

ling, N. Dak., for passage of the Butterworth option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of same alliance, for passage of the Conger lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYNES: Resolutions of the Farmers' Alliance, Townsend Township, Sandusky County, Ohio, favoring the passage of the Conger lard bill and the Butterworth option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HENDERSON, of Illinois: Petition of A. W. Hursey and 6 others, superintendents and teachers of public schools at Tiskilwa, Ill., for the support of the international copyright bill now pending in Congress—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH: Petition of agent for settlers in Colorado and New Mexico for investigation of official corruption—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY: Petition of 175 citizens of Topeka, Kans., asking for the enactment of such laws by Congress as will counteract the bad influence of the recent decision of the Supreme Court in reference to the original-package business, or liquors imported from one State into another and sold in violation of the laws thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR, of Iowa: Petition of citizens of West Branch, Cedar County, Iowa, in favor of the passage of a law to prohibit the importation of intoxicating liquors into States in violation of the laws thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of 27 citizens of Union Vale, N. Y., for passage of House bill 5987—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCRAE: Memorial of First Battalion Fourth Arkansas Union Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'DONNELL: Preamble and resolution of Equity Lodge, Farmers' Alliance, of Rice Creek, Calhoun County, Michigan, in favor of passage of the Butterworth option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, preamble and resolution of same alliance, in favor of passage of the Conger lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PARRETT: Petition and papers to accompany House bill 11014, granting pension to Mrs. Malinda Hawkins, a matron and nurse during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PICKLER: Petitions of 61 citizens of Lake County, 94 citizens of Davison County, and 51 citizens of Hughes County, all in South Dakota, praying passage of a bill prohibiting the transportation of intoxicating liquors from any State or Territory of the United States or District of Columbia into any other State or Territory contrary to and in violation of the laws thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 66 citizens of Garretson, 20 citizens of Kingsbury County, 46 citizens of Minnehaha County, all in South Dakota, for the same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 145 citizens of Jerauld County, South Dakota, the Bethel and Hawkeye Valley Sabbath schools, the Harmony Church and Sabbath school of the Society of Friends, the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Sabbath school of Wessington Springs, and the Jerauld County Sabbath school convention, held at Wessington Springs May 25, 1890, all of Jerauld County, South Dakota, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 58 citizens of Douglas County, 30 citizens of Sully County, 27 citizens of Codington County, all of South Dakota, for same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYERS: Petition of the citizens of Coleman County, Texas, for the free and unlimited coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of citizens of Blanco, Tex., praying passage of House bill 5353—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of San Saba County, Texas, for passage of a bill to prevent the adulteration of lard—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STIVERS: Petition of James F. Ogillespie and 29 others, of Montgomery, N. Y., asking for the prompt passage of House bill 5987, to prohibit the transportation of intoxicating liquors from any State or Territory in the United States into any other State or Territory contrary to and in violation of the laws thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. May Morgan McKoon and 31 others, of Long Eddy, N. Y., asking passage of same measure—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRUBLE: Resolution of Peiro Farmers' Alliance, of Woodbury County, Iowa, No. 1482, urging the early passage of the Butterworth option bill (H. R. 5353)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of Brooks Township Alliance, No. 1560, urging passage of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TARSNEY: Petition of Troy Annual Conference of Ministers, asking that the corps of Army chaplains be enlarged, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YARDLEY: Petition of 140 citizens of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, asking passage of House bill 8608, to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YODER: Petition of Darke County (Ohio) Tobacco-Growers' Association—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, June 19, 1890.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter of the Secretary of the Interior, submitting the estimate of an appropriation in the sum of \$5,000 for appraisement of the Fort Angeles town-site reservation; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

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

A bill (H. R. 5183) for relief of Dabney, Simmons & Co.; and

A bill (H. R. 6018) for the relief of Thomas B. McElwee.

The bill (H. R. 8392) for the relief of William D. Matthews was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 9048) to confirm the title to certain lands in the city of Sault Ste. Marie, and State of Michigan, and to release any reversionary right of the Government of the United States therein was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The bill (H. R. 9523) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Tennessee River at or near Gunter'sville, Ala., and for other purposes was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MORGAN. I have a petition that is addressed to the President of the United States (but I have been requested to present it to the Senate for reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations) by certain citizens of the United States, who claim that they are the rightful owners of certain lands in the Fiji Islands, in the South Sea, now known as the British colony of Fiji, and that they acquired their titles from the native chiefs by certain conveyances, which they proceed here to proclaim. They set forth the grounds upon which their title is based and the difficulty of getting any proper adjudication by the colonial authorities there upon that question; and they ask for a joint commission to be organized by agreement between the Governments of Great Britain and the United States for the purpose of taking into consideration their claim of title to those lands; and they pray that the Senate will take such action upon the subject as may be considered appropriate. Accompanying the paper is a long printed statement which sets forth the grounds upon which their title is based.

I move the reference of this petition or paper, with the accompanying documents, to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of ex-Union soldiers of Logan County, Ohio, praying for the passage of a per diem pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of 11 citizens of Cheyenne, Wyo., praying for the passage of the McKinley tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. VOORHEES. I present the petition of the Lake View Post, No. 246, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, praying for the passage of a service-pension bill, and stating that if the platform of the Republican national convention at Chicago, in 1888, on this subject meant anything it meant the passage of such a bill; and further stating that they believe their interests have been neglected by the present Congress. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VOORHEES presented the petition of John H. Clark and other citizens of Clay County, Indiana, praying for the free coinage of silver and an increase of legal-tender Treasury-note circulation; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of N. L. Noble and other citizens of Sebastian County, Arkansas, praying for the construction of a complete system of levees from Cairo to New Orleans on the Mississippi River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of John Colter, late a member of Company H, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteers, praying to be paid certain sums of money advanced as bounty to enlisted men during the war of the rebellion; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WASHBURN. I present the petition of Eric Johnson, John Grahn, and a large number of other citizens of Stark, Chicago County, Minnesota, praying for the passage of the pending tariff bill called the McKinley bill. The petitioners suggest that they have heard that large importing firms are asking for the defeat of this measure, and that it would be very strange if the Senate of the United States would

take part in favor of the rich importer as against the mortgage-burdened farmers.

I move that the petition lie on the table, as the bill has been reported.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PADDOCK presented a petition of the Sunny Hillside Farmers' Alliance, No. 542, of Cambridge, Nebr., praying for the speedy passage by Congress of House bill 283, known as the Conger lard bill, and also House bill 5353, known as the Butterworth option bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. DIXON presented the petition of A. W. Colvin and 73 other citizens of Kent County, Rhode Island, praying for 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. SAWYER presented the petition of J. E. Kennedy and others, merchants of Oshkosh, Wis., praying that a rebate be given dealers on all refined sugar on hand at the time the pending tariff bill takes effect; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MORRILL. I present memorials from New York, Vermont, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, opposing any heavier tax upon tin than is now imposed. The memorials are in the usual printed style. I move that they lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR presented a memorial of many fish-dealers of Boston, Mass., remonstrating against any increase of duties on fresh and salt fish; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. VEST presented a memorial of District Assembly, No. 4, Knights of Labor, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of House bill 260, for the punishment of parties counterfeiting trade marks, labels, etc., and also remonstrating against the passage of Federal election bills; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Williams Farmers and Laborers' Union, No. 1276, of Blue Springs, Mo., praying for the free coinage of silver and denouncing the subtreasury system; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TURPIE presented a memorial of the Carpenters and Joiners' Union of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the proposed increase of duties upon tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DAWES, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3834) 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, and for other purposes," approved January 14, 1889, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, reported three amendments intended to be proposed to the Indian appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. EVARTS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1411) to authorize corporations to become surety in certain cases in the courts of the United States, reported it with amendments.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9677) to authorize the county of Pulaski, in the State of Georgia, to maintain a high wagon and foot bridge across the Ocmulgee River at or near Hawkinsville, in the State of Georgia, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9521) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Savannah River, reported it without amendment.

Mr. DOLPH. By direction of the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 3917) to adopt regulations for preventing collisions at sea. This bill adopts the regulations agreed upon by the late International Maritime Convention and is recommended by the Secretary of State, by the Maritime Association of the port of New York, the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, and other mercantile bodies. It is an important bill, and I shall ask for its early consideration. It repeals the existing regulations and takes effect only upon the proclamation of the President, which I presume will not be until a sufficient number of nations have agreed to its provisions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. CAMERON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon, which were agreed to; and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 1004) granting a bounty of \$100 to the Second Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry;

A bill (S. 118) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George S. Ackerson; and

A bill (S. 1124) for the relief of Daniel W. Boutwell.

Mr. WALTHALL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon; and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 3436) to correct the military record of Roswell M. Shuttleff; and

A bill (S. 3455) to restore Henry S. Cohn to the rank of second lieutenant.

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 865) to provide for paying certain advances made to the United States by the States of Maryland and Virginia, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3799) making an appropriation for the purchase of a site and the construction of a light and fog-signal at St. Andrew's Bay, Florida, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2792) to make the Lake Borgne outlet and to improve the low-water channel of the Lower Mississippi River, and for other purposes, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 278) to amend paragraph 3 of section 4414 of the Revised Statutes, reported it without amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1358) to remove the charge of desertion against John Milroy, and authorizing his honorable discharge, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3865) to provide for the reorganization of the artillery force of the Army, reported it with amendments.

RETURN OF PAPERS.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to report back, with an amendment, the joint resolution (S. R. 95) relative to certain bonds, drafts, and other papers in the Department of State, and to ask for its immediate passage. It does not involve an appropriation and there is some urgency why the party interested should have these papers. I ask the Senate to consider the resolution now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be read for information and then we can tell whether there will be objection.

The Chief Clerk read the joint resolution, and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. INGALLS. If there be no report in writing, will the Senator from Ohio kindly give us a statement of the reasons why this joint resolution should pass?

Mr. SHERMAN. There is a report in writing, but I can state the case in a few words. Mr. Hargous had a claim against Mexico and submitted it to the Mexican and American Claims Commission, and they rejected it on the ground that it was not within their jurisdiction under the terms of the treaty. So the administrator has commenced a suit against Mexico in the Mexican courts, and it is necessary for him to produce these papers. We asked the Secretary of State if there was any objection. He says there is no objection whatever. The papers belong to a private party, and they were left in the Department of State by the commission because they could not take jurisdiction of the case. That is all there is of it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 20, after the words "claim of," strike out the remainder of the joint resolution in the following words:

The person so entitled as aforesaid against Mexico, the same having been deposited in the State Department in error.

And in lieu thereof insert:

Louis S. Hargous against Mexico presented before the American and Mexican Mixed Commission, numbered 782, 783, and 784, and rejected by said commission for want of jurisdiction, and now in litigation before the courts of Mexico at the suit of Robert S. Hargous, administrator of said Louis S. Hargous, deceased.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution to surrender certain bonds, drafts, and other papers in the Department of State to Robert S. Hargous, administrator of Louis S. Hargous, deceased."

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE AT KANSAS CITY.

Mr. VEST. I am instructed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred House bill 8831, to report it without amendment, and I ask the Senate to consider the bill at the present time, because there is great exigency for its passage. It is very short, and is simply amendatory of a former act of Congress for the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River. It is an extension simply of one of the provisions of that law. It will take but a moment to dispose of the measure.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole,

proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8831) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River at or near Kansas City, Kans., and not over 10 miles above the Hannibal and St. Joseph Railway bridge at Kansas City, Mo.," approved March 1, 1889.

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

NATIONAL HOME FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS.

Mr. HAWLEY. I am instructed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 138) to increase the number of members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and to fill vacancies in such board, to report it with one amendment, and I beg immediate action upon this matter, as the vacancies in the board have existed for some time and ought to be filled for business reasons.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let it be read, subject to objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., 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. Hartranft, 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.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution which was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, with an amendment, in line 11, to strike out the name "Augustus B. Farnham" and insert "Thomas W. Hyde;" so as to read:

Thomas W. Hyde, of Maine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HAWLEY. These vacancies have existed for about two months and a half. For reasons I need not explain I wish the Senate would insist upon its amendment and ask for a committee of conference.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut moves that the Senate insist upon its amendment and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Vice-President was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MANDERSON, and Mr. WALTHALL were appointed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 4110) granting a pension to Cornelius Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WOLCOTT (by request) introduced a bill (S. 4111) to establish and maintain a national park in the State of Colorado; which was read twice by its title.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I rather think that it ought to go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That committee has special charge of the matter of mountain forests.

Mr. TELLER. The bill ought to go the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PADDOCK. Such bills have generally gone to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. EDMUNDS. All right.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MANDERSON introduced a bill (S. 4112) to amend section 1225 of the Revised Statutes, concerning details of officers of the Army and Navy to educational institutions; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 4113) to provide for the removal of saloons, breweries, and distilleries in Washington City on the complaint of persons residing in their immediate vicinity; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 4114) for the relief of John G. Bright and Robert T. Humphrey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HISCOCK introduced a bill (S. 4115) to appropriate \$18,484 for the completion and dedication of the monument commemorating the surrender of Burgoyne at Saratoga; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4116) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Amsterdam, in the State of New York; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. TURPIE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which, together with the accompanying petition of Silas Q. Howe, surviving partner of W. T. Pate & Co., praying for the payment of his audited claim against the Government, and other papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. VOORHEES. I desire to offer an amendment to the sundry civil appropriation bill, to be referred to the Committee on Appropriations. There is a bill (S. 3397) for the purchase of George B. Matthews's portrait of John Paul Jones already pending before the Senate, and I propose it now as an amendment to the sundry civil bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed.

Mr. FAULKNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DOLPH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PRINTING OF TARIFF BILL.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask that 10,000 copies of the tariff bill, reported yesterday, be printed in pamphlet form for the use of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont asks that 10,000 copies of the tariff bill be printed in pamphlet form. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERMAN. I also, in that connection, ask that the printer be instructed to indicate the amendments proposed by the Senate committee in italics in the usual manner, so that any one may see the difference between the House bill and the bill as reported.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That order will be made.

Mr. COCKRELL. We did not catch on this side what was the request of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from Vermont asks for the printing of a large number of copies of the tariff bill as reported, which is right, and I want it printed so as to show the amendments of the Senate committee to the text of the House bill, and then the people of the country may know exactly what has been done.

Mr. MORRILL. There is no objection to that, and I think that would be done, as a matter of course, without a special order.

Mr. COCKRELL. Did I understand the Senator to move for an additional number of copies of the report or of the bill?

Mr. MORRILL. Of the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. Just the bill, with the amendments.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is what I understood.

Mr. SHERMAN. And the amendments to be so designated that anybody may tell the difference between the House bill and the bill as reported.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That order will be made.

Mr. INGALLS. Can the Senator from Vermont inform us when the tabular information that was to be furnished in accordance with the resolution of my colleague [Mr. PLUMB] will be ready for the printer?

Mr. MORRILL. I said yesterday that it would be ready within four days, and it will be ready, I think, sooner than that, to be sent to the printer.

Mr. INGALLS. How long will it take to print it?

Mr. MORRILL. I suppose a few days.

Mr. INGALLS. It will be ready, then, by the first of the week after next?

Mr. MORRILL. Yes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and the order to print will be made as requested.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. MCPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10726) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1891, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (H. R. 7217) to amend "An act for the erection of an appraisers' warehouse in the city of New York, and for other purposes;" and A bill (H. R. 10065) constituting Irondequoit Bay, New York, a navigable water of the United States for certain purposes.

REMOVALS BY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS.

Mr. CAMERON. My colleague [Mr. QUAY] yesterday offered a resolution which went over under objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] coming over from yesterday. It will be read.

The resolution submitted by Mr. QUAY was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms be instructed to make no changes in his subordinates, appointees, or employes, prior to 1st July proximo, without the consent of the Senate.

Mr. CAMERON. I move the following as a substitute for the resolution, and I ask for its immediate consideration:

Resolved, That Charles H. Mann be employed as an additional page in the Senate.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Both these resolutions should go to the Committee on Contingent Expenses. The last one must, under the rule, for it makes a charge on the contingent fund, out of which he has to be paid. I move that both these resolutions be referred to the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not wish to interfere with the resolution offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON], but the other resolution I do not think ought to be referred. It had better be laid on the table.

Mr. INGALLS. The second resolution ought not to pass, for the reason that if an employe is put on the force by resolution of the Senate he is out of the control of the Sergeant-at-Arms. We have a number of those instances already, and they have been increasing from year to year to the detriment of the discipline of the official staff of the body. I have no objection whatever to the appointment of the person who is named in the resolution, but the practice of putting persons on the official staff by order of the Senate and thereby exempting them from the discipline of the Sergeant-at-Arms is destructive of the morale of the force. It ought not to be done; and I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania, with whom I am entirely in sympathy, will have some other arrangements made. We do not want to put people on as pages or as messengers by resolution of the Senate.

Mr. CAMERON. I do not see how any other arrangement could be made that would benefit this boy. I do not know anything about him personally, but I am told he is an exceptionally good lad, and it seems to me hard that he should be turned out at this stage of the session.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It is.

Mr. CAMERON. And thus the little money that he would otherwise get be taken from him. I believe that without any very great stretch of discipline or without violating the rules of the Senate, so that it would make a precedent at all, this resolution might be acted upon to-day and the boy be put where I think he is entitled to be placed.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, assuming that my friend from Pennsylvania is correct about this lad, as I have no doubt he is, it would seem a great hardship that he should be displaced just before the end of the session, and the Committee on Contingent Expenses, I have no doubt, with the unanimous consent of the Senate, can report a provision which will be consistent with the very just observations of my friend from Kansas and at the same time put this boy right from the day when his pay stopped if there is any trouble about it.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no desire to interfere at all with this young man, but the Sergeant-at-Arms is about to leave his position here, he having resigned it, but it seems that he turned out a person, which gave displeasure to the Senator from Pennsylvania, but it ought to be explained, in justice to the Sergeant-at-Arms, that the gentleman named is beyond the age at which he can be retained as a page, and therefore, in order to keep him over the time he gave him other employment, and there was no objection to him, but he was put on some other roll in connection with one of the other branches of the Sergeant-at-Arms's office. But under the rules of the Senate, which are permanent and which we ought not to change except in the form of legislation, the person referred to can not be kept as a page because he is beyond the age. He is now serving on another roll, and kept on another roll until the Sergeant-at-Arms, upon the urgent request of a member of this body, a Senator who had the right to claim something at his hands, gave another very worthy person the place that was occupied, some subordinate place occupied by the gentleman named by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

All I feel is that this resolution introduced and slapping a man in the face just as he is leaving the Senate service, I think ought not to be referred, but it ought to be disposed of, it ought to be laid on the table, and then, if the resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON] can be acted upon, I shall make no objection. This person can be kept on the roll in connection with the service in which he has been employed recently for the time required without violating the rules of the Senate, but he can not be kept as a page without expressly violating the rules.

Mr. CAMERON. If he can not be kept as a page, then the Committee on Contingent Expenses can not report the resolution favorably.

Mr. INGALLS. They can report an amendment to it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The law of the Senate forbids the employment of

a page above a certain age, which we have found a necessary law. If the young gentleman is over that age, of course it is not fair to send him out into the world instantly. Something can be done useful to the Senate and for him, too.

Mr. CAMERON. I was not aware that he was over the age.

Mr. VOORHEES. I ask that the amendment be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That Charles H. Mann be employed as an additional page in the Senate.

Mr. VOORHEES. Is that a substitute for the resolution offered by the colleague of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is in the nature of a substitute. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. EDMUNDS. My motion was to refer both the substitute and the original resolution to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. That resolution would be liable to a point of order if we were strict about it, because the rule fixes the age.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let the resolution be adopted as an amendment to the original proposition, and then the whole be referred to the committee. I think that would be the better way to dispose of it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. If it makes any difference in respect of any implied reproach to the retiring Sergeant-at-Arms, I shall withdraw my motion for the moment in order that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON] may be adopted, and it being adopted then I shall renew my motion to refer it, as it must be referred under the rule.

