that jurisdiction has been properly ceded in usual form to the Federal Government by an act of the last General Assembly of the State of Indiana, but that these grounds are traversed for a half mile or more by the Mississinewa River, an important tributary of the Wabash River, and is in the heart of that great gas belt within whose bosom the mighty engines of old Mother Earth belch up great streams of heat-giving, light-producing natural gas, that element which has dispensed with the necessity of ashes and coal smoke in that region.

This mighty natural force is of incalculable advantage to the United States and was the great consideration that induced the selection of a point within the natural-gas belt for the location of this home.

Within a radius of a few miles from this home scores of great manufacturing industries are driven day and night by smokeless fires fed from the exhaustless fountains below, and thousands of homes and business rooms, as well as the great avenues of the city of Marion, are lighted and heated from the same source.

Upon this farm every want of heat and light is supplied from wells which pour their gas into every stove, fire-place, and jet where light or heat is necessary.

It is no wonder, then, that the people of Indiana, the people everywhere who understand the situation and advantages of this home, are opposed to the growth of any sentiment in this or any other Congress that the Marion Home is to be considered as of secondary importance and that only a few hundred soldiers will ever be cared for there.

I have moved to amend this bill so as to conform to the recommendations of the Board of Managers. I do not ask any extravagance in appropriations for this home, and I know that neither the Committee on Appropriations nor this House intend to be parsimonious.

I do not mean to even suggest that this committee intends to be parsimonious by cutting down the appropriations recommended by the board of managers, but I do think the reduction was mistakenly made, and I ask its correction.

There are already six barracks about completed, with a capacity of at least eight hundred members, and all this room will soon be crowded from the ranks of worthy veterans, who, a quarter of a century ago, in camp, on the hot march and in the hotter battle, earned the right to be cared for by a grateful people, not in poor-houses, but in genuine, comfortable homes such as this one.

This appropriation ought to be \$120,000 for the maintenance of eight hundred members, as asked by my amendment.

As to another amendment which I will offer, that of increasing the allowance for a hospital from \$30,000 to \$50,000, it seems clear to me that this amendment ought to prevail, so as to have abundant room for the care of the sick and dying.

This is not war time, when the sick or wounded might need to be almost piled upon each other, to await the saw and knife and medicine of the tired surgeon. This is a time of peace, when we are building homes for the old veterans, where even the hospital ought to savor of home comfort, and not of the privations of army life. I entreat this committee to allow the amount recommended by the board of managers.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to also urge this committee to adopt, when I offer it, my amendment for the mess-room and kitchen, being the \$20,000 urged by the board of managers, as entirely necessary. Why, within a year there will be eight hundred or more old soldiers in this home, and it is not necessary to build a mess-room so small that they must be divided into reliefs as they march to their morning, noon, and evening meals. There ought to be no "Fall in, second relief!" sounded in the ears of these veterans when meal time comes. The first table is none too good for any of them. The board of managers urge this matter as expedient in every point of view, particularly as to comfort and health.

I desire now to call particular attention to another need, particularly since all appropriation therefor is omitted, namely, for headquarters and for officers' quarters. I have visited these grounds myself more than once, the last time in company with Colonel Brown, of Dayton, Ohio, who is inspector-general of all these homes under direction of the board of managers. On that visit we found General A. F. Devereux, formerly of Cincinnati, in charge.

What kind of accommodations do you suppose they have there for headquarters and officers' quarters for this great United States institution? A rather small house that looked to me to be about forty years old and in no respect very comfortable.

In front of this little house, high in mid-air, was floating the Stars and Stripes, emblem of the strength and dignity of 65,000,000 of people, and if it had not been for the starry banner floating there in the chill fall wind no one would have dreamed that the United States had any headquarters there.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriation offered by my amendments and recommended by the board of managers in these particulars ought to be made. I am sure that not a member of this committee would vote against these amendments if he had visited these grounds, as I have done, and seen the absolute necessity for these improvements.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I come to the last amendment which I will offer, namely: For a chapel, \$7,500, no appropriation for which is provided in this bill, although recommended by the board of managers in the sum I have named. It seems to me there can be no earthly ground for refusing this, and I do not believe the members of this committee will refuse.

Although this home has been opened but a few weeks, already one of the old comrades has been mustered out of the thinning Grand Army below into the growing Grand Army above. He has answered his last roll-call.

Many more, increasing with mournful rapidity, will soon answer "Here!" no more in this life. Ought not these men to have a peaceful place, the gift of the nation they gave so much for, in which to listen to the message of hope, peace, and forgiveness from Sabbath to Sabbath during the few years yet left them? Should they not have a peaceful

altar where their remains might be carried when the battle of life is over with them, and where kindly faces might stoop over the silent face of the sleeper and drop the sympathizing tear for him who may have left neither kith nor kin to pay the last sad tribute of affection?

Mr. Chairman, when we think how freely this body has given from the public Treasury for other public purposes, let us not hesitate to give enough for so worthy an object as this worthy monument of a nation's appreciation of her soldier poor, the Volunteer Soldiers' Home.

Mr. Chairman, I desire now to call the particular attention of members of the committee to the first amendment. I felt upon an examination of this bill that there must have been a misapprehension as to the number of barracks which were already completed at Marion and as to the capacity of those barracks, and on Saturday last I received a telegram in response to one which I had sent asking information on the subject. I had dispatched inquiring as to the number of barracks completed, and here is the reply:

General Devereux reports six barracks completed.

HOUCK & WRIGHT.

General Devereux is in charge as superintendent of the Marion Branch of the Soldiers' Home, and from the information he gives it turns out that there are six barracks completed instead of four, with a capacity for the accommodation of seven hundred and fifty or eight hundred members. From the large number of old soldiers now unable to support themselves and distributed among the poor-houses of the land, I am sure the members of this committee will agree with me that it would be in the interest of economy to have all the space that is now ready for their occupancy utilized, and I am sure that long before the completion of even half of the coming fiscal year there will be accommodation for eight hundred of the old soldiers at that branch, if proper provision is made by this appropriation bill.

For these reasons I have moved to strike out "six" and insert "eight" and also strike out "ninety" and insert "one hundred and twenty," making this an appropriation of \$120,000 for the maintenance of eight hundred members. I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that this branch is one which has been constructed under the provisions of the act of July 29, 1888. That act passed this House without a dissenting vote and was passed in like manner by the Senate, and I am sure that the old soldiers, not alone of Indiana, but wherever they need the benefit of such a home, feel deeply indebted, not only to my distinguished predecessor who introduced the bill, but to the Fiftieth Congress for the passage of that bill.

The people of my district take a peculiar pride in this institution, and now that it is thus far completed they take great interest in seeing that it shall be utilized to the fullest extent. The home is located upon a farm of 211 acres upon the Mississinewa River, near the city of Marion. Upon the farm itself a large number of gas wells have been sunk, and are now supplying all the light and heat that are needed for the institution. I hope that the members of this committee will feel that instead of being extravagant it is in the interest of economy to make this additional appropriation. If these barracks will accommodate 800 members why should we make an appropriation for only 600 and none for the additional 200? I feel that this is a very important matter, and I have tried to do my full duty in relation to it in connection with the Committee on Appropriations. Early in the session I introduced a bill which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. That committee felt that it belonged more properly to the Committee on Appropriations and it was referred there. I sought out the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations repeatedly, but, through no fault of theirs, and yet through no fault of my own, I was never able to have as full a consultation with them in regard to the items of this bill as I desired. I think the subcommittee in recommending an appropriation of \$90,000 for 600 members at the Marion Home acted under a misapprehension as to the number of barracks completed, under the impression that there were but four of those barracks and that they could not accommodate more than 600.

In this connection I want to call attention to this fact: At the time General Franklin, the president of the board of managers of the national homes, was before the Committee on Military Affairs, but four of these barracks had been constructed, though two more were fast approaching completion. Since that time those two have been completed, and, as I understand, are now ready for occupancy. I hope the amendment I have offered will meet the approval of the subcommittee on appropriations, and also of the chairman of the committee, with whom I have not been able to have the conference I would have liked.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if I can have for a moment the attention of members of the Committee of the Whole and of my friend from Indiana, I think I can satisfy them that this amendment should not be adopted. The five old homes, to say nothing about those at Marion and Santa Monica, have capacity for 10 per cent. more inmates than we have appropriated for. This perhaps is proper enough; but we have for the coming year increased enormously—over double—the ordinary increase at the soldiers' homes. For instance, the average number of inmates in 1888 was 10,681; in 1889, 11,727. In 1890 we appropriated for 13,200. In this bill we provide for 15,500. It will be observed that the increase is extraordinary. We have increased the appropriations for soldiers' homes proper to the amount of \$605,000

and over. In addition to this, we provide for 4,000 inmates at the State homes at \$100 apiece under the legislation of 1888. So that I may say the provision recommended in this bill for soldiers' homes is nearly double the ordinary increase heretofore.

One word further. We gave very great attention to the appropriations and recommendations touching the soldiers' homes. We had before us time and again General Franklin and other members of the board of managers. Let me read from the evidence of General Franklin:

The CHAIRMAN. You have four barracks at Marion now; or is it six?

General FRANKLIN. It is four.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any others under contract?

General FRANKLIN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any appropriated for?

General FRANKLIN. No, sir; there is no appropriation for any. The completion of those four exhausted the appropriation. They are completed and occupied.

The CHAIRMAN. That gives you room for seven hundred men?

General FRANKLIN. No, there is not room for that number at Marion, but only room for five hundred. There is room for one hundred and twenty-five to each barracks.

General Franklin further says:

I ought to say that you appropriated \$40,000 for maintenance of the inmates of the branch from January until June of this year, for the four hundred men that are there now. That was done by a special act, and that is now becoming exhausted. The men are living on that fund, and have been since the bill passed.

The CHAIRMAN. How many people have you there?

General FRANKLIN. Three hundred and seventy men.

Then there was a long examination following, from which it appears that they have the four barracks and four only; they have no hospital, no kitchen or mess hall, no building for quartermaster's stores. For these buildings we recommend appropriations in this bill. But it will be time for the snow to fly, and probably longer, before those buildings are completed; in the mean time these barracks have to be occupied in part by these officers.

We have recommended appropriations for two additional barracks and then we make provision for six hundred inmates, far more than there can be for half a year. But it was supposed that upon the completion of the two new barracks the number of inmates would average six hundred, taking the year round, less than six hundred for the first six months and more than six hundred for the last six months. Now, in view of these extraordinary increases which we have made, after the fullest examination, I am satisfied the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations should be adhered to and that this amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. I ask unanimous consent to make a few further remarks upon this subject.

Mr. CANNON. That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. I send to the Clerk's desk to be read an extract from one of the daily papers published in the city of Marion. This article appeared about five months ago.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SOLDIERS' HOME.

The first two barracks at the soldiers' home are approaching completion and will be ready for occupancy the 25th of this month. Workmen are now putting on the finishing touches in the way of painting and varnishing.

The third barracks is under roof and in the hands of the plasterers, and the slate roof is being placed on the fourth. The stone work is completed on the fifth and sixth, and all, except one and two, which were to have been delivered to the Government January 1, will easily be completed within the time called for in the contract.

The barracks as they are completed will be occupied. Their ordinary capacity is about one hundred and twenty-five men each, but they will be crowded by placing cots in the attic, thus giving accommodation to about one hundred and fifty men each. With the six barracks completed May 1, we will have not less than nine hundred veterans with us.

The expenses up to date will about exhaust the original appropriation, and no additional funds will be available until June 1. For the purpose of carrying on the work the board of managers has asked \$311,000, and Congressman MARTIN has introduced a bill appropriating \$250,000. Out of this amount, whatever it may be, a reasonable sum at least will be used for erecting officers' quarters.—*Marion Chronicle*.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the board of managers of the national homes recommend \$120,000 as the amount that would be necessary for maintaining the members of the Marion Branch of the Soldiers' Home. On last Friday night, after the conclusion of our session here, I telegraphed to Messrs. Houck & Wright, prominent gentlemen of Marion, editors and proprietors of one of the daily papers there, asking them how many barracks had already been completed. I send to the desk to be read their reply, which I received on Saturday morning.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARION, IND., June 14, 1890.

Hon. A. N. MARTIN, M. C.:

General Devereux reports six barracks completed.

HOUCK & WRIGHT.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, there certainly must have been some misapprehension at the time General Franklin was before the board. These gentlemen, whose telegram has just been read, live in the immediate locality; and while I do not mean to question at all any statement made by General Franklin, here is the statement of men

whom I know personally and well, and who I know understand what they are talking about, that there are actually six barracks there about ready for occupancy. Before the fiscal year will have half run out there will be accommodations, so far as barracks are concerned, for eight hundred men.

Now, if that be true—and in that connection we should weigh carefully the recommendation of the national board for an allowance for eight hundred members at \$120 each—would it be good economy to make an appropriation of only \$90,000 for six hundred members the year round?

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me just there?

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. With pleasure.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman says that there will be eight hundred members during the year.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. Provision should be made for that number.

Mr. CANNON. Suppose it was. Before this is done there will be a less number than that. Now, this appropriation is available for the entire year. There may be eight hundred for a part of the year and a less number for the remainder of the year. But in making the average, and from the very best data that could be brought to bear, the committee believe that they have made an exceedingly liberal allowance.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. If the telegram just read states the matter correctly, they are ready now for the occupancy of eight hundred.

Mr. CANNON. And just there a word further. It was only last week we exhausted this whole question from the governor of the home himself, from whose report I read, and I think that it is better information than mere newspaper statements. And I submit to my friend from Indiana that with this extraordinary increase made for the inmates of the Soldiers' Home, which is sufficient, it is a question of soldiers and their relief, and not a question of how many should be had at Marion or how many at the Dayton Home.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. Let me suggest to the gentleman in this connection the further fact that if an appropriation of \$120,000 is made, which is admitted will be sufficient and which I claim will be necessary, it does not necessarily expend the money if the views of the gentleman be correct. If we appropriate the money and it is needed, at the rate of \$150 per member, it will be expended under the authority of law. If it is not needed, if it is not expended, then the money will revert to the Treasury. If, on the other hand, the appropriation is not made and the money is needed, then, of course, unusual and unnecessary hardships are entailed upon these people.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, according to the theory the gentleman propounds, why not make short work of the appropriations and appropriate all of the money in the public Treasury for the public service? If it is not needed it will not be used.

The truth of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, this matter has been thoroughly exhausted, and in the views of the committee, after a most careful examination of the question, we have made liberal provision.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. Is not the manuscript from which the gentleman is reading—the printed manuscript—the statement of General Franklin made early in the spring?

Mr. CANNON. No, sir; it was made last week.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. I mean about the four barracks?

Mr. CANNON. Yes, sir; it was made on the 3d of June, 1890.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. I hope, Mr. Chairman, without occupying further time of the committee, the amendment will be adopted, and I ask a vote upon it.

Mr. TARSNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have heard it repeatedly stated here on the floor, during this session of Congress, that there were more than twenty thousand deserving veterans of the Union Army in the poor-houses of this country. When I heard that statement made I did not know whether it was accurate or not, nor do I know now. But if it be true or if it approximate the truth, then it seems to me that this question about whether \$120,000 is necessary to be appropriated for the maintenance of the soldiers' homes, or whether \$90,000 will be sufficient, is quibbling over a matter that this Congress certainly ought not to quibble over.

If there be twenty thousand veterans in the poor-houses of this country, they ought not to be there. That is a matter we will not dispute about, because the duty of supporting them is upon the General Government, and not upon the States or the counties. They should be the wards of the Union, and not the wards of the counties or States. And I desire to say in this House here and now that from personal observation of the Soldiers' Home at Leavenworth, Kans., I believe that \$10,000 expended for such an institution as that does more real good and is better expended than \$100,000 given away in pensions, as this House has been giving them. It is not right to stand here and inquire Will all of this money be needed during the year in these various homes? but Is there likely to be a contingency arise which will require the expenditure of it? If so, it ought to be available; and if the contingency does not arise, and your appropriation is larger than needed at the time, the Government loses nothing, for it is covered back into

the Treasury to be used for any other purpose during the next fiscal year. We should be safe, therefore, in making the appropriations large enough to meet every want that may arise, for there is no more meritorious measure of appropriation, in my judgment, than this.

Mr. CANNON. A single word, Mr. Chairman, at this point. I say again, as against 11,727 people provided for in 1889, that this bill provides and appropriates for 15,500 in soldiers' homes and \$100 each for 4,000 more in State homes. A liberal provision, I think. I am willing to rest upon that.

One further statement and I will ask for a vote. That gentleman says it is well to provide liberally. I assent to that proposition. The committee assented to it, and we have done it. And I call his attention to the fact that last week this House adopted a conference report which will take hundreds and multiplied hundreds of these people out of the soldiers' homes, worthy soldiers, by giving them a pension where they now receive none. I am backed up in my statement by my own observations as well as by the views of the chairman of the Committee on Pensions [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. TARSNEY. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. TARSNEY. Will \$96 a year take these people from the poor-houses and support them?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; but that is not all.

Mr. PETERS. The average sum is larger.

Mr. MORRILL. It provides \$144 a year.

Mr. TARSNEY. Six dollars a month, the minimum, would be \$72 a year only, not \$96.

Mr. CANNON. And \$12 a month, the maximum, would be \$144 a year, and no man will—

Mr. TARSNEY. Are they all going to get the maximum amount?

Mr. CANNON. No man can be admitted to the Soldiers' Home unless he is disabled to such an extent that he will get \$12 a month under the new legislation; and let me say to my friend that \$144 a year, given to the soldier for his support in his own neighborhood, is better than \$150 a year expended for his support in a soldiers' home, better for the Government, better for the soldier, better for humanity, better for everybody concerned, and from every standpoint.

Mr. PICKLER. That is right.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 61, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For hospital, \$30,000.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. I offer the following amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 9, strike out the word "thirty" and insert the word "fifty;" so as to make it read, "For hospital, \$50,000."

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. I desire now to send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read the recommendations of the national board of managers as to the amount necessary for this branch of the Soldiers' Home.

The Clerk read as follows:

For hospital, \$50,000; for mess-hall and kitchen, \$30,000; for commissary and quartermaster's store-room, \$20,000; for officers' quarters (three), \$16,000; for headquarters, \$10,000; for laundry, \$7,500; for two additional barracks, \$46,000; for pumping-station, \$4,000; for chapel, \$7,500.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that with the large experience these managers of the national home have had, their recommendation of \$50,000 for a hospital at this place ought to be given very great consideration, and that the amount recommended by them, \$50,000, ought to be allowed rather than the amount which the committee placed in this bill, \$30,000. I want to call the attention of the committee further to the fact that, while there may be reason for the same, yet it is a fact that the appropriation made for the Pacific branch at Santa Monica, Cal., for six hundred members is \$90,000, an appropriation is also made at that place for the hospital of the sum of \$50,000, it being a branch of the home which I understand is no larger than the one at Marion. Inasmuch as the committee have followed the recommendation of the board in the one case (and I believe the recommendations of the board were made carefully and with a full understanding of the situation), I therefore move the amendment to increase the amount from \$30,000 to \$50,000, which will place it just the same as the amount allowed to the Pacific branch.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this recommendation for a hospital at Marion for \$30,000 was after the fullest inquiry by the committee and the fullest examination of General Franklin. And General Franklin was asked, as shown by that examination, how much, for a soldiers' home calculated to take care of one thousand inmates, the reduction should be both at Marion and Santa Monica, and he said \$30,000 for the hospital at Marion, and reduced to \$50,000 at Santa Monica, the difference being in the location, no doubt, and in the cost of building. The committee, I think I may say, were unanimously of the opinion that the improvements should be made at Marion, Ind., at the new home there, and at Santa Monica, Cal., for one thousand inmates at each place, and recommended appropriations accordingly.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For mess-hall and kitchen, \$15,000.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the word "fifteen," in line 10, and insert the word "thirty," making it read "\$30,000."

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit a few observations in regard to this. I know that on this particular point as well as the other the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has spoken of, General Franklin was examined before the committee. I have examined what he stated upon that occasion and I want to call the attention of the committee and of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to this fact, that he thought that the amount for this purpose should be as recommended, \$30,000, and that \$15,000 was not sufficient. He thought in the interest of health and cleanliness that the amount appropriated ought to be \$30,000 in order that it would not be necessary to divide up the members of the home into reliefs or detachments when the bell sounded for dinner or supper. The amount appropriated in this bill, \$15,000, is with the expectation that when breakfast, dinner, or supper time comes the members will be divided into reliefs, that they will have to eat as members of the first, second, and third relief, and I for my part do not think that ought to be done.

