

By Mr. VINCENT A. TAYLOR: Petition of Franklin Wells and the members of the Seventh-Day Adventists Church, of Bedford, Ohio, and 52 others of the same place, against Congress committing the Government to a course of religious legislation by the passage of any bill or resolution to close the Columbian Exposition on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of the Disciples of Christ of Ohio, representing 500 churches, with 55,000 members; 450 Sunday-schools, with 45,000 members, and 150 Young People's Societies of Christian Endeavor, praying that any further support to the World's Columbian Exposition be withheld, except upon condition that no intoxicants be sold upon the grounds and that the gates of said exposition be closed on the Lord's day—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of the Disciples of Christ of Ohio, representing 500 churches, with 55,000 members; 450 Sunday-schools, with 45,000 members, and 150 Young People's Societies of Christian Endeavor, protesting against the Chinese exclusion act and praying for its repeal—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TILLMAN: Petition of Harkless Alliance, No. 601, of Barnwell, S. C., remonstrating against the passage of the Brosius lard bill, H. R. 395, and praying for the passage of the Padcock pure-food bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Three petitions of Enterprise Grange, No. 25, of Colorado, one for the passage of a law to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs, the second to prevent gambling in farm products, and the third for the encouragement of silk culture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition, by the same grange, for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition, by the same grange, for the free delivery of mails to the rural districts—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of F. Rosenburg, civil engineer, of Pueblo, Colo., for the establishment of the metric system on and after July 1, 1893, in the customs service—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: Petition of post-office clerks of New Orleans, La., praying that immediate action be taken on House bill 3608, classifying clerks in first and second class post-offices and fixing the salaries of same—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WHEELER of Michigan: Petition of Sib Jager, John Sissing, and others, of Muskegon, Mich., against the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of Wesley Guilford and others, of Hart, Oceana County, Mich., against closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, June 30, 1892.

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

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented petitions of the Epworth League of Hamlin Methodist Episcopal Church, of the Epworth League of Grace Church, of the Epworth League of Dumbarton Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, and of the Wesley Chapel Epworth League, all of Washington, D. C., praying for the insertion in the bill making appropriations for the World's Columbian Exposition of a clause prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors within the limits of the Exposition grounds; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. COCKRELL. I present a memorial, signed by a very large majority of the largest wholesale and jobbing houses of the city of St. Joseph, in the State of Missouri, and also by all the banks of that city except one, protesting against the passage of a general bankruptcy law, first, because there is neither necessity nor demand for such legislation; second, because the condition of the country is now, and bids fair to be in the future, so prosperous that no occasion exists for such legislation; and third, because the history of bankruptcy legislation shows that such laws are made only to be repealed, one cause being, as expressed in the petitions of debtors for the repeal of the act of 1867, that "The existence of the act prevented them from making such arrangements with their creditors as would enable them to carry on their business."

I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COKE. I present a petition of a large number of citizens of San Antonio, Tex., praying for the adoption of a constitutional amendment providing that—

No State shall pass any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or use its property, or credit, or any money raised by taxation, or authorize either to be used for the purpose of founding, maintaining, or aiding, by appropriations, payment for services, expenses, or otherwise, any church, religious denomination, or religious society, or any institution, society, or undertaking which is wholly or in part under sectarian or ecclesiastical control.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COKE presented the memorial of W. H. Burk and sundry other members of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church of Black Jack Grove, Tex., remonstrating against the commitment of the United States Government to a union of religion and the state by the passage of any legislation closing the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday or in any other way committing the Government to a course of religious legislation; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. PADDOCK presented the petition of M. A. Kendal and 33 other citizens of St. Paul, Nebr., and the petition of Mrs. L. A. Goff and 14 other citizens of Jamestown, Nebr., praying for the passage of legislation prohibiting the sale, manufacture, and importation of cigarettes in the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

Mr. FAULKNER presented the petition of James M. Miller, of the District of Columbia, praying that indemnity be granted him for injuries sustained by being shot by Joseph Burns, a member of the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. VEST presented a memorial of members of the Cotton Exchange of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against the passage of the Hatch antioption bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of merchants of St. Joseph, Mo., remonstrating against the passage of any bankruptcy law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. QUAY. I present certain resolutions of the encampment of the Union Veteran Legion of the United States. They ask attention to a growing abuse in our legislation. As the resolutions are very brief, I ask that they be read.

The resolutions were read, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS ENCAMPMENT NO. 1,
UNION VETERAN LEGION,
Pittsburg, June 27, 1892.

Your committee, to whom was referred the matter of presenting resolutions upon the enormous number of applications now being filed in Congress by deserters during our late war to have their disabilities removed, the ostensible object being that they can apply for pensions under the June act of 1890, beg leave to report the following:

While this encampment, which is composed only of men who enlisted for three years or during the war prior to July 1, 1863, and who were honorably discharged for any cause after at least two years' continuous service, or at any time discharged by reason of wounds received in the line of duty, will not dispute the fact that there are meritorious cases where charges of desertion ought to be removed, it is not probable nor is it possible that the thousands of applications now being filed at this late date have any merits whatever, and if granted will do great injustice to those who served faithfully and well, and who look upon their honorable discharge as the highest prize they inherited, by reason of their services, that can be handed down to future posterity as the most valued and appreciated heirloom: Be it therefore,

Resolved, That this encampment enters a protest against the removal of charges of desertion except upon evidence that the case is a just and meritorious one, and when the person so charged had returned to duty after the charge of desertion had been recorded or had been by error or some frivolous technicality charged with such offense. Be it further

Resolved, That this encampment furnish a copy of these resolutions to our Senator, Hon. M. S. QUAY, and to our Representatives.

CHAS. F. MCKENNA, Colonel,
GEO. B. CHALMERS, Adjutant.

Mr. QUAY. I ask that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

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

Mr. COCKRELL. Should the resolutions not be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. DAVIS. They should go to that committee.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is the committee which considers those cases.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The request of the Senator from Pennsylvania is that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. QUAY. I have no objection to changing the reference.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolutions will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8224) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two

Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina, Mr. BLOUNT, and Mr. CALDWELL, managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6875) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MUTCHLER, Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts, and Mr. GROUT managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9040) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FORNEY, Mr. DOCKERY, and Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa, managers at the conference on the part of the House.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3050) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the carriage of passengers by sea," approved August 2, 1882, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2920) to establish a subport of entry, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2966) to amend rule 7, section 4233, Revised Statutes, reported it without amendment.

Mr. FRYE. I am instructed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3017) to provide and equip a steam vessel for boarding purposes, at Philadelphia, Pa., to report it adversely, for the reason that the Treasury Department is now building a vessel which will be assigned to the port of Philadelphia. I move that the bill be postponed indefinitely.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1753) to remove charges of desertion in certain cases, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3496) for the relief of A. S. Lee, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BATE, 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. 1779) for the relief of Robert S. Forbes; and

A bill (S. 2815) for the relief of Capt. D. F. Callinan, United States Army.

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

A joint resolution (S. R. 50) authorizing payment of pay and allowances to minors who were discharged from the Army of the United States after the close of the war of the rebellion by special order secured by action of friends and before the date of general order mustering out their commands;

A bill (S. 3190) for the relief of John C. Peters, alias Peter L. Weber;

A bill (S. 3008) for the relief of William Divine, teamster, authorizing president of Board of Managers National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to receive him at one of the branches of said National Home;

A bill (S. 1978) to provide additional artillery for the National Guard; and

A bill (S. 477) for the relief of Jane Boller.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1240) granting to the Minneapolis, St. Paul and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company right of way across the military reservation at Sault Ste. Marie, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PROCTOR, 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. 519) for the relief of Francis Irsch;

A bill (S. 1803) for the relief of Francis Irsch;

A bill (S. 2616) providing for the assignment to active service of army officers previously retired on account of disability incurred in the line of duty upon their restoration to health, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 3089) to regulate the examination of the records and papers concerning soldiers, sailors, and marines of the United

States by claimants for pension, back pay, and bounty, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALTHALL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1103) for the relief of Thomas J. Spencer, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6792) granting to the county of Mariposa, in the State of California, the right of way for a free wagon road or turnpike across the Yosemite National Park, in said State, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CAMERON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1383) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George H. Holmes, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2983) to authorize the construction of a railway across the Government reservation at Willoughby Spit, Va., submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. PROCTOR. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2861), to authorize the Secretary of War to purchase for governmental and industrial use at Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill., a testing machine for tension and compression, to submit an adverse report thereon. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], who introduced the bill, desires that it be placed on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. At the request of the Senator from Illinois the bill will be placed on the Calendar with the adverse report of the committee.

Mr. PETTIGREW, from the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select), to whom was referred the bill (S. 3251) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for celebrating the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus by holding an international exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the soil, mine, and sea, in the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois," reported it with amendments.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I am also instructed by the Select Committee on the Quadro-Centennial, to whom was referred an amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] to the sundry civil appropriation bill, to report it favorably with amendments. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed.

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

Mr. VEST. As a member of that committee I desire to state that the minority of the committee disagree from this favorable report, and also from the action of the committee in offering an amendment to the sundry civil bill. I speak for myself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COLQUITT].

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2906) to amend section 4194 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to certificates of title of vessels, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom the subject was referred, reported a bill (S. 3358) providing for the collection of fees for furnishing certificates of title to vessels; which was read twice by its title.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3188) to extend to Duluth, Minn., the privilege of immediate transportation of unappraised merchandise, reported it with amendments.

Mr. DIXON, from the Committee on Patents, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3246) revising and amending the statutes relating to patents, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

ST. JOSEPH'S CHURCH, EAST BATON ROUGE, LA.

Mr. WALTHALL. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3273) authorizing the St. Joseph's Church, in the parish of East Baton Rouge, in the State of Louisiana, to use the land quitclaimed to it by the United States for school purposes, to report it favorably without amendment.

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the bill just reported.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to authorize the St. Joseph's Church, in the parish of East Baton Rouge, La., to use the land quitclaimed to it by the terms of an act approved September 30, 1890, for religious, school, or charitable purposes, in addition to the right to use the same for cemetery purposes, as expressed in the terms of the act.

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

COURTS IN SOUTH DAKOTA.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3126) to regulate the times for holding the terms of the United States courts in the State of South Dakota, to report it with an amendment, and recommend its passage. This is a local bill, and it is important that it should be passed at an early date. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its consideration at this time.

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

The amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was to add the following additional section:

SEC. 2. The provision of statute now existing for the holding of said courts on any day contrary to the provisions of this act is hereby repealed, and all suits, prosecutions, process, recognizances, bail bonds, and other things pending in or returnable to said court on the days now fixed by law are hereby transferred to and shall be made returnable to and have force in the said respective terms in this act provided in the same manner and with the same effect as they would have had had said statute not been passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

WILLIAM P. KEADY.

Mr. DOLPH. By direction of the Committee on Public Lands, I report favorably the bill (S. 3264) for the relief of William P. Keady, and during the day I shall present a written report, which I shall hand to the Secretary to be printed. As this is purely a private bill on its face to perfect the title to a town in the State of Washington, a mere confirmation of an entry allowed by the register and receiver of the land office, and the bill will consume no longer time than will be necessary to read it, I ask for its present consideration.

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

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. DOLPH. In four places in the bill the words "Territory of Washington" appear. The word "Territory" should be stricken out in each case, as Washington is now a State.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendments will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 9, after the word "Washington," it is proposed to strike out "Territory."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 13, after the word "Washington," to strike out "Territory."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 25, after the word "Washington," to strike out "Territory."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 29, after the word "Washington," to strike out "Territory."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 3356) for the relief of Theodore Ten Eyck, a retired army officer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FAULKNER (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3357) for the relief of Emmart, Dunbar & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. COCKRELL. I introduce by request a bill, not knowing anything about the merits of it.

The bill (S. 3359) for amendment of the military record of Thomas Kehoe as a member of Company A of the Sixty-first New York Volunteers was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DOLPH introduced a bill (S. 3360) to amend section 6 of an act entitled "An act to prohibit the coming of Chinese persons into the United States," approved May 5, 1892; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. DOLPH. It will be remembered that when the conference report on the bill for the exclusion of Chinese laborers from the United States was under discussion some one objected that the word "white" had been used in the clause of the bill requiring Chinamen after the expiration of a year to prove that they had been lawfully in the country by one credible witness. At

that time it was too late to correct the bill. Certainly there was no intention on my part, and I think I can speak for the other members of the committee, to discriminate against any person of color as a witness, the only object being to provide that there should be some witness besides Chinese laborers or Chinese persons. I therefore ask leave to introduce this bill to amend section 6 of the act mentioned by striking out the word "white" and inserting in lieu of it "a witness not a Chinese person or a person of Chinese descent;" so as to carry out what I suppose to have been the intention of the conference committee.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations in the absence of objection.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 3361) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase certain books; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MITCHELL introduced a bill (S. 3362) for the relief of Alonzo E. Miltimore; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. COLQUITT (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3363) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob R. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS

Mr. PADDOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

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

Mr. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 51) to provide for the free coinage of gold and silver bullion, and for other purposes; which was ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF A MEMORIAL.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, on January 27, 1890, I presented a memorial of the State of Washington, upon which I find indorsed the usual order that it be printed in the RECORD. By some inadvertence this memorial never was printed. It is a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, setting forth the advantages of shipping and general commerce in the construction of a fresh-water basin by connecting Lakes Union and Washington with Puget Sound. As use is desired to be made of this memorial, I ask at this time that it may be printed as a document, as by an oversight it was not printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection the memorial will be printed as a document. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INCOME AND SUCCESSION TAX.

Mr. CALL submitted the following resolution; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed:

Resolved by the Senate, That in view of the great amount of money required to be appropriated under existing law for the payment of pensions and the current expenditures of the Government and the unequal pressure of our present system of taxation on the great body of the people the public interests require that an income and a succession tax shall be imposed on all net incomes and all successions and all inheritances which shall exceed \$3,000, which shall increase with the amount of the income and the property inherited or distributed under wills, devises, or by operation of law.

HEATON'S "RECALL OF COLUMBUS."

Mr. QUAY submitted the following resolution; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, That the representatives from the United States to the Columbian Historical Exposition at Madrid in 1892 are hereby permitted to take from the Capitol, for use at said exposition, the picture of the "Recall of Columbus," painted by Augustus G. Heaton.

APPEALS IN CAPITAL CASES.

Mr. MITCHELL. I move that the bill (S. 2171) to amend section 766 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which passed the other House with certain amendments, be taken from the table and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7093) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have been unable to agree.

EUGENE HALE,
W. B. ALLISON,
A. P. GORMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
H. A. HERBERT,
WILLIAM ELLIOTT,
H. C. LODGE,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the difference in the conference upon the naval appropriation bill which has led to this report of a disagreement arises not from any conflict upon the smaller items of the bill. The general makeup of the bill in the House of Representatives was very little interfered with in the Senate. All the general provisions for the conduct of the naval establishment were left as the House had passed the bill, and, as I have said, upon the smaller and not essential items there is no disagreement between the conferees. The disagreement is upon two items. The first is amendment 33, providing for an international naval rendezvous and review under the act of April 25, 1890, providing for the centennial exposition. Section 8 of that act provides as follows:

That the President is hereby empowered and directed to hold a naval review in New York Harbor in April, 1893, and to extend to foreign nations an invitation to send ships of war to join the United States Navy in rendezvous in Hampton Roads and proceed thence to said review.

The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Senate in sustaining it, believed that there was a direct order to hold this review. It provided when it should be held; it provided where it should be held; it provided for invitations to foreign powers to join us, and it has been in the contemplation of the friends of this review that it will be one of the grandest and most inspiring pageants that the American people could ever witness.

Mr. BUTLER. May I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish to ask him if he knows how many foreign governments have accepted the invitation under that provision?

Mr. HALE. I was going on to state that. It is not to be an expensive thing; it is not to involve millions of dollars nor any very large sum; but under this provision the Department has taken occasion to notify foreign powers and is now considering the matter of formal invitations. Some, I think, have already informally accepted. It has become known throughout the world that this review is to be held and foreign powers are getting ready to contribute to it. Spain is making a model of one of the little ships or caravels in which Christopher Columbus made his first voyage of discovery.

The committee, therefore, in accordance with this patriotic sentiment and in accordance with the direction of the law, put on the naval appropriation bill, and the Senate adopted it, the following amendment:

33. International naval rendezvous and review: Toward the expenses of the international naval rendezvous and review, as provided in section 8 of the act creating the World's Columbian Exposition, including pay and drill of seamen temporarily enlisted and used for said review in addition to the regular number of enlisted men and including the construction by the Secretary of the Navy of reproductions of two of the caravels, the Pinta and the Nina, which composed the fleet of Columbus on his voyage of discovery, to be taken after the review to Chicago as a part of the Government exhibit, \$50,000.

The Senate thought that was as little as we could do this year upon this work to which we are committed by every instinct of patriotism, and by the direction of the law. The Secretary of the Navy believed that with this amount we could make preparations, prepare models of the other two caravels, and get in preparation for the extra seamen that would be needed.

The Senate and the House conferees are at loggerheads upon this item. The House conferees can not agree to this appropriation, and the Senate conferees can not, of course, agree to strike it out. That is the first item of difference.

The next matter of disagreement is found in amendment 34, which the Senate put upon the bill, providing, in the course of the regular increase of the Navy, to which the Government and the people are gladly committed, for one battle ship, one harbor defense ship, four small gunboats of light draft for South American and Asiatic rivers, and six torpedo boats. The Senate, in making this appropriation, did not find that much money was needed during the next year, but it believed that these ships are necessary in the regular course of the construction of the Navy, to keep the work going in the future in a moderate way. The Naval Committee of the Senate reported a much larger provision, but the Senate Committee on Appropriations struck it down to these items. It was found that in the necessary work of reconstructing the Navy these ships ought to be started now, not that much will be done with them in the next year, and but little or any money is needed. So the conferees are not at loggerheads as to the amount of money; but the Senate conferees, in consideration of the condition of the work upon the other ships which have been authorized, upon the hulls, and engines, and the armor, firmly believed that these ships ought to be authorized now, so that in future, as to contracts with the plants to furnish armor and ordnance, and with contractors who will build the ships, the work may go on, and that we shall not find two years from now a gap or hiatus with nothing being done. We authorized only one ship last year. Nothing in the way of new ships except that has been done for two years.

The Senate conferees insisted that these items should not go out. The House conferees would not agree, and therefore the committee is constrained to report a disagreement. I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments to the bill and that it ask for a further conference.

Mr. BERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine if his motion can not be divided so as to have the question put in such a way that the Senate will insist on the first amendment but recede from the second amendment. It seems to me that the Senate can not stand on the proposition that it will insist upon building new vessels unless the other House is willing to make the appropriation necessary for that purpose, while it might be very well argued that the Senate should insist on the first amendment.

Mr. HALE. The committee of conference is not at loggerheads on the question of appropriations. It is not the question of increasing the appropriation for the next year. The Senate does not care about that; the Senate committee does not. The Senator did not hear me, else he, I think, would have understood that it is not a question of appropriations.

Mr. BERRY. If the Senator will permit me, I understood him to say that the disagreement on the second amendment arose because the Senate conferees insisted that other vessels should be contracted for, and the House conferees were not willing to contract for them at this time. Is that a correct proposition?

Mr. HALE. Should be authorized.

Mr. BERRY. Authorized to be contracted for.

Mr. HALE. I hope this whole matter will go into conference, because it can be much better dealt with there.

Mr. BERRY. I simply wanted to have the question put in such a way that we might vote separately on the two propositions. However, I shall not insist upon that at this time. I wish it expressly understood, however, that I, for one Senator, think the Senate ought to recede on the second amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maine moves that the Senate further insist on its amendments to the naval appropriation bill, and ask for a further conference with the House of Representatives upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

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

FREE COINAGE.

Mr. McPHERSON. I desire to give notice that to-morrow morning, immediately after the conclusion of the morning business, I shall ask to submit some observations on the question of the bill now pending for the free coinage of silver, and the amendments pending relating thereto.

DISTRICT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6746) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 40, 41, 53, 54, 61, 63, 64, 67, 70, 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 103, 104, 105, 112, 113, 114, 116, 118, 124, 125, 126, 127, 129, 130, 133, 142, 143, and 146.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 18, 28, 37, 44, 45, 55, 56, 57, 58, 65, 68, 73, 76, 85, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 100, 106, 107, 111, 115, 122, 131, 140, and 145; and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$26,250;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$13,200;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert, "\$42,430;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert, "\$3,600;" and on page 6, in line 14, of the bill strike out the word "hereafter" and insert in lieu thereof the words "after December 31, 1892;" and on page 6, in line 27, of the bill, strike out the word "hereafter" and insert in lieu thereof the words "after December 31, 1892;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided further, That the register of wills may designate one of the employees in his office to be paid at not exceeding the rate of \$1,500 per annum out of such fees and emoluments, who shall be authorized hereafter in the necessary absence or inability of the register, from any cause, to perform his duties without additional compensation;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following: "And the salary of the deputy recorder of deeds shall hereafter be \$1,800 per annum to be paid out of the fees and emolument of said office of recorder of deeds;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Sen-

ate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment, insert the following:

"That whoever, not being a Senator or Representative in Congress, intends to present to Congress a bill for an act of incorporation or for an alteration or extension of the charter of a corporation in the District of Columbia, or for any special privileges in said District, shall give notice of such intention by publishing a copy of the bill at least once a week for four successive weeks in a newspaper published in the District of Columbia, the last of said publications to be made at least fourteen days prior to the presentation of such bill. Such newspaper shall be designated by the person proposing the bill and approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$7,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$270,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$24,300;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$98,752;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$36,747;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$51,395;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$58,806;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of said amendment, after the word "and," insert the words "one-half of;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$90,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Provided further, That the detailed plans for said sewer shall be approved by a consulting civil and sanitary engineer, who shall be selected by the President for that purpose, and whose services shall be paid for from this appropriation at a rate to be fixed by the President."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$65,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"That the \$10,000 appropriated by the act of March 3, 1891, for graveling the street connecting Columbia road with Connecticut avenue extended and thence along said avenue to the District line, shall be used for regulating and macadamizing the same; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to contract for regulating and macadamizing said street and avenue forthwith; *Provided*, That the excess of cost for the same above \$10,000 shall be assessed upon the property fronting on said street and avenue in proportion to the number of front feet of each lot or parcel of land so fronting; such assessment shall be collected in the same manner as other taxes are collected on real estate in the District of Columbia. All contracts for such grading and macadamizing of said street and avenue in excess of the \$10,000 heretofore appropriated as aforesaid, shall be made payable and be paid out of the money derived from the taxes to be collected as herein provided."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$50,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 3 and 4 of said amendment strike out the words "Back street and Tennallytown road, so called" and insert: "Back street and Tennallytown road, so called, at or near Schneider lane;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$110,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"That the Washington and Georgetown Railroad Company is hereby required to repair the bridge across Rock Creek at M street northwest at a cost not exceeding \$10,000, said repairs to be made under the direction of the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia and in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by him."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "four;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "eleven;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$613,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After line 25, on page 18 of the bill, insert as a new paragraph the following:

"That hereafter the police shall, as far as practicable, aid in the enforcement of the garbage regulations."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$16,750;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$22,450;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$28,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$61,100;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$6,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$30,800;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$13,995;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$4,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$4,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, and 139, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amended paragraph insert the following:

"Reform School for Girls: For the erection and completion, according to plans and specifications to be prepared by the inspector of buildings and approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, of a suitable building or buildings to be used as a Reform School for Girls, \$35,000, to be expended under the direction of said Commissioners. Said building shall be erected on land belonging to the United States, to be selected by the Attorney-General, the Secretary of War, and the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That if, in their judgment, a suitable site can not be obtained on lands now owned by the United States, not exceeding 85,000 of the sum herein appropriated may be used for the purchase of not exceeding 20 acres of ground, to be selected by them, on which to erect said Reform School for Girls: *Provided further*, That said building shall not be erected on land belonging to the Reform School of the District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 148, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$41,656;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 149, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$90,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 150, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For extending the high-service system of water distribution, to include all necessary land, machinery, buildings, standpipes, mains, and appurtenances, so much as may be available in the water fund during the fiscal year 1893, after providing for the expenditures hereinbefore authorized, is hereby appropriated; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and empowered to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, the land, including necessary portions of public roads, required for the said extension, and the right of way, where necessary, for the construction, maintenance, and repair of the requisite water mains and their appurtenances for the said extension."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 151, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 3. That the Treasurer of the United States is hereby directed and authorized to apply such portion as may be deemed expedient, of any surplus which may remain at the close of the fiscal year 1893, and of each fiscal year thereafter, of the general revenues of the District of Columbia in excess of one-half of those appropriations payable equally out of the revenues of the District and the United States, exclusive of the revenues of the water department, to the payment of the balances yet remaining unpaid of the debts of the District of Columbia created by the act approved July 15, 1882, entitled 'An act to increase the water supply of the city of Washington, and for other purposes,' and of section 2 of the District of Columbia appropriation act approved March 3, 1891: *Provided*, That the amount of said surplus shall be first reported to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Treasurer of the United States by the First Comptroller of the Treasury when called upon to do so."

And the Senate agree to the same.

On amendment numbered 144 the committee of conference have been unable to agree.

W. B. ALLISON,
H. L. DAVES,
F. M. COCKRELL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
ALEX. M. DOCKERY,
BARNES COMPTON,
D. B. HENDERSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. ALLISON. It will be seen from this report that it includes a great number of items, many of which the Senate committee surrender, and many of which the House committee sur-

render, having been inserted as amendments by the Senate. Other items of difference were compromised. We have come to a conclusion as respects every paragraph in the bill, excepting the paragraph found on page 49 of the printed bill and known as Senate amendment No. 144. That amendment relates to the appropriation for the entertainment of the Grand Army of the Republic during its fall session here.

In this matter there were serious differences both as respects the amount and the method of payment, the Senate committee insisting that the appropriation should be regarded as an appropriation for the District of Columbia and should be paid from its revenues whether derived from taxation or from the Treasury of the United States under the law of 1878, the House conferees, on the contrary, insisting that whatever sum is appropriated for this purpose shall be paid wholly out of taxes derived from property assessed in this District.

Passing from that, however, the two committees were unable to agree as respects the amount. The Senate committee made very careful inquiry as to the amount necessary in addition to the amount raised by private subscription in this District to entertain these old soldiers in a becoming way, and the Senate conferees became satisfied that the sum originally appropriated by the Senate, \$100,000, was as small a sum as could be got along with in this entertainment. Indeed, the committees upon this subject who visited the Senate conferees were satisfied that \$100,000 might be an inadequate sum. Therefore, the conferees of the Senate, representing, as they believe, the views of the Senate, refused to concede what the House asked, namely, a reduction to \$75,000. Upon this amendment, as respects the two points I have stated, the conferees were unable to agree.

If any Senator desires specific information as respects the details of the bill, I shall be glad to make such explanation as I can, but otherwise I shall ask that the report of the committee be concurred in by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on concurring in the report of the conference committee.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. ALLISON. Perhaps, Mr. President, I should present, to be published in the RECORD, a statement of the changes made in the bill. I wish to say that these changes are somewhat misleading as they appear in the statement, from the fact that, although we struck out the sum of \$100,000 for water improvements in this District, we indirectly appropriate the water rents, which will amount to very nearly that sum, and that amount is not included in the total.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The statement referred to by the Senator from Iowa will be printed in the RECORD, if there be no objection. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

DISTRICT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Amount as passed House	\$4,987,580.27
Amount as passed Senate	5,906,984.27
Increase made by Senate	919,404.00
Changes in amounts in conference, namely:	
<i>Reduction.</i>	
Assessor's office	3,750.00
Collector's office	1,000.00
Auditor's office	1,000.00
Engineer's office	2,800.00
Contingent expenses District offices	1,000.00
Rent of attorney's office	100.00
Advertising notice of taxes in arrear	1,000.00
Work on sundry streets and avenues	130,000.00
Plats of subdivisions outside of cities Washington and Georgetown	1,000.00
Plan for extension of highways	20,000.00
New main intercepting sewer	22,500.00
Surveys, etc., for sewage disposal	25,000.00
Suburban sewers	10,000.00
Condemnation for sewers	1,500.00
Repairs of county roads	10,000.00
Construction of county roads	35,000.00
Condemnation of streets, roads, and alleys	7,500.00
Sprinkling, sweeping, and cleaning streets	5,000.00
Parking commission	1,000.00
Lighting outside of Washington and Georgetown	1,500.00
Bridges	130,000.00
Washington Aqueduct	1,000.00
Schools	700.00
Metropolitan police, miscellaneous	750.00
Fire department, new engine, house, and lot	3,020.00
Telegraph and telephone service, repairs, etc.	7,000.00
Health department (\$1,000)	5,500.00
Police court, witness fees	2,000.00
Bathing beach	10,000.00
Washington Asylum	3,540.00
Charities (net)	12,850.00
Militia, camp of instruction	5,000.00
Water department, clerical	1,500.00
Water department, maintenance	10,000.00
Water department, extending high service, surplus revenue for 1892 appropriated in lieu of specific appropriation of	100,000.00
Total reduction	573,570.00

Amount of Senate amendments reduced in conference	\$573,570.00
Amount of Senate amendments agreed to in conference	245,834.00
In dispute	100,000.00
	919,404.00

Amount of bill as agreed to

5,303,414.27

Mr. ALLISON. I now move that the Senate insist upon its amendment numbered 144, and ask the House for a further conference upon that amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Iowa moves that the Senate do further insist upon its amendment to the bill numbered 144, and ask for a further conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing vote between the two Houses.

Mr. PADDOCK. I do not quite understand which amendment that is. Will the Senator from Iowa be kind enough to state?

Mr. ALLISON. It is the amendment relating to the entertainment of the Grand Army of the Republic.

Mr. PADDOCK. As I understand, the disagreement is both as to the amount and as to the fund out of which it shall be paid.

Mr. ALLISON. Yes; we disagreed upon both questions.

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

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. ALLISON, Mr. DAWES, and Mr. COCKRELL were appointed.

TAXES ON STATE BANK CIRCULATION.

Mr. BUTLER. A few days ago I gave notice that I should to-day ask the Senate to indulge me in some remarks on a resolution which I offered in the early part of the session, which I will ask may be considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there further morning business? If not, that order is closed, and the resolution referred to by the Senator from South Carolina will be reported.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. BUTLER January 11, 1892, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be, and it is hereby, instructed to report a bill repealing all taxes imposed by Congress on the circulation of State banks of issue.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I propose to discuss this question in a spirit of perfect frankness, with no pride of opinion, but with the sole object of endeavoring to afford relief to the people, and with the hope of securing for it that careful consideration so essential to a clear understanding of the relation it bears to the economic questions now agitating the country. It should not be flouted by the Committee on Finance of this body because some of its members entertain views in opposition to the principles involved, or to the ends sought to be obtained. The people want the subject fairly and fully considered, and their wishes are entitled to respect.

If it were practicable to ask every male adult in the United States whether, in his opinion, the volume of our currency is sufficient to meet the reasonable demands of business, seventenths, perhaps eight-tenths of them, would answer in the negative. And if the same persons could be interrogated as to whether, under our present financial system, there is a fair and equitable distribution of what currency we have, nine-tenths of them would answer in the negative. I mean by a fair and equitable distribution, such a distribution, as that every honest man would have it in his power to procure as much money as his credit and circumstances would justify, and he could profitably use in his business and domestic concerns.

According to our present financial policy the greater part of the circulation is periodically drawn away from the people and hoarded in commercial and financial centers, to be let out again upon such terms, in such amounts, and whenever those who control it may determine. As matters now go millions of men can not get money for their legitimate business transactions, however good their credit or financial standing, because the currency is not within their reach, or if within reach, is held with such severe legal restrictions as in a large measure to destroy its usefulness.

I am not one of those dreamers who holds that there can ever be an equal distribution of wealth until the millenium dawns upon us, or until inequality in intellectual endowments and business qualities is removed, but I do believe that the Government may frame such laws as to give every man equality of opportunity in securing for himself the goods of this world. I think I can demonstrate that this rule is not observed in our existing laws. The following is the statement of the Treasury Department May 1, 1892, showing the amounts of gold and silver coins and

certificates, United States notes, and national-bank notes in circulation at that time:

Statement showing the amounts of gold and silver coins and certificates, United States notes and national-bank notes, in circulation May 1, 1892.

	General stock coined or issued.	In Treasury.	Amount in circulation May 1, 1892.	Amount in circulation May 1, 1891.
Gold coin	\$601,527,222	\$193,911,273	\$407,615,949	\$408,862,781
Standard silver dollars	413,055,390	355,500,903	57,554,487	61,692,818
Subsidiary silver	77,433,950	14,000,427	62,833,523	57,388,507
Gold certificates	179,644,879	21,931,180	153,713,699	138,890,799
Silver certificates	330,499,002	3,209,106	327,289,896	312,933,440
Treasury notes, act July 14, 1890	93,228,690	11,726,920	81,501,770	37,000,234
United States notes	346,681,016	21,895,155	324,785,761	346,184,618
Currency certificates, act June 8, 1872	30,550,000	340,000	30,210,000	
National-bank notes	172,476,575	4,409,486	168,067,089	166,363,616
Total	2,241,096,694	627,524,450	1,613,572,244	1,529,316,833

Population of the United States May 1, 1892, estimated at 65,285,000; circulation per capita, \$24.72.

It will be seen in this table that the entire stock of money "coined and issued" by the Government for the whole country is \$2,241,096,694, of which sum \$627,524,450 remained in the Treasury, leaving \$1,613,572,244 in circulation. The amount of circulation per capita is put down at \$24.72. Dividing the amount claimed to be in circulation (\$1,613,572,244) among our sixty-odd millions of population we should get that result, but it is fair to assume that a part of the amount said to be in circulation, quite an essential part, is held for reserves in banks, and is not in circulation. But let us concede that we have \$24.72 for each man, woman, and child in the United States.

What does it prove? That each man, woman, and child has \$24.72? Not at all. Nobody would be simple-minded enough to claim that. There are millions of people who have not \$2 or 2 cents, much less \$24.72. The statement is therefore misleading and delusive. In certain sections of the country, in the principal financial and commercial centers, the per capita circulation would reach up into the hundreds of dollars, whereas in other sections it will not amount to a hundred cents. To illustrate by my own county of Edgefield in South Carolina: We have a population of about 50,000, largely agricultural and rural, and I venture the assertion there are not \$2 per capita in circulation among the people. What is true of this community is true of all others similarly situated in the South and West and the East as well, outside of financial centers.

Mr. President, the people have not money enough in circulation for their legitimate wants. This fact I want to emphasize, however good their credit, or sound and acceptable their security, or urgent their demands, the money is not in the country, is not accessible, or if accessible, is, I repeat, hedged about by such restraints of the law that it may as well not be in existence. I know the reply to this line of argument is that these conditions are the result not so much of scarcity of circulation as the scarcity of capital, the lack of confidence, because there are not proper inducements offered to attract money, etc.

But, sir, this is neither tenable nor true. In many of the regions of the South and West, where this stringency exists, there is plenty of capital, but little money. Land is capital, and the safest and soundest security. Live stock, personal property of various kinds, personal credit, crops, are capital, but unavailable to a great extent, as a basis of credit, because money is so scarce and so dear for seven months out of the twelve they can not be utilized. I might cite many cases within my own personal knowledge and experience, to establish this proposition, as no doubt other Senators around me can; but it can not and will not be denied.

I grant you that in the great financial centers money is abundant and readily obtained, but the agricultural population can not procure it, except at the most ruinous and exacting rates, because they have not such security as is demanded, thereby having their progress and comfort and legitimate development greatly retarded. And just in proportion as they are retarded and restrained, in the same degree are all other industries, mining, manufacturing, and commercial, hindered and retarded.

It is quite the custom in our public discussions on financial topics to launch off into disquisitions on political economy and abstract propositions and theories, and begot the practical aspects of the subject. We hear a great deal about the "functions of money," "What is money?" "What are the objects and purposes of money?" etc. This is all very instructive and interesting for doctrinaires and schoolmen, and I would not discourage such discussions in a proper form, but here we have to deal with an intensely practical question, and must seek practical facts and conditions to guide and control our actions. Of course there are certain well-recognized, well-defined, funda-

mental principles of finance which can never be safely disregarded in financial legislation, but a man of the plainest intelligence and understanding knows what money is and what purposes it subserves.

All men may not fully comprehend the important fact, that in order to attain its highest usefulness and be safe and effectual in the hands of the people, money must have a sound, stable, and reliable basis. It is the duty of the legislator to impart those qualities to it. But his duty does not stop here. He must see to it that the circulation of money goes out to the people in sufficient volume to satisfy the demands of their business, and has in it an element of elasticity to meet unforeseen financial exigencies as they arise.

I have asserted that our volume of currency is not adequate for our business operations. I do not deny its soundness and stability, but I do deny that under our present laws it has that expansive capacity, if I may use that expression, so essential to progressive business developments. I believe I am safe in saying that ours is the only one of the leading commercial nations of the world where this elastic feature in the national currency is wanted. The Imperial Bank of Germany is authorized by law, upon well-defined conditions and within certain specified limits, to increase its circulation to counteract the damaging effects of financial stringency and distress.

The Bank of England and the Bank of France are endowed with similar privileges, and so with other national systems, while in our comparatively young country, rapidly increasing in population, material progress and development, with a proportionate increased demand for money, our national banks have no such authority to supply it. The Government, reserving to itself the power to issue currency, halts between the contentions of political parties, the demands and requirements of the people on the one hand and the denials of capital on the other, and thus trifles with the prosperity and progress of its citizens. I need not here, Mr. President, enter upon a discussion of our national-banking system. It is sufficient for my present purpose to concede three things in regard to it. It has furnished to the people the safest, soundest, and most uniform bank currency ever vouchsafed to them, three most essential elements in every system of bank currency; but it is unstable, inadequate, and inelastic, three other qualities equally important and indispensable. Let us see if I am correct in this last proposition.

Since the passage of the national-banking act, the amount of national-bank circulation has varied from year to year. In October, 1882, it reached high-water mark, and amounted to \$362,889,134. On the 16th of March, 1892, it had fallen to \$172,533,762, a loss of \$190,355,372 in ten years, very nearly \$200,000,000. This contraction is still going on, falling on the 1st of May, 1892, to \$168,067,089, and must eventually wipe this currency out of existence, while our population is increasing and the demand for more money being accelerated in that proportion. I think, therefore, I am safe in saying the national-bank currency is insufficient, unstable, and inelastic. I do not forget that this reduction in the national-bank currency has been measurably supplied by Treasury certificates based on coin in the Treasury—but this supply, amounting to about \$480,000,000, has not been equal to the contraction and increasing demand.

The United States notes—greenbacks—have remained about stationary at \$46,000,000, in round numbers. If the national-bank currency continues to diminish it must soon pass out of existence and we shall have no paper currency except the Treasury certificates and greenbacks. I am sure it will not be insisted by the most extreme contractionist or monometallist that they will prove adequate to the wants of the people.

Great stress is laid upon the fact that 90 per cent or thereabouts of the business of the country is transacted by checks or drafts or bills of exchange, and the argument is deduced therefrom that there is no occasion for a large volume of currency. Here again, I submit, is a great fallacy.

The power to give a check implies a bank account, and is limited to those who have money to their credit. How many millions of people are there who have never had and can scarcely hope to have a bank account? They must have the cash to discharge their obligations, the currency to pass from hand to hand, so that to them a bank is a sealed vault, and is of no use in their daily transactions, especially if they are not banks of issue, and are scarce of currency.

I could produce abundant proof, if necessary, to show that the country banks are not supplied with currency enough by half, or more than half, to meet the wants of the people who they could otherwise accommodate. And furthermore it can be shown that in those seasons of the year, when currency is most needed, they can not procure it on any terms in sufficient quantities. I know this is true in the South, and doubtless in the West. If this is admitted, what should Congress do to correct the evil? What is the plain duty of Congress in the premises? It is not a sufficient answer to the cry of distress which comes up to us from

all directions, to say that one political party will not do this or that, because the doing it might give the other party an advantage in some election. Or that by failing to adopt certain measures of relief, the party failing will be stronger in particular sections of the country? Will it do to answer this appeal for relief from the laboring and industrial classes, to say, that it is clamor instigated by demagogues and cultivated by ambitious politicians? This would not be wise statesmanship, Mr. President. It is not only not wise, but approaches very close to the verge of criminal neglect.

As a rule the people do not complain without a cause, for the sake of complaining. They realize their wants and necessities much better than is supposed. Their cries for financial relief amount now almost to a lamentation, and if not heeded and acted upon will swell into a loud and irresistible demand, which will assert itself in no uncertain manner at the ballot box.

Wild and untenable vagaries may rise to the crest of the waves of popular agitation, but they will become tame and harmless theories beside the storm of indignant protestations which will press them aside for more positive and radical measures.

Various plans of relief have been, and are being, suggested. Some of them, I think, are mischievous and dangerous, but they are all symptoms of disease, of popular discontent, and unrest. These complaints of the people are not imaginary. They are well founded and based on a deep-seated cause. Our financial system and policy is defective, unjust, ruinous to large classes of the people. It enables a few centers and a few persons to get possession of the currency and hold it from millions of their fellow-citizens upon their own terms. It enables them to hoard the money of the country, and say how much of it shall go out, and upon what terms. You may say that this will be true under any system, but the financial history of this country does not sustain the proposition. It was never true prior to 1863—when the national banking system went into operation, and the national Government delegated to a few persons the power to issue the currency for all the people—except such as it reserved to itself the exclusive right to issue.

I have no war to make on the national banks. I have conceded their value and advantages. They were valuable aids to the Government at the time they were organized, but they have served their purpose. They have been the pampered pets of the Government, and after thirty years of existence if they can not stand alone on their own merits they should go under. The Government laid the strong arm of its taxing power on State banks for their benefit. It taxed the State banks out of existence; it destroyed them for the benefit of national banks. These laws should now be repealed.

I assume it can not be successfully argued that this tax by Congress on the circulation of State banks is unconstitutional, as the Supreme Court has held, in the case of *Veazy Bank vs. Fenno* (8 Wall), that Congress may employ the taxing power to destroy—but it is a question of very doubtful constitutionality whether Congress may use the taxing power solely for the purpose of destroying, and without the raising of revenue being the incident or purpose of its exercise.

The two sections of the statute under which this tax is imposed are as follows:

SEC. 3412. Every national banking association, State bank, or State banking association, shall pay a tax of 10 per cent on the amount of notes of any person, or of any State bank or State banking association, used for circulation and paid out by them.

SEC. 3413. Every national banking association, State bank, or banker, or association, shall pay a tax of 10 per cent on the amount of notes of any town, city, or municipal corporation, paid out by them.

I have not examined the reports of the Treasury Department to ascertain whether any revenue is collected under the provisions of this law, but I feel safe in saying not one dollar goes into the public Treasury from this source.

The law, as was intended, has simply driven the objects of taxation out of existence in the interest of the national banks, and nothing is left upon which it can operate. It is a matter of grave doubt in my mind whether Congress may constitutionally do this.

But let that pass and let us turn to the inquiry as to what would be the effect of the repeal. Would it destroy the national banks? By no means. The tendency in national banking associations is to reduce their currency or circulation to the lowest possible limit. If some other security is not provided for their circulation they must cease to exist by operation of law when the United States bonds held for security are redeemed, and the last of these become due and payable in 1907. There is no indication that Congress will substitute anything in their stead, and this currency must therefore eventually be withdrawn from circulation. Possibly they may be continued as banks of discount and deposit, but not as circulation. I do not see, therefore, how the repeal of this tax is to affect the national banks. Will it restore

the State banks? This will not necessarily follow, but it will open the door for their restoration if the people of the States desire them.

My own judgment is the rehabilitation of the State banks of issue will meet the demands of the financial situation more effectually and completely than any measure that can be undertaken. It would decentralize the fiscal affairs of the country, localize them, and bring about that fair and natural distribution of money now denied under the present system. It would enable every man of credit and standing to procure, in his own vicinity, the money necessary for his wants.

I am fully aware of the arguments urged against State banks of issue, and admit their force. Among other things, it is urged that the currency will not be uniform, and on that account inconvenient and insecure to the holders of the bank bills; that "wild-cat" banking will take the place of the present uniform and safe system of national banking; that the security for the bank bills will be inadequate and insufficient, thereby entailing loss upon the bill-holders; that exchanges can not be safely made and business in different sections can not be conveniently transacted. Those who advance these arguments, Mr. President, lose sight of several important considerations which should have weight in determining so important a question.

In the first place, the science or business of banking has made great progress in the last thirty years; business methods have been improved, and ventures then entered upon would not now be tolerated for a day in the business and financial world. Why? First, because of more accurate and superior knowledge; second, because railroads and the telegraph have brought business men into juxtaposition, and the touch is felt from one end of the country to the other—I might say from one end of the civilized world to the other—we now have no frontier. Railroads and the telegraph have obliterated that field for "wild-cat" banking, and such enterprises would find neither home nor habitation for their operation. Besides these general considerations, why can not the States be trusted to provide restrictions for banking as stringent and safe as those of the National Government upon national banks?

The same supervision may be exercised, the same or similar rules as to reserves, liability of stockholders, the same or similar methods for the protection of bill-holders, may be imposed. Why may not the State provide that its own bonds, if it has any, and if not, such well-recognized solvent bonds as it may designate, may be used by State banks as security for their circulation? This would have the double effect of improving the credit of the State, retaining capital for investment within its own borders, and at the same time furnishing a safe security for the circulation necessary for the people.

Clearing houses, as now employed by national banks, could be instituted for State banks. They would enforce the greatest conservatism in bank management, and impart to the State-bank currency a quality of safety and security that would cause it to circulate generally without restraint. Why should it not? A State could not afford to permit loose and reckless banking. Every sentiment of interest and State pride would forbid. Every consideration of prudence and business experience would make such a thing intolerable. I can recall the fact that the bills of many of the banks of South Carolina and other States, for years prior to year 1861, passed current in all parts of the country without question, because it was known they were managed prudently and conservatively, and we should have a similar experience if they were revived.

But, Mr. President, I am not so much concerned about the want of uniformity in State-bank circulation. This quality, this lack of uniformity, has its advantages, which, I think, outweigh the disadvantages. It would result in bringing the currency back to the locality from which it emanates, there to be employed by the people in their local wants, and in that way correct the evil to which I have referred of accumulating the currency in remote centers, from which it can not be recovered by the people who must have it, except upon hard terms. I care not how much you increase the volume of currency under the present system, this same evil will confront us, this same ruinous ebb and flow of money would obtain whatever the volume of currency. For the sake of argument I will concede that the State-bank currency may not be uniform, but it will answer for all local business purposes.

The insolvent laws, the divorce laws, the inheritance laws, the testamentary laws, the laws of evidence, the jury laws, the criminal laws, the road and corporation laws, of the several States are not uniform, and yet the whole country has prospered and progressed and developed under them. It is this divergence of local State systems and uniformity of the paramount Federal system which gives such strength to our fabric of Government. I, therefore, do not regard uniformity so essential, although I believe a few years of prudent management would

remove whatever of inconvenience that might arise from this source.

But why depend upon State-bank circulation to regulate exchanges between the several States or for the convenience of travel to and from different parts of the country? What is to become of the one thousand six hundred millions of national currency now in existence? Is that to be destroyed by State banks? Why can not this currency be used as at present in the matter of exchanges between the States if the State-bank circulation could not be made available for that purpose? This currency may eventually be reduced by the amount of the national-bank circulation, but that amounts to only \$168,000,000. So that I apprehend no trouble in conducting our business transactions in the several States, not only for the reasons I have just assigned but for those given in another part of my remarks.