Mr. CAMERON. Very well.

Mr. INGALLS. I suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania to modify his amendment by adding the words "for the present session of the Senate," so that this person will not be placed permanently by resolution of the Senate on the rolls as a page.

Mr. CAMERON. I agree to that. I do not desire to place him there permanently against the rule of the Senate. I am informed that I have made a mistake in the name. The name should be George H. Mann, instead of Charles H. Mann.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be so modified. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON] to the resolution offered by his colleague [Mr. QUAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Now, I move that the resolution as amended be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to call the attention of the Senator from Maine to the agreement reached on Saturday last with reference to the bill reported by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 3714) to establish an educational fund and apply the proceeds of the public lands and the receipts from certain land-grant railroad companies to the more complete endowment and support of colleges for the advancement of scientific and industrial education.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Vermont does not propose to antagonize the appropriation bill.

Mr. MORRILL. I suppose it is understood that as soon as the appropriation bill is concluded this bill will come up in order.

Mr. PLATT. What was the understanding reached about that bill?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill was to be taken up after the morning business to-day.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is only an understanding, not an order.

Mr. MORRILL. There was unanimous consent given.

Mr. PLATT. For the time being I do not wish to be put in the position of consenting to have the unfinished business displaced by this. I simply make this remark at this time. I do not suppose there will be any difficulty about it, but I want to preserve my rights if I should see fit to insist upon them.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the agreement reached on Saturday last.

The Secretary read as follows from the RECORD of June 15, 1890:

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, if there is any desire on the part of Senators to have this bill considered and if they will give unanimous consent, so that it shall be considered next Thursday, after the morning business, I will consent to have it go over.

Mr. COCKRELL. Nobody will object to that, I suppose. I suggest that the bill be printed with the amendments already adopted and the amendments pending. Then every Senator can see it and have it before him, and know exactly what to do.

Mr. MORRILL. There is no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont withdraws his motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill notwithstanding the objection, and

asks that it be considered as the order of business on next Thursday—at 2 o'clock?

Mr. MORRILL. No, after the morning business.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. After the morning business. Is there objection?
Mr. HARRIS. Of course I am not inclined to object, but no such consent understanding will displace the unfinished business, and I do not know exactly what it amounts to. However, I shall not interfere with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, that will be the order.
Mr. COCKRELL. Now, let the order be made to print the bill with the amendments already adopted and the amendment pending, and then we can see exactly what it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so ordered. The next bill on the Calendar will be stated.

Mr. MORRILL. By unanimous consent, I understand that the bill is to be taken up immediately after the morning business on Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is to be taken up immediately after the morning business on Thursday next.

Mr. PLATT. There will be no difficulty between myself and the Senator from Vermont. I simply want to reserve all rights, not to have the unfinished business displaced, but we may make some arrangement about it.

Mr. HALE. Meantime let us go on with the appropriation bill.

Mr. EDMUNDS. You have not got it up yet.

Mr. HALE. Oh, yes, I have.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Is the appropriation bill before the Senate?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The appropriation bill is before the Senate.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Very well, let us go on with it.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on the 18th instant, approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 2311) to amend section 3354 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and

An act (S. 2317) to provide for the exportation of fermented liquor in bond without payment of internal-revenue tax.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 10726) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1891, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9066) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, and for other purposes.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Before the reading goes on where it was left off on page 70 at the end of the paragraph on line 16, I wish to go back to page 59, a paragraph that attention was called to when the matter was in charge of the chairman of the committee [Mr. ALLISON], in respect of an additional judge for Arizona.

The Senate on the 7th of June passed a bill providing for an additional judge in the Territory of Arizona and it will undoubtedly become a law, but at any rate it is within the rule, it being to carry out a bill that has passed the Senate to make an amendment to appropriate sufficient for his salary if it should become a law. I accordingly move on page 59, line 13, in the paragraph headed "Territory of Arizona," to strike out the word "two" and insert the word "three," and in line 16 of the same paragraph and page to strike out the word "thirteen" and insert "sixteen," so as to make the total of the appropriation correspond to the \$3,000 increase for the additional judge.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 59, line 13, before the word "associate," it is proposed to strike out "two" and insert "three," and in line 16, before the word "thousand," to strike out "thirteen" and insert "sixteen;" so as to make the clause read:

Territory of Arizona: For salary of governor, \$2,600; chief-justice and three associate judges, at \$3,000 each; secretary, \$1,800; interpreter and translator in the executive office, \$500; in all, \$16,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. On the same subject of "Territorial judges" on page 60, line 10, in the paragraph commencing "Territory of New Mexico," I move to strike out the word "three" and insert "four;" and before the amendment is stated from the desk, and in explanation of it, I will say that the House of Representatives has passed a bill providing for this additional judge in New Mexico; and the Senate Committee on the Judiciary having reported favorably upon a Senate bill of the same character, for convenience the House bill has been substituted on the Calendar, but is not yet reached, so that this motion is in order and is proper.

Mr. HALE. Of course in any of these cases if it happens that unperfected measures do not become laws the amendments will be struck out in conference.

Mr. EDMUNDS. If the bill does not become a law the appropriation goes for nothing.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 60, line 10, before the word "associ-

ate," it is proposed to strike out "three" and insert "four;" so as to read:

Territory of New Mexico: For salary of governor, \$2,600; chief-justice and four associate judges, at \$3,000 each; secretary, at \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. In line 13 of the same paragraph I move to strike out the word "sixteen," before the word "thousand," and insert "nineteen;" so as to make the total correspond to the additional \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON. Yesterday I moved an amendment to the present bill on page 55, line 23, to strike out "two hundred" and insert "five hundred." The Senator then in charge of the bill had it ruled out on a point of order. I find since that he was mistaken as to that point of order, inasmuch as the increase has been recommended by the head of a Department. I now ask that that change be made on page 55, line 23, striking out "two" and inserting "five."

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 55, line 23, it is proposed to strike out the word "two" and to insert "five;" so as to read:

Chief clerk, \$2,550.

Mr. CAMERON. Strike out the word "fifty," so as to read "\$2,500."

Mr. COCKRELL. We can not hear a word. What is the point?

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 55, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "two hundred and fifty" and to insert "five hundred;" so as to read:

Chief clerk, \$2,500.

Mr. CAMERON. I have moved this amendment at the request of the Director of the Mint, who addressed me a letter on the 13th of May, which I will read:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF THE MINT,
Washington, D. C., May 13, 1890.

SIR: I transmit herewith copy of a letter of the superintendent of the mint at Philadelphia and my indorsement thereon to the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending an increase in the salary of the chief clerk of that mint from \$2,250 to \$2,500 per annum. I also inclose copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of the above to the Speaker of the House of Representatives for the favorable consideration of Congress.

Respectfully, yours,

E. O. LEECH, Director of the Mint.

Hon. J. D. CAMERON, United States Senate.

He indorses a long letter from the superintendent of the mint at Philadelphia who says, under date of December 18, 1889:

MINT OF THE UNITED STATES AT PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
Superintendent's Office, December 18, 1889.

Hon. E. O. LEECH, Director of the Mint:

SIR: The chief clerk of this institution is one of the most responsible and important places in it. Under section 3502, Revised Statutes, he becomes, in the temporary absence of the superintendent, acting superintendent, with all the responsibilities of the place. For some unexplained reason, the cashier of the institution in point of salary is rated above the chief clerk, whilst in reality the latter certainly outranks the former, as he can regulate the policy of the duties of the cashier, and the cashier would be obliged to take instructions from him. The salary of the chief clerk is \$2,250 per annum, that of the cashier \$2,500. I want to strongly urge that the salary of the former be increased to \$2,500 per annum, to be at least equal to that of the cashier.

When I assumed the position of superintendent, I desired as the chief clerk of this mint the man best equipped for the place I could get, and I found that Mr. Mark H. Cobb, who was the cashier, was the man I wanted. He came here in 1870, and his long service, earnest, absolute devotion to the interests of this institution has peculiarly fitted him for the position of chief clerk. When I expressed my desire to have him accept the place, he unselfishly said if I desired his services he would render them whenever I chose to designate, although he sacrificed \$250 per annum to take a place he so acceptably fills. Apart from the fact that the place is rated too low in salary, Mr. Cobb's ability entitles him to a salary at least as great as the one he relinquished, and the services he renders the Government in the new place are fully entitled to receive all of the increase requested.

Trusting that the recommendation submitted will meet your cordial approval, I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

O. C. BOSBYSHHELL, Superintendent.

It is needless to add that Mr. Cobb is entirely ignorant of my recommendation, and that he has not referred to it at all.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF THE MINT,
December 19, 1889.

Respectfully referred to the Secretary of the Treasury with the recommendation that he transmit this communication to Congress with an earnest recommendation on his part to have the salary of the chief clerk of the mint at Philadelphia increased from \$2,250 to \$2,500 per annum.

The salary paid the chief clerk of the mint at San Francisco and chief clerk at the assay office at New York is \$2,500 per annum, and yet the salary of the same office in the most important institution in the mint service is only \$2,250. Not only are the duties of the office arduous and important, but the chief clerk is required by law to perform all the duties of the superintendent of the mint, in the absence of the latter officer. The salary of the cashier of the mint at Philadelphia is \$250 more per annum than that of the chief clerk. All of my predecessors, and all of the superintendents of the mint at Philadelphia for a long number of years past, have recommended that the salary of the position of chief clerk be fixed at \$2,500. The present occupant of the office has been in the mint since 1870, and for a number of years past has been the cashier of the mint. He is one of the most experienced and valuable officers in the mint service.

I most urgently request that the increase recommended be granted by Congress.

E. O. LEECH, Director of the Mint.

I know Mr. Cobb personally. He is one of the most capable men that I know of, and I should be very much pleased if this small advance should be made in his salary.

Mr. ALLISON. What is the amendment that is pending?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. On page 55, line 23, to increase the appropriation for compensation of "chief clerk of the mint of Philadelphia" from \$2,250 to \$2,500.

Mr. ALLISON. I make the point of order first that under the arrangement the committee amendments were to be first considered, and I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will not press his amendment now.

Mr. CAMERON. If the Senator will permit me I will say that I expect to leave the Senate in a few minutes to be gone for several hours, and I should be glad to have the amendment considered now. The Senator yesterday made the point of order that this could not be introduced as it was not estimated for. I have a letter from the Director of the Mint asking that this change be made and giving the reasons for the change.

Mr. ALLISON. That does not constitute an estimate, and I still make the point of order that it is not in order, not being estimated for.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that a recommendation, in order to be considered as an estimate, must be made by the head of a Department.

Mr. ALLISON. Is the estimate made by the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. CAMERON. No; it is made by the Director of the Mint. I trust the Senator will not insist upon the point of order. It is a very small matter, and certainly this gentleman is entitled to it.

Mr. ALLISON. If this was the only case I would not object, but this bill is full of items as to which there are similar requests, and I feel constrained to make the point of order, for the present, at least.

Mr. CAMERON. That means for all time.

Mr. ALLISON. I think so.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Chief Clerk resumed the reading of the bill on page 70, beginning in line 17, with the appropriations for "Public Buildings and Grounds."

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to call the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill to the language on page 71, line 14, in the clause providing for watchmen in the different squares and circles. It says, "one at Rawlins Square." The statue of General Rawlins was removed from that square just west of the State Department, as I understand. Does that square still go by the name of Rawlins Square since the removal of the statue?

Mr. ALLISON. I so understand.

Mr. COCKRELL. Because there is no square now where the statue of General Rawlins is.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not think that the removal of the statue would necessarily change the name of the square.

Mr. COCKRELL. As a rule those squares all go by the name of the statues that are placed in them.

Mr. ALLISON. I think these watchmen will be able to find it.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is no doubt he will find Washington Circle, but whether the provision for Rawlins Square ought to be there or not is a question.

Mr. ALLISON. I think it had better remain as it is. It is estimated for in that way.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the appropriations for public buildings and grounds, on page 71, after line 22, to insert:

For one night watchman at Garfield Park, \$720.

Mr. INGALLS. Will the Senator from Iowa oblige us with an explanation of the necessity for a night watchman in Garfield Park?

Mr. ALLISON. That is one of the new reservations, one of the large reservations in the District. Two watchmen for Garfield Park are estimated for.

Mr. INGALLS. By whom?

Mr. ALLISON. The Treasury Department; and it is now included in the other estimates affecting the parks in this city. We have spent a large sum of money there in fitting up that park, decorating and ornamenting it in various ways, and instead of providing for two watchmen we have provided for one night watchman.

Mr. INGALLS. Garfield Park lies south of what was formerly known as Duddington, where there was a few years since one of the few remaining specimens of colonial architecture, a magnificent house surrounded by a noble growth of original forest trees, constituting a part of the original estate of Carroll of Duddington, which, I think to the regret of all lovers of association and art, the Government allowed to be destroyed.

There is nothing in Garfield Park that requires a watchman, night or day. There is no fountain there, no statue, no money has been expended there except for a few gravel drives and walks and the planting of some shade trees. Of course I have no objection if the Government desires to put a day and night watchman there. It may be a very agreeable and comfortable place for some deserving patriot, I have no doubt, but there is no more necessity for a day and night watchman in Garfield Park than there is in any neighboring corn-field adjoining the city.

Mr. ALLISON. I will read what is said in the Book of Estimates respecting it and then leave it to the Senate:

5. One day-watchman for Garfield Park, \$660; one night-watchman for Garfield Park, \$720. Garfield Park, containing an area of about 24 acres, is now highly improved and contains a large number of valuable trees and flowering shrubs.

Many of these have undoubtedly been put there since the Senator from Kansas visited the place.

Mr. INGALLS. Then they have been placed there since last week, when I passed through on foot within that period of time.

Mr. ALLISON. There is a park containing 24 acres and it is possible that a few of these improved trees and shrubs have escaped the attention of the Senator from Kansas. Says the Secretary:

During the past year numerous acts of vandalism have occurred during both day and night. On one occasion the store-house on the reservation was broken open and a number of valuable tools stolen; these were recovered with the assistance of the District police. Watchmen are very much needed at the park.

I merely read this for the purpose of showing why the committee inserted this provision.

Mr. INGALLS. Then why do they disregard the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury when acts of vandalism have been committed there, and only give one-half of what is required?

Mr. ALLISON. Because they were afraid they might find in the Senate some critic who would object, and therefore we thought at present we would limit it to one. That is all.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the appropriations for "State, War, and Navy Department building," on page 72, after the word "laborers," at the end of line 16, to insert "four leading charwomen, at \$300 each;" in line 18, before the word "charwomen," to strike out "eighty" and insert "seventy-six;" and in line 19, after the word "thousand," to strike out "five hundred" and insert "seven hundred and forty;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of the superintendent: One clerk of class 1; one chief engineer, at \$1,200; eight assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each; one captain of the watch, \$1,200; two lieutenants of the watch, at \$840 each; fifty-eight watchmen; one carpenter, \$1,000; one machinist, \$900; one plumber, \$900; one painter, \$900; four skilled laborers, at \$720 each; twenty-four firemen; ten conductors of elevators, at \$720 each; twenty laborers; four leading charwomen, at \$300 each; and seventy-six charwomen; in all, \$118,740.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "Navy Department," on page 72, line 25, after the word "dollars," to insert:

Assistant Secretary of the Navy, \$4,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the end of the same clause, on page 73, line 14, to increase the total amount of the appropriations for compensation of the Secretary of the Navy, Assistant Secretary, and the clerical and other force in the office of the Secretary from "\$41,660" to "\$46,160."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for Hydrographic Office, on page 75, line 12, to increase the total appropriations "for purchase of copper-plates, steel-plates, chart-paper, electrotyping copper-plates, cleaning copper-plates, tools, instruments, and materials for drawing, engraving, and printing," etc., from "\$30,000" to "\$35,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 21, after "San Francisco," to strike out "and;" in the same line, after the word "Oregon," to insert "Portland, Me., and Chicago;" and in line 1, on page 76, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twelve" and insert "eighteen;" so as to make the clause read:

Contingent expenses of branch offices at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, Savannah, New Orleans, San Francisco, Portland, Oregon, Portland, Me., and Chicago, including furniture, fuel, lights, rent and care of offices, car-fare and ferrage in visiting merchant vessels, freight, express, telegrams and other necessary expenses incurred in collecting the latest information for the Pilot Chart, and for other purposes for which the offices were established, \$18,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. At the end of line 22, on page 75, the Chair thinks the comma should be stricken out after the words "care of."

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that it be stricken out.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 76, line 4, after the word "dollars," to insert "one clerk of class 3;" in line 5, after the word "two," to strike out "one clerk" and insert "two clerks;" and after the word "all," at the end of line 6, to strike out "seven thousand five" and insert "ten thousand three;" so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Equipment and Recruiting: For chief clerk, \$1,800; one clerk of class 3; one clerk of class 2; two clerks of class 1; two copyists; one assistant messenger, and one laborer; in all, \$10,380.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for Nautical Almanac office, on page 76, after line 21, to insert:

For rent of building, and for fuel, for use of the Nautical Almanac office, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 3, after the word "each," to insert "one assistant librarian, \$1,200; one copyist, \$720;" and in line 8, after the word "all," to strike out "twenty thousand five hundred and twenty" and insert "twenty-two thousand four hundred and forty;" so as to make the clause read:

Naval Observatory: For pay of three assistant astronomers, one at \$2,000 and two at \$1,800 each; one clerk of class 4; one instrument-maker, \$1,500; two computers, at \$1,200 each; one assistant librarian, \$1,200; one copyist, \$720; four watchmen, including one for new Naval Observatory grounds; two skilled laborers, one at \$1,000 and one at \$720; and seven laborers; in all, \$22,440.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 18, after the word "freight," to insert "including payment to Smithsonian Institution for freight on Observatory publications sent to foreign countries;" and in line 22, after the words "five hundred," to insert "and fifty;" so as to make the clause read:

For repairs to buildings, fixtures, and fences, fuel, gas, furniture, chemicals, stationery, freight, including payment to Smithsonian Institution for freight on Observatory publications sent to foreign countries, foreign postage, expressage, fertilizers, plants, and all contingent expenses, four thousand and five hundred and fifty dollars.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move to strike out the first word "and," in line 22, on page 77, so as to read "four thousand five hundred and fifty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 77, to strike out the clause from line 23 to line 25, inclusive, as follows:

For payment to Smithsonian Institution for freight on Observatory publications sent to foreign countries, \$136.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of the Interior," on page 80, line 9, after the word "building," to insert:

Nine members of a board of pension appeals, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, at \$2,000 each.

Mr. PLATT. I inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill how much of an addition that is to the number of the board of pension appeals?

Mr. ALLISON. An addition of six. There are three now.

Mr. PLATT. Do they go out of office now?

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh, no.

Mr. PLATT. Are the three provided for anywhere here?

Mr. ALLISON. The present law provides for three members of the board. We simply add six, making the number nine.

Mr. INGALLS. It seems to me that it would be better to say "six additional members." It is very ambiguous the way it stands now, and the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] appears to me to be very pertinent. Either the three that are now in will be legislated out of office by this amendment or there are to be nine additional members of the board of pension appeals. I would suggest that if the three that are now in are to remain and there is to be an addition to the force it would be better to say "six additional members of the board of pension appeals, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior," etc.

Mr. PLATT. Then the three would not be provided for, would they?

Mr. ALLISON. The present appropriation for the current year is—Three members of a board of pension appeals, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, at \$2,000 each.