Mr. CANNON. Here is just what General Franklin did say:

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose it was the sense of Congress that you should have a mess-hall and kitchen at Marion that would require a change at least of two services at each meal instead of one service, how much would that decrease the \$30,000 estimate?

General FRANKLIN. It would decrease it one-half.

The CHAIRMAN. That would leave it \$15,000 for building a mess-hall and kitchen?

General FRANKLIN. Yes, sir; that would give a mess-hall and kitchen of about one-half the capacity for which we have estimated.

The CHAIRMAN. The kitchen is sufficient for one thousand men, but the mess-hall would be sufficient for only about one-half of that number?

General FRANKLIN. Yes.

Now, this hospital or barracks, the whole of this establishment, is intended for one thousand men, and the \$15,000 will complete the kitchen and the mess-hall.

It will build a dining-room that will seat five hundred men at one time, and I submit that that is a large enough dining-room. It is true if there should happen to be a thousand people there (and that will not happen very often) they will be required to have a first and a second table; but down here at Hampton they have now and have had for years a first, second, and third table. It takes a little longer to dine, but I submit that we have provided liberally from every standpoint, and that it is liberal enough if you have a dining-room that will seat five hundred people at one time. Time is no object there, and it makes no difference whether they all get their meals at 12 o'clock or half of them at 12 and half at half past 12.

Mr. McCOMAS. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he recollects the statement made early in the session concerning this matter? Statement was made by the managers that there were only fifty men at that home.

Mr. CANNON. But there has been an increase since then.

Mr. McCOMAS. An increase since February, but is not the limit six hundred men at this place?

Mr. CANNON. We are laying out a plan for a thousand.

Mr. McCOMAS. They only spoke of six hundred in February.

Mr. CANNON. I believe that is so. I want to say to my friend—and I appreciate his desire in offering this amendment—we know when we get these matters in our district, that sometimes we feel this and that and the other is due to the institution. I do not complain. I have no doubt that I would do the same as my friend does under similar circumstances. But let it be recollected that this matter of soldiers' homes is for the soldiers. It is not for the locality that it be built a little larger or a little smaller.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. I desire to call attention to other language of General Franklin in regard to this matter on page 100:

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you think it is good economy, as this is a temporary work and can not last over twenty-five years, to cut down so as to seat five hundred men at a time?

General FRANKLIN. That is a question for Congress to decide. If you have one thousand men it is better to dine them all at one time. If you seat five hundred men at a time, you have got to clear off the tables, or else the other five hundred men will be eating on dirty tables, and I think decency requires, when it is possible, that all should be seated at one table.

Mr. CANNON. Suppose you read all.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. You read what follows.

Mr. CANNON. I will read it:

The CHAIRMAN. This is a pretty good home at Hampton, and they do not do it there.

General FRANKLIN. It would be a good deal better if they had a dining-room big enough for all.

The CHAIRMAN. They seem to get along very well; it does not injure their health in any way.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate, I think, as fully as does the gentleman from Illinois that this home is not intended for any locality, that it is not intended for the Eleventh Congressional district of Indiana, nor even for the great State of Indiana itself, which

sent nearly two hundred thousand gallant soldiers to battle for the Union, but it is an offering showing the good will of the people of the United States towards Union soldiers everywhere and they will come from far and near. I will state that those who have given much attention to this matter say that the old homes are crowded and that they are turning them away from Dayton, from Leavenworth, and from other homes. So it seems to me that in making this provision for a new home we ought to make it large enough to accommodate as many as we can.

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will allow me, I will read a statement which shows to the contrary. The extraordinary increase of 15,500 against 11,000 in 1889 does not fill up all the homes by 10 per cent.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For company and quartermaster's store-rooms, \$10,000;
For laundry, \$7,500;
For two additional barracks, \$46,000;
For pumping station, \$4,000; in all \$222,500.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting, at the close of line 16, on page 85, the following:
"For officers' quarters, \$16,000."

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. Now, I desire to say a few words, and wish to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations particularly to this item.

Last fall, during the month of November, I visited the soldiers' home at Marion, Ind., and I found there, as is the case to-day, that although the Government of the United States is building a soldiers' home which will be for the people of the whole country, there are absolutely no quarters there worthy of the name. I found General Devereux, who is in charge there as superintendent of the soldiers' home, and the officers connected with that institution in a little old farm-house which must be forty or fifty years of age, entirely insufficient for the accommodation of the officers and entirely insufficient for office purposes, entirely insufficient in any way for carrying on the business which must necessarily be conducted in connection with this home; and I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to this fact.

I indulged the hope that this had been overlooked rather than that it was intentional. I think that this bill ought to provide for the building of quarters even if all the rest of the amendments, except one more which I want to yet offer, have been rejected. We are building a great soldiers' home there, though not as large as some others. We are building it there, and yet leaving it without any headquarters and without quarters or any place for the transaction of business that must be conducted in connection with that home. I feel that this home ought to be made to look as well as other homes.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio. Do I understand your amendment to be for officers' headquarters?

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. For officers' quarters and business rooms.

Mr. CANNON. Now, then, Mr. Chairman, the committee considered this matter, and we took good care of this whole building, as the report will show, from an economic point of view. Look here:

For laundry, \$7,500.
For two additional barracks, \$46,000.
For company and quartermaster's store-rooms, \$10,000.

We intelligently considered it. So far as these officers' quarters are concerned, by and by, when we have provided for the soldiers, we will then take care of the officers. This amendment is \$16,000 for officers' quarters. The information of the committee is that the farm-house which the officers are now quartered in is better than the average farm-house, and they can very comfortably stay there pending the time of the completion of this home. We shall, of course, make further appropriations for this home hereafter, and in the mean time the officers can be very comfortable there.

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana; and the Chairman declared that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 42, noes 67.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Page 85, after line 16, insert "For chapel, \$7,500."

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I feel authorized to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to consent to this amendment, the last that I intend to offer upon this bill. Here is a soldiers' home where there will be opportunity for the accommodation of eight hundred persons, and yet there is no place for them to assemble on the Sabbath day or at any time for any purpose of worship in which they may desire to engage. It seems to me that this amendment, if no other, ought to be adopted without question, and that a chapel should be erected at that home. In this connection I want to say to the committee that the home is located about 2 or 2½ miles from the city of Marion, and, of course, at a considerable distance from any place where the inmates can have an opportunity of attending upon any kind

of religious service. More than that, it is well known to all that the old soldiers who are sent to these homes are not in a condition of health or strength to enable them to travel even 1 mile, much less 2½ or 3 miles, and I ask the committee to adopt this amendment providing for the erection of the chapel.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman has offered that amendment, because it gives me an opportunity to state why the committee do not at this time make recommendation of an appropriation for a chapel at this home. Later, when we get the soldiers at this place under roof, where they can be kept warm, and can get something to eat, and have wherewithal to be clothed, I think it very likely that it will be the sense of Congress to make an appropriation to build a chapel. But, Mr. Chairman, on this general question, I doubt the wisdom of the erection of a chapel at any soldiers' home that is near to a center of population where there are churches. If there is any one thing that can be justly said against soldiers' homes it is that the old soldiers are there isolated to a great extent, and that there is not sufficient contact between them and other citizens. That criticism has been made. I do not make it myself, but it has been made, and I think it would be strange if there was not justice and force in the criticism. Let me read in this connection an extract from the report of the inspector-general touching the home at Togus, in Maine, and I may add that he says he found the same state of things at the other homes. I read:

During four days' general observation of the members of this home I was deeply impressed with the irksome idleness of over one thousand men. A large number of them would leave their quarters in the morning after breakfast and wander listlessly forth hither and thither over the grounds and surrounding fields and along the roads, without purpose, like withered leaves in a languid and fitful autumn wind. Many others would lie on their beds all the day. With this long-continued lack of occupation their physical strength must dwindle and their mental powers decay. Conversations with the surgeons and officers and with some of the members confirmed this opinion.

That is the criticism the inspector makes. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have entered upon this work, but I think it would have been far better if we had given attention earlier to legislation that would have taken every one of these men out of these "homes" and surrounded them with real homes and friends; and I want to say again that, in view of this condition of things, I think their condition will be far better if they have to go out once a week, in response to the call of the church-bell, to mingle in worship with the citizens of the community at large.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. I think the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has overlooked one fact in connection with this matter. As I have already said, in order to get to any church these crippled old soldiers will have to leave the home and, without other means of travel than walking, go a distance of 2½ or 3 miles to reach church, and it seems to me that ought not to be required of them. Those who have been in the habit, as many of them doubtless have, of attending divine service from Sabbath to Sabbath, ought to have an opportunity to continue to do so.

Although this home has been opened only about sixty days, already one of the old veterans has answered his last roll-call, has gone to join the great army beyond, and when he breathed out his life at that soldiers' home there was not a place on the premises where his remains could be taken for religious service and where his companions could gather about him to pay their last respects. It seems to me that if there is an item in connection with this bill that I ought to insist upon and that the Committee on Appropriations ought to concede it is this appropriation for a chapel.

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana; and the Chairman stated that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 39, noes 40.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana, and Mr. CANNON.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 43, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

In all, \$2,901,765.45.

Mr. CANNON moved to amend by striking out "one," in line 19, and inserting "eleven;" so as to read: "\$2,611,765.45."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio. I move to amend by inserting after the paragraph just read the clause which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Board of Managers for the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers shall hereafter consist of eleven members, and the following-named persons be, and are hereby, appointed managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, that is to say: Edmund N. Morrill, of Kansas, for the unexpired term of office of John A. Martin, deceased; Alfred L. Pearson, of Pennsylvania, for the unexpired term of office of John F. Hartman, deceased; and William B. Franklin of Connecticut, John C. Black of Illinois, Augustus B. Farnham of Maine, and George W. Steele of Indiana, for the terms of office commencing on the 21st day of April, 1890, to fill vacancies occasioned by the expiration of terms of office and by the increase provided hereby.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I make the point of order that this is new legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio. I hope the gentleman will withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. In what particular does this change the present law?

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I might make the further point that the proposed legislation is unconstitutional. That is a point which ought to be made by the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to which I hope there will be no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 20, on page 85, add the following:

"That the following-named persons be, and are hereby, appointed Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, to wit: Edmund N. Morrill, of Kansas, for the unexpired term of office of John A. Martin, deceased; Alfred L. Pearson, of Pennsylvania, for the unexpired term of office of John F. Hartranft, deceased.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio. This amendment provides simply for filling vacancies now existing by reason of death.

Mr. BREWER. For the purpose at least of getting some information, I make a point of order upon the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. If I may be allowed by unanimous consent, I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIAMS] a question. I understand there are now two vacancies in the Board of Managers of the Soldiers' Homes?

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio. In reply to the gentleman's question, I will say that Mr. Martin, of Kansas, who was local manager for the soldiers' home at Leavenworth is dead; and this House, the beginning of April, passed a bill naming the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL] to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Mr. Martin, and also naming General Alfred L. Pearson to fill the vacancy from the State of Pennsylvania occasioned by the death of General Hartranft. It is important that these vacancies should be promptly filled; and the Committee on Military Affairs have agreed on the selection of these two gentlemen.

Mr. FARQUHAR. The bill which we passed is in the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio. It is; but it has not been acted on, and we do not know when it will be.

Mr. SPINOLA. These are the two names agreed upon by our committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio. They are.

Mr. BREWER. I call for the regular order.

Mr. CANNON. I do not make any point of order.

Mr. SAYERS. I renew the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. SAYERS. That this is new legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to inquire where the appointment of these officers now lies.

Mr. CANNON. As I understand, it lies with Congress. I am speaking from general recollection. I know that from time to time the Committee on Military Affairs have reported resolutions making appointments or changes in the management of this board. My understanding from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIAMS] is that there are now two vacancies, and that in view of this fact the Committee on Military Affairs recommended the appointment of our friend from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL] for the Kansas vacancy and General Pearson for the Pennsylvania vacancy. I know this mode of appointment has been the practice, but I have not examined the law. Gentlemen of the Committee on Military Affairs, I suppose, can speak as to that.

Mr. PETERS. I think this amendment does not change existing law at all. It is simply a provision for filling vacancies.

The CHAIRMAN. The appointment of these officers, as the Chair understands, is vested by law in Congress.

Mr. CANNON. These appointments, I have been informed, are made by Congress.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I do not see how they can be.

Mr. BAKER. These appointments are recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The question being taken, there were, on a division (called for by Mr. BYNUM)—ayes 50, noes 36.

Mr. BYNUM called for tellers, but withdrew the demand.

So the amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Back pay and bounty: For payment of amounts for arrears of pay of two and three year volunteers that may be certified to be due by the accounting officers of the Treasury during the fiscal year 1891, so much thereof as may be necessary is hereby appropriated.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out in the fourth and fifth lines the words "so much thereof as may be necessary is hereby appropriated" and insert in lieu of it "\$350,000."

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois, in charge of this bill, in his opening remarks gave to the committee as the amount that the bill carried the sum of \$27,975,143.22. It occurs to me that in making his aggregate he did not take into consideration or include in the sum total of the appropriations recommended the expenditures which are con-

templated by the item under consideration and also by the three items which follow.

The policy suggested by the majority of the committee, as it appears in this bill, reverses the policy which has existed heretofore in regard to this character of appropriations, and which has been pursued in the framing of these bills for the last sixteen years. We are called upon now, instead of making a definite appropriation, to give to the accounting officers of the Treasury authority to disburse money without regard to a supervision by Congress as is now provided by law. It seems to me that this is a most unwise policy. In my judgment it is not a proper system of framing an appropriation bill, and would be unwise for the House to adopt. I think the better plan would be to adhere to the policy which has obtained since 1874, and make this a definite appropriation, as it should be. We are informed that the estimated amount which would be required for this item is about \$350,000 for the next fiscal year, and adhering to the policy heretofore pursued, it will be better and wiser to insert the actual amount in the bill, and also definite instead of indefinite sums, as is proposed in the three following items.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I desire, in accordance with the understanding had with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to speak without limit. I will not occupy any considerable time, but prefer this request, as I may desire to occupy more than the five minutes allowed under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. In the absence of objection, the gentleman will proceed without limit.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, the minority of the committee object to the indefinite appropriation provided in this bill and found on page 86. Instead of appropriating a specific and definite amount for back pay and bounty the bill carries an appropriation in the following terms:

So much therefor as may be necessary is hereby appropriated.

The committee will remember that this new departure in respect to appropriations for the payment of this class of claims was inaugurated when the urgent deficiency bill was under consideration at the beginning of this session, and that the change led to some considerable discussion. At that time a point of order was made against a similar proviso in the deficiency bill for the reason that it changed existing law. After a somewhat protracted discussion the chairman of the Committee of the Whole waived his right to pass upon the question and gracefully referred it to the committee, where, by a bare majority vote, it was decided that the form of the appropriation was in order under the rules. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the law relating to this class of claims. The law provides that—

It shall be the duty of the several accounting officers of the Treasury to continue to receive, examine, and consider the justice and validity of all claims under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of said section (section 5), and the Secretary of the Treasury shall report the amount due each claimant at the commencement of each session to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Presiding Officer of the Senate, who shall lay the same before their respective Houses for consideration.

Mr. Chairman, that is the language of the law which was enacted June 20, 1874, and the policy of definite appropriations has continued from that date until the beginning of this session. These back-pay and bounty claims have first been audited by the accounting officers of the Treasury and then certified under this act to Congress for "consideration." Of course, Mr. Chairman, the language of the statute, "for consideration," necessarily carries with it the right of approval or of rejection. The word "consideration" can mean nothing else, and such consideration must of necessity precede payment. For sixteen years that was the construction of Congress under all administrations. When the urgent deficiency bill was being considered the minority of the committee earnestly opposed the change then made under the circumstances to which I have already adverted. The issue then presented is the same issue involved in the items under consideration.

Our contention is not as to the propriety of the payment of meritorious claims, but that the law which requires the supervision of Congress before payment should be adhered to, whilst at the same time a definite appropriation should be made for the payment of this class of claims, after the "consideration" required by the statute. The act of June 20, 1874, was prepared by the Treasury Department under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, and its intent was to provide an additional safeguard for the Treasury. These indefinite provisos, found on page 86, in fact repeal that provision of the law which requires "consideration;" and therefore the certification to Congress can only be for information, inasmuch as it would be entirely profitless to consider these claims after they had been paid.

No one on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, objects to the payment of any claim which shall have been found under the statute to be meritorious, but we simply insist that the law, which has received the approval of every Secretary of the Treasury since its enactment, shall be maintained in its integrity. Its operations have been wholesome and have heretofore prevented the payment of unauthorized and fraudulent claims. Some few years since, as gentlemen will remember, over \$100,000 of what were called "insurance claims" passed the audit-

ing officers of the Treasury, and but for the safeguards of this statute these fraudulent claims would have been allowed and paid.

Mr. Chairman, if the law which has heretofore required the supervision of Congress is to be ignored and disregarded, I shall at least insist upon the continuance of the policy of making definite appropriations. The people are entitled to know the exact amount of their Governmental expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS], a few moments since, invited the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to the fact that the amount reported carried in this bill, as found on page 97, is \$27,926,000, when in fact it is very much more than that total. To speak plainly and come directly to the issue involved I will say that the effect of these indefinite appropriating clauses in the urgent deficiency bill and the bill now being considered is to conceal and take from the aggregate of the appropriations for the current fiscal year, and until after the November elections, the sum of \$1,092,000.

According to the estimates of the Treasury Department there was concealed in the urgent deficiency bill \$390,000. There is concealed—and I use the word in the sense that it does not appear in the total—there is concealed in this bill, for payments of arrears of pay for two and three year volunteers, \$350,000; there is concealed in this bill for the amount due for bounty to volunteers \$300,000; there is concealed in this bill under the bounty act of July 28, 1866, \$30,000; there is concealed in this bill for commutation of rations \$22,000.

These amounts are the estimates of the Treasury officials and are more likely to be under than over the actual expenditures. There is, therefore, concealed on page 86 of this bill, which amount does not appear in the sum total of the appropriations for the next fiscal year, \$702,000. In other words, instead of this bill aggregating \$27,926,000, as stated by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the aggregate ought to be stated at \$28,628,000, or \$702,000 more than it is.

So that, Mr. Chairman, the effect of these indefinite clauses is to withhold from the people of the United States until after the elections information showing that the aggregate expenditures are \$1,092,000 greater than they purport to be on the face of the bills. I know, Mr. Chairman, that the exigency of our friends on the other side is somewhat great, and I sympathize with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in his efforts to stay the tide of extravagance and prevent an unusual increase of appropriations. We have all witnessed how day after day, in that aisle over there, he has protested against the extravagance of his own party, and it is in view of his economic loneliness that I have been coerced into a measure of sympathy; but I can not, Mr. Chairman, go to the extent of following him when he proposes to conceal by indefinite legislation the appropriation of \$1,092,000 of the people's money. We have witnessed, Mr. Chairman, not only the economic stress of my friend the chairman of the committee [Mr. CANNON], but we have been lookers on at the unusual enforced financial restraints manifested along the whole line of the Republican party.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a marked change in the attitude of that party in respect to some measures. We all remember that about eight days of the last session were occupied by the Republican Representatives in attempting to pass a bill which provided in round numbers \$18,000,000 in what is known as the direct-tax bill. Yet, notwithstanding the zeal of our Republican friends on that occasion in behalf of this measure, it is a matter of great comment that not one of them in this Congress has risen to urge the passage of the bill although its importance was deemed such as to entitle it to recognition in their last national platform. This inattention and neglect of the direct-tax bill probably results from the fact that the appropriations of the present session under the most economic management will be very largely increased over the last Congress.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose at this time to estimate what that increase will be, but it is understood that it will be very great. I have referred to the direct-tax bill. There is the Blair bill also, and other bills carrying enormous sums of money that were urged by the Republican party in the last Congress, whilst the Democratic side of the House was censured for not passing them; and yet, after seven months of the present session have passed, not a gentleman on that side of the House has uplifted his voice either in behalf of the direct-tax bill, the Blair bill, or any other of these bills that were so strenuously urged by the Republican party during the last Congress—

Mr. BLAND. The French spoliation claims.

Mr. DOCKERY. My friend from Missouri suggests the French spoliation claims. Why, Mr. Chairman, we all recollect how the present Speaker of the House, then the leader of the minority, stood on that side of the Chamber and hour after hour urged upon my friend from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] that he should consent that the provision providing for the payment of those musty, antiquated, century claims have a place in the deficiency bill. For seven months the Republican party has exercised arbitrary control over this body, and yet no member has insisted on the payment of these French spoliation claims. We all understand the reason for this inaction—a wholesome fear of the people. I apprehend that our Republican friends are just as anxious as they ever were to pass those old, questionable claims, the direct-tax bill, and the Blair bill; but, confronted as they are with rules which

permit an uninterrupted passage-way to the Treasury, the leaders of that side have been intimidated and coerced by the strong probability of a Treasury deficit, and have therefore reluctantly consented that some of those measures should go over to the short session of Congress which will be held after the fall elections.

