

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware asks unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill indicated by him. Is there any objection?

Mr. HARRIS. What does the Senator from Delaware desire?

Mr. HIGGINS. I desire to have the bill taken up for present consideration. I will state that this is the case where in testing the 12-inch gun at Sandy Hook, the projectile struck a schooner about five miles out at sea. The bill proposes to pay her owners the value of damages as ascertained by the Secretary of War.

Mr. CHANDLER. How much is involved?

Mr. HIGGINS. Not to exceed \$10,000 damages to the owner, and not to exceed \$1,000 for the personal effects of the seamen.

Mr. HARRIS. The bill is too big to be considered just now. The hour is too late. I beg the Senator to let it go over.

Mr. HIGGINS. I think if the Senator will hear it read and will consider the matter a moment there can be no possible objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made to unanimous consent. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. SAWYER. 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 five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened; and (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 9, 1893, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 8, 1893.

CONSULS.

Henry G. Kress, of Wisconsin, to be consul of the United States at Cork, vice John J. Piatt, transferred to the consulate at Dublin.

Josiah E. Stone, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States at Nogales, vice Delos H. Smith, resigned.

POSTMASTERS.

Samuel L. Wallace, to be postmaster at Lincoln, in the county of Logan and State of Illinois, in the place of Jacob M. Morris, removed.

Horace K. Warren, to be postmaster at Kentland, in the county of Newton and State of Indiana, in the place of John French, resigned.

George R. Gibbs, to be postmaster at Carson City, in the county of Mono and State of California, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1893.

Harrison C. Magoon, to be postmaster at Hay Springs, in the county of Sheridan and State of Nebraska, in the place of John F. Powers, resigned.

Miss Eva R. Wiestling, to be postmaster at Middletown, in the county of Dauphin and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Miss Eva R. Wiestling, whose commission expires February 11, 1893.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 8, 1893.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll for the purpose of ascertaining the presence of a quorum.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and thirty members have answered to their names, more than a quorum, and the Clerk will read the Journal.

Mr. PICKLER. Is not the next thing in order the call of the absentees. The roll has only been called over once?

The SPEAKER. It is not. The gentleman made the point that no quorum was present, and the Chair directed the call simply to ascertain the presence of a quorum. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the Journal.

The Journal was then read and approved.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. MARYS RIVER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 3787) to authorize the construction of a bridge across St. Marys River, between the States of Florida and Georgia.

Mr. TURNER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, for the present consideration of that bill.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read subject to objection.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BERGEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia a question. I observe from the reading of the bill that it contains a provision providing that the bridge shall be a post route, and that the compensation of the bridge company may be only such as was paid to the railroad line approaching it for carrying the mails over it. I ask if that is the usual provision relating to the subject?

Mr. TURNER. I will state to the gentleman from New Jersey that the bill contains the usual provision in this regard. It provides that the regulation of the structure shall be committed to the Chief of Engineers. The bill has been carefully considered by the Senate committee, was reported to the Senate, and passed that body. The House committee has considered the bill and agreed to report it favorably without modification.

Mr. BERGEN. The bill is in the usual form then?

Mr. TURNER. In the usual form, and contains all of the usual safeguards.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, and being read the third time, was passed.

On motion of Mr. TURNER, a motion to reconsider the last vote, was laid on the table.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent to take from the House Calendar—

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not yet laid before the House the various matters on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MONONGAHELA RIVER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 3825) to authorize the Homestead and Pittsburg Bridge Company to construct a bridge over the Monongahela River from Pittsburg to Homestead.

Mr. DALZELL. That bill, Mr. Speaker, is identical with the House bill reported by the Committee on Commerce, and now on the Calendar. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read subject to objection.

The bill was read at length.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, and being read the third time, was passed.

On motion of Mr. DALZELL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS GALVESTON AND BRAZOS CANAL.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 3826) authorizing Velasco and Surfside Terminal Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Galveston and Brazos Canal.

Mr. TAYLOR of Illinois. This bill, Mr. Speaker, passed the Senate unanimously; a similar bill was reported to the House by the Commerce Committee unanimously and is now pending on the House Calendar, and I ask unanimous consent to put the bill on its passage.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to objection. The bill was read at length.

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

There being no objection the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, and being read the third time, was passed.

On motion of Mr. TAYLOR, of Illinois, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following Senate bills, which were severally read a first and second time, ordered to be printed, and referred to the committees named below.

A bill (S. 2068) extending relief to Indian citizens, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3812) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Alsea and other bands of Indians located upon the Siletz Reservation in the State of Oregon, and to make appropriations for carrying the same into effect—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 443) granting to the Midland Pacific Railway Company a right of way through the Crow Creek Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 457) for the relief of the assignees or legal representatives of John Roach, deceased, to pay balance due on the United States steamer Dolphin—to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (S. 3409) to extend the jurisdiction of justices of the peace in the District of Columbia and to regulate the proceedings before them—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL QUARANTINE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 9757) granting additional quarantine power and imposing additional duties upon the Marine Hospital Service, with Senate amendments thereto.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. This is a House bill with Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

"That it shall be unlawful for any merchant ship or other vessel from any foreign port or place to enter any port of the United States except in accordance with the provisions of this act and with such rules and regulations of State and municipal health authorities as may be made in pursuance of, or consistent with, this act; and any such vessel which shall enter, or attempt to enter, a port of the United States in violation thereof shall forfeit to the United States a sum, to be awarded in the discretion of the court, not exceeding \$5,000, which shall be a lien upon said vessel, to be recovered by proceedings in the proper district court of the United States. In all such proceedings the United States district attorney for such district shall appear on behalf of the United States; and all such proceedings shall be conducted in accordance with the rules and laws governing cases of seizure of vessels for violation of the revenue laws of the United States.

"Sec. 2. That any vessel at any foreign port clearing for any port or place in the United States shall be required to obtain from the consul, vice-consul, or other consular officer of the United States at the port of departure, or from the medical officer where such officer has been detailed by the President for that purpose, a bill of health, in duplicate, in the form prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, setting forth the sanitary history and condition of said vessel, and that it has in all respects complied with the rules and regulations in such cases prescribed for securing the best sanitary condition of the said vessel, its cargo, passengers, and crew; and said consular or medical officer is required, before granting such duplicate bill of health, to be satisfied that the matters and things stated therein are true; and for his services in that behalf he shall be entitled to demand and receive such fees as shall by lawful regulation be allowed, to be accounted for as is required in other cases.

"The President, in his discretion, is authorized to detail any medical officer of the Government to serve in the office of the consul at any foreign port for the purpose of furnishing information and making the inspection and giving the bills of health hereinbefore mentioned. Any vessel clearing and sailing from any such port without such bill of health, and entering any port of the United States, shall forfeit to the United States not more than \$5,000, the amount to be determined by the court, which shall be a lien on the same, to be recovered by proceedings in the proper district court of the United States. In all such proceedings the United States district attorney for such district shall appear on behalf of the United States; and all such proceedings shall be conducted in accordance with the rules and laws governing cases of seizure of vessels for violation of the revenue laws of the United States.