The year previous the same language was employed that we now employ, to wit, nine. If any Senator thinks this will have the effect to legislate any of the three gentlemen who occupy the places now out of office, I have no objection to a change; but we have put the item in here in the exact language of the Book of Estimates.

Mr. INGALLS. Were the three that are now serving appointed under a clause in an appropriation bill previously?

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to ask in that connection is there any appropriation in this bill for those three members of the board?

Mr. PLATT. That is included in the appropriation for the nine.

Mr. ALLISON. It is included in the nine.

Mr. COCKRELL. That was not in the bill as it came from the House of Representatives.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator is aware that the Committee on Appropriations in the House reported the language that we have here, but on a point of order the whole clause was ruled out.

Mr. COCKRELL. Not only the six increase was ruled out, but the three existing under the law.

Mr. INGALLS. Where were they ruled out?

Mr. ALLISON. In the other House.

Mr. COCKRELL. The House, you know, is no longer a deliberative body, and the clause was ruled out; and not only was the proposed increase of six ruled out, but the three members of the board of pension appeals now existing. So the House bill as it came to us made no provision whatever for any pension appeal board.

Mr. PLATT. I think that explains what I could not understand about this amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. There was no provision made in the House bill, and these members of the board of appeals have been provided for from time to time in these appropriation bills.

Mr. INGALLS. Are they required to be appointed annually?

Mr. ALLISON. Not as I understand. Last year's appropriation provided for six members of the board of pension appeals, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, at \$2,000 each, and the year before the same bill provided for nine, but I do not think there is the slightest trouble about it. They have been carried all the time in these appropriation bills.

Mr. COCKRELL. The language used in this proposed amendment of the Committee on Appropriations is precisely the language which has been heretofore used in the authorization of the existence and payment of these members of the board of pension appeals. Now, I should like to have the Senator from Iowa state to the Senate why it is necessary that we shall increase the board of pension appeals. It was once composed of nine members, and then we reduced it down to three members, and at that time all pension appeal cases were disposed of. Now we are increasing it, and I should like to have the Senator explain to the Senate so that we may see that our action is justifiable.

Mr. ALLISON. My mind was diverted for the moment. Does the Senator wish that I should state why we insert this provision?

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. We insert it because the appeals are now largely in arrears. I think there are about four thousand cases pending; the cases are being disposed of in the Pension Office very rapidly; the Secretary of the Interior deems this number necessary to keep up the work constantly with the work in the Pension Office.

I should say, in addition, that they have now details from the Pension Office, and have had for two or three years clerks doing this business, which we think, if not reprehensible, ought not to be continued.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wanted to make this statement clear to the Senator that in the spring of 1885 the pension appeal cases were practically disposed of, and there were no arrears of business. In consequence of that, in the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1886 the numbers of the board of pension appeals were greatly reduced. But the appeals taken since then have multiplied so rapidly that, as I understand, with the present force it would take them two years to dispose of the present accumulation of appeals.

Mr. ALLISON. That is substantially the situation.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is my recollection. That is, it would take the present number, the three members of the board of pension appeals, two years to dispose of the appeal cases now pending, not taking into account the number that come up from day to day.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does the Senator know how many of these appeals are disposed of per month?

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not know. We have no report as to the number disposed of a month. In the Appropriations Committee we thought it was a necessity to increase the number of members of this board of appeals in order that the pension appeal cases might be heard in the lifetime of the claimants and disposed of.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations on page 80, line 9, which has been read.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 81, line 16, to increase the total amount of the appropriations for compensation of the Secretary of the Interior, assistant secretaries, and the clerical and other force in the office of the Secretary, from "\$174,210" to "\$192,210."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, after the word "dollars," at the end of line 21, to insert "one reporter of land decisions, \$2,250;" and at the end of the same clause, in line 1, on page 82, after the word "all," to strike out "thirty-six thousand seven hundred" and insert "thirty-eight thousand nine hundred and fifty;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of Assistant Attorney-General: For one law clerk, at \$2,750; one law clerk, at \$2,500; one law clerk, at \$2,250; one reporter of land decisions, \$2,250; thirteen law clerks, at \$2,000; two clerks of class 3, one of whom shall act as stenographer; in all, \$38,950.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriation for "General Land Office," on page 82, line 23, after the word "at," to strike out "eighteen hundred" and insert "two thousand;" so as to read:

Three principal clerks, at \$2,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same clause, on page 82, line 23, after the word "each," to insert:

Eight chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same clause, on page 83, line 1, after the word "each," to strike out "forty" and insert "thirty-two;" so as to read:

Thirty-two clerks of class 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the end of the same clause, on page 83, line 7, to increase the total amount of the appropriation for compensation of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, Assistant Commissioner, and the clerical force in the General Land Office, from "\$542,550," to "\$544,750."

Mr. PADDOCK. Under the head of "General Land Office," I propose to offer an amendment from the Committee on Public Lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT in the chair). Is there objection to the adoption of the amendment which is now under consideration?

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senator to withhold his amendment until the Appropriations Committee amendments are first disposed of.

Mr. PADDOCK. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations, in line 7, on page 83.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 21, before the word "copies," to strike out "one thousand" and insert "two thousand five hundred;" and in line 22, after the word "and," to insert "of;" so as to make the clause read:

For connected and separate United States and other maps prepared in the General Land Office, \$15,000; 2,500 copies of said maps shall be delivered to the General Land Office, and of the remainder, one-third shall be delivered to the Senate and two-thirds to the House of Representatives for distribution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for the Pension Office, on page 84, before the word "medical," to strike out "eighteen" and insert "thirty-six;" so as to read:

Thirty-six medical examiners, who shall be surgeons of education, skill, and experience in their profession, at \$1,800 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 21, to increase the total amount of the appropriations for compensation of the Commissioner of Pensions, deputy commissioners, and the clerical and other force in the office of the Commissioner, from "\$1,814,150" to "\$1,846,550."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of the following clause, on page 86, beginning in line 21:

For per diem in lieu of subsistence for one hundred and fifty additional special examiners above provided for, while traveling on duty, at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, not exceeding \$3 per day, and for actual and necessary expenses for transportation and assistance, \$190,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Iowa to the word "assistance," in line 26, and inquires whether it should not be "subsistence."

Mr. ALLISON. I will say to the Chair that it is correct as it is. It is the language employed many years, covering a certain class of expenditures.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment was, in the appropriations for United States Patent Office, on page 87, line 10, before the word "hundred," to strike out "four" and insert "five;" so as to read:

Thirty principal examiners, \$2,500 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 12, to increase the total amount of the appropriations for compensation of the Commissioner of the Patent Office, assistant commissioner, the examiners, and the clerical and other force in the office of the Commissioner, from "\$664,790" to "\$667,790."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for the Bureau of Education, on page 89, line 22, after the word "dollars," to insert:

One specialist in foreign educational system, \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 8, to increase the total amount of the appropriations for compensation of the Commissioner of Education, collector and compiler of statistics, and the clerical and other force in the office of the Commissioner, from "\$45,420" to "\$47,220."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 14, after the word "information," to strike out "two thousand five hundred" and insert "three thousand;" so as to make the clause read:

For collecting statistics for special reports and circulars of information, \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 16, before the word "distribution," to insert "purchase;" and in line 18, after the word "appliances," to insert "text-books and educational reference-books;" so as to make the clause read:

For the purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational documents, and for the collection, exchange, and cataloguing of educational apparatus and appliances, text-books, and educational reference-books, articles of school furniture, and models of school buildings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education, and for repairing the same, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to line 6, on page 90, in the clause making appropriations for the Bureau of Education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires of the Senator from Iowa whether it is advisable to insert the word "at" after the word "clerk" at the end of line 6? The word "at" is usually inserted.

Mr. ALLISON. Where is that?

The SECRETARY. On page 92, at the end of line 6, "one clerk, \$1,000."

Mr. COCKRELL. I move to insert the word "at" after the word "clerk."

Mr. ALLISON. That is better. It is evidently an omission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be agreed to, in the absence of objection.

Mr. ALLISON. The word "at" ought to be inserted in line 9, after the word "watchman," and after the word "janitor," in line 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest that in looking further he observes that when only one person is named in the bill the word "at" is not used, and that where more than one person is named in the bill the word "at" is used. So perhaps it is not necessary to insert the word "at" in these instances.

Mr. ALLISON. The Chair is right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The attention of the Chair was called to it by the Secretary. It seems unnecessary to insert the word "at" in the places named, and it will be omitted if there be no objection. The Chair hears none.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 92, line 23, to increase the total amount of the appropriations for "contingent expenses Interior Department," from "\$75,000" to "\$90,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, line 2, to increase the appropriation "for stationery for the Department of the Interior and its several bureaus and offices, including the Civil Service Commission and the Geological Survey," from "\$50,000" to "\$70,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, line 7, after the words "Bureau of Education," to strike out "four" and insert "five;" after the words "Indian Office," at the end of line 8, to strike out "five thousand five hundred" and insert "six thousand;" in line 10, after the words "General Land Office," to strike out "one thousand five hundred" and insert "two thousand;" and in line 11, after the word "all," to strike out "twenty-one" and insert "twenty-three;" so as to make the clause read:

For rent of buildings for the Department of the Interior, namely: For the Bureau of Education, \$5,000; Geological Survey, \$10,000; Indian Office, \$6,000; General Land Office, \$2,000; in all, \$23,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "surveyors-general and their clerks," on page 94, line 12, after the word "office," to strike out "three thousand five hundred" and insert "seven thousand;" and in line 12, after the word "all," to strike out "five thousand five hundred" and insert "nine thousand;" so as to make the clause read:

For surveyor-general of North Dakota, \$2,000; and for the clerks in his office, \$7,000; in all, \$9,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, line 19, after the word "office," to strike out "three thousand five" and insert "thirteen thousand seven;" and in line 20, after the word "all," to strike out "five thousand five" and insert "fifteen thousand seven;" so as to make the clause read:

For surveyor-general of South Dakota, \$2,000; and for the clerks in his office, \$13,700; in all, \$15,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. I think it due to the Senate that some explanation should be made in regard to these very large increases for the two Dakotas.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, when the estimates were made for North and South Dakota they were estimated for as one office for the surveyor-general of the Territory of Dakota. Then a new surveyor-general was appointed for North Dakota. The law providing for two districts, the House in making up the bill simply divided the sum that had been originally appropriated for the one office. We sent, as the Senator from Missouri perhaps will remember, to the Secretary of the Interior for a statement as to what was needed in these two offices, and the result was a statement of something less than the amount inserted here.

Mr. COCKRELL. If there was only one before, how does it come that there are two now?

Mr. ALLISON. That is on account of the law.

Mr. COCKRELL. A recent law?

Mr. ALLISON. A recent law provides for an additional surveyor-general, or, rather, for two surveyors-general, one in North and one in South Dakota, a law passed at this session.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of the clause making appropriations for "surveyor-general of the Territory of Idaho," on page 95, beginning in line 12.

Mr. ALLISON. On line 14, page 95, I move to insert "\$3,000" instead of "\$1,500."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 95, line 14, strike out "fifteen hundred" and insert "three thousand;" so as to read:

For surveyor-general of the Territory of Idaho, \$2,500; and for the clerks in his office, \$3,000.

Mr. ALLISON. That is an estimate by the Secretary of the Interior furnished us later on, but was omitted in the amount. I desire to insert that amount in order that it may go into conference and we may look at it. The total should be changed.

The SECRETARY. In line 14 of the same clause, after the word "all," strike out "four thousand" and insert "five thousand five hundred;" so as to read:

In all, \$5,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 97, line 11, after the word "office," to strike out "five" and insert "ten;" and in line 12, after the word "all," to strike out "eight" and insert "thirteen;" so as to make the clause read:

For surveyor-general of Washington, \$2,500; and for the clerks in his office, \$10,500; in all, \$13,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Post-Office Department," on page 98, after line 12, to insert:

For twenty temporary clerks for five months' service, at \$60 per month each, to be appointed by the Postmaster-General to enable him to tabulate the returns from all post-offices of a general count of the several classes of mail matter for one week, \$6,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let us have some explanation of that.

Mr. ALLISON. The Postmaster-General states that he has been engaged for several months in classifying or arranging different classes of mail matter. He has a large accumulation of valuable information on this subject, and he now desires a small force for a few months to tabulate the information in his office which can not be tabulated otherwise.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is not to be a permanent force?

Mr. ALLISON. A temporary force for only a few months.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the bill (S. 894) to provide for the admission of the State of Wyoming into the Union, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the bill be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unless there is objection, the bill will be temporarily laid aside, in order that the appropriation bill under consideration may be proceeded with.

Mr. CULLOM. It being the regular order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Certainly, it remains the unfinished business.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 98, line 21, before the words "of class one," to strike out "one clerk" and insert "two clerks;" in the same line, after the word "one," to insert "assistant messenger;" and in line 22, after the word "all," to strike out "ten thousand three hundred" and insert "twelve thousand two hundred and twenty;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of Assistant Attorney-General for the Post-Office Department: Law clerk, \$2,500; two clerks of class 4; one clerk of class 3; one clerk of class 2; two clerks of class 1; assistant messenger; in all, \$12,220.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "Office First Assistant Postmaster-General," on page 99, line 2, before the word "hundred," to strike out "two" and insert "five;" so as to make the clause read:

Chief of salary and allowance division, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 99, line 13, to increase the total amount of the appropriations for compensation of First Assistant Postmaster-General, and the clerical and other force in his office, from "\$123,980" to "\$124,280."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. On page 98, line 21, I move to strike out "two" and insert "three;" that is, substitute "three" for "two;" and in line 23 substitute "\$13,420" for "\$12,220."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be reported by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. In line 21, on page 98, it is proposed to amend the committee's amendment by striking out "two" and inserting "three;" so as to read:

Three clerks of class 1.

In line 23 it is proposed to strike out "\$12,220" and to insert "\$13,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the appropriations for "Office Third Assistant Postmaster-General," on page 100, line 8, before the word "clerks," to strike out "sixteen" and insert "seventeen;" so as to read:

Seventeen clerks of class 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same clause, on page 100, line 9, before the word "clerks," to strike out "twenty-one" and insert "twenty-two;" so as to read:

Twenty-two clerks of class 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 100, line 12, to increase the total amount of the appropriations for compensation of the Third Assistant Postmaster-General, and the clerical and other force in his office, from "\$118,570" to "\$121,570."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for office of disbursing clerk, Post-Office Department, on page 102, line 21, before the word "firemen," to strike out "two" and insert "four;" so as to read:

Four firemen.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 103, line 5, to increase the total amount of the appropriations for office of disbursing clerk, Post-Office Department, from "\$55,780" to "\$57,220."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 103, line 9, after the word "Department," to insert "including the additional building occupied by the money-order division of the Sixth Auditor's Office, and the additional building used for storage of post-office supplies;" so as to make the heading read:

For contingent expenses of the Post-Office Department, including the additional building occupied by the money-order division of the Sixth Auditor's Office, and the additional building used for storage of post-office supplies, namely.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. There seems to be some confusion respecting these contingent expenses in the Post-Office Department and in the Sixth Auditor's Office. The Postmaster-General, who sends me a letter respecting these expenses, states that if he is to have under his control or direction the Sixth Auditor's Office, the contingent expenses provided for by the House of Representatives are entirely insufficient. The chief clerk of the Treasury Department appeared, as the Senator from Missouri will remember, before the Committee on Appropriations and stated that, if a change was to be made, as the House bill provided, the contingent expenses of the Treasury Department should be increased. In that view I think it is proper that this amendment now proposed should remain in the bill. I suppose that it will then give us jurisdiction over the whole question to examine it more in detail than we can do now. The Postmaster-General sent me a letter this morning since 12 o'clock.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that it may be read.

Mr. ALLISON. I will send to the desk the letter of the Postmaster-General to be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The letter will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL, Washington, June 18, 1890.

SIR: On the 12th of February last I had the honor to address Mr. CANNON, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, a letter, of which the inclosed is a copy, requesting that the wording of the appropriations for the contingent expenses of the Post-Office Department (see page 103 of the legislative bill as reported to the Senate) should be so modified as to confine those appropriations, with the exception of fuel and repairs to heating apparatus, to the Post-Office Department, and not to require this Department to pay expenses properly under the charge of the Secretary of the Treasury. I notice that the wording which this Department requested should be eliminated has been restored in the Senate bill. I have the honor to advise you that this Department has not heretofore paid for the contingent expenses incident to the occupancy of the additional building known as Marini's Hall, and that if it is proposed by the wording to which reference is made to require the Post-Office Department to bear these expenses, it will be necessary that additional appropriations shall be made, as follows:

Under the head of "Stationery, blank-books," etc., lines 13, 14, and 15, page 103, \$10,150, a total of \$22,150. Under the heading of "Carpets and matting," line 22, \$1,500, a total of \$4,500. Under the heading of "Furniture," line 23, \$1,500, a total of \$4,500. Under the head of "Miscellaneous items," line 2, page 104, \$412, a total of \$12,412. These appropriations will be absolutely necessary if this Department is to defray the cost of the items for a division of the Treasury Department.

Very respectfully,

JNO. WANAMAKER,
Postmaster-General.

Hon. WILLIAM B. ALLISON,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa whether we left in the incidental expenses of the Treasury Department the total estimates for their incidental expenses, including Marini's Hall.

Mr. ALLISON. Including the Sixth Auditor's Office. This includes the office immediately opposite the Post-Office building.

Mr. COCKRELL. We ought to make an amendment in the item

relating to the contingent expenses of the Treasury Department, so that if we make the appropriations recommended by the Postmaster-General here we can deduct the proper amount out of the Treasury Department appropriations.

Mr. ALLISON. So I think; but the Senator will remember that the chief clerk of the Treasury Department came to us and said that unless the phraseology which is now under consideration be inserted in the bill we must increase the appropriation for the contingent expenses of the Treasury Department. It is evident from this letter that the House of Representatives intend to eliminate from the bill the provision which we have inserted, and that they made what they considered a sufficient appropriation for the contingencies of the Treasury Department. I only call attention to it now.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then they made no provision at all for the contingencies of the Post-Office Department.

Mr. ALLISON. The Treasury Department insist that they made their estimate for contingent expenses upon the basis of the appropriations for the current fiscal year, which included the expenditures for the Sixth Auditor's Office under the direction of the Postmaster-General. The Postmaster-General informs us this morning that they have paid none of these contingent expenses during the current fiscal year, and that they have just now discovered the difficulty between the two offices.

Mr. COCKRELL. That reminds me of the possibility, and even the probability, of a very important factor and a question in connection with these matters which the Senate is compelled to pass upon when they come to us from another branch of the service. It seems that probably sufficient deliberation and consideration had not been given in some place or other to some matters of legislation. In order that we may understand exactly how legislation is disposed of in some branches, I will read a clipping from a newspaper quoting a very distinguished citizen of the United States in regard to one deliberative branch of Congress, and a gentleman who is supposed to be somewhat familiar with the proceedings of that body, and this paragraph may account for what we at one time here witnessed early in the proceedings of the Senate—an announcement at the door of the Senate Chamber from a Clerk of the House of Representatives that "the Speaker" had "passed" certain bills and had sent them to the Senate for the consideration of the Senate. This is a quotation from the New York Star, a paper which I never see, and is dated Washington, June 16:

Meeting—

This is what the correspondent says:

Meeting Speaker REED in the Shoreham to-day, I said: "I presume, Mr. Speaker, it is useless to ask you when Congress is likely to adjourn?" "I can only answer for the House," he replied. "The House will be ready by the 1st of July. It will have completed all its business by that time." "Election bill included?" "Election bill included. Thank heaven, the House is not a deliberative body. We haven't thirty or forty members, each with a six or seven hours' speech in his belly."