I believe, furthermore, that the rehabilitation of State banks would settle all controversies over the silver question. Whether they are reestablished or not, I have no doubt but that free silver coinage may be safely resumed by the Government on the present ratio, and I should cheerfully vote for a bill for that purpose, but I shall not now enter upon a discussion of that question, further than to say, that in my opinion, the importance of free and unlimited coinage of silver is greatly exaggerated by both sides of the controversy. It would not bring the relief claimed by its advocates, and would not do the damage contended for by its opponents. That good would result to the whole body of the people, I have no doubt, and I, therefore, favor it. But that it will relieve the financial stringency under which we are laboring, or cure the evils complained of, I do not believe.

The free coinage of silver would alleviate the distress very greatly, and do no injury to any fair-minded, honest man, I care not what form of contract he may have entered into. The suggestion that it would drive gold out of the country or operate as a repudiation of obligations is, in my judgment, without substance or foundation.

When State banks were in existence, silver and gold coin were used on terms of perfect equality as security for their circulation. Nobody ever questioned their equality, when they bore exactly the same relation to each other, that they do to-day. Nobody inquired, or cared to inquire, in those days. So long as the banks had coin, whether of gold or silver, to support their circulation, confidence was assured, and when it became necessary, under financial stress, to suspend specie payment, no preference was given to the one coin or the other.

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

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. COKE. I ask the Senator if we had the free coinage of silver would it not be a great auxiliary to the appliances for establishing State banks in giving them a coin basis?

Mr. BUTLER. I am just coming to that, Mr. President. In my own State, and doubtless in others, banks were allowed to issue three dollars of paper for one of coin, of gold or silver, and even with this latitude they maintained their credit, when prudently managed, and supplied a currency that proved adequate for all business purposes. Of course this latitude would not be admissible at the present day, would not be expected, and would not be allowed; but a plan of redemption could be required that would make the holders of State-bank bills as secure as the holders of national-bank bills. The free coinage of silver would enlarge the metal money of the country, and thus furnish to the banks whatever of coin might be required for their reserves, give employment to all the silver that could be coined, and injure nobody. The simple truth is that metallic currency is only fit to be used as a bank reserve or as security for circulation, except so much as may be necessary for actual circulation, and this amount is necessarily very limited.

I repeat, therefore, that the repeal of this tax and reestablishment of State banks of issue would settle all controversies over the silver question. If I could get an international monetary arrangement so much the better, but the best way to bring about an international arrangement is to restore silver in this country to its legitimate sphere of free and unlimited coinage, with full legal-tender power.

It may not be entirely appropriate in this connection to discuss the constitutional authority of the States to create banks of issue, as this will not be denied, but it might be well to refresh our minds on this point, and I will therefore read some extracts from the opinions of the court in the case cited above, *Veazy Bank vs. Fenno*. The court was not unanimous in rendering judgment sustaining the constitutionality of the 10 per cent tax on State banks.

Mr. Justice Nelson and Mr. Justice Davis filed a dissenting opinion, in which they say, among other things, on page 550, 10 Wallace—I shall read rather freely from this dissenting opinion,

not, of course, with a view of claiming that it upsets the opinion of the majority, but with a view of giving some historical information which I think will be valuable in regard to this proposed legislation:

The constitutional authority of the State to create these institutions, and to invest them with full banking powers, is hardly denied. But, it may be useful to recur for a few moments to the source of this authority.

The tenth amendment to the Constitution is as follows: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people. On looking into the Constitution, it will be found that there is no clause or provision which either expressly, or by reasonable implication, delegates this power to the Federal Government, which originally belonged to the States, nor which prohibits it to them. In the discussions on the subject of the creation of the first bank of the United States, in the first Congress, and in the Cabinet of Washington, in 1790 and 1791, no question was made as to the constitutionality of the State banks. The only doubt that existed, and which divided the opinion of the most eminent statesmen of the day, many of whom had just largely participated in the formation of the Constitution, the Government under which they were then engaged in organizing, was, whether or not Congress possessed a concurrent power to incorporate a banking institution of the United States.

Since the adoption of the Constitution down to the present act of Congress, and the case now before us, the question in Congress and in the courts has been not whether the State banks were constitutional institutions, but whether Congress had the power conferred on it by the States to establish a national bank. As we have said, that question was closed by the judgment of this court in *McCulloch vs. The State of Maryland*. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution there were four State banks in existence and in operation—one in each of the States of Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, and Maryland. The one in Philadelphia had been originally chartered by the confederation, but subsequently took a charter under the State of Pennsylvania. The framers of the Constitution were therefore familiar with these State banks, and the circulation of their paper as money, and were also familiar with the practice of the States that was so common, to issue bills of credit, which were bills issued by the State exclusively on its own credit, and intended to circulate as currency, redeemable at a future day. They guarded the people against the evils of this practice of the State government by the provision in the tenth section of the first article: "That no State shall * * * emit bills of credit," and in the same section guard against any abuse of paper money of the State banks in the following words: "Nor make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts." As bills of credit were thus entirely abolished, the paper money of the State banks was the only currency or circulating medium to which this prohibition could have had any application, and was the only currency, except gold and silver, left to the States. The prohibition took from this paper all coercive circulation and left it to stand alone upon the credit of the banks.

It was no longer an irredeemable currency, as the banks were under obligation, including, frequently, that of its stockholders, to redeem their paper in circulation in gold or silver at the counter. The State banks were left in this condition by the Constitution, untouched by any other provision. As a consequence they were gradually established in most or all of the States, and had not been encroached upon or legislated against, or in any other way interfered with, by acts of Congress, for more than three-quarters of a century—from 1787 to 1864.

But, in addition to the above recognition of the State banks, the question of their constitutionality came directly before this court in the case of *Briscoe vs. The Bank of the Commonwealth of Kentucky*.

The case was most elaborately discussed, both by counsel and the court. The court, after the fullest consideration, held that the States possessed the power to grant charters to State banks; that the power was incident to sovereignty, and that there was no limitation in the Federal Constitution on its exercise by the States. The court observed that the Bank of North America and of Massachusetts, and some others, were in operation at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and that it could not be supposed the notes of the banks were intended to be inhibited by that instrument, or that they were considered as bills of credit, within its meaning. All the judges concurred in this judgment except Mr. Justice Story. The decision in this case was affirmed in *Woodruff vs. Trapnall*, in *Darrington vs. The Bank of Alabama*, and in *Curran vs. State of Arkansas*.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from South Carolina will please suspend. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 51) to provide for the free coinage of gold and silver bullion, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be informally laid aside in order that the Senator from South Carolina may conclude his remarks.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Tennessee asks the consent of the Senate that the unfinished business be informally laid aside that the Senator from South Carolina may continue his remarks. The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from South Carolina will proceed.

Mr. BUTLER. One other quotation, Mr. President, of a somewhat historical nature from the same decision:

The act of Congress, July 13, 1866, declares, that the State banks shall pay 10 per cent on the amount of their notes, or the notes of any person, or other State bank, used for circulation, and paid out by them after the 1st of August, 1866. In addition to this tax there is also a tax of 5 per cent per annum upon all dividends to stockholders, besides a duty of one-twenty-fourth of 1 per cent, monthly, upon all deposits, and the same monthly duty upon the capital of the bank. This makes an aggregate of some 16 per cent imposed annually upon these banks. It will be observed, the tax of 10 per cent upon the bills in circulation is not a tax on the property of the institutions. The bills in circulation are not the property, but the debts of the bank, and, in their accounts of debits and credits, are placed to the debit side. Certainly no government has yet made the discovery of taxing both sides of this account, debit and credit, as the property of a taxable person or corporation.

If both these items could be made available for this purpose a heavy national debt need not create any very great alarm, neither as it respects its pressure on the industry of the country, for the time being, or of its possible duration. There is nothing in the debts of a bank to distinguish them in this respect from the debts of individuals or persons. The discounted

paper received for the notes in circulation is the property of the bank and is taxed as such, as is the property of individuals received for their notes that may be outstanding.

The imposition upon the banks can not be upheld as a tax upon property; neither could it have been so intended. It is simply a mode by which the powers or faculties of the States to incorporate banks are subjected to taxation, and which, if maintainable, may annihilate those powers.

I observe that the Chief Justice, who was the organ of the court, in delivering the opinion touched upon that suggestion, and seems to have qualified somewhat the force of the opinion as delivered. He says, on page 541:

There are, indeed, certain virtual limitations, arising from the principles of the Constitution itself. It would undoubtedly be an abuse of the power if so exercised as to impair the separate existence and independent self-government of the States or if exercised for ends inconsistent with the limited grants of power in the Constitution.

Mr. Justice Nelson goes on in his dissenting opinion and says:

No person questions the authority of Congress to tax the property of the banks, and of all other corporate bodies of a State, the same as that of individuals. They are artificial bodies, representing the associated pecuniary means of real persons, which constitute their business capital, and the property thus invested is open and subject to taxation, with all the property, real and personal, of the State. A tax upon this property, and which, by the Constitution, is to be uniform, affords full scope to the taxing power of the Federal Government, and is consistent with the power of the States to create the banks, and, in our judgment, is the only subject of taxation by this Government to which these institutions are liable.

As we have seen in the forepart of this opinion, the power to incorporate banks was not surrendered to the Federal Government but reserved to the States; and it follows that the Constitution itself protects them, or should protect them, from any encroachment upon this right. As to the powers thus reserved the States are as supreme as before they entered into the Union, and are entitled to the unrestrained exercise of them. The question as to the taxation of the powers and faculties belonging to governments is not new in this court.

Again, on page 556:

It is true that the present decision strikes only at the power to create banks, but no person can fail to see that the principle involved affects the power to create any other description of corporations, such as railroads, turnpikes, manufacturing companies, and others.

This taxation of the powers and faculties of the State governments, which are essential to their sovereignty, and to the efficient and independent management and administration of their internal affairs, is for the first time, advanced as an attribute to Federal authority. It finds no support or countenance in the early history of the Government, or in the opinions of the illustrious statesmen who founded it. These statesmen scrupulously abstained from any encroachment upon the reserved rights of the States; and, within these limits, sustained and supported them as sovereign States.

We say nothing as to the purpose of this heavy tax of some 16 per cent upon the banks, 10 of which we can not but regard as imposed upon the power of the States to create them. Indeed, the purpose is scarcely concealed in the opinion of the court, namely, to encourage the national banks. It is sufficient to add that the burden of the tax, while it has encouraged these banks, has proved fatal to those of the States, and if we are at liberty to judge of the purpose of an act from the consequences that have followed, it is not perhaps going too far to say that these consequences were intended.

And now, Mr. President, once more recurring to the question of the sufficiency of the volume of our currency, permit me to re-enforce my opinion that it is not large enough by a comparison which is striking and conclusive. I will make this comparison in my own State, as I am more familiar with financial and business matters there than elsewhere.

The population of South Carolina in 1860 was 291,300 white and 412,300 colored, the latter slaves. It will be borne in mind that the colored people, as slaves, had occasion or opportunity to handle very little money, as they were supported and maintained by their owners. It will also be borne in mind that almost the entire business of the State was conducted by the whites, so that the 291,300 white persons may be adopted as the basis for estimating the per capita of circulation in that State.

The population in 1890, all free, was 1,151,149. Of course, more currency would be required for the latter period than the former, but we find a strikingly different condition of affairs. Sometime since I addressed a letter of inquiry to the comptroller-general of South Carolina, requesting him to inform me as to the amount of bank capital and bank circulation in that State for the decades of 1850-'60, and 1880-'90, with several collateral questions of not so much importance.

The following is his courteous reply:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMPTROLLER-GENERAL,
Columbia, S. C., March 9, 1892.

DEAR SIR: In reply to yours of the 6th instant, it is very much to be regretted that this office does not contain the information you desire. Unfortunately our laws do not provide any means or give any authority for the collection and filing of statistics as you inquire about since 1880 and before, and which in my opinion are of great public interest. Some of the older banks or bankers of the State or the American Association of Bankers most likely can give it.

Very respectfully,

W. H. ELLERBE,
Comptroller-General.
Per NORTON.

Gen. M. C. BUTLER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Accompanying this letter was a communication containing some statistics, which, owing to incompleteness of the records, are

only partial, but I incorporate it, throwing as it does some light on the subject of inquiry.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMPTROLLER-GENERAL,
Columbia, S. C., March 9, 1892.

DEAR SIR: The records of this office, as shown by the reports of the comptroller-general of the State, are not entirely complete, and such facts as I am able to give you for the period from 1850 to 1880 (1880 to 1890 being already given) may not prove altogether satisfactory to you, as it is not to myself. The clerical force allowed by law hinders very much the collating and getting together such information as you desire.

I will give you the amounts as shown by comptroller-general's report for two extremes, viz: 1850 and 1880.

This report shows for 1850, capital of bank of State \$1,122,460.63; bank notes issued, Charleston and Columbia, \$1,760,008. (From annual statement of bank, October 1, 1850.)

The last quarterly reports of banks for this year (ending 30th September, 1890) capital was \$5,991,885.63; bills in circulation, \$2,769,531.99. This includes above figures, and it seems there were other banks in the State at this period other than the eight reporting as above to comptroller-general. The report of comptroller-general for 1888-'89 and '90, are not to be found in office, but in 1887 the total amount of capital of banks reporting to comptroller-general, 30th September, not including the Bank of the State, was \$14,837,642.25; bills in circulation, \$7,105,170.51. Bank of State: Capital, \$1,104,367.25, and bank notes issued, \$2,368,928.12.

The State librarian possibly could give you figures nearer your wishes, as doubtless the records there are not broken as in this office as to this period. I have depended for these figures entirely upon reports of comptroller-general, and not records of office as kept by bookkeepers, etc.

Regretting that my facilities are not better for complying with your request, I am

Yours, sincerely,

W. H. ELLERBE, C. G.
Per NORTON, C. C. C. G.

Gen. M. C. BUTLER,
Washington, D. C.

Not being able to procure the information as fully as I desired from this source, for the reasons assigned by the comptroller-general, I addressed a similar letter to Mr. Thaddeus Street, long a member of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, an intelligent business man of that city, and the following is his reply:

CHARLESTON, S. C., March 14, 1892.

MY DEAR SIR: Your esteemed favor of the 10th instant came duly to hand. The information asked for is not easily obtainable owing to the loss of records, but after careful research I am able to give you fair answers to your questions:

First. The banking capital in South Carolina for the decade from 1850 to 1880 was about \$18,000,000.

Second. The circulation was about \$10,000,000.

Third. The capital of South Carolina banks varied considerably between 1880 and 1890, as some of the Charleston banks found it advisable and profitable to reduce their capital, but in 1890 it amounted to about \$4,200,000.

Fourth. I think the bank circulation in 1890 was about \$550,000, but you can get the exact information by applying to the Comptroller of the Treasury at Washington. You may be assured that I shall at all times be pleased to serve you.

Yours, very truly,

THADDEUS STREET,

Hon. M. C. BUTLER,
Senator from South Carolina, Washington, D. C.

Not content to leave the matter here, I applied to the Comptroller of the Currency with a like request, and here is his answer:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY,
Washington, D. C., March 17, 1892.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 14th instant, contents of which have my careful attention.

I herewith inclose a statement which will give you the information asked for in the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth inquiries made in your letter.

It is regretted that the records of this office do not enable me to furnish you the information asked for under inquiries one and two of your letter, but you are respectfully referred to the annual report of Comptroller Knox for the year 1876, which contains much valuable information on the subject of State banks, and from which you may be able to obtain reference to some work which will furnish the statistics you desire.

Respectfully, yours,

E. S. LACEY, Comptroller.

Hon. M. C. BUTLER,
United States Senate.

Statement showing amount of capital stock and amount of circulation outstanding for national banks in the State of South Carolina for each year from 1880 to 1890, both inclusive; also number of such banks for each year.

Year.	No. of banks.	Capital stock.	Circulation outstanding.
1880.....	12	\$2,449,900	\$1,331,300
1881.....	13	1,885,000	1,187,190
1882.....	13	1,885,000	1,169,885
1883.....	13	1,885,000	1,118,135
1884.....	14	1,935,000	1,096,485
1885.....	14	1,935,000	1,002,445
1886.....	16	1,779,100	874,135
1887.....	15	1,698,000	559,875
1888.....	16	1,773,000	420,030
1889.....	16	1,798,000	391,120
1890.....	16	1,798,000	389,965

Maximum amount of national-bank circulation outstanding at any time was, on October 1, 1882..... \$362,889,134

Amount of national-bank circulation outstanding on March 16,

1892..... 172,533,762

A recapitulation of the foregoing facts shows that South Carolina in 1860, with a population of free inhabitants of 291,300 to 412,300 slave, had \$18,000,000 of bank capital and \$10,000,000 of

bank circulation, while in 1890, with a population of 1,151,000, all free, she had only \$1,798,000 of bank capital and \$389,965 of bank circulation. I do not pretend that this is the only currency in circulation. The other kinds of national currency—greenbacks, gold and silver certificates, gold and silver coin—circulate in that State as elsewhere, but not in quantities approximating \$10,000,000. Just how much in addition to the national-bank notes set forth above nobody can accurately estimate, but it is safe to say it will not reach the half the \$10,000,000, while there are nearly five times the free inhabitants.

Nor do I claim that the national-bank capital of \$1,798,000 embraces all the bank capital in that State. We have about \$4,000,000 of State and national bank capital against the \$18,000,000 in 1860.

Now, Mr. President, the simple recital of these facts tells the whole story of the currency famine in the South, for what is true of South Carolina in a greater or less degree is true of the entire section and of the West also.

I am sure I have not overstated the situation at all. Nor have I exaggerated the real condition of affairs. It can not be denied that the exigency urgently demands Congressional action, and that some measures of relief should be promptly afforded. In my judgment no greater or more satisfactory measures of relief could be adopted than the repeal of the 10 per cent tax on State bank circulation.

If this is done I should expect to see a revival of prosperity never before experienced. I should look forward with confidence to a long period of contentment and progress among the people of all sections which would redound to the happiness of all.

It is encouraging to note that one of the great political parties—the Democratic—has, at its recent national convention at Chicago, adopted, as one of the planks of its party platform, a proposition to repeal this tax.

I should regret to see this made a party question; but it is a most hopeful sign that the party which had 100,000 majority in the popular vote at the last Presidential election has embraced this within its party creed and made it a prominent feature of its party policy.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution lie over for the present. It is unnecessary to refer it to the Committee on Finance, that committee having reported adversely on a bill introduced, I believe, by my friend from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS].

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

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 6881) to expedite the prosecution of pension and other claims arising out of the military and naval service of the United States of America was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PENSION APPROPRIATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives nonconcurring in the amendments of the Senate to bill (H. R. 6875) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes, and asking a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

On motion of Mr. CULLOM, it was

Resolved, That the Senate insist on its amendments to the said bill disagreed to by the House of Representatives, and agree to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

By unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the President *pro tempore*.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* appointed Mr. STEWART, Mr. CULLOM, and Mr. GORMAN.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives nonconcurring in the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8224) making appropriations for the service of Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and asking a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

On motion of Mr. CULLOM, it was

Resolved, That the Senate insist on its amendments to the said bill disagreed to by the House of Representatives, and agree to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

By unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the President *pro tempore*.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* appointed Mr. CULLOM, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. BLACKBURN.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives nonconcurring in the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9040) making appropria-

tions for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes, and asking a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

On motion of Mr. CULLOM, it was

Resolved, That the Senate insist on its amendments to the said bill disagreed to by the House of Representatives, and agree to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

By unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the President *pro tempore*.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* appointed Mr. ALLISON, Mr. DAWES, and Mr. COCKRELL.

REMOVAL OF PENSION DISABILITY.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2137) to amend an act entitled "An act amending the pension law so as to remove the disabilities of those who have participated in the rebellion and have since its termination enlisted in the Army of the United States and become disabled," approved March 3, 1877.

Mr. DAVIS. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House and request a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the committee on the part of the Senate, and Mr. PADDOCK, Mr. SHOUP, and Mr. TURPIE were appointed.

INCREASE OF PENSION TO HELPLESS PENSIONERS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1910) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the pensions of certain soldiers and sailors who are totally helpless from injuries received or from diseases contracted in the service of the United States," approved March 4, 1890; which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert a substitute.

Mr. DAVIS. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives and request a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. HANSBROUGH, and Mr. PALMER were appointed.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending that a sum of \$5,000 be appropriated as a deficiency in appropriation for "Contingent expenses independent treasury, 1892;" which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an application for an appropriation in the matter of the claim of James W. Schaumburg for pay and allowance due him as lieutenant of dragoons from July 1, 1836, to March 24, 1845, \$11,165.31; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House further insisted on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7093) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes, agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HERBERT, Mr. ELLIOTT, and Mr. LODGE managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. Res. 145) to provide temporarily for the expenditures of the Government; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*:

A bill (H. R. 626) to provide the times and places for holding terms of the United States courts in the States of Idaho and Wyoming; and

A bill (H. R. 5138) to authorize the Marinette and Western Railroad Company to construct a railroad through the Menominee Reservation, in the State of Wisconsin.

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 yesterday approved and signed the joint resolution (S. R. 83) authorizing and directing the President to proclaim a general holiday commemorating the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America, on the 21st day of October, 1892.

The message also announced that the President had to-day approved and signed the bill (S. 1952) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, A. D. 1880, by extending the privileges of the seventh section thereof to the port of St. Augustine, Fla.

SEATON NORMAN.

Mr. CULLOM. The bill (S. 2777) for the relief of Seaton Norman was by mistake referred to the Interstate Commerce Committee instead of the Commerce Committee, although I think the records perhaps show that it was referred to both committees. I desired to have the records corrected, so that it shall be understood that the bill has been referred to the Committee on Commerce, and not to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Committee on Interstate Commerce will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. CAREY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. PADDOCK this day, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported it favorably and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

FREE COINAGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senate resumes the consideration of the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 51) to provide for the free coinage of gold and silver bullion, and for other purposes; the pending question being on the amendment proposed by Mr. PALMER to strike out all after the first section.

Mr. DOLPH. I observe that the bill under consideration as the unfinished business has never been referred to nor considered by a committee of the Senate, and I move that it and the amendment now pending to the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance. I leave it to the friends of the bill to determine when the motion shall be voted on, as I do not wish to interfere with the agreement about the time when the vote is to be taken on the bill and motions concerning it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Oregon moves that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance. The Chair understands that the Senator does not at this time desire action upon his motion.

Mr. DOLPH. That will be the pending motion, I suppose, and will supersede the pending motion or the motion to insert a substitute. It will be the pending motion, and unless the friends of the measure are ready for a vote upon it of course I shall not press it or ask any consideration of it until the time arrives when it has been agreed that a vote shall be taken.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Does the Senator from Oregon ask for the immediate consideration of his motion? I wish to say to the Senator that scarcely a quorum is present, as there were also very few members of the Senate present on yesterday, I understand, when unanimous consent was asked to agree to a vote to-morrow. I therefore suggest to the Senator that his motion go over until to-morrow morning, when probably the Senate will be full.

Mr. DOLPH. I suggested that I would not press the motion; that I would leave it for the friends of the bill to determine whether it should be voted upon before the hour arrives at which it was agreed that the vote should be taken on the bill and amendments and motions concerning it. I suppose my motion will be first in order when the time for voting arrives.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair begs pardon of the Senator from Alabama, but the Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Oregon to a misapprehension that he seems to be under. The Chair is informed at the Clerk's desk that the bill was before the Committee on Finance and was reported adversely by that committee, and was placed on the Calendar with the adverse report.

Mr. DOLPH. There is nothing on the copy of the bill I have to indicate that. I have sent for another copy of the bill. I was simply mistaken in regard to the facts, but my motion is in order all the same.

Mr. MORGAN. The bill has been taken up by a vote of the Senate on a call of the yeas and nays. It is before the Senate after having been reported back adversely from the Committee on Finance.

I rose to say, however, that it has been the understanding all

around that the vote on the bill and the amendments thereto of whatever character, would take place to-morrow at 2 o'clock. That was agreed to by unanimous consent, and various Senators have absented themselves from the Chamber in consequence of that agreement. The friends of the bill would not be willing, in the present condition of the Senate, to have any vote taken until that hour arrives.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Mr. President, if I am permitted to do so, I want to say a single word with respect to the unanimous consent which I understand was given yesterday that the vote shall be taken upon the pending bill, known as Senate bill 51, and all pending amendments, to-morrow at 2 o'clock. I understand the Senate was very thin, to use a phrase in common use here, at the time, and perhaps there was not much more than a quorum present. I myself was absent on business connected with the Senate, but I was temporarily absent from my seat for only a very few minutes. Had I been here I should have objected to unanimous consent being given to take the vote upon this important bill to-morrow, but as I was not present it becomes me to speak and say what my own conclusions are touching the unanimous consent asked and given on yesterday.

I understand that no member of the Finance Committee who had reported the bill was present on yesterday when this consent was obtained. I think it was understood alike by all members of the Senate that when the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], about the first day of the month or in the first days of the month, asked the unanimous consent of the Senate that this disputed question should not be voted upon by the Senate pending the time the Republican convention was in session in Minneapolis, giving to the Senators who desired to visit that convention all the time necessary to visit the convention and return—I think the date was fixed about the 15th of the month—I made an inquiry at the time of the Senator from Rhode Island, and asked if the same courtesy was to be extended to those of us who desired to attend the convention which was to be held in Chicago later in the month. I understood that Senator to say, speaking for his party on that side of the Chamber, that all the time would be given that was required. Certainly, if the same amount of time were accorded to this side of the Chamber which was freely accorded to the other side, we could not have expected a vote upon this question before the early part of next week. Senators on this side of the Chamber are absent who desire to be heard, and to be heard at length, upon the pending bill. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] only reached the Senate Chamber to-day. He has moved an important amendment to the bill, and desires to be heard at length upon his amendment. I think the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS], who is necessarily absent, but who will be here in the early part of the week, desires to be heard further upon the bill.

Mr. President, it seems to me as though it is an unusual proceeding in view of all the circumstances I have related. There was no expectation on the part of any member of the Senate that the bill would be pressed until both sides of the Chamber returned from their respective conventions and were here and ready to take up this question for consideration. Certainly it was not supposed that an attempt would be made to fix a time at so early a date—a date impossible for those gentlemen to reach here in time to be heard, if they so elect, and to vote on the bill at the time fixed.

I have never permitted myself to object to a unanimous agreement reached in the Senate upon any measure however important even if it were an agreement made in my absence, but in view of the importance of this bill, the most important measure that has been before the Senate during this session, and as both political parties recently met in national convention and declared the policy of both political parties to be in opposition to the principle embodied in the bill, I think it is a most unprecedented and unparalleled performance here, when the Senate had scarcely a quorum present; in the absence of every member of the Finance Committee of this body; and before the Democratic members who desire to be heard upon this important question are able to reach here and enter their protest against its passage, and for one, I may decide it to be my duty to object to this summary method of dealing with so important a subject.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, this is the first time I have ever heard the rule of the Senate deliberately and willfully violated by a Senator on this floor. I regret it very much, because I can see at once that it will not be the last time. The Senate has no previous question in its rules. It has always abstained from a cloture of any kind at all as a part of its legislative proceeding. We have relied for about a century upon the honor of every Senator on this floor to abide by the unanimous consent of this body in regard to legislative procedure.

The Senator from New Jersey can take upon himself the distinction, if he chooses to do so, of violating this rule; but in doing that I desire to notify him that he will not in any way in-

timidate the friends of the silver bill on this floor. If we have a majority here we intend to pass the bill, and this threat will only make us the more solid in our determination to do it. If we have not a majority here we will yield to the vote of the Senate and let the matter go.

Yesterday, as I remember, when this matter was brought up by the Senator from Nevada, some intimation had been made by myself that motions for delay and obstruction were likely to be made here. I thought they had been made. The Senate was looking over this matter with serious consideration. The Senator from Nevada arose and made a proposition that the vote on the bill and amendments should take place to-morrow at 2 o'clock. The Presiding Officer of the Senate, in a very deliberate and clear way, as is the custom of the Presiding Officer, placed the question before the Senate. It was considered silently by every member of this body, and no objection was made. Thereupon it was announced that that was the rule of the Senate.

My remembrance is, though I may be incorrect in that, that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], a member of the Finance Committee, was present at the time that consent was given. I know he was here immediately before that time and immediately afterwards. I do not recall that he was present in his seat at the moment of time. But no advantage was taken of any person in regard to this agreement. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] was absent—he had a right to be absent—attending a national convention. He had a right to measure his own time about returning; and the members of the Finance Committee had the right to pursue their usual custom of being absent from this body except on such occasions when measures come up in which their committee is particularly concerned. The members of that committee on both sides are not overzealous in punctual attendance upon the proceedings of the Senate except upon such matters as concern their own peculiar views of legislation. If the Senate was thin I did not observe it. On the contrary, I think it was a full Senate.

Mr. STEWART. It was full.

Mr. MORGAN. It was quite a full Senate. Of course it was thin in consequence of the absence of the Senator from New Jersey, but not thinner in consequence of that sad fact than it very often is. If the Senator from New Jersey desires to debate this question he or any other Senator can have ample time to do it between now and to-morrow at 2 o'clock. The friends of the measure announced yesterday that they did not desire to debate it any further. In fact it has been debated *ad nauseum* in both Houses of the legislature, in every newspaper in the United States, on every stump in the United States, and in both of the great conventions which have just now closed their sessions. I do not suppose that any human being could add a fact to the argument or make a comment that would be even novel in its character upon this measure.

The proposition of the Senator from New Jersey is evidently one to smother this bill out by delay. I wish to say to that Senator and to all other Senators on this floor that the people are not going to put up with that sort of treatment. They are not in favor of having measures that we have brought forward here and have been discussing now for the better part of twenty years snowed under or overlaid by partisan tactics in the Houses of Congress, and particularly in this august and dignified body, where we are supposed to be able to vote our opinions upon public questions without the dictate of any party candidate for the Presidency on either side.

I dare say this very peculiar and extraordinary objection would not have been made by a Senator who had been so long on this floor as the Senator from New Jersey did he not feel that the coercion of the party whip was upon his back to compel him to do this thing. He is mistaken in the sense and sentiment of his party about this matter. It is a few men in the United States who have got their hands upon the money power of this country and who are determined to wield it against the people who resort to these extraordinary measures, extraordinary breaches of confidence, and faith, and contract, and agreement, on the floor of the Senate, and a violation of the traditional rules of a century, in order to defeat a measure that they know the people want.

I regret, Mr. President, that I am forced now to say what I am compelled to say about this matter. The attempt at coercion of the silver men into obedience of the will of a few men on this floor is open, flagrant, personal, wrongful, insulting, and unjust. No matter what a man's character may be or how he may have demeaned himself in the Senate of the United States for term after term, the effort is made here and elsewhere to force him to turn against his conscience and his will and the interests and the instructions of his people and to force him to do that which is supposed to be for the advantage of some particular party candidate for the Presidency of the United States.

I do not regret that the opportunity has been furnished to me to-day to declare my independence of all such coercive measures,

and my determination to pursue the dictates of my humble judgment and my own conscience in voting upon this measure, which I think is essential not merely for the relief of the people, but it is essential for restoring the constitutional rights of individual men in the United States to the condition in which our fathers placed them. No party trammels, or ties, or reminiscence, or coercion can compel me to bate my breath or change my voice on this floor when I believe that I am right upon any measure of great public concern to this people. I can waive my opinions when a mere question of policy is up, but when I see the people of the United States, and particularly the great party to which I have the honor to belong, demanding this measure, as a measure of personal constitutional right and relief to them, I do not feel that I have a right to be silent or that I have a right to change my opinions at the beck and call of any party convention or any party candidate.

I have been on this floor when the Republicans were in a great majority in the Senate and when a President of the United States vetoed a silver bill; when Stanley Matthews was here, and Thurman was here, and men like these. I could name a great list of splendid and majestic men who, when the question was whether the bill should pass notwithstanding the veto, cast their votes according to their conscience; and they passed the Bland-Allison bill. There was no shrinking then to party demand. There was no clamoring about small, immaterial matters. There was no expression of either a fanciful or a false desire to speak longer upon a bill that the Senator from New Jersey has ventilated with all the powers he possesses for years and years in the past.

There was then no effort to violate agreements and rules of the Senate upon the pretext that a man happened to be absent from his seat in order to get a question beneath the feet of a minority that I am satisfied a majority of the Senate intends to pass. That was a time when Senators came forward and expressed their opinions by their votes conscientiously, without fear or favor or reward, or the hope thereof. But in this day and time I doubt very much whether that condition can be asserted as now existing. In that day the Senate of the United States was a body that had entitled itself to the respect of mankind by its uniform courtesy and course of just procedure; and I never heard a Senator who had voluntarily or involuntarily absented himself from this Chamber come into it after an agreement had been made and insist upon his personal right to set agreements aside.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Will the Senator yield to me a moment.

Mr. MORGAN. I will.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I do not think the Senator really understood my position—

Mr. MORGAN. I hope I did not.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I made the declaration, I think very full and very precise, that there had been a former agreement entered into by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], representing his side of the Chamber, concerning the time required for both political parties to attend their respective conventions, and it was accorded to us by unanimous consent, and also by our consent to the other side of the Chamber. I claim, and I think I fairly claim, that until our members upon this side who desire to be heard upon this bill shall have an opportunity of being heard it is a violation of the agreement entered into unanimously by both sides of the Chamber in a full Senate; and therefore I would not be violating any fair understanding by objecting now.

Mr. STEWART. At the proper time I shall have the agreement read.

Mr. MORGAN. The records of the Senate show what agreements have been entered into here, and the Senator from Nevada says he will have them read. I remember very distinctly what the agreement about this particular silver bill was, that no vote should be taken upon it before the 15th day of June. That is the only agreement that has been made about the bill. That was made in open Senate, as I remember, and went upon the record; at all events, I know that was the agreement.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from Alabama allow me to make a suggestion to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARRIS. No matter what agreements were made prior to the conventions, they have passed, the conventions are over, and the Senate is engaged in the transaction of its ordinary business. Yesterday when I was absent as well as the Senator from New Jersey there was a unanimous consent agreement that the vote should be taken upon the free-coinage bill and amendments thereto at 2 o'clock to-morrow, with which I understand from the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey this morning he is not satisfied.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I claim it to be a violation of the prior agreement.

Mr. HARRIS. I suggest to the Senator from New Jersey that the only practical remedy which occurs to me in his reach to accomplish his object and preserve the traditions and habitual

methods of the Senate is to ask unanimous consent for a postponement to such day and such hour as in his opinion will meet his convenience. It seems to me it is the only method of adjusting this matter, unless the Senator is ready to acquiesce in the unanimous-consent agreement made yesterday.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator from New Jersey has not made any such request.

Mr. HARRIS. My suggestion was that he should resort to that method.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator from New Jersey has not made any intimation of a desire to change the rule by unanimous consent. He made no offer or proposition to change the consent rule, but he came in and assuming to himself the right, which of course I can not deny to him as a Senator, to violate the rule upon an argument which he made or a pretext which he asserted, which is not true by the record, announced his intention of violating the rule, of breaking through it. It is in defense of the agreement of the Senate that I have taken the floor as well as in defense of the right of the majority of the Senate to have a vote upon the bill, no one objecting to it, at 2 o'clock to-morrow.

So far as I am personally concerned (I do not know how other Senators may feel about it) I should have no objection to having the consent rule enlarged and naming another day, but if this practice is to be resorted to for the purpose of defeating the bill and preventing an opportunity during this session of Congress to get it forward so that the other House can act upon it, then I would not grant any consent of that kind. I am entirely satisfied that if the House of Representatives get this bill they will pass it.

It has been stated time and again here by Senators that they were entirely satisfied the President of the United States would veto the bill if it was passed by the other House. I dislike to make allusions to the Chief Executive, and would extremely regret to see that any Senator had authority for stating that the President of the United States, in advance of the action of these bodies, had used his executive power or his influence to repress legislation, or intimate that if we passed the bill he would not sign it.

I undertake to do the President the credit, until somebody states to the contrary, of presuming at least and assuming that he has not thus violated the proprieties of the Executive office and the comity due between these two bodies. If he has done so it is the first instance in my observation or experience where a President of the United States has ever assumed to say to the Houses or to any members of the Houses that he would veto a bill if it was passed by these bodies. Such an anticipatory use of the veto power is simply outrageous, no matter who may employ it. It is enough if the President of the United States would exercise his functions under the Constitution of returning the bill to the House in which it originated with his written objections, on which the Houses may pass. That full power, given to him under the Constitution which he has sworn to support, is the only power he has got. I can not assume that the President of the United States has said that he would veto the silver bill if we passed it through both Houses.

I should extremely regret to hear that any Senator had authority from the President of the United States to prove that I am in error in this matter. Judging from the good common sense of the President of the United States, and his knowledge of the wishes of the people of the United States, and his personal courage and fidelity to his principles, his convictions, and his obedience to the laws of the land and the just methods of legislation, I would assume, if I dared to make any assumption about it at all, that he would approve the bill. Such has been my confident conviction, not from anything the President has ever said, but judging of the man and the measure and the condition of the country it has been my hopeful belief that he would not veto the bill.

But why Democrats should desire to keep him from an opportunity of doing so is more than I can comprehend. They may have good reasons for that, but I dare say it is not benevolence towards the President of the United States that induces these gentlemen after trying to delay and thwart and prevent the passage of the bill. It is benevolence towards certain powers in the United States Government which have the control of the destinies of the people, who have a garrote upon the money of the country, which they intend to use to bind tighter or looser, according to their will and pleasure, to make money cheap or to make money dear according to their own private interests, and to use the people and the power of the people of this country, under the laws as they now exist, simply for their own private and personal aggrandizement.

These influences are very powerful; they are ever present; they have cost us more money amongst the industrial people of the United States since 1873 than the civil war did; they have destroyed more men, more fortunes, more homes, more employ-

ments, and driven more men to banishment from the industrial pursuits of this country than even the civil war did. When we are here laboring with good conscience and without any expectation of any other reward than such as comes from a good conscience, trying to give relief to the people, who are demanding their constitutional rights in regard to the demonetization of silver, which was butchered and destroyed in 1873, it is not to be expected of us that under any domination or any threat or any persuasion we are going to yield our convictions upon a question of this kind.

How are we going to do so and keep peace with ourselves during the balance of our natural lives? What a mean creature a man must be who has honest and sincere convictions, which he has voted time and again on the floor of the Senate in moments when there was no particular party pressure, who can now turn around and without saying that he was in error, without claiming he was mistaken, reverse his opinions at the dictation of any man in the world or any party in the world, and that upon a great question concerning the vital interests and welfare of the people of the United States. Let those men who want to change their opinions do so in a manly way and come out and state that we are wrong and they are right now in changing their votes; let them give reasons for it, and the world will applaud them, no matter what may be the depth or the breadth of the mistakes they are now making.

To ask a man to smother his honest, conscientious convictions in behalf of the people he knows to be suffering, the people who are holding up their hands in supplication to him, and appealing to him day after day for relief—to ask him to put by a measure of relief of this kind, as we consider it, to reverse our own records, ignore our own pledges, defile our own honor, in order to become obedient to the will of a political party is asking more, Mr. President, than I shall ever consent to yield.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask that the Secretary may read the orders which have been taken in reference to the pending bill, so that we may know when it was first called up and what has been done with it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The matter referred to will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

December 10, 1891, read twice and laid on the table.
January 13, 1892, referred to the Committee on Finance.
February 9, 1892, reported adversely.
May 25, 1892, taken up by yeas 28, nays 20 (over).
May 27, 1892, considered as in Committee of the Whole and amended.
May 31, 1892, considered as in Committee of the Whole.
June 1, 1892, considered as in Committee of the Whole.
June 2, 1892, considered as in Committee of the Whole.
June 6, 1892, considered as in Committee of the Whole (over).
June 9, 1892, considered as in Committee of the Whole.
June 15, 1892, considered as in Committee of the Whole; amendment by Mr. PALMER to strike out all after section 1.
June 16, 1892, considered as in Committee of the Whole.
June 29, 1892, considered as in Committee of the Whole, and, by unanimous consent, vote is to be taken on the bill and amendments on Friday, July 1, 1892, at 2 o'clock p. m.
June 30, 1892, motion by Mr. DOLPH to refer to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STEWART. I ask the Secretary now to read the agreement which was made that there should not be a vote until after the 15th of June.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That is in the RECORD of several weeks ago, and it will take some time to look it up. The Chair will direct that it be found and read to the Senate.

Mr. KENNA. Can not the Senator state the agreement?

Mr. STEWART. The agreement was that the vote should not be taken until after the 15th of June.

Mr. MORGAN. On this bill?

Mr. STEWART. On this bill, and that would cover the time to enable Senators who wished to attend the convention in Minneapolis to return. We perfectly understood that the same privileges were to be extended to those who desired to attend the Chicago convention, and consequently we have waited until more than a week after the adjournment of that convention.

We are now nearing the end of the session, and it has been suggested that we may have a final adjournment without disposing of the bill. It is perfectly manifest that it must be considered speedily or not at all.

In a much fuller Senate than we have now the bill was called up yesterday, and several suggestions were made as to its disposition. Finally, to bring the matter to an end, I asked unanimous consent that the bill with its amendments should be voted on to-morrow, Friday, at 2 o'clock. The question was deliberately put to the Senate, and it was agreed to unanimously.

If this were a new question and the request were made for an opportunity to discuss propositions to throw light upon it, we might listen to such a request, and might make some change for the convenience of Senators; but the very suggestions as to debate by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON] show that the purpose is for delay. He says that the Senator from

Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS], who has already made an elaborate speech, wishes to make a long speech, and the Senator from New Jersey himself wants to make an extended speech on the bill.

If the RECORD is examined, Senators will find hundreds and hundreds of pages of debate on this question. There has been an opportunity now, since the bill was called up by a vote over a month ago, to discuss it. It has in fact been discussed for years. Any attempt at delay is an attempt to defeat the will of the majority of the Senate.

I know it is in the power of any Senator to violate the time-honored usage which has been maintained for a hundred years, and has been the only instrument which has relieved the Senate from the previous question; it has been the only means which could be resorted to in order to avoid the previous question, which we all so much desire to avoid.

Now, it is proposed that that shall be wiped away and a necessity created for the gag rule in this Senate in order to do business. I give the Senate due notice that if that is done on a bill which has been discussed for the last fifteen years and it can not be voted on under a unanimous agreement, there shall be no more unanimous agreements while I am a member of this body, for I should regard it as the grossest violation of faith to break an agreement to vote on a bill which has been discussed until the discussion has become a by-word, until we hear on all hands that it is talked to death.

A man can hardly speak of the silver question without being reproached with discussing a threadbare subject. And here, at this late hour of the session, after all reasonable delay has been granted, after a week has been granted since the adjournment of the Chicago convention in order to allow members of that convention to be here, and after a fair agreement has been reached in the Senate to give Senators the opportunity to vote upon this question—I say, after all this has occurred, if the agreement is to be violated, then it will lead certainly to arbitrary rules in the Senate, which we should all deplore. If one Senator may do it another may, and if that good faith which has lasted for a hundred years is to be violated here to further discuss a subject which the newspapers and Senators continually tell us has been discussed until they are disgusted with the discussion, then there will be an end to further unanimous agreements.

We are told that enough Senators desire to make long speeches to occupy all the remaining hours of the session with the necessary interruption of appropriation bills coming in from time to time. The time for discussion has passed; the time for action has arrived. This bill has been on the Calendar since the 9th of February, ready to be called up and discussed at any time by any member of the Senate. It has been called up, and by a vote of the Senate has been pending here for over a month, and discussed from day to day. Was not that opportunity enough? Oh, no. The object is to prevent a vote; the object is to prevent action; the object is that this bill shall not be sent to the House of Representatives for action; the object is that it shall not be sent to the President in time for him to act upon it; the object is to defeat the will of the people.

I give Senators notice that so far as the friends of the bill are concerned, we shall do all in our power to discharge our duties. The country will understand that any plea for further time to argue this question can not possibly be made in good faith. The country will understand that it is for the purpose of delay; the country will understand it is for the purpose of defeating this just measure. They can not be deceived. They know the measure has been here for years; they know that this particular bill has been up now for more than a month; they know that every Senator has had an opportunity to express his views upon it. The public can not be fooled with any declaration that there has not been an opportunity to fully discuss the question.

If we had called the bill up during the convention at Chicago; if we had not waited for a reasonable time, a full week, for Senators who attended that convention to return, there might be some excuse for the course proposed. It takes only one day to come from Chicago here, and it was the duty of Senators to return here when a bill of this kind was pending; but they can defeat the will of the people and serve the gold-standard contractionists; they can serve Lombard and Wall streets by being absent. They can not, however, deceive the people by a pretense of want of opportunity to discuss the measure. That can not be done. We understand perfectly the pretense that they wish to discuss the subject further. They ought to understand that their action will be regarded by the country as a sham and as an attempt to defeat the will of the people.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I was here yesterday afternoon when the agreement last referred to was entered into. Everyone remembers the agreement which was made in the first week in June, that there should be no vote taken on the bill until after the 15th, a courteous agreement intended to accommo-

date Senators of both parties. The 15th is passed to be sure, but the Senate has hardly been itself five days of this month, that is, there has not been a full Senate attending to the business of the Senate. Senators are but just arriving here. On their return from those conventions; some of them we should call lame in the army, who fell behind, perhaps some of them wounded, perhaps some of them are lazy, and perhaps some of them took the opportunity of a broken month to go home and attend to other business that they had, and they have only just got back here.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] says that there was a large Senate here yesterday afternoon at the time when this agreement was made. I have been told by a Senator who counted that at the time the agreement was made there were but thirteen Senators present. I know there were not half as many present then as are here now, because I looked around to see who were here upon this side. I had just come in and do not know how much had been said in regard to this matter, but when I got in I gathered that the Senator from Nevada had been rather severely lecturing my colleague [Mr. PLATT] for some remarks he made in the direction of a postponement, whereupon my colleague got up and said the exhibition might proceed, so far as he was concerned, and the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] said substantially the same thing.

The Senator from Nevada at first proposed that the vote should be taken on Friday afternoon at 4 o'clock. I suggested 2 o'clock rather selfishly, because I thought of going away at 3:15 o'clock on Friday, and I did not want to be disappointed in recording my vote against this business. After I had to that small degree participated in that agreement, it was not two hours before I repented, and I now repent for having assented to it, not because of anything personal to myself, for I will get up in the middle of the night, on Sunday, or at any other time, or under any circumstances to vote against this bill, to oblige any friend who is for it. It does not trouble me at all. I found that one Senator said that he desired to offer an amendment; another Senator said "before I vote upon this question I wish to explain myself;" and one was on one side of the question and the other on the other; one was going to vote for free silver and the other against it; but in order in each case to set himself right before his constituents, he thought it was fair that he should have an opportunity to say something. I found this view of it prevailed on both sides of the Chamber, that Senators were not ready for a vote. True the bill, as the Senator says, has been here for a month, but it has been here like one of those things that is always with us.

I have heard some rather severe language; it is not offensive, and could not be, coming from the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], for I love to hear him, but it was a good deal in the style of a severe fatherly lecture. I judge that somebody has been running away; I judge that somebody is afraid to vote; I judge that there is somebody who has been told he must not vote as he wants to vote. I do not know any such people. I do not know anybody about here who is not ready to vote upon this question. I take none of the lecture to myself.

The phrase "the will of the people," pronounced so sonorously here, does not disturb me. I know where Connecticut is and Connecticut knows where I am. I am not at all embarrassed at the suggestion that we shall vote on the bill, though I am sorry I assented to unanimous consent to the vote being taken to-morrow, because I say it was not fair. I say that there were twenty Senators absent, perhaps ten, no matter, who would have objected to the agreement had they been here. The agreement was made without consideration and within two minutes, and it was hardly cold before Senators came into the Chamber asking why on earth we agreed to do that. In some cases the motive may have been political, which is a legitimate motive, and delay is a legitimate measure in opposition to this bill. So far as I am concerned I would rather delay it indefinitely for the next century; others would delay it until next December, others would be glad to get rid of it for three days; some because they want to speak upon it and some because they believe the thing to be a calamity.