"Sec. 3. That the Supervising Surgeon-General of the Marine Hospital Service shall, immediately after this act takes effect, examine the quarantine regulations of all State and municipal boards of health, and shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, cooperate with and aid State and municipal boards of health in the execution and enforcement of the rules and regulations of such boards and in the execution and enforcement of the rules and regulations made by the Secretary of the Treasury to prevent the introduction of contagious or infectious diseases into the United States from foreign countries, and into one State or Territory or the District of Columbia from another State or Territory or the District of Columbia; and all rules and regulations made by the Secretary of the Treasury shall operate uniformly and in no manner discriminate against any port or place; and at such ports and places within the United States as have no quarantine regulations under State or municipal authority, where such regulations are, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, necessary to prevent the introduction of contagious or infectious diseases into the United States from foreign countries, or into one State or Territory or the District of Columbia from another State or Territory or the District of Columbia, and at such ports and places within the United States where quarantine regulations exist under the authority of the State or municipality which, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, are not sufficient to prevent the introduction of such diseases into the United States, or into one State or Territory or the District of Columbia from another State or Territory or the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, in his judgment it is necessary and proper, make such additional rules and regulations as are necessary to prevent the introduction of such diseases into the United States from foreign countries, or into one State or Territory or the District of Columbia from another State or Territory or the District of Columbia, and when said rules and regulations have been made they shall be promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury and enforced by the sanitary authorities of the States and municipalities, where the State or municipal health authorities will undertake to execute and enforce them; but if the State or municipal authorities shall fail or refuse to enforce said rules and regulations the President shall execute and enforce the same and adopt such measures as in his judgment shall be necessary to prevent the introduction or spread of such diseases, and may detail or appoint officers for that purpose. The Secretary of the Treasury shall make such rules and regulations as are necessary to be observed by vessels at the port of departure and on the voyage, where such vessels sail from any foreign port or place to any port or place in the United States, to secure the best sanitary condition of such vessel, her cargo, passengers, and crew; which shall be published and communicated to and enforced by the consular officers of the United States. None of the penalties herein imposed shall attach to any vessel or owner or officer thereof until a copy of this act, with the rules and regulations made in pursuance thereof, has been posted up in the office of the consul or other consular officer of the United States for ten days, in the port from which said vessel sailed; and the certificate of such consul or consular officer over his official signature shall be competent evidence of such posting in any court of the United States.

"Sec. 4. That it shall be the duty of the Supervising Surgeon-General of the Marine Hospital Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, to perform all the duties in respect to quarantine and quarantine regulations which are provided for by this act, and to obtain information of the sanitary condition of foreign ports and places from which contagious and infectious diseases are or may be imported into the United States, and to this end the consular officer of the United States at such ports and places

as shall be designated by the Secretary of the Treasury shall make to the Secretary of the Treasury weekly reports of the sanitary condition of the ports and places at which they are respectively stationed, according to such forms as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall also obtain, through all sources accessible, including State and municipal sanitary authorities throughout the United States, weekly reports of the sanitary condition of ports and places within the United States, and shall prepare, publish, and transmit to collectors of customs and to State and municipal health officers and other sanitarians weekly abstracts of the consular sanitary reports and other pertinent information received by him, and shall also, as far as he may be able, by means of the voluntary cooperation of State and municipal authorities, of public associations and private persons, procure information relating to the climatic and other conditions affecting the public health, and shall make annual report of his operations to Congress, with such recommendations as he may deem important to the public interests.

"Sec. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time issue to the consular officers of the United States and to the medical officers serving at any foreign port, and otherwise make publicly known, the rules and regulations made by him, to be used and complied with by vessels in foreign ports, for securing the best sanitary condition of such vessels, their cargoes, passengers, and crew, before their departure for any port in the United States, and in the course of the voyage; and all such other rules and regulations as shall be observed in the inspection of the same on the arrival thereof at any quarantine station at the port of destination, and for the disinfection and isolation of the same, and the treatment of cargo and persons on board, so as to prevent the introduction of cholera, yellow fever, or other contagious or infectious diseases; and it shall not be lawful for any vessel to enter said port to discharge its cargo, or land its passengers, except upon a certificate of the health officer at such quarantine station certifying that said rules and regulations have in all respects been observed and complied with, as well on his part as on the part of the said vessel and its master, in respect to the same and to its cargo, passengers, and crew; and the master of every such vessel shall produce and deliver to the collector of customs at said port of entry, together with the other papers of the vessel, the said bills of health required to be obtained at the port of departure and the certificate herein required to be obtained from the health officer at the port of entry; and that the bills of health herein prescribed shall be considered as part of the ship's papers, and when duly certified to by the proper consular officer or other officer of the United States, over his official signature and seal, shall be accepted as evidence of the statements therein contained in any court of the United States.

"Sec. 6. That on the arrival of an infected vessel at any port not provided with proper facilities for treatment of the same, the Secretary of the Treasury may remand said vessel, at its own expense, to the nearest national or other quarantine station, where accommodations and appliances are provided for the necessary disinfection and treatment of the vessel, passengers, and cargo; and after treatment of any infected vessel at a national quarantine station, and after certificate shall have been given by the United States quarantine officer at said station that the vessel, cargo, and passengers are each and all free from infectious disease, or danger of conveying the same, said vessel shall be admitted to entry to any port of the United States named within the certificate. But at any ports where sufficient quarantine provision has been made by State or local authorities the Secretary of the Treasury may direct vessels bound for said ports to undergo quarantine at said State or local station.

"Sec. 7. That whenever it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the President that by reason of the existence of cholera or other infectious or contagious diseases in a foreign country there is serious danger of the introduction of the same into the United States, and that notwithstanding the quarantine defense this danger is so increased by the introduction of the same into the United States, and that notwithstanding the quarantine defense this danger is so increased by the introduction of persons or property from such country that a suspension of the right to introduce the same is demanded in the interest of the public health, the President shall have power to prohibit, in whole or in part, the introduction of persons and property from such countries or places as he shall designate and for such period of time as he may deem necessary.

"Sec. 8. That whenever the proper authorities of a State shall surrender to the United States the use of the buildings and disinfecting apparatus at a State quarantine station, the Secretary of the Treasury shall be authorized to receive them and to pay a reasonable compensation to the State for their use, if in his opinion they are necessary to the United States.

"Sec. 9. That the act entitled 'An act to prevent the introduction of infectious or contagious diseases into the United States, and to establish a national board of health,' approved March 3, 1879, be, and the same is hereby, repealed. And the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to obtain possession of any property, furniture, books, paper, or records belonging to the United States which are not in the possession of an officer of the United States under the Treasury Department which were formerly in the use of the National Board of Health or any officer or employee thereof."

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland—

Mr. KILGORE. I would like to know if that bill is now before the House.

The SPEAKER. This is a House bill with Senate amendments, and it is in order to move to concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. KILGORE. But the Senate having amended the bill, must not the Senate amendments receive their first consideration in the Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. The Chair examined the bill last night as well as he could and did not see anything in the Senate amendments which required their consideration in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the House take a recess until fifteen minutes before 1 o'clock.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. Speaker, I have been recognized, and I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. ANTONY. And I move to lay that motion on the table.
Mr. RAYNER. And upon my motion I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] moves to concur in the Senate amendments, and on that demands the previous question.

Mr. ANTONY. I have moved to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. HOLMAN. That motion is not in order.