That may account for the shape in which some of these bills come to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the appropriations for contingent expenses of the Post-Office Department, on page 103, line 14, before the word "thousand," to strike out "eleven" and insert twelve; so as to read:

For stationery and blank-books, including amount necessary for the purchase of free-penalty envelopes, \$12,000.

Mr. ALLISON. Before the word "thousand," I move to strike out "twelve" and insert "twenty."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to line 22, on page 103.

Mr. ALLISON. In line 22, before the word "thousand," I move to strike out "three" and insert "four;" so as to read:

For carpets and matting, \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. In line 23, before the word "thousand," I move to strike out "three" and insert "four;" so as to read:

For furniture, \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I give notice that later on I shall move to deduct similar amounts from the Treasury contingent expenses, and that will leave the whole matter to be further examined.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 103, line 24, after the word "purchase," to strike out "of;" so as to read:

For purchase and keeping of horses and repair of wagons and harness to be used only for official purposes, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 104, line 7, after the words "Marini Hall," to insert "which shall be vacated;" in line 9, after

the word "Department," to strike out "four thousand five hundred" and insert "five thousand;" in line 10, after the word "dollars," to insert "and for expenses of removal to new location, \$500;" in line 12, after the word "supplies," to strike out "three" and insert "five;" and in line 12, after the word "all," to strike out "seventeen" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the clause read:

For rent of topographer's office, \$1,500; for rent of a suitable building or buildings for the use of the money-order office of the Post-Office Department, \$8,000; for rent of building other than the Marini Hall, which shall be vacated; for the use of the money-order division of the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department, \$5,000; and for expenses of removal to new location, \$500; for rent of a suitable building for the storage of post-office supplies, \$5,000; in all, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Justice," on page 105, line 8, before the word "Assistant," to strike out "three" and insert "four;" so as to read:

Four Assistant Attorneys-General, at \$5,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same clause, on page 105, line 21, after the word "each," to insert:

Clerk in charge of pardons, \$2,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same clause, on page 105, line 22, before the word "clerks," to strike out "five" and insert "four;" so as to read:

Four clerks of class 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same clause, on page 105, line 23, after the words "disbursing clerk," to strike out "and clerk in charge of pardons;" and in line 24, after the word "dollars," to strike out "each;" so as to read:

Additional for disbursing clerk, \$200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 106, line 8, to increase the total amount of the appropriations for compensation of the Attorney-General, Solicitor-General, Assistant Attorneys-General, and the clerical and other force in the office of the Attorney-General from "\$122,070" to "\$127,470."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 15, page 106.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In line 15, after the word "for," the Chair suggests that the words "use of" should perhaps be inserted.

Mr. COCKRELL. It should read "for the use of the Department."

Mr. ALLISON. Yes; "for the use of the Department."

Mr. COCKRELL. Put in the words "the use of."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 106, line 15, after the word "for," insert the words "the use;" so as to read:

For purchase of session laws and statutes of the States and Territories for the use of the Department, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Department of Labor," on page 108, line 4, after the word "laborers," to strike out "at \$600 each;" and in line 8, after the word "thousand," to strike out "five hundred" and insert "six hundred and twenty;" so as to make the clause read:

For compensation of the Commissioner of Labor, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; disbursing clerk, \$1,800; three statistical experts, at \$2,000 each; two clerks of class 4, who may be statistical experts; five clerks of class 3; six clerks of class 2; eight clerks of class 1; five clerks, at \$1,000 each; two copyists; one messenger; one assistant messenger; three watchmen; two laborers; two charwomen; six special agents, at \$1,600 each; ten special agents, at \$1,400 each; four special agents, at \$1,200 each; in all, \$85,620.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 108, line 20, to increase the appropriation for postage-stamps to prepay postage on matter addressed to Postal-Union countries from "\$200" to "\$250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 109, after line 3, to insert:

For the investigation of, and report upon, the various industrial school systems, and also technical school systems, of the United States and foreign countries, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for United States courts, on page 110, line 7, to increase the amount of the appropriation for compensation of the district attorneys of the United States from "\$20,550" to "20,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 110, line 10, to increase the appropriation for compensation of the district marshals of the United States from "\$13,300" to "\$13,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire now to make the corresponding amendment with reference to the contingent expenses of the Treasury De-

partment. On page 44, line 19, I move to strike out "eight" before "thousand;" so as to read "\$20,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 44, line 19, before the word "dollars," it is proposed to strike out "twenty-eight" and insert "twenty;" so as to read:

For stationery for the Treasury and its several bureaus, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. On page 46, line 1, before the word "thousand," I move to strike out "six" and insert "five;" so as to read:

For purchase of carpets, carpet-border and lining, linoleum, mats, rugs, matting, and repairs, and for cleaning, laying, and relaying of the same by contract, \$5,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. On page 46, in line 10, before the word "thousand," I move to strike out "ten" and insert "nine;" so as to read:

For purchase of boxes, book-rests, chairs, chair-caning, chair-covers, desks, book-cases, clocks, cloth for covering desks, cushions, leather for covering chairs and sofas, locks, lumber, screens, tables, type-writers, ventilators, wardrobe cabinets, washstands, water-coolers and stands, \$9,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. In the appropriation for "clerks and messengers to committees," on page 13, line 18, after the words "war claims," I move to insert "irrigation of arid lands." This is a request that comes from the House of Representatives.

Mr. COCKRELL. How is that?

Mr. ALLISON. I have a note from the chairman of the House committee suggesting it.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is a dangerous precedent for the Senate to go to interfering with the offices of the other House.

Mr. ALLISON. I withdraw the amendment if there is any objection to it.

Mr. COCKRELL. No, wait a moment. If we have any authority from the House Committee on Appropriations that this is an omission, or anything of that kind, and they desire us to insert it, as a matter of courtesy to them, I have no objection to doing it.

Mr. ALLISON. I withdraw it, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. ALLISON. I should be glad to have the Senator read that letter, and if he assents to it I will offer the amendment. Otherwise I will not press it. [The letter was handed to Mr. COCKRELL.] On page 10, line 16, I move to strike out "ninety-two" and insert "ninety-one." That is in accordance with the other changes made yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 16, before the word "thousand," it is proposed to strike out "ninety-two" and insert "ninety-one;" so as to read:

For compensation of the officers, clerks, messengers, and others in the service of the House of Representatives, \$391,113.30.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. On page 73, line 17, before the word "clerks," where it first occurs, I move to strike out "four" and insert "five."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 73, line 17, in the appropriation for Bureau of Navigation, before the word "clerks," where it first occurs, it is proposed to strike out "four" and insert "five;" so as to read:

Five clerks of class 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I move, on page 73, in line 21, to change the total to correspond with the amendment just made in line 21, from \$28,120 to \$29,920.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. In the appropriations for the office of the Secretary of the Senate, on page 3, line 5, I move to strike out "five" and insert "six."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, at the end of line 5, it is proposed to strike out "five" and insert "six;" so as to read:

Six clerks, at \$2,220 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. On page 3, I ask unanimous consent to omit the amendment which has been agreed to in line 7, so as to leave it "five clerks at \$2,100 each."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment already adopted on page 7 will be disagreed to, if there be no objection.

Mr. ALLISON. It has been agreed to, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be reconsidered and disagreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so considered, so that the line will read, "five clerks."

Mr. ALLISON. I move to change the total there so as to read, "\$64,538.90."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent that in the appropriation

"for compensation of officers, clerks, messengers, and others in the service of the Senate," on page 2, lines 3, 4, and 5, the proper sum may be inserted when it is footed up according to these amendments. The clerks will be able to fix that amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the clerks will be authorized to insert the proper amount.

Mr. ALLISON. They will make the computation. The clerk of the Committee on Appropriations will aid them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is so ordered.

Mr. PADDOCK. From the Committee on Public Lands, I report an amendment to come in on page 82 of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 82, it is proposed to strike out all after the words "General Land Office," in the tenth line, down to and including the word "dollars," in the eighteenth line, and to insert in lieu thereof:

For the Commissioner of the General Land Office, \$5,000; one assistant commissioner, to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall be authorized to sign such letters, papers, and documents, and to perform such other duties as may be directed by the Commissioner, and shall act as Commissioner in the absence of that officer, or in case of a vacancy in the office of Commissioner, \$3,500.

Mr. ALLISON. Inasmuch as that amendment changes existing law, I think it is subject to a point of order, and therefore I make the point of order.

Mr. PADDOCK. Do I understand the Senator to make the point of order against the amendment?

Mr. ALLISON. I do.

Mr. PADDOCK. I think the amendment is clearly within the rule. It is recommended by a standing committee of the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Appropriations in accordance with the rules of the Senate. It is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, the head of the Department of which this officer is a subordinate. I think the point of order is not well taken. It has the double recommendation of a standing committee and of the proper head of a Department—the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ALLISON. Of course I do not wish to discuss the point of order, but it is clear to my mind that if this salary can be changed every salary in the bill can be changed, and we open up a field that is certainly a very dangerous one to enter upon. I happen to know the Commissioner of the General Land Office to be a most able, efficient, and capable man, and I should be glad to serve him in any way possible or practicable, but I think that we can not afford to open the door to the increase of salaries that are provided for in the bill under existing statutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chief Clerk will read the portions of the rule which refer to the question of order.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

RULE XVI.

And no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill, the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session; or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate of the head of some one of the Departments.

2. All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least one day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and when actually proposed to the bill, no amendment proposing to increase the amount stated in such amendment shall be received.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of opinion—

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. President, allow me to make a suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was about to decide in favor of the amendment being in order.

Mr. PADDOCK. Then I shall not interpose any objection to the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, this amendment, having been reported by the Committee on Public Lands and referred to the Committee on Appropriations more than one day previous to the time of its being moved, is in order under the last clause of section 1 of Rule XVI.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. President, the argument made by the chairman of the committee against an increase of the salary of this officer, which he will admit as readily as any Senator on this floor is too low a salary, considering the responsibilities and duties of the office and considering the equipment required for the faithful and thorough and capable performance of those duties, I think is a very poor argument, with all due deference to my distinguished friend from Iowa. If comparisons are to be instituted I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Iowa, the chairman of the committee, to other salaries which are above and not below; and I believe the Senator from Iowa will admit that the duties and responsibilities of this officer are as great as those of any one of the officers to whom I shall call his attention.

The Comptroller of the Currency receives \$5,000; the Treasurer, \$6,000; the Second Comptroller, \$5,000; the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, \$6,000; the Commissioner of Pensions, \$5,000; the Director

of the Geological Survey, \$6,000; the Commissioner of the Department of Labor, \$5,000; the Commissioner of Patents, \$5,000.

I do not think it is necessary to make any comment on those salaries. Whatever may be below I care to say nothing about by way of invidious comparison. Even these salaries may be too low; I know in some instances they are too low. I know the one in question is conspicuously, exceptionally, and the most absurdly low salary that is paid by the Government, considering the amount, character, and responsibility of the duties performed.

Here is an officer who is not only an executive officer, not only in charge of administrative affairs, with three or four hundred people or more under him to look after, but he is a judge. He is required to pass upon questions of law and of fact. In his hands there are the titles of hundreds of thousands of people which are to be adjusted. Why, sir, this officer passes upon a larger number of titles than any court of this country, not excepting the Supreme Court of the United States. The Director of the Geological Survey gets a salary of \$6,000 for overlooking a section of country which is not one-half of the whole area within the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of the General Land Office. And yet every acre of these arid lands which the Director of the Geological Survey has to deal with is under the jurisdiction of the General Land Office.

I make no complaint as to the salary paid to this officer, but I do complain, I protest, considering the enormously greater jurisdiction, labor, and responsibilities of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, that his salary should be only two-thirds as large as that of the officer in charge of these surveys, and that it should be permitted to be at least a thousand dollars less than that of any officer of his grade in the public service. It is wrong. It is shamefully unjust.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. PADDOCK].

The question being put, there were on a division—ayes 10, noes 6—no quorum voting.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. FAULKNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY].

Mr. HIGGINS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON], and I withhold my vote, in his absence.

Mr. PASCO (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. FARWELL]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. PLATT (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BARBOUR], and will withhold my vote unless it shall be necessary to make a quorum.

Mr. WALTHALL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. DIXON (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HAMPTON], and in his absence, I wish to withdraw my vote.

Mr. CASEY. I desire to State that my colleague [Mr. PIERCE] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE].

Mr. MORRILL (after having voted in the negative). In the absence of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS], with whom I am paired, I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 11; as follows:

YEAS—26.

Allen,	Dolph,	Moody,	Sherman,
Bate,	Evarts,	Morgan,	Squire,
Blair,	Gibson,	Paddock,	Stewart,
Call,	Hawley,	Payne,	Stockbridge,
Casey,	Hiscock,	Power,	Teller.
Chandler,	Ingalls,	Sanders,	
Cullom,	Mitchell,	Sawyer,	

NAYS—11.

Allison,	Coke,	Gorman,	Pugh,
Berry,	Edmunds,	Hale,	Vest.
Cockrell,	Frye,	Hoar,	

ABSENT—47.

Aldrich,	Dixon,	Kenna,	Reagan,
Barbour,	Eustis,	McMillan,	Spooner,
Blackburn,	Farwell,	McPherson,	Stanford,
Blodgett,	Faulkner,	Manderson,	Turpie,
Brown,	George,	Morrill,	Vance,
Butler,	Gray,	Pasco,	Voorhees,
Cameron,	Hampton,	Pettigrew,	Walthall,
Carlisle,	Harris,	Pierce,	Washington,
Colquitt,	Hearst,	Platt,	Wilson of Iowa,
Daniel,	Higgins,	Plumb,	Wilson of Md.
Davis,	Jones of Arkansas,	Quay,	Wolcott.
Dawes,	Jones of Nevada,	Ransom,	

The VICE-PRESIDENT. No quorum having voted, the roll will be called.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen,	Cullom,	Hiscock,	Power,
Allison,	Dixon,	Hoar,	Pugh,
Bate,	Dolph,	Ingalls,	Sanders,
Berry,	Edmunds,	Mitchell,	Sawyer,
Blackburn,	Evarts,	Moody,	Sherman,
Blair,	Faulkner,	Morgan,	Stockbridge,
Casey,	Frye,	Morrill,	Teller,
Chandler,	Gibson,	Paddock,	Turpie,
Cockrell,	Gorman,	Pasco,	Vest,
Coke,	Hale,	Payne,	Walthall,
Colquitt,	Higgins,	Platt,	Wilson of Md.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Forty-four Senators have responded to their names. A quorum is present. The roll will be again called on the question of agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. PADDOCK].

Mr. BERRY. Is the question open to debate?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber when the matter was presented a few minutes ago. I have been informed, however, that the pending amendment is a proposition to increase the salary of the Commissioner of the General Land Office from \$4,000 to \$5,000. Is that the question pending?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That is the pending question.

Mr. BERRY. There was a bill reported from the Committee on Public Lands proposing to increase this salary. It came before the Senate some two or three weeks ago. It was debated some time, and it was evident that a majority of the Senate was opposed to the increase. The senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. INGALLS] made a very able speech in opposition to an increase of salary for this particular officer when that bill was pending. That bill is still before the Senate, and now the Senator from Nebraska seeks to take out of that bill, which could not be passed upon its merits, and place in an appropriation bill an increase of the salary of this officer.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas a question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. BERRY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. PADDOCK. I should like to know upon what authority the Senator states that the bill when it was up for consideration by the Senate was substantially defeated. I got no such impression as that from the action of the Senate, nor did the friends of the bill.

Mr. BERRY. It was so evident that the friends of the bill allowed it to go over.

Mr. PADDOCK. The bill went over because there was an absence of a quorum; and we were on the Calendar of unobjected cases. The Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] objected to its further consideration in the absence of a quorum, and therefore it had to go over.

Mr. BERRY. The RECORD will show what was done upon that occasion. It was evident I think to every Senator upon this floor at that time that the bill would be defeated, and the friends of the bill did not press it upon the Senate, but agreed that it should go over.

Mr. PADDOCK. The bill went over, as I said before, for want of a quorum. I urged a vote repeatedly, and only yielded because it was impossible, under the objection raised, to get one.

Mr. BERRY. But this is a proposition to increase an officer's salary upon an appropriation bill when there is a bill pending for the same purpose now on the Calendar of the Senate which the Senate has declined to pass.

I want to say in addition, Mr. President, that there are a number of other officers who receive less salary than is proposed to be given in this amendment. The Assistant Secretary of the Interior, if I remember correctly, receives only \$4,000 or \$4,500 a year. There are a number of other officers who were named at the time of that debate (I do not remember them now) whose positions are equally as important as this officer's and who receive less than that sum. I can see no justice, no reason, no equity in selecting out one particular officer and increasing his salary while others equally important are left with a less amount.

A similar proposition came before the Senate during the last Administration to increase the salary of this officer from \$4,000 to \$4,500. I opposed the proposition then, and it was opposed in the Senate by a large number of Democrats at that time, when we had a Democratic administration. It is claimed now that the salary of the Commissioner of Pensions was increased when we had a Democratic majority. Probably it was increased to \$4,500.

But the law upon the statute-book fixes the salary at a less sum than has been appropriated for a number of these officers from year to year. This method of making the law state that an officer shall receive so much and then trying to hoodwink the country by coming in here and making an appropriation for a larger sum is, in my opinion, an unjust system. If the law says that the salary of an official shall be \$4,000 a year, then I think that it is unjust and unfair to go on and appropriate \$4,500 or \$5,000 when the statute fixes the amount on the deliberate judgment of Congress as to what the officer should receive. If it is not enough it ought to be corrected by an act regu-

larly for that purpose, so that the country would understand that we were increasing the salary.

We go before the people from year to year and insist that we are opposed to the increase of salaries, and when you seek to increase them for the purpose of giving some favorite more money than he is entitled to you ought to come up and do it directly, by a repeal of the present law, and not increase it by putting an amendment on an appropriation bill.

I think that this officer should be treated as other officers. If the salary is not enough, let the bill now on the Calendar take its chances, but do not seek to select him out and make a specialty of him because he happens to have friends when others have not, and give him more than the statute says he is entitled to receive.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas if it is not true that the salary of the Commissioner of Pensions during the last Administration was increased upon an appropriation bill by Democratic effort, and Republican effort as well, because, as I remember, every Republican believed it ought to be, and was willing to see it increased?

Mr. BERRY. I stated awhile ago that while General Black occupied the position of Commissioner of Pensions the salary of the office was increased on an appropriation bill, I think, from \$4,000 to \$4,500. But I opposed it then, as did a number of other Democrats. It was carried by a majority, some Republicans and some Democrats voting for it, I do not know the proportion. But I care not whether it was in that Administration or in this Administration. I say that it is a wrong system and an unjust system, and that the salaries should be fixed by the statute, and that the amount should not be increased in an appropriation bill.

Appropriation bills are intended to appropriate according to the laws in force, but it is proposed to leave the law standing which provides that this officer shall have \$4,000 and to give him by an appropriation bill \$5,000. I say, Mr. President, that is not dealing openly; that is not dealing fairly. It misleads the country, and they do not understand it. It is an unjust way of dealing with salaries, and it is doubly unjust to pick out one particular officer when there are others equally important and equally entitled to an increase of salary, and give it to him on an appropriation bill, and that too when there is a bill pending, now on the Calendar, which will settle the whole question in regard to this salary.

Mr. PADDOCK. That seems to me to be a very absurd proposition on the part of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BERRY. I did not hear the remark.