Mr. McCOMAS. Do I understand my friend from Missouri to be indicting the Republican party for extravagance, and sustaining his indictment by a list of appropriations that they do not make?

Mr. DOCKERY. I think my friend does not misapprehend my position. I am arraigning the Republican party for hypocrisy upon these public measures. [Applause on the Democratic side and cries of "Oh!" on the Republican side.]

Mr. McCOMAS. I understand, then, that you are going to relieve the Republican party from the charge of extravagance.

Mr. DOCKERY. I wish that I could relieve the Republican party from the charge of extravagance, but their record forbids such generosity and leniency. It is true that no attempt has thus far been made to pass the direct-tax bill, the Blair bill, or the French spoliation bill—

Mr. RICHARDSON. Or the subsidy.

Mr. DOCKERY. But the subsidy is with us. It will be passed shortly. But even deducting the enormous sums embraced in those measures, the appropriations will still be very burdensome, and the chairman of the committee [Mr. CANNON] in his frank and honest way will doubtless so state when he gets the floor.

Mr. McCOMAS. Does my friend take into that amount the enormous deficiencies that have come to us as a legacy from the last Administration?

Mr. DOCKERY. I know of no deficiencies that were made by the last Administration that are unusual or extraordinary. I trust that the gentleman does not refer to the deficiencies that come to this Congress that were made by bureau officers in violation of law and which have led to their removal.

Mr. McCOMAS. I will take occasion soon to recite to my friend a list of the deficiencies that came to us as a legacy from the last Administration. I will recount to my friend and bring them to his memory a little later.

Mr. DOCKERY. Very well; I hope my friend will explain some of these deficiencies, because they require explanation. The country desires information.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us return for a moment to the item under consideration. We desire to appropriate for back pay and bounty every dollar that the Treasury Department estimates is necessary.

In this view my friend from Texas has offered an amendment providing the \$350,000 that the Department estimates for pay of two and three year volunteers, and it will be followed up by other amendments which will provide the full estimate. It can not be, Mr. Chairman, that the object of this appropriation is to afford speedy payment, because the minority propose to appropriate \$702,000, which is all the Department estimates is necessary.

And now, Mr. Chairman, but a single further word in conclusion. Before this money can possibly be expended Congress will be in session again, and if the Department officials find they have underestimated they can send in a supplemental estimate, so that we can amply provide for any deficiency likely to arise.

Mr. CANNON rose.

Mr. SAYERS. I desire to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. SAYERS. I call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the four items of appropriation designated and I would ask him how much he has estimated will be involved in these four items of appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. The four that are now being considered?

Mr. SAYERS. Allowances for back pay and bounty, and for the commutation of rations.

Mr. CANNON. It is estimated that it will take at least \$702,000.

Mr. SAYERS. Does the gentleman from Illinois include that amount of \$702,000 in his amount as estimated of \$27,926,143.22?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no, sir.

Mr. SAYERS. It is an addition, then?

Mr. CANNON. Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman, I have only a word or two to say. Gentlemen will recollect that for many years heretofore items audited in the Treasury Department for payment of soldiers of the late war for back pay and for bounty and for commutation of rations have been certified to Congress. They have passed the accounting officers, and then awaited appropriations. So that frequently as much as ten or twelve months after the amount has been ascertained the soldier gets his money. Members of Congress, I apprehend, have gotten letters, just as I have, where they are informed that this amount is due them and that it can not be paid until appropriations are made by Congress.

The old soldiers write us and say: "For God's sake why can not we get our money? We have waited for a quarter of a century, after earning it in the heat of battle and on the long march. Now we are entitled to it, and we only want our money, and the money is in the Treasury." Now, in view of that fact, on a deficiency bill during this

session of Congress we appropriated some of this money—an indefinite sum, sufficient to meet all that class of claims for the balance of this year, ending June 30, which is just in front of us.

This is to provide every dollar that is needed, whether it is great or small; whether it be \$500,000, or \$700,000, or \$1,000,000, or \$2,000,000—whatever is needed is made available by this provision to pay back pay, bounty, and commutation of rations, as the accounting officers of the Treasury shall find it due. The very moment they find it due, if we enact this law, whatever may happen, the soldier will get his money.

Now, the gentleman from Texas criticises this provision. It was settled after a determined contest that this was right, and I only ask the House to do on this bill for the coming year what we have done for a part of this year in the deficiency bill in this exact language.

Mr. SPRINGER. I would like to ask my colleague a question.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. SPRINGER. Whose fault is it that these accounts have remained unadjusted for twenty-five years—the gentleman has said that they have been pending for a quarter of a century?

Mr. CANNON. I will say to my friend in part by the fault of Congress and in part by the fault of the soldiers, because the soldier, like everybody else, must make application for that which is due him before it is paid. I will say it is not worth while to endeavor to say whether the most of the fault lies in Congress or not. I have no desire to do that. I think that in the Second Auditor's Office some years heretofore the appropriation for the clerical force has not been as much as it ought to have been.

Mr. SPRINGER. These accounts embrace pay of soldiers and bounty provided for under the act of July 28, 1866, and accounts for commutation of rations.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely.

Mr. SPRINGER. It seems to me that Congress is at fault for allowing these claims to remain unpaid for a quarter of a century. I do not know how much of the fault lies with the soldier for his failure to make his claim; but it does seem to me very strange that the accounting officers of the Treasury Department have not been able to adjust these accounts during these many years. Many of the persons have died in the mean time and will never get the benefit of what is due them. I do not object to making this appropriation, but what I complain of is that they ought to have been paid at least twenty years ago. There ought to have been something to stimulate a man to make his claim, and there ought to have been a statute of limitations requiring him to make it within five years, or he should thereafter be forever barred. These cases are coming in now every day, and while the work is going on it seems to me that the gentleman can not do better service than require that all these cases be filed within a certain time in order that there can be an end to it some time in the future.

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will allow me, in reply I will state I am not anxious for any statute of limitations for the men who earned this money in the Army a quarter of a century ago, or to their legal heirs. Now, I am glad to welcome my colleague [Mr. SPRINGER] as a recruit in favor of this provision of the bill. It is not necessary to say at this time whose fault it is that those claims were not paid before, paid when they were audited, as they were not this year until we made the deficiency appropriation. But it would be my fault and the fault of my colleagues if every dollar of these claims that are audited during the next year was not to be paid as soon as audited, and if this provision stands they will be paid. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is all I want to say in favor of this provision. I think the House understands it. It has been fought over and settled very fully on the deficiency bill.

One further word. I do not design at this time to speak in reply to my friend from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY], my colleague upon the committee. I thank him very heartily for his, in the main, hearty and earnest co-operation in the preparation and passage of this bill so far, and I have the same to say of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS]. I want to thank them both for the substantial support that they have given to me and to this side of the House in the passage of the bill through this Committee of the Whole up to this time, because, when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MARTIN] and various other gentlemen on that side have offered amendments increasing the bill, and I have resisted them as best I could, my friend from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] and my friend from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] have stood up and voted with me. They did it because they knew it was right, but they were awfully lonesome on that side of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. SAYERS. Will not the gentleman go further and state that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] proposed in committee to reduce the amount of this bill much lower than it is now?

Mr. CANNON. I think not. I think there has been no difference of opinion between the two sides of the Committee on Appropriations except upon these items, and possibly one other that is to follow, and the criticism on the other item, as I understand it, is that we have not made it large enough.

Mr. SAYERS. Were not the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] and myself always found voting in committee for the lowest appropriations?

Mr. CANNON. I understand that as to the appropriation for the Public Printer my friend claims that it is not large enough.

Mr. SAYERS. When we get to the Printing Office item we will talk about it.

Mr. CANNON. But I will say of my friend from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] that he has done his work conscientiously in connection with the preparation of this bill, and he and I have not disagreed seriously about it. He has done his work well and has done it from a non-partisan standpoint. But, Mr. Chairman, I was calling attention now, by way of reply to my friend from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY], who has been rather severe in his criticism, to the fact that I felt disposed to thank him for his personal attitude in this matter, and I repeat that I have been thankful to him from time to time and also to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] for the support which they have given me in carrying the bill through this Committee of the Whole, especially because, as I have already said, they were quite lonesome upon that side of the House.

Mr. DOCKERY. I suppose the gentleman from Illinois has shared somewhat in that sense of loneliness. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. No, I think not. I think my friends have stood by me pretty well, including the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY].

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that it always will be the case that members of Congress will have to be industrious and vigilant and firm to see that the public money when it is taken from the Treasury shall be appropriated for legitimate objects and in proper amounts. We have had to do that this session, we have had to do it in every session that I have served here, and I have no doubt that it will always have to be done. We are here for that purpose, to appropriate for worthy objects, to refuse to appropriate for unworthy objects, and to make economical appropriations. I think that when this Congress adjourns we shall be able to say that we have not made extravagant appropriations. It looks to me that way now. So far there is not much that can be complained of, and I believe the majority of this House will so work it out to the end. When it is all over and the curtain is about to ring down upon this the first session of the Fifty-first Congress, then it will afford me great pleasure to meet my friend from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] and post books and see what we have done.

Mr. DOCKERY. We are keeping accounts.

Mr. CANNON. In the mean time I would be glad to have this amendment voted down.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in this amendment because of the principle involved, and I regret that it arises out of an appropriation which makes an appeal to a sentiment which may obscure the real principle involved. I do not think there is any duty or power imposed upon or granted to this House more important than its supervisory power over the action of executive officers prior to the payment of the claims found due by those officers. The power of the purse, primarily given to this House, and its power of supervision over the action of the Executive Departments, constitute the largest ordinary duty and the most important that is given to it. I say "ordinary," because there are times of extraordinary emergency when the permanence of the Government and the maintenance of our institutions may be involved; but in the daily routine of work, in the ordinary exercise of our duties, there can scarcely be a more important function than the exercise of control over executive officers, that the condition precedent to their expenditure of the public money shall be our warrant. It is not merely, as my friend from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] suggests, the question of definite or indefinite appropriations, but, in addition, it is the surrender of the power of supervision over the claims to be paid by the executive officers; and if the question arose upon any other matter than a payment to the soldiers of the late war, I venture with great respect to suggest the observation that there would not be a gentleman of this House who would cast his vote for this bill in its present shape.

But there seems to be a feeling on the part of many gentlemen here that if we touch any question connected with those who served in the late war it immediately becomes exceptional, and when the precedent is once made it may be applied to many other matters. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] of course has not examined this question very carefully or he would know that the statute of limitations had long since been applied to certain of these classes of claims and had been removed, and is now temporarily suspended under the provisions of the act of August 13, 1888.

During his term of service here, and, so far as I know, without any opposition from him, the statute of limitations as to certain of these claims was enacted, and afterwards was suspended for a period of only three years.

But this does not really touch the issue involved in this amendment, which is, shall Congress supervise the action of the auditing officers of the Government? I urge that we ought to do it in all cases, and the objection I have to this amendment is that it does not go far enough. It makes the appropriation indefinite instead of indefinite; but, if we could have carried that proposition, it ought to have gone one step further.

The other objection urged by my friend from Missouri is, of course, one which ought to receive the consideration of the committee. This is a mode by which appropriations are made without being estimated

and revealed in the act making them; it is a mode by which appropriations are enacted and the amount concealed—a mode by which executive officers are granted authority to pay out the public money without the people knowing the extent of the authority thus granted. We ought never to pass an appropriation bill that does not bear on its face, not only the object of the appropriation and the nature of the expenditure, but the amount to be expended, so that this may be clearly understood by those whom we represent. Of course there are permanent appropriations which, within certain narrow margins, are indefinite; but they are comparatively few, and the margin within which they are indefinite is small. For instance, the permanent appropriation for the payment of the interest on the public debt, which is a mere matter of calculation, and that for the payments into the sinking fund. These two items make up more than \$90,000,000 of the permanent appropriations of \$101,000,000 or \$102,000,000, and in the main the other items are substantially of a character easily ascertained. These matters of indefinite appropriation ought to be reduced to the narrowest possible limit; they ought to be made as simple, as direct, as distinct as possible.

There is room for practical reform here, for careful and wise legislation. It is possible that there is necessity for certain permanent and indefinite appropriations; but they ought to be very few, the necessity thereof clear, and even then Congress ought to require strict accountability for their proper expenditure. It is, perhaps, unfortunate that we do not more carefully examine and scrutinize these permanent appropriations, and I do not doubt that they could be materially reduced to the betterment of the public service.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation here proposed is in line with the abdication of the powers of the House which has been going on during the whole of this session. It would seem as though our friends on the other side want to impair every dignity and power of the House, as far as lies within their power, whenever our prerogatives come in conflict with the functions of any other branch of the Government. Who would have expected to see two of the most eminent Republicans on this floor justify votes for measures which their consciences condemned and their judgments disapproved, because they look to the Senate to repair the wrong, the want of wisdom, the folly, and the despotism of this House?

Who could have foreseen that the great question of currency would have been decided by this House upon the avowal, openly made, that the judgment of the House was not the judgment of the people; that the enactment of the House was not in accordance with wisdom, but that the dictates of a party caucus required that the measure pass the House that it might be corrected by the judgment of the Senate? Who could have expected to see a great measure involving the raising of revenue—taxation in the name of the tariff—passed in this House by the vote of gentlemen who openly admitted that it was not in accordance with their best judgments or with their sense of statesmanship, but that they united with the majority because they hoped it would be so amended in the other end of the Capitol as to make it endurable?

Now, when we have presented to us the question of making the Executive Departments observe the law, when we are passing an appropriation for the purpose of having these executive officers spend the money under our control, we propose on the very face of the enactment to abdicate to these executive officers the power of supervision of expenditures as we have abdicated to the Senate the power of deliberate legislation.

One of my friends on the other side speaks of deficiencies. Mr. Chairman, it has not been assigned to me until this session of Congress to study with particularity questions of appropriation. I do not profess yet to understand them. I have voted with great reluctance during my term of service for certain deficiency bills. I shall, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, try to be just and liberal as to such measures, no matter by what officers the deficiencies may have been made, for, whoever may be in power in the administration of the Government, this is my Government; and its honor, its integrity, the payment of its debts of every sort, are as dear to me as if the officers charged with executive duties belonged to my party.

But I want to say that I think this whole question of deficiencies runs along with this very species of appropriation. We permit the law to be violated by executive officers. We undertake to measure in our appropriation bills the amount that shall be expended, and that should be the measure of the manner in which the executive officer discharges his duties. In the teeth of the law, in defiance of the action of Congress, the officer makes these deficiencies. Whether he be Democrat or Republican the case is precisely the same in my eyes. It is in violation of the spirit of the law.

The excuse that he could not do the duty assigned him without creating the deficiency is an excuse which simply means that he feels he is above Congress and his judgment higher and wiser than the law of the land. And I listen to appeals for deficiency bills, I confess, not only with a certain spirit of reluctance, but with some spirit of responsive indignation; and these deficiencies, whether created under the last Administration or under the present Administration, are simply arguments in favor of our putting into this bill and other bills of like character limitations upon the power of the executive officers instead of extend-

ing their powers and giving them greater authority and concealing the amounts involved.

I presume, sir, as a matter of fact that there will be in the future as there have been in the past deficiency bills required. Some of the items embodied will be just. Some have already been passed that met my approval; as, for instance, certain appropriations for the Printing Office, where the preceding estimates can not well be made, and there must be some degree of flexibility about such appropriations. But in the larger number of cases the claims presented have been simply deliberate violations of law by the head of a bureau or the chief of a Cabinet Department who expects us to supply that deficiency because of our sensitiveness to the honor of the Government that the debts which it has created shall be promptly paid.

I take it for granted that under this Administration the same thing has gone on that we have seen under other Administrations for the last thirty years. I am not speaking in the spirit of the partisan only. I am a partisan, and I do not put on any airs about it. I do not pose in the attitude of a Liberal who is almost a Republican. I never was near unto being a Republican in my life, and what I have witnessed during the last seven months would have utterly obliterated any tendency which I might possibly have possessed in that direction. [Laughter.]

But what I mean is this, that ever since the war, if not before, and notably in the last twelve or thirteen years when these things have been carried on with rather more than ordinary indifference to the law, with a complete belief that we will make it up, there have come demands upon Congress for deficiencies charged to former Administrations, and accompanied with all the excuses that we will hear or have heard in the past. But it does not change the essential principle that the House of Representatives ought to hold that power which it is abdicating day by day and which it is proposed in this bill to make another abdication of, and which it is prepared to surrender in that deficiency bill which will be reported in the next few weeks.

Take, for instance, as an illustration, that department which is the largest in expenditure and the most sensitive to criticism—that of Pensions. I heard my friends on the other side of the House criticize the last Administration because it estimated that the Pension Department would require only a certain amount when the deficiency turned out to be over \$21,000,000. The last Pension Commissioner—and he is safe from any criticism of mine, except that which is absolutely official, for he who bears upon his person the pathetic marks of so much gallantry shown in support of the cause in which his heart was enlisted is sacred from any personal criticism—conceived that he had the power to use the appropriations of 1889-'90 to pay the deficiencies for 1888-'89 utterly without law, absolutely without warrant of law, simply taking the money that Congress had appropriated to one year and applying it to the preceding year, an action which was illegal and in defiance of law. The estimate which was made by the present Commissioner, who is certainly one of the most capable men who has appeared before the committee of which I am a member, upon which we based the deficiency bill for \$21,500,000, has turned out to be a mistake.

He estimated before the committee in January or February that the deficiency would require, in round numbers, twenty-one and one-half millions of dollars. That amount was appropriated, and we have already passed another deficiency bill for over \$3,000,000, and unless I am mistaken that amount will be found not sufficient. It ought to have been much larger and he will have to violate the law by taking out of the appropriations for next year certain amounts to pay for that which ought to be appropriated for this year.

Mr. DOCKERY. And he virtually admits it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. It was virtually admitted, as my friend from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] says.

But the gentleman at the head of that bureau knows—and I speak it with respect to the House—he knows that the House dare not investigate the Pension Bureau. He knows that the House dare not treat that bureau as it would treat any other bureau of the Government; he knows that the House is afraid of what it supposes to be the popular sentiment upon that question. He believes he can again violate that law with impunity. He believes that his department is above the law of the land.

So he and his predecessor, and probably the predecessors of that predecessor running back for years, have not hesitated and do not hesitate to violate the law and use the appropriations of one year for the expenditure of the preceding or subsequent years, and then demand from Congress—for scarcely a word less absolute than "demand" describes the manner in which such requests are submitted to Congress—demand of Congress to make it up, with an absolute certainty that the demand will be complied with.

Now, sir, I think this ought not to be carried further. If gentlemen think that there are influences which require of them that treatment of that particular department, then confine it to that exclusively and do not let us carry it into any other department of the Government. It is not a question of party politics. It is a question affecting the right and dignity and power of the House and its relations to the Executive Departments of the Government. It is one that we cannot afford to ignore.

What interest has any representative statesman—and I am not

speaking now of the ephemera that appear at every election and who hold their seats in this body under a commission of their people for temporary service, with the knowledge of their people that it is to be but temporary—but speaking of the men who largely control the House, men who have been here for years, gentlemen like the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who has borne the commission of his people for eight or nine terms, what interest have such men in concealing or attempting to conceal from the people what is in appropriation bills?

What interest have such men in playing the petty game of politics in the handling of the public money coming into the Treasury from the coined sweat of the labor of the people? It is a mistake, by whomsoever made, by whatever party, at whatever time. The franker we are with the people, the more open we are in our dealings with them, the more confidence we repose in their judgment, their patriotism, and their wisdom, the more they will repose their confidence in us and the greater will be their affection for us.

Why, then, is there any necessity to hide in the provisions of this bill a million of dollars? Why attempt to sugar-coat it by an appeal that it is for the soldiers who fought twenty-five years ago? Let us frankly say to the people, "These are the objects not of bounty but of justice. We promised to pay these. They have been slow in making their claims. We have been tardy in auditing their claims. We will see to it that they are paid, but we can not use these claims to make a precedent by which corrupt parties in possession of the House of Representatives may conceal appropriations. We will not use this exceptional case as a precedent to give power to bureau officers. We will not use it to impair the dignity of the House and lessen its power." And, my word for it, the very objects of the appropriation will be those who will most commend that action.