Of course, we have strong differences on this question. That is why we are here. That is why this American Congress is here, because the people differ upon great questions and send men to come together to compose those difficulties, if not by compromise, then by the square defeat of somebody and the honorable submission of the other side. I am not disturbed; nobody is hurt in Connecticut; nobody is in doubt there about anybody's position there; but the fair thing is not to force this vote to-morrow, and the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH] to commit this bill is, in my judgment, quite in order, and is a parliamentary as well as an honorable motion.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to have the agreement which was made in regard to voting read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The agreement of yesterday?

Mr. STEWART. No, the agreement made on the 1st of June.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will read, at the request of the Senator, the proceedings on this subject had on the 1st day of June.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. STEWART. I do.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask the Senator from Nevada to yield to me in order to make a suggestion. It is well known that a large number of Senators will be obliged to be absent from the Senate for several days after to-day, and as they and others desire to speak upon this important question, my suggestion is that there be an understanding that no vote shall be taken until after the 14th of the present month.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand that the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island refers to the bill now under consideration?

Mr. ALDRICH. The bill under consideration; yes, sir. The agreement, if made, of course will not interfere with debate from day to day, but will be that no final vote shall be taken until after the 14th.

Mr. MORGAN. That would mean, I suppose, that any Senator would have the right within that time to call up the bill for discussion if he saw proper?

Mr. ALDRICH. The suggestion is that no vote shall be taken upon the bill nor any amendment to it until after the 14th; that the discussion shall proceed at the pleasure of the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. The bill to maintain its place?

Mr. ALDRICH. The bill to maintain its place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island asks unanimous consent that the bill now under discussion shall not lose its place upon the Calendar, but that debate may proceed upon the bill until the 14th of the present month, and that no vote be taken on the bill or any amendment to it until the 14th of June.

Mr. ALDRICH. Until after the 14th of June.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Until after the 14th of June.

Mr. HISCOCK. I do not understand at all that the vote is to be taken on the 14th.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island to be that no vote shall be taken on the bill or any amendment to it until after the 14th of June.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I should like to say that I do not object to that. I consent to that because I am compelled to. There will be no quorum here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Mr. President, I should like to state in that connection that there may be a reason why the time should be extended beyond the 14th of June.

Mr. ALDRICH. Undoubtedly. My suggestion is that no vote be taken on the bill until after the 14th. It may be the 21st, and possibly not until after the 25th, that a vote will be taken. I simply suggest the 14th, for it is very evident that no vote ought to be taken until after that date.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I wanted to be certain in regard to that.

Mr. MORGAN. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I desire to give notice that I shall press a vote on this bill after the 14th.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Mr. President, the proposition of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] was that there should be no vote taken on the pending bill until after the 14th of June. The Republican national convention assembled in Minneapolis on the 7th. This colloquy, as I understand, was on the 1st day of June, giving fourteen or fifteen days' time to enable Senators upon the other side of the Chamber to reach here from the convention. As I understood, the reply of the Senator from Rhode Island, upon which I am now acting, was that a like amount of time would be given to those who desired to attend another convention.

There were but few Senators upon this side of the Chamber who left this body to attend that convention before the 18th or 19th. The convention was dissolved last Friday evening, and we have hardly had time, and, as the results have shown, all Senators have not had time to return. I therefore have based my opposition to the action of the Senate yesterday upon the ground that it was not fulfilling the terms of the unanimous agreement entered into on the 1st day of June. The Senator from Rhode Island spoke for his political party, and, as I supposed at that time, the same courtesy and the same period of time was to be granted to us if needed.

Mr. STEWART. More time has been given than was asked. The Republican convention met on the 7th of June and the Democratic convention met on the 21st, and now we have agreed to wait until the 1st of July. We have given the Democrats more time to get back than was allowed the Republicans.

Mr. MCPHERSON. In these understandings of the Senate time is not counted by hours and minutes. If in the opinion of the Senate there has been a complete fulfillment of all the terms of the agreement entered into on the 1st day of June by the representative on that side of the Chamber, speaking for his party, and, as I believed at that time and all the Senators on this side believed and still believe that he spoke not only for them, but for us, and we permitted him to do it—if there has been a fulfillment I say of that agreement both expressly and impliedly, then I wish to say to the Senator from Nevada that I do not mean to stand here alone and offer any objection to carrying into effect the agreement entered into on yesterday; even though it be true as stated somewhere that when this agreement of yesterday was reached there were but very few Senators present in this body. If this be so, it is hardly fair in the

absence of two-thirds or three-fourths of this body that an agreement should be entered into which will supersede and abrogate an agreement already made, and the terms of which have not been complied with or fulfilled. This does not look to me exactly like a fair proceeding.

EXTENSION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the resolution from the House of Representatives extending appropriations.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the pending bill will be informally laid aside, and the Chair will lay before the Senate the joint resolution from the House of Representatives the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (H. Res. 145) to provide temporarily for the expenditures of the Government.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution. It is important that it should be acted upon and signed by the President to-day.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent of the Senate that the joint resolution just reported be now considered. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was read twice by its title, and considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Will the Senator from Iowa please explain the necessity for this legislation?

Mr. ALLISON. The purpose is to continue the appropriations of the current fiscal year until such time as the appropriations for the next fiscal year shall be made. Not one appropriation bill thus far has been signed by the President, and it is necessary that this joint resolution should be passed to-day.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Does the Senator fix any time?

Mr. ALLISON. The House fixes the time at fifteen days, and we agree to it.

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

A message was subsequently received from the House of Representatives by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announcing that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 145) to provide temporarily for the expenditures of the Government; and it was thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*.

FOREMAN OF PRESSWORK IN GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to which were referred certain resolutions of the printing pressmen of St. Louis in favor of a House bill providing for a foreman of presswork in the Government Printing Office, to report the resolutions back, and ask that the committee be discharged from their further consideration. I submit a written report which shows the reasons for the action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The report will be agreed to in the absence of objection.

Mr. COCKRELL. May I ask what the resolutions referred to?

Mr. MANDERSON. They are resolutions of the pressmen of the city of St. Louis, Mo., asking that there be created a new office in the Government Printing Office, to be called foreman of presswork. The committee ask to be discharged from the further consideration of the subject.

Mr. COCKRELL. All right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report has been agreed to, in the absence of objection.

NICARAGUA CANAL.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred a resolution submitted by Mr. MORGAN June 23, reported it without amendment; and the resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate 500 copies of Senate Report 1944, Fifty-first Congress, omitting the maps accompanying said report, it being the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations relating to the construction of the Maritime Canal of Nicaragua.

REPORTS ON EUROPEAN IMMIGRATION.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following resolution, reported it without amendment:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, with the 6,000 copies already ordered to be printed of the reports on European immigration, the Public Printer be directed to include the letters to the Commissioners from the European steamship companies and the accompanying circulars, the appendix to the report on Russia, without the map, and the general index, under the supervision of the Commissioners, and also to print as a separate volume the general appendix containing the consular letters, of which volume 1,200 copies shall be printed and bound, 400 copies for the use of the Senate and 800 copies for the use of the House.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

By unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MANDERSON. I find that the cost of printing this additional matter, which seems to be important to this work, is but \$275.

Mr. COCKRELL. What report is that?

Mr. MANDERSON. A report from the Committee on Immigration. The resolution was submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], the chairman of that committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT FOR 1891.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following resolution, submitted by him June 16, 1892, reported it without amendment; and by unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to its consideration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That there be printed 6,500 copies of the fourteenth number of the Statistical Abstract of the United States for the year 1891, prepared by the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department; 1,500 copies for the use of the members of the Senate, 3,000 copies for the use of the members of the House of Representatives, and 2,000 copies for the use of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is that the last report of the Bureau of Statistics, the Statistical Abstract?

Mr. MANDERSON. Yes; this is the last report.

Mr. COCKRELL. How many copies—1,500 for the Senate and 3,000 for the House?

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask that the resolution may be again read, which will give the Senator the information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be again read.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. I desire to say that I doubt very seriously whether the number there allotted to the Senate will be sufficient. This report contains the imports and exports up to the 1st day of last January, and necessarily, as this is a campaign year, it will be in greater demand than usual.

Mr. MANDERSON. The Senator will recall that quite a number have already been printed, and that this is an addition to the several thousand copies which have been printed for the use of Congress heretofore.

Mr. COCKRELL. If it is an additional number it may be sufficient. Does the resolution provide the number the chief of the Bureau requests for the use of his own office?

Mr. MANDERSON. The resolution is in accordance with the recommendation of the chief of the Bureau.

Mr. COCKRELL. All right.

The resolution was agreed to.

REPORT ON COMMERCE WITH EUROPE.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That there shall be printed 6,000 copies of the special report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department in regard to our commerce with the countries of Europe from 1870 to 1890, 1,000 copies for the use of the members of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the members of the House of Representatives, and 3,000 copies for distribution by the Bureau of Statistics.

JAMES B. EAMES.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to ask the change of reference of the bill (S. 3100) for the relief of James B. Eames, which I introduced on the 9th of May, and had referred to the Committee on Claims. I learn now that bills of a similar character go to the Committee on Military Affairs. I move that the Committee on Claims be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

FREE COINAGE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 51) to provide for the free coinage of gold and silver bullion, and for other purposes.

Mr. WARREN. I send to the desk an amendment intended to be proposed to the pending bill, which I ask may be read and printed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The proposed amendment will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

And all bullion from any country or any source whatsoever except bullion hereinafter produced from mines located in the United States.

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. President, the agreement of yesterday afternoon to take a vote on this bill and its amendments at 2 o'clock to-morrow was made in my absence. Had I been present I should have objected to it, because otherwise I find myself

forced into the presentation of some views on this question without having had an adequate opportunity of preparation.

I had not expected, in addition to this difficulty, to be met by the statement from any Senator, and least of all from the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], that this bill had already been discussed *ad nauseam*. To be sure, he had made at least three set speeches upon it, and he followed up that declaration with another one to-day. While the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], who has particular charge of this bill, holds the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON] and all the members of this body to the rigid exactions of the agreement made under these very peculiar circumstances, and almost, as the Senator from New Jersey well said, in violation of an antecedent agreement out of deference to the Democratic members of this body and the necessity to attend the Chicago convention, the Senator from Nevada, under those circumstances, insists upon our going on with this vote to-morrow, and accuses those who desire adequate opportunity to debate the question of wishing to perpetrate gag rule.

It may be idle to refer to these matters when I propose to discuss the subject-matter of this bill, but I do so because this performance—if I may be permitted to speak of it as such—is in keeping with the attitude of the promoters of this bill from the time the question has been brought before the Senate. Those who are opposed to it belong to a gang of wicked conspirators, genuinely bad men, those who have been ascertained and found out and marked and spotted—plutocrats, and I believe they have been called in the West Plutarchs—men who have their grip upon the gold of the country, upon its currency, upon its life-blood, utterly wanting in regard for the interests of the people. They are opposing this bill, it is said, in order to continue the wicked exactions in which they have been indulging since 1873.

All this, Mr. President, is interesting. On the other hand, the Senators who have particular charge of this measure and promote it find themselves in a position of peculiar, singular, and most enviable self-satisfaction. They represent the people, the people who are being outraged. Somehow or other they have a special mandate from the people of this country. It may not be impertinence on my part to inquire whence they got it. Are they sent here in any manner other than all the rest of us? Does the Senator from Alabama, who has reiterated again and again that the people are in his charge and he is their savior, come here other than as the representative of the people of Alabama and elected by its Legislature? Can the Senator from Nevada, any more than myself, claim—coming from States as small in population as we do—that we can speak for all the people of this country?

The history of the relation of the people to the proposal for the free coinage of silver is a curious and most interesting one. Two years ago, when the then pending bill, which afterwards became the present act of 1890, was before this body, a majority of the Senate turned it into a free-coinage bill, passed it, and sent it to the House of Representatives, elected by the people and not elected by the Legislatures of the States. That body, then Republican by a majority of 20, did not pass the bill. For once in the history of this country it was startled by finding that the Senate was no longer the conservative but had become the reckless branch of the Government, and the conservative interests of this country were lodged with the popular branch, with the House of Representatives.

In this Congress, with a two-thirds majority Democratic and Farmers' Alliance together, the promoters of this measure, or its equivalent, came forward with confidence which seemed to be justified by events; but lo, and behold, they rode to a fall, and in a House of Representatives thus constituted, elected by the people and amenable to the people, that measure failed on a tie vote, and those who are responsible for its action have seen proper not to bring it up since. Thus, whether you consider one Congress representing a majority of one party, or the present House of Representatives when there is such an overwhelming majority of Democrats, we find those amenable to the people dare not pass such a measure.

But there is another branch of the Government, which is popular, that is the Executive, elected substantially by the vote of the people. Both parties have held their conventions and made their nominations. Each has put up a candidate about whose opinions and in the expression of whose opinions there has been no uncertain sound; and neither party dared put up any candidate who was not known to be opposed to the isolated free coinage of silver. Nay, more, go to the platforms of both parties, to the expressions of opinion made by the great national conventions, and you find that our confident and daring friends, who are ready here to bell the cat and dare do anything, were in those conventions as mild as sucking doves. They did not even propose any platform or plank that carried out the principles of this bill, knowing, as they did, that they could not on any such

ground successfully appeal to the verdict of the American people; and yet on this floor, back behind the ramparts of their Legislatures and their terms of six years, they can here be courageous and claim that they par excellence represent the people and that everybody else misrepresents them.

When this measure came to this floor, after the opening speech of the Senator from Alabama shelling the woods, as it was said, to find lurking Democratic candidates who were afraid to express themselves on this issue, an inquiry, the interest in which seems to have evaporated by this time, he was followed by the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] in a mortuary discourse, asking who killed this great bill, who killed Cock Robin; and his colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], apologized to the Senate for remarks which he made, as he said, when it was no longer of any use; but at last the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], with infinite pluck, brought up his measure and put it before the Senate by a comfortable vote, and has kept it as the pending business; and now in rather a quick, I will not say a snap judgment, has fixed it so that we must vote upon it to-morrow, and we find ourselves face to face with this question.

I regret Mr. President, that long as this bill has been before the Senate, my other engagements have not permitted me to give the time for the preparation of the views I entertain, so that I can do satisfaction to myself in asking attention of the Senate upon it.

As I understand the issue between the two sides of the discussion, it arises out of the fact of the disparity of the metals. Gentlemen on the other side would ignore and whistle down the wind the fact that to-day the bullion in the American silver dollar is not worth more than 70 cents. I have not the exact rate of exchange of the price of silver to-day.

Before that disparity arose the metals had stood in equilibrium at one ratio or another from time immemorial. Within the memory of man, from the time when statistics upon the subject were first taken, as far as we know silver and gold have been the immemorial currency of the race from the earliest dawn of civilization and in times of which history no longer tells the tale. It went on until the disparity arose and the dislocation of the two metals took place on and after 1873.

I will ask to have printed with my remarks some tables which I extract from the speech of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], made on the 15th day of June, showing the ratio from 1493 until 1890, and also I ask to have printed with my remarks an extract from a speech made by ex-Senator Thurman as one of the commissioners of this Government to the conference in Paris on the money question.

The papers referred to are as follows:

TABLE D.—Showing the proportion of silver in the world's total production of gold and silver in periods from 1493 to 1890; also their varying ratios of market value prior to the mint enactment of France in 1803; and with special reference to their remarkable approach to constancy of mutual value, under extraordinary variations in their proportions of production, during the seventy years to 1873, in which the mints of France coined gold and silver without limit, as legal-tender equivalent, on her ratio of 1 to 15.50.*

Period.	Pounds avoirdupois.		Proportion of total.		Average ratio of market value of silver to gold.
	Silver.	Gold.	Silver.	Gold.	
1493-1520.....	2,895,200	537,380	89	11	10.5-11.10
1521-1544.....	4,762,560	378,048	93	7	11.25
1545-1560.....	10,968,320	299,552	97	3	11.30
1561-1580.....	13,178,000	300,960	98	2	11.50
1581-1600.....	18,431,600	324,720	98	2	12.10
1601-1620.....	18,607,600	374,880	98	2	12.50
1621-1640.....	17,318,400	386,200	98	2	14.00
1641-1660.....	16,117,200	385,880	98	2	14.50
1661-1680.....	14,82,8000	407,440	97	3	15.00
1681-1700.....	15,043,600	473,660	97	3	14.96
1701-1720.....	15,646,400	564,080	97	3	15.21
1721-1740.....	18,972,800	839,520	96	4	14.71
1741-1760.....	23,458,380	1,082,840	96	4	14.71
1761-1780.....	28,720,560	911,020	97	3	14.64
1781-1800.....	38,678,640	782,760	92	2	14.76
1801-1810.....	19,671,300	391,116	98	2	15.42-15.61
1811-1820.....	11,896,940	251,790	98	2	15.54
1821-1830.....	10,132,320	312,752	97	3	15.80
1831-1840.....	13,121,900	446,358	97	3	15.57
1841-1850.....	17,169,130	1,204,698	93	7	15.75-16.00
1851-1855.....	9,747,265	2,172,665	82	18	15.42
1856-1860.....	9,954,890	2,266,638	81	19	15.33
1861-1865.....	12,112,650	2,036,353	83	14	15.26
1866-1870.....	14,729,935	2,110,900	87	13	15.55
1871-1875.....	21,663,675	1,877,425	92	8	15.98
1876-1880.....	24,200,088	1,831,726	93	7	17.90
1881-1885.....	29,333,894	1,694,258	95	5	18.76
1886-1890.....	37,962,785	1,863,700	95	5	21.49

*Mints of France from 1803 to 1873 equally open to silver and gold on the ratio of 15.50 to 1.

Mr. President, and gentlemen, the general discussion having closed, we are brought, by the previous orders of the conference, as I understand them, to a consideration of the questionnaire. I propose to submit some brief ob-

servations on some of its points; but they will be little more than an expression of my individual opinions, with little or no argument.

The first question propounded is substantially as follows: "Have the diminution and great oscillations in value of silver that have occurred, especially of late years, been injurious or not to commerce, and, consequently, to general prosperity?"

"Is it desirable that the relation of value between gold and silver should be stable?"

I do not see how it is possible to give any but an affirmative answer to these questions; unless, indeed, the use of silver as money is to be wholly discontinued; and no one, here or elsewhere, advocates that. Although, according to the logic of gold monometallists, it might seem that if an exclusive gold currency is the best for one country, it must be for all countries, yet I do not understand that anyone proposes to inaugurate measures for the universal demonetization of silver.

Silver, then, in a greater or less degree, is still to be used as money by commercial nations everywhere, and, this being admitted, can argument be required to prove that great fluctuations in its relative value must necessarily be injurious to commerce and to general prosperity? And as gold is also to be used, is it not equally obvious that the relative value of the two metals should be as stable as possible? The effect of an unstable and greatly fluctuating currency upon debtors and creditors, at one time to the injury of the former, and at another to the injury of the latter; the discouragement to production, the uncertainties of employment, and the difficulties of exchange, to say nothing more, are sufficient to demonstrate how great are the calamities that such a currency is sure to inflict, and how imperative is the duty of Government to prevent, or, at least, to mitigate them.

We are next asked, "whether the fluctuations in the value of silver of late years are to be attributed to an increase in the production of that metal, or rather to legislation?"

It seems to me very clear that they were caused by unfriendly legislation, and not by increased production. According to the table presented by Dr. Broch, the mean price of silver in 1845, in the London market, was 15.93 of silver for 1 of gold, and the mean price, or ratio, in 1873, twenty-nine years later, was precisely the same.

During this period there were some fluctuations, not very great, however; and, taking the mean of the whole twenty-nine years, we have the striking fact that the relation was 15.54 to 1, being almost exactly the legal relation (15½ to 1) that has existed in France for about seventy-eight years, and that now exists in the states of the Latin Union.

But, during the twenty-nine years above mentioned, the production of gold was enormous, and was, in value, at least double that of silver; so that, if either metal should have lost value as compared with the other, it would seem that it should have been gold, and not silver. Yet their relative value was precisely the same in 1873 that it was in 1845.

But in 1873 began, both in America and Europe, that course of legislation to which, in my judgment, are chiefly to be attributed the monetary troubles which this conference has met to consider. In the United States, by acts of Congress of 1873 and 1874, silver was demonetized; and, although the error, after the lapse of several years, was corrected, yet the coinage of full legal-tender silver is greatly restricted.

In Europe, Germany and the Scandinavian states have become gold monometallic, while the states of the Latin Union have almost wholly suspended the coinage of the white metal. That metal, being thus, by force of legislation, condemned and dishonored, its fall in value was inevitable, and the only matter of surprise to me is that it is no greater than it is. Look at the facts. In 1873 the relation between silver and gold was 15.93 to 1. Then commenced the legislation of which I have spoken, and its effect was instantly seen. In 1874 the relation was 16.16; in 1875, 16.63; in 1876, 17.80; in 1877, 17.19; in 1878, 17.96; in 1879, 18.39, and in 1880, 18.06 to 1. Was ever a result more directly traceable to its cause?

Mr. HIGGINS. I venture to read from the final sentence of Mr. Thurman's letter, as it is short, the facts as to when this disparity arose.

But in 1873—

He says—

began, both in America and Europe, that course of legislation to which, in my judgment, are chiefly to be attributed the monetary troubles which this conference has met to consider. In the United States, by acts of Congress of 1873 and 1874, silver was demonetized; and, although the error, after the lapse of several years, was corrected, yet the coinage of full legal-tender silver is greatly restricted.

In Europe, Germany and the Scandinavian states have become gold monometallic, while the states of the Latin Union have almost wholly suspended the coinage of the white metal. That metal, being thus, by force of legislation, condemned and dishonored, its fall in value was inevitable, and the only matter of surprise to me is that it is no greater than it is. Look at the facts. In 1873 the relation between silver and gold was 15.93 to 1. Then commenced the legislation of which I have spoken, and its effect was instantly seen. In 1874 the relation was 16.16; in 1875, 16.63; in 1876, 17.80; in 1877, 17.19; in 1878, 17.96; in 1879, 18.39, and in 1880, 18.06 to 1. Was ever a result more directly traceable to its cause?

The promoters of this bill claim that this disparity arose by the act of Congress of 1873. I contend that it had nothing whatever to do with it; but on the contrary it does appear from the figures given by this sage of Democracy and wise man in the councils of our Government, Mr. Thurman, vouched for by the distinguished Senator from Alabama when he prints with commendation the letter in his speech, that the disparity arose when the adverse legislation of Europe was enacted on this question, and the disparity was fixed and established before we ever resumed specie payments in 1878, and of course before our act of 1873 could affect the question of the money metals in any way whatever. We did not resume specie payments until January 1, 1878. Silver was demonetized by Germany in acts running from 1871 up to 1873. It was followed by the Latin Union in 1875; and before that, as I understand, by some of the other countries of Europe.

So by 1875 or 1876 all of Europe had ceased the coinage of silver and the United States had not resumed specie payments. Whatever effect the act of 1873 by our Congress had, it could only have been at least in the way of inducement to the other nations to take like action, though it is not to be presumed they knew

what was done here. We were then under paper currency and not on a specie basis at all. Thus we find that this disparity, this dislocation of the metals was complete and established before any action touching the matter taken by our own Government.

It is claimed by the friends of this measure that we can safely indulge in the free coinage of silver, that we can dare indulge what I should call isolated free coinage alone, and that such isolated coinage by the United States will restore silver to a parity with gold. I contend that the depreciation of silver arises out of the action of the European governments and that it can only be restored by our joint cooperation with them or theirs with us.

I also ask leave to print with my remarks certain tables on the ratio between the two metals, which I take from an article in the June number of the Forum by the Director of the Mint.

The tables are as follows:

Commercial ratio of silver to gold each year from 1837 to 1872.

Year.	Ratio.	Year.	Ratio.	Year.	Ratio.	Year.	Ratio.
1837	14.94	1734	15.39	1781	14.78	1828	15.78
1838	14.94	1735	15.41	1782	14.42	1829	15.78
1839	15.02	1736	15.18	1783	14.48	1830	15.82
1840	15.02	1737	15.02	1784	14.70	1831	15.72
1841	14.98	1738	14.91	1785	14.92	1832	15.73
1842	14.92	1739	14.91	1786	14.96	1833	15.93
1843	14.83	1740	14.94	1787	14.92	1834	15.73
1844	14.87	1741	14.92	1788	14.65	1835	15.80
1845	15.02	1742	14.55	1789	14.75	1836	15.72
1846	15.00	1743	14.85	1790	15.04	1837	15.83
1847	15.20	1744	14.87	1791	15.05	1838	15.85
1848	15.07	1745	14.98	1792	15.11	1839	15.62
1849	14.94	1746	15.13	1793	15.00	1840	15.62
1850	14.81	1747	15.26	1794	15.37	1841	15.70
1851	15.07	1748	15.11	1795	15.55	1842	15.87
1852	15.52	1749	14.80	1796	15.65	1843	15.93
1853	15.17	1750	14.55	1797	15.41	1844	15.85
1854	15.22	1751	14.39	1798	15.59	1845	15.92
1855	15.11	1752	14.54	1799	15.74	1846	15.60
1856	15.27	1753	14.54	1800	15.08	1847	15.80
1857	15.44	1754	14.48	1801	15.46	1848	15.85
1858	15.41	1755	14.68	1802	15.26	1849	15.78
1859	15.31	1756	14.94	1803	15.41	1850	15.70
1860	15.22	1757	14.87	1804	15.41	1851	15.46
1861	15.29	1758	14.85	1805	15.79	1852	15.59
1862	15.31	1759	14.15	1806	15.52	1853	15.33
1863	15.24	1760	14.14	1807	15.43	1854	15.33
1864	15.13	1761	14.54	1808	15.08	1855	15.38
1865	15.11	1762	15.27	1809	15.96	1856	15.38
1866	15.09	1763	14.99	1810	15.77	1857	15.27
1867	15.13	1764	14.70	1811	15.53	1858	15.28
1868	15.11	1765	14.83	1812	16.11	1859	15.19
1869	15.09	1766	14.80	1813	16.25	1860	15.29
1870	15.04	1767	14.85	1814	15.04	1861	15.50
1871	15.05	1768	14.80	1815	15.26	1862	15.35
1872	15.17	1769	14.72	1816	15.28	1863	15.37
1873	15.20	1770	14.62	1817	15.11	1864	15.37
1874	15.11	1771	14.66	1818	15.35	1865	15.44
1875	15.11	1772	14.52	1819	15.33	1866	15.43
1876	15.15	1773	14.62	1820	15.62	1867	15.57
1877	15.24	1774	14.62	1821	15.95	1868	15.59
1878	15.11	1775	14.72	1822	15.80	1869	15.60
1879	14.92	1776	14.55	1823	15.84	1870	15.57
1880	14.81	1777	14.54	1824	15.82	1871	15.57
1881	14.94	1778	14.68	1825	15.70	1872	15.63
1882	15.17	1779	14.80	1826	15.76		
1883	15.09	1780	14.72	1827	15.74		

The decline in the price of silver, as compared with gold, commenced in 1873. The relative value of silver to gold since that period has been as follows:

Year.	Ratio.	Year.	Ratio.	Year.	Ratio.	Year.	Ratio.
1873	15.92	1878	17.94	1883	18.64	1888	21.99
1874	16.17	1879	18.40	1884	18.57	1889	22.02
1875	16.59	1880	18.05	1885	19.41	1890	19.76
1876	17.88	1881	18.16	1886	20.78	1891	20.92
1877	17.22	1882	18.19	1887	21.13		

The average price of silver in 1873 was 54½ pence per ounce (British standard), equivalent to about \$1.30 per fine ounce, the exact equivalent of the French ratio being 60 13-16 pence, or \$1.33, per fine ounce. The lowest price of silver was reached on March 23, 1892, viz., \$0.85½ per fine ounce, a decline in the brief period of nineteen years of 47½ cents an ounce, or over 55 per cent. Forty years ago, England and Portugal were the only countries in Europe which had the gold standard. Silver was practically the money of Europe. To-day the situation is entirely reversed.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. President, I contend that silver can be restored to its parity with gold only by the joint action of the nations of the earth.

When we consider the importance of this issue we may well ask the friends of this bill to support their contention by some argument or some demonstration, because if they could show to the satisfaction of the country, if they could show to the satisfaction of the Senators who are opposed to this measure, that their contention is right, they surely would have no opposition to it. Whether there have been at any time in this country doctrinaire

monometallists or not, those who believe that other countries as well as this country will be better by having gold alone as the money metal of the world, I confess that now I do not know of any.

I have but one man in my mind who ventures to make that contention. America has come freely and fully to adopt and accept the principle of bimetalism, and the promoters of this bill have no right to claim that they *par excellence* are its friends and its only friends. Least of all have they any right to impugn the motives and cover with wanton and unnecessary abuse and reproach those who want silver to be made equal with gold as a money metal, but fail to see how the United States can do it alone. When we ask them for arguments they indulge in prophesy. They say it will be done because it will be done.

We have had prophesy from that quarter before. When the bill of 1890, which afterwards became the act of that year, was pending the Senate was hypnotized by the genius of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES] into the belief that by the purchase of four and a half million ounces of silver per month by our Government silver would go to a parity. They said at first, buy four and a half million dollars, but afterwards they said only give us ounces and that will make it sure. So the question was, I think in a conference committee, whether it should be four and a half million dollars or four and a half million ounces that was to be purchased, and at last we conceded that it should be ounces, and that was put in the bill. Some indulged in speculation and bought and got their fingers burned. Silver went up to 119 if not to 120 cents per ounce, and then it went back and lower than it ever did before. The act would provide for a larger measure of purchase of silver to-day if it had been four and a half million dollars instead of that many ounces, because the price of silver is about 90 cents per ounce.

Thus have the prophecies of our friends on the other side been confounded. Have they any standing room on which they can ask us any longer to indulge in their reading of the future? Shall we venture again to take their prophecies on the great financial interests of this country, reaching to every man's home and touching the pocket of every person, interesting the people, interesting the workingman, who sells his labor and is the largest creditor in the world, interesting the laboring man who is thrifty enough to save his money and put it in savings banks, interesting that large class who are the object of the bounty of this Government, its pensioners. All those are interested. Have we any justification in taking the prophecy of these gentlemen?

I confess I know of but one argument that they have urged, and that is not an argument, it is an illustration. They say that France opened its mints to coinage in 1803 under the control of Napoleon, and keeping them open to free coinage until 1873 maintained the parity of the metals during all that time. Their argument is, and I want to put it with perfect fairness and as strong as any of them can do it, that because France maintained the parity from 1803 to 1873, when they ceased the coinage of silver, therefore the United States can do the same thing.

Mr. President, the trouble with the argument or illustration is that it does not accord with the fact. It is not candid. It is not true. It is true that France during that time had her mints open to free coinage, but it is not true that upon the free coinage of France alone the parity of the metals rested during those seventy years. On the contrary, every government in Europe was on a silver basis except England and Portugal, which was a sort of appendage to England. The real statement of the situation as it subsisted during those years is that England was upon a gold standard. That is, under the act by which they resumed specie payments in 1816, passed, I think, about 1806, gold alone was a legal tender, except silver for 40 shillings. So England was on the gold basis. Yet they made a very large use of silver during that time, amounting to considerably over a hundred million dollars of our money. Portugal, I believe, was on a gold basis, but she is so small that she does not count. All the rest of Europe with France was upon a silver basis. So the true proposition is that silver was maintained at a parity with gold by the joint cooperation of the rest of the world in the free coinage of silver and gold, whether England and Portugal cooperated with them or not, because all of that time, of course, besides the rest of Europe the United States also was coining silver, and upon a silver basis, and a large user of silver.

So, when we come to what is, as far as I can see, the only and the final argument urged here, you discover that it is no argument at all. With absolute confidence, berating us with all the flourish of broomsticks like a virago, one and another Senator comes at those on this side and says the United States can restore the parity of silver with gold by coining silver alone and isolated from the rest of the world. If that is true we have already an example of free coinage which ought to bring about this result, namely, in India. India is now coining silver freely. All the miners of Colorado and the Rocky Mountains can send their silver there if they want to do so. India is open to free

coinage. Why does not that restore parity? We have free coinage in Mexico and South America as well.

Oh, but they say India is in Asia. Suppose it is. Its population is fast growing up, approximating to 300,000,000 people, and while individually they are poor, in the aggregate they represent enormous wealth and enormous exchanges. It is not the India that Burke described in his great speeches on Warren Hastings. It is not the India of the mutiny. It is the India of the close of the nineteenth century, radiating with railways, all its vast population in peaceful avocations, and going forward with enormous strides in the march to wealth under the protection and the aegis of the British Empire. If those 300,000,000 people with free coinage can not restore the parity of silver with gold, how can gentlemen here say to us that we alone can do it?

There is one other thing to be said, and that is that India has gone to a silver basis. Or rather she has never been on anything else, and it differs radically from the proposition to coin silver freely in America, for we maintain the silver we have already coined at a parity with gold. Why? Because we coin silver in a restricted amount, in an amount so restricted that it can always obtain a dollar in gold. It is virtually, if not directly, redeemable in gold. The silver dollar of our coinage is virtually a bill of exchange or draft drawn upon our Treasury Department to pay a dollar in gold, and as long as you can get a dollar in gold the parity is maintained.

But it is argued by our friends on the other side that we can throw our mints open to free coinage and have all the silver of the world come here and keep that vast mass at a parity with gold. Of course, so long as any man can bring here 70 cents' worth of silver bullion and get a dollar in gold with it he will do it. Hence you may expect that the vast mass of foreign silver will be brought from abroad when this measure passes. We know we can not respond. Already there is more anxiety than we like to admit as to the effect of the present law of 1890 upon our gold reserve.

The junior Senator from Nevada himself has argued here that under the operation of the present law there is danger of the gold going out, and yet in the face of that we are told that by our own fiat we can lift the vast mass of depreciated silver of the world to a parity and keep it there, so that the relatively small reserves of gold that we have will not be drawn out and that we will not be carried to a silver basis.

Mr. President, I have stated as far as I know the arguments that have been made in support of this phase of the question by the friends of this measure and the reasons that there are against it. If this bill should be passed and free coinage were decreed and enacted by this Government, either silver would be brought to and maintained at a parity with gold, on a ratio of 16 to 1, or it would not. If it did not come to such a parity and were not maintained there, then our gold would go out and we would come to a silver standard. One of the results would be that instantly our stock of gold, from \$600,000,000 to \$700,000,000, would cease to be currency and would become a commodity. By one fell stroke you would contract our currency to that extent, and we would have to wait until the silver was brought here from other countries in order to fill the vacuum with it, or we would have to meet it by larger issues of paper money or fiat money.

The senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], who is not in his seat, ventured the remark that if we had to choose between a gold or a silver standard he would welcome the silver standard. As I understand it, he considers that we are on a gold standard now, and therefore if the free coinage of silver continued the disparity he would prefer to bring this country to the silver standard, to the use of silver alone, to the expulsion or the hoarding of our gold, rather than to maintain the bimetallic arrangement that we now have, by which we have gold and silver in almost equal amounts in furnishing the currency of the country in addition to our greenback notes.

It seems to me that any man who takes that ground, who takes it advisedly and takes it after study of the question, is taking with it a grave responsibility and is acting with infinite rashness. I do not propose to detain the Senate or to cumber the pages of the RECORD by an attempt at the story of even America under depreciated currency. No one the traditions of whose family go back to the Revolutionary period can but carry in his mind the burning recollections of the losses suffered by continental money. The very act of Napoleon in the free coinage of silver was taken when he cast out the wretched paper money issued by the French democracy during the reign of terror.

Take the experience that we had before we resumed specie payments in 1878. Take the warnings that were given on this floor when the legal-tender act was first passed, done under a war necessity and costing this people more almost in treasure and loss suffered by it than by the direct outflow of money on account of the war of the rebellion. I know of my own experi-

ence that before we came to the resumption of specie payments, and especially before the panic of 1873, when gold was at a premium of from 50 to 100 per cent, it in my State cost the farmer more to raise a bushel of grain than he could get for it. Farm after farm, the product of prosperous agriculture in former years, went under the hammer of the sheriff.

Interest came to be 18 per cent per annum and the usurer thrived. When at last this country resumed specie payments and drove out an irredeemable and fluctuating currency, the worst scourge of mankind, it brought about a general prosperity and crowned the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], who has been subjected to such defamation by the promoters of this measure, with undying fame. He had the double honor to project that measure on this floor and to administer it in the executive branch of the Government. Yet it is after such experiences that Senators assume the people of this country can be drawn into another trial of an irredeemable and fluctuating currency.

Mr. President, we have had one battle on that field and that was on the greenback question. The Greenback party has gone out, and I think it has gone out to stay. When we see both of the great parties going into national convention this year, and, notwithstanding they have had so much of training and declaiming and obfuscation from the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Nevada, planting themselves before the people firmly upon the principle of honest money, I have no doubt as to what the answer will be from the people of the United States. It is no way for our friends from the Western prairies to recoup whatever losses they may think they have suffered and to supply whatever wants they think they may have for more money to launch themselves on this dangerous sea of irredeemable and fluctuating currency.

But there is another class whose representatives are advocating this bill and who have been most severe in their denunciations of all who have been opposed to it, and they are the representatives on this floor of the silver States. I do not mean by that to include all of them. I am very glad to except all from that remark who have not seen proper to indulge in the violent language of the Senator from Nevada and the Senators from Colorado as well as the Senator from Alabama. But, if I am correct in the assumption that isolated free coinage by the United States will not bring silver to a parity, then I claim to be a better friend to the silver miners of America than their representatives here. It was their representatives who induced the Senate to vote for the purchase of four and a half million ounces of silver per month on the claim that it would send silver to a parity. It has not done it. Suppose isolated free coinage by the United States does not do it, are they in any better case?

But suppose, on the other hand, that coöperation by the nations of the world should do it, then every dollar mined by the miner of Colorado and the Rocky Mountains will be worth its dollar in gold and not worth 70 cents.

Yet after the President of the United States has called a conference of the nations to take such action, and after he has had favorable responses from all and such conference is about to meet, when the names of its members for this Government are about to be sent to us for confirmation before we disperse, we have the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Nevada on this floor denouncing this great measure of relief before it is put in operation and saying that we must have isolated free coinage or nothing.

I have been told in conversation by gentlemen of one branch of Congress or the other from the South and from the West their constituents did not care so much for silver as that they wanted more money. There are, of course, large classes in this country who believe in the doctrine that lay behind the greenback heresy, that the Government should emit fiat money. Cheap money has no terrors or no horrors for them, however much it may affect their interests. Whether they are wrong or right, it is a matter of great and dire concern to the owners and the laborers in silver mines. What they want is that their product shall be sold for the most that it is worth, and they can not afford to have this country go to free coinage and put it upon a silver standard and have the price of silver no higher than it has been made by free coinage in India.

Believing as I do, and submitting this argument in all fairness to the other side, I say here with the utmost deliberation, and I only wish that my voice could go into every mining camp and into the office of every smelting works in the West, they have enemies, deadly enemies, and those enemies are the gentlemen who misrepresent their interests on this floor by endeavoring to precipitate our Government and people into an isolated free coinage of this nation alone, when, judging from all in the past as well as the present, and in all reason, there is no probability that it will advance the price of silver at all beyond its present price.

Mr. President, I have something to say to the Republicans from the silver States. I believe what was said by my friend

from Wyoming in conversation on this subject. When Senators stated that their people were in favor of the free coinage of silver he said that no man was worthy of a seat on this floor who could not mold the sentiments of his people on a question where he was right, and it would be better to have them against him and have it go the other way than to tamper with a subject of such dire concern as this or one which so infinitely affects the interests of the people.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON. I submit the report of the committee of conference on the amendments to the agricultural appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The report will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9089) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 8, and 19.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 22, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$10,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$6,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$27,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$12,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following:

"Provided, That so much thereof as may be necessary may in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be expended in investigating and preparing to carry on experiments next year in sugar-cane production on reclaimed swamp lands in some suitable place in the San Joaquin or Sacramento Valley, California, to be used by the Department free of charge: *Provided further*, That all products of the experiments may be sold and the proceeds thereof be used in the experimental work, and that a full and accurate account of the proceeds of such sales be transmitted to Congress."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 20 and 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: "In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendments insert the following: "and the Secretary is hereby authorized to make promotions in the service without prejudice to those transferred from the Signal Service of the War Department;" and the Senate agree to the same.

W. B. ALLISON,
S. M. CULLOM,
WILKINSON CALL,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

W. H. HATCH,
A. CAMINETTI,
E. H. FUNSTON,

Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate concur in the report?

The report was concurred in.

FREE COINAGE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 51) to provide for the free coinage of gold and silver bullion, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question on the bill is to recommit to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PALMER. I rose to inquire whether that is not the pending motion. The Chair has given me the information I sought.

Mr. FAULKNER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. FRYE. Will the Senator from West Virginia kindly withdraw the motion in order that we may have an executive session?

Mr. FAULKNER. I will withdraw the motion. The Senator from Maine desires an executive session.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, July 1, 1892, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 30, 1892.

POSTMASTERS.

Benjamin A. Osborn, to be postmaster at Watsonville, in the county of Santa Cruz and State of California, in the place of Abram B. Hawkins, whose commission expires June 30, 1892.

Bertrand Ragsdale, to be postmaster at Santa Rosa, in the county of Sonoma and State of California, in the place of Christopher C. Farmer, whose commission expires June 30, 1892.

Edwin Adams, to be postmaster at South Norwalk, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in the place of Charles E. Doty, removed.

Nehemiah Jennings, to be postmaster at Southport, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in the place of Nehemiah Jennings, whose commission expires July 18, 1892.

Bartow F. Carter, to be postmaster at Cedartown, in the county of Polk and State of Georgia, in the place of Thomas G. W. McMeekin, removed. This nomination is made to correct an error in name, Mr. Carter having been confirmed by the Senate May 20, 1892, as Benjamin F. Carter.

Henry S. Adams, to be postmaster at Eminence, in the county of Henry and State of Kentucky, in the place of Miss Lucy Hocker, whose commission expires July 21, 1892.

Lewis W. Brannon, to be postmaster at Princeton, in the county of Mercer and State of Missouri, in the place of Joel H. Shelly, whose commission expired May 10, 1892.

Edward J. Day, to be postmaster at Monett, in the county of Barry and State of Missouri, in the place of George B. Draper, resigned.

Robert F. Schofield, to be postmaster at Edina, in the county of Knox and State of Missouri, in the place of Louis Weishar, whose commission expired May 10, 1892.

Fred H. Powers, to be postmaster at Starkville, in the county of Oktibbeha and State of Mississippi, in the place of Homer C. Powers, resigned.

Louis McCloud, to be postmaster at East Orange, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey, in the place of William H. Baldwin, deceased.

Florence A. Smith, to be postmaster at Schoharie, in the county of Schoharie and State of New York, in the place of Jesse W. Smith, deceased.

Joseph P. Carver, to be postmaster at Newtown, in the county of Bucks and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Mrs. Fredrika H. Bryan, removed.

John C. McLean, to be postmaster at Union City, in the county of Erie and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Horatio L. Church, resigned.

William D. Crum, to be postmaster at Charleston, in the county of Charleston and State of South Carolina, in the place of Albert H. Mowry, whose commission expired December 20, 1891.

Neill B. Lovelace, to be postmaster at Martin, in the county of Weakley and State of Tennessee, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1892.

Leonard H. Harral, to be postmaster at Ladonia, in the county of Fannin and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1892.

Samuel Bigwood, to be postmaster at Winooski, in the county of Chittenden and State of Vermont, in the place of Christopher G. Allard, whose commission expires June 30, 1892.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 30, 1892.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Samuel P. Bartlett, of New Jersey, to be collector of customs for the district of Little Egg Harbor, in the State of New Jersey.

APPOINTMENT IN REVENUE CUTTER SERVICE.

Charles W. Zastrow, of Maryland, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue Cutter Service.

PROMOTION IN THE REVENUE CUTTER SERVICE.

Second Assistant Engineer Andrew J. Howison, of Pennsylvania, to be a first assistant engineer in the Revenue Cutter Service.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

First Lieut. Stephen W. Quackenbush, United States Marine Corps, to be a captain in that corps.

First Lieut. George F. Elliott, United States Marine Corps, to be a captain in that corps.

First Lieut. Robert D. Wainwright, United States Marine Corps, to be a captain in that corps.

Passed Assistant Engineer Alexander B. Bates, to be a chief engineer in the Navy.

Assistant Engineer Benjamin C. Bryan, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy.

Assistant Engineer Harold P. Norton, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy.

Assistant Engineer Clarence A. Carr, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Subsistence Department.

Capt. Abiel L. Smith, Fourth Cavalry, to be commissary of subsistence with the rank of captain.

Signal Corps.

First Lieut. George P. Scriven, to be captain.

Artillery arm.

Second Lieut. John D. Barrette, Third Artillery, to be first lieutenant.

Infantry arm.

First Lieut. Christian C. Hewitt, Nineteenth Infantry, to be captain.

Second Lieut. William F. Martin, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Edward P. Lawton, Thirteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. James Mitchell, Fifteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, June 30, 1892.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

SANDY WALKER, DECEASED, VS. THE UNITED STATES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Sandy Walker, deceased, against the United States—ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

ARMY BREVETS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the major-general commanding the Army, with inclosures, submitting reasons why Senate bill 2699, relating to army brevets, should not become a law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. D. MUMMA ET AL. VS. THE UNITED STATES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of H. D. Mumma *et al.* against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FORNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report back to the House the bill (H. R. 9040) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, with Senate amendments thereto, and to ask non-concurrence in the Senate amendments and request a conference with the Senate.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. I hope that may be done as requested by the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9040) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY], from the Committee on Appropriations, reports back this bill, with the recommendation that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendments and ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. If there be no objection, this order will be made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees Mr. FORNEY, Mr. DICKERY, and Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER, OMAHA, NEBR.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk, which is simply to extend the charter of a bridge company.

Mr. WATSON. I demand the regular order.

Mr. BRYAN. I think if the gentleman will allow me to make an explanation he will not object, because I do not think he is interested in monopoly. This is for an extension of a charter for a new bridge across the Missouri River. The city of Omaha has voted \$750,000 for the bridge—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it requires unanimous consent—

Mr. BRYAN. I think the gentleman will withdraw his objection. It is a mere formal matter, extending the charter, and

the Senate has acted upon it unanimously, and so have the Committee on Commerce of the House, and it brings up no new provision at all. It simply extends a charter already granted, in order that the bridge may be completed. Unless the gentleman is interested in the present bridge company I do not see how he can object to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, now I hope I will be allowed by courtesy to make a statement. I would be very glad to oblige the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN], because he has endeavored to oblige me, but my people feel that the measure we have asked to have considered would destroy a monopoly that is far more disastrous in its consequences, and more general in its operations, than any bridge bill can possibly be affecting the transportation over any river in this country; and until we get some respectful and fair treatment in reference to our bills, I think I owe it to my people to use every inducement I can to get the Ways and Means Committee to obey the instructions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. WATSON. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded, which is equivalent to an objection.

HIGHWAYS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HEARD] desires to present a conference report, which is a privileged matter. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1307) to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill S. 1307, "A bill to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the first amendment of the House and agree to the same, amended to read as follows:

"That the amount awarded by said court as damages for each highway or reservation, or part thereof, condemned and established under this act, shall be one-half assessed against the land benefited thereby, and the other half shall be charged up to the revenues of the District of Columbia;" and that the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the second amendment and agree to the same amended to read as follows:

"That one-half of the amount awarded by said court as damages for each highway or reservation or part thereof, condemned and established under this act, shall be charged upon the lands benefited by the laying out and opening of such highway or reservation or part thereof, and the remainder of said amount shall be charged to the revenues of the District of Columbia;" and that the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the third amendment and agree to the same with an amendment which inserts one-half instead of one-third; and that the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its fourth amendment.