The SPEAKER. It is not in order to move to lay the motion on the table. The gentleman from Maryland has demanded the previous question.

Mr. KILGORE. And I move that the House take a recess until fifteen minutes to 1 o'clock.

Mr. ANTONY. I move that the House take a recess till 1 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] has moved that the House take a recess—

Mr. ANTONY. Then I move now that the House do now adjourn, and pending that I move that when the House adjourns it be to meet on Saturday next.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the question. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] moves that the House take a recess until fifteen minutes before 1 o'clock. Pending that motion the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANTONY] moves that the House do now adjourn, and he also moves—

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Can a motion to adjourn be entertained on a day when the House has assembled to perform a function imposed upon it by law under the Constitution?

The SPEAKER. The law requires the two Houses to be in joint session at 1 o'clock. The Chair will look to that matter.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Then an adjournment would carry the House over until to-morrow, and would defeat the count of the electoral vote. I do not know but that is the object of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANTONY]. [Laughter.]

Mr. ANTONY. Under those circumstances I withdraw the motion to adjourn, but insist upon my motion that when the House adjourns it be to meet on Saturday next.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the question. The House will please be in order, so that members may hear what is going on. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] moves to concur in the Senate amendments to the House bill, and on that demands the previous question. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] moves that the House do now take a recess until fifteen minutes before 1 o'clock, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANTONY] moves that when the House adjourn to-day it be to meet on Saturday next. The question will be taken on the latter motion.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order upon the motion of the gentleman from Texas that that can not be done without the consent of the Senate.

A MEMBER. Which gentleman from Texas?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. An adjournment can not be taken until Saturday without obtaining the consent of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that it is not beyond the constitutional limit. This is Wednesday. Either House may adjourn for three days without the assent of the other. The question will be put on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANTONY] that when the House adjourn to-day it be to meet on Saturday.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. ANTONY. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 2, noes 216.

The SPEAKER. The noes have it, and the motion is not agreed to; and the question is now on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] that the House take a recess until fifteen minutes to 1 o'clock to-day.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. KILGORE. I demand a division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 2, noes 191.

Mr. KILGORE. I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly apparent that one or two people are trying to prevent the Government of the United States from protecting the people of the United States against pestilence. I hope, in view of what we have seen here, that the Speaker will refuse to recognize these dilatory motions [cries of "Regular order!"] and allow this House to legislate in the interest of the people. [Renewed cries of "Regular order!" and much confusion.]

The SPEAKER. The Sergeant-at-Arms will request members to take their seats.

The question was taken on ordering the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Seven gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused; the noes have it, and the motion is not agreed to; and the question is upon the demand of the gentleman from Maryland for the previous question.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. KILGORE. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided.

The SPEAKER. On the demand for the previous question 220 gentlemen have voted in the affirmative, and 3 in the negative.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The ayes have it—

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the House take a recess until ten minutes to 1 o'clock.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That is a dilatory motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is ordered. Pending that, the gentleman from Texas moves that the House now take a recess until ten minutes of 1 o'clock, to-day.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. KILGORE. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 3, noes 217.

The SPEAKER. The noes have it, and the motion is not agreed to. The question now is upon the motion of the gentleman from Maryland, to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. I would like to inquire how many amendments there are.

The SPEAKER. There is one amendment.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. The ayes have it, and the amendment is concurred in. [General applause.]

On motion of Mr. RAYNER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment was concurred in was laid on the table.

WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE INDIAN RESERVATION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 9527) to restore to the public domain a portion of White Mountain Apache Indian Reservation, in the Territory of Arizona, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur in the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the title of that bill was not heard, owing to the confusion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the title of the bill. There is so much confusion that gentlemen can not understand what business is being transacted. The House will please be in order.

The title was again reported.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arizona moves to nonconcur in Senate amendments, and asks for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the appointment of the following gentlemen as conferees on the part of the House: The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PEEL], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ENGLISH], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WILSON].

HARLOW L. STREET.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 1162) for the relief of Harlow L. Street, with Senate amendments.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider that bill at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of this bill.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let it be read, subject to the right of objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill, and then the Senate amendments.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, that seems to be a case of special legislation, and I must object to its consideration at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk has simply read the bill passed by the House; he has not yet reported the Senate amendment, which will now be read.

The amendment of the Senate was read.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made, and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH THE PUYALLUP INDIAN RESERVATION.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a bill (H. R. 7762) to ratify and confirm an agreement between the Puyallup Indians and the Northern Pacific Railway Company for a right of way through the Puyallup Indian Reservation, with an amendment of the Senate thereto.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Page 3, line 27, after the word "sum," insert "not less than \$1,500 per acre."

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. McMILLIN. I will ask the gentleman from Washington to state the effect of the change proposed by the Senate amendment.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. For the information of the gentleman I will state that when the bill passed the House the section providing for compensation to the Indians for this right of way left the rate of compensation to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. The Senate, by this amendment, has fixed the price to be paid at not less than \$1,500 per acre, which is \$500 more than any land on the reservation has heretofore been appraised at. The original agreement was \$750 an acre, and the Senate amendment fixes the minimum at double that sum.

Mr. McMILLIN. That is, it leaves the price to the discretion of the Secretary above \$1,500, but not below that sum?

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Not below that sum.

Mr. McMILLIN. And do I understand the gentleman to say that that price has not been paid for any of this land in any other instance?

Mr. WILSON of Washington. All the land has heretofore been appraised, and the highest appraisement of any of it was \$1,000 an acre, so I think the allowance here is ample.

Mr. McMILLIN. Then does the gentleman know why the limit is fixed in this amendment at \$1,500.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Well, those lands are growing in value, and have been for some time. I am not advised as to the exact reason why the Secretary fixed this amount.

The motion of Mr. WILSON of Washington to concur in the Senate amendment was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. WILSON of Washington, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment was concurred in was laid on the table.

AGREEMENT WITH KICKAPOO INDIANS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a bill (H. R. 7633) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Kickapoo Indians in Oklahoma Territory, and to make appropriation for carrying the same into effect.

Mr. PEEL. Mr. Speaker, that is the bill that was read yesterday morning and, at the instance of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], went over and was printed in the RECORD of today for the information of the House. I move to nonconcur in the amendment of the Senate and agree to a conference.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, let us have the Senate amendment read, so that we may see what is the effect of the change.

The amendment of the Senate was read in full as printed in the RECORD of this date, page 1293.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as that is a very long amendment, amounting almost to a substitute, I would like to have the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PEEL] make some explanation of the differences between it and the House bill.

Mr. PEEL. I can explain it in a word, Mr. Speaker. The appropriation in the Senate amendment is exactly the same as in the House bill. The amendment changes the disposition of the money, and in that respect is different from the House bill, and it changes the legislation proposed in the House bill in regard to the disposition of the land. The Senate amendment puts the land under the general homestead law, while in the House bill we made some restriction upon that. The appropriation, I repeat, is the same as in the House bill. I renew my motion that the House nonconcur in the amendment of the Senate and agree to a conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House, Mr. PEEL, Mr. BRAWLEY, and Mr. KEM.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. OHLIGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 9176) relating to navigation of vessels, bills of lading, and to certain obligations, duties, and rights in connection with the carriage of property.