Mr. Chairman, we are now nearly at the end of seven months of this session. A remarkable and unique session it has been. Under a system of rules which gives to the minority no right of amendment on any of the great measures that have been before us, bills have been passed; not under that system of rules merely, but under a series of gag rules brought in by the Committee on Rules, governing nearly all the matters which have been considered by this House. The tariff bill, the silver bill, the bill reorganizing the judiciary of the United States, taking from the circuit courts their jurisdiction, conferring upon the district courts vast and new jurisdictional powers—that bill was passed within an hour and a half—have been passed under special rules framed to prevent amendments, to suppress deliberation, to prohibit true debate, and render representative independence impossible.

I do not complain of this. I am not saying this in a spirit either of censure or criticism; but I am using it as an argument that in this Committee of the Whole we should reserve the power of amendment, that in the action of this peculiar and ancient committee, which from the very foundation of parliamentary liberty in Great Britain has been the body where the spirit of freedom has resided when questions of taxation were under discussion, that in this body we should not abdicate our power. Do not let us, for any supposed temporary party advantage, give up our duties or surrender them to the executive officers of the Government. And so far as I am concerned, taking advantage merely of this particular amendment to utter this argument, germane to it and to every other form of legislation like unto it, I desire to ask the committee, in all seriousness, not to stoop to this particular form of evil legislation.

We are going to change the Administration. I do not mean to say that it is going to be Democratic next time, merely. I think it is more than likely that it will be; otherwise I would have a very poor opinion of the wisdom of the American people, and would have a very lofty opinion of the power of the "fat" that is "fried out;" but what I mean to say is that all these parties are in a broad sense of the word temporary. Some of us who are old enough have seen the Whig party go to destruction and have seen the Democratic party divided and lose power. We will live to see new persons in power, new questions coming into this House, new alignments of men and States and sections; but we will never see the end of a dangerous precedent.

We will see the personnel of the Government changed. We will see the alignment of parties readjusted upon new issues. We will see States break away from their sectional connections into new combinations, like the elements of a kaleidoscope, making new pictures by the turn of the hand of fate and under the power of a Supreme will; but we will never get rid of the influence of a dangerous precedent, of an admission of power in any other department of the Government. The impairing of our powers gives to the next generation who may want to belittle the House of Representatives the value of our name and the advantage of our character. When in another Congress some Representative is resisting, as I do to-day, this sort of legislation or something like unto it, he will be answered with the statement that in the better and purer days of the Republic the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], canonized then by death and sanctified by forgetfulness of all but his good qualities, did this thing, and if he could do it, they could afford to do it too. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

My friend from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS] and my friend from Kansas [Mr. PETERS], who, I am sorry to see, is going out of public

life, attired not only in the beauty of their present vigorous manhood, in all the gracefulness of their present eloquence, but with the added beauty which is given by that distance which lends enchantment to the view, will be described as the statesmen who, under august and earnest debate, gave their sanction to the principle that the appropriating power of Congress was not the supervision of expenditures, but was merely to hand the public money over into the hands of the auditing officers to be paid without regard to any further action by Congress.

And it has been so from the beginning. Everything ever done in this House to the injury of liberty, that hurt our institutions, that twists the nature of our Government, that gives new power where it ought not to be given and where it has not been conferred by the Constitution, is defended and justified by some former precedent, something no larger than this, but of the same nature. Therefore to-day I plead not merely for this small appropriation of a million of dollars; for what is a million of dollars in a Government that expends four hundred millions of dollars a year? What is a million of dollars? A mere drop in the bucket; nay, no larger than the dew-drop that in the morning sparkles in the sun, compared with \$170,000,000 that we pay for pensions, and the millions upon millions that are crowded into other expenditures which are made at the demand of those who have selected Representatives. It is not for this paltry million of dollars that I plead to-day, but it is for the establishment of another precedent that the power of the purse does not mean an appropriation of money only, but means the supervision of the expenditure which is appropriated for in our bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I can not hope, of course, to follow the gentleman from Kentucky in his eloquence or in his elocutionary pyrotechnics. I desire, however, to call attention to one or two practical questions in connection with this amendment, and in doing so I will go back and call attention to one or two matters about which some expression of surprise has been made. One of these is that these debts, which are conceded to be debts, were not paid twenty-five years ago.

Now, there is a difference between these claims and the claims of many others that are brought before the Government officers. One main difference is this, that these were as much debts of the Government in 1865 and 1866 as they are to-day. The reason why these old soldiers did not receive their arrears of pay and bounty and commutation of rations at the time they were mustered out of the service, when they should have received them, was the negligence and default of the Government itself.

Mr. DOCKERY. Right there I hope the gentleman will be frank enough to this side of the House to state that the object of this amendment is not to refuse the pay, but simply proposes to appropriate the full amount of the estimates.

Mr. PETERS. I understand that, and will come to it presently. Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. If it will not interrupt my friend right there, I want to ask why pass a statute of limitations if it were not also to compel other persons who had not made their claims to file their claims?

Mr. PETERS. I conceive that it is to some extent, as the gentleman from Illinois has stated, the fault of the claimant himself, because in a hundred thousand cases I will guaranty that it was not until years and years after the close of the war that the individual himself ever knew that he was entitled to anything further from the Government. He supposed when the flag of the Union became triumphant and when the soldiers were mustered out, when the accounts were settled, and the boys went marching home, that he had received his entire due from the Government, and that nothing further was due to him. It was not until years afterwards that he ascertained that the Government had failed in its obligation to him, and had failed to pay him the full amount of compensation that was due him for the services he had rendered it. And now shall the old soldier who failed to have knowledge of the wrong the Government committed against him in declining to adjust his account according to law—shall that old soldier now be held responsible by a statute of limitations or any other criticism to say, "You have not applied for twenty-five years, therefore you shall not be allowed to do so now?"

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman will allow me to state right here that there is no such question as that in offering this amendment.

Mr. PETERS. That issue was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER]. I know that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] is broad enough in his heart that beats in sympathy with the soldier, that his energetic legislative mind is too keen and too shrewd and too great to make criticisms of that kind. [Laughter.] But I want to come to this question, Mr. Chairman, that the soldier is absolutely guiltless in relation to this matter because he did not make application. If there is any fault that can attach to any one it can not attach to the soldier, simply because in time past he may have had the means with which to sustain life. He might have had money enough to buy provisions for his family and to clothe them and himself without calling upon the Government for any of its indebtedness.

That is not now the question in regard to these claims, but it is in regard to pensions. How many men are there who are entitled to pensions who from a feeling of pride did not make their application until

poverty came in at the window and their necessitous condition compelled them to seek some support and seek that from the Government which was due them? Then in their extremity was it that they made application for a pension. So it is in a large number of these claims. Although they may have ascertained that something was due them from the Government, yet they did not need it, nor did they make application for it until poverty came in at the door and necessity drove them to do it. Then they make their application for this pittance which is due to them.

Mr. SAYERS. If this rule which obtains to these four classes is a proper rule to be observed by Congress, why do you place any limitation on your appropriation for pensions? Why do you not authorize the Commissioner of Pensions to pay them just as fast as he can issue the certificates?

Mr. PETERS. I will state, first, as a general proposition, that any limit, I care not what it is, to be effectual must be based on an accurate estimate, and that accurate estimate is impossible in this class of cases. And now let me say a word further—

Mr. SAYERS. Can you not make just as accurate an estimate in regard to this class of cases as you can in regard to pensions?

Mr. PETERS. Yes, sir. I will state—

Mr. SAYERS. Then why do you not enforce the same rule in regard to pensions that you do in regard to back pay and bounty?

Mr. PETERS. I am willing to say that so far as pensions are concerned there is no more need of a limit as to the amount to be paid out in pensions than there is necessity for it here, and why? Because no power under the sun can do anything more than guess at the number of applications that will be made for pensions, for payment of arrears, for bounty, for commutation of rations. It is the merest guesswork in the world. No executive officer can do more than guess. The Pension Office can estimate as to the amount of money necessary to pay the clerical force, as to the amount necessary to pay the running expenses of the Pension Department; so estimates can be made as to the amount necessary for the clerical expenses in the Second Auditor's Office and in the Second Comptroller's Office and so of other similar items in the general expenditures of the Government; but there is nothing whatever upon which to make an accurate estimate as to the number of applications that will be made for the payment of pensions, for the payment of arrears, or for commutation of rations. There is nothing in the books that can furnish any basis for such an estimate.

Mr. SAYERS. Then the gentleman is willing to make indefinite appropriations for pensions?

Mr. PETERS. I am willing to make indefinite appropriations for the payment of pensions, just as we make indefinite appropriations for a great many other things concerning which there is less justification than there is in the matter of pensions.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman name any other indefinite appropriations that we make?

Mr. PETERS. Why, the whole of the permanent appropriations, several hundred million dollars, are really indefinite appropriations. We make appropriations each year for the payment of the permanent appropriations.

Mr. SAYERS. But there is an actual appropriation made by existing law for each year.

Mr. PETERS. Certainly. The law as it exists provides that certain things shall be paid each year, but there is no limit fixed. Take, for example, the interest on the public debt; that is a permanent annual appropriation. There is no law which says you shall pay so much, or you shall pay only so much each year; the law simply says that the interest on the public debt shall be paid, whether it be a million, two million, or a hundred million dollars a year. And so with regard to the sinking fund.

Mr. DOCKERY. But the analogy does not hold good, for the reason that there is no opportunity there for discretion. The amount of the indebtedness is fixed and the interest is fixed.

Mr. PETERS. So is the amount of the indebtedness fixed here.

Mr. SAYERS. What fixes it?

Mr. PETERS. It is fixed by prior law, the law which put these men in the field and said to them: "You shall have certain pay, certain bounty, certain commutation of rations if you are a prisoner of war." The original law first created the indebtedness, the relation between the soldier and the Government, and you are simply auditing the indebtedness which was created by that law.

Mr. DOCKERY. That involves discretion both as to the fact and as to law.

Mr. PETERS. No, sir.

Mr. DOCKERY. As to the application of the law to a given state of facts.

Mr. PETERS. It involves a discretion in the Auditor and the Second Comptroller as to the application of the law and as to the ascertainment of facts, but when the application of the law is made and the facts are ascertained the whole case is *res adjudicata*, or should be, and this Congress should have nothing to do with it.

Now, I do not want to take up the time of the committee too long, but I wish to call attention to one other matter in connection with this subject. Here is an indebtedness which has existed for long years, and

all there is to do is for the auditing officers of the Treasury Department to make application of the law and ascertain the facts and certify the amount to Congress. The whole question raised by this amendment is this, shall we pay this indebtedness as it is ascertained by these officers of the Government, or shall we not pay it until after that ascertainment is made and we have received the ascertainment? In other words, shall we compel these creditors of ours to wait until Congress, by reason of its being in session, can look over and examine these adjudications of the officers of the Treasury Department and see that they are correct, or shall we make the appropriation now and say that whenever the adjudication is made the money shall be paid? The amendment proposes a limit of \$350,000. That, I say, is the merest guesswork. The amount may be sufficient or it may be insufficient. If it exceeds the amount of \$10,000 it is no limit upon the discretion of the departmental officers. If it exceeds the limit of \$5,000 it is no limit upon their discretion; and, being the merest guesswork, it is really no limit at all. It is no safeguard to the Government; it is simply an injustice to the soldier. If the Government could derive any benefit from this limitation that is sought to be placed upon this appropriation, then the soldier might be content; but I submit that this simply does injustice to the soldier without any benefit to the Government.

In view of these considerations, it seems to me the proper way to make appropriations for all claims of this class as to which an estimate can not be accurately made is to make the appropriation indefinite, just as we do in all other matters where similar considerations apply. I can see no reason why a discrimination should be made against the soldier. I can see no reason why these claims which have been due for twenty-five years should be discriminated against. I hope, therefore, the amendment as offered will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN (having put the question on the amendment of Mr. SAYERS). The yeas seem to have it.

Mr. SAYERS. I call for a division.

The question being again taken, there were—ayes 59, yeas 46.

Mr. CANNON. I call for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. CANNON and Mr. SAYERS were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 71, yeas 67.

So the amendment was adopted. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment of amounts for bounty to volunteers and their widows and legal heirs that may be certified to be due by the accounting officers of the Treasury during the fiscal year 1891, so much therefor as may be necessary is hereby appropriated.

Mr. SAYERS. I move to amend by striking out in the paragraph just read the words "so much therefor as may be necessary" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$300,000."

Mr. DOCKERY. That is just the amount of the estimate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to do with respect to the bounties which have been due the soldiers for twenty-five years just what has been done by a vote of the Committee of the Whole, with three or four majority, touching the claims of the soldiers for arrears of pay which have been due for twenty-five years. I would be content to let this amendment be adopted, and let the question be finally settled by a vote of the House, were it not that the specious speech of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] seems to have made upon some minds the impression that he was contending for a great and conservative principle touching the methods of appropriation. Now, I want to say, with the highest respect for the gentleman and for his remarks touching this matter, that his speech reminded me of the sweet sound of a silver bell. I recollect they had one out in our country a good many years ago, and they rang it on all occasions. Finally somebody said, "I want to know what they are ringing that bell for? What is going to happen?" Somebody replied, "It does sound awfully sweet; I guess they are just ringing it to hear it sound." Now, my friend from Kentucky, who is always able, and whose speech sounds like the sweet tones of a silver bell, spoke from that same standpoint, because the facts here did not justify the speech; and I will in a minute show why.

The gentleman says he wants to retain with the House of Representatives the power to examine these accounts. Now, there is nothing in that suggestion, I submit to the gentleman, for this reason: What is the manner of expenditure in this country? We appropriate for the Army, for the Navy, and for other branches of the public service. The money goes into the hands of the disbursing officer and is paid out, and is not reported to Congress except in general amounts of expenditure. Why is there any more necessity for reporting the \$5, the \$15, the \$20, or the \$100 that is due to the soldier, that he earned twenty-five years ago—why is there any more necessity for reporting these matters to be scrutinized here than there is to report these other items?

Why, sir, according to the gentleman's logic the Government could never pay a dollar for anything until the amount was first audited, reported to Congress, and examined by Congress item by item.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. That is precisely the way it is done. The Secretary of the Treasury transmits to Congress an esti-

mate of each particular item—so much for pay of the soldier, so much for his subsistence, so much for his transportation, etc.; and there is also sent to Congress each year a report of the expenditures of the year before; and there is a provision of law prohibiting any officer from paying out money except upon warrant of law. That is precisely the way in which the expenditures are made.

Mr. CANNON. The disbursing officer pays every man his money before the matter is reported to Congress. But while, as to the pay of the soldier now in our Army, the money is paid through the disbursing officer and reported to Congress afterward, in these cases where the soldier earned the money years ago, the gentleman would have the amount audited and let the soldier wait until after it has been reported to Congress.

Mr. SAYERS. Can the gentleman inform the committee why it was that the act of 1874 was passed requiring all claims of this kind to be reported to Congress for its consideration?

Mr. CANNON. The law of 1874 to which the gentleman refers was, like many other acts, passed without consideration as to many items. That law is still in force, and the reports can still be made.

One word further in reply to the gentleman from Kentucky. It is said that this bill ought to show the \$700,000 or \$800,000 or \$1,000,000 in the aggregate. It never showed it under your Administration [addressing the Democratic side of the House].

Mr. DOCKERY rose.

Mr. CANNON. I measure my words when I say this, and the gentleman will be satisfied when I make my statement. These amounts never appeared under your Administration until after the audited claim was reported to Congress. For instance, two years ago, in 1888, the sundry civil appropriation bill did not carry one dollar—

Mr. DOCKERY. Just there the gentleman will allow me to say that according to the Department estimates \$390,000 does not appear in the appropriations for this fiscal year that ought to be there, should the gentleman desire to enter upon a comparative statement.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, certainly; but I said that two years ago this bill, the sundry civil bill, did not carry one dollar for this purpose.

Mr. DOCKERY. And why? Because we complied with the law which required the consideration of these items before their payment.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me to proceed, I will state the whole question. I say now that the sundry civil appropriation bill of two years ago did not carry one dollar for this purpose, and Congress adjourned and you did not appropriate one dollar for it. But ten months afterward you come in and appropriate by way of a deficiency. Now, we appropriate in the first instance, in place of a deficiency, enough money to do the work. That is the whole matter.

Mr. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. DOCKERY. Is the gentleman from Illinois not willing to accept the estimates or statements of his own Department officials?

Mr. CANNON. No, I am not in every case.

Mr. DOCKERY. Oh, well, if the gentleman distrusts his own officials, of course I have no word to say.

Mr. CANNON. Because I do not want to appropriate \$700,000 or \$800,000 or \$1,000,000, which will not be enough. But whether it be much or little, I want to appropriate a sum sufficient to pay these claims.

Then one further step, and I beg the gentleman from Kentucky to give me his attention. There are \$101,000,000 every year of indefinite appropriations that have not been passed upon by Congress. All of this is of the kind of legislation to which the gentleman objects and which he criticises; and yet that \$101,000,000, a part of it at least, for a school for the blind in his own State of Kentucky, is an indefinite appropriation, not scrutinized or examined by Congress and passed as this is proposed to be passed.

And yet the gentleman's silvery voice is silent as to that \$101,000,000 of indefinite appropriations. But the moment you undertake to make what he calls an indefinite appropriation to pay the back pay and bounty of the soldiers, the gentleman's sweet voice is heard by the hour in denunciation, and he says it is all without precedent and proceeds to lecture this side of the House. It makes some difference, Mr. Chairman, whose ox is gored, I will submit to you and the committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Will the gentleman from Illinois allow me to say that I stated in my speech that of the sum to which he alludes now nearly \$48,000,000 was the sinking fund and a large amount was interest on the public debt and various other objects which went to make up the total?

But will the gentleman from Illinois allow me to ask him another question? He introduced a bill to repeal all indefinite appropriations. Now I would like to ask my friend if the Committee on Rules, of which the gentleman is so conspicuous a member, will give us an opportunity to vote for a reform in that direction under the lead of the gentleman? If it will do so it will not need any lengthy speaking, if he and his committee in good faith will give us an opportunity, to carry out that bill and make that much needed and most desirable reform. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. I did introduce such a bill and it has been intro-

duced *pro forma* for the last half dozen years. [Laughter on Democratic side.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. *Pro forma!* So I supposed; but I knew the gentleman did not ever do anything *pro forma*; that he did what he did always in earnestness, and hence I had hopes that we would have an opportunity of having a vote on the bill because he introduced it.

Mr. CANNON. It was introduced year after year by the late gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Randall, and by others at different times, and has been referred to the Committee on Appropriations time and again. But the voice of the gentleman from Kentucky was not heard, like "the voice of the turtle in the land," in former Congresses begging that we might have a vote upon that bill. [Laughter.]

Now, I grant you that I do favor the principle, and if we were to start anew in the making of appropriations, in my opinion indefinite appropriations would not be made. But how are you going to avoid it when you swallow one hundred millions of indefinite appropriations, including the school for the blind in the State of Kentucky, and all along the line for almost every conceivable object? You swallow the camel without complaint, and when called upon to swallow the gnat, and pay the poor pittance of from \$5 to \$100 to these poor men when the claims are audited, your stomachs turn inside out because of the gnat. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. As the gentleman from Illinois has now closed that sentence, will he allow an interruption?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. That bill to which the gentleman has referred was sent to the Committee on Appropriations, of which the gentleman is chairman. Has the gentleman taken any steps to have that bill considered in that committee and reported to the House?

Mr. CANNON. I referred that bill to a subcommittee, and I have been prayerfully waiting and waiting for the eloquent voice of the gentleman from Kentucky, who is upon that committee, to lift it out and ask for an early consideration. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. But I am not on the committee. The gentleman did not assign it to me. And if he had done so, he did not use the right word when he said he had been "prayerfully" waiting, for as a matter of fact he has been silently waiting. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOCKERY. Allow me to say to the gentleman from Illinois that I represent the minority in part on that committee, and have frequently urged upon the chairman of the subcommittee the consideration of that measure; and the fact that it has not been so far considered is no fault of the minority. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. Well, now, I have talked long enough about this. [Laughter.]

I want to say to this side of the House that we owe it to these men, who have waited for a quarter of a century for their money, to make this appropriation. We fought it over and settled it on the deficiency bill; and from the time the deficiency bill was passed in last February up to the close of this fiscal year, our friends on the other side having been overcome in that contest are now renewing it, and asking us to reverse the engines and refuse to do for the coming fiscal year what we are responsible for doing for a part of this fiscal year.

I trust we will not do it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I want to ask my friend a question before he takes his seat. The suggestion is made that this requires a careful computation and searching of the evidence before these appropriations can possibly be made. I want to ask the chairman of the committee [Mr. CANNON] if it is not the fact that all which has to be ascertained is, when the soldier volunteered, how long he served, and whether he was guilty of any act during that service which disqualified him from the benefit of this.