That the House recede from its fifth amendment.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the sixth amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment to read as follows:

"In case the court shall enter judgment of condemnation in any case, and appropriation is not made by Congress for the payment of such award within the period of six months, Congress being in session for that time after such award, or for the period of six months after the meeting of the next session of Congress, the proceedings shall be void, and the land shall revert to the owner;" and that the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its seventh amendment.

That the House recede from its eighth amendment.

That the House recede from its ninth amendment.

J. J. HEMPHILL,
JOHN T. HEARD,
P. S. POST.

Conferees on the part of the House.

ISHAM G. HARRIS,
JAMES McMILLAN,
B. W. PEKKINS.

Conferees on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement of the conferees.

The statement of the managers on the part of the House was read, as follows:

Statement to accompany the report of the House conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendments to Senate bill No. 1307 "To provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities."

The most material amendment of the House to which the Senate objected relates to the payment of damages assessed for the condemnation of land taken for the purposes of highways, etc. The Senate bill, as it originally came to the House, provided that one-third of the damages so assessed should be put upon the lands abutting on the highway. The House changed this by providing that the amount awarded as damages in any case of condemnation should be assessed wholly upon the lands benefited thereby, or upon the lands and the District of Columbia, as the court should adjudge; and that the amount assessed against the District of Columbia should be paid exclusively from the revenues thereof. The Senate insists that the proportion to be paid in each case by the District and the property-owners re-

spectively should be definitely fixed in the law; and insists on making it half to each, and the House conferees recommend agreement thereto.

The second and third amendments relate to the same point, and are made to harmonize the bill with the change proposed in the first.

The fourth amendment of the House was designed to exempt the United States from all liability for any expense in connection with any street, reservation, or circle, or other improvement outside of the cities of Washington and Georgetown.

The conferees on the part of the Senate insist that this exemption is too broad, as it would apply to the Washington Aqueduct, the reservations on which its reservoirs are located, and apply to any and all kinds of improvements now existing or hereafter to be made in the District outside of the cities under authority of Congress; and that it is better for Congress to deal with each such case as it may arise on its merits. The conferees, agreeing with this view, recommend that the House recede from said amendment.

The fifth amendment of the House is rendered unnecessary by those agreed on by the conferees and recommended for the approval of the House, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from the same.

The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the sixth amendment of the House, with the following amendment: "In case the court shall enter judgment of condemnation in any case, and appropriation is not made by Congress for the payment of such award within the period of six months, Congress being in session for that time after such award, or for the period of six months after the meeting of the next session of Congress, the proceedings shall be void, and the land shall revert to the owner."

This amendment is to provide against the act becoming inoperative by reason of Congress not being in session in time to give effect to its terms relating to the appropriation of the money necessary to satisfy awards made against the District of Columbia.

The seventh amendment of the House was designed to give preference in the opening of streets and avenues, to those localities in which the greatest areas of ground might be dedicated for such use. Your conferees agree with those of the Senate that such provision might compel the opening of some streets and avenues in preference to others in which the public had a much more important interest. That in this regard the Commissioners should be allowed discretion in this work greater than would thus be given them, to select for first attention those sections demanded by the best interests of the public. We therefore recommend that the House recede from the amendment.

The eighth and ninth amendments are rendered unnecessary by reason of the changed phraseology and form of the bill as made by the amendments already recommended, and your conferees therefore recommend that the House recede from the same.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, the statement submitted by the conferees explains fully the points of difference between the two bodies and the basis of agreement arrived at by the conferees; and unless there is some demand for a further explanation I shall ask for a vote upon the adoption of the report.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to hear the reading of the statement, owing to the fact that a number of gentlemen in my vicinity were holding an animated discussion on other matters, and I would like to inquire as to the effect of the measure in the shape in which the gentleman from Missouri now recommends it, in regard to the payment for land taken in the opening of new streets. By whom is the money for damages for the taking of that land to be eventually paid?

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in answering the question, and in stating that as the bill came originally to the House from the Senate it provided that in any case of condemnation one-third of the damage assessed was to be put upon the abutting property, and two-thirds to be paid out of the general Treasury. The House amended that. The first amendment offered in the House contemplated the assessment of half that damage upon the land, but before that amendment was acted upon, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. COBB] offered a further amendment in the nature of a substitute for that, which was adopted by the House, which provided that this should be assessed wholly upon the land or upon the land and the revenues of the District of Columbia, as should be adjudged by the court making the award. In that form the bill left the House.

Now, the Senate insists that it is better to fix a definite amount for which the District may become liable and for which the abutting property owners may become liable, rather than to leave it in any uncertainty, believing that there would be greater freedom of action perhaps on the part of the Commissioners in the opening or planning for the opening of a street, if they knew that the award of damages which might be assessed against the revenues of the District would not in any case exceed one-half, and on the other hand that those interested in applying for the opening of these streets would be better satisfied if they knew the limit to which their liability might extend; and therefore the amendment as reported by the conferees is the same as the first one offered in the House, that one-half should be assessed against the land and one-half against the revenues of the District and not against the Treasury generally.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. And that is the shape in which it now is?

Mr. HEARD. That is the shape in which it comes to the House from the conference committee; one-half to be assessed against the abutting property and one-half against the District, to be paid out of the revenues of the District.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. And you recommend concurrence in it in that shape?

Mr. HEARD. We do.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has answered almost what I wanted to ask him, but I have felt so much inter-

est in this matter that I want to make the question specific. I understand the gentleman to state that in no event does any of the money come out of the general Treasury of the United States for the purpose of paying these damages?

Mr. HEARD. Not one cent. As I stated before, one-half is to be assessed on the property abutting, and the other half is to be charged to the District, to be paid exclusively out of the revenues of the District.

Mr. BLOUNT. And in no event to be paid out of the general Treasury?

Mr. HEARD. Not at all. The limitation is carried out through all the subsequent provisions of the bill, that the money which does not come from the abutting property shall come from the revenues of the District of Columbia, exclusively.

I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, there were but three points of material difference, and that is one which I have tried to explain. Another point was that by amendment in the House it was provided that hereafter no liability should ever attach to the General Government for any improvement made in the District outside of the city on streets, reservations, circles, or anything else. The Senate resisted that and your conferees agreed to recede from it for the reason that it would put upon the District, in some cases, the expense of the improvement of property wholly owned by and under the control of the Government, by putting the expense upon the District of any improvements which the Government chose to make upon its reservations in the District. Therefore, your committee agrees with the Senate committee, that for work to be done which can only be done by authority of Congress hereafter, that should be dealt with upon its merits in each case as it arises, the Congress having ample power to limit and prohibit, if necessary, the attaching of any liability to the United States for any such improvement.

But we did not think that it is necessary or proper to put that kind of a condition on this bill, when its reach would be so much further than designed. It goes much further than to embrace the circles, the streets, and avenues. This bill was designed to lay down a general plan for the opening of the streets and avenues only. The Senate resisted the amendment which we proposed and we have agreed to recede from said amendment, which would extend the limitation to any property owned by the Government, either the Naval Observatory, the reservation on which the reservoirs stand, or any other property, and going to any other improvement which the Government may in the future decide to make in said territory inside the District but outside the cities.

I think that the views of the Senate are correct upon this proposition, and that we can wisely refrain from insisting upon this, for the reason that it will at all times be in the power of Congress to attach to each individual case that limitation which the circumstances seem to call for.

Mr. BLOUNT. Does the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HEARD. There are two or three other points to which I desire to call attention.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. I would like to ask a question or two of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HEARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLOUNT. I have no objection to the gentleman going on. Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri a question. He, in the course of his investigation, undoubtedly ascertained—

Mr. HEARD. I am perfectly willing to answer any question the gentleman from New Jersey may ask that is within my power to answer, but I would like to hear the question, which I can not on account of the confusion.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri how the land obtained for streets by condemnation is paid for under the present system?

Mr. HEARD. Well, I will say to the gentleman that there is a general system of condemnation in the District similar to that in force in most of the States; but I could not undertake to give all its details. As to that proposed in this bill, however, I would say that first, the Senate proposed to make one-third chargeable against the property—

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. I understand that. What I want to get at is whether your present bill alters the present system, and, if so, in what respect?

Mr. HEARD. I am not prepared at present to make a more definite statement about the condition of the law of condemnation in force in the District in the general law to which the gentleman refers; but I have explained fully just what this bill is. If there is any objection to this measure, let it be discussed upon that.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. I understand that Blackstone lays it down that in providing a remedy it is well to look at the old law and the mischief arising under it. Another question. Is there any provision made in this bill which will prevent

a man or a syndicate of men buying up a large tract of land adjoining the laid out portion of the city and which is valueless to them, for their purposes, until streets are laid out through it?

What is there to prevent them securing the condemnation of the land for these streets and receiving one-half the pay for the land thus taken, which is absolutely necessary to their purposes to be taken. In other words, is there any provision made for the dedication by owners of land for streets in the opening of such streets?

Mr. HEARD. The same law in regard to dedication will obtain that now exists. The greater part of the streets opened is given by dedication. I will say further, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman's inquiry leads me to another point of difference between the two Houses.

I will say that an amendment was put upon the bill by this House which provided that in the opening of streets and avenues the Commissioners should give preference in approving the plans, for opening streets, etc., to those localities where the greatest areas might be dedicated for the purpose. That the Senate has very properly objected to, and we propose to recede from our amendment, for the reason that the gentleman states by implication, or argumentatively, for it is held by the Senate, and I think they are correct, that in some localities the dedication might be offered to such an extent as would control the action of the Commissioners in giving preference to the opening of that particular street or avenue over all others, when its opening might be of very little consequence to the public. Therefore, we think it ought to be given to the locality where the public interests call for it.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. One more question, and I will relieve the gentleman and the House. If the gentleman can not give me the present status of the law, or the present method of condemnation and payment for lands thus condemned, and if this bill does not make any change in the principle of dedicating the land of the city for streets, I would ask him what need there is for this particular legislation?

Mr. HEARD. Well, I will say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, in response to his question, that I can not be prepared to give at a moment's notice the details of every law on the statute book affecting the District of Columbia in response to any inquiry of this kind. As applied to this particular subject, it may not be unreasonable for the gentleman to ask me the condition of the law at this time. I will say to him, after having had occasion to examine the law frequently in this regard, as he probably has, that the general provision for condemnation authorizes the appointment of a jury, which takes cognizance of the matter and makes an award, reporting the fact to the courts, and the courts either confirm, reject, or modify, as the case may be. It is very much the system which is in vogue in most of the States at the present time.

I will tell the gentleman why it is necessary to pass this law for this District, aside from any resemblance it may bear to, or any divergence it may exhibit from any existing law. It is to give to the District of Columbia what it should have had long years ago; that is to say, a system under which the general plan of the city may be preserved and the streets and avenues extended towards the boundary lines of the District in a proper and systematic manner; the extensions to be continued, as far as the jurisdiction of Congress extends, in accordance with the prevailing plans of the city. It is an exceedingly important matter, and with the provision put in here as to how much may be chargeable to the property-holders of the District, and how much to the District revenues, it advises Congress, as well as the people of the District themselves, as to the extent to which they may be called upon to contribute to the expenses necessary for this part of the public service.

I regard this measure, and I speak within proper bounds when I say it is, in my opinion, the most important bill coming from the District Committee since I have had the honor of serving there, for some seven years past. For six years the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rowell] and myself tried to get a bill of this character through the House of Representatives. At the other end of the Capitol, Senator HARRIS has persistently, for the last ten years, been endeavoring to secure the passage of a bill for the general purposes of this, and we have been aided in both Houses of Congress by the active coöperation of excellent committees of both bodies. This bill is the result of the best work we can offer. It has the approval of both the House and the Senate, and is vital to the interests of the District.

The only other difference of consequence between the House and Senate, and it is absolutely necessary we should make that provision, is that as the bill came from the Senate it was provided that if the award was not accepted and provision made for payment by Congress within three months after the award was made, the work should fail, and amount to nothing.

Our House extended this provision to cover a period of six

months, but failed to provide that during that time Congress should be in session; and the Senate amendment—inasmuch as such award may be made shortly after the adjournment of Congress on the 4th of March, when the short session terminates, and when within six months Congress would not be in session again—provided that during that six months Congress may be in session and have an opportunity to act upon the award and give effect to the terms of the law, which might otherwise become inoperative.

Mr. GOODNIGHT. Let me ask the gentleman if this report directly or indirectly provides for the extension of North Capitol street to the cemetery?

Mr. HEARD. No, sir; not any more than for the extension of any other street. It is general, and does not apply to any particular street.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on this subject.

Mr. HEARD. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. BLOUNT. Well, I will be as brief as possible.

Mr. HEARD. I want to dispose of the question within the hour by demanding the previous question.

Mr. BLOUNT. I shall not occupy a great deal of time. The gentleman can dispose of it within the hour.

Mr. HEARD. Then I yield the floor, Mr. Chairman, reserving the remainder of my time.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, having had occasion to discuss this measure somewhat when it was before the House on a former occasion, and being then impressed, as I am now, with the fact that this provision involves an enormous outlay of money from the Federal Treasury—

Mr. HEARD. If my friend will allow me to correct him, I am sure—

Mr. BLOUNT. My friend from Missouri will have an opportunity to correct any misstatement that I may make hereafter.

Mr. HEARD. But I am sure the gentleman does not want to base his remarks on a wrong assumption.

Mr. BLOUNT. I say my friend will have an opportunity to correct me if I make any misstatement.

Mr. HEARD. Well, you have clearly made already a misstatement. I thought you would prefer to make your speech on a correct statement of the facts.

Mr. BLOUNT. Undoubtedly; but the difficulty is I am not willing to take my friend's statement as to the accuracy of the facts. I have a different opinion.

Mr. HEARD. Very well.

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman from Missouri has rightfully said to the House that this is the most important measure, in his judgment, which has ever come from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HEARD. Since I have been in service on it.

Mr. BLOUNT. Since the gentleman has been in service on it, and it covers quite a period. As he has stated, there has been a struggle in the House and Senate covering a long period for the purpose of bringing to fruition this measure.

The gentleman has denied the statement that I have made, that this involves the General Government in a large expenditure of money. The gentleman has said, and doubtless rightly, that in this conference report, so far as the opening of highways is concerned, the damages assessed do not come out of the general Treasury, and with that I agree; but what I wish to call the attention of the House to is that after that has been accomplished there is over and beyond it the most magnificent scheme of expenditures that was ever conceived of by the Congress of the United States. What is it? The bill declares—

That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to prepare a plan for the extension of a permanent system of highways over all that portion of said District not included within the limits of the cities of Washington and Georgetown. Said system—

Mark you! I invite the attention of the House to the character of this system—

said system shall be made as nearly in conformity with the street plan of the city of Washington as the Commissioners may deem advisable and practicable.

Further on, in reference to the maps to be made by the Commissioners, it declares:

In making such maps the Commissioners are further authorized to lay out at the intersections of the principal avenues and streets thereof, circles, or other reservations corresponding in number and dimensions with those now existing at such intersections in the city of Washington.

There is a map to be made, laying out the territory outside of the cities of Washington and Georgetown on the plan obtaining in the city of Washington, with such circles and reservations as obtain in this city. This is to pervade this entire 10 miles square. The House of Representatives placed in the bill in this connection a provision that this magnificent scheme and the expenditures attendant thereon should not be charged upon the Federal Treasury.

The conferees on the part of the House have seen fit to yield to the Senate conferees and to recede from the limitation which I have stated. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HEARD] says that they did it for the reason that we have some public works outside of these two cities. He went too far. He yielded too much. Had he made exceptions in cases where the Government was interested in the matter of its public works, then we should have found nothing to complain of in the yielding on the part of the House conferees.

Mr. McMILLIN. Does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] say that this bill provides for the laying out of the entire District on the plan of the city?

Mr. BLOUNT. I will read to my friend and let the bill answer for itself.

Mr. McMILLIN. And that that expense shall be paid by the people of the United States?

Mr. HEARD. Not one cent of it.

Mr. BLOUNT. I hope my friend from Missouri will let me answer the questions put to me.

Mr. HEARD. Well, go on.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to invite the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee and the attention of this House to this bill, which reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to prepare a plan—

I ask the attention of my friend from Tennessee to this—

That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to prepare a plan for the extension of a permanent system of highways over all that portion of said District not included in the limits of the cities of Washington and Georgetown. Said system shall be made as nearly in conformity with the street plan of the city of Washington as the Commissioners may deem advisable and practicable.

It goes on and directs the preparation of maps, and says, in that connection:

In making such maps the Commissioners are further authorized to lay out at the intersection of the principal avenues and streets thereof, circles or other reservations—

Of what sort?

corresponding in number and dimensions with those now existing at such intersections in the city of Washington.

Have I not answered the gentleman from Tennessee, and does not this bill refute the opinion expressed in the reply of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HEARD]?

Mr. HEARD. Will my friend allow me to make an inquiry?

Mr. BLOUNT. Certainly.

Mr. HEARD. Does not my friend admit that the limitation which was put in this amendment, that the expense shall be chargeable exclusively to the revenues of the District of Columbia, exempt the United States from the charge.

Mr. BLOUNT. I am going to answer my friend.

Mr. HEARD. That is the question I ask you.

Mr. BLOUNT. I answered it at the outset, and I will answer it again. I ask this House to listen to the answer. In regard to the damages for the opening of streets those damages are to be paid by the property-owners, or out of the funds of the District of Columbia in certain proportions. That is not the subject that I am discussing. I am discussing the provision in reference to the future improvement of these streets, highways, circles, reservations, etc., according to the plan obtaining in the city of Washington.

Mr. HOLMAN. After they are laid out?

Mr. BLOUNT. After they are laid out.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. Their maintenance.

Mr. BLOUNT. After the damages have all been assessed and paid.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. Their maintenance.

Mr. BLOUNT. Their maintenance and the laying out of the streets does not touch this question.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Will the gentleman from Georgia allow me a question?

Mr. BLOUNT. I will.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Do you believe that the Government of the United States will hesitate a moment to do this thing when the necessity for it occurs, and do you not believe that to provide for that necessity now will be to save money to the Government?

Mr. BLOUNT. I fear that I did not quite get the point of the question.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Whenever the necessity for extending the streets of this city occurs will not the Government see that the proper extensions are made, and remove any obstacles that may exist in the way of making such extensions?

Mr. BLOUNT. Probably.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Now, if that is true, will it not be less expensive to the people of the United States for us to provide for that now before there are any obstacles in the way rather than to wait until they occur?

Mr. BLOUNT. Ah, Mr. Speaker, that is an infinitesimally

small subject-matter compared to that which I am discussing. It is the most preposterous suggestion that could be made in connection with the magnificent proportions of this scheme, and I do not want my mind or the mind of the House diverted by these mere quibbles from the contemplation of the great scheme contained in this measure. There may be some buildings to be removed hereafter, and we may have to pay a few dollars for them, but is that a reason why we should now commit the Government of the United States to the enormous scheme of extending the plan of this city to the limits of the District and obligate it to pay one-half the cost of the work?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have suggested, as I understand it, the scope of this bill. I have not taken it from inference. I have taken it from the very terms of the bill itself. If this scheme for extending the streets of this city all over the District shall be adopted, what then? Several years ago, I think during the Forty-fifth Congress, you passed a general law providing that one-half of the expenses of the District of Columbia should be paid out of the District treasury and the other half out of the Treasury of the United States.

That is the existing law. It was passed at a time when no man foresaw any such scheme as this. It was adopted at a time when the growth of this city was somewhat at a standstill. It was adopted with but small debate. It was passed through the Congress upon the idea that the Government of the United States owned one-half of the property of the District, although when you came to investigate the matter you found that that half lay principally in the streets intended for the convenience of the property-owners. That law passed at a time when it put upon the Treasury of the United States a comparatively small burden, less than \$100,000; but under it we have gone on until we take millions out of the general Treasury.

Mr. OATES. Will the gentleman from Georgia permit a question?

Mr. BLOUNT. I prefer to go on and state in my own way and in my own order my views of this matter. That proposition was even then objectionable to my mind, and the objections to it which existed then have constantly gained importance and force, as, in the progress of time, measures like that which is now under consideration have been brought forward here, opening up in the future schemes of magnificent and profligate expenditure of the treasure of the American people. If the people of Washington desire to beautify their city, if the people of the District of Columbia desire to build palaces and paved ways, let them at least assume an equitable share of the burden, and not place it upon the people of other portions of this country.

We have reached a point now where we are proposing to go out into the country with these expenditures. What do you find now when you go beyond the present boundaries of this city? Why, sir, you find that even at the present time, under the operation of the general law of which I have spoken, beyond the limits of Washington and Georgetown these magnificent asphalt pavements are going down. You find already, in advance of this scheme, these very expenditures going on. Take the line to the Soldiers' Home, you find the asphalt pavement there. Go in almost any direction and you find the District Commissioners going out into what may be properly termed the country with these costly improvements.

Again, pass out of the city on the road connecting with the Pennsylvania avenue line to Georgetown, and you find in one place some 1,500 acres, it is stated, just outside the city limits, belonging to a syndicate. If this bill shall pass that syndicate will have the right to ask for the opening of their lands in accordance with the plan here contemplated. They are contiguous to the city, and they will bring to bear upon the Commissioners arguments to show the importance and necessity of having the circles and squares and reservations laid out according to the plan approved in this statute. Then, sir, by reason of the expenditures which you will have made from the public Treasury, those speculators will have their property beautified and adorned, and will reap from it many times the millions that you will have taken out of the public Treasury to enrich them. This is but a single illustration.

Take any road leading from this city into the country and you will find palatial residences along its line, you will find signs of the wealthy land speculator everywhere, and if you pass this bill you will soon find the Government laying out parks and squares and circles and reservations upon those lands in the country "according to the plan obtaining in the city of Washington," for that is the language of this bill. I think this report ought to be voted down. I think that when we have gone beyond the city limits, when there is no pretense that in the country the Government owns one-half the property, and when this rich prospect for the speculators begins to open up before us, we should say just here that this matter of contribution out of the general Treasury shall cease.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BLOUNT. Certainly.

Mr. HOLMAN. I did not observe carefully the character of this measure as it passed the House, but I understand the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] to say that as it passed here it contained a provision that in carrying out this general scheme beyond the limits of the city of Georgetown and Washington no part of the expense should be incurred by the United States.

Mr. BLOUNT. That was the provision.

Mr. HOLMAN. And I understand the gentleman to say that that has been stricken out.

Mr. BLOUNT. That has been stricken out, and the reason given for that action by my friend from Missouri is that the Government waterworks are outside the city limits there and that there may be some other Government work which will be required to be improved.

Mr. HEARD. Will the gentleman allow me to say that our objection to the House provision was that the amendment went much further than the gentleman suggests? It went far beyond the question of streets, avenues, and reservations, and provided that neither for those or for "any other improvement" should the Government pay anything. Now, it is in the discretion of the House to strike out those words "or any other improvement," and if it shall determine to do that it will take away the objection of the House conferees. We have no objection to the provision that the Government of the United States shall not bear any part of the expense of improvements which are pertinent to street extension, but we do believe there is a strong objection to the language of the House provision which extends it to "any other improvement."

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I wish my friend had induced the conferees to agree to the limitation that he says he is willing to accept, and I hope he will agree that this report shall be voted down, and will then meet the Senate conferees again and ask their assent to the proposition which he now seems to be willing to accept. We can not amend this conference report, but the gentleman, as a conferee of the House, can take care of its views in conference. Mr. Speaker, I have brought this subject up, having no other interest in it than this. When I first came here the District government projected a system of expenditures in this District which, after all that was contributed to it out of the Treasury of the United States, and after the expenditure of the sums assessed upon the citizens, ended with a bankrupt Treasury and \$26,000,000 of debt which the Government of the United States had to indorse.

The scheme of improvement adopted by the then District government was one which might well cover a period of twenty years. It was an imitation of the Tweed system in New York, and it fell by reason of its own rottenness and the stench which emanated from it. It is because I have that experience before my eyes that I now ask this House not to permit any local government here to inaugurate another such scheme such as is what is contemplated by this bill.

Mr. HEARD. Does not my friend know that the local government as it is now constituted can not involve the Government in one single penny of expenditure without the consent of Congress? At the time to which he refers this District had a local legislature—a lawmaking power; now it has none.

Mr. BLOUNT. And that local government involved the District in an indebtedness of \$26,000,000, which the United States had to indorse.

Mr. HEARD. Yes; they issued bonds, but they then had the power and authority to contract indebtedness and now they have no such power.

Mr. HOLMAN. They had not the authority then. Only \$10,000,000 was authorized by the original act.

Mr. HEARD. But they had a lawmaking power at that time.

Mr. BLOUNT. And they incurred that debt, and the people complained and came to Congress for relief and the Government of the United States indorsed that indebtedness of \$26,000,000.

I propose, sir, not to take a step that is not careful and guarded. I will not join in putting on the statute book a law which renders it possible for these gentlemen to make their maps and bring in their schemes, and set to work their influences of every sort in order to bring about expenditures for their benefit on the part of the Federal Government. It is idle to say that future Congresses may be relied upon to interpose an effectual restraint in this regard. This is a temporary body. Five years from now there will be here a new body not familiar with the reasons actuating us in any legislation we may adopt. By reason of this system of change there is begotten advance upon advance on the ideas embodied in legislation, until the original beginning is entirely lost sight of. Just so surely as this bill is passed in this shape, there will come out of it a monster of expenditure on the part of the Federal Treasury that will awaken the resentment of our constituents.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. The gentleman will allow me a suggestion? Suppose we guard this bill as proposed, providing that not only the origination, but the maintenance of these reservations, etc., shall be provided for from other sources than the general Treasury. What is there to prevent any future Congress providing that this expense shall be imposed upon the general Treasury?

Mr. BLOUNT. I say to the gentleman that the only security is the vigilance of Representatives. If we shall exercise the vigilance and fidelity which God has given us the opportunity to exercise on this occasion, it may inspire those who come after us to observe our action and follow the same course.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. One other question: Does not that vigilance often prove, when we rely upon it, a broken reed?

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not know exactly what my friend implies when he speaks of a "broken reed." I have seen in this House during the twenty years I have been here two conflicting ideas at work. I have seen men who believed honestly in economy in relation to public expenditures; I have seen others who cared no more as to the amounts appropriated out of the public Treasury than for the wind. Sometimes one class dominates here; sometimes another. And whatever may happen in our political affairs or the affairs of the world in general is not of so much concern to the individual Representative as that he shall observe in his conduct such integrity and business carefulness in relation to the public funds as he exacts from his neighbor and as his neighbor exacts from him in the ordinary intercourse of life.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, in calling attention to the provisions of this bill I aimed to point out the reason why the House conferees had yielded to the insistence of the Senate and receded from this amendment. Our action did not imply a recommendation for the withdrawal of any limitation on the power to appropriate money from the general Treasury for the embellishment, ornamentation, and general improvement of the circles and reservations appurtenant to the streets now in question; our idea was that the language went so far as to amount to an actual inhibition upon any improvements of any kind within the territory in question. I therefore insist, Mr. Chairman, that whatever may be the judgment of the House in this direction to the conferees on this subject, the conferees ought to be instructed to omit from the amendment the language "or other improvement."

It must be clear to the mind of every gentleman on this floor that whatever limitation we may insert now, it will be within the power of any future Congress to repeal, and if we leave out the provision suggested, no money can be expended by the District authorities, except by order of Congress. Therefore this matter is greatly magnified in importance. The question is one under the control of Congress as it may express itself on this occasion, and it is a matter which will forever continue in the power of Congress, as to whether it will carry out this ornamentation and embellishment at Government expense.

Mr. Speaker, the object of this bill is not, as the gentleman from Georgia seems to apprehend, to foster any illegitimate schemes of plunder with reference to the public Treasury. It is to provide for the extension of the streets and avenues of this District outside of the city limits upon a general plan—that and nothing more. I call attention to the fact that the area lying outside the city, as much as the area within the city limits, is under the control of Congress for legislative purposes; it is subject to the action of Congress with reference to taxation. Every one of these highways that the gentleman from Georgia talks about is constructed from taxes paid by the people, the people of the city paying in larger proportion than those outside, because within the city limits the rate of taxation is \$1.50 on every \$100 while outside it is \$1 on every \$100. It is not unnatural therefore that Congress should in the future, as it has for years past, make reasonable and proper provision for the comfort and convenience of these suburban residents since it is paid for by taxes paid by themselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to the proportion paid by the General Government towards the expenses of this District, that is a matter with which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] has had something to do, but in which I had no participation. I was not here when that scheme was adopted, when that proportion was established.

Mr. BLOUNT. As the gentleman has alluded to me, I wish to say in this connection that I did what I could to prevent the passage of that measure.

Mr. HEARD. Whether the gentleman was right or wrong in his action at that time is a point upon which I reserve my judgment. But if the proposition were presented now to diminish the percentage which the Government of the United States should pay, I should probably stand with the gentleman from Georgia in opposition to fixing it as high as one-half. I realize

the great increase in values of real estate here within the years past, so that the proportion of taxation assigned to the General Government may now be too great. But I insist, Mr. Speaker, that this bill does not affect that question a particle; because it is provided that the improvements to be made under the bill shall not be paid for out of the general Treasury.

Now, the gentleman says that Congress may make provision for the ornamentation of these reservations at public expense. But there is nothing in the bill which requires Congress to make such a provision; there is nothing imposing upon Congress any legal or moral obligation in that regard.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. If this bill should be passed in its present form might not those upon whom we are seeking to impose the expense of improving these reservations, etc., come to Congress and claim that there is an intimation in the bill that the General Government should bear this expense?

Mr. HEARD. I will say to my friend from Ohio that they could not rationally do so, because there is no such intimation in the bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to know whether the gentleman does not agree that the law providing that one-half the expenditures in this District shall come out of the Federal Treasury and one-half out of the treasury of the District of Columbia, puts property outside of the city limits on the same footing as property inside; and when these improvements shall have been inaugurated outside of the city limits under this law, will it not be just as legitimate for the District authorities to make estimates for their payment to the extent of one-half out of the Federal Treasury as with reference to improvements inside the city limits?

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, most clearly; but that has no relation to this subject at all, for the reason that this bill declares positively that the expense of all improvements made under its authority shall be paid for to the extent of one-half by assessments upon property abutting on the improvements, and as to the other half by a charge upon the revenues of the District, which are not contributed at all by the Government, but are a charge specially upon the taxpayers of the District.

Mr. BLOUNT. Does not that limitation relate simply to the matter of opening these highways; and in the future, if this bill should be passed, and a street should be paved one mile beyond the city boundary, or a circle or reservation be set apart, might not one-half of the expense be charged to the general Treasury?

Mr. HEARD. Why, Mr. Speaker, I hold the contrary, distinctly. At the same time, there is nothing in this bill to prevent any future Congress from appropriating for that sort of thing.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will my friend from Missouri be kind enough to call attention to any language which restrains or forbids any such construction as I have just indicated?

Mr. HEARD. Why, Mr. Speaker, I refer the gentleman to the language of the bill, which provides that the improvements to be made under the bill shall be chargeable, one-half to the revenues of the District and one-half to the property abutting on the improvements.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then why did you strike out the provision which forbid any money being taken out of the general Treasury for the improvement of reservations, etc., outside of the District of Columbia?

Mr. HEARD. I have no objection to the reinstatement of that part of the language which relates to circles, reservations, or parks connected with the street plan; and in view of the discussion which has been had here, and of my attention having been called to this point, I shall ask to withdraw this report so that the bill may be modified by taking out that broad language, "other improvements of the District," and yet leave it so that the operation of the bill may be limited as to any work done under the bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. I did not wish to ask too much of my friend, but if he would limit the language of the bill in the manner I have indicated it would relieve the minds of a good many members of the House.

Mr. HEARD. It is my purpose to do that. I wish, however, to say that the objection to the amendment—I call the attention of the House candidly to this matter—was that it went too far; and in view of the insistence on the part of the Senate we were disposed to yield, for the reason that not one dollar can ever be appropriated for the embellishment of any of the squares, streets, or avenues inside or outside the District without the express authority of Congress.

Now, one word further. The gentleman from Georgia knows as well as I do that it is out of the power of this Congress to prohibit any future Congress from making such appropriations as it may decide to be proper; any future Congress will be fully competent to override any limitation of that kind which we might attempt to put in the bill. Whether the proposed limitation goes into the bill or goes out of it it will be a question presenting

itself to the discretion of any future Congress as to whether it will appropriate money from the public Treasury for the improvement in whole or in part of these squares and reservations, just as similar power is exercised by Congress with reference to squares or reservations within the city limits.

Mr. BLOUNT. Does not my friend think that if such a limitation were now inserted, it would be the first thing which interested parties would undertake to get out of the way in a future Congress?

Mr. HEARD. Of course, that limitation would have to be removed or overridden. I will concede, in view of the inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE], that these people may in the future insist that as Congress has authorized the improvement of squares and reservations within the city at the public expense, it may properly be called upon to make similar provision with reference to these reservations or squares. I will admit there is some force in that suggestion. I therefore feel it my duty to ask consent of the House to withdraw this report in order that the sense of the House as I understand it, may be enforced as to striking out certain expressions contained in the bill as now agreed upon. It is my judgment, upon reflection, the matter having been brought to my attention, that there might be very properly inserted a limitation that so far as concerns the improvement of the squares and circles appurtenant to or lying adjacent to these streets, there should be no charge upon the general Treasury for their improvement.

Mr. BLOUNT. That would leave the paving of those streets in every direction still chargeable to the General Government in the same way as the paving of streets within the city limits.

Mr. HEARD. That is a matter which should be chargeable to the Treasury, because those people pay their portion of taxation just as do those inside the city limits.

Mr. BLOUNT. That is just what I think the House intended should not be authorized.

Mr. HEARD. On reflection, I think I will withdraw the remark I just made, because I may have conceded too much. I think the limitation here as to the expenditures for these improvements clearly fixes the liability upon the revenues of the District alone, so far as they are to be paid for by the public. There can be no question about that, so far as establishing streets, etc., extends. As to the improvement of streets in the District, whether inside or outside the city limits, I think the same rule of appropriation should apply, so long as the same rule exists for the taxation of both parts of the District.

Mr. BLOUNT. But why not leave the amendment just as the House put it on, with a qualification as to the ways or avenues of the Government, leading to the waterworks and similar public structures within the District?

Mr. HEARD. If the gentleman will allow me to interrupt him, I will suggest that in my judgment the proper way and the only way is this—and I will, if it be left to my choice, recommend that a limitation shall apply to all improvements made in connection with the parking, laying off, and extending the streets and avenues, circles and reservations, appurtenant thereto, but would not touch any reservation or property of the Government not made by or connected with the opening of streets, etc., under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not know what the people of the United States have to do with the petty work of planting trees along the streets of this city.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, I have said nothing about planting trees, nor does the bill under discussion.

I think the gentleman will see that as to this question of opening streets, etc., the charge is upon the property-holders along the line of the streets and avenues and the District revenues, and the only question in doubt is as to the circles, which I am perfectly willing to exclude.

Mr. BLOUNT. I entirely differ with the gentleman, I am sorry to say.

Mr. HEARD. Very well; I can not help that. I am but the agent of the House when acting in conference committee, and desire to represent its views, and will take its directions and carry them out conscientiously and in detail as far as I am able to do so. I am willing to admit that there is force in the objection made to taking out the entire limitation. I would not now be in favor myself of going that far, and I ask permission to withdraw the bill with a view to putting the qualified limitation upon it.

Mr. BLOUNT. Before that is done, if the gentleman will allow me—

Mr. HEARD. I am not ready to do so yet, but will hear the gentleman if he has a suggestion to make or a question to ask.

Mr. BLOUNT. Has the Senate acted yet upon this conference report?

Mr. HEARD. No; the House has the papers. We are to act first upon it. It is in our possession yet.

Mr. HOLMAN. The report can be withdrawn.

Mr. BLOUNT. I have no objection whatever to that. The only question is as to the better way of getting it before the conference.

Mr. HEARD. I hope the gentleman from Georgia will not resist that suggestion.

Mr. BLOUNT. I certainly shall not, and could not if I wanted to; but I will resist by way of argument everything that I do not think is proper.

Mr. HEARD. That is clearly right, and thereby the gentleman may serve the people.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. If the gentleman from Missouri desires to withdraw the bill—

Mr. HEARD. I wish to submit an observation before that. I want the House, Mr. Speaker, to thoroughly understand the condition in which this matter is placed. It is true the main feature of the bill, and all that was designed by the framers of the bill and the friends of the measure, both in Congress and the District, was to provide for the extension of the streets and avenues of the District upon a general, systematic, and thoroughly defined plan.

At present Congress is importuned, the District Committee is beset with applications—and I hope my friend from Georgia will give me his attention, for no man knows better than the gentleman from Georgia that in every instance of the extension of the streets here these appeals come up from different parts of the city, and under the system as it now prevails any particular section of the city that desires to extend a street sends its application to Congress and then has to hang around the doors of the committee room and Hall importuning members to pass a law authorizing the desired extension. That system only begets jealousy, and where there is a proposition in one quarter for such an extension there is opposition to the extension from another quarter.

But if the matter is fixed upon some general basis and the people of the District recognize that the executive officers of the District, the Commissioners, have it in their charge, in their proper discretion, of course it treats the people of all sections of the District entirely alike, and does not subject anyone to the suspicion of favoritism of one section over another. We are trying to remedy what has been shown to be an objectionable feature of the present arrangement. In doing so let us correct the bill so that no wrong can come to the United States or the treasury of the District of Columbia, and at the same time that there shall be no obstruction thrown in the way of any proper extension of the streets and avenues. This bill is recommended upon the basis of a general plan instead of carrying on the work, as now done, by piecemeal, with one part of the District appealing for an improvement and another part seeking to defeat it because of jealousy. I apprehend that a plan which allows a uniform extension, where no such charge of favoritism or special preference can be made, must commend itself to any man who gives the matter consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to say about the extravagance of this District in years gone by. It was a stench in the nostrils of the American people. But my friend knows that at that time there was suffrage in this District; that there was a city council, a Territorial Legislature, a governor; and under some semblance of law they were authorized to issue the securities of this District, and they abused that authority, as has been done by municipal boards elsewhere. Perhaps it was done here to a greater extent than anywhere else. It was a disgrace to the nation and a great burden upon our Treasury. That has been disposed of by our assumption of the debt; but the gentleman knows and the House knows that the District government as it exists to-day can not incur the expense of one dollar. They can simply make recommendations to us. That is what they are there for. It is their province to advise Congress when it seeks to legislate for the good of the District.

We can accept their suggestions when they seem to us fit for our approval, and reject them if they are not. They have no power to put a dollar of expense upon us, and I trust in God they may never have. Probably they never will have that power again. Our experience is that it is best to allow Congress to control the appropriations, when Congress has to foot the bills. Now, the gentleman has adverted to the matter of the future expense for the improvement and maintenance of parks, reservations, and streets. As I have explained, the expense to the General Government for the opening of these streets, parks, and circles will not be one farthing. Now, in view of this discussion, believing it to be the sense of the House that the provision in that respect should be better guarded, I will labor to put in a limitation which will protect us against the expenditure of any money from the general Treasury for the improvement of these reservations and circles appurtenant to the work which is proposed to be done in the bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. Do I understand my friend to say that his limitation will simply be as to parks and reservations contiguous—

Mr. HEARD. Appurtenant to this work; that is to say, the work contemplated in this bill, but not assuming to say that Congress should not legislate with regard to any other matters in the future, as may seem best at the time it may be presented.

Mr. BLOUNT. But so far as paving the streets beyond the city—

Mr. HEARD. I would leave that on the same basis as streets within the city.

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman does not propose to put any limitation on that?

Mr. HEARD. I say that is properly provided for in the law as it now exists.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will my friend agree that the limitation which the House saw fit to put upon it, expressing its own thought, shall be, so far as he is concerned, placed upon the bill now?

Mr. HEARD. I ask the House to modify that amendment. The House can do as it pleases, of course. I suggest to the House that the language ought to be modified. An attempt is being made, on a bill which provides for the extension of streets and avenues, to legislate on subjects entirely irrelevant to and far beyond that. In so far as it relates to work to be done under the contemplation of this bill, I am willing to put on the limitation; and I say to the gentleman that if it is his pleasure to offer a resolution to the House that the House direct its conferees just what to do in the premises, I have no objection.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will pardon me for the suggestion, I hope that the gentleman will, as he has indicated, withdraw the report for the present, and then the invitation on the part of the House for a future conference will be a matter for him to consider. There is some question in my mind—a conference having been had between the two Houses, and the conferees having agreed upon a report—whether it would be courteous for the House to take action under the circumstances—

Mr. HEARD. I hold, though, that it is competent for either House to instruct its conferees at any time when a conference report is before that body for its consideration. It is a part of the duty of the House and part of its privilege. There is no question about that. Yet I am perfectly willing to take the suggestion of the gentleman, for I think I know the sense of the House, and I think, perhaps, that I and my associates on the conference committee would be able to impress upon the Senate conferees the fact that this House would insist upon a limitation going so far as any work which is contemplated by this bill is concerned, that it should not be chargeable against the Federal Treasury.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to say to my friend, just there, that his colleague on the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL], as I understood him, agreed that he would not assent to any proposition binding the general Treasury for any part of the expenditures in regard to the improvements of streets, circles, and reservations outside of the city. Perhaps I ought not to say that in the absence of the gentleman, but I accepted his assurance as I understood it.

Mr. HEARD. I am very sure that if the gentleman were present, if he made any such agreement as that, he would adhere to it; but I say to my friend, that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] agreed to that conference report with me, he believing, as I did, that the limitation suggested by the House amendment was too broad. But I am satisfied now that there should be a modification of our recommendation, and that the limitation which we have agreed to strike out should not be wholly abandoned.

Mr. BLOUNT. I want to say that so far as my understanding as to what the gentleman from South Carolina stated is concerned, I state it with the qualification that I am just as likely to be mistaken as is the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HEARD. I know, and the gentleman from Georgia knows, that whenever he or the gentleman from South Carolina makes a statement as a matter of fact, it would only be a failure of the memory of either one if the statement was not correct. I know neither would misrepresent. The gentleman from South Carolina in agreeing to the report thought as I did, and the question of its acceptance is for the consideration of the House. With the consent of the House, I will withdraw the report.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. HEARD. With pleasure.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. If the report is to be withdrawn for further consideration, will not the House conferees for a moment consider the interest of a class which seems to be overlooked in the discussion—the taxpayers of this District—and try to so shape their bill so that the modest home of a poor clerk

or workingman in the eastern part of this city will not be taxed to lay out costly circles on the lands owned by men of wealth in the northwest?

Mr. HEARD. Nobody knows better than the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN], who is a good lawyer, that the conferees have no power to say who shall or shall not pay taxes for carrying on work in the District. The tax laws are general and should apply to all property alike.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. You are providing in your very conference report as to the percentage which shall be levied upon these lands, and upon the taxpayers of this District. Now, when that goes back to you for further action, you can provide for that the same as any other matter in your report; and, being a good lawyer, I assert that with emphasis.

Mr. HEARD. Has the gentleman from New Jersey any suggestion to offer to the conferees as to how they can effect any greater equality than now exists in the taxation for these purposes?

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. I have.

Mr. HEARD. What is it?

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. The same as is provided for in many cities, that the streets and circles which are laid out shall be paid for by the owners of the adjacent lands.

Mr. HEARD. I deny in toto that any improvement is for the exclusive benefit of those whose lands might adjoin. If that is the case, it would be worse than useless to open up any of these streets. It is only where it is valuable for public use that a street should be opened, and not for the benefit of the property which is adjacent.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. Ten or twenty acres immediately adjoining a city, valuable for building purposes only, becomes valuable as the lands are made accessible by the building of streets.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, I fail to see that the gentleman from New Jersey gives me any suggestion, except that he would levy the cost of the improvement entirely upon the land abutting.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. I will not detain the House, but will give my ideas to you in detail whenever you are ready.

Mr. HEARD. I am ready now.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. I will not detain the House, as I know it is anxious to get to the consideration of the tin-plate measure. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. HEARD. I know that the gentleman from New Jersey does not wish to put me in a false attitude in the matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. Not at all.

Mr. HEARD. If the gentleman wants, when we come back here with another conference report, to say that it was the sense of the House that this assessment shall be made wholly on the land abutting, I want that expression of the House made now. I am disposed to leave it as the conference report places it, and as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. COBB], who formulated the amendment of which this takes the place, is willing that it shall remain. That one-half the cost shall be assessed on the property adjoining, and one-half comes out of the revenues of the District. Now, if the House has any other view, I hope it will give us that instruction.

Mr. BLOUNT. In pursuance of the suggestion of the gentleman from Missouri, I offer the following motion:

That the House instruct its conferees to insist that a provision shall be inserted in the bill providing that any expense for improving the walks, streets, circles, avenues, or reservations outside of the cities of Washington and Georgetown, under this act, shall be chargeable against the general Treasury.

Mr. HEARD. Will my friend allow an inquiry? How are the reservations pertinent to his instructions? What connection can any of the reservations have with this bill. They may be Government reservations—for the Naval Observatory or water-works.

Mr. BLOUNT. I have no objection if my friend wants to offer an amendment in connection with the Naval Observatory.

Mr. HEARD. I do not know the name or description of all the reservations; I only thought the gentleman desired to limit it to the operation of the act as contemplated by its terms.

Mr. BLOUNT. I want to put it in here to prevent any expenditure outside of these two cities.

Mr. HEARD. What has that to do with the reservations? The language in regard to the reservations is what I am speaking of.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wanted to cover the reservations and the streets, too.

Mr. HEARD. I therefore ask the gentleman if he does not think that this bill contemplates a certain work only—the opening of streets, etc.; and if he does not think that the limitation he desires should apply only to reservations, circles, etc., made by authority of this act?

Mr. BLOUNT. Of course I mean the reservations contemplated by your map.

Mr. HEARD. Therefore I suggest to my friend that all obscurity will be avoided by saying "circles and reservations made under the provisions of this act." That will cover the case.

Mr. BLOUNT. What reservations does my friend refer to?

Mr. HEARD. I do not know all the reservations of the District. I only mean to limit this provision to the operations under this act. It will then be as broad as the gentleman from Georgia desires, and will not embarrass anything else. That has been my contention from the first.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri withdraw the conference report?

Mr. HEARD. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] proposes to offer an instruction.

The SPEAKER. That would not be in order. This conference report is an agreement.

Mr. HEARD. Then I ask permission to withdraw the report.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in order to make the proposition which the gentleman from Missouri invited me to make, I ask him to withhold his request for leave to withdraw the report, so that I may move to recommit it with instructions to agree to an amendment assessing the cost of condemnation for streets, alleys, circles, etc., upon the adjacent land benefited thereby.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New Jersey that that motion would not be in order. This is a conference report.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. I propose to recommit it to the conferees.

Mr. HEARD. I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey that that matter was all gone over in the House during his temporary absence, and very thoroughly discussed, and I think the conclusion reached is satisfactory to a large majority of the House.

If, however, there is any mistake about that, and I am permitted to act further as a conferee on this bill, I will say to the gentleman plainly that I should be in favor of bringing back a report providing as this does, that one-half of the expense should be assessed upon the District treasury and the other half upon the adjacent property. It will then be within the power of the House to accept or reject that proposition.

Mr. ATKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri whether he believes that this conference report is the best possible solution of the questions involved?

Mr. HEARD. I am not prepared to say that.

Mr. ATKINSON. I am asking for the gentleman's own judgment.

Mr. HEARD. I say I am not prepared to express an opinion upon that point. I am willing, however, to try to get a result which, according to my present views, will be more consonant with the judgment of the House.

Mr. ATKINSON. If the conclusions reached by the conferees who have given this whole subject careful attention is satisfactory to them, and if they believe it to be a good solution of the questions presented, then I shall object to withdrawal of the report, and will ask for a vote upon it.