ADMISSION OF LADIES TO THE FLOOR.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follow:

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper be directed to admit to the floor of the House ladies having tickets issued for the reserved galleries, during the joint session for the count of the electoral vote, and also, upon request of Senators and Representatives, the ladies of their families.

The resolution was adopted.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the electoral count is to begin at 1 o'clock, I will not now ask the

House to proceed to the further consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, but immediately upon the conclusion of the count (which will occupy probably about one hour) I will ask the House to resume, in Committee of the Whole, the consideration of that bill.

LOAN OF PICTURE TO COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to call up for present consideration Senate joint resolution No. 134, authorizing the loan, for exhibition at the World's Columbian Exposition, of the picture entitled "The Recall of Columbus," by Augustus G. Heaton.

The SPEAKER. The joint resolution will be read, subject to objection.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Architect of the Capitol be, and he hereby is, authorized to loan to the Department of State the picture in the Capitol entitled "The Recall of Columbus," by Augustus G. Heaton, for exhibition at the World's Columbian Exposition.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to ask if this has been considered by a committee of the House?

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. It has been considered by the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition and reported favorably.

A MEMBER. Does it involve any expense?

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. It provides simply for the loan, through the State Department, to the World's Columbian Exposition of this painting, which hangs on the walls in the Senate end of the Capitol. It was painted by one of the most distinguished American artists, Mr. Augustus G. Heaton, of Washington, D. C., and purchased by Congress some years ago as a most meritorious production. It will involve a very trifling expense, simply the packing and removal of the picture.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, and being read the third time, was passed.

On motion of Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

FORT RANDALL MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. KEM. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2931) to provide for the survey and transfer of that part of the Fort Randall military reservation in the State of Nebraska to said State for school purposes.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think we had better not take up that until the House is in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was about to state that there was so much confusion, necessarily incident to the entrance of those persons authorized to be admitted to the floor under the resolution recently adopted, that it would be very difficult to transact any business understandingly.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SPRINGER. I move that the House take a recess until five minutes before 1 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Before submitting the motion the Chair desires to call the attention of the House to a part of the law respecting the regulations in the Hall of the House to-day for the count of the electoral vote. It is provided that:

The Senators shall have seats in the body of the Hall upon the right of the presiding officer.

In pursuance of that provision it will be necessary for the members to vacate the first four rows of seats on the right of the Speaker's platform, the Chair is informed, as there must be sufficient room provided there for the Senators, 88 in number. It has been customary, in pursuance of this regulation, to assign these seats to the Senate, and a sufficient number of them must be set apart for the purpose of accommodating those who may attend on the count. The regulation also specifies that provision will be made—

For the Representatives, in the body of the Hall not reserved for the Senators.

For the tellers on the part of the Senate and House, at the Clerk's desk. For the other officers of the two Houses, in front of the Clerk's desk and upon each side of the Speaker's platform.

The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House take a recess until five minutes before 1 o'clock to-day.

Mr. ENLOE. I would like to suggest that if the doorkeepers do not guard the doors well we will have unutterable confusion if we take a recess.

The SPEAKER. The Chair directs the doorkeepers to admit no one to the floor of the House, under the resolution just adopted, or by reason of the recess, except those persons who may hold tickets to the galleries and are unable to obtain admission, and also the wives and families of Senators and Representatives at

their request; so that during the recess no one will be entitled to admission except as specified in that resolution.

Mr. PENDLETON. Mr. Speaker, there is an understanding amongst members here that ladies generally are to be admitted to the floor. Is that correct?

Mr. SPRINGER. The resolution had better be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia will give his attention, and the resolution adopted by the House will be read. The Chair understands the resolution to be a copy of that adopted four years ago.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper be directed to admit to the floor of the House ladies having tickets issued for the reserved galleries during the joint session for the count of the electoral vote, and also, upon the request of Senators and Representatives, the ladies of their families.

Mr. PENDLETON. Has that resolution been adopted?

The SPEAKER. It has been.

The motion of Mr. SPRINGER was then agreed to; and accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.

COUNTING OF THE ELECTORAL VOTE.

The recess having expired, the House resumed its session. At two minutes before 1 o'clock the Doorkeeper announced the Vice-President and the Senate of the United States. The Senate entered the Hall, preceded by its Sergeant-at-Arms and headed by the Vice-President of the United States and the Secretary of the Senate, the members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The Vice-President took his seat as presiding officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House occupying the chair on his left.

Senators HALE and BLACKBURN, the tellers appointed on the part of the Senate, and Representatives CHIPMAN and LODGE, the tellers appointed on the part of the House, took their places at the Clerk's desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senate and House of Representatives have met together in joint session, pursuant to the Constitution and laws of the United States, on this the day appointed for the opening of the certificates and the counting of the votes for electors for President and Vice-President of the United States. The certificate of the State of Alabama will be read by the tellers, who will make a list of the votes therefrom.

Mr. HALE (one of the tellers) read at length the certificate of the vote of the State of Alabama, giving 11 votes for Grover Cleveland, of the State of New York, for President of the United States, and 11 votes for Adlai E. Stevenson, of the State of Illinois, for Vice-President of the United States.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Following the precedents observed on former occasions, unless in any case there be a demand that the certificate be reported in full, the tellers having ascertained that the certificates are in due form and properly authenticated, will omit the executive certificate of the ascertainment of the proceedings of the Electoral College, and will simply announce the result.

The tellers then proceeded to announce the electoral votes of the several States in their alphabetical order. On the announcement of the electoral vote of Illinois there were demonstrations of applause.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that manifestations either of applause or disapproval are in violation of the rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and that they disturb the dignity and decorum which should characterize the great transaction now proceeding in the presence of the representatives of the American people.

The announcement of the electoral votes of the several States having been concluded

The VICE-PRESIDENT said: The tellers will now announce the result of the vote.

Senator HALE (one of the tellers). The state of the vote for President of the United States as found by the tellers and now delivered to the President of the Senate is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 444. Grover Cleveland, of the State of New York, has received for President of the United States 277 votes; Benjamin Harrison, of the State of Indiana, has received 145 votes, and James B. Weaver, of the State of Iowa, has received 22 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice-President of the United States as found by the tellers and now delivered to the President of the Senate is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for Vice-President of the United States is 444. Adlai E. Stevenson, of the State of Illinois, has received 277 votes; Whitelaw Reid, of the State of New York, has received 145 votes, and James G. Field, of the State of Virginia, has received 22 votes.