Mr. CANNON. And whether he has been paid.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. And there is nothing else.

Mr. CANNON. No; and all appears of record.

Mr. DOCKERY. And \$100,000 of fraudulent insurance claims would have been allowed.

Mr. CANNON. Not under this bill. Those claims were not appropriated for here.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. My friend suggests that in the army appropriation bill there is a large amount appropriated for pay of mileage of soldiers and all that, but before that is paid there must be the ascertainment of the fact as to whether an order has been issued requiring the soldier to make a trip, whether he made the trip, whether the vouchers are regular or not. Now certainly we risk no more in making this appropriation to pay a long existing debt than we do in making an appropriation under the army bill.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The exact difference is the difference between the bill as reported and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS]. We do put in the army bill the amount which is to be paid and in this bill you do not. That very principle which is contended for is the one carried into the army bill. So much for the pay of soldiers, so much for the transportation of soldiers, etc.

Mr. CANNON. Why not so much for this blind asylum?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I do not know anything about that. I have had no connection with that blind asylum. I confess it does seem something like blindness to try to find out what the Republican party are endeavoring to do about this.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. The record in this case is made up and the facts are ascertained.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Possibly.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. In the other case you limit the appropriation, thereby limiting the amount of indebtedness which may be created under the appropriation in the matter of ordering this or refraining from ordering that. In one case the record is all made up and the facts ascertained and are incontrovertible. In the other you limit the appropriation because you would limit the amount of service that may be ordered under it, and there is a manifest distinction in the two cases.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not necessary.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. This is under a general order for debate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, on this and the next item, if the gentleman will indicate about the time he wants, I would like to limit the debate.

Mr. BLOUNT. I want about five or ten minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Suppose you limit the debate to fifteen minutes.

Mr. McCOMAS. I want ten minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Make it twenty minutes.

Mr. SAYERS. I want five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Let us limit it to thirty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and the next be limited to thirty minutes.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Fifteen minutes will be allowed to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] and fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. SAYERS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT].

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, an act of Congress provides that these claims shall be reported to Congress for its consideration with a view to appropriation. It was a wise provision. It is, independent of this, a wise course of legislation any way, to appropriate in detail for expenditures out of the public Treasury. The policy of this country has been continually, from the beginning of the Government onward, in the direction of separating items of expenditure in order that they may be the more easily seen and examined, discussed, and acted upon. The early history of Congress discloses great laxity in this regard, and this statute to which I have referred, the act of 1874, coupled with many others, all point to the public necessity for appropriating in detail. It is in this way that there is brought before the House continually every item of expenditure with a view to its examination. The auditing of accounts does not carry absolute verity with it. Oftentimes error occurs, and it has happened in the past that in this class of claims errors have occurred. Therefore it is but the conservation of a wise principle in legislation that is sought to be applied by this amendment, and I trust that both sides of the House, recognizing its value, will preserve those proper methods in legislation that any gentleman disconnected with any proposition where he may have some special interest or inclination would see fit to approve.

Now, my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] says we have a great many indefinite appropriations, amounting to over \$100,000,000. They are the law of the land. It is not for the Committee on Appropriations, it is not for the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], nor the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], nor any other member of the Committee on Appropriations, to come into this House and on an appropriation bill endeavor to repeal that general legislation. It is a law to us, and it has no part in this discussion. For instance, as stated by the gentleman from Kentucky, the appropriations for the sinking fund are common in their nature, and are made so in order to give assurance that the financial policy of this country should not be subject to the accidents of annual legislation.

So it may be said of other items. Therefore, it has nothing to do with reaching a proper conclusion here. I would not undertake, sir, to say as other gentlemen have that the subjects covered in this provision relating to permanent appropriations were not wise, and certainly it is not true in relation to the sinking fund. There is no occasion why it should be subject to the incident of annual legislation. What harm is there in it? Why should the declaration of \$300,000 in the statute be omitted? Why should we not, when we read the statute, know what the amount is and of every item?

This is the representative branch of the Government. This is the place where is reposed the power first to originate appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAYERS. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. SPRINGER. A question here. I understood that this provis-

ion was to be considered without reference to the five-minute limit of debate.

Mr. PETERS. But while you were out we agreed upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent debate was limited to thirty minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. But that does not change it with reference to these other amendments.

Mr. BLOUNT. Now, what reason can there be for inserting an unknown amount here? Is the object to conceal the amount of money carried by the appropriation bill? Is it simply to have its effect upon a tabulated statement of the expenditures of the Government? If it is true, is it not sacrificing a salutary rule for a partisan purpose? The gentleman certainly can not justify this. I sympathize with the gentleman from Illinois oftentimes in his work with reference to expenditures. I concede that his services have for years been of great value. I have oftentimes co-operated with him with pleasure in keeping down the rate of expenditure, but this does not touch the amount. It simply preserves a rule which is contemplated by the statute, contemplated by wise legislation, and ought to be upheld by this body and by all succeeding Congresses.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] says that there are just three or four things to be ascertained. Why, that may be said of many claims. They may turn on a single item, but because it turns on a single item are we to ignore examination? Is it to conceal anything from this House? The merits do not depend upon points entirely, but upon its correctness. The appropriating of money should be made after all opportunities for examination. The auditing officers are likely to make mistakes. They have made them in the past, and they make them in this item.

The gentleman is persuasive, because it relates to an item for the soldiers of the country. Why, sir, there is no difficulty in the spirit of this House to provide for these things. I have never witnessed it here on either side of the House. The only matter involved is to preserve the law and proper practice in the matter of appropriations. And I trust that we shall not fail in our duty in this regard on this very point. I care nothing about the amount; it is only the principle, and the gentleman from Illinois, with his fidelity to the public Treasury, ought to be one of the last gentlemen on this floor to depart from such a principle.

Mr. Chairman, I care for no further time and yield it back to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McCOMAS. Mr. Chairman, in respect to the doctrine contended for, I heartily agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], and the practice and record of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] most conspicuously accords with the same general doctrine of the responsibility of Congress to consider appropriations and its right and duty to supervise and carefully scrutinize the estimates of appropriations. That ought never to be abandoned, but ought rather to be advanced; but when I see here the case of volunteers and their widows and heirs a quarter of a century after the war, I know from a service of six years on the Appropriations Committee and four years on the deficiency subcommittee having charge of these audited claims that no Appropriation Committee has ever reaudited these claims in fact, nor can do it in fact, as the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Georgia suggest. This is one of the class of audited claims wherein you ascertain the date of entering and ceasing service and the right of the soldier growing thereout; the identity of the person and the verification of the marriage of his widow.

All of these claims are for very small sums of money, and it is impossible for a subcommittee or the House to take them up by the hundreds and the thousands and go over the track of the auditing officer. They can do no more than carry on a general investigation, and that they can do now, and do as well under this form of appropriation as in any other way. So my point is that this is the explanation that I imagine can properly be made in regard to this appropriation; and certainly when you consider that after the average length of a lifetime these claims of soldiers, their widows and heirs, have gone by and are almost coming to an end in their application to the Government and their adjudication by the auditing officers, certainly there is no dangerous precedent here, and this explanation can fairly be made, that the only possible effect in thus appropriating will be to advance for ten months or twelve months the payment of these claims which have been delayed to the soldier or his widow, who has long been waiting, long expecting that which was but justly due and which is but a pittance in thousands of the items in these payments.

But I desire to speak to what has been said by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKERY] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] with respect to the general subject rather than to this particular item. They have talked here of the large appropriations thus far made, but they have not given attention to deficiencies. I desire to call the attention of this committee to the difference of method between this Republican House and our Democratic predecessors when in control of this House. You have this year, by way of deficiencies, \$1,000,000 for the Department of Justice, not provided for by the leg-

islation of the last Congress. You have \$1,200,000 deficiencies in the Navy Department not provided for by the legislation of the last Congress.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCOMAS. If it is a very brief one.

Mr. SAYERS. Does not the gentleman now report, in this very bill, an appropriation for the Government Printing Office which the officers say is \$400,000 less than will be necessary?

Mr. McCOMAS. When that comes up I will explain to my friend that we give the Public Printer more than was given the same official last year, and what they can get along with.

Now, the deficiencies for post-offices and post-roads was \$3,000,000—

Mr. SAYERS. Does the gentleman mean to say that the appropriation contained in this bill for the Printing Office is, in his judgment, sufficient to meet the expenditure of that office during the fiscal year?

Mr. McCOMAS. I will give my friend my view of that question when we reach it. I will ask him not to leap until we come to that stile. I am talking now of the deficiencies created by the action of the Democratic Congress, amounts not provided for by the legislation of the Democratic Congress and coming over from a Democratic Administration to ours.

Mr. SAYERS. What about a Republican Senate?

Mr. McCOMAS. The Republican Senate is here and I have no doubt will do as we have done, make up the appropriations for these deficiencies which have come over from a Democratic Administration.

Mr. SAYERS. Why did not you—

Mr. McCOMAS. Now, I trust the gentleman will allow me to proceed without interruption, or else that he will yield me some time, and then I will be glad to answer his questions. I ask my friend's attention now to the Post-Office Department, where there is a deficiency of more than three millions, and then there is the pension deficiency, which amounts to about twenty-five millions of dollars, and deficiencies in other Departments, making about \$35,000,000 of deficiencies coming from all the Departments, some for expenditures under the present Administration and some under the last, but all coming over as deficiencies, because the appropriations made by the Democratic Congress were not sufficient to meet the public expenditures, and all to be taken care of by this House as deficiencies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one result of the liberal appropriations made this year, which do exceed by \$35,000,000, as gentlemen have said, those of the year 1889—one result of these liberal appropriations is an increase of two millions and odd in the Navy for this year and eighteen millions more for pensions, in order that there may be no more deficiencies in this department such as we have had coming over here from the past Administration and hampering the new one in doing justice to the soldiers. There are twelve millions more for the Post-Office Department. Because of our liberal provision for these deficiencies, and for next year, we no longer hear, as we heard a year or two ago, complaints coming up from every city and every community in the country of the inefficiency of the postal service, of the want of facilities for carrying the mails, or the slowness and uncertainty of the service.

Two or three years ago, under the last Administration, the people were loud and clamorous in their complaints upon this subject, but now they are quiet and contented, because we have provided for these deficiencies and have had the courage to provide in advance \$12,000,000 more to meet the growth of the country and in order to guard against a recurrence of such a condition of things as that which arose under the deficient appropriations of the last Administration.

Then as to pensions, in view of the large deficiency that has arisen in that department and in view of the outrage that it is upon the old soldiers to retard the payment to them of money which has been due for twenty-five years, this House has not hesitated, even on the verge of a Congressional election—this House, I say, has not hesitated even under such conditions to urge on and hurry up by all means possible the adjudication of pension claims, while in the Pension Office they have worked faster in order that long-delayed justice to the soldier and to the helpless widow of the soldier may be done, as, in the national convention that gave us the platform that gave us control of this Government, we pledged ourselves it should be done.

Mr. Chairman, we have done more than that. This Congress has been a virile Congress. Gentlemen have criticised it for some things that it has done and for some things that it has not done, for appropriations it has made and for some appropriations it has not made. I have, therefore, called attention to the virtue and the wisdom of these appropriations to which reference has been made. Gentlemen have talked also about certain laws that have not been enacted upon different subjects. My hope, gentlemen, is that we will have a chance yet, before this Congress comes to an end, to vote for an educational bill. I believe you will soon find it on your Calendar. One word further. For fourteen recent years you have had control of this House. We have had it seven months, half as many months as you have had it years, but I appeal to the record to show that the country has never seen a Congress with more industry than this. You have complained of the rapidity of legislation here, yet now, although we have been busy all the time, you complain that while we have done some things there are some things that we have not done. Well, gen-

tleman, the time has been well employed, crowded with noble and courageous legislation by the Republican party.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CANNON. I yield the gentleman the balance of the time.

Mr. McCOMAS. You confessed that you ought not to hamper the Supreme Court of the United States and denied it relief; but this House has passed a bill to make eight new circuit-court judges in order to give that court relief, and have sent it to the other end of this Capitol, where it will no doubt become a law.

We pledged ourselves in the last campaign to admit the new States, and already four of them have gone flying up to their places in the galaxy of States, and two more of them, Wyoming and Idaho, by the vote of this House are spinning their way toward the same destination. You have merely talked about trusts; but this House has passed a bill for the regulation and control of trusts which will soon be a law to be coiled about some of the most oppressive monopolies which burden our people.

You have wavered. We, having pledged you in our national platform that we would make "such a revision of the tariff laws as will tend to check imports of such articles as are produced by our people, the production of which gives employment to our labor, and relieve from impost duties those articles of foreign production (except luxuries) the like of which can not be produced at home," have done so; we have sent the McKinley bill to the Senate in full, fair, and honest compliance with the pledge of the Republican party. We said that silver and gold should both be used as money; and we have provided by the vote of this House that all the silver dug from all the mines, refined and smelted by the labor and capital of our country, should be turned into dollars. We have given you all the inflation that any prudent man could want or ask, taking the silver of the country and issuing upon it certificates of legal-tender value all over the country, on the same footing with gold.

You in your talk for years have promised pension legislation and have given none. We, after providing an appropriation for all the pensions that can be adjudicated at the Pension Office, have passed a general bill that will lift 100,000 widows from penury and want, which will take 200,000 soldiers from distress, some of them from the almshouses of the country—a bill which has already passed both Houses of Congress, has gone to the President for his signature, and will soon afford great, much-needed, but by you long-delayed relief to the soldiers of this country and those dependent upon them.

This Congress has made these exhibitions of its patriotism and courage. After all these years we have achieved more than any Congress since the Thirty-ninth Congress has achieved. We have marched up to the platform of the party, which I hold in my hand; we have taken its pledges one after another, and discarding your "stale, flat, and unprofitable" excuses for doing nothing, we have taken up these great questions with which you gentlemen did not care to grapple. We have passed upon them. And I believe we shall soon pass upon that other great and important question; we shall soon bring forward a measure whereby those who represent this great nation on the floor of Congress shall have a right and title which can be sifted in the light of public discussion, and to the contentment of the public mind be approved, when this Congress shall have had the courage to march up and by a wise and prudent extension of national legislation see that there shall be an honest count of a fair ballot safely and honestly returned, and a certificate which, undergoing the scrutiny of both State and national officials, shall be a double title to credence when any man takes his seat upon this floor. We have been busy; we have used our time, and used it with important results, used it with courage, nobly, and well. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] has seven minutes.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, one might well imagine from the remarks just delivered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS] that he was upon the stump after the adjournment of the session, before his constituents, expatiating upon the very many great things that the Republican party had done for the country during the present Congress and the very many bad things which the Democrats did while they had control here.

Now, the gentleman knows just as well as he knows anything that the deficiency in the matter of pensions, of which he complains, is not to be attributed to the failure upon the part of this House in the last Congress to appropriate all sums of money which were estimated and asked for by the Commissioner of Pensions. The records and proceedings of Congress show the statement which I make to be true.

Mr. McCOMAS. Will the gentleman allow me half a minute? Perhaps I ought to be more explicit.

Mr. SAYERS. Certainly.

Mr. McCOMAS. I will make amends to this extent: Perhaps the reason you did not pass any pension legislation in the last four years your party had control here was that you were kept so busy in sustaining President Cleveland's vetoes of pension bills that you had not the time. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SAYERS. Well, sir, the country will pass upon the merits of

what you and your party have done and may do during this session upon the matter of pensions; and the country will decide whether you and your party, thrusting your hands into the public Treasury, shall be commended and indorsed for taking out during each fiscal year more than \$50,000,000 of the people's money upon the demand of the Grand Army of the Republic; and this, too, notwithstanding we are paying out more than \$100,000,000 annually to pensioners under existing laws. The issue in that respect has been made, and upon that issue both parties will appeal to the constituencies.

The gentleman talks about the appropriation bills of this session being swollen on account of the failure of the last Congress to pass the necessary amounts. Sir, was not his party in control of the Senate; and could any appropriation bill have become law without the consent of that body? Why, then, throw the entire responsibility of a deficiency (if a deficiency has really occurred for which Congress should be held responsible) upon the House?

The gentleman and his party may pass their election bill; they may enact such legislation as they please, but let me tell him it will not add one member to the other side of this Chamber.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Why not?

Mr. SAYERS. Because the people will declare themselves utterly opposed to any such policy, and will repudiate your candidates at the polls in the North as well as in the South, in the East as well as in the West. That is the reason.

But, Mr. Chairman, we should not forget the proposition involved in the item under consideration. It is this and nothing more: Sixteen years ago, as I am informed, the then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Sherman, advised and urged upon Congress the enactment of a law which would furnish a safeguard against the reckless expenditure of money in matters of the kind before us. In response to that advice the act of 1874 was ingrafted upon the statute-book. Congress after Congress has met, deliberated, and adjourned, and yet that law has been faithfully observed until now. Since 1874 all claims like these under consideration have been referred to Congress for review and none have been paid without the proper appropriation, made in due course of procedure.

This policy, however, which has worked so well and which carries with it a responsibility by the Executive Departments and officials of the Government to Congress, is to be reversed and the same authority which adjudicates the claim is to be invested with the power of payment without the intervention of the law-making power. In this particular Congress is to surrender the key to the Treasury and to yield up its most important function. This is the issue, nothing else. It remains for Congress to decide whether it will adhere to the policy of sixteen years past, or whether it will relinquish its own high authority and confer upon executive officials an unlimited and irresponsible power not only to adjudicate, but also to pay claims of the character we are now considering.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the committee the debate was limited and the time has been exhausted.

Mr. SPRINGER. I was not aware that a limitation had been placed upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas, which the Clerk will report.

The amendment was again read.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 66, noes 72.

Mr. SAYERS. I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. SAYERS and Mr. CANNON were appointed tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 68, noes 70.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment of amounts of bounty under the act of July 23, 1866, that may be certified to be due by the accounting officers of the Treasury during the fiscal year 1891, so much thereof as may be necessary is hereby appropriated.

Mr. SAYERS. In view of the vote just taken on the preceding paragraph, I will not offer a similar amendment to this item or to the one succeeding.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rent and incidental expenses, Territory of Alaska: For rent of offices for the marshal, district attorney, and commissioners; furniture, fuel, books, stationery, and other incidental expenses, \$500.

Mr. SPRINGER. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add after line 12, on page 89, the following additional paragraphs:

"Public building in the Territory of Oklahoma: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to construct in the city of Guthrie, Territory of Oklahoma, a public building suitable for the accommodation of the executive, legislative, and judicial departments of the Territory, the sum of \$50,000, provided an equal sum of money is furnished by the people of said Territory and placed in his hands to be used in the construction of said building."

Mr. CANNON. As to that amendment, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. SPRINGER. I hope the gentleman will not make the point of order, but will allow an explanation as to the necessity for this.

Mr. CANNON. I have no objection to the gentleman making an explanation, but still I must make the point of order. The gentleman can make any statement he sees proper to make in regard to the matter.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the gentleman will withdraw the point of order after hearing the statement.

Mr. CANNON. No, I will not withdraw the point of order; but will be very glad if my colleague will make his statement. I am always very glad to hear my friend talk; he says so little on the floor of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. I have been listening to my distinguished colleague all day with so much pleasure and interest that I can hardly summon up courage enough to take the floor in the brief time I shall occupy it, because he can do the work so much better.

Mr. CANNON. Thank you.

Mr. SPRINGER. But I desired to call the attention of the committee to the fact that we have recently organized the Territory of Oklahoma, appointed a governor and other officers who have gone there for the purpose of transacting the public business, and there is not a building in the Territory in which they can perform the business required of them by the law. This proposition is based upon the condition that the citizens there will furnish an equal amount of money with the amount appropriated by Congress, namely, \$50,000 for the construction of this building.

Now, if I can have the attention of my colleague and as the gentleman has an opportunity of addressing the Speaker oftener than anybody else, I hope he will not consume the time of the committee for that purpose, as I see he is engaged in conversation with him. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. I am listening.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wanted to call his attention to one fact, that the public officers in that Territory are required to perform their duties without having any place furnished therefor, and, if you will allow this appropriation to go in, the citizens residing there have agreed and stand ready to furnish an equal amount by private subscription, and put it in the hands of the Secretary to build a substantial and suitable structure for this purpose.

There is already an acre of land reserved there by the Government, and a land office has been erected, costing, I believe, only \$800, a wooden building which has been placed upon this vacant lot. If, therefore, this appropriation is made the Government gets the benefit of a \$100,000 building for the expenditure of but \$50,000; and I think in the interest of economy, especially as the interest on \$50,000 will not equal one-fourth of the rents the Government must pay for the offices of the Territorial government there, this amendment ought to be adopted. So it is a matter of economy as well as public necessity.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Illinois any statute which authorizes this construction?