Mr. PADDOCK. I say, with all due deference to the Senator, it seems to be rather an absurd proposition to oppose the amendment because a bill is pending on the Calendar which was intended to accomplish the same purpose. Here is an amendment reported from the committee that reported the bill to which the Senator refers—a standing committee. The amendment was reported regularly and in order, and referred properly to the Committee on Appropriations, and now presented, not only as a report from a standing committee, as the bill itself was, but backed up by the opinion and the desire and the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior himself.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, as to whether my position as a Senator is absurd or otherwise, that is simply the opinion of the Senator from Nebraska. It is no argument in regard to the proposition.

Mr. PADDOCK. What I mean is this—

Mr. BERRY. The statute law at this time fixes the salary of the Commissioner of the General Land Office at \$4,000, or \$3,500, I do not remember which it is.

Mr. PADDOCK. If the Senator will allow me just one moment, I do not object to his antagonizing the bill on its merits. That is his undoubted right, but I do object to his making an invidious reflection upon this particular proceeding, which is altogether regular and just and fair and proper. Here is a most meritorious officer, one of the most capable and efficient and thorough officers who has ever been in the administration of that bureau, and everybody knows it on both sides of the Chamber. He has accomplished reforms and systematized the work there, purified the service, and among other results accomplished has reduced the number of final entries pending fully sixty thousand since he came into office, and kept the routine work of the office up from day to day.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, as to my manner of opposing or antagonizing this amendment, with all due respect to the Senator from Nebraska, I will select that myself, and not look to him to dictate as to how or in what manner I shall oppose it. I opposed the bill and I opposed putting it on this appropriation bill because I believe that the system is wrong. I am opposed, in addition to that, to increasing this officer's salary, because he receives enough already. I oppose it because there are other officers equally important who are receiving a less salary than it is proposed to give this one. I oppose it for the same reason that was so ably given by the Senator from Kansas when this matter was last before the Senate, that this is a bad time to be increasing the salaries of the officials of this Government, at a time when there is distress throughout the country, when the farmers are complaining from one end to the other.

It is proposed to give this officer \$5,000 a year, and to do it in an indirect way, when you have not the courage to come in and pass a bill to give it to him directly. You seek to cover it up by putting it on an appropriation bill, and point to the statute as though he were receiving \$4,000, when in fact he is receiving \$5,000. I say if there is anything insidious about my manner of opposing this amendment it is far less so than this attempt to mislead and hoodwink the people and tell them the salaries are so and so when you are giving to the officers on appropriation bills more than the statute says they are entitled to have. I say that the system is wrong. It was inaugurated by the Republican party, and if the Democratic party or any part of it in the last Administration did it that was a mistake. The Republicans invariably quote something of that kind where the Democrats follow them in their worst methods.

I hope, Mr. President, that the Senator from Nebraska will let this question be settled upon the bill now pending upon the Calendar, and not seek to force it on an appropriation bill where it does not belong.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I do not see why there should be any discrimination in salary against the Commissioner of the General Land Office. That was supposed to be the most important bureau in the Interior Department, and it ought to be to-day. They have taken from it in various ways and usurped its jurisdiction in various forms. I admit that that bureau is very much crippled, to the detriment of the people. It is true it fell behind, and it may have been the fault of some Commissioners and it may have been the fault of the appropriations. It got into disrepute.

Mr. ALLISON. I will state to the Senator from Nevada that this is a statutory salary that has been in existence for a great many years.

Mr. STEWART. I understand that. I will ask the Senator a question about statutory salaries when I get a little further on, and I hope the Senator will stay here a moment longer.

Mr. ALLISON. I have been here all day, and propose to stay.

Mr. STEWART. I say the Commissioner of the General Land Office ought to be at the head of the most important bureau in the Interior Department, and it would be if the legislation would allow an officer there who is competent. I must say that I believe the present incumbent is competent. I have not been able to say that for some of the Commissioners, and I profess to be familiar with the Land Office. I believe this gentleman is competent, and I do not know why he should not receive as much as the Commissioner of Patents or the Commissioner of Pensions, both of whom receive \$5,000 under this bill. The Director of the Geological Survey receives \$6,000. Whether that is useful or not posterity can judge.

Besides, the Director of the Geological Survey has an executive officer at \$3,000. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Iowa what that executive officer is for, and what he does. I see that none of the other bureaus have that kind of an officer. It is an anomaly; and I want to know under what law that office was created and what are the duties of an executive officer of the Geological Survey.

Mr. ALLISON. The executive officer of the Geological Survey, I have no doubt, is engaged in the various executive and administrative duties of that office, while the Director of the Survey is engaged in the examination of scientific questions. But I did not know that that question was under consideration at this moment. If the Senator desires to make any motion respecting the executive officer of the Geological Survey he may not find me opposing it, unless he also wants to increase that salary.

Mr. STEWART. I do not want to increase any salary except that of the Commissioner of the General Land Office. I want to put his salary up to that of the other Commissioners, simply because I think it is fair. The Commissioner of Patents and the Commissioner of Pensions receive \$5,000, and the Commissioner of the General Land Office has not only the same executive duties that they have to perform, but he has judicial functions. It requires a lawyer of high standing to discharge the duties of that office well, and we rarely get a man competent. I believe we have one now, and I think if we put the salary at \$5,000 we should secure the services of a competent man. There has been great difficulty in filling that office with competent men, and the suffering and inconvenience of the people in consequence of incompetency in the Land Office have been immense.

Mr. HALE. We have had good men there.

Mr. STEWART. You had good men there formerly. You had Mr. Hendricks there at one time, and his decisions are luminous.

Mr. HALE. Voluminous?

Mr. STEWART. Not voluminous, but luminous. They were landmarks. You had Joe Wilson there.

Mr. MANDERSON. And Sparks.

Mr. STEWART. I do not want to talk about him; that is too recent. But you have had great failures in recent dates. The present Commissioner is from Nebraska. He is a lawyer and a competent man, and I would put him on a level with the Commissioner of Patents and the Commissioner of Pensions. I do not see that the bureau of posterity should be placed above the other bureaus, the living bureaus. They are bureaus for posterity; yet the head of the bureau for posterity gets \$6,000. If we should reduce that to \$5,000 and raise the salary of the Commissioner of the General Land Office to \$5,000 we

should have all of these great bureaus on a level. It seems to me that nobody could object to that.

I hope that the amendment will prevail; and I will try to move a further amendment then, if that is proper, to equalize the salaries by reducing the salary of the Director of the Geological Survey \$1,000, the amount that we should add to the salary of the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

Mr. PADDOCK. I hope the Senator will not move such an amendment now.

Mr. STEWART. I would not make that motion now, but I say it might be done if anybody wants to make the motion.

Mr. MITCHELL. The Senator does not desire to decrease the general expenses, then?

Mr. STEWART. I should like to decrease them by getting rid of the executive officer of the Geological Survey. I think unless somebody can say what he is useful for I shall make that motion. But I hope that the Commissioner of the General Land Office will be placed on an equality with the Commissioner of Patents and the Commissioner of Pensions. I hope he will be placed on a level with them, because he is an important officer.

As to whether we shall give a large amount of money to officers we have no use for in this generation, I leave that to the Senate; but so far as these officers are useful we ought to make no discrimination among the useful ones. The Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Commissioner of Patents and the Commissioner of Pensions are useful and necessary officers, and their compensation should be equal. There is no reason why it should not be.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. PADDOCK].

Mr. ALLISON. The occupant of the chair a few moments ago decided that this proposition is in order. I think that is a matter of so much importance that we ought to understand clearly and definitely that this is now a proposition to change on an appropriation bill the salary of an officer fixed by law. If this can be done in the case of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, it can be done as respects every salary in the United States, including our own, and the salaries of all the bureau officers, of the members of the Cabinet, etc. I think it is a matter of such grave and serious importance that it ought to be decided on the question of order.

There shall be in the Department of the Interior a Commissioner of the General Land Office—

Mr. INGALLS. What is the Senator reading from?

Mr. ALLISON. I am reading from the Revised Statutes of the United States, second edition, 1878.

Mr. INGALLS. What section?

Mr. ALLISON. Section 446, chapter 3:

There shall be in the Department of the Interior a Commissioner of the General Land Office, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall be entitled to a salary of \$4,000 a year.

Mr. BLAIR. That is the existing salary.

Mr. ALLISON. That is the existing statutory salary. I therefore make the point of order again. This is a matter of so much moment and affects so many other things involved in this bill and in other bills that I think it is a question which ought to be understood in the Chamber.

Mr. PADDOCK. I will state that this question has already been decided by the Chair, but not by the present occupant of it. I do not see how the Chair can determine it a second time. Of course I do not object to a ruling by the present occupant of the chair, but I can not see how there can be any other ruling by anybody.

Mr. MANDERSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, whether it is not a fact that the salaries of a great many other of the executive officers of the Government that are fixed by general statute, by the law creating the office, have been changed by legislation upon appropriation bills and their salaries increased, and whether that increase of salary as made upon appropriation bills has not received the sanction of the Appropriations Committee year after year, and the raising of the salaries been recognized in appropriation bills.

Mr. ALLISON. I have no recollection of any such instance, but it may be true. I should be glad to have an instance called to my attention; I have no recollection of any such instance.

Mr. MANDERSON. Is it not true as to the Commissioner of Pensions?

Mr. ALLISON. The Commissioner of Pensions formerly received a salary of \$6,000. It was reduced to \$5,000.

Mr. MANDERSON. By a general statute?

Mr. TELLER. We raised it during the last Administration.

Mr. MANDERSON. On an appropriation bill, when Mr. Black was Commissioner.

Mr. ALLISON. We changed the salary; I do not remember precisely how it was changed. But the salary of the Commissioner of Pensions, as I understand it, is not a salary fixed in the Revised Statutes, as is this salary. The salary of the Commissioner of Pensions was reduced and afterwards restored. That is my recollection about it.

This is a matter I care nothing about personally. I know the Com-

missioner of the General Land Office, and I know him to be an estimable person; but I want the Senate now to decide whether the whole question and range of public salaries and compensation shall be subject to change from year to year upon these appropriation bills. That is all.

Mr. INGALLS. Mr. President, when the bill to which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] adverted was under consideration by report from the Committee on Public Lands, to raise the salary of the Commissioner of the General Land Office from \$4,000 to \$5,000, I expressed myself in opposition to it. Upon further inquiry, I became satisfied that the position I took was incorrect, and that considering the amount of labor performed, and by comparison with other officers of similar rank and grade, he was entitled to the benefit of the bill reported from the Committee on Public Lands.

When the occupant of the chair temporarily, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], in the absence of the Vice-President, ruled upon the point of order suggested by the Senator from Iowa, I was inclined to coincide with him and to support its correctness, supposing, as I did then, that the salary of the Commissioner of the General Land Office had been established in an appropriation bill, and not by general statute. If that were the case, an amendment to increase the item of appropriation or add a new item increasing the aggregate of the bill would plainly have been in order if reported from a standing or select committee and referred to the Committee on Appropriations one day previous to its being offered in the Senate.

I was not aware, until my attention was called to the fact by the Senator from Iowa, that the salary of the Commissioner of the General Land Office was fixed by statute. That being the case, the salary could only be changed by a general law, and that would be by general legislation. The third clause of Rule XVI provides that—

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

Therefore it seems, the salary having been fixed by general statute, that an attempt to change that by an amendment to an appropriation bill would be within the terms of the rule "general legislation," and in my opinion, therefore, open to objection, as suggested by the Senator from Iowa.

I sincerely regret to come to this conclusion, because I should, under the information that I have received, were I not forbidden by the rules, very cordially support the amendment proposed to raise the salary from \$4,000 to \$5,000.

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to inquire if the amount appropriated is the amount of salary fixed by the general law.

Mr. INGALLS. It is.

Mr. MANDERSON. I desire simply to correct the statement based on the recollection of the Senator from Iowa, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. In the few moments that have been given me for examination, I find that every one of the officers who are of like grade to the Commissioner of the General Land Office has had his salary raised upon appropriation bills. By the Revised Statutes the salary of the Commissioner of Pensions is fixed at \$4,000 a year. While General Black, I think, was the incumbent of that office his salary was raised to either \$4,500 or \$5,000 a year, and so it stands upon this appropriation bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations. So the committee stands in the position, if this amendment be in violation of the rules of the Senate, of violating the rule as to that officer and changing the existing statute by an appropriation bill that it reports and advocates on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say, if the Senator will allow me—

Mr. MANDERSON. Certainly I yield.

Mr. ALLISON. The salary of the Commissioner of Pensions is in the exact attitude of the proposed amendment now. That was put on an appropriation bill two or three years ago over the head of the Committee on Appropriations in this Chamber.

Mr. MANDERSON. Still it stands as changing the existing law for the coming fiscal year by the report of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MANDERSON. The fact that the Senate at that time violated the rules of the Senate is no precedent for the Committee on Appropriations that it should violate the rule by again reporting an increase.

Mr. ALLISON. It is, under the law.

Mr. MANDERSON. Now, I turn to the Commissioner of Patents, and I find that his salary is fixed by general statute at \$4,500 a year, and by this bill the salary of the Commissioner of Patents is raised to \$5,000 for the coming fiscal year.

So we have abundant precedent for this violation of the rule, if it be a violation. But it seems to me, with all deference, that this is not a violation of the rules of the Senate. It is a fixing of the compensation of this officer for the coming year, and I submit that it is within the right of Congress to change, increase, or diminish his compensation during the coming fiscal year. It is a matter of increase of appropriation, and not general legislation, within the meaning of the rules.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The point of order having been ruled upon by the previous occupant of the chair, the present occupant submits the question raised by the Senator from Iowa to the Senate for decision. Is the amendment in order?

Mr. PADDOCK. Would it not be more appropriate to put to the Senate the question whether the ruling of the preceding occupant of the Chair shall stand?

Mr. MANDERSON. No; it is not an appeal.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is, Is the amendment in order?

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I certainly think that this amendment is not in order under our rules. The rule has been read by the Senator from Kansas, and the amendment is certainly objectionable under that rule.

I fear that Senators do not appreciate the delicate position in which the Committee on Appropriations is so often placed in regard to this question of the increase of salaries. Year by year we are besought, beseged by the executive officers and their friends, by Representatives and by brother Senators, to increase this salary and that salary; and, unfortunately for the tax-payers, we have never been solicited to reduce any salary, whatever the amount might be; it is always an increase that is desired.

At the present session there is scarcely a bureau here in the Departments, where we have not been importuned in some way—I mean solicited or asked—to increase the salary, if not of the head of the bureau, of some official of that bureau. We have done the very best we could in maintaining the salaries at the amounts heretofore fixed by law or by the preceding appropriation acts.

I have some knowledge of the duties of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and I have some knowledge also of the manner in which the present incumbent of that office has performed his duties. It gives me very great pleasure to say that in my judgment the present incumbent, Judge Groff, is doing the very best he can. I have for the present, at least, but one criticism to submit, and that is a criticism which I shall submit under a different branch of the bill, in regard to the inefficient and worthless employes in his office, who are dead timber there, who are doing no equivalent for their salaries and ought to be discharged peremptorily and summarily. But that is not the only office where incompetent clerks are, and I presume that Judge Groff is in the same position with a great many others, and is unable to have his own way in regard to that matter.

My good friend from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] says the civil service prevents it. I desire now to say distinctly that not one solitary human being is kept in office in any shape, manner, or form by the civil-service law. The civil-service law has nothing to do with retention in office, and those who want to retain incompetent persons in office can not shield themselves behind the civil-service law. The civil-service law guards the entrance to office, the front door, and not the back door. The back door is always open, and it ought to be kept open a great deal more than it is, and there ought to be a great many more exits added. The work of the Departments could be brought up a great deal better.

I appreciate, I say, that Judge Groff is doing the very best he can; that he is an efficient officer, and relatively with other officers his salary is not adequate to the labor and the responsibility of his office.

Mr. PADDOCK. Will the Senator allow me one moment?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. PADDOCK. I think if the Senator will investigate he will find that the present Commissioner, during the brief period in which he has been in charge of the General Land Office, has done more thorough and good weeding out than any man ever did in the same length of time who was at the head of the bureau. He has done all he could under the civil-service circumstances in which he has been placed.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am not discussing that. I want simply to say in regard to the General Land Office that it never has been run systematically and efficiently since 1833, I can not help in whose Administration or under whose control that office has been. There was a record-book prepared in that office in which the title to every tract of land disposed of by the General Government was to be traced and entered, so that you could go to that one book and there see the subdivision of the land, when disposed of, at what price, in what manner, to whom, whether it was confirmed or not, the date of the issue of the patent, to whom the patent was delivered, and where it was recorded, and in that one book you could have the complete history of every piece of the public domain. The entries in that book have not been filled up since 1833. The blanks are there, but they have never been filled. So the office has not been managed in a business way. After I had investigated into the methods of business in 1887 my judgment, deliberately made, without any prejudice or passion in the matter, was that the only word that would describe the condition of the business of the General Land Office was chaos.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL. Has the Senator made any investigation since the present Commissioner came in with reference to the manner in which the office is conducted?

Mr. COCKRELL. I have not.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then it is hardly fair, I suggest to the Senator, to say that the office has not been conducted in a proper business way since 1833.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am perfectly satisfied as to the entries, that there has been no effort to bring all the mass of past entries up to this time, so that they will have one record, where the entire history of the public lands can be traced.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to assure the Senator that the office is being better administered now than it has been for a good many years.

Mr. COCKRELL. That may be. I am not disputing that. I am not raising that question. But the Commissioner of the General Land Office, with the number of incompetents he has under him and the force he has, can not even dispose of the business on hand, much less undertake to bring up arrears of business for thirty or forty years. I am not speaking of this in the way of criticism of the present Commissioner, for I have no doubt he is doing very well.

Mr. BLAIR. Why should the Senator make this wholesale charge against the employes of the bureau?

Mr. COCKRELL. Simply because it is true; that is all.

Mr. BLAIR. I do not believe it is true. I think the Senator is wrong.

Mr. COCKRELL. I can not help what the Senator from New Hampshire thinks.

Mr. BLAIR. I know something about those employes as well as the Senator from Missouri. There may be incompetent persons among them, but I venture to say that there is not an equal body of men in the employ of the Government who, as a whole, render better service than those engaged in the Land Office. While it may be proper to make charges by saying that there is incompetency here and there, so there is in the church, so there is in society generally, and there were failures in heaven even.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not know how the Senator has any right to assert the last proposition, that there have been failures in heaven.

Mr. BLAIR. I do it on high authority.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not know when the Senator came from there or when he was there.

Mr. BLAIR. I do not pretend to know it.

Mr. PADDOCK. Will the Senator from Missouri allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. COCKRELL. Wait one moment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri declines to yield.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from New Hampshire is simply speaking without any authority.

Mr. BLAIR. I do not admit that; but when the Senator makes an absolutely incorrect charge against an entire force under this Government, and of the kind he does, for incompetency, and says that they ought to be discharged—

Mr. COCKRELL. When did I make any charge against the entire force?

Mr. BLAIR. A few moments ago.

Mr. COCKRELL. Not at all.

Mr. BLAIR. Without a single exception.

Mr. COCKRELL. No; I said there were inefficient, incompetent people there.

Mr. BLAIR. I do not know what the Senator may have said at the very last, since being interrupted, but I refer to his first assertion. I noted it, and I asked him the question if he meant the whole of it, and he made no response; perhaps he did not hear me. But as to the Land Office as an office, I venture to say that it is as well and as honestly and as competently administrated as any bureau of the Government.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I read now a letter addressed by the Acting Commissioner of the General Land Office to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1890.

Sir: Referring to a verbal inquiry made on the 27th inst. by one of your committee as to the efficiency of the clerical force of the General Land Office, I have the honor to state that the clerical force of this office embraces about forty clerks and copyists whose efficiency may be said to be below the average of others in their respective grades. Four of these receive annual salaries of \$600; seven, \$900; four, \$1,000; five, \$1,200; eleven, \$1,400; eight, \$1,600; and one, \$1,800.