Mr. HEARD. If the gentleman objects to the withdrawal of the report, it will be in the power of the House to reject it, so that he will not accomplish what he desires.

Mr. ATKINSON. It will also be in the power of the House to adopt the report, and if it is right, why should not we adopt it now?

Mr. HEARD. I will say to my friend candidly, that in view of what has occurred here this morning, and the discussion that has taken place, I should personally prefer to withdraw the report and make a further effort to harmonize the views of the conferees of the two bodies upon a basis more acceptable to this House.

Mr. ATKINSON. I do not see any reason why our conferees, if they have given the questions submitted to them all the attention and consideration they can, should not be sustained by the House instead of being sent back with their efforts repudiated.

Mr. HEARD. I thank my friend for his kindness and consideration, but I have stated my view as to what should be done with the report under the circumstances.

Mr. ATKINSON. But it is an improper view, and we know that the conferees do not deserve such treatment.

Mr. HEARD. I do not think they deserve it, but I would rather be permitted to withdraw the report than to have it sent back by any other action of the House.

Mr. ATKINSON. Well, I do not believe that is the proper solution of the matter.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House instruct the conferees—

The SPEAKER (interposing). The Chair will state to the gentleman from Georgia that no motion is in order except to vote the conference report up or down. The report is an agree-

ment. If the report is voted down, then it will be in order to make the motion which the gentleman contemplates.

Mr. BLOUNT. I supposed that was true; and I hope that my friend from Missouri will consent to have the report voted down *pro forma*, in order that I may have an opportunity to submit my motion, and then he can have his further conference.

Mr. BURROWS. Why will not the end be accomplished by letting the report be withdrawn with the hope of getting, by further conference, a result more in accordance with the views of the House?

Mr. BLOUNT. Because of the ruling which has just been made by the Chair, that it is necessary, under the rules, to vote the report up or to vote it down.

Mr. BURROWS. The Chair held that a motion was not in order at this time, but that the report might be withdrawn.

Mr. BLOUNT. I understood the Chair differently. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLOUNT. If the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HEARD] withdraws the conference report instead of having the House act upon it, will it then be in order to offer a resolution instructing the House conferees as to the disposition to be made of the bill?

The SPEAKER. It will not, until the subject comes before the House by a report from the committee of a disagreement.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then the only way that the House can express its sense upon this question is by voting the conference report down or voting it up?

The SPEAKER. If a conference report is an agreement, as this one is, it must be voted down before any amendments can be offered, because if it is agreed to that passes the bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. I had not intended to propose an amendment. Of course we all understand that we can not amend a conference report. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HEARD] has expressed a desire to withdraw the conference report in view of the opinions which have been expressed here, I wish to offer a resolution declaratory of the sense of the House in relation to a certain provision in the bill. In the first place, however, I would like to know whether, if the gentleman should withdraw the report, it would be competent for me to offer that resolution?

The SPEAKER. It would not.

Mr. BLOUNT. That is what I supposed all the while. Therefore, as I understand, Mr. Speaker, the only way in which the House can prevent the adoption of this provision or express its opinion upon it is by a vote on the report.

Mr. HEARD. I have asked permission to withdraw the report. The gentleman from Georgia and the House understand, of course, that the object of withdrawing the report is that we may try to make it more acceptable to this body. If we should fail in that effort the motion to reject will be competent when the question comes back. Therefore, the gentleman need not insist upon voting the report down now, I think.

Mr. BLOUNT. But, as I understand, the gentleman does not agree with some of us in the House as to what ought to be done.

Mr. HEARD. If the conferees should disagree or should fail to meet the judgment of the gentleman from Georgia when our subsequent report is presented it will be perfectly competent for him to enter his objection then and, if he deems proper, ask the House to vote down the report.

Mr. BLOUNT. That would involve another discussion before the House. It seems to me the proper course is to vote down the report, which will be equivalent to an instruction to the House conferees, and is in fact the only way we can instruct them.

Mr. HEARD. Under the circumstances I ask permission to withdraw the report.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. If the gentleman withdraws this report what will be the attitude of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The bill will be in the hands of the conferees.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. But suppose the Senate has already adopted the conference report?

Mr. HEARD. That can not be done. We have the papers and jurisdiction of the case.

The SPEAKER. The report of a conference committee is always submitted first to the House which is in possession of the papers.

Mr. BLOUNT. Before action is taken upon the request of the gentleman from Missouri, I wish to say that the modification he suggests will not accomplish the purpose. If the change which he proposes be made it would leave the existing law in operation, by virtue of which the paving of streets outside of the city limits is at this very moment going on.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. When a conference report has been made to the House, embodying an agreement between the conferees of the Senate and the conferees

of the House, is it in the power of the House conferees to withdraw that report?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman means, can it be withdrawn without unanimous consent?

Mr. MUTCHLER. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania raises the inquiry whether it is in the power of the gentleman from Missouri, after this report has been submitted and debated, to withdraw it without the consent of the House.

Mr. HEARD. That question need not be raised. I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. BLOUNT. Before that request is submitted I wish to ask the gentleman from Missouri whether he would be willing to assent to a proposition which I drew a while ago for submission to a vote—that the House instruct its conferees to insist that this provision be inserted in the bill:

Provided, That no expense for improvement and maintenance of streets, circles, avenues and reservations, outside of Washington and Georgetown, shall be chargeable against the general Treasury.

Mr. HEARD. There are two other conferees associated with me for whom I am not authorized to speak on this point. So far as I am concerned I will be perfectly candid and state that I believe the word "reservation" should be qualified so as to include simply reservations made in pursuance of this bill; it should not apply to reservations generally. I do not know how many reservations the Government may own within the District. I can not understand why the gentleman from Georgia should insist upon making the language of his proposition embrace reservations which are not contemplated to be made under this bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. Perhaps my friend and I can come to an agreement on this matter. Will he state what reservations there are in the District of Columbia outside of the limits of Washington and Georgetown?

Mr. HEARD. I do not pretend to be able to answer that question. I know, however, that there are several reservations within the District—Government reservations.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. I rise to a question of order. The gentleman from Missouri having asked unanimous consent to withdraw this report, is not this discussion out of order?

Mr. HEARD. I am perfectly indifferent as to what may be done with this report. I shall still endeavor to have this bill perfected, for I regard it as very important.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. I ask that the question be submitted to the House whether there is consent that the report be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put that request whenever the gentleman from Missouri makes it.

Mr. HEARD. I have already made the request. Probably the Chair did not understand it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood it, but the gentleman after making the request proceeded to debate the matter.

Mr. HEARD. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this report with the view of trying to harmonize it with the views of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to withdrawing the report?

Mr. BLOUNT. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. HEARD. Then let the vote be taken on agreeing to the report. I am unwilling to occupy further the time of the House. I think the House now understands the question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri demand the previous question?

Mr. HEARD. I do, unless my friend from Alabama [Mr. COBB], a member of the committee, desires to be heard.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Well, if the House wants to vote upon it now I am content, but I do not think they understand exactly what this matter is.

Several MEMBERS. Oh, yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered, under the operation of which the report was rejected.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, is it now in order to offer a resolution instructing the conferees?

The SPEAKER. It is in order to ask a further conference, and instructions are in order.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move that the House ask a further conference on this bill, and that the conferees be instructed to insist that a proviso shall be inserted in the bill in the following words:

Provided, That no expenses for improvement or maintenance of streets, circles, avenues, or reservations outside of Washington or Georgetown shall be chargeable against the general Treasury.

And on that I ask the previous question.

Mr. HEARD. Before the gentleman does that I would like to

ask a question for the information of the House and of the conferees who are to act upon this matter.

Mr. BLOUNT. I will withdraw the motion, Mr. Speaker. I think the action of the House on the conference report is a sufficient indication.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. McMILLIN. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

Mr. HOLMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour be dispensed with, and that gentlemen having reports to offer may be permitted to hand them in at the desk.

Mr. REED. I object to that.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to say to the House that the necessary joint resolution must be passed at an early moment, extending the appropriations for the current year into the next.

The SPEAKER. The committees will be called for reports.

SUITS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. RAY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back the bill (S. 1111) amending the act of Congress approved March 3, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States;" which was referred to the House Calendar.

TOWNSEND'S LIBRARY.

Mr. CUMMINGS, from the Committee on the Library, reported back the bill (H. R. 4416) authorizing the Librarian of Congress to purchase "Townsend's Library of National, State, and Individual Records, comprising a collection of historical records concerning the origin, progress, and consequences of the late civil war;" which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLICATION OF THE ELEVENTH CENSUS.

Mr. BENTLEY, from the Committee on the Census, reported back the bill (H. R. 8582) to provide for the publication of the Eleventh Census; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

EQUALIZATION OF THE PAY OF LETTER CARRIERS.

Mr. DUNPHY, from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 291) to increase and equalize the pay of letter-carriers; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. McMILLIN. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole—

Mr. HOLMAN. Before that I desire to submit a report from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McMILLIN. I withdraw the motion.

EXTENSION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. HOLMAN. I am instructed by the Committee on Appropriations to submit for present consideration the joint resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 145) to provide temporarily for the expenditures of the Government.

Be it resolved, etc., That all appropriations for the necessary operations of the Government, and of the District of Columbia, and for the payment of pensions under existing laws, which shall remain unprovided for on the 30th day of June, 1892, be and they are hereby continued and made available for a period of fifteen days from and after that date, unless the regular appropriations provided therefor in bills now pending in Congress shall have been previously made for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893; and a sufficient amount is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry on the same: Provided, That no greater amount shall be expended for such operations than will be in the same proportion to the appropriations for the fiscal year 1892, as fifteen days' time bears to the whole of said fiscal year; Provided, further, That the total expenditures for the whole of the fiscal year 1893, under the several appropriations hereby continued, shall not exceed in the aggregate the amounts finally appropriated therefor in the several bills now pending, except in cases where a change is made in the annual, monthly, or per diem compensation, or in the number of officers, clerks, or other persons authorized to be employed by the several appropriations hereby continued, in which cases the sums authorized to be expended shall equal fifteen three-hundred-and-sixty-fifths of the appropriations for the fiscal year 1892, and three hundred and fifty three-hundred-and-sixty-fifths of the appropriations contained in the several bills now pending when the same shall have been finally passed, unless the salary or compensation of any office shall be increased or diminished without changing the grade or the duties thereof, in which case such salary or compensation shall relate to the entire fiscal year and run from the beginning thereof.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the passage of this joint resolution by the two Houses is now manifestly necessary. The fourteen regular appropriation bills are in the following condition. The following have passed the Senate, and are in conference:

The agricultural, the District of Columbia, the Indian, legislative, executive and judicial, the Military Academy, naval, pension, post-office, and river and harbor appropriation bills, nine in all, are now in conference.

The following bills have been agreed upon in conference: The army, and the consular and diplomatic appropriation bills, two.

Not yet reported to the Senate from the proper committee of the Senate, three, as follows: Fortifications, sundry civil, and general deficiency appropriation bills. So that the adoption of this resolution is obviously necessary to carry on the several departments of the Government.

It has not been customary heretofore, in passing this resolution, to insert the term "pensions," as that bill has generally passed through Congress before the 1st of July. It is not certain but what the resolution would be broad enough without the insertion of "the pension appropriations;" but out of abundant caution the appropriations for pensions for the current year are included in the joint resolution. That bill—the pension appropriation bill—passed the House long since.

Mr. Speaker, without consuming the time of the House, as our time is now valuable, I ask leave to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of the condition of the fourteen appropriation bills as they passed the House of Representatives, all of the appropriation bills, fourteen in number, having passed the House prior to the 27th day of the present month. Of course it is impossible to make more than a statement of the condition of the several bills as they were passed by the House.

The statement is as follows:

Comparison of appropriations as passed by the House at this session and those made by the Fifty-first Congress at its last and first sessions.

Title.	Fifty-second Congress, first session, appropriations as passed House 1892-'93.	Fifty-first Congress, law 1891-'92.	Law 1890-'91.
Agricultural.....	\$3,210,495.50	\$3,028,153.50	\$1,799,100.00
Army.....	24,236,899.82	24,613,529.19	24,206,471.79
Diplomatic and consular.....	1,478,245.00	1,656,925.00	1,719,815.00
District of Columbia.....	4,987,580.27	5,597,125.17	5,769,544.15
Fortifications.....	2,412,376.00	3,774,803.00	4,232,935.00
Indian.....	7,437,299.44	616,386,284.86	7,262,016.02
Legislative, etc.....	21,683,752.05	22,027,674.75	21,030,752.75
Military Academy.....	298,605.18	402,054.61	435,296.11
Navy.....	23,476,773.00	31,541,654.78	324,136,035.53
Post-Office.....	78,586,632.92	77,907,232.61	72,228,668.99
Sundry civil.....	25,222,682.27	238,395,393.99	231,100,341.38
Total.....	193,121,871.45	225,330,801.49	193,910,006.72
Pension.....	134,825,096.00	135,214,785.00	98,457,461.00
River and harbor.....	21,346,975.00	(e)	25,136,295.00
Deficiencies.....	714,441,121.22	638,699,746.96	638,617,448.96
Total.....	369,735,033.67	399,245,333.45	356,121,211.68
Miscellaneous.....	2285,863.94	719,408,531.10	67,010,905.27
Total regular annual appropriations.....	364,030,897.61	418,743,864.55	363,132,116.95
Permanent annual appropriation.....	121,863,880.00	122,486,808.00	131,324,131.70
Grand total regular and permanent annual appropriations.....	485,894,777.61	541,230,672.55	494,456,248.65
Deduct pensions, including deficiencies therefor.....	142,499,398.00	164,550,383.34	123,779,308.35
Remainder.....	343,395,379.61	376,680,289.21	370,676,940.30

a Includes special appropriations for ratifying agreements, together with \$2,991,450, payment to the Choctaws and Chickasaw Nation of Indians; in all, \$8,617,740.75.

b Includes \$1,000,000 appropriated by joint resolution September 22, 1890, for nickel ore or nickel matte for naval purposes.

c Includes \$985,000 estimated expenditures under indefinite appropriation for pay and bounty claims.

d Includes \$1,362,059.16 actual expenditure under indefinite appropriation for pay and bounty claims.

e No general river and harbor act was passed for 1892.

f Includes \$7,674,332 for pensions for fiscal year 1892.

g Includes \$29,335,598.34 for pensions for fiscal year 1891.

h Includes \$25,321,907.35 for pensions for fiscal year 1890.

i This is the amount of miscellaneous appropriations made by law up to date this session.

j Includes \$15,727,000 for refund of direct taxes, estimated to be necessary under an indefinite appropriation.

k Includes \$1,000,000 for procuring farm mortgage and other statistics; \$1,364,000 for aid to agricultural colleges; \$1,200,000 for the Rock Creek Park; and \$568,085.81 for additional clerical force in pension and other offices.

l This is the amount originally submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury as estimated to be necessary under permanent specific and permanent indefinite appropriations, except that to the amount thus submitted for 1891, \$101,023,453, there is added expenditures under permanent appropriations made by the last Congress subsequent to said estimate, as follows: Salaries diplomatic and consular service, \$27,756.79; redemption national bank notes, \$23,552,298.50; expenses of Treasury notes, \$218,362.60; coinage of silver bullion, \$210,893.14; rebate tobacco tax, \$770,682.39; and repayments to importers, and for debentures and drawbacks, customs service, \$4,915,288.33; in all, \$29,695,678.70. The estimate for 1893, as stated above, includes \$48,632,000 to meet the requirements of the sinking fund for that year.

Amount of estimated revenues for fiscal year 1893..... \$375,000,000.00
Amount of estimated postal revenues for fiscal year 1893..... 80,336,350.44

Total estimated revenues for fiscal year 1893..... 455,336,350.44

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the publication in the RECORD, but as the gentleman has not submitted the matter to me, I want it coupled with authority for me to make a statement and have it published in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection these requests will be granted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a word before that is finally passed on. I want to offer a few words on this statement. It is a statement that just came into my hands a few minutes ago, and makes a comparison between the appropriation bills as they have passed the House at this session and the laws of 1890-'91 and 1891-'92. It makes no comparison as between the bills that passed the House at this session and the appropriation bills that passed the House of Representatives at the first session of the last Congress, or of any session of Congress. That sort of a statement going to the country would be misleading, and I feel it to be my duty at this time, in addition to the privilege granted by the House to file at my convenience a full statement, to show that it is unusual at this time and this stage of the proceedings of Congress in respect to appropriation bills to make such a statement.

But it has been usual for both sides of the Committee on Appropriations, after the Congress has finished its work on appropriation bills, to make a statement to the country in respect to the condition of the appropriation bills. In addition to that, I wish to say this: That the total of the appropriation bills as they have passed this House at this session amounts to \$485,884,777.61, while the total of the appropriation bills that passed the House at its first session in the Fifty-first Congress (and this includes the permanent appropriations in both cases as originally estimated for by the Secretary of the Treasury) was \$443,475,665.87.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman allow me right there?

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Allow me to finish my statement. So that the aggregate of the appropriation bills as they have passed this Congress at this session as compared with the aggregate of the appropriation bills as they passed at the first session of the last Congress is greater in this session by \$42,409,111.74. [Applause on the Republican side.]

That fact, Mr. Speaker, ought to go to the country with the quiet little statement which has been submitted by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Will the gentleman wait until I get through with my statement? In addition to that, I feel it to be my duty to say that if there should be an increase made, gentlemen thinking that the pension appropriations have made this large increase, I will relieve their minds by this additional statement, that the total pension appropriations that have passed the House at this session are \$142,499,398, including deficiencies, the deficiencies amounting to \$7,674,332, whereas the pension appropriations at the first session of the Fifty-first Congress amounted to \$164,550,333.34, being an amount in excess of the pension appropriations of this session of \$22,050,935.34.

Mr. GROUT. For pensions.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. For pensions.

In addition to that, I desire to say that the pension appropriation bill, as it passed this House, amounted to \$134,000,825.66 for the next fiscal year, 1893, while the expenditures for the current year amounted to \$142,000,000, and it is evident that the necessities of the Government for pensions for 1893 will be at least \$12,000,000 more than has been appropriated for that year by this House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel it to be my duty to make this simple statement, and to call the attention of the House and of the country to the fact that the statement submitted is a comparison between the bills of this House and the laws enacted by the last Congress.

Mr. SAYERS. At what amount do you put the permanent appropriations made at the first session of the Fifty-first Congress?

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. I put the amount just at the figures as originally estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury and as given me by the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations. We are discussing appropriations as they appear upon their face; not expenditures as they have been or may be made.

Mr. SAYERS. I ask the gentleman to give me the figures.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. I assume that the gentleman is referring to the amount that was turned in under the act of 1890, the silver act, so called.

Mr. SAYERS. No, sir; I want to know the exact amount at

which the gentleman puts the permanent appropriations for the first session of the Fifty-first Congress?

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. I have given the exact amount of the bills and of the laws as given to me by the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations. I asked him to make the figures from the law and from the bills.

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman does not answer my question.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. I have answered it fully.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have not had an opportunity to verify the figures presented by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON], but they are undoubtedly correct. I take that for granted, because he says he got them from the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, whom we all regard as entirely non-partisan in such matters.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. He simply gave me the figures that I asked for in the aggregate.

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes; and, as my friend knows, he is the highest authority upon such subjects. He has been clerk of the committee for many years, in both Republican and Democratic Houses. I speak of this merely to show the absolute confidence with which his figures may be received.

The statement I have before me is made out somewhat differently. It shows the appropriations made by this House up to the present time to be \$485,844,777.61. The appropriations made for 1891-'92 were \$541,230,672.55. The appropriations made at the first session of the last Congress (1890-'91) were \$494,456,248.61. That is the state of the account, including pensions. Excluding pensions and pension deficiencies, deducting them, the amount of the appropriations as proposed by the House appropriation bills is \$343,385,379.61. For the present fiscal year (1891-'92), deducting pensions, the amount appropriated is \$376,680,289.21.

For the first session of the last Congress (1890-'91) deducting pensions, the appropriations were \$370,676,880.30. So it will be seen that the appropriations covered by the appropriation bills passed this session by the House are lower by from twenty to thirty million dollars, deducting pensions, than the appropriations at either of the two sessions of the Fifty-first Congress. That is all I desire to say, and if no other gentleman wishes to be heard, I call for the previous question.

Mr. SAYERS. I ask the gentleman to withhold that. I want to say a few words on this subject.

Mr. HOLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. REED. Before the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] sits down, I would like to ask him if it is a fact that the regular and permanent appropriations for this session of Congress are likely to be over \$500,000,000?

Mr. HOLMAN. I can only answer that question by the statement that I have shown what the appropriations are as covered by the bills which have passed this House. It is impossible for any person to anticipate whether there will be any increase or not.

Mr. REED. Is it not probable that they will be over \$500,000,000?

Mr. HOLMAN. I can not tell what the action of the Senate may be.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts (to Mr. REED). Do your own figuring.

Mr. REED. What is the remark?

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Do your own figuring.

Mr. REED. I really was not doing myself the honor to address the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. But I was listening to the gentleman, and addressing him.

Mr. HOLMAN. The amounts which have been appropriated by the House in these various bills are ample, and more than ample, to carry on this Government in every one of its departments.

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman from Indiana frankly answer my question?

Mr. HOLMAN. I will not answer any question more fully than I have done. I have stated what the House has done.

Mr. REED. Will not the appropriation bills—

Mr. HOLMAN. I say that if the Senate increases the amounts carried by these bills it will do so wrongfully; that the bills cover all that is required.

Mr. REED. I will ask my friend—

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. I will answer the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. REED. I would like to have an answer.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. There is no gentleman on the Appropriations Committee who does not know that the amount of these bills must go over \$500,000,000. And that is not all. There is no conference committee that does not know it must agree to Senate propositions absolutely demanded by the necessities of the Government.

Mr. REED. Then the gentleman from Indiana, instead of giving the House and the country economy, has only given them evasion. That is a fact, is it not?

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. That is a question which gentlemen must answer for themselves.

Mr. REED. He has given us bookkeeping, instead of virtue! [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. DOCKERY. In that connection, I wish to say, we have had no assistance from that side of the House in our efforts to keep down the appropriations. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. The gentleman from Missouri knows that I have coöperated in striking out everything that seemed improper. On the deficiency bill I helped to strike out over \$6,000,000. But I have contended and struggled for such expenditures as were demanded by reasonable men to run a great government economically, but wisely and truly.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, the record will bear me witness that the Republican side of the House has persistently sought to increase the appropriations reported by the Committee on Appropriations in every instance where they have come before the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And it has been done for the purpose of endeavoring to vindicate the action of the last Congress. [Renewed applause.]

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. The record of this House will condemn that statement, as will the committee records.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen will please suspend their remarks. The Chair wants to ascertain who is entitled to the floor.

Mr. DOCKERY. I had it, but the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] took it away from me.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Iowa, if he wishes to occupy the floor.

Mr. REED. I wish to ask the gentlemen from Iowa another question—whether we really have anything in the nature of economy left except the resolution introduced at the beginning of the session by the gentleman from Indiana and passed by the House; in short, whether there is anything left belonging to the shop except the sign? [Laughter.]

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention very briefly to the statement submitted by the gentleman from Iowa. I hold in my hand the statement which he proposes to insert in the RECORD as a part of his speech, and I propose to demonstrate to this House and to the country its incorrectness.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. The gentleman will allow me to say that those are the figures I have already given, as furnished by the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations. The other statement I am going to give at my leisure.

Mr. SAYERS. Very well; the gentleman hands me the statement upon which he bases the sum total of the figures he has given to the House; and in this statement he makes the permanent appropriations for the first session of the Fifty-first Congress \$101,628,453, whereas in truth and in fact, as is shown by the estimates furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury, those permanent appropriations amounted to \$147,598,288.07. In other words, he has given the appropriations which are justly chargeable against the first session of the Fifty-first Congress at \$34,448,338.15 less than they really were, after deducting the direct tax, amounting to \$11,521,496.92 expended in 1891.

Mr. DOCKERY. A mistake of only \$34,000,000.

Mr. SAYERS. That is all.

But, Mr. Speaker, because I desire to deal fairly with the House and the country I will say that the sum of \$147,598,288.07 to which I have alluded contains an item amounting to \$11,521,496.92 for refunding the direct tax. This latter sum, though expended during 1891, was not appropriated for until the second session of the Fifty-first Congress. It should, therefore, not be counted as a charge against the first session of the Fifty-first Congress.

The gentleman from Iowa also says that we ought not to institute a comparison between the present session of this Congress and the second session of the Fifty-first Congress. Why not? The gentleman knows very well that at the first session of the Fifty-first Congress the customs administrative act was passed, for which no appropriation was then made, but which comes down to us entailing an increased expenditure of \$5,000,000. A bounty on sugar was also then provided for, and which will cost this session of Congress at least \$8,000,000; and in addition to these the dependent pension bill of June 27, 1890, which will require an appropriation by this Congress of about \$49,000,000 more. In other words, the present session of Congress will have to provide for at least sixty-two or sixty-three millions of dollars more than was incumbent upon the first session of the Fifty-first Congress in consequence of laws passed by that Congress. But when a comparison is instituted between the appropriations of the present session and those of the second session of the last Congress,

there will be found a difference in favor of this session of fully \$60,000,000, and perhaps more.

Now, I challenge the gentleman from Iowa, either now or at any other time when he has arranged his figures and estimates, to successfully controvert the fact that \$101,628,453, as given by him, is at least \$34,000,000 less than is properly chargeable against the first session of the Fifty-first Congress. Here is the book from which I quote. He has it in his hands. Let him explain the discrepancy if he can.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Texas is very skillful in presenting his points and figures; but if he will read this record as it is he would not give the figures he has given, and certainly would not give them with so much confidence.

Mr. SAYERS. Read them.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. These figures of \$147,598,000 are the amounts expended for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891.

Mr. SAYERS. I said so.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Whereas I have sent for the estimates for that year and the amounts estimated are found in the regular Book of Estimates for 1891, and as given by the Secretary of the Treasury are exactly as the clerk of the Appropriations Committee gave them and as I gave them to the House, amounting to \$101,628,453. The gentleman is taking the appropriations given in the subsequent Book of Estimates and adding everything of that kind. He is reading from the Book of Estimates for 1892 and 1893. I hold the Book of Estimates for 1890 and 1891, the period under discussion. Here is the book to show for itself. And now I challenge the gentleman here or elsewhere to contradict the accuracy of my statement.

Mr. SAYERS. I will answer the challenge of the gentleman right now. The gentleman reads from the estimates that were originally made to the first session of the Fifty-first Congress; but when the Secretary of the Treasury revised his estimates for the second session of that Congress it was seen that his estimates for 1891 were \$126,703,149.72 instead of \$101,628,453—an increase of more than \$25,000,000—and in his estimates to this Congress the amount of indefinite and permanent appropriations for 1891 was fixed at \$147,598,288.07. Deducting \$11,521,496.92 for refunding the direct tax, and we have \$136,076,791.15 as properly chargeable against the first session of the Fifty-first Congress in the way of permanent and indefinite appropriations, instead of \$101,628,453, as given by the gentleman from Iowa, a difference of \$34,448,338.15.

I do not speak of the estimates sent to the first session of the Fifty-first Congress, because they were too small, as was shown by subsequent estimates from the Treasury Department; but if gentlemen will examine the estimates sent to the second session of the Fifty-first Congress and also to this Congress they will see that I have correctly given the estimates for permanent and indefinite appropriations for 1891, which are justly chargeable against the first session of the Fifty-first Congress.

Mr. SCOTT. You are speaking now of the revised estimates.

Mr. SAYERS. I quote from the revised estimates.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. But the gentleman is adding appropriations and seeking to incorporate them to make up his figures. Of course the definite and specific appropriations are as well known to the Secretary of the Treasury as anything can be. But the gentleman is trying to ring in another lot of appropriations to make up his \$147,000,000.

Mr. SAYERS. No, sir; I am not. And to show that the direct tax was not known to the Secretary of the Treasury at the time he made his estimates, of which the gentleman speaks, it is only necessary to say that the direct-tax bill was not passed until the closing hours of the second session of the Fifty-first Congress. The appropriation for this purpose for 1891 amounting to \$11,521,496.92, I have deducted from \$147,598,288.07 because of that fact.

The gentleman from Iowa is off his balance. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] in January last made a statement to this House drawing a comparison between the Fifty-first and Fiftieth Congresses, and exhibited the figures which the gentleman from Iowa is using. But when he revised his remarks he adopted the estimates which I now use—that is, \$147,598,288.07.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman from Iowa permit me to ask the gentleman from Texas a question?

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. REED. Does the gentleman from Texas deny that the appropriations for this session will be \$500,000,000?

Mr. SAYERS. If this House should have its own way—

Mr. REED. The House will notice that I am not getting an answer.

Mr. SAYERS. I do not intend to hold the Democratic side of this House responsible for Republican extravagance; but I mean to say this: that if this side of the House will maintain the

ills as they have been passed by the House, the appropriations will not reach \$500,000,000.

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman answer me, because it is better to be frank than to be victorious. [Laughter.]

Mr. SAYERS. I will endeavor to be as frank as the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. DOCKERY. We are liable to be both.

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman from Texas say that he does not think the appropriations for this session will reach over \$500,000,000.

Mr. SAYERS. I do not think they will.

Mr. REED. How much short will they be?

Mr. SAYERS. If you will tell me what the Senate will do—

Mr. REED. Never mind that. Give me your judgment.

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman's question is not as specific as it ought to be.

Mr. REED. Oh!

Mr. SAYERS. But if he will tell me how economical or how extravagant the Senate will be, I will answer his question. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. REED. You see and the House will see the difficulty we have in getting at the facts in this case. I did not really expect the gentleman from Indiana to answer me. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Texas I did, and he has answered enough; and the gentleman from Indiana has refused to answer enough to make it perfectly apparent to this House that the appropriations, permanent or otherwise, for the expenditures of the Government for the first session of the Fifty-second Congress will be \$500,000,000 or upwards. This by-play about what the Senate is liable to do is a mere political fling.

The Senate is a coördinate branch of the Government. Of course some of us who are unable to get there would be very glad to abolish it. [Laughter.] But it exists, and is a factor in the history of the country. It was a factor in the history of the last Congress, and will be in this; and it is perfectly apparent that the expenditures are going to be finally, with the sanction of this Democratic House, \$500,000,000 for the first session, whereas they were but \$461,000,000 at the first session of the Fifty-first Congress.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. REED. Allow me to elaborate this first. Now, the point is this: The Democracy made enormous statements in regard to the wickedness of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-first Congress, and especially because it was not economical like the gentleman from Indiana.

Now, this economical Democratic House is three to one Democratic, and of course we Republicans have not influenced it so much as the gentleman from Missouri, in his inflamed imagination, supposes we have. Of course we Republicans have been the most conspicuous figures in this Congress, on account of our evident anxiety for honest, upright, and fair dealing. [Great laughter and applause.] Nevertheless, I confess that all this talk about our having dominated the House is more than I can admit. [Laughter.] We ought to have done it. But we find that this economical Democratic House—three to one Democratic—has raised the expenditures of this Government something like \$35,000,000, probably \$40,000,000.

Mr. SCOTT. Has not your side advocated those increases?

Mr. REED. Now, if it was wicked for us to spend \$461,000,000 for this country, what must it be for the friends of economy to spend \$35,000,000 more?

Mr. GROUT. That is easily answered under the rule of three.

Mr. REED. That is a perfectly fair inference.

Mr. SCOTT. Has not your side advocated those increased expenditures?

Mr. REED. Our side, when you are three to one! Do not plead the baby act, whatever you do. [Great laughter.]

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman, who is frank—

Mr. REED (interrupting). Quite so, and I am going to be franker before I get through. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCOTT. I suppose so. Now, will the gentleman from Maine, who asks for frankness, be frank enough to answer the question, whether in the case of every single item that has been raised in this House the increase has not been voted for by his side of the House?

Mr. REED. Well, I should say no to that broad question; but the truth is we have advocated the raising of a good many items, and we have done it for the reason that we believe that this is a growing country, and that its expenditures are necessarily large, and you yourselves have had to admit it. What I am pointing out to you is the unspeakable and ineffable humbug of your talk two years ago. [Laughter.] I am trying to bring Democracy face to face with itself. I am trying to bring its talk into the usual contradiction of its action.

Mr. SCOTT. You are a sort of Moses of the Democracy. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Moses! No; I could not lead you fellows into the light. [Laughter.] What would be the use? You have not got any eyes to see if you were led there. [Laughter.] You do not do this on purpose; you do not do it intelligently; you have not made these increases on account of your superior intelligence; you have done it because you have been driven to it in spite of your ignorance. [Laughter.] You have had to do it, and that is all the good that we ever get out of the Democratic party. The people of the United States are so much superior to it, and circumstances outside of it are so controlling, that it furnishes another instance where the Lord makes the wrath of man to praise Him and restrains the remainder of wrath. [Laughter.] Why, just contrast yourselves with yourselves. Just think of your attitude as you started out in this Congress with a broad placard upon your breasts passed by your own votes, reading: "Look at us; see how economical we are;" and now look at your results: \$40,000,000 more than what you called "wicked" in the last Congress! [Laughter.]

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not follow the gentleman from Maine into the domain of wit and satire and invective, in which arena he is so accomplished a master, but in reply to his suggestion I desire to invite the attention of the House to the fact that the extraordinary appropriations made by the last Congress, of which the country complained, were made at the second session and not at the first. [Cries of "No!" "No!" on the Republican side.]

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that although the appropriations made at the first session of that Congress were out of the usual order, it was not those appropriations of which the country especially complained, but it was the appropriations which were made at the second session of that Congress. The gentleman states that the appropriations made at the first session of the Fifty-first Congress aggregated \$461,000,000. I do not concede the accuracy of that statement, but, admitting it for the moment, will the gentleman say to the House and to the country that the ordinary and normal growth of the appropriations should have been \$80,000,000 in one year?

The appropriations at the first session of that Congress amounted, as the gentleman says, to \$461,000,000, whilst the appropriations at the second session of that Congress, according to the statement of the clerks of the House and Senate appropriation committees, aggregated \$525,000,000; an increase of \$80,000,000; including the indefinite appropriations for the direct tax, back pay, and bounties, and the bounty on sugar. So that when we come to look at the total appropriations made by the Fifty-first Congress, we find that the growth of appropriations from the first session of that Congress to the second was more than \$80,000,000, and yet the gentleman from Maine speaks here of the Democratic party as though it was a clog on the wheels of progress, because we object to this enormous and unnecessary increase.

Mr. REED. Oh, no! I never did anything so superfluous as to say that. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOCKERY. You did not?

Mr. REED. Never. That goes without saying. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. DOCKERY. I am glad to have the gentleman's correction of his statement. Now, Mr. Speaker, the increase of \$80,000,000 in the appropriations of this Government in one year was altogether out of proportion to the requirements of the public service. But, Mr. Speaker, why was that increase of \$80,000,000 made? I will tell you why it was made, and I am sure that gentlemen on this side of the House will verify the accuracy of my statement. It was made for the purpose of depleting the Treasury so as to hamper, if possible, the efforts of the Democratic party in the direction of tariff reduction. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the reason why you resisted our efforts to cut down the appropriations; you thought to deplete the Treasury; and your purpose in doing that was to hinder, delay, and impede the efforts of the Democratic party toward lifting the taxes from the shoulders of the people of this country.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] has been indulging in the usual Democratic method. He has been taking to himself and his party credit for virtues which the Democratic party intends to exhibit. Now, with such credit as that on its side even the Democratic party can be raised to par; but no Democratic Congress has ever been so raised by virtues which it actually exhibited. The comparison which we make is a comparison of fact with fact; the comparison which the gentleman undertakes to make is a comparison between fact and fancy.

Mr. DOCKERY. Not at all.

Mr. REED. If they have beaten us \$40,000,000 on the first session, what shall we expect on the second?

Mr. DOCKERY. I deny the accuracy of the gentleman's statement.

Mr. REED. Now, the truth is that is the way the Democracy always talk. It is beautiful in the future. Its face is always turned toward some sort of gaslight; but you never catch the Democratic party doing anything that comes up to its anticipations. The gentleman from Missouri, as well as every other Democrat in this House, knows that not a single convention of theirs has ever dared to denounce any item in the bills that were passed by the Republican House of the Fifty-first Congress. They have never dared to offer to repeal any of those bills. They talk about pensions; but they do not dare to undertake to undo what we have done. They talk about various things connected with this matter; but they do not dare to act. They give us book-keeping and language, whereas they ought to give us facts and deeds. Juggling with figures is a poor substitute for the beautiful economy so loudly proclaimed.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add one word—

Mr. HOLMAN. How much time does the gentleman desire? Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. I wish to add a word in reply to my friend from Missouri. I do not care to occupy more than two or three minutes.

Mr. HOLMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa three minutes.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, everyone familiar with the appropriations as they have been framed and passed through this House at the present session must know that the impending Presidential campaign has forced you gentlemen on the other side to an extreme which nothing else could effect, and that at the next session, instead of appropriating simply \$485,000,000, which your bills now aggregate, you will be compelled yourselves, by deficiencies and otherwise, to make appropriations exceeding \$500,000,000. You will be compelled yourselves to tip the beam at as high a point, if not higher, than the second session of the Fifty-first Congress. You are compelled to admit now that at least \$12,000,000 of the remaining \$14,000,000 required to bring your bills up to \$500,000,000 will be demanded for pensions alone in 1893, saying nothing of the "cuts and slashes" that have been made all along the line. This is all I wish to say.

Mr. HOLMAN. I call for the previous question. The previous question was ordered; and under the operation thereof the joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HOLMAN, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. McMILLIN. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering bills raising revenue.

Mr. BURROWS. I wish to inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee whether it is the intention to take up in Committee of the Whole the tin-plate bill?

Mr. McMILLIN. It is the purpose to take up the bill reducing the duty on tin plate.

Mr. BURROWS. I move, then, that the House take a recess until 4 o'clock.

Mr. PAYNE. I move to amend that motion by naming 5 o'clock instead of 4.

Mr. DALZELL. I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] by striking out "5" and inserting "6."

Mr. ANDREW. I hope gentlemen on the other side are not going to filibuster against relieving the necessities of the people.

The question being taken on Mr. DALZELL'S amendment to the amendment of Mr. PAYNE, there were—ayes 3, noes 163.

Mr. BURROWS. Is that a quorum?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. BURROWS. I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the point that no quorum has voted. The Chair will appoint tellers. [A pause.] The Chair finds that the vote is just one short of a quorum. The Chair might vote to make a quorum.

Mr. REED and others. Too late! [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as tellers the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN].

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 0, noes 168.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURROWS. I think we had better have the yeas and nays on this.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan demands the yeas and nays.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HERBERT. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a privileged report. I am instructed by the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the naval appropriation bill to submit the report I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The report will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7093) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, having met, after full and free conference have been unable to agree.

HILARY A. HERBERT,
WILLIAM ELLIOTT,
H. C. LODGE,
Managers on the part of the House.
EUGENE HALE,
WILLIAM B. ALLISON,
A. P. GORMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HERBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate, and ask a further conference.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. HERBERT, Mr. ELLIOTT, and Mr. LODGE as managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. On the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the House take a recess until 6 o'clock, the gentleman from Michigan demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, not voting 156; as follows:

YEAS—1.

Shonk.

NAYS—171.

Abbott,	Coombs,	Herbert,	Pearson,
Alderson,	Covert,	Holman,	Pendleton,
Alexander,	Cox, N. Y.	Hooker, Miss.	Pierce,
Andrew,	Cox, Tenn.	Johnson, Ohio	Robertson, La.
Arnold,	Crawford,	Johnstone, S. C.	Rockwell,
Babbitt,	Crosby,	Jones,	Sayers,
Bailey,	Culberson,	Kem,	Scott,
Baker,	Cummings,	Kilgore,	Seerley,
Bankhead,	Daniell,	Kribbs,	Shell,
Beeman,	Davis,	Kyle,	Shively,
Beltzhoover,	De Armond,	Lanham,	Snodgrass,
Bentley,	De Forest,	Lapham,	Snow,
Bland,	Dickerson,	Lawson, Va.	Sperry,
Boatner,	Dixon,	Lawson, Ga.	Stevens,
Branch,	Dungan,	Layton,	Steward, Ill.
Brawley,	Dunphy,	Lester, Ga.	Stewart, Tex.
Breckinridge, Ark.	Durborow,	Little,	Stout,
Bretz,	Edmunds,	Livingston,	Stump,
Brickner,	Elliott,	Long,	Tarsney,
Brookshire,	Ellis,	Lynch,	Terry,
Brown,	English,	Mallory,	Tillman,
Brunner,	Epes,	Mansur,	Tracey,
Bryan,	Everett,	McAleer,	Tucker,
Buchanan, Va.	Fellows,	McCreary,	Turner,
Bullock,	Fitch,	McGann,	Turpin,
Bunn,	Forney,	McKaig,	Van Horn,
Bunting,	Fyan,	McMillin,	Warner,
Busby,	Gantz,	McRae,	Warwick,
Butler,	Geissenhainer,	Meredit,	Washington,
Bynum,	Gillespie,	Montgomery,	Watson,
Cable,	Goodnight,	Moore,	Wheeler, Ala.
Cadmus,	Grady,	Moses,	Wheeler, Mich.
Campbell,	Greenleaf,	Mutchler,	White,
Capehart,	Hall,	Oates,	Whiting,
Caruth,	Halvorson,	O'Ferrall,	Wilcox,
Castle,	Hamilton,	O'Neil, Mass.	Williams, Mass.
Chipman,	Hare,	Otis,	Williams, Ill.
Clarke, Ala.	Harries,	Outhwaite,	Wilson, Mo.
Clover,	Harter,	Owens,	Wilson, W. Va.
Cobb, Ala.	Hayes, Iowa	Page, R. I.	Winn,
Cobb, Mo.	Haynes, Ohio	Parrett,	Wise,
Coburn,	Heard,	Patterson, Tenn.	Yountans,
Compton,	Henderson, N. C.	Paynter,	

NOT VOTING—156.

Allen,	Buchanan, N. J.	Craig, Pa.	Gorman,
Amerman,	Burrows,	Crain, Tex.	Griswold,
Atkinson,	Bushnell,	Curtis,	Grout,
Bacon,	Byrns,	Cutting,	Hallowell,
Bartine,	Caldwell,	Dalzell,	Harmer,
Barwig,	Caminetti,	Dingley,	Hatch,
Belden,	Catchings,	Doan,	Haugen,
Bellnap,	Cate,	Dockery,	Hemphill,
Bergen,	Causey,	Dolliver,	Henderson, Iowa
Bingham,	Cheatham,	Donovan,	Henderson, Ill.
Blanchard,	Chapin,	Enloe,	Hermann,
Blount,	Clancy,	Enochs,	Hitt,
Boutelle,	Clark, Wyo.	Fitchian,	Hoar,
Bowers,	Cockran,	Flick,	Hooker, N. Y.
Bowman,	Cogswell,	Forman,	Hopkins, Pa.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Coolidge,	Fowler,	Hopkins, Ill.
Broderick,	Cooper,	Funston,	Houk, Ohio
Broslus,	Cowles,	Geary,	Houk, Tenn.

Huff,	Meyer,	Raines,	Stone, W. A.
Hull,	Miller,	Randall,	Stone, Ky.
Johnson, Ind.	Milliken,	Ray,	Storer,
Johnson, N. Dak.	Mitchell,	Rayner,	Sweet,
Jolley,	Morse,	Reed,	Taylor, Ill.
Kendall,	Newberry,	Relly,	Taylor, Tenn.
Ketcham,	Norton,	Reyburn,	Taylor, E. B.
Lagan,	O'Donnell,	Richardson,	Taylor, J. D.
Lane,	O'Neill, Pa.	Rife,	Taylor, V. A.
Lester, Va.	O'Neill, Mo.	Robinson, Pa.	Townsend,
Lewis,	Page, Md.	Rusk,	Wadsworth,
Lind,	Pattison, Ohio	Russell,	Walker,
Lockwood,	Patton,	Sanford,	Waugh,
Lodge,	Payne,	Scull,	Weadock,
Loud,	Peel,	Simpson,	Wever,
Magner,	Perkins,	Smith,	Wike,
Martin,	Pickler,	Springer,	Williams, N. C.
McClellan,	Post,	Stahnecker,	Wilson, Ky.
McDonald,	Powers,	Stephenson,	Wilson, Wash.
McKeehan,	Price,	Stockdale,	Wolverton,
McKinney,	Quackenbush,	Stone, C. W.	Wright.

So the motion was rejected.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. BLAND with Mr. DINGLEY.

Mr. HATCH with Mr. HARMER.

Mr. HERBERT with Mr. BOUTELLE.

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. WILSON of Kentucky.

Mr. PATTISON of Ohio with Mr. DOAN.

Mr. STONE of Kentucky with Mr. MORSE.

Mr. COCKRAN with Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. STOCKDALE with Mr. BRODERICK.

Mr. AMERMAN with Mr. RUSSELL.

Mr. WEADOCK with Mr. RANDALL.

Mr. FORMAN with Mr. STEPHENSON.

Mr. HOAR with Mr. QUACKENBUSH.

Mr. CRAIG of Pennsylvania with Mr. BELDEN.

Mr. COWLES with Mr. KETCHAM.

Mr. MCCLELLAN with Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota.

Mr. FITHIAN with Mr. TAYLOR of Illinois.

Mr. REILLY with Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEARY with Mr. SANFORD.

Mr. PEEL with Mr. WILSON of Washington.

Mr. ANDREW with Mr. WALKER.

Mr. CAUSEY with Mr. SHONK.

Mr. COOLIDGE with Mr. CURTIS.

For this day:

Mr. LAGAN with Mr. MILLIKEN.

Mr. SPRINGER with Mr. HITT.

Mr. BYRNS with Mr. DOLLIVER.

Mr. NORTON with Mr. LODGE.

Mr. ENLOE with Mr. LIND.

Mr. MARTIN and Mr. PICKLER are paired for three days.

Mr. BARWIG and Mr. HAUGEN are paired until otherwise ordered.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina in the chair). The question now recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from New York to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the House take a recess until 5 o'clock.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 0, noes 101.

Mr. PAYNE. No quorum.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* announced the appointment of Mr. PAYNE and Mr. McMILLIN as tellers.

The House again divided.

Pending the announcement of the vote

Mr. PAYNE withdrew the point of no quorum.

The tellers reported—ayes 0, noes 122.

So the House refused to agree to the amendment.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a conference report, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] submits a conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill. The report is very long, and without objection the Clerk will read the statement of the House conferees, and the conference report will be printed in the RECORD.