The report, as officially certified by the tellers, is as follows:

The undersigned, EUGENE HALE and JOSEPH C. S. BLACKBURN, tellers on the part of the Senate, and J. LOGAN CHIPMAN and HENRY CABOT LODGE, tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice-President of the United States for the term beginning March 4, 1893:

Number of electoral votes to which each State is entitled.	States.	For President.			For Vice-President.		
		Grover Cleveland, of New York.	Benjamin Harrison, of Indiana.	James B. Weaver, of Iowa.	Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.	Whitelaw Reid, of New York.	James G. Field, of Virginia.
11	Alabama	11			11		
8	Arkansas	8			8		
8	California	8	1		8	1	
4	Colorado			4			4
6	Connecticut	6			6		
3	Delaware	3			3		
4	Florida	4			4		
13	Georgia	13			13		
3	Idaho			3			3
24	Illinois	24			24		
15	Indiana	15			15		
13	Iowa		13			13	
10	Kansas			10			10
13	Kentucky	13			13		
8	Louisiana	8			8		
6	Maine		6			6	
8	Maryland	8			8		
15	Massachusetts		15			15	
14	Michigan	5	9		5	9	
9	Minnesota		9			9	
9	Mississippi	9			9		
17	Missouri	17			17		
3	Montana		3			3	
8	Nebraska		8			8	
3	Nevada			3			3
4	New Hampshire		4			4	
10	New Jersey	10			10		
36	New York	36			36		
11	North Carolina	11			11		
3	North Dakota	1	1	1	1	1	1
23	Ohio	1	22		1	22	
4	Oregon		3	1		3	1
4	Pennsylvania		32			32	
9	Rhode Island		4			4	
9	South Carolina	9			9		
4	South Dakota		4			4	
12	Tennessee	12			12		
15	Texas	15			15		
4	Vermont		4			4	
12	Virginia	12			12		
4	Washington		4			4	
6	West Virginia	6			6		
12	Wisconsin	12			12		
3	Wyoming		3			3	
444		277	145	22	277	145	22

EUGENE HALE,

JO. C. S. BLACKBURN,

Tellers on the part of the Senate.

J. LOGAN CHIPMAN,

HENRY CABOT LODGE,

Tellers on the part of the House of Representatives.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 444, of which a majority is 223.

Grover Cleveland, of the State of New York, has received for President of the United States 277 votes;

Benjamin Harrison, of the State of Indiana, has received 145 votes; and

James B. Weaver, of the State of Iowa, has received 22 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice-President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice-President of the United States is 444, of which a majority is 223.

Adlai E. Stevenson, of the State of Illinois, has received 277 votes;

Whitelaw Reid, of the State of New York, has received 145 votes; and

James G. Field, of the State of Virginia, has received 22 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate is, by law, a sufficient declaration that Grover Cleveland, of the State of New York, is elected President of the United States, and that Adlai E. Stevenson, of the State of Illinois, is elected Vice-President of the United States, each for the term beginning March 4, 1893, and will be entered together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives. [The announcement of the result of the vote was received with applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The count of the electoral votes having been completed and the result declared, the joint meeting of the two Houses is dissolved; and the Senate will now return to its Chamber.

The Senate then retired from the Hall (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.), when the Speaker resumed the chair, and the House was again called to order.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of general appropriation bills.

The question being taken on the motion, the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. PICKLER) there were—ayes 118, noes none.

Mr. PICKLER. No quorum.

The SPEAKER appointed as tellers Mr. DOCKERY and Mr. PICKLER.

The tellers reported—ayes 166, noes 1.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, with Mr. RICHARDSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. DE ARMOND:

Amend by inserting the following at the end of line 22, page 20: "Also, to ascertain and report what, if any, departmental work could be done cheaper or better, or cheaper and better, by contract than by the methods now employed; how many employes in the several Departments have been in the Government service eight years or longer; to what extent and why, if at all, Government employes are credited to States or Territories of which they are not citizens; to what extent members of the same family and persons related to one another by blood or marriage are in the Government service; the relative proportion in which, under operation of the civil-service law, places in the Government service have gone to the adherents of the several political parties of the country; how the Government employes in the several Departments are divided politically among the parties; how many persons residing in the District of Columbia when appointed to Government places have been credited to the States and Territories; what proportion of the employes of the Government in the classified service went into such service through civil-service examinations; and how the amount and character of the services rendered by Government employes compare with those of persons doing like work at similar rates for individual firms and corporations."

Mr. DE ARMOND. At the request and suggestion of some gentlemen upon the Committee on Appropriations, and in view of the fact that a prolonged struggle may be occasioned by the pendency of this amendment, I will withdraw it.

Mr. PICKLER. I object to its withdrawal.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not object to it. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND], who offered the amendment, has a right to withdraw it.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, it is perhaps proper that I should say at this time—my colleague [Mr. DE ARMOND] having kindly withdrawn his amendment in order to expedite the progress of the bill—that this provision of the bill comes to the House with the unanimous sanction of the Committee on Appropriations, Republicans and Democrats alike. It only proposes in its terms to examine the status of the laws organizing the Executive Departments, bureaus, divisions, and other Government establishments at the national capital; the rules, regulations, and methods for the conduct of the same; the time and attention devoted to the operations thereof by the persons employed therein, and the degree of efficiency of all such employes; whether any modification of these laws can be made to secure greater efficiency and economy; and whether a reduction in the number or compensation of the persons authorized to be employed in said Executive Departments or bureaus can be made without injury to the public service.

In other words, this resolution, which has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Appropriations, looks simply to administrative reform in the Departments, if, after such investigation, such reform is found to be necessary. It has no relation whatever to legislation touching pensions or any other question of that sort; and no such construction, in my judgment, could properly be placed upon the language of the resolution, and no such intention was in the minds of any member of the Committee on Appropriations, so far as I have knowledge; and I believe that I have knowledge of the views of the members of that committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope we will have a vote on the pending paragraph.

Mr. PICKLER. I desire to offer an amendment. And in connection with what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] says, if this amendment is adopted, then, as far as I am personally concerned, it will relieve a good deal of the hostility which I have had to this proposition. My amendment provides

exactly for what the gentleman from Missouri now announces as the intention of the paragraph in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman want a vote on his amendment that he now has pending?

Mr. PICKLER. I offer another. I want a vote by and by, but I offer this now, and I ask the Clerk to read it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, by adding after the word "bureaus," in line 13, the words, "except the Pension Bureau."

Mr. PICKLER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] assures the House—and this is the first time he has given us that assurance—that this proposition is not to interfere or go into the question of pensions. Now, I confess that a good deal of the opposition that I have manifested to this proposition is caused by the language of the proposition, from which I think that adverse pension legislation is intended in some lines by the proposition, or at least may result in that.

Now, if the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] and the committee mean what they say, this amendment simply fixes it, and it should fix it for this reason: In the pension bill, which is reported by the same committee, a committee of five is provided to investigate the Pension Office on all lines as to economy and the abuse of it and all those matters. Now the Committee on Appropriations have reported this proposition in this bill and the proposition in the pension bill, and in addition to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Invalid Pensions there is another select committee of this House on which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WHEELER] is chairman, which also has jurisdiction to inquire into any abuses of the Pension Office.

Now, there are three several committees that are already at work or have jurisdiction of this Pension Bureau; and I submit, gentlemen, that that is enough to deal with that Pension Bureau at one time. Now, I simply desire to take out of this proposition the consideration of the Pension Department; and I offer this amendment excepting the Pension Bureau after what the gentleman from Missouri has said, that this does not intend to relate to pension legislation in any respect.

Now, with the acceptance of the amendment, which I understood the gentleman from Missouri to state exactly, that will take away a good deal of my hostility to the proposition, or smooth it down; at least I will take that part of the bill with a great deal better grace.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. Why not withdraw your objection to this, and raise your objection against the provision in the pension appropriation bill? Would not that accomplish what you desire?

Mr. PICKLER. Simply for this reason: I understand this morning that the Committee on Appropriations have authorized, when the pension bill comes before this House, the offering of further amendments to the pension appropriation bill by some of their members against pensions. Already propositions are contained in the pension bill that if adopted will destroy pension legislation and cut off pensions.