A few of these have been long in the service, and their partial lack of efficiency is due to infirmity and old age. None are entirely worthless. It may be proper to add that the office contains a still larger number of clerks who are above the average of their respective grades in efficiency and who merit increased compensation.

Very respectfully,

GEO. REDWAY, Acting Commissioner.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
House of Representatives.

Mr. BLAIR. How many clerks are there in that office?

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not remember exactly the number now.

Mr. BLAIR. There are more than twice the number that are there mentioned, I am very confident—about three times the number.

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh, as a matter of course. I have forgotten the exact number, but there are more than twice the number, or three times, probably four times the number mentioned here.

Mr. BLAIR. I had occasion to know something of that office myself some years ago. I do not remember the number of employes, but it is very much larger than the forty which the Senator's document says are below the average of the others. Now, taking those who are above

the general average, perhaps forty could well be selected who are below the general average. It would be so anywhere else, at all events.

Mr. COCKRELL. I only spoke of this incidentally. I am not holding the present Commissioner responsible for the retention of this inefficient force. It exists there. It has been there for years. It existed under a preceding Republican Administration, it continued largely under a Democratic Administration, and it exists to-day.

Mr. REAGAN. It ought to be stated that if it was continued under a Democratic Administration it was continued against the wishes and desires of the Commissioner of the General Land Office. He did not wish it, and would have turned them out if he could have done so.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not know whether he would have turned them out or not. I never heard of any effort that was made to turn them out.

Mr. REAGAN. I know what he told me himself.

Mr. COCKRELL. That may be. I never inquired on that point. I know of one instance—

Mr. PADDOCK. Will the Senator allow me to make a statement as to the labor performed there by the inefficient force of which he speaks?

Mr. COCKRELL. After I get through, the Senator from Nebraska will have plenty of time.

Mr. PADDOCK. It will take but a moment.

Mr. COCKRELL. Very well.

Mr. PADDOCK. When the present Commissioner took the office in September last there were 292,886 final entries pending and awaiting action. There are now pending 232,198 entries, showing a net gain of 60,688 entries disposed of, in addition to keeping up with the current business of the office. If a better record than that can be shown in any other bureau of the Government I should like to have the Senator point it out.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is not worth while to talk about a better record in any one bureau of the Government. I can point the Senator to one bureau where the business was cleaned up inside of sixty days, when there were over forty thousand cases pending there, and the business has been since disposed of on the day it is received, and that is in the pension and record division of the War Department.

I am not criticising the present Commissioner of the General Land Office, because, as I have said, I believe he is doing the very best he can, and I believe relatively with others the salary ought to be higher than it is—relatively with others—but I simply state, as a matter of fact, the condition of the business there, and the condition it had been in ever since 1833, and the inefficiency of the force, which has existed there for some time.

Mr. President, I simply desire to say that we can not increase all these salaries. The Commissioners in that office for a good many years have been receiving this salary. I believe myself there ought to be a readjustment of the salaries of a good many of the executive officers so as to place them nearer on an equality. If we increase the salary of the officer in this case, there is my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES], who stands ready to have the salary of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs placed on an equality, and then everybody else whose friend is not receiving \$5,000 a year must come in, and they must be placed upon an equality.

It is not worth while to throw up to us the salary of the Director of the Geological Survey at \$6,000. There it is. It is in the law. If it is to be amended or changed, let it be so amended or changed without throwing that duty upon the Committee on Appropriations.

I think that this amendment is amenable to the point of order which has been made. Under ordinary circumstances, if we were in a condition to equalize these salaries and this was not an appropriation bill, I should support an increase of the salary of this office, believing that the officer himself is entitled to it and believing that the office, with its duties and responsibilities, relatively to the other offices which have been named, ought to have a higher salary than \$4,000.

Mr. BLAIR. I should like to make one inquiry. Has any Senator ever known an instance where a hardship in the case of the salary of any particular officer was remedied by the passage of a bill applying to that office alone? I have known several to be introduced, but I never knew the pay of a single officer to be increased otherwise than upon an appropriation bill. I venture to say that there never will be, in the experience of any Senator, a specific bill passed to increase the salary of this or any other one officer. You do not get general legislation of that kind through at all. If this man's salary goes up we shall have to do it this way, as all other similar grievances have been remedied hitherto.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is, Is the amendment in order?

The question being put, there were, on a division—ayes 20, noes 17; no quorum voting.

Mr. ALLISON. What is the state of the vote?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. No quorum has voted. The roll will be called.

Mr. INGALLS. Let us have the yeas and nays, to avoid calling the roll.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANDERSON. I simply desire to call the attention of the

Senate to Rule XVI. It seems to me that, on deliberation, Senators will be compelled to conclude that the proposed amendment is not subject to this point of order. In the first place there is a uniform precedent of the Senate in this direction, as suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR], according to which the salary of no one of these numerous executive officers—and nearly all of them have been raised that are of this grade—has ever been raised by an amendment to the general statutes, but in every instance, as in the case, I think, of the Director of the Geological Survey, but certainly in the cases of the Commissioner of Pensions, the Commissioner of Patents, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the raise of salary has been upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. DAWES. Have those that the Senator has just enumerated been raised at all or were the offices created with that salary?

Mr. MANDERSON. They have been raised from the amount fixed in the general statute by legislation, if it be such, upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. DAWES. The Director of the Geological Survey?

Mr. MANDERSON. I so understand.

Mr. DAWES. I think the salary of that office was fixed when it was created. I may be mistaken.

Mr. STEWART. I do not think it was created at all.

Mr. DAWES. When the office was created the salary was fixed, whether it was created by a separate statute or by putting an amendment into an appropriation bill, as was the habit in former years, for the whole Army was reorganized and the salaries of the Army were readjusted in an appropriation bill. It is true that it has been the habit to raise salaries in appropriation bills, but it occurred to me that, in some of the instances the Senator referred to, the salary was attached to the office when it was created. I may be mistaken.

Mr. MANDERSON. I do not know how that may be as to the Director of the Geological Survey. As to that official I may be mistaken.

Mr. HISCOCK. I want to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question, if the Senator from Nebraska will allow me; and that is, Does the Committee on Appropriations hold that the increase of a salary for a current year has the effect to amend, modify, change, or repeal the law fixing the salary?

Mr. DAWES. It will stand as the law for that year.

Mr. HISCOCK. Has it not been the custom of the Committee on Appropriations to base the salaries for the next fiscal year on those of the current fiscal year without attempting to change them, and then in all subsequent years after that to maintain them at the amount fixed in that appropriation?

Mr. DAWES. It has been the custom to run along from year to year, and when a salary once gets raised it stays raised.

Mr. HISCOCK. I inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if that custom is not a violation of the rule that is invoked here.

Mr. ALLISON. What is that?

Mr. HISCOCK. My question is this: In an appropriation for a fiscal year if a salary is increased, that is, if it is an appropriation of so much money to pay the salary of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, \$4,000 or \$5,000, as I understand it the effect of that appropriation is only to repeal the statute *pro tanto*, for that year for which you appropriate.

Mr. DAWES. So I understand.

Mr. HISCOCK. Now, then, by what authority in a subsequent appropriation bill do you continue to appropriate that increased amount?

Mr. ALLISON. By the same authority that we continue to appropriate for the decreased amount. There are probably two hundred salaries in this bill that are below the statutory requirement.

Mr. HISCOCK. Let me ask the Senator this question: It is always, I understand, within the rule to appropriate a less amount than is required to pay an indebtedness, but there is an entirely different rule that applies when you proceed to appropriate a larger amount than is necessary to pay an indebtedness.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator from New York will point out where we have violated any rule of the Senate in making an amendment, I shall be glad myself to concede the point.

Mr. HISCOCK. I am not talking about a concession of the point. I am asking, on the point that was suggested by the Senator from Nebraska, that this appropriation bill contains violations of the rule which is invoked here to keep out this amendment.

Mr. MANDERSON. I submit they are not violations of the rule, although that construction is attempted to be forced. I find, upon an investigation kindly made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], that the salary of the Director of the Geological Survey was originally fixed in an appropriation bill and has remained at the amount fixed originally; but, as to the other officials I have referred to, in every instance their salaries have been raised from those fixed in the general statute by an appropriation bill, and the most notable case is that where the salary of the President of the United States, fixed, as I believe by general statute, was doubled upon an appropriation bill, and that sum has been appropriated annually ever since for the pay of the President.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from Nebraska allow me to ask him if the fixing of official salaries is not the subject of general legislation?

Mr. MANDERSON. No, I do not think it is, within the meaning of the Senate rules.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the test. If it be the subject of general legislation, then, of course, it is prohibited by the third clause of Rule XVI upon this bill. If it is not general legislation, then that clause does not affect it. I think myself this is a subject of general legislation.

Mr. MANDERSON. I do not think it is within the provisions of Rule XVI. I will come to that in one moment.

I am simply now trying to show the numerous precedents that Congress has established in the direction of this proposed change in the salary of this officer. They are numerous and beyond question, and I suggest, as I submitted before, that the Committee on Appropriations has itself repeatedly and again upon this very bill done the same thing. By the confession of the chairman there are some two hundred instances in this bill where salaries have been either raised or lowered.

Mr. ALLISON. I say two hundred instances where they have been reduced, not in this bill, but in former bills, below the statutory compensation.

Mr. MANDERSON. Well, in other appropriation bills besides this, which, it seems to me, is the very principle I am advocating, and that is, that the Committee on Appropriations have thought it within their power and within the power of the Senate of the United States to change salaries by annual appropriation bills, and either to raise or to lower them above or below the figure established by general law.

Now, Mr. President, one word as to Rule XVI. It seems to me that this case comes rather under section 2 of this rule, which reads:

2. All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill.

That, I think, is this case. We propose to increase the appropriation for the pay of this officer for the next fiscal year from \$4,000 to \$5,000. Has that proposition gone through the process prescribed by Rule XVI? Has it been referred to a regular committee of the Senate? I understand that this amendment was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and that committee reported in favor of the change and within the time limited by this rule, and then had it referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Now, I submit to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that in no instance has he known a Presiding Officer of this body to rule otherwise than as suggested. I do not think the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] when he occupied the position of Presiding Officer, or the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS], or the Senator from Kansas [Mr. INGALLS] ever ruled that a change of salary, either lowering it or raising it, has been in the nature of general legislation and came within this language of section 3 of Rule XVI:

3. No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill, nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject-matter contained in the bill be received.

As suggested by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], while there have been no adverse rulings by any Presiding Officer of this body, in no instance where the question has been presented for the decision of the Senate by the Presiding Officer has it been held that we were limited in this regard, and that we could not change the appropriation for the fiscal year the expenditures of which were the subject-matter of the bill.

One word, Mr. President, in response to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL]. I do not understand from him that he holds the present head of the General Land Office as responsible for any of the alleged inefficiencies in the clerical force of that office?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly not.

Mr. MANDERSON. As to whether there is inefficiency there or not, I do not know. I simply know that the head of that office is as hard-worked a man as there is in the employ of this Government. I know that he brings to the performance of his duties an ability of such character that it has challenged the respect, and the admiration even, of those who differ with him in politics. I submit that no man goes there to transact his business with the Government who does not come away with increased respect for the efficiency and the ability of this man. He works early and late. You compare his work with that of those officers who are better paid, the Railroad Commissioner, for instance. I hardly know what the duties of that office are, but it seems to me an office that is rather ornamental than useful, and yet he is paid higher than this most important officer—

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator will allow me, I would say there is about as much difference between the duties of the Commissioner of Railroads and those of the Commissioner of the General Land Office as there is between the duties of the Commissioner of the General Land Office and those of the head of one of his divisions, just about.

Mr. MANDERSON. I think that would be about a parallel.

Mr. President, on this question of high salaries, I do not believe that the people of the United States desire that their public servants shall be poorly paid. Poor pay means poor work; it means inefficient service; and certainly the people of this country do not desire that. At this session of Congress we have passed through both Houses what is known as the customs administrative bill. We created by that bill nine appraisers, I think they are called, with salaries of \$7,000 each

per annum, and I venture the assertion that when that board gets under full headway, and in the performance of the duties that will devolve upon it, no man of the board will have one-half of the labor incident to his well paid office that the Commissioner of the General Land Office has to-day.

I think it is no more than fair, as Congress has seen fit to raise the salaries of these other heads of bureaus, that this efficient and hard-worked officer should receive the compensation that his ability and his labor certainly entitle him to.

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

Mr. MANDERSON. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator spoke about the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and about his salary being raised by an appropriation bill. I find that by this bill only \$4,000 is appropriated for the salary of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and I think that is the amount which the law specifies. Now, why should not the Commissioner of Indian Affairs receive \$5,000 as well as the Commissioner of the General Land Office?

Mr. MANDERSON. I will answer that in a word. It is because I do not think the office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs has one-half the labor, one-half the responsibility, and does not require as high a degree of professional talent as that of the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

BOUNDARIES OF UNCOMPAGRE RESERVATION—VETO MESSAGE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 4 o'clock has arrived, the hour set apart for memorial exercises. The Chair will first lay before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I return without my approval the bill (S. 1762) to change the boundaries of the Uncompahgre reservation.

This bill proposes to separate from the Ute Indian reservation in Utah and restore to the public domain two ranges of townships along the east side of the reservation and bordering the Colorado State line. It is said that these lands are wholly worthless to the Indians for cultivation or for grazing purposes, and it must follow, I think, that they are equally worthless for such purposes to white men.

The object, then, of this legislation is to be sought, not in any public demand for these lands for the use of settlers—for if they are susceptible of that use the Indians have a clear equity to take allotments upon them—but in that part of the bill which confirms the mineral entries, or entries for mineral uses, which have been unlawfully made "or attempted to be made on said lands." It is evidently a private and not a public end that is to be promoted. It does not follow, of course, that this private end may not be wholly meritorious and the relief sought on behalf of these persons altogether just and proper. The facts, as I am advised, are that upon these lands there are veins or beds of asphaltum or gilsonite, supposed to be of very great value.

Entries have been made in that vicinity, but upon public lands, which lands have been resold for very large amounts. It is not important, perhaps, that the United States should, in parting with these lands, realize their value, but it is essential, I think, that favoritism should have no part in connection with the sales. The bill confirms all attempted entries of these mineral lands at the price of \$20 per acre (a price that is suggestive of something unusual) without requiring evidence of the expenditure of any money upon the claim or even proof that the claimant was the discoverer of the deposits.

The bill requires "good faith," but it will be next to impossible for the officers of the Interior Department to show actual knowledge on the part of the claimant of the lines of the reservation. The case will practically be, as to this matter, in the hands of the claimant. But why should good faith, at the moment of attempting the entry, without any requirement of expenditure, and followed, it may be within twenty-four hours, by actual notice that he was upon a reservation, give an advantage in the sale of these lands that may represent a very large sum of money?

In the second place, I do not think it wise without notice even to the Indians to segregate these lands from their reservation. It is true, I think, that they hold these lands by an Executive order, with a contract right to take allotments upon them, and that the lands in question are not likely to be sought as an allotment by any Indian. But the Indians have been placed on this reservation and its boundaries explained to them, and to take these lands in this manner is calculated to excite their distrust and fears and possibly to create serious trouble.

BENJ. HARRISON.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, June 19, 1890.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. TELLER. I suggest that the message be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The message will be so referred and printed, in the absence of objection.

RECIPROCITY TREATIES WITH THE LATIN-AMERICAN STATES.

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 your information a letter from the Secretary of State, inclosing a report of the International American Conference, which recommends that reciprocal commercial treaties be entered into between the United States and the several other Republics of this hemisphere.

It has been so often and so persistently stated that our tariff laws offered an insurmountable barrier to a large exchange of products with the Latin-American nations that I deem it proper to call especial attention to the fact that more than 87 per cent. of the products of those nations sent to our ports are now admitted free. If sugar is placed upon the free-list, practically every important article exported from those states will be given untaxed access to our markets, except wool. The real difficulty in the way of negotiating profitable reciprocity treaties is that we have given freely so much that would have had value in the mutual concessions which such treaties imply. I can not doubt, however, that the present advantages which the products of these near and friendly states enjoy in our markets—though they are not by law exclusive—will, with other

considerations, favorably dispose them to adopt such measures, by treaty or otherwise, as will tend to equalize and greatly enlarge our mutual exchanges. It will certainly be time enough for us to consider whether we must cheapen the cost of production by cheapening labor in order to gain access to the South American markets when we have fairly tried the effect of established and reliable steam communication and of convenient methods of money exchanges. There can be no doubt, I think, that, with these facilities well established and with a rebate of duties upon imported raw materials used in the manufacture of goods for export, our merchants will be able to compete in the ports of the Latin-American nations with those of any other country.

If, after the Congress shall have acted upon pending tariff legislation, it shall appear that, under the general treaty-making power or under any special powers given by law, our trade with the States represented in the conference can be enlarged upon a basis of mutual advantage, it will be promptly done.

BENJ. HARRISON.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, June 19, 1890.

Mr. HALE. Is there a report accompanying that message?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is a letter from the Secretary of State.

Mr. HALE. I ask that that be not read here, but printed in the RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The letter of the Secretary of State will be printed in the RECORD, if there be no objection. The Chair hears none.

Mr. FRYE. What reference is made of the papers?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. What is the pleasure of the Senate as to the reference of the message and the accompanying papers?

Mr. HALE. They should lie upon the table, should they not, as the tariff bill has been reported?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The message of the President and the letter of the Secretary of State will be printed in the RECORD and also as a document, and lie on the table, if there be no objection.

The letter of the Secretary of State is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, Washington, June 4, 1890.

To the President:

I beg leave to submit herewith the report upon "Customs Union" adopted by the International American Conference.

The act of Congress, approved May 24, 1888, authorizing the President to invite delegates to this conference named, as one of the topics to be considered, "Measures toward the formation of an American Customs Union, under which the trade of the American nations shall, so far as possible and profitable, be promoted."

The committee of the conference to which this topic was referred interpreted the term "Customs Union" to mean an association or agreement among the several American nations for a free interchange of domestic products, a common and uniform system of tariff laws, and an equitable division of the customs dues collected under them.

Such a proposition was at once pronounced impracticable. Its adoption would require a complete revision of the tariff laws of all the eighteen nations, and most, if not all, of our sister republics are largely, if not entirely, dependent upon the collection of customs dues for the revenue to sustain their Governments. But the conference declared that partial reciprocity between the American Republics was not only practicable, but "must necessarily increase the trade and the development of the material resources of the countries adopting that system, and it would in all probability bring about as favorable results as those obtained by free trade among the different States of this Union."

The conference recommended, therefore, that the several Governments represented negotiate reciprocity treaties "upon such a basis as would be acceptable in each case, taking into consideration the special situations, conditions, and interests of each country, and with a view to promote their common welfare."

The delegates from Chili and the Argentine Republic did not concur in these recommendations, for the reason that the attitude of our Congress at that time was not such as to encourage them to expect favorable responses from the United States in return for concessions which their Government might offer. They had come here with an expectation that our Government and people desired to make whatever concessions were necessary and possible to increase the trade between the United States and the two countries named. The President of the Argentine Republic, in communicating to his Congress the appointment of delegates to the International Conference, said:

"The Argentine Republic feels the liveliest interest in the subject, and hopes that its commercial relations with the United States may find some practical solution of the question of the interchange of products between the two countries, considering that this is the most efficacious way of strengthening the ties which bind this country with that grand Republic whose institutions serve us as a model."