The conference report is as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6746) "making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 40, 41, 53, 54, 61, 63, 64, 67, 70, 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 103, 104, 105, 112, 113, 114, 116, 118, 124, 125, 126, 127, 129, 130, 133, 142, 143, and 146.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 18, 23, 37, 44, 45, 55, 56, 57, 58, 65, 68, 73, 75, 85, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 100, 106, 107, 111, 115, 122, 131, 140, and 145, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$25,250;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$13,200;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$42,430;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,600;" and on page 6, in line 14 of the bill, strike out the word "hereafter" and insert in lieu thereof the words "after December 31, 1892;" and on page 6, in line 27 of the bill, strike out the word "hereafter" and insert in lieu thereof the words "after December 31, 1892;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided further, That the register of wills may designate one of the employés in his office, to be paid at not exceeding the rate of \$1,500 per annum, out of such fees and emoluments, who shall be authorized hereafter in the necessary absence or inability of the register, from any cause, to perform his duties without additional compensation;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following: "And the salary of the deputy recorder of deeds shall hereafter be \$1,800 per annum, to be paid out of the fees and emoluments of said office of recorder of deeds;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following:

"That whoever, not being a Senator or Representative in Congress, intends to present to Congress a bill for an act of incorporation, or for an alteration or extension of the charter of a corporation in the District of Columbia, or for any special privileges in said District, shall give notice of such intention by publishing a copy of the bill at least once a week for four successive weeks in a newspaper published in the District of Columbia, the last of said publications to be made at least fourteen days prior to the presentation of such bill. Such newspaper shall be designated by the person proposing the bill, and approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$7,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$270,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$24,300;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$98,752;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$36,747;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$51,305;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$58,805;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of said amendment, after the word "and," insert the words "one-half of;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$90,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided further, That the detailed plans for said sewer shall be approved by a consulting civil and sanitary engineer, who shall be selected by the President for that purpose, and whose services shall be paid for from this appropriation at a rate to be fixed by the President;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$5,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"That the \$10,000 appropriated by the act of March 3, 1891, for graveling the street connecting Columbia road with Connecticut avenue extended, and thence along said avenue to the District line, shall be used for regulating and macadamizing the same; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to contract for regulating and macadamizing said street and avenue forthwith: Provided, That the excess of cost for the same above \$10,000 shall be assessed upon the property fronting on said street and avenue in proportion to the number of front feet of each lot or parcel of land so fronting; such assessment shall be collected in the same manner as other taxes are collected on real estate in the District of Columbia. All contracts for such grading and macadamizing of said street and avenue in excess of the \$10,000 heretofore appropriated as aforesaid shall be

made payable and be paid out of the money derived from the taxes to be collected as herein provided."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$50,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 3 and 4 of said amendment, strike out the words "Back street and Tennallytown road, so called," and insert "Back street and Tennallytown road, so called, at or near Schneider lane;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$110,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "That the Washington and Georgetown Railroad Company is hereby required to repair the bridge across Rock Creek at M street northwest, at a cost not exceeding \$10,000, said repairs to be made under the direction of the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, and in accordance with plans and specifications to be prepared by him;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "four;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "eleven;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$613,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After line 25, on page 18 of the bill, insert as a new paragraph the following:

"That hereafter the police shall, as far as practicable, aid in the enforcement of the garbage regulations."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$16,750;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$22,450;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$23,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$61,100;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 108: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$6,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$30,800;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$13,995;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 123: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$4,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$4,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendments numbered 134 to 139, inclusive: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, and 139, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amended paragraph insert the following:

"Reform School for Girls: For the erection and completion, according to plans and specifications to be prepared by the inspector of buildings, and approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, of a suitable building or buildings to be used as a reform school for girls, \$35,000, to be expended under the direction of said Commissioners. Said building shall be erected on land belonging to the United States, to be selected by the Attorney-General, the Secretary of War, and the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That if, in their judgment, a suitable site can not be obtained on lands now owned by the United States, not exceeding \$5,000 of the sum herein appropriated may be used for the purchase of not exceeding 20 acres of ground, to be selected by them, on which to erect said reform school for girls: *Provided further*, That said building shall not be erected on land belonging to the Reform School of the District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 148: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 148, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$41,656;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 149: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 149, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$90,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 150: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 150, and agree to the same with

an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For extending the high-service system of water distribution, to include all necessary land, machinery, buildings, stand-pipes, mains, and appurtenances, so much as may be available in the water fund during the fiscal year 1893, after providing for the expenditures hereinafter authorized, is hereby appropriated; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and empowered to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, the land, including necessary portions of public roads, required for the said extension, and the right of way, where necessary, for the construction, maintenance, and repair of the requisite water mains and their appurtenances for the said extension."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 151: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 151, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 3. That the Treasurer of the United States is hereby directed and authorized to apply such portion as may be deemed expedient of any surplus which may remain at the close of the fiscal year 1893, and of each fiscal year thereafter, of the general revenues of the District of Columbia in excess of one-half of those appropriations payable equally out of the revenues of the District and the United States, exclusive of the revenues of the water department, to the payment of the balances yet remaining unpaid of the debts of the District of Columbia created by the act approved July 15, 1882, entitled 'An act to increase the water supply of the city of Washington, and for other purposes,' and of section 2 of the District of Columbia appropriation act approved March 3, 1891: *Provided*, That the amount of said surplus shall be first reported to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Treasurer of the United States by the First Comptroller of the Treasury when called upon to do so."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 144: On amendment numbered 144 the committee of conference have been unable to agree.

ALEX. M. DOCKERY,
BARNES COMPTON,
D. B. HENDERSON,
Managers on the part of the House.
W. B. ALLISON,
H. L. DAWES,
F. M. COCKRELL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement of the managers on the part of the House was read, as follows:

The managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 6746) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1893, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report, namely:

On amendment numbered 1: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, for two laborers at \$360 each, instead of \$313 each, as proposed by the House.

On amendments numbered 2 and 3: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, for one additional assistant inspector of plumbing at \$1,000.

On amendment numbered 4: Appropriates, as proposed by the House, for three additional assistant assessors until January 1 next at the rate of \$2,000 per annum each, instead of for the entire fiscal year 1893, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments numbered 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13: Transfers, as proposed by the Senate, from the collector's office to the assessor's office two clerks at \$1,400 each and one clerk at \$1,200, and strikes out increase proposed by the Senate of one clerk and bank messenger at \$1,000 in the collector's office.

On amendments numbered 14 and 15: Strikes out increase proposed by the Senate of one clerk at \$1,000 in the auditor's office.

On amendments numbered 16, 17, 18, and 19: Strikes out increase proposed by the Senate of one clerk and stenographer at \$1,000 and one general inspector of streets at \$1,800 in the engineer's office, and appropriates for one additional inspector of lamps at \$900, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments numbered 20 and 27: Fixes the compensation of the register of wills to take effect after December 31 next, at \$3,600, instead of \$3,000, as proposed by the House, and \$4,000 as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes the register of wills to designate an employee in his office who shall be paid not exceeding \$1,500 per annum out of the fees of his office to act as deputy register of wills.

On amendments numbered 28 and 36: Fixes the compensation of the recorder of deeds to take effect after December 31 next, at \$4,000 per annum, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,600 as proposed by the House, and limits the salary of the deputy recorder of deeds to \$1,800 per annum, to be paid out of the fees of his office.

On amendment numbered 37: Appropriates \$3,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,500, as proposed by the House, for the salary of the superintendent of charities.

On amendment numbered 40: Appropriates \$24,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate, for contingent expenses of the government of the District of Columbia.

On amendment numbered 41: Strikes out appropriation of \$100 proposed by the Senate for rent of the attorney's office.

On amendment numbered 42: Provides that, whoever, not being a Senator or Representative in Congress, intends to present to Congress a bill for an act of incorporation or for an alteration or extension of the charter of a corporation in the District of Columbia, or for any special privileges in said District, shall give notice of such intention by publishing a copy of the bill at least once a week for four successive weeks in a newspaper published in the District of Columbia, the last of said publications to be at least fourteen days prior to the presentation of such bill.

On amendment numbered 43: Appropriates \$7,000, instead of \$5,500 as proposed by the House, and \$8,000 as proposed by the Senate, for advertising notice of taxes in arrears.

On amendments numbered 44 and 45: Appropriates \$2,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,000, as proposed by the House, to enable the assessor to continue the account of arrears.

On amendments numbered 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, and 52: Appropriates \$270,000, instead of \$200,000, as proposed by the House, and \$400,000, as proposed by the Senate, for work on sundry streets and avenues, with the provision that the streets and avenues shall be completed in the order in which they appear in the schedule submitted in the Book of Estimates, and also that one-half of the cost of widening High street, in Georgetown, shall be charged to the Georgetown and Tennallytown Railway Company.

On amendment numbered 53: Appropriates \$4,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, for plats of subdivisions outside of Washington and Georgetown.

On amendment numbered 54: Strikes out appropriation of \$20,000 proposed by the Senate for the preparation of a plan for the extension of a permanent

system of highways over all that portion of the District not included within the limits of the cities of Washington and Georgetown.

On amendments numbered 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, and 63, relating to sewers: Appropriates \$45,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$40,000, as proposed by the House, for cleaning and repairing sewers and basins; \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20,000, as proposed by the House, for replacing obstructed and insufficient sewers; \$75,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$65,000, as proposed by the House, for main and pipe sewers; requires that the construction of the new main intercepting sewer shall be a part of and in accordance with the general plan for sewers recommended by the board of sanitary engineers; appropriates \$90,000 for commencing said sewer, instead of \$60,000, as proposed by the House, and \$112,500, as proposed by the Senate; and requires that the detailed plans for said sewer shall be approved by a consulting civil and sanitary engineer, to be selected by the President for that purpose, and to be paid for his services out of the appropriation at a rate to be fixed by the President; strikes out the appropriation of \$25,000 proposed by the Senate for making needful surveys and investigations, detailed plans, specifications, and estimates for constructing a system of works for the disposal of the sewage of the District; appropriates \$65,000, instead of \$58,300, as proposed by the House, and \$75,000, as proposed by the Senate, for suburban sewers; and appropriates \$3,500, as proposed by the House, instead of \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, for condemnation of rights of way for public sewers.

On amendment numbered 64: Appropriates \$50,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$60,000, as proposed by the Senate, for repairs of county roads.

On amendments numbered 65, 66, 67, 68, and 69, relating to the construction of county roads: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, as follows: For extension of Kenesaw avenue to Zoological Park, \$4,000; for widening, grading, and extending Harewood road to Bates's road, \$5,000; strikes out appropriations proposed by the Senate of \$5,000 for grading North Capitol street, and \$30,000 for regulating and macadamizing the street connecting Columbia road with Connecticut avenue extended; makes the appropriation of \$10,000 heretofore made for graveling the street connecting Columbia road with Connecticut avenue extended available for regulating and macadamizing the same, and authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to contract for regulating and macadamizing said street and avenue, the excess of cost of the same above the said \$10,000 to be assessed upon the property fronting said street and avenue; said contract to be made payable and to be paid out of the money derived from the taxes so collected.

On amendments numbered 70 and 71: Appropriates \$2,500, as proposed by the House, instead of \$10,000, as proposed by the Senate, for condemnation of streets, roads, and alleys, and authorizes the Commissioners to open by condemnation and extend Thirty-seventh street between Back street and Tenth street, and so soon as the ground necessary therefor shall have been donated for that purpose, or money to pay for such ground shall have been provided and paid into the Treasury.

On amendments numbered 72 and 73: Appropriates \$110,000, instead of \$103,000, as proposed by the House, and \$115,000, as proposed by the Senate, for sprinkling, sweeping, and cleaning streets, avenues, and alleys, and strikes out limitation proposed by the House of 24 cents per thousand square yards for sweeping improved streets.

On amendment numbered 74: Appropriates \$18,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$19,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the parking commission.

On amendment numbered 75: Strikes out appropriation of \$1,560 for lighting, by means of incandescent lamps, streets outside the cities of Washington and Georgetown.

On amendment numbered 76: Appropriates \$100, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$50, as proposed by the House, for repair and replacement of public scales.

On amendments numbered 77, 78, and 79: Strikes out appropriations for rebuilding bridges proposed by the Senate, as follows: For bridge across Rock Creek at K street northwest, \$40,000; for bridge across Rock Creek at M street northwest, \$40,000; and for bridge across Rock Creek at P street northwest, \$50,000, and inserts a provision requiring the Washington and Georgetown Railroad Company to repair the bridge across Rock Creek at M street northwest, at a cost not exceeding \$10,000.

On amendments numbered 80 and 81: Appropriates \$20,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$21,000, as proposed by the Senate, for Washington Aqueduct, and strikes out provision proposed by the Senate that the appropriations for the Aqueduct shall be available until expended.

On amendments numbered 82 and 83: Strikes out appropriation of \$900 proposed by the Senate for a clerk to the superintendent of schools for the first six divisions.

On amendments numbered 84, 85, 86, and 87: Provides for three public school teachers at \$1,400 each, instead of \$1,300 each.

On amendment numbered 91: Appropriates \$8,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$10,000, as proposed by the House, for material and apparatus for instruction in manual training.

On amendments numbered 92 and 93: Appropriates \$35,000, as proposed by the Senate, for free text-books for the first six grades of the public schools, instead of \$12,000, as proposed by the House, for the first four grades.

On amendment numbered 94: Requires the Commissioner of Education to examine and report to Congress on the first day of its next session, as to the organization, efficiency, methods, and cost of the schools of the District, and appropriates \$500 to pay him for that service.

On amendments numbered 95, 96, 97, 98, and 99: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, for fifteen additional policemen at \$900 each, and three additional drivers of patrol wagons at \$360 each, and appropriates \$16,750, instead of \$16,000, as proposed by the House, and \$17,500, as proposed by the Senate, for the miscellaneous expenses of the police department.

On amendments numbered 100, 101, 102: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, \$7,640, for an additional fire company from the 1st day of January next, and \$28,500, instead of \$31,500 for a new fire engine and house and lot for the same.

On amendment numbered 103: Appropriates \$8,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$15,000, as proposed by the Senate, for general supplies for the telegraph and telephone service.

On amendments numbered 104, 105, 106, 107, and 108, relating to the health department: Strikes out provision for five inspectors of garbage at \$900 each, proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$800, as proposed by the Senate, for a chemical laboratory for food inspection; appropriates \$2,500, as proposed by the Senate, on condition that the garbage of the District of Columbia is removed in inclosed steel tanks, and immediately destroyed; and appropriates \$4,000 instead of \$1,500, as proposed by the House, and \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, to prevent the spread of scarlet fever and diphtheria.

On amendments numbered 109 and 110: Appropriates \$6,000 instead of \$8,000, as proposed by the Senate, and \$4,500, as proposed by the House, for witness fees in the police court.

On amendment numbered 111: Appropriates \$600, as proposed by the Senate, for the expenses of compiling the laws of the District.

On amendment numbered 112: Strikes out appropriation of \$10,000, proposed by the Senate, for a bathing beach.

On amendments numbered 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, and 118, relating to the Washington Asylum: Strikes out increase proposed by the Senate of one overseer, at \$900; one watchman, at \$335, and the increase in compensation of nurses from \$60 to \$75 each; provides for one additional cook at \$120, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out appropriation of \$2,500, proposed by the Senate, for renewing and repairing the plumbing.

On amendments numbered 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, and 142, relating to the charities: Appropriates \$14,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$16,000, as proposed by the House, for relief of the poor; \$4,000 instead of \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, for a municipal lodging house and wood and stone yard; \$2,500 as proposed by the House, instead of \$3,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Temporary Home for Soldiers and Sailors; strikes out appropriation of \$250 proposed by the Senate for constructing a retaining wall to alley for the Woman's Christian Association; \$4,500 instead of \$6,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital; \$2,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$3,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the German Orphans' Asylum; strikes out appropriation of \$500 proposed by the Senate for repairs to the property of the Association for Works of Mercy; appropriates \$2,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$500, as proposed by the House, for St. Joseph's Asylum; strikes out appropriation of \$4,000 proposed by the Senate for reconstructing the garret of the old central building for the Industrial Home School; appropriates \$35,000 for erection of buildings for a reform school for girls on grounds now owned by the United States and to be selected by the Attorney-General, the Secretary of War, and Engineer Commissioner of the District, with authority, in the event that they can not find a suitable site on grounds belonging to the United States, to use not more than \$5,000 of the sum appropriated for the purchase of not exceeding 20 acres of land on which to construct said reform school; appropriates \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,500, as proposed by the House, for the St. Rose Industrial School; and appropriates \$4,300, as proposed by the House, instead of \$3,400, as proposed by the Senate, for the education of feeble-minded children.

On amendment numbered 143, strikes out appropriation of \$5,000 proposed by the Senate for expenses of camp of instruction for the District militia.

On amendments numbered 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, and 150, relating to the water department, appropriates for an additional clerk at \$1,000, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out appropriation of \$1,500 proposed by the Senate for an additional assistant engineer; appropriates \$90,000, instead of \$85,000, as proposed by the House, and \$101,000, as proposed by the Senate, for fuel and other current expenses of the department; and authorizes the use of the surplus water fund during the fiscal year 1893 for extending the high-service system of water distribution.

On amendment numbered 151, provides that the surplus of the general revenues of the District in excess of appropriations shall be applied to the payment of the balances yet remaining due to the United States on account of advances made for increasing the water supply of the District.

On amendment numbered 144, making an appropriation of \$100,000 for the encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, the committee of conference have been unable to agree.

The bill as it passed the House appropriated \$4,987,580.27, to which the Senate added \$919,401. Of the latter sum the conference committee recommend that the Senate recede from \$573,570, and that the House agree to \$245,834, leaving the sum of \$100,000 added by the Senate for the Grand Army encampment undisposed of.

A. M. DOCKERY,
BARNES COMPTON,
D. B. HENDERSON.

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, the total increase made by the Senate over the bill as it passed the House up to this time amounts to \$245,834. I desire to print in the RECORD, without reading it, a statement of the items of that increase.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. That is satisfactory, Mr. Speaker. We have no objection to that.

The statement submitted by Mr. DOCKERY is as follows:

Increase of District of Columbia bill as it passed the House by action of the conference committee on the amendments of the Senate.

Page.	Amendment No.	Items.	Amount.
2	2	Two laborers, \$313 to \$365 each	\$67
3	1	One assistant inspector of plumbing	1,065
3	18	One inspector of lamps	900
11	37	Superintendent of charities, \$2,500 to \$3,000	500
13	38	Advertising arrears of taxes, \$5,500 to \$7,000	1,500
13	44	Account of arrears of taxes, \$1,000 to \$2,000	1,000
14	46	Street improvements, \$200,000 to \$270,000	70,000
17	55	Sewers:	
17	56	Cleaning sewers, \$40,000 to \$45,000	56,700
17	57	Replacing obstructed sewers, \$20,000 to \$25,000	
17	58	Main and pipe sewers, \$65,000 to \$75,000	
17	59	Main intercepting sewer, \$60,000 to \$90,000	
19	62	Suburban sewers, \$58,300 to \$65,000	
20	65	Kenesaw avenue	4,000
21	68	Harewood road	5,000
23	72	Sprinkling and sweeping streets, \$103,000 to \$110,000	7,000
25	76	Public scales, \$50 to \$100	50
27	84	Public schools:	
31	91	Three school teachers, \$1,200 to \$1,400 each	21,000
31	91	Material for manual training reduced from \$10,000 to \$8,000	
31	93	Free school books, \$12,000 to \$35,000; making net increase of schools	
32	94	Commissioners of education, for special report	500
33	95	Fifteen policemen, at \$900 each	13,500
33	96	Three patrol-wagon drivers, at \$360 each	1,080
34	98	Miscellaneous expenses, police department	750
35	100	Additional fire company from January 1	7,640
35	101	New fire engine and house	28,500
35	106	Chemical laboratory for food inspectors	800
38	107	Collecting garbage in street tanks	2,500
38	108	To prevent scarlet fever and diphtheria, \$1,500 to \$4,000	2,500
39	109	Witness fees, \$4,500 to \$6,000	1,500
39	111	Compilation laws of the District	600
41	115	Cook for Washington Asylum	120

Increase of District of Columbia bill as it passed the House, etc.—Continued.

Page.	Amendment. No.	Items.	Amount.
41	115	Charities:	
44	123	Relief of poor reduced from \$16,000 to \$14,000.....	
45	128	Municipal lodging houses, \$4,000.....	
46	131	Central Dispensary, \$4,500.....	
47	140	St. Joseph's Asylum, \$500 to \$2,000.....	
		St. Rose Industrial School, \$2,000 to \$5,000; making net increase for charities.....	\$10,500
50	145	One clerk in water department.....	1,000
51	149	Current expenses water department, \$85,000 to \$90,000.....	5,000
		Total.....	245,834

Mr. DOCKERY. I ask a vote now on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the House that this is a partial agreement upon the District of Columbia appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. BURROWS. I desire to inquire of the gentleman from Missouri if the increases made by the Senate are increases that ought to be made, which the conferees have agreed to?

Mr. DOCKERY. Oh, I will state to the gentleman from Michigan that these increases have been allowed in a spirit of mutual forbearance, as it were. The majority of the conferees on the part of the House were of the opinion that these increases should not have been made, but the gentleman knows very well that the Senate is a coordinate branch of the Government—

Mr. BURROWS. Yes.

Mr. DOCKERY. And while we thought the bill as it passed the House carried a proper amount, reducing, as it did, the appropriations \$609,569 as compared with last year, yet we knew that the Senate had the right to insist upon its amendments, and so in a spirit of concession, as has been the rule throughout the constitutional history of the country, the House acceded in part to the demands of the Senate.

Mr. BURROWS. I understand you recommend that these increases be adopted.

Mr. DOCKERY. Why, certainly we do; and the gentleman well understands the status of the matter. The majority of the conferees of the House did not believe that these increases ought to have been made; but the Senate thought that there ought to be an increase amounting to about \$900,000. The conferees of the House of course were not willing to concede that amount and found themselves unable to reach an agreement except by mutual concessions.

Mr. BURROWS. What you have agreed to meets with your approval, of course?

Mr. DOCKERY. Well, I hope the gentleman from Michigan understands the English language sufficiently well to understand my statement. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURROWS. Yes; I understand it perfectly.

Mr. DOCKERY. If the gentleman does not understand it I confess my inability to make him do so.

Mr. TERRY. I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly.

Mr. TERRY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri what is the amount of the concession that you have made?

Mr. DOCKERY. It amounts to \$245,834, as is shown in the statement which I have sent up to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the conferees have finally agreed among themselves. Do I understand that the adoption of this report will conclude this question entirely?

Mr. DOCKERY. It will not. If the gentleman had given attention to the reading of the report he would understand that Senate amendment numbered 144, relating to the proposed appropriation of \$100,000 for the Grand Army encampment, is yet in disagreement, and as soon as the conference report is disposed of we will have a proposition to offer with respect to that item. The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. DOCKERY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HARRIES] to offer a resolution.

Mr. HARRIES. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 144 and agree to the request of the Senate for another committee of conference; and it is hereby declared to be the judgment of the House that in the adjustment of the differences between the two Houses on the said amendment, there should not be appropriated to exceed \$75,000, to be paid wholly from the revenues of the District of Columbia, for the proper and legitimate expenses attending the reception and entertainment of such honorably discharged Union soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the war of the rebellion as may attend, as delegates or otherwise, the 26th annual encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic in the city of Washington, D. C.

Mr. DOCKERY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield to my colleague, Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa, to offer a substitute.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk as a substitute for the motion just offered.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 144, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For the proper and legitimate expenses attending the reception and entertainment of such honorably discharged Union soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the war of the rebellion as may attend, as delegates or otherwise, the twenty-sixth national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, and attending the preparation for such reception and entertainment \$100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary. Said sum shall be paid to and disbursed by the citizens' executive committee of Washington, having in charge such reception and entertainment, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War; and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to grant permits for the use of any reservation, or other public space in the city of Washington for purposes connected with such encampment or with any reunion of veteran soldiers to be held at the same time, and which in his opinion will inflict no serious or permanent injury upon such reservation or other public space; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may designate for such purposes such streets and avenues in the District as they may deem proper and necessary therefor."

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I hope I will have the attention of the House, as I am feeling quite unwell and desire to conclude my remarks in a very few moments. Mr. Speaker, the issues between the Senate and the House are two. The first is as to the amount; the second is as to the fund from which it is proposed to be paid. The position of the Senate is well expressed in the substitute offered by my colleague from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON], which proposes to appropriate \$100,000, to be paid out of the general Treasury of the United States. The attitude of the House conferees, in a spirit of compromise, is expressed in the resolution which has been offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HARRIES] appropriating \$75,000, to be paid entirely from the revenues of the District of Columbia.

If the proposition submitted by the gentleman from Minnesota should prevail it would provide, in connection with the \$50,000 to be raised by the citizens, a total of \$125,000 for entertaining the delegates who attend the Grand Army encampment. This amount, in the judgment of the majority of the House conferees, is ample when we remember that at Milwaukee there was only expended on account of entertainment of the Grand Army \$48,915. At Boston the entire expenditure was \$88,693.67, while at Detroit the total expenditure was only \$97,488.88.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman state what was expended at St. Louis?

Mr. DOCKERY. The total amount provided, and I am proud to say that it was raised by individual and voluntary contribution, was \$90,000. Of that amount \$78,000 only was expended for entertaining the Grand Army and the \$12,000 remaining was distributed to a charity of some kind, but of what nature I do not now recall. So that, as I was about to state, when this fund of \$125,000 is provided, it will furnish the Grand Army encampment to be held in this place in September with a fund \$28,000 larger than was ever expended at any of the annual encampments. Now, a word as to the fund from which this should be paid; and in this connection it may be well to refer to the terms of the invitation extended by the people of this city.

Mr. COX of Tennessee. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question before he goes from that branch of the subject?

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly.

Mr. COX of Tennessee. When you speak of the amount of money that is to be raised by the citizens, what assurance have you that there is any raised, or that there will be any raised?

Mr. DOCKERY. I am glad that the gentleman has called my attention to this question. I will read in answer from the testimony of Mr. Edson, chairman of the executive committee, before the Committee on Appropriations, April 15 last. Here is what he says:

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand you to say that you have made no increase in your subscription list?

Mr. EDSON. We are going to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean since the encampment decided to come here?

Mr. EDSON. When we returned we organized our regular committees. We divided it up, and different committees had charge of different things. We selected a different man to take charge of the finance committee, and we started out to get these subscriptions that had been given or promised before. They gave a regular signature and agreement to pay this money; whereas I went around to the banks and others, and they would say, "Put me down for so much," and I would put them down without their signature, though I knew it was perfectly good. The new chairman went around to get the subscriptions confirmed. So far he has got \$40,000; but there is no difficulty about it. We can get \$100,000, or whatever we think necessary.

That is the testimony of Mr. Edson, a very accomplished business man, who is in charge of the executive committee.

Now a word further upon this point from the same authority. I quote from the testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. I notice in the Star of August 1 a copy of the silver engraved invitations, together with the portraits as well as the names of the invitation committee, from which it appears that the railroad interests, the real-estate interests, the legal profession, newspapers, merchants, hotels, restaurants, contractors, etc., were all represented. In the invitation it is stated that "as an earnest of our hospitable intentions an ample guaranty fund has been subscribed for the encampment for the usual expenses of such assemblages." Will you kindly give to the committee the amount of that guaranty fund?

Mr. EDSON. We stated it was a \$50,000 guaranty fund. It was forty-nine thousand and some hundred dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. All solvent?

Mr. EDSON. Yes, sir; except as to those who have died or gone out of business since?

The CHAIRMAN. What additional sums, if any, have been subscribed since that time?

Mr. EDSON. We have not raised anything in addition to that.

It appears, therefore, that a guaranty fund of \$50,000 has been subscribed, with the assurance of Mr. Edson that \$100,000 can be raised, if necessary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order that the House may fairly determine its obligations in respect to this encampment, it may be well for me to read an extract from the invitation which was extended the national encampment at Detroit by the citizens of Washington. I will read that part in which the guaranty fund is pledged:

The citizens of Washington, the capital of the nation, extend to the Grand Army of the Republic a hearty invitation to hold its national encampment in 1892 in this city.

It is needless to speak of the welcome the veterans of the Union will receive when they come to Washington. There is no city in the world that would not be proud to receive them, and there is no city in the land which Washington would permit to outdo it in honoring and entertaining the Grand Army. The citizens of Washington were glad enough when the boys in blue came there in 1861. They will make them feel more than welcome if they will come again in 1892—come again and see a city that is four times as large as then and a thousand times as beautiful. As an earnest of their hospitable intentions an ample guaranty fund has been subscribed to provide for appropriate entertainment of members of the encampment and for the usual expenses of such assemblages. This invitation is extended with a belief on the part of the citizens that, great as is their desire to welcome to their homes the men who fought for the Union, there are many thousands of veterans who have a desire equally as strong to visit Washington and the battlefields in its vicinity, ground consecrated by the valor of the soldiers of the Union.

Mr. Speaker, this invitation is extended to the Grand Army of the Republic by the citizens of Washington. The citizens of Washington had no power, either express or implied, either in law or in equity, to impose one cent of liability upon the Federal Government, but they did have the right to impose upon themselves the obligation to properly entertain the Grand Army of the Republic.

The citizens of Washington extended this invitation and the Grand Army encampment at Detroit accepted it. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no issue raised by the House conferees as to the necessity for proper, I might say lavish, provision for the entertainment of the Grand Army of the Republic in this city. The only question is how shall the cost be borne?

Mr. COX of Tennessee. Was that invitation extended by the officials of this city or by citizens?

Mr. DOCKERY. By both; the invitation was signed by the District Commissioners and by a committee of, I think, about fifty leading citizens, representing the street railroads, the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, the hotels, the restaurants, and other interests.

Mr. COX of Tennessee. There was no official act of the city government—no officer was authorized to sign the invitation.

Mr. DOCKERY. Oh, no. On the contrary I asked that question of the District Commissioners, and it is in evidence that they expressly disclaimed any authority to entail any liability upon the District for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Washington invited the Grand Army to hold their encampment here. In my humble judgment, and with great respect to the good people of the city (for I would not let a word fall that would reflect either upon the city or upon any citizen of it), I think the business interests that extended this invitation should defray the cost of the entertainment, without asking either the Government or the treasury of the District of Columbia for one cent. [Applause.]

That is my view. But there being a precedent in the case of Boston, which contributed, I believe, \$75,000 for a purpose of this kind, and a precedent in the case of Detroit, which made a contribution of \$50,000, the House conferees, in a spirit of compromise, were willing to allow \$75,000 to be appropriated for this purpose, entirely out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. COOPER. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Does it not appear to him that the simple fact that this demonstration is to take place in the national capital makes the case essentially different from those which he has instanced at Boston and other places?

Several MEMBERS. Not at all.

Mr. COOPER. In other words, inasmuch as so large a body of the soldiers who defended the capital will be here, is it not proper that some expression should be made on the part of the

Government of the United States on the occasion, and is not the best way of giving such expression the making of a suitable appropriation for their entertainment?

Mr. REED. And will not the numbers in attendance here be necessarily greater than at either of the places which have been mentioned?

Mr. DOCKERY. There is no question as to the increased attendance. I alluded to that fact in the opening of my remarks when I said that the proposed appropriation of \$75,000 would provide a fund \$28,000 in excess of any fund raised and expended at any prior encampment.

Mr. HEARD. And is there any sort of reason why Congress should make any appropriation to help in defraying these expenses except the fact that Congress is the only authority which can appropriate the revenues of this District?

Mr. DOCKERY. No reason whatever. This proposition ought not to come here, and would not come here but for the fact that we act as the town council of the city of Washington.

Mr. HEARD. Exactly.

Mr. DOCKERY. The citizens of Washington are compelled to come here in order to secure their appropriations.

Mr. DICKERSON. Is there any reason why the citizens of Washington should be relieved of expense in this regard because the citizens of Boston and other places have been relieved?

Mr. DOCKERY. I have already stated that the good citizens of this District ought to defray every dollar of this expense.

Mr. REED. But we pay ordinarily half the expenses of the District of Columbia, and why should we make a discrimination in this case?

Mr. DOCKERY. The entertainment of visitors, I care not how worthy they may be, is not a legitimate function of Government.

Mr. REED. That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. DOCKERY. Very well; but it is my opinion that such an appropriation is not the exercise of any legitimate function of Government.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman from Missouri consider that the appropriation of public money for the entertainment of these visitors at Boston or Detroit was a legitimate use of the public funds?

Mr. DOCKERY. I do not care to go into any question as to local expenditures. The people of Boston invited the Grand Army to visit them; and when it was found that individual subscriptions were insufficient to provide for their entertainment, they made an appropriation out of their own public funds. Now then, if this appropriation is to be made it should be put exactly on "all fours" with the action taken at Detroit and Boston; and we do so when we provide the necessary amount out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HEARD. That is right.

Mr. BUTLER. Provided the money be given at all.

Mr. DOCKERY. One other thing; and this is the view which I took of the matter when these gentlemen were before our committee. I want to deal in all frankness and kindness with these good people; I have no disposition to criticize them; yet I am compelled under my oath to discharge my duty as I see it. Whenever you impose any part of this expenditure upon the people of the United States, it operates, to a certain extent (it matters not how remotely), as a tax upon the guests of the city for their own entertainment.

Another thing. How did this proposition come here? Let me read from the testimony:

The CHAIRMAN. When was the first proposition formally made to apply to the Government?

Mr. EDSON. It was first made in the executive committee in January or February.

The CHAIRMAN. But in the meantime you made no additional effort to secure subscriptions?

Mr. EDSON. We made efforts to confirm them and get them into proper shape.

The CHAIRMAN. You had not gone out to seek any additional subscriptions?

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have here the evidence of the representative of the District that no thought was entertained, or at least no organized effort was made, looking to an application to Congress for relief in this behalf until January or February last.

Mr. Speaker, I could multiply quotations from each of the enterprising newspapers of the city—the Post and the Star—confirming the statement that this application to Congress for assistance was an afterthought; that when this invitation was originally accepted the citizens proposed to pay every dollar of the expense.

Why, Mr. Speaker, the Star is crowded with expressions in this direction, and the Post teems with promises as to what the people of Washington would do, and, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DUNGAN] suggests, Mr. Hatton, the editor of the Post, was one of the committee.

Now, a word further as to the fund from which this appropri-

ation should be made. I quote from an editorial of the Post of the 18th of April last:

THE GRAND ARMY REUNION FUND.

The item of \$100,000 for subsistence and quarters of veterans during the Grand Army encampment, which the Senate inserted in the District appropriation bill, though fair and just in itself, has provoked more or less criticism throughout the country, largely because of a general misunderstanding as to the peculiar relations which the District of Columbia bears to the Federal Government, having no municipal or lawmaking authority of its own, and for the further reason that there is a seeming inconsistency in taxing the old soldiers, no matter how inappreciably, for the expense of an entertainment to which they have been invited by the citizens of Washington.

There is no time now, even if it were possible, to explain to the country the reasonableness of the appropriation as it stands, and, under the circumstances, it will be better to so modify the proposition that no part of the sum proposed shall come out of the Treasury of the United States, but wholly and unconditionally from the revenues of the District.

This would have been the more advisable plan in the first instance; it is certainly the most advisable and only plan at the present juncture, and is free from all the objections, captious or otherwise, that have been raised to the action of the Senate.

The citizens of Washington will thus be placed in an attitude before the country thoroughly honorable to themselves and acceptable to the guests within their gates. The burden which they assume will be greater by far than has ever been borne before by any other city upon a similar occasion even with State and municipal aid included. But they would sooner bear a still greater burden than to have a solitary soldier of the Grand Army come here feeling that either in a direct or indirect sense he is being taxed for the hospitalities in which he has been cordially invited to participate.

The Post, as a representative of the people of Washington in all matters pertaining to their good name and best interests, is satisfied that an arrangement by which the appropriation as a whole is made chargeable to the District will be agreeable to them and settle upon a satisfactory basis all question as to the financial needs and complete success of the encampment.

Mr. GOODNIGHT. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly.

Mr. GOODNIGHT. I understand the gentleman to say that he puts an appropriation by Congress out of the District revenues on "all fours" with an appropriation by Boston or Detroit out of their funds by their city council.

Mr. DOCKERY. I do.

Mr. GOODNIGHT. I would like to ask if he thinks it is the same thing for Congress to take such action, in the case of a city like Washington, where the poor people have no representation, for Congress to go on and make an appropriation, taxing them as this is proposing to tax them, when the people of Boston or Detroit are taxed by their own council, elected to represent them, and who do represent them in the meetings of their boards?

Mr. DOCKERY. Under the organic law of 1878 we are the representatives of the people of Washington. I do not believe that there is any general complaint that Washington has not been fairly represented on this floor in any Congress? I do not think there has been such complaint. I have not heard it. I think we have a number of gentlemen who are willing and ready to represent the interests of the people here, and who do represent them fairly and well.

Mr. GOODNIGHT. But the gentleman knows that the District has no voice whatever in these matters, and no vote on this floor.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is true.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly.

Mr. SNODGRASS. In our representative capacity have we any power, in the opinion of the gentleman, to appropriate their funds to pay hotel bills or to bear the expenses of invited guests, or is our power confined to the appropriation of the funds of the District for the public and necessary expenses of the District of Columbia?

Mr. DOCKERY. Well, that is a question that the gentleman must determine for himself under his oath, and with his own views as to his responsibility.

May I ask how much time I have occupied?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has occupied thirty minutes.

Mr. DOCKERY. I shall occupy the floor but a few moments longer and then reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DUNGAN. If the gentleman will allow me, I wish to ask whether there has been any protest received from the taxpayers of the city upon this matter? I have no information upon that subject, and I think it is proper to know whether such has been done.

Mr. DOCKERY. I do not know of any formal protest in respect to this appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say, before yielding the floor, that the Grand Army should be properly and hospitably entertained; but the issue, however, is, first, whether the citizens who extended the invitation shall pay the expense; secondly, whether the citizens' subscriptions shall be supplemented by an appropriation from the Federal Treasury; or, third, whether the citizens' guar-

anty fund shall be reinforced by an appropriation from the District revenues. I am quite content to submit the whole question to the judgment of the House.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri apologizes for even being willing to give the \$75,000 out of the District funds exclusively. In other words, the proposition of the majority of the conferees on the part of the House, being that offered by the gentleman from Missouri, we are told is offered in a spirit of compromise. The Senate put on an appropriation of \$100,000 in no such spirit.

As one of the conferees on the part of the House I have offered the substitute, which has been read, in no such spirit. I believe that \$100,000 is needed; that the citizens have a right to ask for it, and that it should be paid, as other appropriations of the District of Columbia are paid, out of the general funds of the District.

This committee, it would seem, the executive committee, made up of a large number of the best citizens of the District of Columbia, are reflected upon because they dare to ask Congress for any appropriation, and it is adverted to that they did not think of that when they went before our convention at Detroit, asking for this meeting to be held here. I think that is unfair to the citizens of Washington. No city on this continent stands so constantly, with such open and generous arms extended to the people of the entire nation, bidding them welcome, and making welcome every conceivable convention that can be held here; and in no city on this continent are there so many public gatherings held as in Washington. All who come here go away delighted with the generous hospitality that has been accorded to them.

The citizens of Washington went, as other committees have gone to the different national encampments, tendering their city as the place for the next gathering. Boston was a candidate at one time. Cleveland, St. Louis, Milwaukee, New York, and I think San Francisco, and other places sent their committees. That was not preceded by any legislative action, municipal, or State. Like public-spirited men they went to open their arms to the old soldiers, and said "Come," and holding forth the usual inducements to make them comfortable and to attract them. So did the citizens of Washington; and as they said before our investigating committee, the matter of the details was a matter to be determined after it was settled that the encampment was to come here.

When that was determined by a close vote at the last encampment at Detroit, then the citizens organized thoroughly and well, and went to work to properly provide for this coming encampment. On the 15th of April the executive committee appealed to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. No appropriation for any sum was put upon the District bill as it passed the House. Their prayer was respectfully heard and respectfully denied. The President of the United States issued the following message on the 24th of March, 1892, which message I ask the Clerk to read:

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, accompanied by a letter from the chairman of the executive committee organized by the citizens of Washington for the reception and entertainment of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, which is to be held in Washington during September next. An appeal is made for an appropriation by Congress of \$100,000, one-half to be paid out of the District revenues, to aid in defraying the expenses attending this reception.

The event is one of very high and, as I believe, of national interest, and the attendance of the surviving Union soldiers will, I do not doubt, be larger than at any annual encampment that has ever been held. The public authorities of the cities or States, or both, in which the encampments have been held have, I believe, usually appropriated liberally to make the occasions worthy and the entertainment hospitable. The parade of the survivors of our great armies upon Pennsylvania avenue will bring vividly back to us those joyful and momentous days when the great victorious armies of the East and of the West marched through the streets of Washington in high parade and were received by our citizens with joyful acclaim. It seems to me that it will be highly appropriate for Congress suitably to aid in making this demonstration impressive, and in extending to those soldiers whose lives a beneficent Providence has prolonged an opportunity to see in the security and peace, development and prosperity, which now so happily pervade the national capital, the fruits of their sacrifice and valor.

BENJ. HARRISON.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 24, 1892.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, thus spoke the Executive of this nation on both propositions, first as to the amount, and secondly as to what fund it should come from. Some of the soldiers of the country, being, as we all were when we first came here, ignorant of the peculiar relations of this city and District to the General Government, were astonished and in some places took exception to the idea of any of this money coming from the Federal funds. This misunderstanding and criticism induced Gen. John Palmer, the commander-in-chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, to make investigation into the affair and the

questions involved, and on May 4, from his headquarters, he issued General Order No. 11, paragraph 1 of which I will ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

[General Orders No. 11.]
HEADQUARTERS GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC,
ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Albany, N. Y., May 4, 1892.

1. At the twenty-fifth annual encampment at Detroit, Mich., the choice of location for the twenty-sixth national encampment was between Lincoln, Nebr., and Washington, D. C.; the latter place was chosen.

The President of the United States, in a special message to Congress, recommended an appropriation for the reception and entertainment of the twenty-sixth national encampment.

The citizens' executive committee of Washington, D. C., having in charge the arrangements, have already raised by subscription a very handsome sum, and following the example of other cities they made application to Congress for an appropriation of \$100,000, from the District funds, for the purpose specified in the President's message.

The city of Washington has no mayor, board of aldermen, or common council. It is governed by Congress solely, with three Commissioners as executive officers, appointed by the President. Its taxes are paid directly into the Treasury of the United States; not a dollar of the same can be used, for any purpose, except when appropriated by Congress.

Congress, which owns more than half of the property in the District, passed a law in 1878 that all expenses should be borne equally by the General Government and the taxpayers of the District, and since then such a course has been continuously pursued for all municipal expenses; and therefore the application to Congress by the citizens' committee for the appropriation.

It is reported that certain Grand Army posts located at Lincoln, Nebr., have sent to Congress protests against such an appropriation and, as it is charitably believed that such posts are unacquainted with the true management of the affairs of the District, the foregoing is published for the information of all members of the Grand Army of the Republic.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Now, Mr. Speaker, after the issuance of that order no more protests reached this body. We think we are members of Congress, and so we are; but we are to this city members of a city council, and as such I will now address you.

In order to judge of the true merits of the questions involved, namely, from what fund shall this be paid, and secondly, what amount, we must understand our relations as legislators to the District of Columbia and the city of Washington.

Prior to June 11, 1878, no aid was given by the General Government to carry on the expenses of this District. Indeed, prior to that date the citizens of Washington had played the benevolent part, giving large donations of territory to the General Government. Your streets, your parks, your reservations, the one where the White House stands to-day, were donated by the citizens.

Nearly 350,000,000 acres of the public land have been given to the States for public purposes, for railroads, for universities, and other educational purposes. Some \$25,000,000 in round numbers of surplus cash in the Treasury up to 1885 were taken and distributed to the States. But up to 1878 the General Government never gave one dollar to aid this city, while their donations amounted to over \$30,000,000 to aid in putting up public buildings, to say nothing of the donations of land that I have spoken of. But on June 11, 1878, a bill became a law changing the whole system of the District government. It is known as the "Blackburn bill." Mr. BLACKBURN of Kentucky, then a member of this body, was the author of the bill which became then and is now the law governing this District. That law provides that the expenses of running this city and District shall be paid one-half out of the District and one-half out of the Federal revenues.

Why, this was done should not properly enter into this discussion, because we have to deal only with the law; but I will here pause a moment to refer to the principle upon which it was done, because that principle in a measure touches the merits of this debate. This city is filled with public buildings belonging to the Federal Government, with vast reservations; millions and millions of dollars of property piled up here in vast edifices.

This is the capital of a great nation, and in 1878 the people began to realize what a nation it was, and it was discovered and realized that this city was a place for the convenience of the nation. Your schools are patronized by the children of over 20,000 American citizens who are not citizens of the District of Columbia. During my term in Congress my children have attended the public schools, as have the children of most of you. Your lights light the pathway of those who come on here on public business. I am afraid that the police even have something to do with regulating the conduct of others than citizens of the District of Columbia.

At all events, the principle was that inasmuch as this Government was not taxed a single cent to carry on the expenses of this Government, and every year the foot falls of a million feet outside of the citizenship are wearing out your streets and children of other cities occupying your schools and creating the necessity for the vast army of teachers, the Blackburn policy was deemed the thing we ought to have. The United States Government under your law pays one-half of the salaries of the

Commissioners of the District, and of every judge, the recorder of wills, and every official connected with the District. It pays one-half of your entire police force and one-half the expenses of all your teachers in the District. It pays one-half of the expenses of your fire department, including the building of the engine houses, the purchase of the fire engines and their equipments. It pays one-half of all the expenses of all your courts here including your jurors. It pays one-half of the expenses of the market master and of lighting your city and sweeping and cleaning your streets. At 9 o'clock every night a little army of men are at work cleaning your streets and carrying away the dirt, and when you rise in the morning the streets look like the waxed floor of a kitchen.

My city of Dubuque, the city of my friend from Missouri, and every Federal taxpayer in the country, help to pay one-half of all these expenses. They help to pay for the erection of your schools, to carry on your schools, to pay for your educators, and to buy all the text books for the poor children. They pay for the sewers, and in most cases a large part of the charities. The Federal Government supports the parking commission. They pay for the planting of trees, and pay the expenses of furnishing the tree boxes and the iron strips around them, and for attending to them. They pay for your public pumps, for your bridges, and for the telephone service of the city. They help to pay for the health department, and to keep up your prisons and reformatories, to take care of the insane, the deaf and the dumb, and to support the militia of the District of Columbia. Everything that this municipality has to-day in its government the Federal Government pays one-half of it.

Now, there is no city council here, as Commander-in-Chief Palmer says, to make these appropriations. This is the city council. The citizens have no other legislative body to turn to for these appropriations. The citizens come here and through the Commissioners and through committees and individually submit what they need, and we legislate for it. They ask you to help to clean their streets, and under the law you do it. They ask you to take care of your prisons and reformatories and your criminals; to light your lamps at night, and you do it; and since 1878 not a District appropriation bill has passed this House of Representatives that did not make the Federal Government pay half of the amount. The bill before you, appropriating over \$4,000,000, takes one-half of it from the Federal Treasury.

The report is made this morning, and that is agreed to, and that is locked up and nailed down tight and fast; but when this city appeals to its city council and says give us an appropriation to help to welcome the men who saved the national capital, then it is that it is discovered that the Federal funds should not be touched. For shame, I say, to raise this quibble when the poor, crippled blue coat comes staggering here as a member of the Grand Army, the Federal Government that has been taxing him to pay every other expense where he is not immediately interested, which is all paid and appropriated, and this bill does it, taking out \$2,000,000, but for him we become suddenly technical and want to reverse the wheel.

Gentlemen, you have the power to do it, but no member of this city council shall do it without understanding what he is doing.

The city of Berlin subjects its property, every building, palace, and public place, to taxation the same as other property, and it goes into the city funds to carry it on. The great parks and vast expenditures that are made in other capital cities are made without taxing the city. The question now is: Shall the city of Washington be permitted to appeal to its own council to give it an appropriation when it can have none from the General Government excepting through this channel?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will my friend allow me to send a letter up to have it read?

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Wait until I get through and then you can have it done in your own time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I have no time.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. You are a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

This is a matter that I have a little honest feeling about, and nothing beyond that. Since this debate began the gentleman from California [Mr. CUTTING] has handed me a memorandum showing that when the soldiers went there the State of California voted \$25,000 to entertain them, and the citizens of San Francisco \$75,000, so that there was a contribution of \$100,000 for this purpose at that far-away point by the Golden Gate, where so few of us were able to go. The State of Massachusetts—there she stands, look at her!—the State of Massachusetts voted by her Legislature \$75,000 out of her treasury to pay the expenses of welcoming the Grand Army, and the city council of Boston also made a liberal appropriation. The city of Detroit did likewise. In those great business centers of manufactures and commerce, where

a million dollars can be as easily raised by contribution as \$100 in Washington, which is only a vast boarding house—even there they appropriated money out of the city treasury and out of the State treasury to welcome the Grand Army of the Republic.