Mr. SPRINGER. The Chair understands very well that I do not submit any statute authority.

The CHAIRMAN. But the point of order is made that there is no existing law.

Mr. SPRINGER. No; that is correct. There is no law.

Mr. BURROWS. So the gentleman misapprehended the question of the Chair.

Mr. SPRINGER. The law does not authorize the construction of the building, but it authorizes these officers to perform and requires them to perform certain duties, while it furnishes no place in which to do them. Now, if they must perform their duties, they must have some office in which to perform them. I desire it also to be remembered, Mr. Chairman, that I hold in my hand an obligation on the part of the citizens there to subscribe an equal amount with the amount appropriated by the Government for this building.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will sustain the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment of the fees and expenses of United States marshals and deputies, \$675,000: Provided, That not exceeding \$400,000 of this appropriation may be advanced to marshals, to be accounted for in the usual way, the residue to remain in the Treasury, to be used, if at all, only in the payment of the accounts of marshals in the manner provided in section 856, Revised Statutes.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. I move to amend this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 5, page 90, strike out "four hundred thousand" and insert in lieu thereof "one hundred thousand dollars."

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. I understand that amendment is approved by the Treasury Department. I have a letter from the First Auditor of the Treasury, dated March 10, 1890, which was transmitted to me by the Secretary of the Treasury, and I take it for granted the Secretary of the Treasury approves the amendment. The Auditor inclosed to me some extracts from a report that was made to

the Secretary of the Treasury not long since by a commission appointed by the Secretary in regard to the payment of the expenses of United States marshals, and I send these extracts forward to the desk, and ask that they be read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Earnest attention is called to a practice which has obtained for years of advancing money to United States marshals for the appropriation of "Fees and expenses of United States marshals." Upon the qualification of a marshal, and before he has entered actively upon the discharge of his duties, it is the common practice to advance to him large sums upon the requisition of the Attorney-General, thus practically paying the marshal his fees before they are earned and his expenses before they are incurred.

This is the only instance known in which compensation is advanced before it is due, and in the absence of any reason for the exception we think it is an unsatisfactory business, in a measure demoralizing and often resulting in loss to the Government. The basis upon which it rests is that the marshal must have the money to meet the expenses of deputies in serving processes, etc. But it is believed that in the majority of cases, if not all, the marshal, upon the receipt of the funds, takes what he supposes he may earn in the ensuing quarter and deposits the remainder to his official credit to be drawn upon at option.

Generally the deputies bear their own expenses, and nothing is paid to them by the marshal until the accounts are settled at the Treasury. Thus, after paying himself in advance, he has remaining on hand, sometimes for months, very large sums, tempting him to misapplication. The books of the First Comptroller's Office show that the larger portion of balances remaining outstanding against United States marshals is on account of this appropriation, and caused by disallowances made of fees and expenses charged in excess and illegally paid by the marshal to himself or deputies. The loss and delay in making settlement with this class of officers could be to a very great extent avoided if no money was advanced to them except upon rendition and settlement of their accounts.

If this was required no balance would appear against a marshal in this class of accounts, and only the amount actually found to be due him would be remitted after settlement. The present practice of remitting in advance causes balances to appear, necessitates demands for deposits to close accounts, and very often entails actual loss of money and tedious suits by the Government. That the existing practice should be discontinued, and only sufficient sums advanced to meet the current necessities of the service, appears to be both just and proper.

We can find no warrant of law for this present practice, but, on the contrary, section 856 of the Revised Statutes seems clearly to indicate that the fees and expenses of all court officers are reimbursable and only payable after settlement of the accounts therefor.

In the last appropriation act passed by Congress was incorporated a provision wisely prohibiting an advance of more than \$300,000 of the \$675,000 appropriated for these services for the year 1889.

We are of opinion that nothing should be advanced; but if the practice is to be continued the sum of \$100,000 would be ample to meet all emergencies, and this, judiciously distributed, would perhaps insure the Government against loss.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. The paper just read is also contained in Report No. 3, special session of the Senate, submitted to the Senate by Mr. COCKRELL, March 28, 1889, from the Select Committee to Examine the Methods of Conducting Business in the Executive Departments (page 58).

I hope the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] will accept that amendment. It seems to be approved by the Treasury Department.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a paper without date and so far as I can see it is without signature.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. I have here the letter of the First Auditor, Mr. George P. Fisher, dated March 10, 1890, transmitted to me by the Secretary of the Treasury, in which letter that paper is inclosed. The First Auditor says:

I inclose for your consideration a copy of the report bearing upon the accountability of marshals and clerks, and suggesting some changes in the present practices of the Department, which was prepared in my office some time ago and transmitted to the Secretary for his appropriate action. I shall be glad to render any further service in my power either to yourself or your committee, to the end that some measures may be adopted to correct an evil which has become a national scandal.

The letter of Mr. Fisher, the Auditor, was first transmitted to the Secretary of the Treasury and then by the Secretary of the Treasury transmitted to me, so I got it through the regular channel.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems that the Auditor who has the first guess at auditing the accounts, but who does not have the last guess—the Comptroller has that—has written a letter. Now, I do not understand that it is in the shape of an official document which has ever received the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. And, if it is, these are appropriations for the Department of Justice, and I will say to the gentleman from North Carolina that last Congress we went into this matter fully, and we did include the proviso that there should not be more than \$400,000—

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. Three hundred thousand dollars for the year ending June 30, 1889, and \$400,000 this year. I would like to know why the gentleman has increased the amount \$100,000 this year.

Mr. CANNON. I think it was \$400,000 last year. I will see in a moment. Yes, it was \$400,000 last year. My friend is mistaken.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. I have not looked at the statute, but I took it for granted that the report was correct. The report says it was \$300,000.

Mr. CANNON. This proviso is exactly the same as was passed in the last Congress. We inquired about it, and, while it was not recommended, the official who came up from the Department of Justice said it seemed to him that a continuation of the provision might result in economy and closer administration. Therefore we put it in; but they insisted that the \$400,000 ought to go on if they were to proceed without very considerable embarrassment.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. I want to know if the gentleman is positive that this has not been increased from \$300,000 to \$400,000.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes; there is no doubt about that.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For fees of United States commissioners and justices of the peace acting as United States commissioners, \$100,000. And no part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used to pay any fees to United States commissioners, marshals, clerks for any warrant issued or arrest made, or other fees in prosecutions under the internal-revenue laws, unless the prosecution has been commenced upon a sworn complaint setting forth the facts constituting the offense and alleging them to be within the personal knowledge of the affiant, or upon sworn complaint by a collector or deputy collector of internal revenue or revenue agent, setting forth the facts upon information and belief and approved either before or after such arrest by a circuit or district judge or the attorney of the United States in the district where the offense is alleged to have been committed or the indictment is found.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of line 3, page 92, the following: "Provided, That in each case where such prosecution has been approved by the district attorney, as herein required, he shall make out a written statement of the grounds upon which he rests such approval, and shall send a copy of the same to the Attorney-General."

Mr. CANNON. I make the point of order that that changes existing law.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. I hope the gentleman will allow me to explain the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. It is getting late; still if the gentleman desires to do so I will allow him to make his explanation.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. All I want is to put upon record the opinion of the Attorney-General in favor of this amendment.

Mr. CANNON. I must insist upon the point of order.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. Then I ask leave to print the statement of the Attorney-General.

Mr. CANNON. I am perfectly willing that should be done, and I do not want to shut off the gentleman's statement if he wishes to make it; but I notify him that I must make the point of order.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. This is approved in express terms by the Attorney-General in a letter dated April 20, 1890, from which I will ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The second section, I think, is right, but I would make one further provision, and that is that in every case where the prosecution has not been approved before the warrant issues, but is approved by the district attorney afterward, he shall make up a written statement of the grounds upon which he rests such approval, and send a copy of the same to the Attorney-General.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. Now, bearing upon that subject, I want to quote from the report of Attorney-General Miller to the present Congress, and I will ask the Clerk to read what the Attorney-General says right there.

The Clerk read as follows:

From a number of judges, as well as from other sources, comes the information that very great abuses arise out of the action of commissioners of the circuit courts in the amount of fees they make and charge for themselves, as well as those which they assist the marshals, and, in some cases, district attorneys, in making. Whether it is practicable to eliminate entirely the excessive charges in the enormous bills of expense in proceedings had before these commissioners is perhaps doubtful; but certainly Congress, by enacting a clear and definite fee-bill for such proceedings and by providing that no prosecutions shall be commenced, except in an emergency shown in an affidavit, until the district attorney shall have approved of the commencement of such proceedings, and by prescribing severe punishment for any violations of the laws so enacted, can do much to repress these abuses and relieve the treasury from illegal exactions.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, just one remark further. I want to have read the opinion of the First Auditor on this same question, which will be found in the letter dated March 10, 1890.

The Clerk read as follows:

Section 2 of the bill, requiring the approval of the district attorney of all warrants in internal revenue cases, is already embodied in the appropriation act for the current fiscal year, and although no perceptible diminution of the number of internal-revenue cases has resulted by reason of its enactment, I have no doubt that it is a wise and wholesome restraint and should be retained.

I would, however, recommend the amendment of the existing requirement and also of section 2 of the bill, so as to provide for the approval of the district attorney or his assistant, in writing, of all warrants issued by United States commissioners before the arrest, except in cases in which the delay in obtaining such previous approval might result in the escape of the supposed offender, which last fact should be clearly shown by the commissioner. It seems to me a very useless requirement to make of the district attorney, to approve the issuance of a warrant, after the party has been arrested and, in many instances, after he himself has earned his fee in the case.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. I hope the point of order will not be insisted upon, as I know by experience that unless this amendment can be adopted now the legislation desired will fail. It is conceded that the amendment is in the line of good legislation, but it is insisted upon that it ought not to be tacked on to this bill. I do not know how else to get the proposition agreed to. For more than five years I have been diligently striving, in season and out of season, to secure favorable action by Congress upon many measures which I have formulated and devised for the relief of the citizen from injustice and oppression and to protect the Treasury from spoliation.

This section of this bill which the Clerk has just read is the latter part of section 2 of a bill—H. R. 5931, first session of the Fiftieth Congress—which passed this House on my motion on February 7, 1888. The whole of said bill was made a part of the Mills tariff bill, and was adopted by the House of Representatives when that bill passed a few months later. The Mills bill also contained a number of other provisions draughted by me and contained in other bills introduced by me, intended to repeal burdensome laws upon the tax-payer and to ameliorate and remove obnoxious and annoying features of the internal-revenue laws. The sections of the Mills bill to which I allude are 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 40.

I refer also to the bill "to modify the internal-revenue system of legislation," etc., which on my motion was considered by the House on March 3, 1887, and which failed to pass, a two-thirds vote being required, although the yeas were 139 and the nays were 112. There are many other gentlemen who have been quite as earnest as I have been to secure the enactment of similar legislation. All things, they say, come to him who waits, unless perchance he is a Representative in Congress. The section under consideration would not now be a law if the Committee on Appropriations had not consented to insert it in the sundry civil appropriation bill, and the amendment which I have just offered, approved by the Attorney-General and by the Secretary of the Treasury, will stand no chance for consideration in any other form by the Fifty-first Congress.

Nearly all the propositions I have mentioned have passed the House of Representatives several times. Two of them were enacted into law by the Fiftieth Congress, and one or two more may succeed in becoming law before this Congress adjourns. All the others will fail, because the business of Congress is so conducted that it is almost impossible for any measure of general importance to be safely engineered through the House and the Senate unless it is contained in some bill which is cordially approved by the Committee on Appropriations or by the Committee on Ways and Means. If either of these committees is determined that any measure shall pass, it is almost sure to become a law. I regret that the point of order will rule out my amendment.

Mr. CANNON. I only say that this may be proper legislation presented, but I do not know about it. I make the point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point of order well taken. The Clerk read as follows:

The payment of such miscellaneous expenses as may be authorized by the Attorney-General, including the employment of janitors and watchmen in rooms or buildings rented for the use of courts, and of interpreters, experts, and stenographers; of furnishing and collecting evidence where the United States is or may be a party in interest, and moving of records, \$140,000.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I move to strike out that section providing that miscellaneous expenses may be authorized by the Attorney-General.

I do so for the purpose, Mr. Chairman, of calling the attention of the committee to the section of the bill which gives an appropriation for the judiciary department of the Government. It amounts to \$3,606,000, and of course there will be a deficiency. There always has been and there always will be and practically there is no control over this expenditure.

The Attorney-General himself can not control it under our system, and Congress will not pass the necessary limitations, as we have just seen, which this Attorney-General has asked and which his predecessor asked. We grant over \$900,000 for the fees of witnesses, and over \$600,000 for jurors' fees, and without any real control over it; and it is one of the means by which much injustice is done to the private citizen.

Under the internal-revenue laws it produces in a small way almost innumerable frauds, and a corruption that is growing into the very courts of justice themselves, and producing a good deal of arbitrary oppression. Now, I do not know that there is any remedy for it; but certainly it is getting worse every year instead of getting better. Expenditures grow larger; not much larger, but they are expenditures which ought not to grow any larger. There is field for real reform here, and no man seems to be willing to undertake the labor of it. A change from the fee system to the salary system would at once change the whole mode of action now in vogue in prosecutions in our courts.

Now, in cases where the Federal law is violated and there are prosecutions for it, the simple change from the fee system to the salary system would reduce the number of prosecutions probably 60 per cent., reduce the expense of these particular branches of the judiciary expenditure perhaps 60 per cent., and would relieve the Federal courts of the unjust, but very widespread suspicion that some of the court officials are in combination with marshals and other officers in making unnecessary fees in frivolous and oppressive prosecutions.

I do not desire to do more than call attention to two points: First, that there will inevitably be a deficiency in this item and, second, that this bill perpetuates all the evils of the system which have grown up, and these evils are extremely numerous. I offered the amendment simply for the purpose of calling attention to it and to express the hope that the gentleman who is at the head of the Committee on Appropriations or the gentlemen who are on the Committee on the Judiciary may, after taking a clear view of this matter from one of these

committees, report some well considered bill which would change our system, a system which is so oppressive and so expensive.

I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. OATES. Mr. Chairman, I do not know who controls the time. Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. You can renew the amendment.

Mr. OATES. I renew the amendment.

I merely wish to say, in relation to the statement made by the gentleman from Kentucky respecting the present fee system of compensation of United States court officials, that, being a member of the Committee on the Judiciary detailed specially for the purpose of investigating the abuses in that connection, I can safely assure the House that the Judiciary Committee will soon report a bill which the investigation has shown to be absolutely necessary in the way of a wholesome reform and to change the fee system, not only in respect to the compensation of the district attorneys, but of many others of the court officials—the marshal and probably the commissioners also, and the clerks of the courts, perhaps, as well. I can agree with the gentleman from Kentucky that there is no way of reforming these abuses which now exist under the system, because they are largely due to the defects of the system itself; but I think it is a thing assured that before the expiration of this Congress—if not at this session, early in the next—the House will have an opportunity to pass such a reformatory measure.

The Clerk read as follows:

For printing and binding for Congress, including the proceedings and debates, \$806,000. And printing and binding for Congress chargeable to this appropriation, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress, within the fiscal year for which this appropriation is made (all reserve work shall be bound in sheep); and the heads of the Executive Departments, before transmitting their annual reports to Congress, the printing of which is chargeable to this appropriation, shall cause the same to be carefully examined, and shall exclude therefrom all matter, including engravings, maps, drawings, and illustrations, except such as they shall certify in their letters transmitting such reports to be necessary and to relate entirely to the transaction of public business.

Mr. BYNUM. I desire to offer the following proviso to come in at line 9, page 95.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert the following after the word "business," on page 95, line 9: "Provided, That no money appropriated by this or the preceding paragraph or by this act shall be paid to any person employed in the Public Printing Office for or during any time such employee is on leave of absence with pay under existing law in excess of the pay allowed during such leave of absence, nor shall any such person receive pay for leave of absence during the time such person may be at work and receive pay therefor. And provided further, That no money appropriated under said paragraph or under this act shall be paid to any person for work or labor performed in excess of eight hours a day, as prescribed by existing law, unless such labor in excess of eight hours a day is performed on the daily proceedings of Congress, when extra labor could not be procured in time for the publication of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the morning succeeding the daily sessions of Congress."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, to that amendment I make the point of order that it changes existing law and is not in order.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to call the attention of my colleague from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] to the fact that this was one of the provisions that I had in mind when I expressed a desire for general debate, and I claim the right to the floor now for general debate under that demand.

Mr. CANNON. I do not want to legislate upon this bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. This is not legislation; this is to carry out the law.

Mr. CANNON. The law carries itself out.

Mr. SPRINGER. Not under this Administration.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I must make the point of order upon the amendment.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to be heard upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] has the floor.

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Chairman, on the point of order I desire to say that this amendment does not change any existing law; it does not modify any existing law, nor does it provide for any new legislation.

Mr. CANNON. Then what is the use of it?

Mr. BYNUM. The use of it is simply to compel, as we have heretofore done upon appropriation bills, officers of the Government to obey existing laws which they are violating. That is the object of it.

Mr. CANNON. That is to say, if an officer of the Government does not obey the law, if you pass the law over again he will obey it. Is that it?

Mr. BYNUM. No, that is not it. In the Forty-ninth Congress we provided for granting a leave of absence of fifteen days to employes in the Government Printing Office, and I think that every member of this Congress who was here at the time supported that law heartily, because the clerks in the other Departments were then receiving thirty days' annual leave of absence with pay, while no leave was given to the employes of the Government Printing Office, and it was generally conceded by every one that they needed the rest more than the employes of any other Department. Therefore, fifteen days' leave of absence was granted to them almost if not quite unanimously; and then, following that, in the Fiftieth Congress, fifteen days more was granted,

placing the Government printing employes upon an equality in that respect with the employes in all the other Departments.

While it is true that it was intended to grant a leave of thirty days to employes in the Government Printing Office with pay, I do not think a single member of Congress ever intended that those employes should receive double pay during the time of their "leave;" yet some of them have received it. That certainly was not the spirit in which the law was passed; that was not the purpose for which it was enacted. It was passed, first, to give those employes a sufficient leave of absence for rest during a certain season, the same as was given to other Government clerks. It was passed probably, in the second place, for the purpose of giving other persons, printers and others, who did not have employment, an opportunity to find work during that brief period. Now, the present Public Printer is not enforcing that law. Upon the contrary, he is violating not only the spirit but the letter of the law by working these employes during the time of their leave of absence and paying them for the work as well as compensation for their leave.

If that is the object of the leave, I am opposed to it. If we are not paying sufficient wages to the employes in this office, let us increase their wages; but do not leave it in the hands of the Government Printer to allow double pay for thirty days during the year to favorite employes, a thing which I am informed he has done and is doing. The Public Printer who preceded the present one held that he could not do that. When any employe approached him and said, "I desire to work during my leave of absence if you will pay me for the work and also for the time of my leave," the former Public Printer replied, "I can not do it; the law does not allow me to do it;" but when the present Public Printer is approached by an employe who makes the same request he does agree to do that, and he has, in several instances, paid the employes both for the work and for the time.

Now, this amendment is intended to put an end to that practice. It does not change existing law; it only provides that the existing law shall be carried out. And the same is true of the amendment as to the eight-hour law.

Mr. OATES. What is the language of the law with reference to this leave of absence?

Mr. BYNUM. These employes are given a leave of absence for thirty days with pay. I can not quote the language, but that is the substance of it.

Mr. OATES. Does the Public Printer violate the law when he lets them work?

Mr. BYNUM. I think he does. I think the law for granting the leave of absence means that they shall take their leave and be paid for the time; not that they shall take no leave, but shall work during the time and shall receive double pay.

Mr. OATES. Very likely the gentleman states the intention of the law correctly, but I suggest to my friend whether it would not be well to define clearly just what was intended by that law.

Mr. BYNUM. Well, this amendment proposes that when they work during the time of their leave they shall not receive double pay. It requires them to take their leave and thereby give an opportunity for some other employe to work during the time of their absence.

Mr. OATES. Your amendment is intended to make that clear?

Mr. BYNUM. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. The law does not require an employe to take his leave, but it says that he may have leave and may receive pay the same as if he were at work; but the Public Printer has construed that to allow him to give a man formal leave and then keep him at work and allow him double pay.

Mr. OATES. I think the principle is all wrong, but I would not single out the employes of any one Department.

Mr. BYNUM. There is no other Department in which this practice prevails.

Mr. OATES. The leave of absence, I think, is applicable to all the Departments.

Mr. BYNUM. But the employes are required to take their leave in the other Departments.