It was therefore unfortunate that the Argentine delegates, shortly after their arrival in Washington, in search of reciprocal trade, should have read in the daily press that propositions were pending in our Congress to impose a heavy duty upon Argentine hides, which for many years had been upon the free-list, and to increase the duty on Argentine wool. Since the adoption of the recommendations of the conference, which I herewith inclose, hides have been restored to the free-list, but the duty upon carpet wool remains, and, as the Argentine delegates declared, represents the only concession we have to offer them in exchange for the removal of duties upon our peculiar products.

Only those who have given the subject careful study realize the magnitude of the commerce of these sister nations. In 1888 the combined imports of Chili and the Argentine Republic reached the enormous sum of \$233,127,698. The statistics of Chilean commerce for 1889 have not yet been received, but the imports of the Argentine Republic for that year were \$143,000,000. These imports consisted in the greater part of articles that could have been furnished by the manufacturers of the United States, yet in 1888, of the total of \$233,000,000 imports, we contributed but \$13,000,000; while England contributed \$90,000,000; Germany, \$43,000,000; and France, \$34,000,000.

With our extraordinary increase in population and even more extraordinary increase in material wealth, our progress in trade with South America has been strangely hindered and limited.

In 1868 our total exports to all the world were \$375,737,000, of which \$53,197,000 went to Spanish America, 14 per cent.

In 1888 our exports to all the world were \$742,368,000, an increase of 100 per cent., while but \$69,273,000 went to Spanish America, little more than 9 per cent.; and the greatest gain (nine millions) has been noticed during the last two years.

It was the unanimous judgment of the delegates that our exports to these countries and to the other Republics could be increased to a great degree by the negotiation of such treaties as are recommended by the conference. The practical, every-day experience of our merchants engaged in the trade demonstrates beyond a question that in all classes of merchandise which we have long and successfully produced for export they are able to compete with their European

rivals in quality and in price; and the reiterated statement that our Latin-American neighbors do not buy of us because we do not buy of them or because we tax their products has been annually contradicted by the statistics of our commerce for a quarter of a century. The lack of means for reaching their markets has been the chief obstacle in the way of increased exports. The carrying trade has been controlled by European merchants who have forbidden an exchange of commodities. The merchandise we sell in South America is carried there in American ships or foreign ships chartered by American commission houses. The merchandise we buy in South America is brought to us in European vessels that never take return cargoes, but sail for Liverpool, Havre, Bremen, or Hamburg with wheat, corn, and cotton. There they load again with manufactured goods for the South American markets, and continue their triangular voyages, paying for the food they are compelled to buy of us with the proceeds of the sale of their manufactures in markets that we could and would supply if we controlled the carrying trade.

France taxes imports as we do, and in 1880 her merchants suffered, as ours do now, from the lack of transportation facilities with the Argentine Republic. Under liberal encouragement from the Government direct and regular steamship lines were established between Havre and Buenos Ayres, and, as a direct and natural result, her exports increased from \$3,292,872 in 1880 to \$22,996,000 in 1888.

The experience of Germany furnishes an even more striking example. In 1880 the exports from Germany to the Argentine Republic were only \$2,365,152. In 1888 they were \$13,310,000. "This result," writes Mr. Baker, our most useful and intelligent consul at Buenos Ayres, "is due, first, to the establishment of quick and regular steam communication between the two countries; second, to the establishment of branch houses by German merchants and manufacturers; and, third, to the opening of a German-Argentine bank to facilitate exchange."

There is no direct steamship communication whatever between the United States and the Argentine Republic and there are no direct banking facilities. The International American Conference has earnestly recommended the establishment of both; but reciprocal exchanges of tariff concessions will be equally effective in stimulating commerce and in increasing the export of the products of which we have the largest surplus, not only to the progressive republic named, but to all the other American nations.

The conference believed that, while great profit would come to all the countries if reciprocity treaties should be adopted, the United States would be by far the greatest gainer. Nearly all the articles we export to our neighbors are subjected to heavy customs taxes; so heavy, in many cases, as to prohibit their consumption by the masses of the people. On the other hand, more than 87 per cent. of our imports from Latin America are admitted free, leaving but 12 per cent. upon which duties may still be removed. But, mindful of the fact that the United States has, from time to time, removed the duties from coffee, cocoa, India rubber, hides, cinchona bark, dye and cabinet woods, and other Latin-American products, our Government may confidently ask the concessions suggested.

The increased exports would be drawn alike from our farms, our factories, and our forests. None of the Latin-American countries produce building lumber; the most of them are dependent upon foreign markets for their breadstuffs and provisions; and in few is there any opportunity or inclination for mechanical industry.

The effect of such reciprocity would be felt in every portion of the land. Not long ago the Brazilian Mail Steam-Ship Company took the trouble to trace to its origin every article that composed the cargo carried by one of its steamers to Rio de Janeiro, and the investigation disclosed the fact that thirty-six States and Territories contributed to the total, as follows:

New York.....	\$74,516.00	North Carolina.....	\$2,647.00
Vermont.....	96.00	Maryland.....	2,359.00
Delaware.....	20,908.00	Mississippi.....	2,056.00
Illinois.....	19,331.47	Louisiana.....	2,111.00
New Jersey.....	17,054.40	Wyoming.....	1,800.00
Pennsylvania.....	43,065.00	Oregon.....	1,183.00
Connecticut.....	11,874.00	Tennessee.....	1,150.00
Kansas.....	11,332.00	Iowa.....	807.00
Indiana.....	9,098.00	South Carolina.....	587.00
Massachusetts.....	7,190.00	Kentucky.....	781.00
Ohio.....	6,230.00	Wisconsin.....	576.00
New Hampshire.....	6,085.00	California.....	239.00
Missouri.....	5,773.00	Dakota.....	230.00
Georgia.....	5,096.00	Texas.....	162.00
Rhode Island.....	4,020.00	Nebraska.....	125.00
Michigan.....	3,732.00	Alabama.....	56.00
Virginia.....	3,704.51	Florida.....	40.00
Maine.....	2,765.00		
Minnesota.....	2,668.00	Total.....	301,417.41

The 12 per cent. of our imports from Latin America upon which duties are still assessed consists only of raw sugar and the coarse grades of wool used in the manufacture of carpets.

The sugar-growing nations comprise four-fifths, or forty millions, of Latin America; but with geographical conditions against them their free labor can not successfully compete with the cool labor of the European colonies. A slight discrimination in their favor would greatly stimulate their agricultural interests, enlarge their purchasing power, and tend to promote friendly sentiments and intercourse.

The wool-growing nations are Chili, Uruguay, and the Argentine Republic, and from them our manufacturers of carpets receive a great portion of their supply. It was most strongly urged by the delegates who had carefully studied this subject that the free admission of coarse wools from these countries could not prove injurious to the wool-growers of the United States, because the greater profit derived by them from the higher grades discourages, if it does not actually prohibit, their production. On the contrary they maintained that the free importation of the coarse wool would result in a large reduction in the cost of the cheaper grades of carpets and enable the manufacturers of the United States to secure an enormous export trade in these fabrics. It was also suggested that the use of the coarse wools for the purpose of adulteration in the manufacture of clothing might be prevented by requiring that imports withdrawn for the manufacture of carpets should be so designated to exempt them from customs dues, and the existing duty retained upon those used for other purposes.

The wool-growers of the Argentine Republic protest against what they consider a serious discrimination against their products in the tariff laws of the United States, which impose a duty upon the gross weight instead of the value of the article.

The Argentine wools are much heavier in grease and dirt than those from Australia and New Zealand, which is said to be due to unavoidable climatic conditions, and sell at a lower price. But the imports from the three countries are subject to the same duty. This fact was very strongly urged, to the end that at least equal advantages should be given to the products of a friendly country with which we are endeavoring to build up a trade.

The Argentines desire the free admission of their coarse wool and other Latin American States desire the free admission of their sugar to the ports of this country, with the understanding that our peculiar products shall, in turn, be admitted free into their ports. At present, by reason of the high duties levied by them, the chief articles of our production are beyond the purchasing power

of the great mass of the people in those countries, and are luxuries which only the wealthy can enjoy.

Excepting raw cotton, our four largest exports during the last fiscal year were breadstuffs, provisions, refined petroleum, and lumber.

The following statement shows the total exports of each of said articles in 1889, and the proportion exported to Latin America:

Articles.	Total exports.	Exported to Latin America.
Breadstuffs.....	\$123,876,423	\$5,123,528
Provisions.....	104,122,328	2,507,375
Refined petroleum.....	44,830,424	2,948,149
Wood and lumber.....	26,907,161	5,039,886

These figures should be closely studied. It would be difficult to understand, but for the explanations given in the conference, why, out of the three hundred millions of staples exported from this country only fifteen millions should be consumed in all Latin America, with its population of 50,000,000 of people, when the United States is the only source of supply for those articles which are regarded by us as the necessities of life.

The foreign delegates all agreed that this proportion could be increased many fold by extending to their people the ability to purchase, and the ability to purchase rests, in their opinion, upon reciprocal concessions.

Attached hereto is a statement showing the duties charged by the South American countries of the largest commerce upon the articles which they import chiefly from the United States, and also a statement showing the meager amounts of our peculiar exportable products shipped to the several Latin-American states. By a comparison of these statements the effect of the removal of the duties upon these articles by the countries of Latin America will at once be apparent.

Fifteen of the seventeen Republics with which we have been in conference have indicated, by the votes of their representatives in the International American Conference and by other methods which it is not necessary to define, their desire to enter upon reciprocal commercial relations with the United States; the remaining two express equal willingness could they be assured that their advances would be favorably considered.

To escape the delay and uncertainty of treaties it has been suggested that a practicable and prompt mode of testing the question was to submit an amendment to the pending tariff bill, authorizing the President to declare the ports of the United States free to all the products of any nation of the American hemisphere upon which no export duties are imposed whenever and so long as such nation shall admit to its ports, free of all national, provincial (state), municipal, and other taxes, our flour, corn meal, and other breadstuffs, preserved meats, fish, vegetables, and fruits, cotton-seed oil, rice, and other provisions, including all articles of food, lumber, furniture, and all other articles of wood, agricultural implements and machinery, mining and mechanical machinery, structural steel and iron, steel rails, locomotives, railway cars and supplies, street-cars, and refined petroleum. I mention these particular articles because they have been most frequently referred to as those with which a valuable exchange could be readily effected. The list could no doubt be profitably enlarged by a careful investigation of the needs and advantage of both the home and foreign markets.

The opinion was general among the foreign delegates that the legislation herein referred to would lead to the opening of new and profitable markets for the products of which we have so large a surplus, and thus invigorate every branch of agriculture and mechanical industry. Of course the exchanges involved in these propositions would be rendered impossible if Congress, in its wisdom, should repeal the duty on sugar by direct legislation instead of allowing the same object to be attained by the reciprocal arrangement suggested.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES G. BLAINE.

APPENDIX A.—EXPORTS TO LATIN AMERICA.

Statement showing the amount of breadstuffs, provisions, refined petroleum, and lumber exported to the Latin-American States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889; also, the population of each of said States.

BREADSTUFFS.

In 1889 our shipment of breadstuffs to Latin America were as follows:

Countries.	Population.	Exports.
Mexico.....	12,000,000	\$345,018
Central America.....	2,800,000	821,218
Colombia.....	3,900,000	821,318
Venezuela.....	2,200,000	668,766
Brazil.....	14,000,000	2,812,281
Uruguay.....	600,000	2,033
Ecuador.....	1,000,000	None.
Argentine Republic.....	3,900,000	None.
Bolivia.....	1,200,000	None.
Chili.....	2,500,000	None.
Paraguay.....	250,000	None.
Peru.....	2,600,000	46,284
Total.....	46,950,000	5,136,528

PROVISIONS.

Our exports of provisions during the same year were as follows:

Countries.	Population.	Exports.
Mexico.....	12,000,000	\$390,423
Central America.....	2,800,000	255,873
Colombia.....	3,900,000	607,474
Venezuela.....	2,200,000	554,653
Brazil.....	14,000,000	438,395
Uruguay.....	600,000	42,900
Ecuador.....	1,000,000	None.
Argentine Republic.....	3,900,000	49,431
Bolivia.....	1,200,000	None.
Chili.....	2,500,000	None.
Paraguay.....	250,000	None.
Peru.....	2,600,000	114,873
Total.....	46,950,000	2,507,375

Statement showing amount of breadstuffs, etc.—Continued.

REFINED PETROLEUM.

Our shipments of refined petroleum were as follows:

Countries.	Population.	Exports.
Mexico.....	12,000,000	\$175,537
Central America.....	2,800,000	(*)
Colombia.....	3,900,000	(*)
Venezuela.....	2,200,000	88,926
Brazil.....	14,000,000	832,367
Uruguay.....	600,000	241,276
Ecuador.....	1,000,000	None.
Argentine Republic.....	3,900,000	426,654
Bolivia.....	1,200,000	None.
Chili.....	2,500,000	183,889
Paraguay.....	250,000	None.
Peru.....	2,600,000	None.
Total.....	46,950,000	2,948,149

* None reported.

WOOD AND LUMBER.

Our exports of wood and the manufactures thereof, including furniture, were as follows:

Countries.	Population.	Exports.
Mexico.....	12,000,000	\$1,280,126
Central America.....	2,800,000	205,160
Colombia.....	3,900,000	457,519
Venezuela.....	2,200,000	72,765
Brazil.....	14,000,000	384,495
Uruguay.....	600,000	412,754
Ecuador.....	1,000,000	None.
Argentine Republic.....	3,900,000	1,839,012
Bolivia.....	1,200,000	None.
Chili.....	2,500,000	279,495
Paraguay.....	250,000	None.
Peru.....	2,600,000	108,560
Total.....	46,950,000	5,039,886

APPENDIX B.

Statement showing duties charged by several South American nations upon merchandise imported from the United States.

The following statement shows the duties charged by several countries of South America upon the principal articles imported from the United States. Duties are assessed upon the gross weight of the package, including the lumber of which it is made and the waste often used to fill up. The duty on petroleum, for example, is charged per pound upon the whole, the can and the wooden frame that incloses the can:

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.

Law of 1886.

Tariff not a continuing law. Only runs the year for which enacted, each Congress modifying its provisions. Tariff except for few specified articles is ad valorem.

Tariff for 1889.

Specified articles:	Per cent. ad valorem.	Per cwt.
Wheat.....		\$0.80
Starch.....		3.50
Crackers and biscuits.....		4.50
Flour and corn-meal.....		2.00
Kerosene, per quart.....		.05

Furniture, preserved fruits, preserved vegetables, preserved meats.....	Per cent. ad valorem.
White-pine and spruce lumber.....	10

Agricultural implements:	Per cent. ad valorem.
Plows.....	5
Spades, handles, axes, hatchets, cutting-knives, sickles.....	25
Machines for adjusting wire fences; for making butter.....	25
Fanning machines.....	5
Corn mills.....	25
Thrashing machines.....	5
Steam-engines.....	5
Mowers and reapers.....	5
Fish.....	25

Provisions:	Per cent. ad valorem.
Beef, pork, bacon, lard, butter, cheese, etc.....	25

NOTE.—By a supplemental law there is a duty of 1 per cent. additional to the rates above specified on all articles of importation.

BRAZIL.

Breadstuffs:	Per cwt.
Barley.....	\$4.00
Biscuits:	
Ship biscuits.....	1.20
Other kinds of crackers.....	4.00
Corn.....	1.00
Flour.....	1.20
Fish:	
Salted, dried, or pickled.....	.40
Preserved, in whatever manner prepared.....	5.70
Kerosene.....	1.10
Provisions:	
Hams, prepared in any way.....	4.70
Canned, of any preparation not medical.....	5.70
Sausages.....	9.50
Lard.....	2.30
Butter.....	6.60
Cheese.....	5.70
Wood:	
Oak (stocks).....	per meter, \$0.16 to \$3.25
Pine (stocks) or other wood not classified.....	do..... .08 to 1.68

Statement showing duties charged by several South American nations, etc.—Cont'd.

BRAZIL—continued.

Planks or logs:		
Of oak, teak, or pine.....	per cubic meter..	\$0.67
Staves.....	per pound..	.04
Chairs.....	each.....	\$0.12 to 3.36
Beds.....	do.....	3.36 to 12.60
Bureaus.....	do.....	2.10 to 12.60
Washstands.....	do.....	.75 to 8.40
Tables.....	do.....	1.68 to 15.12
Sofas.....	do.....	.63 to 8.40

CHILL.

Articles.	Per cwt.	And ad valorem.
Agricultural implements:		
Machinery, gross.....	\$10.00	15
Plows, gross.....	6.50	15
Spades, shovels, gross.....	20.00	15
Forks:		
Three teeth, per dozen.....	7.00	15
Four teeth, per dozen.....	8.00	15
Five teeth, per dozen.....	12.00	15
Six teeth, per dozen.....	15.00	15
Biscuits:		
Ship.....	6.50	35
Cabin.....	8.70	35
Fish, large, dried, smoked, or salted, gross.....	6.00	35
Salmon:		
Dried, smoked, or salted, gross.....	8.50	35
Tinned, gross.....	12.50	35
Small fish:		
Dried, smoked, or salted, net.....	8.50	35
Tinned, net.....	11.00	35
Fruits, preserves, gross.....	15.00	35
Naphtha, paraffine, petroleum, and kerosene.....	4.00	25
Provisions:		
Salted, beef or pork, gross.....	6.00	25
Lard:		
In tins, gross.....	15.00	25
In kegs, gross.....	11.00	25
Cheese.....	20.00	25
Vegetables:		
Dried, gross.....	75.00	25
In water, vinegar, or sauce:		
Bottled, gross.....	10.00	25
Barreled, gross.....	5.00	25
Wood:		
Furniture, on valuation.....		35

NOTE.—In addition to the percentage specified in the tariff, there is a surcharge of 40 per cent, on all goods.

COLOMBIA.

	Per cwt.
Flour, corn-meal, and other breadstuffs.....	gross weight... \$2.30
Potatoes, onions, corn, rice, and beans.....	do..... .50
Codfish, meat in pickle.....	do..... 2.30
Preserved meats.....	do..... 10.00
Petroleum.....	do..... 4.50
Lumber.....	do..... .50
Beds, large tables for dining.....	do..... 2.50
Other furniture.....	do..... 15.00
Iron or steel wire for fences.....	do..... 1.50
Machinery:	
Exceeding a ton in weight.....	do..... .55
Under a ton in weight.....	do..... 2.50
Agricultural machines.....	do..... 1.00

NOTE.—An additional duty of 25 per cent, is charged (under decree 693 of 1835).

VENEZUELA.

	Per cwt.
Breadstuffs:	
Bran, barley (in husk), corn, oats, rice (in grain), rye (in grain), wheat (in grain).....	gross weight... \$0.87
Beans, rice (ground), potatoes.....	do..... 2.21
Barley, corn starch.....	do..... 6.63
Crackers:	
Sweet.....	do..... 6.64
Plain.....	do..... 2.21
Wheat flour.....	do..... 2.21
Potato, corn, and rye flours.....	do..... 6.63
Fruits:	
Fresh apples, pears, and grapes.....	do..... .87
Dried or in liquor or in sirup.....	do..... 6.63
Fish (salt or smoked).....	do..... 2.21
Steel wire.....	do..... 6.63
Iron wire (galvanized), unmanufactured.....	do..... .87
Beer.....	do..... 2.21
Kerosene.....	do..... 2.21
Provisions:	
Hams, tongues.....	do..... 2.21
Lard and butter.....	do..... 2.21
Cheese.....	do..... 6.63
Vegetables, preserved.....	do..... 6.63
Wood manufactures:	
Common, such as boards, beams, and scantling, of pine, oak, etc., for sawing into boards.....	gross weight... .87
Sawed, planed, or joined, fine, for musical instruments and cabinet work, veneers, barrels, pipes, or hogsheads, set up or in part, staves, blinds for doors and windows.....	gross weight... 2.21
Manufactured (not specified), billiard and bagatelle tables, with accessories, boxes, chairs, piano stools, carpenters' chests, planes, saddle-trees, furniture (common) of wood, cane, or straw.....	gross weight... 6.63
Sashes, molding, trunks.....	do..... 11.05
Furniture, upholstered or of fine woods.....	do..... 11.05

APPENDIX C.—INTERNATIONAL AMERICAN CONFERENCE.
REPORT ON CUSTOMS UNION AS ADOPTED APRIL, 1890.