Now, forsooth, because the citizens' executive committee here makes a similar request of this, its common council, and asks that this city be treated in this great enterprise as it is treated in all other matters of appropriations—for there is not an exception on a general appropriation bill that has passed this House since 1878—you propose to deny that request. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing asked in this case that is not on all fours with the precedents and in perfect keeping with the law and with the necessities of the occasion. I do not urge the argument that this capital city should act grandly on such an occasion.

I put it on the solid foundation of the city's right to get this fund as it gets all other funds, half and half. But there are those who will appreciate the thought expressed in the President's message, which I think will come, like the waters of a fountain, bubbling up in every generous and noble heart, the thought that the capital of this nation, which a few years ago saw these battalions marching by, modest but happy because they went up Pennsylvania avenue within sight of the dome of the Capitol of a rescued nation, should gladly welcome them now on their return. There are those who will appreciate the thought that thousand and tens of thousands of those veterans will come back in September next for the first time to see this dear old Capitol which they saved, and that the occasion ought to be made worthy of their coming.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to the amount required, Col. John Joy Edson, the chairman of the citizens' executive committee, who, as the gentleman from Missouri has said, is a man of high business character, made a statement in answer to a question of our chairman, which I read:

THE CHAIRMAN. What amount will be necessary to entertain the encampment?

MR. EDSON. I have got my figures made, and the lowest possible amount is \$150,000. If we had \$100,000 more we could spend it.

THE CHAIRMAN. I mean on the basis of a reasonable and proper expenditure?

MR. EDSON. In Boston they accommodated 10,400 veterans in what they called free quarters. It is impossible to find quarters. These different cities have expended money for sleeping quarters. Outside of Boston there were about 35,000 more veterans accommodated. Those accommodations cost in Boston \$45,000; in the city of Boston it cost \$23,000 and the suburban towns and cities made up the balance. In Detroit they accommodated 35,000 soldiers at a cost of \$44,000. In Columbus they accommodated nearly 40,000 at a cost of \$54,000.

MR. HENDERSON. Did the city of Columbus appropriate any money?

MR. EDSON. They raised it through an exhibition fund and the Board of Trade. I never found out exactly how they raised the money there, though I have tried.

MR. HENDERSON. Does your committee realize that this is going to be the largest encampment ever held on the continent?

MR. EDSON. We have located some three hundred posts, comprising probably 25,000 men, and in every instance where we have asked how many men they had at Boston, Detroit, Columbus, etc., the number they say is coming here is two to six times as many as went to the other cities. The number is appalling. Quarters will have to be furnished. We will have more than 100,000 soldiers.

And it appears, Mr. Speaker, that twice as many other citizens will come here, taking advantage of the low excursion rates, the fathers, mothers, widows, and children of the soldiers themselves.

MR. COX of Tennessee. Will the gentlemen permit me to ask him a question at that point?

MR. HENDERSON of Iowa. I would a little rather that the gentleman would wait until I get through, and then I will answer any questions that may be asked. I will read a further extract from this statement:

MR. HENDERSON. I will ask a question, and any one of you gentlemen can answer it. Are you agreed among yourselves, after ascertaining by correspondence as to what will probably be the attendance at the encampment, and what the cost will be, as to how much will be necessary to properly provide for and entertain this encampment?

MR. EDSON. I stated awhile ago that in every case where we have inquired of encampments, we have found that there will be from two to six or eight times as many soldiers who will attend, from every post, than have heretofore attended any previous encampment. We take it that there will be 150,000 or 200,000 Grand Army men.

Then further on he says as to the amount:

We have got more to contend with here than in the other cities; but we are going to work. We have more to raise than \$50,000, for I do not see how it is going to cost less than \$200,000.

MR. CRAIN of Texas. Why should this city pay that?

MR. HENDERSON of Iowa. I will answer the gentleman later if I have not answered him sufficiently already. I will read now in this connection a letter from the passenger agent of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company:

THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY,
PASSENGER DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1893.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of the 17th instant, beg to advise you that the Pennsylvania Railroad expects to be crowded to its utmost capacity

in handling people who will visit Washington during the encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic next September, and the indications at this date lead us to believe it will be in excess.

Yours truly,

ROBERT A. PARKE,
Passenger Agent, Southeast District

MR. JOHN JOY EDSON,
Chairman Executive Committee,
Grand Army of the Republic, Washington, D. C.

And the Baltimore and Ohio says:

ESTIMATE AND CAPACITY OF BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD, ACCOUNT OF THE NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT, GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC, SEPTEMBER, 1892.

BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY,
PASSENGER DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1893.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your favor of the 17th instant, I beg to advise that there was a meeting of the general superintendent, general passenger agent, the superintendent of this company, and myself, to confer relative to the best plan of handling this business in a safe and expeditious manner. We estimated that it would be necessary for our company to arrange to handle at least 150,000 people on this occasion.

Since that date reports have come from every section of increased numbers, and in a talk I had about a week ago with General Passenger Agent Scull, relative to this matter, he stated that the amount of business we will receive on this occasion from present indications will exceed 200,000 people instead of 150,000, as previously estimated.

As to our ability to handle the same, we shall be taxed to our utmost capacity. We have the greatest task before us we have ever undertaken at the national capital.

Yours truly,

S. B. HEGE, G. P. A.

JOHN JOY EDSON, Esq.,
Chairman Citizens' Executive Committee,
Grand Army of the Republic, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Speaker, I have myself no small means of personally knowing what the attendance will be here. Correspondence and intercourse with the soldiers at Detroit, when it was determined that the reunion should be held here (for I was a delegate to that encampment), conversation on the train with soldiers on their way home, and the talks I have had with them since, have all satisfied me that there will be a much larger attendance at this encampment than at any held since the war. I had a letter the other day from Capt. M. E. Erwin, of my own city, Dubuque, chief of staff for the department of Iowa. He wrote me that there would be here from Iowa alone three thousand soldiers, uniformed, to march up Pennsylvania avenue in procession. Our State has sent probably from five hundred to one thousand to previous encampments. There will be here a similar proportion also of the relatives and friends of these soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, the pleasures of that occasion will include visiting the old battlefields all around Washington. To many of the soldiers of the Western army this will be a new experience. They have heard of those battlefields and know of them by the history of events from 1861 to 1865, but they have never seen them. I tell you, these Western soldiers will flock to this encampment eager to see those old defensive spots. I can understand their interest in this matter, for I know what were my feelings when a short time ago I visited the fields of Gettysburg and Antietam, which I had never seen before. Then, again, from all around this region will come the men who fought under Gen. Cogswell and Gen. Hancock, and who were connected with other army organizations of the East. Do you not realize that they will come here to see the fields on which they camped and fought?

I merely mention these things that every thinking man may realize the fact that the holding of this encampment at the national capital is a sufficient inducement to bring thousands here. There will be drawn here by these old historic scenes and associations a gathering that will fill this city with numbers never before dreamed of in connection with an occasion of this kind. Col. Edson told me only this morning that he trembled at the responsibility which he found resting upon his shoulders as chief of the local committee having this matter in charge. I want to do my duty here to this District and to this common council by impressing upon members that \$100,000 added to the \$50,000 which the people of the District will raise in order to carry out these arrangements, will be, if anything, too small. Gen. Cogswell suggests to me that there must be raised \$100,000 outside of this, and I have no doubt of the truth of this statement. And Col. Edson estimates for \$200,000. And since that testimony was given all the estimates indicate a largely increased necessity for preparation.

Mr. Speaker, I am talking to the common council of Washington, not to the House of Representatives; and I appeal to this common council to adopt the substitute which I have offered, which is practically the Senate amendment, adding provisions which we all agree to, even the majority conferees of the House, looking to the use, by permission of the Secretary of War, where it will not do injury, of certain public squares, reservations, and streets in connection with this celebration. I appeal to you not to make the fatal mistake of stepping outside your current line of treatment of this city; I appeal to you as a common council to appropriate dollar for dollar as you do in other cases.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the residue of my time.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY], the chairman of this conference committee, has stated this case so lucidly and succinctly that but for some things which have been said by my friend from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] I would not detain the House with any further discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I differ with my friend from Iowa. I shall not undertake to repeat (for he has correctly repeated, not with entire fullness, but, so far as he went, correctly) the history of this District which led to the legislation under which this Congress acts in making appropriations for the District of Columbia. But, Mr. Speaker, I differ with my friend from Iowa. This is not the common council of Washington City. The common council of Washington City was abolished, and that action was taken because, in a measure, of the outrageous conduct of the so-called common council of Washington City.

In this way the legislation which made Congress the legislative body for Washington City was brought about. But, Mr. Speaker, this body does not act simply as a legislative body for Washington City, because, under the organic law, 50 cents of every dollar appropriated for the maintenance of the local government in this District comes out of the pockets of the people; and it is the Congress of the United States which properly legislates on this question. Therefore, sir, our powers are broader, our responsibilities are greater, infinitely greater, than those imposed upon any common council in America.

But Mr. Speaker, my friend has made an appeal here which I hoped would not be made. I acquit him of any purpose to give to this matter any political coloring. It has been my pride and pleasure since the assembling of this Congress to serve in intimate relations with my friend from Iowa upon the Committee on Appropriations—particularly on this bill. I recognize in him a man who has demonstrated the capabilities of American citizenship on the field and in the forum. I know that his capacity is large; I know that his vision is extensive; I know that his impulses are as noble and generous and patriotic as those that abide in the breast of any man on this floor. Therefore I acquit him of any purpose to give to this question a political coloring so far as he is concerned.

But, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman appeals to the patriotic impulses of the members of the House, when he makes the speech he did, and the allusions he has seen proper to inject into it as to the conduct and the suffering of the soldiers who are to come here, now lame, halt, blind, and maimed, and seeks to move our sympathy by appeals of this character to our patriotism. Sir, that is not the issue. That is not the question that is presented at all. I want to say to him that while I neither wore the blue nor the gray, and though my sympathies were with the gray, no man now living feels more kindly than I do, or appreciates more deeply and sincerely the magnificent valor displayed by the Union soldiers in the defense of the Union.

There is a scene, sir, connected with the streets of this capital that was witnessed at the close of the war, a scene unparalleled, in my judgment, in the history of the world, and that is, the march of these gallant men, following the banner of the Union, the banner for which they had been willing to give their lives, and the Union they loved and the capital they defended—these remnants of the old army, marching down these streets in an unbroken column. And for one I want to say that if the purpose and object of this appropriation were to commemorate that grand event I would not hesitate to vote all of the money necessary out of the Federal Treasury itself for that purpose. But I repeat, sir, that is not the question. This is an entirely different matter. It is a question that has been raised deliberately and premeditatedly by the citizens of Washington themselves in their own name and for their own sake.

Now, permit me, if I do not tire the House, to read from the testimony that has been taken in regard to this very matter a little further. I refer to the investigation made by the Committee on Appropriations held on the 15th day of April last. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] read the terms in which the invitation was extended, that the citizens of Washington were glad to have the opportunity to extend it. In their invitation to the Grand Army they say:

As an earnest of their hospitable intentions, an ample guaranty fund has been subscribed to provide for appropriate entertainment of members of the encampment and for the usual expenses of such assemblages. This invitation is extended with a belief on the part of the citizens that, great as is their desire to welcome to their homes the men who fought for the Union, there are many thousands of veterans who have a desire equally as strong to visit Washington and the battlefields in its vicinity, ground consecrated by the valor of the soldiers of the Union.

There was a guaranty; there was a condition; there was the temptation laid down side by side with the offer made by the city of my distinguished friend, who agreed to and offered to provide everything necessary for the comfort, care, and well-being of the soldiers while there. They knew, they must have

known from the words they used when they penned that invitation to these soldiers, what the language meant and what effect it was intended and expected to convey.

Now, listen:

Mr. HENDERSON. Did not the Grand Army take the initiative here in Washington, and did they not make representations as to what the cost would be?

Mr. EDSON. They said \$50,000 would be ample.

Mr. HENDERSON. You felt justified in relying upon their representations? Mr. EDSON. Mr. Pipes spoke for them, and they said \$50,000 would be enough. Others said it would take more. The impression I got was that \$50,000 would be enough to guarantee the ordinary expenses.

Then came the papers of the District and declared the amount sufficient, and that if it were not, enough would be subscribed to meet all of the requirements of the entertainment proposed. Mr. Edson says in regard to this matter:

So far, he has got \$40,000, but there is no difficulty about it. We can get \$100,000 or whatever may be necessary.

Now, a little further on, Commissioner Douglass being upon the stand, in response to a question, he says:

As to the amount of money, we called in four or five members of the Grand Army who had had experience in encampments, and they said \$50,000, and not less, would be sufficient. We looked around and visited a number of citizens, and we got the subscription. That was the idea I had; and that was all I knew about it. I had not previously had my attention directed to the matter of expense. We said we would have a guaranty fund of \$50,000, supposing it would be enough. It was thought that that would be ample. We got this information from men who knew, as we thought. We had a lively time over it, and we talked to soldiers and became satisfied that more would be required.

Now, these gentlemen have put themselves in this predicament; they find by reference to the expenditures that other cities have incurred in this respect, and taking into consideration the probably much greater number of soldiers and others accompanying them, who will visit Washington, that a much larger sum would be necessary. What then do they ask? They do not seek to make up this fund amongst themselves as was expected, but they come here to Congress and ask us to assist them, to put our hands into the Treasury of the Federal Government and make up the deficiency.

As one of the conferees, Mr. Speaker, I am willing to put my hand into the Treasury to make up a reasonable amount to supply the wants and requirements for this occasion. But I insist, as a matter of right and justice, that that money should come out of the proceeds of the revenues collected in this District. This is a District show and nothing more or less.

Now, gentlemen do not let us say it is not right because the District of Columbia is not able to stand such a strain. Why, sir, we are told to-day that there will be nearly a half million of dollars surplus in the Treasury in the shape of receipts from the taxes collected in this District of Columbia after the expenditures of the year are made.

The District is amply able to stand it, and to-day, as my friend suggests, it is one of the lightest-taxed cities in the country. If the necessity existed, if the nature of the occasion was such as in my poor judgment required it, I would not hesitate for a moment to vote out of the Treasury the necessary funds to promote this affair and make it what it should be. But I can not see it in that light. These people are amply able to stand the expense, and there is no reason why they should not stand it.

Mr. Speaker, there is another thing which should not be forgotten, and which, in my opinion, is quite important, and that is the fact that the city of Washington in itself, by virtue of its public buildings, having, as I learned, offered its public school buildings, with all its other buildings, with all its immense facilities for the entertainment of these people, can take care of them at a less cost than any other city in this country. This is a big item in this matter, and should be considered. As my friend says, the proposition to give these gentlemen \$75,000, added to their \$50,000, makes an amount which is \$28,000 in excess of any amount ever expended in the entertainment of the old soldiers in any city in this country; and, in God's name, how much more would they have? Like all those who get appropriations from this Government, they could, if we were more lavish, spend the money as long as they had dollars to spend; but there is no sense or justice in that. There is nothing right about it. They are amply able to pay it, and they should pay it.

And now as to the amount. I repeat the statement which I have just made, that the \$50,000 subscribed by the citizens and the \$75,000 from the treasury of the district, makes an amount \$28,000 in excess of the greatest amount expended at any reunion of these soldiers in the country; and in my judgment, with the facilities which Washington affords, and this additional amount, every man who comes here will be provided for, properly cared for, and will be well pleased with his entertainment. Of course they should be well provided for. Make no mistake about that.

I do not want to see these people improperly treated. I do not want to see any man coming here wearing the blue, as my friend

suggests, who has bared his breast in battle in defense of his country—I do not want to see any man of that character come to this city and not be amply, adequately, and liberally provided for; but believing that this sum will do it I can not give my consent, unless I am otherwise instructed by this House, to vote for an additional amount.

I yield the remainder of my time to the chairman of the committee [Mr. DOCKERY].

Mr. DOCKERY. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HARRIES].

Mr. HARRIES. Mr. Speaker, the question for us to determine is simply whether this appropriation shall be paid out of the revenues of the District, or shall be paid out of the general fund, in which the Federal Government shares half of the expense. We are drifting somewhat away from the real question. It must be borne in mind that the city of Washington will largely realize and receive the benefit of this encampment when it is held here in September next. The probability is that the people who come here will expend perhaps in the neighborhood of a million of dollars in the city of Washington. They are not mendicants or semidependents. What it is necessary to provide is for their lodging, and heretofore in the several encampments there has been considerable expended in decoration. That perhaps is not necessary here so much, or if it is it is already provided for to a large extent by the men who are in the employ of the Government.

These parks all about the city have received the work of the gardener in setting out the different corps badges in flowers that at that time will blossom and bloom in colors, so that they will be distinct and readily seen. It is not necessary to provide for the gratuitous entertainment of these visitors. They do not ask for that. All they want is that they shall have an opportunity to lodge themselves and to provide something for themselves to eat at a reasonable sum. Now, while the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COMPTON] acquits my friend from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] of attempting to give this question any political tinge, I am inclined to think that perhaps the gentleman is mistaken, and that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] did attempt to give it a political color, because it can make no difference to him nor the Grand Army whether this amount is paid out of the revenues of the Government or whether it is paid out of the revenues of the District, so far as furnishing the amount which is necessary for the comfortable entertainment of these men when they come here. The gentleman seeks to give it that bias by insisting that the appropriation shall be made out of the general Treasury, and that the Government shall pay one-half of it just the same as it does to put down the asphalt pavements in the city of Washington.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the matter that confronts us simply with this proposition: Here is a large city, grown wonderfully magnificent within the last quarter of a century. It is no more entitled to this relief, if it may be so called, than any other city where the encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic has been held in the past. It is no more entitled to this favor than was Detroit, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Milwaukee, or any of the cities where, during the past twenty-five years, the encampment has been held from year to year. Why, then, should we make this appropriation in this way and relieve the citizens of Washington from any burden, if it is a burden? They are going to receive the benefit of it, largely at least, and there is no necessity for doing anything of the kind. The Grand Army of the Republic do not ask it themselves. I have been to nearly all the encampments held within the last four or five years, and know whereof I speak. They are ready to pay their own way. All they ask is that it shall be reasonable and that they be given an opportunity to do it. This city is no more entitled to this favor than Philadelphia, Harrisburg, or Baltimore.

When the lines of Gen. Lee and his gallant army went back from Cemetery Ridge and across the Potomac, those cities were protected just as much as Washington was. Those cities would perhaps have gone into the hands of the enemy just as readily and just as quickly as the city of Washington. There is no reason why this distinction should be made at this time, and this appropriation should be made out of this general fund. Indeed, it has been already stated that if this appropriation is made it will provide for an amount that will exceed what has ever been used at any national encampment. The amount that was used at Milwaukee was \$48,915.66, the amount used at Boston was \$88,603.67, and the amount used at Detroit was \$97,848.88.

This will provide a fund of \$125,000, or \$28,000 more than ever has been utilized and used at any one of these national encampments, and this city is peculiarly situated in having a large number of magnificent buildings and places where men can be housed, where they can have opportunity to meet and gather together, and, if need be, to sleep. The other cities have not had that advantage. In other cities it was necessary to erect buildings for

a particular purpose in some cases. Here we have magnificent grounds, beautiful places, where tents can be set up, where every facility is granted for the taking care of these men, and where the amount that would be requisite for their well-being and to take care of them would be a minimum as compared with other cities where the encampments have been held from time to time.

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, this proposition is a plain and simple one. Here is a large city with a population of about 232,000 people. It is proposed to have the national encampment here, when there would be spent in the neighborhood of \$1,000,000, and perhaps more. The people who reside here will realize the benefits of it. They will have that money put in circulation, and there is no reason why they ought not to contribute to this expense. They do not ask or protest against this expenditure of \$75,000 in the shape of a tax upon their own resources; but, so far as I know, and so far as I have any reason to believe, they are perfectly willing that it should be done.

So far as I know there is not a protest coming from any citizen of the city of Washington against this proposition. A self-constituted committee, as my friend from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] says, "the executive committee" of this city—I do not know where he gets that from—a committee of citizens here have asked that this Congress shall make this appropriation of \$100,000 and that \$50,000 of it shall be paid out of the National Treasury and \$50,000 out of the revenues of the District. Now, my proposition is simply to provide that these people who are going to receive the benefits of this gathering shall have the privilege of contributing for their entertainment just as the other cities all over this whole land have done.

We probably have been doing more for this city of Washington than would be reasonable; and if we had this capital located out in the Mississippi Valley we would take care of the entire expense and would not ask the General Government for one single cent. Not only that, but we could and would donate them more land and better land than they have here. Their land would not have been worth \$10 an acre if it had not been for the location of the capital. I understand my friend to say that because these people contributed one-half of the city's expenses that they are doing the National Government a favor.

Let me tell the gentleman that the city of Washington exists only because it contains the nation's Capitol. If it was not the seat of Government there would not be any city here. The Government created, it built the city, and to it the city owes the fact that it exists. All that this city has and is due to the liberality of the United States and not to the liberality of the citizens of the District of Columbia.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert in my remarks the following newspaper editorials upon this subject, viz:

A VERY SHABBY SHAM—WASHINGTON FOLKS KNOWINGLY MISLEAD—THEY SAY THE BIG APPROPRIATION IS TO PAY EXPENSES OF GRAND ARMY MEN—IT IS NOT, AND GRAND ARMY MEN WOULD NOT ACCEPT IT IF IT WERE.

Whitewater Register: The action of the Washington City authorities in asking a donation from Congress of \$100,000 to aid in caring for the Grand Army encampment this fall is being justly denounced by the press of the country and also by the Grand Army posts. It is claimed that large sums are needed to entertain the visiting veterans free; that is all pretense. The Grand Army of the Republic people ask no free entertainment; they are willing to pay their way and expect to do so. The cities which they have visited heretofore have always done a good deal in the way of decoration, as in the case of other conventions, and usually have provided tents or halls for such veterans as might desire to "camp out," but if Washington does not wish to do this no old soldiers are going to kick. They do kick, however, on being advertised as semidependents and will not submit to the insinuation. Doubtless there will be a much smaller attendance on account of this effort of the Washington City officials to put the old soldiers in a wrong light for the benefit of the local treasury.

Also this from the Milwaukee Telegraph, a Republican journal, edited by Col. J. A. Watrous, himself a gallant soldier in the Iron Brigade:

WASHINGTON'S INEXCUSABLE CONDUCT.

The silliest claim that has yet been made by the people of any city where the Grand Army was ever held is that made by the Washington people. They claim that the hundred thousand dollars which Congress has been asked to appropriate is for use in feeding and housing the veterans who go there to attend the national encampment. Not one penny of that money will be used for that purpose, not a penny. More than that, the self-respecting members of the old Union Army who visit Washington on that occasion do not ask that a penny be used to feed and house them on that occasion. All they ask is to be furnished food and comfortable housing and be given an opportunity to pay a reasonable price for them. They are not going there as mendicants; the self-respecting men of the old Union Army are anything but paupers. Washington has, as stated last week, insulted not only the Grand Army of the Republic, but the whole soldier element by asking the General Government to pay its expenses in preparing for a national encampment that will take to the city not less than \$2,000,000.

It is the most contemptible piece of business that was ever perpetrated in the name of hospitality. The soldiers of all portions of the country resent it, and they are asking their Congressmen to defeat the measure, and it should be defeated; defeated in the interest of decency, in the interest of the survivors of the Union Army, in the interest of honesty. If it has come to pass that a city that invites the national encampment to hold its annual session in its midst must go to the National Government and ask for money with which to make preparations to properly receive the guests, it is high time that the national encampment abandon forever the custom of holding these great national gatherings.

If that bill goes through Congress, and Washington persists in using the money for the purpose for which they ask it, namely, to decorate the city and pay the expenses of committees, expenses for which other cities have raised money themselves, etc., let the word be passed along the line that there will be no general gathering at the national encampment; that it will be simply a gathering of six or seven hundred representatives to transact the business of the order, instead of a great gathering of a quarter of a million of people. That would be proper treatment for Washington if she does not change her conduct in this matter, and would be such a plain declaration to other cities that might want the Grand Army to visit them as would prevent any more going to Congress and begging for the necessary funds to make arrangements for the visitors.

Washington promised magnificently at Detroit last summer, but it is fulfilling shamefully, disgracefully, not only to the disgrace of itself, but, as already stated, to the disgrace of the Union veterans. At Detroit Henry Fink, of Milwaukee, said to the Washington delegation seeking of the national encampment: "I am opposed to going to Washington. Many of the older residents of Washington are the old rebels and do not care anything about the Grand Army, except that their coming will afford them an opportunity to gather in the shakels. They will pay the soldiers no honors, give them no hearty welcome, and the result will be that the clerks in Departments and officials sent there from all parts of the country will be called upon to foot the bills." He was answered by several of the delegation: "By no means; the people of Washington will raise all of the money that is necessary." "I do not believe it," was the brief answer of Mr. Fink. Yes, Washington is raising the money; but how is it raising it? By asking the people of the United States to contribute it.

For shame, Washington.

Mr. DOCKERY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS].

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of Horace Greeley Post, New York, Grand Army of the Republic. I yield to no man in loyalty and patriotism, and I yield to no man in fealty to the Constitution. I am sworn to support it. I can find no warrant in the Constitution of the United States for this outlay of Federal money.

Sir, the Federal Government did not invite the Grand Army to hold its encampment in Washington. This municipal council of the city of Washington, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] terms us, did not invite the Grand Army to come here.

The citizens of Washington invited the Grand Army here. As the citizens of Washington are to reap the benefits arising from the encampment, let Washington foot the bills. The Federal Government ought not to be asked to do so. The Constitution will not allow it. By what right then do you assume to tax the tobacco-growers of Virginia and of North Carolina to give the Grand Army a "blow out" in the District of Columbia? By what right do you tax the rice-grower of South Carolina, the fruit-raiser of Georgia, and the cotton-grower of the Gulf States to give this grand "blow out?" The wheat-grower of the West, the sorghum-planter of Kansas, the lumber-worker of Michigan and Wisconsin has something to say about where his money shall go.

It is assumed that this donation shall be made out of the Federal Treasury because the encampment is to be held in the capital of the United States. The argument does not hold. There is no precedent for it. When the State encampment of the Grand Army was held in Albany no Republican in a Republican Legislature had the hardihood to urge that we should tax the State for its entertainment on the ground that it was held in the capital of the State. The encampment has been held in Detroit, it has been held in St. Louis, in San Francisco, and in Boston. Did any of the inhabitants of those cities ask the Federal Government for an appropriation to entertain the Grand Army when holding its encampment there? Why should an exception be made of the city of Washington?

If you establish this precedent, where are you going to stop? Some citizens of Washington may invite that select band of veteran aristocrats known as the Loyal Legion [laughter] to hold their encampment here. Will you give \$100,000 to entertain them? Some citizens of Washington may invite the the Society of the Army of the Potomac to hold its encampment here. Are you going to give \$100,000 for the entertainment of that society? Yet if the city of Washington is specially indebted to anybody for its safety, it is to the Army of the Potomac.

If the Society of the Army of the Cumberland, or of the Army of the Tennessee, should be invited by the citizens to hold a session here, does that bind the Federal Government to make an appropriation for their benefit out of the Federal Treasury? By no means, sir. Enough has been already subscribed for this purpose, and if the city of Washington desires to expend \$75,000 out of her own revenues, we are told, and we know, that it will be \$28,000 more than was ever spent to entertain an encampment of the Grand Army in any other city.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DOCKERY. I yield the gentleman from New York two minutes more.

Mr. CUMMINGS. And, Mr. Speaker, if this money is voted for this purpose, it may well be asked why a similar sum was not set aside for Vicksburg, when both the Grand Army and the Confederate veterans held a reunion on the anniversary of the

surrender of that city? The war is over. Confederates and Federals are now Union men, and stand equal in the Government. I can imagine what a howl of agony there would be in this House if somebody in the city of Washington should invite the Confederate veterans to a reunion here, and then gravely propose to donate \$100,000 to entertain them. Yet the cases are similar. If you have the right to do the one under the Constitution, you certainly have the right to do the other. If the Masonic fraternity or the Woman's Christian Association should be invited to hold a reunion here would anybody come into the House and gravely move that we should make an appropriation of \$100,000 to entertain them? The conditions are similar. We are already expending \$140,000,000 a year for the support of our veterans and their widows and orphans. There is no constitutional warrant for this appropriation, nor has the Grand Army asked for it. Our only obligation here is to perform the duty we are sworn to perform, to obey the laws of the United States, and to support the Constitution of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] occupy the remainder of his time now.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROCKWELL].

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I cannot sit here and quietly let pass the insinuations which have been made with reference to an organization of which I have the honor to be a member, and which has been invited to hold its annual encampment in the city of Washington during the coming fall. Nor, when I remember of what class of citizens that organization is constituted, where it is distributed, the influence which it has in this country, and its worth, can I afford to sit here and let it go to the country that every man who is opposed to this proposition upon the floor of this House is a Democrat and every man in favor of it is a Republican.

Gentlemen on my side of the House have said this should not be made a party matter; and it is for this reason—that it may not be made a party matter, that it may not be made a partisan matter—that I rise to enter my protest against what has been said and the action which has thus far been taken by Democratic members on this proposition. Why, sir, do you know who they are who have been invited here? Do you know that this organization comprises within its ranks 7,000 posts, containing over half a million of the very best citizenship of this country? Do you know that this organization comprises within its ranks the President of the United States, Senators in Congress, members of the House of Representatives, gentlemen representing the Supreme bench of the United States and the supreme bench of every State in this Union? Do you know that these are the gentlemen who constitute a large element in this organization. It does not embrace simply the poor, old, crippled veterans to whom the gentleman from Iowa referred as crawling or staggering here upon crutches; it is not such alone that we are asked to do honor to on this occasion.

Now, these men have been invited here. A very distinguished citizen of this nation, whose name has recently been in every mouth, once said with regard to a great political question: "It is a condition, not a theory, that confronts us." Now, that is exactly the state of affairs here. The condition is that this great organization has been invited not alone by the citizens of the District of Columbia or the city of Washington. They have been invited here, as they understand and as they have the right to understand, to be the guests of the nation at the nation's capital. This is not the first time they have visited this capital. When almost thirty years ago they were here in such large numbers there was no question raised about their entertainment. We were all glad to see them. The nation was glad to see them come here, to give them welcome, and to do them honor. And I was glad to hear the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COMPTON] advert to that great parade, when the armies of Grant and Sherman marched up the avenue and received the plaudits of the nation. Thirty years have since elapsed. Those men have grown old and gray. After the war they formed this organization, based upon the principles of fraternity, loyalty, and charity; and, as I have said, that organization has grown until it comprises within its ranks half a million of the best citizenship of this country. Year by year they have held their national encampments. Cities have vied with each other in inviting them. When they were invited to Boston the State of Massachusetts made an appropriation to assist in entertaining them; the city of Boston made an appropriation for the same purpose. When they went to Detroit that city, through its municipal authorities, made an appropriation to entertain them. They were invited to come here.

The invitation did not emanate from the citizens of Washington alone. It was signed by representatives of the national Government—among others by the Commissioners who have charge

of the affairs of this District; it was officially signed by them. The Grand Army had the right to believe that the invitation came, not from the citizens of Washington, not from the Grand Army organization in this District, but that they were invited to come here to be the nation's guests, for the invitation came from the agents of the nation having charge of the municipal affairs of this District.

It has been said there was a guaranty fund. So there was. Nobody believed at the start that \$50,000 would not be a sufficient amount to properly entertain the encampment. It turns out that \$50,000 is insufficient. Why, Mr. Speaker, do you know that within a radius of twenty-four hours' ride by rail from the city of Washington there are living 230,000 members of the Grand Army of the Republic? Do you know that in the States constituting New England there are 62,000 members of this organization?

Do you know that in the State of New York there are 45,000 members; that in the great State of Pennsylvania there are 55,000; in New Jersey, 9,000; in Maryland, 4,000; in West Virginia, 4,000; in Ohio, 50,000, making in all in round numbers 230,000. Is the gentleman from Missouri aware that in his own State there are 20,000 members of the Grand Army of the Republic?

Mr. DOCKERY. I am quite aware of it, and I am aware of the further fact that when we extended an invitation to this Grand Army the citizens of our State made ample contribution to entertain them, there being a surplus of \$12,000, which was devoted to charity. [Applause.]

Mr. ROCKWELL. Now, let me answer the gentleman from Missouri right here. It is a condition, not a theory, that we are meeting. Let me say that it is impossible in the city of Washington to raise by subscription enough money to take care adequately of all the soldiers, with their friends, who will come here.

A MEMBER. Why, then, were they invited?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I say that when the invitation was given nobody anticipated that there was to be so great an attendance. I have just stated that there are 230,000 members of the Grand Army within a radius of twenty-four hours' ride by rail from the city of Washington. There are over 200,000 more old soldiers who are not members. These veterans who were mustered out of service nearly thirty years ago desire to come here with their wives and their sons and their daughters to revisit the scenes connected so closely in history with their past service. They have so desired for years, and it was to meet this well-known desire that the invitation was extended. It was to give the veterans and their sons and daughters an opportunity to revisit the Capitol which they saved and the fields on which they fought. Within a radius of a hundred miles from Washington are all the battlefields over which the glorious Army of the Potomac marched and fought for four long years. This encampment gives the half million survivors of that army, now grown gray, easy opportunity to revisit those fields. These are some reasons why so many more veterans are coming to Washington than have ever attended any other national encampment.

Mr. MEREDITH. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MEREDITH. I want to ask you in all seriousness whether or not there is any warrant in the Constitution of the United States to appropriate the money from the Treasury of the Government for any such purpose?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I answer the gentleman that there is just as much warrant for making this appropriation from the joint fund as there is for making it from the funds of the District of Columbia. It is as constitutional to make it in the usual way as it will be to make an exception against the old soldiers. If there is any constitutional provision in the way at all to prevent it, then the whole operation should be voted down, and you should not provide a dollar for this purpose.

Mr. BUTLER. That is the right view.

Mr. ROCKWELL. If it is to be voted at all, do not make a distinction with reference to this fund as against every other appropriation made out of the funds of the District of Columbia. You provide for other expenses which have no more constitutional warrant than this without question. You buy pictures and statuary, adorn parks and support zoological and botanical gardens and furnish music to the populace—

Mr. MEREDITH. My friend does not answer my question. Now I assume that he is a lawyer and a good one. I take it that he is a constitutional lawyer—

Mr. ROCKWELL. Well, I will admit that. [Laughter.]

Mr. MEREDITH. And I ask if there is any warrant in the Constitution to give away the people's money for such purpose as that contemplated here?

Mr. SNODGRASS. And if so, to point out the clause of the Constitution in which it may be found.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I say that if there is any warrant at all—

Mr. MEREDITH. But the question is, is there any warrant?

Mr. ROCKWELL. If there is any warrant to vote away the people's money raised by taxation in the District for the purpose of such entertainment, there is just as much warrant for voting the provision contained in the original amendment. We have no more right to take it exclusively from the funds of the District of Columbia than from the Government Treasury, when you look at it as a constitutional question. The \$75,000 proposition, about which I understand there is no question, is recommended by the very gentlemen who are now raising this constitutional quibble.

Mr. MEREDITH. My friend has not answered my question, although he has taken an oath to support the Constitution he will not answer it.

Mr. ROCKWELL. In answer to the gentleman I will say that the municipal powers of the city of Washington, having been entrusted to this Congress, it is virtually its common council; and I believe that the entertainment of this organization at this time is just as much a proper municipal expense as various other items about which there is no question. It is as much a "public use" within the meaning of the Constitution.

Mr. MEREDITH. But the common council has no right to vote away the money of the people except in the manner that the law warrants them to vote it.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Congress is the common council, and may make any law for the expenditure of money not prohibited by the Constitution. Other municipalities have held this to be a public use of corporate funds, and as such constitutional. It was done in Boston; it was done in Detroit; it was done in San Francisco without question, and this is precisely the same proposition.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me ask the gentleman if in his judgment it was legal for them to do it in those places? Is it legal to use the public funds in Boston or in any other place for such a purpose?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I think it is. You raise money by taxation, erect statues in honor of dead soldiers, and pay it out of the Federal Treasury, but you quibble when it comes to honoring the living ones. You appropriate money without stint to the Columbian Exposition and call it a "public purpose" because it teaches lessons in history and the arts. Will not this occasion equally well teach lessons in history and patriotism?

Sir, the teaching which will come from the spectacle of half a million citizen-soldiers and soldier-citizens, revisiting the scenes where thirty years ago they saved the nation's life, received a nation's thanks, and then quietly returned to the pursuits of civil life, will be of the utmost value to the rising generation, and may well warrant the expenditure by that nation of this paltry amount as for a public purpose of the highest degree—an object lesson in American patriotism.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR].

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I will talk purely business now for a few minutes.

There are fifteen or twenty large Government buildings in this city. If these Government buildings were owned by private individuals they would be taxed, and would contribute to this expense, if the tax were levied as in Boston and other cities. There are several thousand acres of land here belonging to the Government. If this land were owned by individuals and taxed as the land around other cities is owned and taxed it would also contribute to this expense. There are hundreds of parks in this city, more parks than are in any other city in the world, and they are owned by the Government. If these parks were owned by individuals and taxed as private property is taxed they would contribute to this expense.

There are perhaps two hundred Congressmen here who live in two hundred of the houses of this city, and while these buildings pay taxes the two hundred Congressmen pay none; and there are more than twenty thousand Government employes in this city who pay no taxes on personal property because they are coming and going and are regarded as transient residents.

In any other city this twenty thousand people would pay taxes on their personal property. Here they do not. Their personal property can not be reached for purposes of taxation.

Now, the only question is whether this Government, which owns such a large portion of the city, owns such a large proportion of the buildings, such a large amount of the lands in and about the city in parks and reservations and which is represented so largely by its officers, clerks, and employes, Congressmen, and others, men who represent the Government but who pay no taxes, I say the only question is whether this Government, under these circumstances, shall contribute its share to the expense of entertaining the veterans.

We appropriate money to build monuments, to erect statues, to maintain expositions, and we certainly owe a greater obligation to the men who saved this capital and the life of the Republic than to any other class of people for whose benefit we have ever appropriated money. Besides, this is not a large appropriation. If this so-called tax were equally distributed it would only put a burden of 90 cents on a thousand people—less than a mill per capita.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has seven minutes.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. I yield that time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker [applause on the Democratic side], I suppose the applause from the other side is not out of any respect for myself, but I accept it as the failure on your part to properly consider the question now before the American Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I would like to have spoken on this subject in a quiet and business like way. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Speaker, I hope we will have order. I do not care for the applause of the gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. PENDLETON. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we may have order. The gentleman is entitled to it, as well as any other member.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for his courtesy. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!" on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House will be in order.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Those gentlemen who are calling for a vote will, I presume, vote "no" on the proposition.

I am not in sympathy with the citizens of Washington on this proposition. Those who have been here for a short time know that the citizens of Washington get all they can out of us. [Laughter.] I am glad that that meets with a sympathetic response on the part of the members. [Renewed laughter.] But the question before us, Mr. Speaker, does not reach simply the citizens of Washington, the boarding-house keepers, and the hotel men, but this is a national affair, and we should look at it from that standpoint. Probably this meeting of the encampment this fall in Washington will be the last that the old soldiers of the war of 1861 will ever take part in. It is a matter which appeals to every patriotic citizen of the United States. [Applause.]

I was not in the army myself, but I see many on this floor who were, and whether they wore the blue or whether they wore the gray, as American citizens I believe they should feel an interest in an affair of this kind. [Applause.] You gentlemen on that side of the House who took part in trying to destroy this Union fought like tigers. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. REED. Like Tammany tigers. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Yes, you were entitled to the credit of the nations of the world for your bravery in the cause which went down, and which by going down was the grandest thing that ever occurred to the people of this or any other country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Speaker, I favor the passage of this bill and shall vote for the same.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, two or three gentlemen on this side desire to be heard briefly, and then I would like to ask for a vote. I do not wish to detain the House.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. If you are going to have more speeches, we had better adjourn until to-morrow and take it up afresh.

Mr. DOCKERY. No; let us finish it to-night. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN].

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to one phase of this question which has not impressed itself upon the minds of those who have spoken.

I am willing to concede that those who favor this appropriation, favor it in all earnestness, and because they believe it is proper, and I hope they will concede as much to those of us who do not believe that it is a proper expenditure of the public money.

There are two questions involved. First, whether we shall pay any part of this appropriation out of the national Treasury, and second, whether we, acting as a common council for the District of Columbia, shall impose a part or all of it upon the District. What has been said so far has largely been directed against taxing the people generally—the whole people of the United States. I have received some protests, which I ask permission to insert in the RECORD, from Grand Army posts in my State, protesting against being made to contribute to their own entertainment, against being compelled to expend money to extend hospitality to themselves, as it were, when it was promised to them by the people of Washington.

The peculiar form of government here is not sufficient justification for this request for national contribution. If granted, we may be embarrassed by similar requests from other cities.

Whether the Nebraska soldiers would object to the people of the District of Columbia being taxed for that purpose or not I do not know; but for myself I am opposed to our imposing upon the people of the District of Columbia a tax so extraordinary as that which is asked by this proposition, whichever form you may adopt.

Mr. Speaker, I have been impressed in this Congress with the value of precedents. It is only necessary to cite some precedent here in order to get through almost anything you want. We have had cited the precedents of Detroit and Boston as proof positive that we ought to do the same thing here.

I ask the members of this House to remember that if the Congress of the United States imposes upon the District of Columbia this extraordinary expense for the entertainment of guests there is not a city in the United States where the precedent will not be invoked as an excuse for using money raised by taxation to entertain people who may come there upon one pretense or another. Where can we draw the line between the entertainment of the members of the Grand Army of the Republic and the entertainment of any other civic body in our midst?

I am not discriminating against the soldier. If there is a body for the entertainment of whose members I would be willing to appropriate the public money, it is the Grand Army of the Republic; but, Mr. Speaker, regarding my oath, I am not willing to appropriate money raised by taxation for the entertainment of that body or any other body. I am not willing to say to the people, "You shall contribute money whether you wish to or not to entertain people invited to the city for the purpose of making money for the people who invited them."

Who asks that the 230,000 people of the District shall bear this burden; not the soldiers themselves? Not the home-owners or the taxpayers, but the ones who on their own responsibility and for their own benefit promised the hospitality which other cities stood ready to extend. What right have we to lay unnecessary burdens on 99 per cent of the people here at the request of 1 per cent and for the direct benefit of that 1 per cent?

It was a business proposition pure and simple. Who extended the invitation? The invitation was extended by the representatives of the railroads, who tell you that they will scarcely be able to transport all of the people who are coming. It was extended by the keepers of hotels, whose houses will be overcrowded during the encampment. It was extended by the street-car companies. It was extended by those various business men, who invited the Grand Army of the Republic not because they are survivors of the late war, not because they risked their lives in our nation's defense, not because they maintained the integrity of this country, but because by coming here they will bring money and leave it in the pockets of those who extended the invitation.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Is it not true that the invitation is signed by the District Commissioners?

Mr. BRYAN. But by what authority?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Is there an officer of a street-car company or a hotel-keeper on that invitation?

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly.

Mr. ROCKWELL. One?

Mr. SNODGRASS. And the saloon-keepers.

Mr. BRYAN. Here are the names of the agents of both the principal railroad companies of this paper. But, Mr. Speaker, another thing. If we can say that the United States will impose upon the people of the District of Columbia a tax for the purpose of entertaining public gatherings, I ask you what opportunity the other cities of this country will have to compete with the city of Washington in the entertaining of public bodies. With the Federal Treasury behind her she can outbid all the cities put together. They tell you that when they invited this body here they did not expect it would be so large; they thought that \$50,000 would be sufficient; and yet in the invitation they go on to tell you that it is a most beautiful city, and that more people will come here than will go to any other place.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BRYAN. I ask the gentleman from Missouri to yield me one more minute.

Mr. DOCKERY. I yield one more minute.

Mr. BRYAN. Now, Mr. Speaker, if it is worth \$50,000 to the people, to the railroads, to the street-car companies, to the hotels, restaurants, and other business houses, to entertain 50,000 people in the District of Columbia, I ask if it will not be worth \$100,000 to entertain 100,000 people? They want to purchase a \$100,000 or \$150,000 business advantage for \$50,000, and ask the National Government or the District treasury to pay the rest.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, is there any provision here that compels

the people of the District of Columbia to pay their \$50,000 before they get the public contribution? Not one; and I venture the prediction that if we appropriate this money the public funds will be used before the guarantee fund will be called for. That is the way it is everywhere. I do not blame these people. They are simply human. They are asking that the burden which now rests upon themselves shall be transferred, if possible, to the shoulders of other people. Believing that it should neither be put upon the whole people nor the District of Columbia, I shall vote against both propositions. [Applause.]

I append resolutions passed by three soldier associations of my district, protesting against this appropriation:

FARRAGUT POST, GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC.

At a regular meeting of Farragut Post, No. 25, Grand Army of the Republic, Lincoln, Nebr., held April 9, 1892, the following resolutions and preamble were adopted:

Whereas at the national encampment held in Detroit, Mich., September, 1891, the city of Washington was the successful competitor for the encampment in 1892; and

Whereas said city of Washington by its written agreement, by its written proposition, promised and agreed to entertain said encampment and furnish all things necessary as per its schedule in writing filed with its proposition, which said promise and agreement was accepted by said encampment and believed to have been made in good faith; and

Whereas it has come to our knowledge that said city of Washington is now asking for a large appropriation from the national Treasury wherewith to pay the expenses of said encampment, which is not in accord with the promise and agreement of the said city of Washington upon which it secured the location of said encampment; and

Whereas there are still hundreds and thousands of honorably discharged Union soldiers who are unable to earn a comfortable living, are suffering for the necessities of life notwithstanding the liberality and generosity of our Government; and

Whereas if said appropriation is made or any appropriation is made for the object for which it is asked it will establish a dangerous and expensive precedent which will in time become a great drain upon our national resources, absorbing funds that are needed, and might better be applied to the support of aged, indigent soldiers. Therefore

Be it resolved, That we are opposed to the said appropriation, or any appropriation for the object stated, either in favor of the city of Washington or any other locality, for the same purpose, and we most respectfully ask our honorable Senators and Representatives in Congress to oppose said appropriation and all others of its kind.

And be it further resolved, That we approve the firm and manly course pursued by our honorable Senator, A. S. PADDOCK, in said matter, and we hereby tender him a vote of thanks, assuring him that we believe, with him, that said appropriation, if made, would be an injustice to other localities and not in the interests of our honorable, indigent ex-soldiers.

And be it further resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the National Tribune with the request that they be published and that a copy be sent to each of our honorable Senators and Representatives in Congress.

L. M. SCOTHORN, *Commander*.
T. B. BEACH, *Adjutant*.

E. U. POST, GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC.

At a regular meeting of E. U. Post, No. 62, Department of Nebraska, Grand Army of the Republic, held in Bennett, Nebr., April 9, 1892, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas Washington City is now asking Congress to appropriate \$100,000 to aid said city in entertaining the next national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held in Washington City in September, 1892:

Resolved by the members of E. U. Post, No. 62, Department of Nebraska, Grand Army of the Republic, in regular meeting, That we denounce the action of Washington City in asking for said appropriation as an act of bad faith upon the part of the citizens of said city, who secured the location of the encampment for the year 1892 upon the promise that they would care for and entertain the same and provide the necessary funds therefor.

Resolved, That we respectfully ask our honorable Senators and Representatives in Congress to oppose by all honorable means said appropriation now pending before Congress.

Resolved, That E. N. Cobb and W. A. Hartley be appointed a committee to forward a copy of these resolutions to Hon. W. J. BRYAN, member of Congress.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the resolutions passed at meeting above mentioned.