Mr. OATES. They ought never to have been given leave with pay, but I would not make the rule applicable to this particular Department when it is not applied to others.

Mr. BYNUM. I am not stopping to discuss that question. In the other Departments, as I understand, employes are required to take their leave in order to secure pay for the leave. In short, they are not allowed double pay in any other Department. Nor were they allowed double pay in the Government Printing Office until the present Public Printer so applied the law.

Now, with regard to the eight-hour law, the very same principle comes up. The law provides that eight hours shall constitute a day's work. We passed a provision on an appropriation bill in the last Congress requiring the Public Printer to enforce the eight-hour law. Some complaints had been made by Mr. Benedict to the effect that it was impossible to enforce the law, and there was complaint by the typographical union, who appealed to Congress on the subject, and, as gentlemen will recollect, the O'Neill amendment was ingrafted on the appropriation bill, requiring the Public Printer to enforce the eight-hour law.

In the Government Printing Office we pay ample wages to enable

printers there, even by piecework, to earn good wages during a day of eight hours. In fact, they earn much better wages when they work by the piece than when they work by the day. The typographical union has been here asking Congress to pass a law restoring the rate of wages for daily labor to \$4 instead of \$3.20, for a day of eight hours. But good printers working by the piece are able to earn more than \$4 a day.

It is very true, as many printers and employes of that office have said to me, that there are some men in all Departments who are not content with their share. The object of the eight-hour system is first to establish eight hours as a day's labor, to carry that principle through all the Departments of the Government. And one special reason for applying this principle to Government employes is the influence which it will have throughout the country. I do not doubt that a great majority of the members here are honestly in favor of the establishment of the eight-hour system. I repeat that one important object in enforcing this system in all the Departments of the Government where it can be is because of its influence with regard to labor throughout the country.

For this reason labor organizations have come to Congress desiring the establishment of this system in all the Departments of the Government wherever possible. And they are now asking that there be incorporated in all Government contracts for the construction of public buildings a provision requiring of the contractors that all such work shall be conducted on the eight-hour basis. I heartily favor this, because I believe the Government ought to take the lead in this matter and establish wherever it can be done the eight-hour system, paying good wages for a day's work of eight hours.

And whenever an employe in the Government Printing Office earns a good salary by working eight hours a day, I say he ought to be required to stop there, and give an opportunity for the employment of some of the idle labor upon the outside. But there are men there who want to work twelve, fourteen, or sixteen hours a day, earning \$5 to \$8 a day, as some of them do, while a large number of working people are forced to remain idle.

The whole object of this amendment is to require these men to take their leave if they get pay for it—to require the men who are employed to work so far as practicable upon the eight-hour basis. In this amendment I have provided one exception, which I think will be found necessary. In printing the daily proceedings of Congress it is probable the Government Printer would not be able to find idle printers to be called in during the evening or night to assist in setting up the RECORD. Hence, in the amendment I have provided this exception: that in the printing of the daily proceedings, if extra labor can not be supplied, the regular employes may work more than eight hours and receive pay accordingly.

The proposition I have submitted is in accord with the sentiments of the members of the Federation of Labor, who presented to the President a short time ago a statement of the evil influences and effects of the continual violation, by the officers of the Government, of this law which has been on the statute-book ever since 1868. They have called the President's attention to the fact that in the Government Printing Office this law is violated with impunity and have asked the President to take some action in regard to the enforcement of the law.

Not only has this law been on the statute-books since 1868, but, during the last Congress, as I have already stated, we ingrafted upon an appropriation bill a provision requiring the Government Printer to enforce it. The present incumbent violated it with impunity and ignores both the law and the instructions to enforce it. I have offered this amendment, providing that no money shall be paid under this appropriation except in accordance with the provisions of law. The amendment is not open to objection, so far as the rules of the House are concerned or so far as regards the merit and the propriety of the proposition.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a word on the point of order. This provision does change existing law or there is no necessity for it. The gentleman alleges—whether such is the fact or not, I do not know; I have no reason to say it is not so—he alleges that the Public Printer employs people in his establishment during their thirty days' leave of absence. Now, the Public Printer can not do that and have his accounts audited at the Treasury Department unless there is law for it. Then, if there is a law for it, this changes it. The bare statement of the proposition argues it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Does the gentleman from Illinois mean to say that the fact that an auditor passes an account is conclusive proof that there is a law to justify the auditor in so doing?

Mr. CANNON. So far as the machinery of Congress has provided to settle these cases, yes.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. But the bare fact that an auditor passes an account can not be conclusive proof that the auditor is infallible or that there is law for it. It may turn out that he was acting in combination with somebody else to produce an unwarranted result or his decision may involve a mistake.

Mr. CANNON. Congress has provided a tribunal to audit these accounts. Who? First, the Auditor and then the First or Second Comptroller. In practice, the Public Printer draws the money from the public Treasury and pays for this labor; but he can not settle his accounts or discharge his bond until first the Auditor has passed upon his accounts and second the Comptroller. That is the court of last resort

that Congress has provided to construe the law and settle the accounts. Now the gentleman claims that under the law as enforced to-day the Public Printer is employing people during their thirty days' leave and paying them. If that is true, the law is that way and his provision changes the law.

Again the statutes of the United States declare that eight hours shall constitute a day's work. This provision repeals that law in part, because the gentleman now proposing this amendment in the name of the eight-hour law, and professing to be the friend of labor, in the latter part of the amendment authorizes the Public Printer to employ people more than eight hours, another change of law.

Now, I make the point of order for this reason: The House of Representatives has said to the Committee on Appropriations and to the Committee of the Whole, "You shall not report—you shall not have the power to report or consider legislation in connection with the appropriation bills." My own opinion was that that rule ought to be changed, and I made an effort to get it changed, that we might investigate and that we might within certain limits legislate upon appropriation bills. But the House of Representatives refused to make the change and we have not investigated it. Now the gentleman from Indiana, and perchance other gentlemen, notwithstanding the rule of the House, want to come in here and move amendments changing existing law. Against that I protest. If the law needs a change here is the Committee on Printing, which has jurisdiction and is a privileged committee for many purposes, to which such matters should be referred. Let the committee consider and let it report what legislation, if any, is needed.

Mr. OATES. Suppose the law is silent and the accounts of the Public Printer are presented for audit in just such a case as that suggested here by the gentleman from Indiana—I do not know anything of the facts—

Mr. CANNON. Neither do I.

Mr. OATES. But in such a case, if the law is silent and the Auditor sees proper to pass the accounts, seeing that they are for work honestly performed for the Government, though it might embrace payments to men for a portion of the time when they were allowed leave of absence, the gentleman from Illinois holds, as I understand him, that that makes the law?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. The statute places in the hands of the Comptroller the power to construe the various acts of Congress touching public expenditures, and his construction is just as much the law as when the court construes it. He is the court.

Mr. PETERS. But he has no discretion to go outside of the law.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly not.

Mr. OATES. Then you hold that, although the law may not be specific, yet it is sufficient to authorize the payment, if the Auditor so finds. I doubt that.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely. If the gentleman's statement is correct (of which, as I have said, I have no knowledge), I hold that his amendment works a change of law.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. BLOUNT. I understood him to say that he tried to change that rule in this Congress. I do not think the report of the debates discloses any efforts on the part of the gentleman; and I would like to know where he made the effort.

Mr. CANNON. Well, perhaps I was a little too broad in the statement. I say that I advocated the change.

Mr. BLOUNT. At some other place. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. No; at this place.

Mr. BLOUNT. Well, then, before some other body than this.

Mr. CANNON. I have been at all times desirous of such a change, and in this body.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard for a few moments on the point of order.

On the 16th of February, 1888, when the sundry civil bill was pending in Committee of the Whole, a member from Missouri, Mr. O'Neill, moved the adoption of the following amendment:

The Public Printer is hereby directed to rigidly enforce the provisions of the eight-hour law in the department under his charge.

Thereupon the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Burnes, in charge of the bill, made the point of order that the amendment proposed a change of existing law and was new legislation. The Chairman of the committee at that time—

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Who was he?

A MEMBER. Mr. SPRINGER. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. No, it was not, but it was a good decision, anyway. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. If it was the gentleman from Illinois, he knows all about it, for we have never had a better parliamentarian. If he made the decision I know it is a good one; and if it was made by anybody else and he indorses it I am satisfied that it must be reliable.

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not happen to find the name here, but I will

find it and state it afterwards. I will read, however, what the Chairman said:

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Burnes] to cite the statute in reference to this matter. The gentleman seems to admit with his colleague that there is an eight-hour law applying to this class of labor.

And further on, after an interruption:

The Chair understood the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Burnes], in charge of the bill, to raise the question of order on the ground that the amendment offered by his colleague changed existing law. The Chair now understands him to admit that it does not change existing law, and if it does not the Chair would not feel disposed to exclude it.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I move the adoption of the amendment.

After some debate had been had upon the bill the amendment was adopted by the committee and reported to the House and a ye-and-nay vote was ordered upon it; and on the 17th of February, 1888, this was adopted—yeas 182, nays 53; and in the affirmative on that amendment I find the name of my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON].

So that he voted at that time—

That the Public Printer is hereby directed to rigidly enforce the provisions of the eight-hour law in the department under his charge.

Now, since that proposition was passed the Public Printer has refused to enforce the eight-hour law in the spirit which this House understands that law, namely, that eight hours, as the law says, shall constitute one day's work. Notwithstanding that fact, the Public Printer is now paying perhaps half of the employees in that department by piece, and by the hour, to work from ten to twelve and sometimes sixteen hours out of the twenty-four, and they are paid by the hour for those hours.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Can he work piece hands on the eight-hour system? There is a practical printer's question, and you can get but one answer to it from Portland, Oregon, and San Francisco, to Portland, Me.

Mr. SPRINGER. I will answer that by saying that in the Printing Office the time required to do particular amounts of work is well understood.

Mr. FARQUHAR. You are complaining of this piece matter.

Mr. SPRINGER. So much time is allowed for each of these purposes, and the time is regulated by the office, under the office rules, and by the rules of the printers' union. But it is not on piecework that the complaint is made. It is on hour work; and will the gentleman say that under the rule the Public Printer is authorized to use this money to pay for more than eight hours' work? Will he answer that?

Mr. FARQUHAR. I will answer that question. The Committee on Labor investigated this matter, and as I am not chairman of that committee I do not want to say anything about the conclusions of the committee, but there were parties who appeared before the Committee on Labor on this eight-hour matter, and, as I remember, I asked the question of the practical printers—because of the complaint that had been made against the Public Printer—if it was possible to carry out the law in respect to piecework, and every practical printer before that committee said it was impossible to do it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Not in regard to piecework; but you have not answered the other question.

Mr. FARQUHAR. When you come to your hour hands you are in a different way, but this is not the city of New York, nor it is not the city of Chicago, nor St. Louis. You can not go out into your streets and get your men to fill up after your eight hours, nor you can not make a running schedule of your pay-roll. The Government is differently situated from that, and so the result is that—

Mr. SPRINGER. Is the gentleman making a speech now?

Mr. FARQUHAR. No; the gentleman is talking some genuine printer's sense.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman from New York always says something that is worth hearing.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I have no personal care about this thing at all, but I have heard a great many critics outside of the Government Printing Office criticise the present Printer, and they also criticised his predecessor, Mr. Benedict, but any practical printer who has had charge of one hundred or two hundred hands knows how impossible it is to do piecework under the eight-hour rule.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is the hour work that I am talking about.

Mr. FARQUHAR. About the hour work there is this trouble, that you can not get your months or weeks to run even on work with the matter that you pour into the Government Printing Office, and the result is that no Public Printer can do any differently than the foreman there has done, in regulating the time of the men and numbers employed.

Mr. TURNER, of New York. Did not the delegation which appeared before the committee of which the gentleman from New York and myself were both members find a great deal of fault about this very evil that the gentleman from Indiana aims at in his amendment, and did they not say that he repeatedly employed men, when there was no necessity for it, to do piecework, and that they were employed for ten and twelve hours by the hour?

Mr. FARQUHAR. I do not mean to criticise the general objections

that were made at that time, but when they were before the committee I asked those who were most emphatic in their complaint—I asked the question positively of one of them, could he run the office any better than it was run now under the eight-hour system, and how he would regulate it, and he could not answer the question. Neither could any practical printer answer it. You have got to enact the restoration of wages bill, and you have got to put your men on a different footing in the Printing Office before you can work your eight-hour law, or else the Government work must stay behind.

Mr. TURNER, of New York. Did not this same delegation, which came from the Federation of Labor in this District, say that there were plenty of printers who could be had here in this city at any time if there was any extra rush of work?

Mr. FARQUHAR. I would answer that just as Mr. Benedict and the present Public Printer, Mr. Palmer, answered it, by saying that they had not been found.

Mr. TURNER, of New York. Did not that delegation say so?

Mr. FARQUHAR. It is utterly impossible to do in the city of Washington as you could do in the city of New York or in the city of Chicago. In the city of Washington there are not the number of printers to call upon.

Mr. TURNER, of New York. I want you to state, as a member of the Committee on Labor, what the delegation coming from those printers said to the Committee on Labor.

Mr. CANNON. Why does not the gentleman [Mr. TURNER], who is a member of this Committee on Labor, report, in his own time, some legislation instead of trying to put it on this bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. The point I wish to make in regard to this question of order is that this proposition is in order for another reason. It is there stated that no money appropriated by this act shall be paid for any time in excess of eight hours a day or paid for any time when they are getting leave-pay. Now it is in order for this purpose to limit the purposes of the appropriation. We can say for what purpose any money, under this bill, shall be appropriated, and can withhold it from any other purpose than that for which we say it shall go.

The CHAIRMAN. It provides for payment in excess of eight hours.

Mr. SPRINGER. That it shall not be paid for any work performed in excess of eight hours.

The CHAIRMAN. It provides that it shall be paid in excess of eight hours for certain kinds of work. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken.

Mr. BYNUM. I will strike out the latter clause, if that is objectionable.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order on the other ground.

Mr. SPRINGER. Now, I move to strike out the last word of this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that at the time when the O'Neill matter was pending the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS] denounced the Public Printer, Mr. Benedict, for failing to carry out the eight-hour law.

Mr. McCOMAS. I am in favor of it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Why do you not carry it out?

Mr. McCOMAS. I am in favor of carrying it out.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; but in place of the present Public Printer carrying it out, with respect to more than two-thirds of his employes he has failed to obey that law; and personally I am in favor of anything that will enforce it absolutely.

I want to state that after the O'Neill amendment was passed Mr. Benedict did obey that law and continued to obey it as long as he remained in office and that it has been violated since the present Public Printer came in.

Mr. FARQUHAR. For how long did Mr. Benedict carry it out?

Mr. SPRINGER. Until he went out of office.

Mr. FARQUHAR. It was stated by his own foreman that he did not carry it out.

Mr. SPRINGER. I state that he did carry it out.

Mr. FARQUHAR. And, more than that, I say that he could not do it if he would.

Mr. SPRINGER. But I say that he did carry it out.

Mr. FARQUHAR. For not more than thirty days.

Mr. SPRINGER. I say that anybody who says he can not carry out a law of Congress should resign and not be allowed to hold such an office. It is no excuse for gentlemen to say that we can not enforce the laws of Congress. It is only for Congress to state that it must be done and it will be done.

Mr. McCOMAS. I want to say that if you ask the foreman of the Public Printing Office he will tell you that Mr. Benedict did not enforce that law.

Mr. SPRINGER. I know that the gentleman from Maryland did say that the Public Printer, Mr. Benedict, did not observe that law, and that he could have observed it if he had wanted to do so. Mr. Benedict, when he first came into office, simply followed the precedents until Congress compelled him to execute the law, and he executed it until he went out of office.

Mr. McCOMAS. His foreman will deny that.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is in order for this House to say that no money shall be paid under this bill for any unlawful purpose. I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. BYNUM. I desire to offer the same amendment with the exception stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers the amendment previously offered, but strikes out the proviso.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let it be read, then.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert following after the word "business," on page 95, line 9:

"Provided, That no money appropriated by this or the preceding paragraph, or by this act, shall be paid to any person employed in the Public Printing Office for or during any time such employe is on leave of absence with pay, under existing law, in excess of the pay allowed during such leave of absence; nor shall any such person receive pay for leave of absence during the time such person may be at work and receive pay therefor: And provided further, That no money appropriated under said paragraphs or under this act shall be paid to any person for work or labor performed in excess of eight hours a day, as prescribed by existing law."

Mr. CANNON. I renew my point of order to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SPRINGER. Upon that ruling I desire to appeal. I want simply to state that would rule that this bill may appropriate money for violating the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the committee?

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to debate that. I do not think it ought to stand. [Laughter.] I want to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to state in explanation of this amendment that it simply provides that no money shall be paid under this bill in violation of law, and the Chair by ruling out this amendment says that you can use this money for purposes prohibited by general law already. Now, as a fact, there is a law on the statute-book that says eight hours shall constitute a day's work. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR] says that it is impossible to enforce this on piecework. I say that the Printing Office has certain working hours and other certain hours. The Public Printer has the key and can open the doors and close them at his will, so that those employed can go out when the eight hours have expired, and they can not stop there a moment unless he is willing that they shall stay there. The work is to be done at the Printing Office, and eight hours is to constitute a day's work.

The gentleman claims under the point of order that you can use money for the purpose of paying for sixteen hours' work performed. That not only means that when the law says he may be entitled to a leave of absence for thirty days that he may receive full pay for thirty days as if at work, but the Public Printer may allow him thirty days' leave and then employ him and let him work through the same thirty days and pay him extra for those thirty days, which is paying him double for the work done. That is in violation of law and against the spirit of this law. This amendment was simply for the purpose of saying that in reporting an appropriation of this kind no money shall be used by the Public Printer to pay a person in excess of the time when legal work can be performed, and also for time that the person was assumed to be, and legally was, on leave of absence and not at work at all.

So that under both features of this amendment, for the reason that it is to prevent this money from being used contrary to law and for the reason that it is the province of this House and of Congress to direct the objects and the purposes for which any and all appropriations are made, it is in order. And, with all due respect to the Chair, I hope this decision will not stand as the judgment of the committee. I hope that this committee will not say that the Public Printer may violate the eight-hour law and the leave-of-absence law at will and that we will sustain him in it. I hope my eloquent friend from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS], who says he is in favor of the eight-hour law and who so fiercely denounced Mr. Benedict for doing what this Public Printer is now doing, will vote to enforce that law.

Mr. McCOMAS. I will vote for the proposition in another form.

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this appeal, with all due respect to the Chair, for the purpose of ascertaining the sentiment of the committee upon the correctness of the ruling. It strikes me that this amendment does not in any respect or any particular conflict with the rules of the House. It is in plain words and provides for nothing except the enforcement of existing laws. The present law for leave of absence certainly means that the employes shall have a leave of absence and shall receive pay for the time of the leave.

The eight-hour law applies to the Government Printing Office just the same as to any other Department. There is no exception made by the law. If the law is deficient in that respect it ought to be amended. I have before me the address made by Mr. Denham, the president of the Federation of Labor Unions of the District of Columbia, to the President of the United States on the 27th day of May last, in which, calling attention to the violation of the eight-hour law, he says:

"We instance at the present time the Government Printing Office, where employes are required and allowed to make over-time."

Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR] speaks of the

difficulty of enforcing the eight-hour law with the men employed on piecework. Does not the very same difficulty arise in granting those men their thirty days' leave of absence? Yet every man who works piecework gets his thirty days' leave of absence. It is just as difficult to give a man whose work is piecework his thirty days' leave of absence as it is to require him to work only eight hours a day. The eight-hour law was enforced by Mr. Benedict when he was Public Printer, probably not up to the full extent of the law, but it was enforced much more rigidly than ever was done before or has been since his time.

I remember that Mr. Benedict did make some complaint about it, but nevertheless he went to work and enforced the law as faithfully as he could and complaints ceased, and the foreman of one of the divisions in the office told me that by the enforcement of the eight-hour law he was enabled to give extra work to a large number of men who were out of employment and who needed the work very badly; and that was one of the objects of the law.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. If the law requires that eight hours shall constitute a day's labor and the piecework can not be so arranged as to make a day of eight hours, is it not a violation of law for the Public Printer to continue to give piecework instead of paying his men by the day?

Mr. FARQUHAR. There is a bill now before Congress to provide for employing all the men equally on the same basis, and if that bill were passed and extra compensation made for night work there would not be any trouble at the Government Printing Office in regard to the eight-hour question. No man stands on this floor who is a better friend of the eight-hour law than I am. I have been its friend since 1866. I walked in the first procession of workmen demanding the eight-hour law, and I will walk in the last, probably.