Mr. CRAIN. What has the Committee on Appropriations to do with that?

Mr. PICKLER. I have the floor, I believe; but really I would say to the gentleman from Texas that is my question, nevertheless they take jurisdiction.

In the pension bill I understand the committee authorize the offering of amendments and propositions to cut off all soldiers' widows who have married the soldiers since 1870, and to cut off pension to soldiers who are in the Government service, and for such service shall receive \$600 per annum. Another proposition is to transfer the Pension Department to the War Department, and to reduce pension examining boards from three members, as I understand it, to one.

Now, with such propositions coming in upon us here, and believing in pensions and the justice of pensions to the soldiers of this country, with this proposition pending, giving them jurisdiction to cut down the force of the Pension Office, with two committees already appointed, and another sought to be appointed, for the investigation of that Bureau, I think it is but justice to exclude pension business from this bill; and for that reason I offer my amendment here. I do not desire to detain this House unnecessarily. My opposition is not factious; but I am opposed to this committee of the Fifty-third Congress, when we have three committees, two already appointed and another one to follow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I only desire to say, in reply to the suggestion of the gentleman from South Dakota, that the language of this proposition to which he excepts was prepared and handed to me by a distinguished Republican member of this House whose name I will not give without his per-

mission; but I assure him there is no more eminent member of the House than the gentleman who prepared the very language to which he objects.

Now, in the statement I made a moment ago I said that this investigation looked to administrative reform. It has no connection whatever with the proposition to which the gentleman has just referred; and now, will the gentleman from South Dakota say, in this presence, that there should be no investigation of that Bureau with reference to administrative reform, if such reform should be found to be necessary?

Mr. PICKLER. I want to say—

Mr. DOCKERY. Is the clerical force of that office, are the methods of business in the conduct of that office, so sacred that the gentleman would forbid the inauguration of an investigation looking to an improvement of the methods of business, the dispatch of business, and the greater efficiency of that force? If so, I can understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota; but I do not believe, I can not believe, that the gentleman from South Dakota would, if he could, forbid an honest, nonpartisan investigation of the administration of that office—

Mr. PICKLER. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. DOCKERY. In connection with other officers of the Government.

Mr. PICKLER. The gentleman from Missouri grows facetious, and states an altogether different proposition from what he did when he was on the floor a short time since.

Mr. DOCKERY. Oh, no.

Mr. PICKLER. I only recall your language, and understood you to say that this did not refer to pension matters.

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly; not to pension legislation.

Mr. PICKLER. I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri that I am opposed to this commission having anything to do with the Pension Office in any way, administrative or any other. You already have the Committee on Invalid Pensions that has jurisdiction over it.

Mr. DOCKERY. Not at all. Will the gentleman pardon me? The Committee on Invalid Pensions has no jurisdiction, under the rules of the House, of any matter relating to the administration of that office.

Mr. PICKLER. I beg the gentleman's pardon; the rule is very broad, and any bill referred to that committee they will have jurisdiction of that in any way concerns pensions. Then the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department has jurisdiction of this whole matter of the administration of the Pension Office, as the gentleman will find from the rules. Furthermore, a select committee was appointed by this House to examine into the abuses of the Pension Office, if there be any; and, still further than that, you have provided in the pension appropriation bill for a committee to investigate all such matters.

Now, my proposition is that with three existing committees having jurisdiction of the Pension Office, to examine into it all along the line, and with a proposition in the pension appropriation bill to appoint another special committee for that purpose, the Pension Office ought to be excepted from this bill. If the gentleman [Mr. DOCKERY] means what he said in the first place, that the Pension Bureau is to be excepted from this bill, let my amendment be adopted and we shall probably get along a good deal more smoothly with this bill, but I fear the attacks that are made on the Pension Bureau here.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is proper that I should say a single word with reference to the status of the proposition which has caused the dispute that has arisen here. I think there is an entire misapprehension in some minds as to what is proposed by the appointment of this joint commission. The proposition has received the approval of all the members of the Committee on Appropriations on both sides, for this simple reason: The matter was first brought to the attention of Congress and of the Committee on Appropriations by a paragraph in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, in which he calls attention to the condition of the laws with reference to the organization of the several Executive Departments, and suggests that modifications can be made in the interest of a more efficient conduct of business, and at the same time in the interest of economy. In that view the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] offered his resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and unanimously reported by that committee and adopted by the House, with authority for the Committee on Appropriations to include in an appropriation bill a provision for this commission.

Now, what is the exact work which it is proposed this commission shall carry out? It is in the line suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury; and I want to call the attention of my friend from South Dakota, who, I think, misapprehends somewhat the jurisdiction that this joint commission would have, to the exact language that is used. It is provided that this joint commission—

Shall inquire into and examine the status of the laws—

What laws?—

the status of the laws organizing the Executive Departments, bureaus, divisions, and other Government establishments at the national capital.

Nothing beyond that. Simply the administrative laws that affect the working of the several departments. And for what purpose? For the purpose of simplifying them in some directions, because they are the outgrowth of more than fifty years of legislation, with much patchwork in them, and in many respects they are unsuited to the present condition of the public business. Now, this joint commission is simply to inquire into those laws, and if upon inquiry they find that the laws organizing the several Departments require amendment or modification, they will so report.

And I ask my friend from South Dakota to bear in mind that there is not one law controlling the administrative work in the Pension Bureau and another law for another bureau or department, but that the same general principles apply to one and all; so that if the laws relating to the conduct of business in the Departments are to be modified in any manner, they must be modified so as to affect the laws regulating the conduct of business in all the Departments, in the interest of efficiency, in the interest of economy; and I am sure that no one would more strongly favor any increase of efficiency in the Pension Bureau, or in any bureau of this Government, than my friend from South Dakota.

Now, with reference to the suggestion of my friend that this commission may interfere with and report amendments to the laws regulating the granting of pensions to soldiers, I say to him that the commission will have no jurisdiction of that subject. They are simply to have jurisdiction of the laws relating to the organization of the Departments and the conduct of business in them. My friend from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] assuming, as he has assumed, that this provision would give the commission authority to go into those matters, very properly objected to having two or three committees organized to cover the same ground.

If the commission had been authorized to go to the extent assumed by my friend from South Dakota his objection would be well founded; but it is not, because the scope of this commission refers only to the organization and administration of the Departments here at Washington.

Now, I want to say to gentlemen that in my judgment there can be good work done in this direction, which will make every Department of the Government more efficient and more economically conducted, the Pension Bureau among others. I am sure, therefore, that with this understanding of the matter my friend, feeling that this proposition does not go in the direction which he supposed, will consent that there shall be no further delay in disposing of it, and then, when the other matter to which he has referred shall come up, we will be in a position to take such action as is thought proper.

Mr. BLOUNT. Let me add to what the gentleman has said about the present Secretary of the Treasury, that when Mr. JOHN SHERMAN was Secretary of the Treasury he urged upon Congress the revision of the laws relating to the organization of the Departments, stating that over a million dollars might be saved by such a revision.