E. N. COBB, *Post Commander*.

UNION VETERAN REPUBLICAN CLUB.

At a regular meeting of the Union Veteran Republican Club of Nebraska, held at the club headquarters in the city of Lincoln, April 11, 1892, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas at the national encampment held in Detroit, Mich., in 1891, the city of Washington, D. C., was the successful competitor for the location of the encampment in 1892; and

Whereas said city of Washington by its written proposition promised and agreed to entertain said encampment and furnish all things necessary therefor, as per its schedule in writing filed with the proposition, which said proposition and agreement was accepted by said encampment and believed to have been made in good faith; and

Whereas it has come to our knowledge that said city of Washington is now asking for an appropriation from the national Treasury for a large sum of money wherewith to pay the expenses of said encampment, which is not in accordance with the promise and agreement of said city of Washington upon which it secured the location of said encampment; and

Whereas there are still hundreds and thousands of honorably discharged Union soldiers and sailors who are unable to earn a comfortable living and are suffering for the necessities of life, notwithstanding the liberality and generosity of our Government; and

Whereas if said appropriation is made or any appropriation is made for the object for which it is asked, it will establish a dangerous precedent which will in time be a great drain upon our national resources, absorbing funds that are needed and which might better be applied to the support of our indigent soldiers: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That we are opposed to the said appropriation or any appropriation for the object stated either in favor of the city of Washington or for any other locality for the same purpose, and we most respectfully ask our honorable Senators and Representatives in Congress to oppose said appropriation and all others of its kind.

And be it further resolved, That we approve the firm and manly course pursued by our honorable Senator, A. S. PADDOCK, in said matter, and we hereby

tender him a vote of thanks assuring him that we believe with him that any appropriation for the object claimed is an injustice to other localities and not in the interest of our honorable indigent ex-soldiers and sailors.

And be it further resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be furnished the Republican press of the State, and the National Tribune, with the request that they be published, and that a copy be sent to each of our honorable Senators and Representatives in Congress, and to the President of the United States.

J. B. STRODE,
C. M. PARKER,
H. C. MCARTHUR,
J. STEVENSON,
J. S. BARWICK,
JOHN GILLESPIE,
JOS. MCGRAW,
Committee.
BRAD. P. COOK,
Secretary.
J. E. HILL, *President.*

Mr. DOCKERY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DUNGAN].

Mr. DUNGAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] with his ready figures and his flowing eloquence almost convinced me that the city of Washington has been too generously dealt with by the Government, and when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SMITH] followed by stating that Washington has always been getting all it got out of us, I thought he ought to have added that we have been paying for all that we got out of it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one phase of this question which has not been touched, and as a member of the Grand Army of the Republic from its inception, and as one who is interested in its honor and its future, I desire to protest against taking \$100,000 out of the Federal Treasury to entertain us. I do so, because of the effect it will have upon the organization in the future. When cities ask us to hold our encampment they will say, Washington provided a fund when they invited us, and it turned out that we found we could not be entertained there without calling upon the Federal Government to help, and, therefore, we will find the invitations will be scarcer. We want to enjoy the respect of the people of this country as an order; we want to retain our own respect, and we do not want to be put in the attitude of beggars and paupers.

From three to five times the usual number have responded to this invitation to come to the city of Washington, showing that they are able to come. This money is not to help the poor soldiers to come here who can not come here. It is not a donation. It is not a charity; it does not rise to the dignity of that kind with the Grand Army of the Republic. It is simply to enable the city of Washington to do what any other city in America would have been proud and glad to have had the opportunity to do. [Applause.]

Mr. DOCKERY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DEARMOND].

Mr. DEARMOND. Mr. Speaker, it was, perhaps, proper that "the condition which confronts the House" should be stated, and it has been fully stated by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN]. Until he made a statement of the whole condition it had been only partially stated. What is the condition that confronts this House? When the question of determining where the next encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic should be held arose, and when representatives of different cities competed for the honor of entertaining the veterans, some gentlemen, a dozen or perhaps a hundred, from this city went before the meeting, professed that they had a guaranty fund sufficient to amply and generously entertain the Grand Army, and in competition with the representatives of other cities urged that they come to Washington and here hold their approaching encampment. These people who gave this invitation are spoken of here as though they constitute the population of the city of Washington or of the District of Columbia. In fact they are comparatively few. This question has been treated as though it were a question whether or not the veterans should be entertained here.

That is not the question. There is no doubt that provision will be made for their entertainment. This city, these citizens who will derive great benefit from their coming, these gentlemen who have pledged themselves to raise the fund required for their entertainment, can not, will not, dare not fail to provide the necessary fund, unless it shall become unnecessary for them to do so by reason of this Congress—not the common council of the city of Washington, but this Congress of the American people—taking the contract off their hands and making an appropriation to relieve them.

I repeat, this is not a question of whether or not the veterans shall be entertained. It is a question of who shall contribute the funds to entertain them. It has been stated by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON], and it is uncontradicted, and I take it to be true, that in the fourteen years since the passage of the act of 1878 that law has been adhered to, and whenever

appropriations have been made with reference to the District of Columbia one-half has been paid out of the Federal Treasury, and one-half out of the funds of the District of Columbia.

The first question fairly involved is this: Is the appropriation which the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio proposes to make one which ought to be made, as for fourteen years all appropriations made by Congress with reference to the District of Columbia have been made, one-half out of the Federal Treasury and one-half out of the District treasury? The logic of the situation, so far as there is any logic for making the appropriation at all, is with the gentlemen who are in favor of making it as all other appropriations have been made for years past, out of the District treasury and out of the Treasury of the United States, half and half. Those who oppose that oppose it in the main not upon the broad, tenable ground taken by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN], that there is no authority to make this appropriation out of either treasury or out of both, but they say, "We will compromise and make this a lone instance, a special example." They are shirking the responsibility of going to the American people and saying "Here, we appropriated \$50,000 of your money to entertain visitors invited by certain gentlemen of Washington City." They seek to escape that responsibility by saying, "We made the appropriation out of the District treasury."

I say the logic of the discussion, so far as this appropriation is concerned, if an appropriation is to be made at all, is with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON]. If this appropriation ought to be made, it ought to be made as all other appropriations have been made for the District of Columbia for years past. But certainly the American people ought not to be taxed to make such appropriations; and have the people of the District of Columbia asked for this appropriation? Have they asked what some gentlemen have characterized as the common council of the city of Washington to make this appropriation? No; the men who have guaranteed the funds, the men who stand responsible in honor, who stand responsible financially, who stand responsible in interest, to make up the fund that is required to entertain these veterans, if Congress refuses to raise it for them, they are the men who are asking for this appropriation. The question has been asked whether there has been any protest against this appropriation by the people of this District. The poor, the ordinary, the common people of this District are not around making protests. I do not wonder, sir, that when that argument is addressed to us we are spoken of, as we have been, as "the common council of the city of Washington."

Mr. DOCKERY. I yield two or three minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I desire only to say in closing this discussion on our part that in all that has been said by every speaker who has opposed this proposition the fact has been overlooked that under the law of 1878 the Government of the United States is practically a citizen of the city of Washington and the District of Columbia, and as such when appropriations are made for this city it has to bear under the law its part of the burden. No one has refuted that proposition.

As to the constitutional objection which has been raised here—an objection which has never been suggested in any committee or subcommittee on this subject—no one has pointed to any constitutional inhibition; and no one can show any reason why under the law of 1878 we can not make this appropriation just as well as we can appropriate for cleaning the streets or lighting the lamps or doing any other work of this District for which every citizen of the Republic who pays Federal taxes has to bear his share. This is all I have to say.

Mr. DOCKERY. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MOSES].

Mr. MOSES. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the statement made just now by the gentleman from Iowa that we are unwilling to entertain Federal soldiers, I wish simply to say that within the last year or two the city of Atlanta—a city which was practically burned up during the war by the Union forces—invited the Grand Army of the Republic to meet there; and if this organization had accepted the invitation, the old Confederate soldiers would have been too proud to come here and ask the Federal Government to bear the expense of that reunion. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I say this in reply to the suggestion that the South, that Southern men, and Democrats are not willing to entertain Federal soldiers. I repeat, we are too proud to invite people to come and be our guests and then ask the Federal Government to bear the expense of our hospitality.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. I will say to my friend from Georgia that I said nothing of the kind that he has referred to, and made no such intimation.

Mr. DOCKERY. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH].

Mr. CARUTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to read a letter which

I have received from the commander of Walter C. Whitaker Post, No. 75, Department of Kentucky, Grand Army of the Republic:

HEADQUARTERS WALTER C. WHITAKER POST, NO. 75,
DEPARTMENT OF KENTUCKY, GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC,
Louisville, Ky., May 2, 1892.

DEAR SIR: The committee of arrangements for the national encampment, Grand Army of the Republic, to be held in Washington in September next, have assigned for the use of the posts of Louisville and Jefferson County, the Weightman school building for our headquarters while in Washington. The building contains twelve rooms, which will hold cots enough, three hundred, for our delegation. If you can do anything for us, all we ask of the Government is to place the three hundred cots with comforts and pillows in this building. This is all that any other city has done for us where the national encampments have been held in the past six years; this is about all any of the departments ever asked for. So you see it won't take any hundred thousand dollars to grant our request. We will furnish our own rations, etc.

Respectfully,

P. W. HAGER.

Hon. A. G. CARUTH.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this letter expresses the sentiment of the common soldiers of this country. The people who want to drink champagne and be feasted and fed on these occasions may desire \$100,000 from the Government. Such persons may get the advantage of an appropriation of that kind; but the poor common soldier would not.

Mr. DOCKERY. I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, there is one point, and one only, involved in this question so far as I am concerned, and I wish to express it. I, as a Representative of the American people, have no right to vote one dollar or one cent of public money for any other purpose than absolutely public purposes. [Applause.]

Mr. DOCKERY. I now demand the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is first on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] for the resolution of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HARRIES]. The substitute will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of H. R. 82, numbered 144, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For the proper and legitimate expenses attending the reception and entertainment of such honorably discharged Union soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the war of the rebellion as may attend, as delegates or otherwise, the twenty-sixth national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, and attending the preparation for such reception and entertainment, \$100,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary. Said sum shall be paid to and be disbursed by the citizens' executive committee of Washington, having in charge such reception and entertainment, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War; and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to grant permits for the use of any reservation or other public space in the city of Washington for purposes connected with such encampment or with any reunion of veteran soldiers to be held at the same time and which in his opinion will inflict no serious or permanent injury upon such reservation or other public space; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may designate for such purpose such streets and avenues in the District as they may deem proper and necessary therefor."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute which has just been read.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. On that I would like the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 64, nays 142, not voting 122; as follows:

YEAS—64.

Atkinson.	Cox, N. Y.	Hermann.	Ray.
Bartine.	Crosby.	Hopkins, Ill.	Reed.
Belknap.	Curtis.	Houk, Tenn.	Reyburn.
Bentley.	Cutting.	Huff.	Rife.
Bergen.	Dalzell.	Jolley.	Rockwell.
Bowers.	Doan.	Loud.	Scull.
Broderick.	Enochs.	McDonald.	Smith.
Brosius.	Flick.	McKaig.	Stone, C. W.
Buchanan, N. J.	Funston.	O'Donnell.	Sweet.
Burrows.	Gantz.	O'Neill, Pa.	Taylor, Tenn.
Cadmus.	Geissenhainer.	Page, R. I.	Taylor, J. D.
Caldwell.	Grout.	Payne.	Townsend.
Campbell.	Harmer.	Perkins.	Waugh.
Cogswell.	Hayes, Iowa.	Post.	Wever.
Coombs.	Henderson, Iowa.	Powers.	Wilson, Wash.
Cooper.	Henderson, Ill.	Raines.	Wright.

NAYS—142.

Abbott.	Breckinridge, Ark.	Catchings.	Dixon.
Alderson.	Bretz.	Cate.	Dockery.
Alexander.	Brickner.	Clarke, Ala.	Dungan.
Arnold.	Brookshire.	Cobb, Ala.	Dunphy.
Babbitt.	Brown.	Cobb, Mo.	Durborow.
Bailey.	Brunner.	Coburn.	Edmunds.
Baker.	Bryan.	Compton.	Elliott.
Bankhead.	Buchanan, Va.	Covert.	Ellis.
Beaman.	Bunn.	Cox, Tenn.	English.
Blanchard.	Busey.	Crawford.	Epes.
Blount.	Butler.	Culbertson.	Everett.
Boatner.	Bynum.	Cummings.	Fellows.
Bowman.	Cable.	De Armond.	Forney.
Branch.	Caruth.	De Forest.	Fyan.
Brawley.	Castle.	Dickerson.	Goodnight.

Grady,
Greenleaf,
Hall,
Halvorson,
Hamilton,
Hare,
Harries,
Harter,
Hatch,
Haynes, Ohio
Henderson, N. C.
Holman,
Hooker, Miss.
Houk, Ohio
Johnson, Ohio
Johnstone, S. C.
Jones,
Kem,
Kilgore,
Kribbs,
Kyle,

Lanham,
Lapham,
Lawson, Ga.
Layton,
Lester, Ga.
Little,
Livingston,
Long,
Lynch,
Mallory,
McCreary,
McGann,
McMillin,
McRae,
Meredit,
Meyer,
Montgomery,
Moses,
Mutchler,

O'Neill, Mass.
Otis,
Outhwaite,
Owens,
Patterson, Tenn.
Paynter,
Pearson,
Pendleton,
Pierce,
Price,
Robertson, La.
Sayers,
Seerley,
Shell,
Shively,
Shonk,
Snodgrass,
Snow,
Sperry,
Steward, Ill.
Stout,

Stump,
Tarsney,
Terry,
Tillman,
Tracey,
Tucker,
Turner,
Turpin,
Warner,
Watson,
Wheeler, Ala.
Whiting,
Willcox,
Williams, Mass.
Williams, Ill.
Wilson, W. Va.
Winn,
Wise,
Youmans.

NOT VOTING—122.

Allen,
Amerman,
Andrew,
Bacon,
Barwig,
Belden,
Beltzhoover,
Bingham,
Bland,
Boutelle,
Breckinridge, Ky.
Bullock,
Bunting,
Bushnell,
Byrns,
Cammett,
Capehart,
Causey,
Cheatham,
Chapin,
Chipman,
Clancy,
Clark, Wyo.
Clover,
Cockran,
Coolidge,
Cowles,
Craig, Pa.
Crain, Tex.
Daniell,
Davis,

Dingley,
Dolliver,
Donovan,
Enloe,
Fitch,
Flithian,
Forman,
Fowler,
Geary,
Gillespie,
Gorman,
Griswold,
Hallowell,
Haugen,
Heard,
Hemphill,
Herbert,
Hitt,
Hoar,
Hooker, N. Y.
Hopkins, Pa.
Hull,
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, N. Dak.
Kendall,
Ketcham,
Lagan,
Lane,
Lester, Va.
Lewis,
Lind,

Lockwood,
Lodge,
Magner,
Mansur,
Martin,
McAleer,
McClellan,
McKeighan,
McKinney,
Miller,
Milliken,
Mitchell,
Morse,
Newberry,
Norton,
Oates,
O'Ferrall,
O'Neill, Mo.
Page, Md.
Parrett,
Pattison, Ohio
Patton,
Peel,
Pickler,
Quackenbush,
Randall,
Rayner,
Relly,
Richardson,
Robinson, Pa.
Rusk,

Russell,
Sanford,
Scott,
Simpson,
Springer,
Stahnecker,
Stephenson,
Stevens,
Stewart, Tex.
Stockdale,
Stone, W. A.
Stone, Ky.
Storer,
Taylor, Ill.
Taylor, E. B.
Taylor, V. A.
Van Horn,
Wadsworth,
Walker,
Warwick,
Washington,
Weadock,
Wheeler, Mich.
White,
Wike,
Williams, N. C.
Wilson, Ky.
Wilson, Mo.
Wolverton.

So the substitute was rejected.
The following additional pairs were announced for the rest of the day:

Mr. GILLESPIE with Mr. ATKINSON.
Mr. WOLVERTON with Mr. CHEATHAM.
Mr. O'FERRALL with Mr. HOPKINS of Pennsylvania.
Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky with Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR.
Mr. MANSUR with Mr. SMITH of Illinois.
Mr. PICKLER with Mr. MARTIN.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.
The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the resolution offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment numbered 144 and agree to the request of the Senate for another committee of conference, and it is hereby declared to be the judgment of the House that in the adjustment of the difference between the two Houses on the said amendment there should not be appropriated exceeding \$75,000, to be paid wholly from the revenues of the District of Columbia, for the proper and legitimate expenses attending the reception and entertainment of such honorably discharged Union soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the war of the rebellion as may attend as delegates or otherwise the twenty-sixth annual encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic in the city of Washington, D. C.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit a parliamentary inquiry. Can that question be divided? There are two propositions involved.

The SPEAKER. How would the gentleman suggest a division?

Mr. DE ARMOND. One proposition is that the House insist upon its disagreement. Another is that the House recommend \$75,000 to be appropriated out of the funds of the District. The reason I ask for a division is that I am for one proposition and against the other.

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair it may be divided.

Mr. DOCKERY. I think it is clearly divisible.

The SPEAKER. The question will first be taken upon the latter part of the resolution, if there be no objection.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Would not the question come more properly on the first part?

The SPEAKER. It is not material.

Mr. DE ARMOND. If the House refuses to insist upon its disagreement the second proposition would not be involved at all. If the House insists, then the question is whether it will instruct the gentlemen who may be appointed its conferees.

The SPEAKER. There is no motion to recede and agree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I understand that. The first proposition

is that the House insist on its disagreement. If it does not insist it will be a virtual instruction to the conferees to concur, and the second proposition would not be involved.

The SPEAKER. Unless the first part is adopted there will be no other conference. But, if the gentleman would prefer, the vote can be taken on that question.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I would prefer that course.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the first part of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 144, and agree to the request of the Senate for another committee of conference.

Mr. BROWN. In order that I may vote understandingly I would like to know what the amendment of the Senate is.

The SPEAKER. It has just been read. This is the proposition offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, but the vote will be taken only on the first part of it, and afterwards on the part which expresses the sense of the House.

The question was taken; and the first part of the resolution was adopted.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now read the second portion of the resolution on which a separate vote is asked.

The Clerk read as follows:

It is hereby declared to be the judgment of the House that in the adjustment of the difference between the two Houses on the said amendment there should not be appropriated exceeding \$75,000, to be paid wholly from the revenues of the District of Columbia, for the proper and legitimate expenses attending the reception and entertainment of such honorably discharged Union soldiers, sailors, and marines, who served in the war of the rebellion, as may attend as delegates or otherwise the twenty-sixth annual encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic in the city of Washington, D. C.

Mr. DICKERSON. Are we operating under the previous question?

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered.

Mr. DICKERSON. I ask unanimous consent to offer this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will cause it to be read if there be no objection, and afterwards submit the request of the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding:

"Provided, That no part of the \$75,000 appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia shall be used until the whole amount of the fund guaranteed by the citizens of Washington City shall have been exhausted."

Mr. DICKERSON. I offer that because I believe the shopkeepers and people who get the benefit of the soldiers coming here will use this general fund out of the public Treasury instead of the guaranteed fund, and thereby escape all liability.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. HARRIES. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection being made, the question recurs on the second branch of the resolution which has just been read.

Mr. SNODGRASS. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division, there were—yeas 38, noes 94.

Mr. BYNUM and Mr. SEERLEY. No quorum, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. COX of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The yeas and nays have been refused.

Mr. COX of Tennessee. On this proposition?

The SPEAKER. Yes, on this proposition. The point of no quorum is made, and the Chair will appoint the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HARRIES] as tellers.

Mr. HATCH. I hope the gentleman from Indiana who made this point of no quorum will withdraw it. I have a unanimous conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill, which I would like to present, and I want to get one appropriation bill before the President of the United States before the fiscal year ends, if possible. It will not take five minutes to consider it.

Mr. BYNUM. I want to get this amendment adopted before the other bill goes through.

The SPEAKER. The point is not withdrawn. The tellers will take their places.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that this vote may be suspended for a few minutes until I can make a privileged report on the agricultural appropriation bill, and let the report be agreed to, in order that the bill may go to the President before the close of the fiscal year. It is a unanimous report.

The SPEAKER. The trouble with the proposition of the gen-

tleman is that the point of no quorum has been made, and no business can be transacted in the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BYNUM. I will withdraw that point and move to reconsider the vote by which the yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana withdraws the point of no quorum. The yeas are 38 and the noes 94. The resolution is disagreed to.

Mr. BROWN. I renew the point of no quorum on that vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana renews the point of no quorum.

Mr. HATCH. I hope the gentleman from Indiana will not raise the point at this time; but will let the agricultural appropriation bill come before the House.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to that, but we want a quorum here.

Mr. HATCH. But the point of no quorum destroys all chance of getting the conference report before the House.

Mr. COX of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. There is some confusion and misunderstanding as to the vote. We do not exactly understand it. At least I do not, and I speak for myself.

The SPEAKER. On the resolution, the question being taken, the yeas were 33 and the noes 94; but the point is made that no quorum has voted, and therefore the Chair appointed tellers.

Mr. COX of Tennessee. Now, is it not proper to renew the call for the yeas and nays on that proposition?

The SPEAKER. No; the yeas and nays have been refused.

Mr. COX of Tennessee. On the same proposition?

The SPEAKER. On the same proposition. The tellers will take their places.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Indiana will withdraw the point. [Cries of "Regular order!"] I hope the gentleman will allow me to ask unanimous consent—[Renewed cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded from all parts of the House. Less confusion will ensue by pursuing the regular order. The tellers will take their places. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HARRIES].

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, why is it necessary for the tellers to take their places?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana renewed the point of no quorum.

Mr. REED. But that was after the Chair had announced the result.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood the gentleman [Mr. BROWN] to renew the point which had just been withdrawn by his colleague [Mr. BYNUM].

Mr. REED. That was after the announcement had been made by the Chair.

The SPEAKER. It was after the announcement was made, but the Chair is generally—

Mr. REED. If the gentleman says he intended to renew it, then the Chair is bound to recognize him; but if he did not, how is it possible, after the thing is over—

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood, by the gentleman's renewing it, that of course it must have been his intention to immediately renew it. It could not be renewed after the announcement, without the intention existed, to have the matter retain its status at the time his colleague made the point.

Mr. SEERLEY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SEERLEY. I rise for the purpose of saying that I made the point of no quorum, and that I never withdrew it.

Mr. REED. All right, that settles it.

The SPEAKER. The tellers will take their places. As many as favor the resolution offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will now pass between the tellers and be counted.

Mr. POWERS. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The House is now dividing, and the Chair could not entertain that motion just at this moment.

The House again divided.

During the count by tellers

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa said: A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Suppose this proposition is defeated, do the conferees go back without instructions?

The SPEAKER. They will go back without instructions.

During the further count

Mr. BROWN said: Mr. Speaker, it is evident that I am defeated, and I will therefore withdraw the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SEERLEY] also made the point of no quorum, and the point is insisted upon, as the Chair understands.

The count was continued and concluded.

The SPEAKER. On this question the yeas are 57 and the noes 112. The yeas have it, and the resolution is not agreed to.

The Speaker announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. DOCKERY, Mr. COMPTON, and Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate further insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 7093) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and had appointed Mr. HALE, Mr. ALLISON, and Mr. GORMAN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

It also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 5734) granting a pension to Eliza M. Boatright, the surviving widow of Alexander M. Boatright, who was a soldier in the Black Hawk war.

It also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles; in which concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (H. R. 5119) to prevent the building of houses along certain alleys in the city of Washington, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 3971) to provide for the opening of alleys in the District of Columbia.

It also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 981) granting a pension to Elizabeth N. Dunn;

A bill (S. 2118) restoring the name of Allen De Witt Hatch to the pension rolls of the United States;

A bill (S. 3076) granting an increase of pension to Wells Johnson;

A bill (S. 3134) for the relief of settlers upon certain lands in the States of North Dakota and South Dakota;

A bill (S. 3273) authorizing the St. Joseph's Church, in the parish of East Baton Rouge, in the State of Louisiana, to use the land quitclaimed to it by the United States for school purposes; and

A bill (S. 3126) to regulate the times for holding the terms of the United States courts in the State of South Dakota.

It also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6746) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes, and had insisted upon its amendment numbered 144, asked a further conference with the House on the amendment, and had appointed Mr. ALLISON, Mr. DAWES, and Mr. COCKRELL as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 8224) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CULLOM, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. BLACKBURN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

It also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1910) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the pensions of certain soldiers and sailors who are totally helpless from injuries received or from diseases contracted in the service of the United States," approved March 4, 1890, asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. HANSBROUGH, and Mr. PALMER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

It also announced that the Senate insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6875) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. STEWART, Mr. CULLOM, and Mr. GORMAN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

It also announced that the Senate insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 9040) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ALLISON, Mr. DAWES, and Mr. COCKRELL as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

It also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution (H. Res. 145) to provide temporarily for the expenditures of the Government.

It also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9089) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893.

It also announced that the Senate had passed the following concurrent resolutions, in which concurrence was requested:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That with the 6,000 copies already ordered to be printed of the reports on European immigration, the Public Printer be directed to include the letters to the commissioners from the European steamship companies and the accompanying circulars and appendix to the report on Russia, without map, and the general index under the supervision of the commissioners; and also to print as a separate volume the general appendix containing the consular letters, of which volume 1,200 copies shall be printed and bound, 400 copies for the use of the Senate and 800 copies for the use of the House.

Also:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 6,500 copies of the fourteenth number of the Statistical Abstract of the United States for the year 1891, prepared by the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department, 1,500 copies for the use of the members of the Senate, 3,000 copies for the use of the members of the House of Representatives, and 2,000 copies for the use of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WARWICK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 626) to provide the times and places for holding terms of the United States courts in the States of Idaho and Wyoming;

A bill (H. R. 5133) to authorize the Marinette and Western Railroad Company to construct a railroad through the Menomonee Reservation, in the State of Wisconsin; and

Joint resolution (H. R. 145) to provide temporarily for the expenditures of the Government.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, I present the report of the committee of conference on the agricultural appropriation bill. The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7089) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 8, and 19.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 22, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$10,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$6,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$27,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$12,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following: "Provided, That so much thereof as may be necessary, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be expended in investigating and preparing to carry on experiments next year in sugar cane production on reclaimed swamp lands in some suitable place in the San Joaquin or Sacramento Valley, California, to be used by the Department free of charge: *Provided further*, That all products of the experiments may be sold and the proceeds thereof be used in the experimental work, and that a full and accurate account of the proceeds of such sales be transmitted to Congress;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 20 and 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendments insert the following: "and the Secretary is hereby authorized to make promotions in the service without prejudice to those transferred from the Signal Service of the War Department;" and the Senate agree to the same.

W. H. HATCH,
A. CAMINETTI,
E. H. FUNSTON,

Managers on the part of the House.

W. B. ALLISON,
S. M. CULLOM,
WILKINSON CALL,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement of the House conferees was read, as follows:

The conferees on the part of the House submit the following statement to accompany the report herewith submitted:

The report submitted is unanimously agreed to by the conferees on the part of both House and Senate.

As the bill passed the House on the 8th day of June, 1892, it appropriated the sum of \$3,190,495.50.

Senate amendment No. 1 increased the salary of the chief of forestry from \$2,000 to \$2,500. The Senate conferees receded from the amendment, and the appropriation stands as it passed the House.

Senate amendment No. 2 was one of addition made necessary by amendment No. 1, and the Senate conferees receded as a matter of form.

Senate amendment No. 3 increased the appropriation to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to continue investigations concerning the feasibility of extending the demands of foreign markets for agricultural products of the United States. This is a very important work, and the results of experiments heretofore made have been satisfactory and encouraging. Believing that the sum of \$15,000 was larger than necessary, the House conferees receded with an amendment reducing the Senate amendment from \$15,000 to \$10,000.

Amendment No. 4, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to collect information on the best modes of irrigation, was agreed to with an amendment reducing the amount from \$10,000 to \$6,000.

Amendment No. 5 was one striking out the following words: "strictly confined to a statement of the percentage totals by States and a full total, without comment or argument," and inserting the following: "embrace only a statement of the condition of the crops by States and in the United States, with such explanations and comparisons with other months and years as may be useful for illustrating the above matter," and was agreed to, as the purpose is the same, and the explanation of the Senate conferees was accepted as entirely satisfactory.

Amendment No. 6, increasing the appropriation for the botanical division from \$25,000 to \$30,000, was agreed to with an amendment fixing the amount at \$27,500.

Amendment No. 7, merely corrects a clerical error in drafting the original bill, and was agreed to.

Amendment No. 8, increasing the appropriation for the division of entomology from \$17,800 to \$22,000, was receded from by the Senate conferees and the increase stricken out.

Amendment No. 9, making appropriations for the division of vegetable pathology from \$15,000 to \$20,000, was agreed to by the House conferees upon the statement of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture as to the necessity for it at this time.

Amendment No. 10, was one of verbiage only and was agreed to by the House conferees.

Amendment No. 11, increasing the appropriation for the division of forestry from \$8,000 to \$20,000, was agreed to with an amendment reducing the amount to \$12,000.

Amendments Nos. 12 and 13, are of verbiage only, and were agreed to by the House conferees.

Nos. 14 and 15 were submitted upon recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury, and were agreed to by the conferees.

Nos. 16 and 17 were merely informal, and were agreed to.

Amendment No. 18, Senate conferees receded with amendments which are as follows: Insert after the word "California," in line 4, page 20, the following words, "to be used by the Department free of charge," and striking out all after the word "Congress" in line 7, page 20.

Amendment No. 19, introducing experiments to test the application of electricity to farm machinery, was receded from by the Senate conferees.

No. 20 is one of punctuation merely, and was agreed to.

No. 21 was agreed to with the following amendment: After the word "make," in line 5, page 24, add "promotions in the service without prejudice to those transferred from the signal service of the War Department."

Amendment No. 22, striking out the words "not exceeding 99 per cent of existing rates," was agreed to upon the part of the House conferees.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

W. H. HATCH,
A. CAMINETTI,
E. H. FUNSTON,

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, the statement just read is a full one, noticing every amendment put upon the bill by the Senate. I will state to the House that more than two-thirds of the increases of the amounts placed upon the bill were receded from by the Senate conferees. They amounted in gross to nearly \$50,000, more than two-thirds of which was taken off; and the amendments left upon the bill were very strongly recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HOLMAN. How much will the bill carry as agreed upon?

Mr. HATCH. The Clerk has just read the statement. It carries about \$15,000 more than when it was reported to the House. It is the most reasonable addition to an appropriation bill I have ever known coming to the House from the Senate. Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question on the adoption of the report.

Mr. McMILLIN. Before doing that, will the gentleman from Missouri let me ask him a question? If there be a proposition here looking to a change or transfer of the question of the importation of animals from the Treasury Department to the Department of Agriculture, was there any change of that kind incorporated by the Senate in the bill?

Mr. HATCH. The Senate put on an amendment keeping the matter just where it is, but instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to report to the Secretary of the Treasury. As these amendments were agreed to by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury, we agreed to them. As agreed to, the bill leaves the law just as it stands.

Mr. McMILLIN. Who appoints the officials?

Mr. HATCH. The Secretary of the Treasury has entire control so far as the customs are concerned.

Mr. McMILLIN. I would like to hear the provision of the bill read, if it is not too long.

Mr. HATCH. It will be found in the report on the bill.

Mr. McMILLIN. I understand that the Secretary of the Treasury recommended this amendment.

Mr. HATCH. If the Clerk will read the amendment to the bill the gentleman will see what it provides.

Mr. McMILLIN. I do not desire to detain the House. If it

is the desire of the House it can go over until to-morrow, and I will look to it.

Mr. HATCH. I will ask the Clerk to read the amendment which I have pointed out, and the one following.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 16, after line 7, insert:

"That whenever the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury what countries or parts of countries are free from contagious or infectious diseases of domestic animals, and that neat cattle and hides can be imported from such countries into the United States without danger to the domestic animals of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury shall suspend the prohibition of the importation of neat cattle and hides in the manner provided by law."

Mr. HATCH. Let him read the other amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, after line 7, insert: "That the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury what are recognized breeds and pure-breed animals under the provision of paragraph 482 of the act of Congress approved October 1, 1890."

Mr. McMILLIN. I suggest to the gentleman from Missouri that that changes existing law. It puts it in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture to determine what are pure strains, and hence what shall be imported. It seems to me to have that effect.

Mr. JOHNSTONE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. It simply provides for giving the Secretary of the Treasury the knowledge and information which the Secretary of Agriculture has upon this subject, nothing more. I will state to the gentleman from Tennessee that this provision was taken by the Senate committee and submitted to both Secretaries. These two provisions were drafted and submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury, and were agreed to by both, and they passed the Senate without a division.

Mr. McMILLIN. My friend misapprehends my point. It is not as to the concord between the two Secretaries—I take his word for that. My point is that if this amendment is adopted it puts it in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture to determine what is admissible to be imported and what is not, and that ought to be determined by the law itself.

Mr. HATCH. But there must be a discretion somewhere to interpret the law.

Mr. McMILLIN. The law itself must designate what shall be admissible and what shall not. Let the law be arbiter and let others be construers of the law.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. But as a matter of necessity some officer must execute the law.

Mr. McMILLIN. Some one must execute the law; but let the courts stand open for an appeal.

Mr. CAMPBELL (to Mr. HATCH). Does this apply to the importation of animals from Canada?

Mr. HATCH. It does, and also to importations from other countries.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be captious about this matter, but as I understand the amendment it authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to determine what animals shall be admissible and what shall not, and that is a discretion that in my judgment ought not to be given to any living man.

Mr. HATCH. The law to-day gives the Secretary of the Treasury power to suspend it, and it has stood so for twenty years past.

Mr. McMILLIN. But the law itself fixes what is admissible and what is not.

Mr. HATCH. And the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Agriculture have always interpreted and construed it.

Mr. McMILLIN. Subject to an appeal to the courts.

Mr. HATCH. The same appeal exists now. The provision is just as carefully drawn and guarded as it was possible for the two Secretaries and the Senate committee to make it, and it is utterly impossible to frame it any better than as it stands in this bill.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Are the conferees united in opinion about it?

Mr. HATCH. The conferees on the part of the House and of the Senate examined it carefully and agreed to it unanimously.

Mr. McMILLIN. I think that in this bill as it was reported to the House, there was a provision giving to the Secretary of the Treasury discretion to determine what should be imported and what should not.

Mr. HATCH. Oh, no; to the Secretary of Agriculture; that has been stricken out.

Mr. McMILLIN. That has been stricken out. Now, from the reading of this amendment it sounds to me as if the same discretion was here given to the two Secretaries combined.

Mr. HATCH. I tell the gentleman it is not. I demand the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McMILLIN. Well, I will let it go, upon the statement of the gentleman from Missouri that no such provision is contained in the bill.

Mr. HATCH. I state to the gentleman frankly and candidly that it is not in the bill and that the law is not changed. This is simply a provision to guard against any possible friction between the two Departments. That is the idea.

Mr. McMILLIN. And it leaves the general law unchanged.

Mr. HATCH. It leaves the general law untouched.

Mr. McMILLIN. And the Secretary of Agriculture—

Mr. HATCH. The Secretary of Agriculture has no power in the matter except to report to the Secretary of the Treasury. I demand the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. DICKERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The House is dividing on ordering the previous question.

Mr. HATCH. I demand the regular order.

The question was taken on ordering the previous question; and the Speaker declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. KILGORE. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 28, noes 11.

Mr. KILGORE. No quorum.

Mr. DICKERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HATCH. I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of no quorum, and pending that, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. DICKERSON] moves that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HATCH. I hope the House will vote down that motion.

The question was taken on the motion to adjourn; and the Speaker declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. KILGORE. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 68, noes 63.

So the motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. MANSUR, from the Committee on Claims:

A bill (H. R. 8486) to pay James McCabe for his expenses in contesting the seat of Godlove S. Orth, of Indiana, in the Forty-sixth Congress. (Report No. 1699.)

A bill (H. R. 3309) for the relief of Henry Gumberts, sr. (Report No. 1700.)

A bill (H. R. 1238) for the relief of Holmes & Leathers. (Report No. 1701.)

A bill (H. R. 9276) to refund money wrongfully paid for duties on imports by Daniel Marcy. (Report No. 1702.)

A bill (H. R. 4295) for the relief of Witherby & Gaffney. (Report No. 1703.)

By Mr. SHELL, from the Committee on War Claims: A bill (H. R. 8638) for the relief of James B. McElhose. (Report No. 1704.)

By Mr. COX of New York, from the Committee on Claims: A bill (S. 1612) to compensate Thomas G. Hayes for legal services rendered under direction of the Attorney-General. (Report No. 1705.)

By Mr. WILSON of Missouri, from the Committee on Pensions: A bill (H. R. 8159) to increase the pension of Abraham Dally, late corporal of Capt. Andrew Bremner's company, Eleventh Regiment Heavy Artillery, commanded by Lieut. Cornelius Harsen. (Report No. 1709.)

A bill (H. R. 5343) granting a pension to Joseph J. Bradford. (Report No. 1710.)

A bill (H. R. 6321) for the relief of Lavina Jobe, widow of Robert M. Jobe, deceased. (Report No. 1711.)

A bill (H. R. 5418) for the relief of Mrs. Mary A. Menifee. (Report No. 1712.)

A bill (H. R. 5518) to pension Reuben Riggs. (Report No. 1713.)

A bill (H. R. 4023) granting a pension to Philip G. Dunn. (Report No. 1714.)

A bill (H. R. 5236) to increase the pension of Maggie E. Calhoun. (Report No. 1715.)

A bill (H. R. 7237) granting a pension to James W. Kertley. (Report No. 1716.)

By Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina, from the same committee: A bill (H. R. 2151) granting an increase of pension to William C. Howell. (Report No. 1717.)

By Mr. NORTON, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 5329) for the relief of Mrs. E. S. Luke, widow of John L. Luke, late a soldier in the Black Hawk war. (Report No. 1718.)

By Mr. WILSON of Missouri, from the same committee: A bill (H. R. 8038) granting a pension to William M. Watson, of Walker County, Ga. (Report No. 1719.)

By Mr. BUNN, from the Committee on Claims: A bill (S. 2981) for the relief of the Citadel Academy of Charleston, S. C. (Report No. 1720.)

A bill (H. R. 3253) for the relief of Charles T. Brant. (Report No. 1721.)

A bill (H. R. 8852) for the relief of Martin Maddux. (Report No. 1722.)

A bill (H. R. 6204) for the relief of Thomas S. Lutterloh. (Report No. 1723.)

By Mr. PICKLER, from the Committee on War Claims, a resolution referring the following bills to the Court of Claims: H. R. 8031, for the relief of Thomas M. Hobbs, of Limestone County, Ala.; H. R. 1707, for the relief of the estate of Jane Taylor, deceased, late of Fauquier County, Va.; H. R. 1705, for the relief of Hannah Burke, of Fauquier County, Va.; H. R. 2959, for the relief of the estate of William G. Birchett, deceased, late of Prince George County, Va.; H. R. 2961, for the relief of the legal representatives of John Avery, deceased, late of Virginia; H. R. 3331, for the relief of the legal representatives of A. F. Dulin, deceased, late of Baltimore, Md. (Report No. 1724.)

By Mr. BULLOCK, from the Committee on Claims: A bill (H. R. 1521) for the relief of the legal representatives of George K. Otis, deceased. (Report No. 1726.)

By Mr. COX of New York, from the same committee: A bill (H. R. 5869) for the relief of Archie St. Clair and Charles E. Rogers. (Report No. 1727.)

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois, from the same committee: A bill (H. R. 4381) for the relief of the Merchants and Miners' Transportation Company of Baltimore, Md. (Report No. 1728.)

A bill (H. R. 7144) for the relief of Catherine E. Whitall. (Report No. 1729.)

A bill (H. R. 1003) for the relief of the Continental Fire Insurance Company, Eagle Fire Insurance Company, and the Commercial Mutual Insurance Company, of New York City; the Western National Bank, the Merchants' National Bank, the Chesapeake Bank, and the Maryland Fire Insurance Company, of Baltimore, Md., and the Eastern Railroad Company of Massachusetts. (Report No. 1730.)

A bill (S. 978) for the relief of William M. Keightley. (Report No. 1731.)

A bill (S. 977) for the relief of B. F. Rockafellow. (Report No. 1732.)

A bill (S. 976) for the relief of Horace A. W. Tabor. (Report No. 1733.)

A bill (S. 975) for the relief of the legal representatives of Royal M. Hubbard. (Report No. 1734.)

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were re-referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1940) for the relief of William G. McSpadden—the Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 1829) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James A. McElroy—the Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII bills of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 9410) to define and to provide for the execution of the provisions of sections 1390, 1476, and 1480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE: A bill (H. R. 9411) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the celebrating the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus, by holding an international exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of soil, mine, and sea, in the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. MCALEER: A resolution requesting the State Department to examine into the arrest and conviction of Dr. Thomas Gallagher, a citizen of the United States, now in British prison—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BELDEN: A bill (H. R. 9399) for the relief of Charles L'Vander Haynes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELTZHOVER: A bill (H. R. 9400) for the relief of George Horting—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9401) for the relief of Isaac Gorgas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 9402) to correct the military record of John F. Brown, late first lieutenant Seventh Iowa Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURROWS: A bill (H. R. 9403) for the relief of Henry Myers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMINETTI: A bill (H. R. 9404) relating to the equitable and legal rights of Jesse Benton Fremont in possession of certain lands and improvements thereon in California, and to provide jurisdiction to determine those rights—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHIPMAN: A bill (H. R. 9405) granting a pension to Augusta L. Mumford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9406) to authorize the Quartermaster-General to investigate the claim of the representatives of Robert T. Williams, deceased, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HALVORSON: A bill (H. R. 9407) for the relief of James E. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIVELY: A bill (H. R. 9408) granting an increase of pension to James T. Liggett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9409) granting a pension to Mrs. Hoppee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ALDERSON: Petition of James R. Buster, of Fayette County, W. Va., praying for the reference of his claim to the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARTINE: Petition of the Gettysburg Battlefield Association of Washington, D. C., for the early completion of the line-of-battle work on the Gettysburg battlefield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Custer Post, No. 5, Grand Army of the Republic, of California, relative to marking battle lines at Gettysburg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELKNAP: Petition of the Congregational Church of Hopkins, Allegan County, Mich., for the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. BOWERS: Petition of citizens of Villa Park, Cal., for a law prohibiting the manufacture and sale of cigarettes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBURN: Petition of James Smith and others, against any legislation by Congress regarding the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. DURBOROW: Six resolutions in regard to the World's Fair, as follows: Of the American Unitarian Association of Boston, Mass.; of the Western Unitarian Conference of Chicago; of Edward Everett Hale, D. D., and 79 others, Unitarian ministers of America; of J. Lloyd Jones, Emil G. Hirsch, LL. D., and 20 others, Liberal ministers of the West; of Edward E. Hale, D. D., and 79 others, Unitarian ministers of America, and of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Emil G. Hirsch, LL. D., and 26 others, Liberal ministers of the West; all against Sunday legislation concerning the World's Fair—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. FITCH: Petition of citizens of New York City, requesting the enactment of the Torrey bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GANTZ: Petition of citizens of Mendon, Mercer County, Ohio, against closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of citizens of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., communicants of the Eighteenth Street Methodist Episcopal Church, to the number of 1,000; also, of Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, numbering 800; also, members of Grace Sabbath School, of 700, protesting against the opening of the Columbian Exposition on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa: Four petitions of Hopkinton,

Iowa, urging that the World's Fair be closed on Sunday and that no intoxicating liquors be sold—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio: Affidavits in support of House bill 7424, granting an increase of pension to Richard C. Tiner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: Petition of J. F. Short and 38 others of Greer County, Tex., favoring the Hatch antioption bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCALEER: Three petitions of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., as follows: Of the Burns Club, Philadelphia, of the Sarsfield Branch of the Irish Catholic Benevolent Union, and of the St. Paul's Temperance Hall, all praying the Senate and House of Representatives to take action concerning the alleged unlawful imprisonment and conviction of Dr. Gallagher, a citizen of the United States, in a British prison, and securing his release therefrom—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'DONNELL: Petition of 29 citizens of Battle Creek, Mich., protesting against imposing any condition by Congress relative to Sunday opening or closing of the World's Fair—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Missouri: Petition of Antioch Baptist Church of St. Louis, requesting the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: Three petitions of citizens of Shelby County, Tenn., in opposition to the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of Clara E. Bain and others, of Sac City, Iowa, against any action on the part of Congress with reference to closing the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. PICKLER: Petition of Adam Hagle and 104 others of the Adventist Church, Bowdle, Edmonds County, S. Dak., asking that no law be passed by Congress concerning closing of the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 40 citizens, members of the Adventist Church, Millbank, S. Dak., asking that no law be passed by Congress concerning the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. ROCKWELL: Petition of members of Iron Molders' Union of Seneca Falls, N. Y., against imposing conditions on the World's Fair appropriation about keeping said Fair open on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of Illinois Yearly Meeting of Friends, in favor of a law against capital punishment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELL: Two petitions of citizens of South Carolina; one of Mush Creek Alliance of Greenville County, and the other of citizens of Spartanburg, remonstrating against the passage of the Brosius lard bill, H. R. 395, and praying for the passage of the Paddock pure-food bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of citizens of Jackson and Union Counties, Ill., requesting that certain improvements be made on the Mississippi River to prevent the destruction of lands by the Mississippi River in said counties—to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Illinois: Two petitions of citizens of Chicago, Ill., against imposing conditions either as to keeping open or closing on Sundays the World's Columbian Exposition—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of Mrs. M. D. Sperra and others, of Randolph, Portage County, Ohio, against closing the World's Fair on Sundays—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Protest of citizens of Sargent, Saguache County, Colo., against any legislation committing the Government of the United States to a union of church and state—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. TRACEY: Petition of citizens of Guilderland, Albany County, N. Y., favoring a law in opposition to cigarette making—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Allegany County, N. Y., for the passage of a sixteenth amendment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of McClure, Walker and Gibson, of Albany, N. Y., against the pure-food bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOLVERTON: Protest of Joseph Dickens and 5 members of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church and 16 others, against the passage of any bill or resolution to close the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, July 1, 1892.

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental list of claims allowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury Department; which, on motion of Mr. COCKRELL, was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY.

Mr. HAWLEY. Of course I would not make the motion without the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SAWYER presented a memorial of citizens of Waushara County, Wis., remonstrating against the passage of any legislation closing the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. FELTON presented a petition of 40 citizens of Ontario, Cal., and a petition of 32 citizens of Pasadena, Cal., praying for the passage of legislation prohibiting the sale, manufacture, and importation of cigarettes in the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9089) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6746) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes; insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 144, agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. DOCKERY, Mr. COMPTON, and Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa, managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4667) to incorporate the Maryland and Washington Railway Company, reported it without amendment.

Mr. PADDOCK. I am directed by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2618) to establish an electrical experiment station for the purpose of investigating and determining whether electricity can be profitably applied as a motive power in the propulsion of farm machinery and implements, to report it adversely, the subject of the bill having been provided for in the agricultural appropriation bill. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3235) to provide for the establishment, protection, and administration of public forest reservations, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments.

Mr. PADDOCK. I am also directed by the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2763) for the protection and administration of the public forest reservations, to report it adversely. I move that it be indefinitely postponed, as the subject has already been provided for.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 382) for the protection of trees and other growth on the public domain from destruction by fire, reported it adversely, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3090) providing for an experimental forestry tree-culture reserve, reported adversely thereon.

Mr. SANDERS. I should like to have the bill placed on the Calendar.

Mr. PADDOCK. I desire to state to the Senator from Mon-