Mr. SPRINGER. Well, walk in the procession here now. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYNUM. This is the first time I have ever heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR] assert upon this floor that the eight-hour law could not be enforced. I remember that when the amendment of Mr. O'Neill was ingrafted upon the appropriation bill the gentleman from New York was silent as to the difficulty of enforcing it, and this is the first time that he has come forward to say that it can not be enforced.

Mr. FARQUHAR. When Mr. O'Neill, with myself and others, agitated upon this floor in favor of the enforcement of the eight-hour law, it was to get the law enforced where it could be enforced, but I never said that it could be enforced in piecework, and I know it can not.

Mr. BYNUM. There was no qualification made in regard to that.

Mr. SPRINGER. Can not the Public Printer define the hours when the office shall be opened and when it shall be closed, and can not the law be enforced in that way?

Mr. FARQUHAR. Well, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] is so much of an amateur printer that I can not well answer his question. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. I have been in a printing office and I know perhaps as much about it as some people who claim to know more.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in order to give my colleague, the eminent laborer from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], and the other eminent laborer from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] a chance to "mend their hold," I move the committee do now rise. [Laughter.]

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURROWS, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10884) making appropriation for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. FRANK. I move that the House do now adjourn.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Pending the motion to adjourn, leave of absence was granted as follows:

- To Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania, for the remainder of the week.
- To Mr. CUTCHEON, for two days.
- To Mr. CRAIG, for ten days.
- To Mr. MANSUR, till Wednesday next.
- To Mr. CONNELL, for the rest of this week.
- To Mr. COLEMAN, for about two weeks.
- To Mr. BARWIG, for this day.
- To Mr. LEHLBACH, for three days.
- To Mr. DIBBLE, for five days.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—FOREST FIRES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President; which was read, referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the information of Congress, with a view to securing such legislation as may be appropriate, a communication from the Secretary of the Interior relating to the destruction by fires, carelessly kindled or left, of the timber upon the public lands. If proper penalties were imposed by law and a few convictions thereunder secured, I do not doubt that much waste of our forests would be prevented.

BENJ. HARRISON.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, June 16, 1890.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same.

A bill (S. 3932) granting to the Chicago, Kansas and Nebraska Railway Company power to sell and convey to the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company all the railway, property, rights, and franchises of the Chicago, Kansas and Nebraska Railway Company in the Territory of Oklahoma and in the Indian Territory; and

A bill (H. R. 8152) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891.

The motion of Mr. FRANK was then agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

ALFRED B. MALLET VS. UNITED STATES.

Letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact by said the court in the case of Alfred B. Mallet against the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION FOR ARMY AND NAVY PENSIONS.

Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriations for Army and Navy pensions for the current fiscal year and urging immediate action thereon—to the Committee on Appropriations.

CLAIMS FOR ANTE-BELLUM MAIL SERVICE, ETC.

Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting certain claims arising under the postal laws and regulations of the Flint and Pèrre Marquette Railroad Company, and Pacific Mail Steam-Ship Company; also a list of claims for ante bellum mail service, together with a report thereon by the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department—to the Committee on Claims.

RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, the following resolutions were introduced and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTTERWORTH:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives meet on the 4th of July, at 11 o'clock a. m., and that said day be set apart and devoted to the celebration, by suitable exercises, of the adoption and promulgation of the Declaration of Independence.

Second. Resolved, That the Senate be invited to be present and participate in the exercises.

Third. Resolved, That the society of the Sons of the American Revolution be invited to attend the meeting of the House.

Fourth. Resolved, That a committee of nine members of the House be appointed by the Speaker to make suitable arrangements for carrying into effect the objects and purposes hereof;

to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby directed to have printed for the use of the House 3,000 copies of public act No. 145, entitled "An act to simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenues," approved June 10, 1890;

to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR:

Resolved, That on Wednesday, June 18, immediately after the reading of the Journal, the bankruptcy bill, No. 3316, reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, shall be considered in the House, and that on the succeeding day at 1 o'clock p. m. the previous question shall be considered as ordered and the vote on all pending amendments and on the passage of the bill shall be taken;

to the Committee on Rules.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk and disposed of as follows:

Mr. SIMONDS, from the Committee on Patents, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 10955) authorizing the Commissioner of Patents to refund money paid by mistake for Patent Office fees, accompanied by a report (No. 2458)—to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOLLIVER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 4451) for the removal of the charge of desertion from the record of Daniel Mahoney, accompanied by a report (No. 2459)—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 6852) for the relief of North Storms, accompanied by a report (No. 2460)—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PAYSON, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported favorably the bill of the Senate (S. 3817) for the protection of actual settlers who have made homestead or pre-emption entries upon the public lands of the United States in the State of Florida upon which

deposits of phosphate have been discovered since such entries were made, accompanied by a report (No. 2461)—to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on Elections, to which was referred the contested-election case of John M. Langston vs. E. C. Venable, from the Fourth Congressional district of the State of Virginia, reported the following resolutions, namely:

Resolved, That E. C. Venable was not elected a Representative of the Fifty-first Congress from the Fourth Congressional district of Virginia, and is not entitled to a seat therein.

Resolved, That John M. Langston was elected a Representative of Congress from the Fourth Congressional district of Virginia, and is entitled to a seat therein;

accompanied by a report (No. 2462).

Mr. O'FERRALL, on behalf of the minority of said committee, submitted their views in writing thereon; which report and resolutions, together with the views of the minority thereon, were ordered to be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and a joint resolution of the following titles were introduced, severally read twice, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTINE: A bill (H. R. 10970) for the enlargement and improvement of the United States mint and grounds at Carson City, Nev.—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 10971) to authorize the appointment of a board of review in certain cases—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYNUM: A bill (H. R. 10972) imposing punishment for counterfeiting, etc., trade-marks, labels, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: A bill (H. R. 11000) to amend an act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters," approved March 3, 1883—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STOCKBRIDGE: A joint resolution (H. Res. 179) continuing in effect chapter 1065 of the acts passed at the first session of the Fiftieth Congress—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. ANDREW: A bill (H. R. 10973) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Downing—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARTINE: A bill (H. R. 10974) granting a pension to Nathaniel Frost—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAYNE: A bill (H. R. 10975) for the relief of the officers and crews of the rams Lioness, T. D. Horner, Dick Fulton, Mingo, and Sampson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BYNUM: A bill (H. R. 10976) for the relief of H. Leiber & Co., Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHIPMAN: A bill (H. R. 10977) for the relief of Jane McNeil—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONGER: A bill (H. R. 10978) granting a pension to Mrs. Jennie B. Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULBERTSON, of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10979) for the relief of Louis A. Bright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUBOIS: A bill (H. R. 10980) to allow Hong Sling, a native of the Chinese Empire, to become a citizen of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENLOE: A bill (H. R. 10981) for the relief of Stephen Moore, administrator of William Hopper, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOUK: A bill (H. R. 10982) for the relief of Richard G. Sharp, of Little Barren, Tenn.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KERR, of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10983) granting a pension to Dennis Hogan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINSEY: A bill (H. R. 10984) for the relief of Henry Kortzendorfer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 10985) granting a pension to Isaac N. Jacobs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANSUR: A bill (H. R. 10986) to increase the pension of T. R. Dice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10987) granting a pension to Robert H. Metcalf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCCREARY: A bill (H. R. 10988) to increase the pension of H. S. Mayball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10989) to increase the pension of Martin V. Roark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10990) granting a pension to Sarah A. Phelps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 10991) for the relief of the estate of H. S. Simmons, deceased, of Franklin County, Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEWART, of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 10992) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary B. Floyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10993) for the relief of Benjamin F. Rogers—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VANDEVER: A bill (H. R. 10994) for the relief of James Otterson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 10995) for the relief of Pardon Worsley, his heirs or assigns—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILKINSON: A bill (H. R. 10996) for the relief of the estate of Hugh Montgomery, deceased, of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10997) for the relief of the estate of Samuel McC. Montgomery, deceased, of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 10998) for the relief of John C. Stretch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KERR, of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10999) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Susannah P. Swoope—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition for the passage of laws for the perpetuation of the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petition of John C. Stutch, for amendment of record, and to accompany bill for his relief—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BREWER: Papers relating to the pension claim of Mary B. Swift—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYNUM: Papers in the case of H. Leiber & Co., of Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: Petition of the heirs of Mrs. Hixey Parker, late of Warren County, Mississippi, for reference of claim to the Court of Claims under the provisions of the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHIPMAN: Petition of Fairbanks Post, Grand Army of the Republic, in behalf of Mrs. Jane McNeil—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONGER: Memorial of 13 ladies, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Minburn, Iowa, for legislation subjecting intoxicating liquors transported into a State to the laws thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 326 citizens and voters of Dallas County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 70 voters and 52 others of Minburn, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, remonstrance of 70 laboring men of Des Moines, Iowa, against proposed amendment to interstate-commerce law permitting the free transportation of barrels filled with petroleum—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, memorial of Prairie View Grange, No. 480, of Winterset, Iowa, consisting of 26 members, in favor of the Butterworth option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of same alliance in favor of the Conger lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 124 voters of Des Moines, Iowa, for prompt passage of bill subjecting intoxicating liquors transported into a State to the police regulations thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNELL: Petition of 75 teachers and superintendents of public schools of Lincoln, Nebr., in favor of an international copyright bill—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CULBERTSON, of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Cambridgeborough, Pa., asking for passage of House bill 5978, prohibiting the transportation of intoxicating liquors, etc.—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of sundry citizens of the Twenty-second Congressional district of Pennsylvania in favor of the passage of laws to perpetuate the national-banking system, etc.—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DE LANO: Petition for the passage of the Butterworth bill to prevent gambling in farm products and the Conger bill to regulate the sale of compound lard—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition for the passage of laws for the perpetuation of the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOCKERY: Petition of postal clerks at St. Joseph, Mo., asking for an increase of compensation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DORSEY: Resolutions of the Bluff Center Alliance, Hall County, Nebraska, asking for the passage of the Conger and Butterworth bills—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of the West Emerick Farmers' Alliance, of Emerick, Nebr., for same measures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the Mt. Olive Alliance, of Sherman County, Nebraska, for the same measures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Riverside Alliance, Ewing, Nebr., for same measures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of the Lincoln Alliance, of Knox County, Nebraska, for same measures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Farmers' Alliance, No. 1003, of Buffalo County, Nebraska, for same measures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Unity Alliance, No. 500, of Ansley, Nebr., for the same measures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of the Mt. Olive Alliance, of Sherman County, Nebraska, for the same measures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of the Birdwood Alliance, Nebraska, asking passage of same measures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DUBOIS: Petition of Judge H. P. Henderson, H. W. Smith, Mayor Frederick J. Kirsell, and numerous leading citizens of Ogden, Utah, asking that Hong Sling be allowed to become a citizen of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEAR: Petition of 118 citizens of Henry County, Iowa, praying for the passage of an act prohibiting the importation of intoxicating liquors into a State in contravention of the laws thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 225 citizens of Washington County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 47 citizens of Jefferson County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 70 citizens of Louisa County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIFFORD: Petition of citizens of Twin Brooks, Grant County, South Dakota, for the passage of a law prohibiting the importation of liquors into States adopting prohibition—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSBROUGH: Petition of citizens of Lisbon, Ransom County, North Dakota, for the passage of House bill 5978—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Caledonia, Traill County, North Dakota, for same measure—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Yorktown, Dickey County, North Dakota, for same measure—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HAYNES: Petitions of Sandusky Trade and Labor Assembly, favoring the passage of House bill 260, imposing a punishment for counterfeiting trade-marks, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also petition of 30 citizens of the Tenth district of Ohio, for Sabbath observance—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolutions of the Sandusky Township (Ohio) Farmers' Alliance, favoring the passage of the Conger lard bill and the Butterworth option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HERMANN: Remonstrances of citizens of Oregon, against the Conger bill, taxing compound lard—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOSEPH: Petition of citizens of the Territory of New Mexico, asking for the passage of laws by Congress for the perpetuation of the present national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of O. P. McMains, of the Territory of New Mexico, relating to private land claims in that Territory—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. KERR, of Iowa: Petition of 120 citizens of Cedar County, Iowa, for the passage of a law prohibiting the importation of liquors into States in violation of the laws thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNAPP: Petition of dairymen from Delaware County, New York, for pure dairy products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Milton, Ulster County, New York, for passage of House bill 5978—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Delaware County, New York, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition for pension for Isaac N. Jacobs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAWS: Petition of citizens of Hayes County, Nebraska, asking for free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of Bluff Alliance, Nebraska, favoring passage of the Conger and Butterworth bills—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Farmers' Alliance of Frontier County, Nebraska, for same measures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Sappa Alliance, Nebraska, for same measures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Franklin County, Nebraska, for same measures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of certain citizens of New Jersey, for pure lager-beer—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESTER, of Georgia: Petition of Daniel McDonald, of Liberty County, Georgia, praying for the reference of his claim to the Court of Claims under act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McMILLIN: Petition of discharged employes of the Fif-

tieth Congress, asking for compensation for services rendered—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MAISH: Petition of 24 veterans of the late war, praying for the relief of Edward Woodward, of Gettysburgh, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana: Petition to accompany the bill to correct the military record of Joseph Grathis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: Petition of Thomas Leigh and others, for the perpetuation of the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the Congregational Conference, at Pittsfield, Me., for enactment of a law allowing States to control the sale of liquors within their borders—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRILL: Petition of J. E. Love and 40 others, of Whiting, Kans., asking passage of House bill 5978, an act prohibiting transportation of intoxicating liquors, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of I. J. Miller, of Baker, Kans., for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of citizens of Taunton, Mass., in favor of fewer hours and more pay for post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MUTCHLER: Petition of citizens of the Eighth Congressional district of Pennsylvania for the passage of a law to perpetuate the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NORTON: Petition of John Elder and 30 others, of Pike County, Missouri, asking passage of Senate bill 2716—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition of same persons for passage of House bill 836—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. PAYNTER: Petition of F. M. Hanna and 13 others, of Lewis County, Kentucky, asking that \$6,200,000 be appropriated to improve Galveston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of George W. Reid and 26 others, of Bath County, Kentucky, for same measure—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PERRY: Petition of citizens of Fairfield County, South Carolina, for passage of Senate bill 2716—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of citizens of Dodge City, Kans., for temperance legislation to counteract the results of original-package decision—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLER: Resolutions of Garfield Alliance, No. 454, South Dakota, asking immediate passage of House bill 5353, the Butterworth option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Darlington Alliance, No. 68, South Dakota, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of same alliance for the Conger lard bill, H. R. 283—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 9 citizens of Arlington, Kingsbury County, South Dakota, asking immediate passage of bill prohibiting transportation of intoxicating liquors into prohibition States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 39 citizens of same county, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 59 citizens of Erwin, same county, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 39 citizens of Lake Henry, in same county, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 69 citizens of Miner County, South Dakota, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 74 citizens of Carthage, in same county, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 9 citizens of South Dakota, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 350 members of a Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Falk County, South Dakota, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 41 citizens of Cavour, Beadle County, South Dakota, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 43 citizens of Moody County, South Dakota, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 23 citizens of Rauville, Codington County, South Dakota, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 19 citizens of Waverly, in same county, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 35 citizens of Hand County, South Dakota, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 39 citizens of same county, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POST: Resolution of the Center Point (Ill.) Farmers' Alliance, for the passage of the Butterworth option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the same Alliance, for passage of the Conger lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of M. G. Osborn and 15 others, citizens of Moore County, Tennessee, praying for passage of Senate bill 2716, for first-class harbor on the coast of Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SIMONDS: Petition of Thomas H. L. Tolcott, for bounty for the children of Henry H. Lee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH, of West Virginia: Memorial of the Board of Trade and petitions of citizens of Huntington, W. Va., praying for the erection of a suitable public building in the city of Huntington, W. Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STRUBLE: Petition of the Red Ribbon Club, of Lincoln, Nebr. (nearly 400 voting at regular meeting), asking for a law giving relief to States from the original-package decision of the United States Supreme Court—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Oto Farmers' Alliance, Woodbury County, Iowa, urging passage of the Conger lard bill (H. R. 283)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR: Petition of citizens of Atwater, Portage County, Ohio, for a law prohibiting the circulation of obscene literature—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of 65 individuals from the Nineteenth district of Ohio, for a national Sunday-rest law—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. TOWNSEND, of Colorado: Petition of citizens of Colorado, for the perpetuation of the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania: Petition of T. O. Hazen and 132 others, citizens of Mercer County, Pennsylvania, asking for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolutions of Farmers' Excelsior Alliance, Beaver Falls, Pa., asking for passage of the Conger lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VANDEVER: Petition of 35 citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., for a national Sunday-rest law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON: Petition of Grand Army of the Republic Post No. 327, Warren County, Pennsylvania, for per diem and dependent pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Post No. 354, Grand Army of the Republic, Venango County, Pennsylvania, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Post No. 336, Grand Army of the Republic, Warren County, Pennsylvania, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Grange No. 236, in same county, for free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, memorial from same grange, for same legislation—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio: Petition of John N. Bell and 140 others, ex-soldiers and sailors of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the enactment of a law prohibiting the sale, use, manufacture, and importation of banners or flags representing the confederate flag or the red flag of the anarchist—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Memorial of Watkins Post, No. 68, of Towanda, Pa., Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, asking for dependent and service pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Myron French Post, No. 512, Grand Army of the Republic, of Jackson, Pa., asking for per diem and service pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Phelps Post, No. 124, Bradford County, Pennsylvania, asking for removal of limitation of arrears of pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of J. W. Reynolds Post, No. 98, Grand Army of the Republic, of Wyoming County, Pennsylvania, asking for passage of the dependent pension bill and the per diem service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Captain Lyons Post, No. 85, Grand Army of the Republic, of Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Gilman Post, No. 227, Bradford County, Pennsylvania, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of McKee Post, No. 584, Grand Army of the Republic, of same county, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of E. F. Roberts Post, No. 437, Grand Army of the Republic, of Pennsylvania, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial W. M. Williams Post, No. 392, of Wyoming County, Pennsylvania, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Rufus Frear Post, No. 323, Grand Army of the Republic, of same county, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Capt. John Whitney Post, No. 268, of same county, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of McPherson Post, No. 509, Grand Army of the Republic, of Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Frank Hall Post, No. 505, Grand Army of the Republic, of same county, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Sergt. O. Phillips Post, No. 486, Grand Army of the Republic, of same county, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Bissell Post, No. 466, Grand Army of the Republic, of same county, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of A. J. Rosser Post, No. 452, Grand Army of the Republic, of same county, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of M. Dowd Post, No. 291, Grand Army of the Republic, of same county, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Southworth Post, No. 222, Grand Army of the Republic, of same county, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Lieutenant Rogers Post, No. 143, Grand Army of the Republic, of same county, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Moody Post, No. 53, Grand Army of the Republic, of same county, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Oliver Mumford Post, No. 873, Grand Army of the Republic, of Wayne County, Pennsylvania, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Sergeant Rix Post, No. 397, Grand Army of the Republic, of same county, for same measure—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Sergt. C. D. Waltz Post, No. 575, Grand Army of the Republic, of same county, for same measures—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, June 17, 1890.

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

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

BURNING OF TIMBER ON PUBLIC LANDS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of Congress, with a view to securing such legislation as may be appropriate, a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, relating to the destruction by fires, carelessly kindled or left, of the timber upon the public lands.

If proper penalties were imposed by law, and a few convictions thereunder secured, I do not doubt that much waste of our forests would be prevented.

BENJ. HARRISON.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, June 16, 1890.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The message with the accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on Public Lands and printed, if there be no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I should like to make a suggestion to the committee. This is one of the most important subjects that they can consider. The present system of sending agents to guard the forests without having some arrangement whereby the citizens can co-operate, is exceedingly defective. It is necessary to have a more friendly understanding between the agents of the Government and the people, who are as much interested as the Government. There is great friction between them. Without discussing who is to blame for it, the result is that the forests are being destroyed by fires. It is estimated that last year more timber was burned by fires than has been cut by settlers since the first settlement of the country, and under the present system of agents it will continue. The more money you spend and the more convictions you have under the present system, the more bad feeling will be created and the great forests will be burned. It is a subject that should be carefully considered.

The forests can not be protected without the co-operation of the people. There is no reason why the Government should not act in conjunction with the States and with the local communities in protecting the timber, and some system ought to be devised whereby we can have the co-operation of all the people. The agents who are sent there get on bad relations with the communities, whether rightfully or wrongfully, and it is impossible for them to protect the timber. If you spend any amount of money it can not be done; you must have the co-operation of the people who live there; and some arrangement ought to be made and some law ought to be passed whereby the States and the local communities will co-operate with the Government in protecting the forests from fires, or we shall lose all our timber.