The committee on Customs Union has made a careful study of the questions submitted to its consideration by the International American Conference, in reference to forming a Customs Union among the several nations of this continent.

It is generally understood by Customs Union the establishing among several nations of a single customs territory, to wit, that the nations forming the union shall collect import duties on foreign goods under substantially the same tariff laws; divide the proceeds thereof in a given proportion, and mutually receive, free of duty, their respective natural or manufactured products.

The acceptance of this plan would demand, as a previous requirement, a change in the fundamental laws of the countries accepting the Union. Even after they were ready to make such changes, a great many other difficulties, almost insurmountable, would have to be overcome, as, for instance, fixing the representation of each nation at the International assembly empowered to frame a common tariff and amend it in the future. The territorial extent, the populations, and the national wealth differ so much among the American Republics that if these conditions should be taken as the basis of representation at said assembly the small states would not have sufficient protection for their interests; and if all the nations were admitted as sovereigns, to wit, on an equal footing, the large ones would be sufficiently protected. It might be necessary, to obviate this difficulty, to create two bodies, one representing the population and the other the states, as this problem was solved in the Constitution of the United States of America. But this step would, in the opinion of the committee, require not only a partial sacrifice of the national sovereignty of the American nations, but more radical changes in their respective constitutions than in their judgment they are willing to accept.

If by Customs Union is meant the free trade between the American nations of all their natural or manufactured products, what is properly speaking unrestricted reciprocity, the committee believes it is in principle acceptable, because all measures looking to the freedom of commerce must necessarily increase the trade and the development of the material resources of the countries accepting that system, and it would in all probability bring about as favorable results as those obtained by free trade among the different States of this Union.

But while the committee believes that such a union is at present impracticable as a continental system, among other reasons, because the import duties levied on foreign trade constitute the main source of revenue of all the American nations, and such of them as are not manufacturing countries would thus lose more or less such revenue, on which they depend in a great measure to defray their national expenses; while the manufacturing countries, as the United States of America, would have to abandon, at least partially, the protective policy which they have adopted to more or less extent, and they do not seem yet prepared to change that system. Besides, a reciprocity treaty mutually advantageous between two contiguous countries might prove onerous if extended to all as a continental compact, especially as the products of many of the American Republics are similar. Therefore, while these obstacles are in the way, it seems premature to propose free trade among the nations of this hemisphere.

But if it is not easy, in the opinion of the committee, to arrive at once at unrestricted reciprocity, that end might be obtained gradually and partially. The first and most efficient step in that direction is the negotiation of partial reciprocity treaties among the American nations, whereby each may agree to remove or diminish their respective import duties on some of the natural or manufactured products of one or more of the other nations, in exchange for similar and equivalent advantages, as, if the mutual concessions were not equivalent, the treaties would soon become odious, could last but for a limited time, and would discredit the system. If after this has been tried for some reasonable time a good result should follow, as it is to be expected, the number of articles on the free-list might be enlarged in each case, from time to time, until they attain, through the development of the natural elements of wealth, other sources of revenue or an increase of the existing ones, which would allow the contracting nations to reach unrestricted reciprocity or a free trade among some or all the American nations.

Therefore the committee proposes:

To recommend to such of the Governments represented in the conference as may be interested in the celebration of partial reciprocity commercial treaties, to negotiate such treaties with one or more of the American countries, as it may be in their interest to make them, under such a basis as may be acceptable in each case, taking into consideration the special situation, conditions, and interests of each country, and with a view to promote their common welfare.

Mr. HALE. I offer an amendment upon this subject-matter to the tariff bill, which I ask to have read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be read.

The amendment was read, as follows:

And the President of the United States is hereby authorized, without further legislation, to declare the ports of the United States free and open to all the products of any nation of the American hemisphere upon which no export duties are imposed whenever and so long as such nation shall admit to its ports, free of all national, provincial (state), municipal, and other taxes, flour, corn-meal, and other breadstuffs, preserved meats, fish, vegetables, and fruits, cottonseed oil, rice, and other provisions, including all articles of food, lumber, furniture and all other articles of wood, agricultural implements and machinery, mining and mechanical machinery, structural steel and iron, steel rails, locomotives, railway cars and supplies, street-cars, refined petroleum, or such products of the United States as may be agreed upon.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE NUTTING.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, April 5, 1890.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. Newton W. Nutting, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, As a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased and in recognition of his eminent abilities as a distinguished public servant, that the House, at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Mr. HISCOCK. Mr. President, Newton W. Nutting was most emphatically a self-made man. He was born and resided until his death in the county and Congressional district of New York which he represented in Congress at the time of his death. The district is overwhelmingly Republican and comprises a part of the fairest portion of the State of New York; I believe that no part of the State is richer in agricultural resources; it ranks high in manufactures; the merchants and bankers in the leading towns and cities are men of marked ability and high character. Mr. Nutting was a lawyer by profession, and until his election to Congress devoted himself assiduously to the practice of that profession, and I may add that the bar of the district was a very able one. In his Congressional district an election to the House of Representatives was regarded as a distinguished mark of favor and appreciation by the constituency. Their varied industries, their dependency to some extent upon Federal aid, prompted close scrutiny into

the character and capacity of the candidate of the Republican party. I say the candidate of the Republican party because the district was so overwhelmingly Republican that whatever contest there was within the ranks of that party, and it is just, therefore, to say of Mr. Nutting that he competed for the honor with the best and purest of the State of New York, but his political triumphs were never won by unworthy means or doubtful methods. There, sir, the tricks of machine politics and packed caucuses were unknown, and success depended entirely upon the judgment of the people, and, without undue or unseemly effort on his part, Mr. Nutting easily commanded the honors conferred upon him.

I knew him well; we were warm personal friends. He died after a protracted struggle with a painful and from the outset a recognized deadly disease. He was a devoted husband and father, and I well remember when in this Chamber, with suppressed emotion and without regret for himself, he told me of his approaching death; that he was hopelessly afflicted, and within a few months at farthest must die. It is sad, sir, to hear a strong man speak of his sure, near, and certain death, seemingly without emotion, until the thought of wife and children like a great wave rushes over him, when, with the same immobility of countenance, the tears stream from either eye.

Mr. President, Mr. Nutting was stricken down in the full strength of manhood, in the possession of all his physical and intellectual powers. He was possessed of far more than ordinary ability, was industrious, and had a rare power of application. His friends might well have expected for him higher honors than he had achieved. As I have said, we were personal friends, and "friends" hardly expresses our relation. With a most absolute confidence in his integrity and judgment I would almost unquestionably have responded to his call for support of any legislative measure here that he approved.

When a valued friend dies, for a period, at least, one feels that his place can not be supplied. It is true, however, that vacant places in our social and political life are quickly filled. I believe, sir, that it is better so, as otherwise we would always wear the badges of mourning, and it is far better for society and each individual that griefs should be put behind us while we devote ourselves to the labors of life; but, sir, it will be a long time before Newton W. Nutting will be forgotten by me and the other friends who loved and admired him.

Mr. President, I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate shares with the House of Representatives in its expressions of sorrow at the death of Hon. Newton W. Nutting, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That as a mark of sympathy toward the family of the deceased the Secretary will transmit to them a copy of these proceedings.

Mr. EVARTS. Mr. President, the State of New York within the twelve months has been called upon three times to lament the death of distinguished citizens who held seats in the House of Representatives. A numerous delegation such as the State is entitled to exposes us, no doubt, to a greater frequency by this invasion of death than other States in their representations; but it has been an unusual occurrence that within this brief period three excellent and worthy Representatives, standing so high in the opinion of their colleagues, whether in that House or in this, and with the public at large, should have passed away.

My colleague [Mr. HISCOCK] has narrated the circumstances of Mr. Nutting's life, both private and public; and I might well leave that portion of the considerations that attend an occasion of this kind to what he has said; but the life of Mr. Nutting as narrated is a very striking and interesting one. It is interesting in the circumstances which I shall advert to, and remarkable, while it is not uncommon in the experience of our wide citizenship of this land.

Mr. Nutting was born near the place of his residence and his home at the time of his death, and never, I believe, moved outside of that Congressional district. He was born the son of a poor clergyman, who was unable to give the advantages of collegiate education to this son, who, from the earliest time, attracted the attention of all who saw him as giving promise for distinction in life.

But, Mr. President, while it is very common to speak of sons born in the circumstances that I have adverted to as not enjoying the advantages for a career that are open to the sons of those who live in affluence and ease, the observation of American life justifies no such opinion.

What better can there be for a career under institutions like ours than that a son should be born to a clergyman, himself educated and the husband of a wife attracted by considerations personal and elevated in character and in conduct—what better chance in life and under our institutions is there for a boy thus born and thus to be nurtured? Enjoying an academic education and with the father and mother attending his early efforts to overcome the disadvantage of not enjoying a college education (which I by no means depreciate), this boy went on and on in the eyes of his neighbors, in the eyes of his county, in the eyes of his district, and everybody knew that what he gained in public opinion and in his personal powers was what belonged to his nature and his right of birth, and his whole progress showed that he was strong enough to make his pathway for himself; and thus, without any step backward and without unseemly ostentation, he grew in the eyes of those about him till, as a natural interest of their own that his

promotion should be accorded, he took step by step in the profession, in a judicial employment, in confidence, in all the great relations of society, till he became a Representative from a great State, with great interests, in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, it has been wisely stated, no doubt, that no one should be called fortunate until he be dead, and we might find much to notice in the darker shades of this departed life which might make us say that our deceased friend could not be pronounced fortunate when he was dead. "It is appointed unto all men once to die," but it is not appointed to all men to stand for many months in view of the open grave that is being prepared for them. It is not appointed to every man to die when he has reached the high plane of personal, of moral, and of political influence and authority, and then have all these accepted and enjoyed faculties and duties suddenly taken from him. And that was what befell our friend in his fiftieth year, when he had reached, by climbing, a plane from which no further climbing was necessary, for all the rest would follow from his accumulated power and credit.

And yet, Mr. President, when you look at the more serious relations of life, how it is but a span, whether it be of fifty years or of eighty years, and when you see that this life had been without a flaw and without a moral defeat, when you see, that there gathered around him ever an increasing number of adherents, admirers, and friends, and when you see, as is disclosed in what is stated by his colleagues in the House of Representatives, that his early faith had attended him from his boyhood to this open grave, we can say that this, too, is a fortunate life and a fortunate end. Mr. President, no man but must be affected by the conduct of our friend during these declining months, which have so touchingly been adverted to.

He was submissive. He was resigned. But, more than that, he was serene, and he left a memory and a faith to his household that will be to them a blessing and to them a sentence that their father's and their husband's life and the son's life was fortunate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolutions offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. HISCOCK].

The resolutions were agreed to unanimously.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE DAVID WILBER.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, May 24, 1890.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity be afforded members to pay proper tribute to the memory of Hon. David Wilber, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That in the death of David Wilber the country has lost the services of a safe legislator and faithful public servant.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the House shall at the conclusion of these ceremonies adjourn.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Mr. EVARTS. Mr. President, David Wilber lived to the age of seventy years, and died very near the spot in which he was born, in the Otsego district of the State of New York. Yet probably, though his home was the same, no greater change could be found in a man's lifetime than in the surroundings in which he was born and in the surroundings in which he died.

Seventy years ago, Mr. President, calls up to mind a condition of life, both in nature and society, at the spot at which David Wilber was born that was almost frontier life in a certain sense, and in some very important particulars much more of a frontier life than our present system of sending populations to occupy new lands. The railroads, the telegraphs have changed wholly the circumstances of new settlements which attended far beyond the time of Mr. Wilber's birth the situation in which he was born.

Mr. Wilber was born entirely poor, but from parents of great character and conduct in life. He followed the path of life of one who labors in the pursuit of wealth or prosperity at least. I believe that he met no misfortunes in the whole career in which he started in life with nothing but the earnings of his hands.

His thrift, his prudence, his savings, his faculties, his high moral character, and his large and increasing authority among his fellow-men brought him to be possessed of a great fortune and to be at all times an animating member of all interests surrounding him in his town, in his county, in his section of the State, in his party, and, so far as his private and public life were connected with it, the welfare of the country.

Without education, I believe, even academic, there has been no stage in his progress in which he did not show those natural faculties and those natural traits which made him adequate for increasing obligations, increasing responsibilities, and increasing duties. His relations to his neighbors, whether in the interest of commerce and manufactures, or of society, or then opening into a political career, wrought from all sides, from all portions of society, a consenting confidence in him, however differences might give preference for this or that competitor. I believe that political opponents at no time hesitated to feel that David Wilber brought into all these employments, whether public or private, a character and a conduct that every one should recognize as an advantage and an honor to the communities in which he lived.

Mr. President, he grew up to the age of seventy to see himself surrounded and the whole State filled up with largest interests of popu-

lation, of commerce, of manufacture, and of political interests of that State and that State's share of political interests in this great country.

It is not easy to speak without great respect of a life that has thus been made up from the beginning and is closed with no shadow of turning in the traits and conduct which have made him useful to his fellow-citizens and always remembered by those who survive him.

I can hardly say that I had the privilege of any beyond a mere personal acquaintance with David Wilber, but I had long known him and respected him for his situation and conduct in life.

He did not live to take his seat in this Congress, but died at home. He was elected in 1872 a member of the Forty-third Congress and in 1878 of the Forty-sixth Congress and then of the Fiftieth Congress. He was expecting and was looked for by all who surrounded him to do a useful duty during this Congress, but Providence directed otherwise. His steps were turned to a greater and higher sphere, and he passed out of life in the honorable respect and affection of all who knew him.

Mr. President, I offer the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate receives with deep sensibility the announcement of the death of the Hon. David Wilber, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of New York, and tenders to the family and relatives of the deceased the assurance of its sympathy in their bereavement.

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to transmit to the family of Mr. Wilber a copy of the foregoing resolution.

Mr. HISCOCK. Mr. President, I avail myself of this opportunity to respectfully pay a tribute to my late colleague in the House of Representatives from the Twenty-fourth Congressional district of New York, Hon. David Wilber.

Mr. Wilber was born near Quaker street, in the city and county of Schenectady, New York, on October 5, 1820. In boyhood he removed with his parents to Milford, Otsego County, New York, where he received a common-school education.

At the time of his death he was president of the Wilber National Bank of Oneonta, N. Y. He was a Representative of the State of New York in the Forty-third, Forty-sixth, Fiftieth, and was re-elected to, but on account of the illness of which he died never took his seat in, the Fifty-first Congress.

This brief statement is the history of his progress and achievements from boyhood to manhood, and will find a parallel in the career of many of those men who have contributed to the development of New York and maintained her political and commercial supremacy. Without the advantages of inherited wealth, without the aid of a liberal education, much less than that—with a common-school education of fifty years ago—Mr. Wilber accumulated a large fortune, and by his business methods, marked by ability and integrity, so impressed himself upon a constituency represented by 36,000 voters that at four general elections he was chosen to represent them in the most honorable position within their power of selection.

I am conversant, sir, somewhat with the Congressional district that Mr. Wilber so long and so ably represented, and I believe it embraces within its boundaries the earlier settlements in New York west of Albany. Rich in agricultural resources, it early invited immigrants from more eastern parts of New York and the New England States, and Mr. Wilber was compelled to measure mental and moral forces in the achievement of his positions with the best intellects and the highest culture of his native State, and there was hardly a contest between him and others for supremacy. A thoroughly honest man, a decidedly able man, he gained, and continued to possess until his death, the esteem, absolute confidence, and admiration of all who knew him; he accumulated wealth, but not at the sacrifice of the respect of his fellow-citizens, and when he was selected to high official positions his political opponents conceded his eminent fitness, and that they were worthily bestowed by his political party. He was, sir, one of those men who, without trickery or manipulation, commanded a large support from his political opponents. He was not a brilliant man, as that expression is applied to orators, and he was not a genius, as we often apply the term to those who have been eminently successful. His growth was slow but constant and unmarked by disaster to others or by those questionable methods that are so often in the public mind obscured by great results.

It is just to say that he was not regarded as a great man, compared with many who have added to the renown of his native State; yet, sir, I can recall very few who accomplished so much as a leader, in molding sentiment or voicing its purposes, as David Wilber. And in his generation I do not recall one who has contributed more to the material interests of a Congressional district, more largely influenced its people, and at the same time maintained, as he had a right to, the confidence and respect of those whom he represented, than he.

Men of his character and achievements, taking into account the disadvantageous circumstances with which he was surrounded in early youth, are fast joining the majority upon the other side, and I believe, sir, it is more than doubtful if others will be found to fill their places.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolutions submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. EVARTS].

The resolutions were agreed to unanimously.

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

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 20, 1890, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, June 19, 1890.

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

APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the Journal as read will be approved.

Mr. MILLS. I object to the approval of the Journal.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Let the entire Journal be read. I think the reference of bills has not been read, as well as other matters which properly belong to the Journal.

The SPEAKER. It has not been. Only the usual portions have been read.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I move that the Journal be approved, and upon that I demand the previous question.

Mr. MILLS. I move to correct the Journal as follows—

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I rise to a question of order. The motion of the gentleman from Ohio is not in order until the Journal has been read through. The Clerk has not read the entire Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Journal has not been read in full.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I supposed the Clerk had concluded the reading of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the remainder of the Journal. Any member has a right to demand the reading of the Journal in full.

Mr. MILLS. I move to correct the Journal in the following particulars, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal. The Clerk had only completed the reading of those portions of the Journal which are usually read.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I did not mean, of course, to be understood as criticising the Clerk for the manner in which the Journal had been read.

The SPEAKER. Not at all; but whenever any member wants the Journal read he can have it done. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the Journal, as follows:

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills and joint resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A bill (S. 662) for the better protection of hotel-keepers, inn-keepers, lodging-house keepers, and boarding-house keepers of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 1244) for the relief of the sureties of Dennis Murphy—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1418) for the relief of Dwight Hall—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1759) for the relief of Maj. Joseph W. Wham, paymaster United States Army—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1971) for the relief of William Clawson—to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (S. 1992) relating to the execution of customs-revenue bonds—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

A bill (S. 2184) granting a pension to Sarah L. Knight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

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—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2750) to remove the charge of desertion against Almon R. Tobey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2782) to provide for the reduction of the Round Valley Indian reservation, in the State of California, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 2783) for the relief of the Mission Indians in the State of California—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3078) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James H. Dennis—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3134) to perfect the military record of Henry C. Barney, of Pella, Tex.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3494) to establish a light station at or near Page's Rock, in York River, Virginia—to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3562) authorizing additional compensation to the assistant commissioners to the industrial exhibition held at Melbourne, Australia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

A bill (S. 3716) to provide for the examination of certain officers of the Army and to regulate promotions therein—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3723) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A joint resolution (S. R. 90) providing for the printing of decisions of the Department of the Interior regarding public lands and pensions, for sale—to the Committee on Printing.

A joint resolution (S. R. 53) authorizing the printing of the annual report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics on internal commerce for 1889—to the Committee on Printing.

HOUSE BILL WITH SENATE AMENDMENTS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a House bill of the following title with Senate amendments was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5381) directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move the approval of the Journal, and on that I demand the previous question.

Mr. MILLS. I have the floor to move a correction of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio submits a motion which is in order.