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes; I understand it has been recommended by almost every Secretary of the Treasury for many years, and I beg gentlemen not to misconceive the object of this proposition, and not to arrest the good that may be accomplished by this means.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to indorse fully, so far as I understand the scope of this proposed inquiry, every statement that has just been made by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY].

Mr. PICKLER. Oh, there is no doubt that the members of the Committee on Appropriations agree. [Laughter.] I suppose they agreed to this pension legislation contained in the pension bill, too.

Mr. DINGLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. PICKLER. Well, it was submitted without any minority report. Now, Mr. Chairman, if this commission was to be confined to the scope which the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] states, the proposition in the bill might be a very different one, but I desire in all candor to ask the gentleman from Maine a question in relation to the language of this provision. I read from page 20, lines 19, 20, and 21; among the subjects to be inquired into by this commission is the following:

And whether a reduction in the number or compensation of the persons authorized to be employed in said Executive Departments or Bureaus can be made without injury to the public service.

Now, I want to ask the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] whether, under that part of this provision, if this joint commission should see fit to recommend that half the special examiners who go out into the field to examine pension cases should be cut off or that the number should be doubled, they would not have the right to do so?

Mr. DINGLEY. Oh, of course; a great many suggestions can be made as to what might possibly be done.

Mr. PICKLER. But is not that the fact?

Mr. DINGLEY. Why, of course.

Mr. PICKLER. Now, another question. Does not the gentleman from Maine know that that would be the most effective method of interference with pension legislation that could be enacted on any bill?

Mr. DINGLEY. Let me say to my friend, in order that we may not fall into lines of discussion that are not at all practical, that this commission, from the very nature of the case, when appointed must be a nonpartisan commission; it must be composed practically, according to the arrangement, of four Republicans and four Democrats.

Mr. PICKLER. Oh, the House does not know anything about your practical "arrangements."

Mr. DINGLEY. And I beg of my friend, in the pursuit of an object which I have at heart in common with him, not to arrest certain reforms that may be accomplished and which will certainly be beneficial in the very directions in which he desires, increased efficiency.

Mr. PICKLER. Does not the gentleman think that the three other committees having this jurisdiction ought to be sufficient?

Mr. DINGLEY. But there has got to be one body of legislation if anything is to be done covering all the Departments.

Mr. PICKLER. Why?

Mr. DINGLEY. Because the organization of all the Departments is based upon common general laws. The subject can not be divided up in the way my friend suggests. That has been one of the difficulties in the past. There have been and there are committees having jurisdiction of this particular thing, and other committees having jurisdiction of that particular thing, and others having jurisdiction of another particular thing, but no effective legislation can be had until the whole ground is covered by one law applying to the organization of all the Departments. And, Mr. Chairman, it certainly is not surprising that after the lapse of one hundred years, with only a little patchwork applied here and there to the original laws establishing these Departments, there should now be need for reform and improvement. Mr. SHERMAN, when he was Secretary of the Treasury, brought this matter to the attention of Congress, and now Secretary Foster has done the same thing.

Mr. PICKLER. Not as to the Pension Office.

Mr. DINGLEY. As to all the bureaus and Departments.

Mr. PICKLER. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] now oppose the amendment proposing to except the Pension Bureau?

Mr. DOCKERY. Oh, do not—

Mr. PICKLER. If you mean what you said, why do you not accept the amendment?

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Dakota has said that the provision which he has read would cover the laws regulating the granting of pensions. Now, those laws are one thing and the laws affecting the organization of the Pension Bureau or the other Departments or bureaus is quite another thing—

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I know something about this pension legislation and the practice growing out of it. I live where there are a great many pensioners, and I know that an increase or a decrease in the number of these special examiners with corresponding instructions to them from the Department, the one way or the other, can be made the most effective way of adding to pensions or of cutting off pensions that can be put upon the statute book.

The gentleman from Maine and the gentleman from Missouri both say that this provision will enable this commission to recommend a decrease of the number of these special examiners; and that is the most fatal objection to it. This is the worst kind of a bill in that respect.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does not the gentleman understand that every legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill covers all these officials; and the reduction can be made without the recommendation of any commission. This matter has nothing to do with reduction or increase.

Mr. PICKLER. This commission will sit all summer and will report by bill to the next Congress. I tremble for anybody who undertakes to oppose anything that may be recommended with a committee of Congress behind it claiming to be nonpartisan urging it.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I wish to ask the gentleman from South Dakota this question: If all that he predicts in regard to this commission should be realized, will not the whole matter still be before Congress, and shall we not have the same power to legislate on the subject as we should have if we received no recommendation from the commission at all? In other words, will the work of this commission be anything more to this House

than simply a matter of information, which may help the House to act intelligently?

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I have just undertaken to answer that question. Too often have we seen such flattering promises as these in the outset. When a bill is reported by a committee or a commission it comes before the House with this kind of an argument: "Here is the report of a nonpartisan commission which sat all summer examining and inquiring into all these matters; this is their solemn and deliberate judgment." No House will vote down such a recommendation as that.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I had the honor of taking part, as I was very glad to do, in the careful consideration in committee of the proposition now under discussion. The argument of the gentleman from South Dakota that this will in any way curtail the supervision on the part of the special examiners of the Pension Office with reference to the claims of soldiers is wholly without foundation. It has been stated in the testimony of Mr. Raum, Commissioner of Pensions, that he himself, of his own volition, has curtailed the body of pension examiners from almost three hundred to one hundred and fifty, the number existing to-day.

Mr. PICKLER. Yes; he regulates the number according to his needs; sometimes there is a decrease and sometimes an increase.

Mr. BINGHAM. But this has nothing to do with that. The appropriation for special examiners, for their daily compensation and traveling expenses, comes under another provision of law. To-day the Commissioner details clerks, as he is allowed to do under the law, in addition to these special examiners.

In response to the remarks of the gentleman with reference to the Committee on Appropriations, I wish to say that when any issue of principle or general policy arises as to the protection of the soldiers or their interests there are on that committee as pronounced partisans as the gentleman himself.

Mr. PICKLER. I believe so. But will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. BINGHAM. Let me finish. But when we take up a question which is wholly irrespective of principle or general policy, a question of adjustment of methods, aiming at the attainment of practical conclusions, it has been the judgment of the committee that the appointment of this commission will be wise legislation calculated to reach a conclusion which the gentleman from South Dakota and myself and the minority of the Committee on Appropriations desire to reach—the granting of pensions where the law warrants it and where the individual merits a pension, the withholding of pensions where the law does not warrant them and where the merits of the individual present no claim upon the Government. [Applause.] This is simply an adjustment of methods; there is no principle involved in it; and no soldier will suffer from it.

Mr. PICKLER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question before he sits down. I wish to know whether he or his colleagues brought in any minority report on the pension bill or protest as to its provisions?

Mr. BINGHAM. No; we never do.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph be considered as closed.

Mr. PICKLER. I object.

Mr. DOCKERY. What time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. PICKLER. I will agree to no time.

Mr. DOCKERY. I move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN proceeded to put the question on the motion that the committee rise.

Mr. PICKLER (during the vote). Does the gentleman from Missouri refuse to do what he said he would be willing to do, to take out the Pension Bureau? Does he now retract that proposition?

The question being taken, the motion that the committee rise was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10331) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. DOCKERY. I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of general appropriation bills; and pending that motion, I move that all debate upon the pending paragraph of the legislative appropriation bill and amendments that may be offered thereto be limited to one minute.

Mr. PICKLER. I move that the House now take a recess until 4 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion to close debate in Committee of the Whole, the gentleman from South Dakota moves a recess until 4 o'clock.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker—
 The SPEAKER. The question is not debatable.
 Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker—
 The SPEAKER. The gentleman will be in order. The Sergeant-at-Arms will require him to take his seat.
 Mr. PICKLER. I rise to a privileged question.
 The Speaker rapped for order.
 Mr. PICKLER. I rise to a privileged question.
 The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not violate the rules of the House.
 Mr. PICKLER. I am not undertaking to do so.
 The SPEAKER. The gentleman, then, will resume his seat when he is called to order. The gentleman made a motion which was not debatable.
 [The Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms, bearing the mace, advanced to Mr. PICKLER, who resumed his seat.]
 Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker—
 The SPEAKER. The Chair will not hear the gentleman until order is restored.
 Mr. PICKLER. I rise for a parliamentary inquiry.
 The SPEAKER. The gentleman has made a motion that the House take a recess until 4 o'clock, which motion is not debatable.
 Mr. PICKLER. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to debate the motion, but to make a parliamentary inquiry, whether a motion now to adjourn would be in order?
 The SPEAKER. If the gentleman makes a motion to adjourn, the Chair will pass upon it.
 Mr. PICKLER. I was trying to get that recognition.
 Mr. Speaker, when called to order, I desired to move to adjourn, and I was in order and not out of order when called to order by the Speaker.
 The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota.
 Mr. PICKLER. I move that the House now adjourn.
 The question was taken; and the Speaker decided that the motion was rejected.
 Mr. PICKLER. I demand a division.
 The SPEAKER (having submitted the question in the affirmative). No gentlemen having voted in the affirmative, the motion is lost. [Laughter and applause.]
 The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from South Dakota, that the House take a recess until 4 o'clock to-day.
 The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PICKLER) there were—ayes 3, noes 124.
 Mr. PICKLER. No quorum has voted.
 The SPEAKER appointed Mr. PICKLER and Mr. DOCKERY as tellers.
 The House proceeded to divide.
 Mr. PICKLER. I withdraw the point of no quorum.
 The SPEAKER. The point of no quorum being withdrawn, the motion of the gentleman from South Dakota is lost, and the question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, to limit debate to one minute on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto.
 The motion was agreed to.
 Mr. PICKLER. That is with the understanding that an amendment submitted here is to be accepted by the committee.
 The SPEAKER. The proposition just voted upon does not cut off amendments, but only limits the debate.
 The question now recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of appropriation bills.
 The motion was agreed to.
 The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. RICHARDSON in the chair.
 Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, debate has been limited to one minute, and I yield that time to the gentleman from Maine.
 Mr. DINGLEY. A single suggestion, Mr. Chairman, in that minute of time. It has been stated by the gentleman in charge of this bill, and also by myself, that this commission, proposed to be appointed, would have no jurisdiction over pension legislation. That is the intention; and I think it is clearly expressed in the provision itself.
 But I am perfectly willing that there shall be a proviso added to the effect that the commission authorized herein shall have no jurisdiction to report on pension legislation. Another committee has charge of that matter.
 Mr. PICKLER. I offer this amendment, in the line of the suggestion of the gentleman from Maine.
 The Clerk read as follows:
Provided, That the commission herein authorized shall have no jurisdiction to inquire into or report on pension legislation.
 Mr. BINGHAM. Debate is not in order, I am aware; but this commission never had any purpose to act on pension legislation.
 The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been closed by order of the House.

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. PICKLER; and on a division there were—ayes 58, noes 20.
 So the amendment was adopted.
 Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.
 The Clerk read as follows:
 After the word "Congress," in line 7, page 20, insert "not more than two of whom shall belong to the same political party."
 Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I do not think the committee will object to that.
 The CHAIRMAN. Debate is not in order.
 The amendment was rejected.
 Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. Then I offer a further amendment.
 The Clerk read as follows:
 After the word "Congress," in line 7, page 20, insert "not more than three of whom shall belong to the same political party."
 The amendment was rejected.
 Mr. MILLER. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.
 The Clerk read as follows:
 Amend by adding at the end of line 5, page 21: "The amount to be expended by said commission shall not exceed the sum of \$5,000."
 Mr. MILLER. I hope the gentleman will accept that.
 Mr. DOCKERY. Why the whole expense of this commission will not probably exceed seven or eight hundred dollars. I ask a vote.
 The amendment was rejected.
 The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill.
 Mr. CRAIN. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.
 The Clerk read as follows:
 After the word "available," in line 18, page 22, add the following:
 "To enable the Secretary of State to purchase from John H. Haswell, Chief of the Bureau of Indexes and Archives in the Department of State, the manuscript of 'The Chronological History of the Department of State and the Foreign Relations of the Government from September 5, 1774, to July 1, 1885,' prepared by him, the sum of \$6,000 is hereby appropriated.
 "And the Public Printer is hereby authorized, upon the requisition of the Secretary of State, to cause to be printed and bound in cloth for the use of and distribution by the Department of State 1,000 copies of the above-mentioned work."
 Mr. DOCKERY. I am compelled to raise the point of order against that amendment, that it is not authorized by law.
 Mr. CRAIN. I ask the gentleman from Missouri to reserve his point of order, in order to enable me to present to the House, briefly, the merits of the proposition which I submit.
 Mr. DOCKERY. I reserve the point of order.
 Mr. CRAIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that this proposition is found in the Book of Estimates for the current year for which the House is now providing appropriations. On page 17 of the Book of Estimates is found the following:
 HISTORICAL REGISTER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.
 To enable the Secretary of State to purchase from John H. Haswell, chief of the Bureau of Indexes and Archives in the Department of State, the manuscript prepared by him of a historical register of the Department of State and of the foreign service of the Government, from September 5, 1774, to July 1, 1885, containing, among other things, a list of the names, dates of appointment, and terms of service of the following: Presiding officers of the Colonial Congress; committees having charge of foreign affairs; Presidents of the United States; Secretaries of State and all subordinate officers of the Department of State, including clerks and messengers; all the diplomatic and consular officers of the United States, including special and secret agents; all foreign ministers accredited to this Government; also briefs of all powers conferred upon the Secretaries of State and United States ministers to conclude treaties, and synopses of all the treaties concluded with foreign powers; also a list of the numbers of international tribunals, boundary and claims commissions, etc., \$6,000. And the Public Printer is hereby authorized, upon the requisition of the Secretary of State, to cause to be printed and bound in cloth, for the use of the Department of State, 5,000 copies of the above-mentioned work. (See House Executive Document No. 110, Forty-eighth Congress, second session.)
 In addition to this, Mr. Chairman, I submit for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole a letter from the present Secretary of the Treasury to the Speaker of the House, in which he commends to the favorable consideration of the House the proposition which I have submitted, as follows:
 DEPARTMENT OF STATE, Washington, January 14, 1893.
 SIR: I have the honor to call your attention to and to bespeak your favorable consideration of an item submitted in the estimates of appropriations required by this Department for the coming fiscal year, in the sum of \$6,000 for the purchase of "The Historical Register of the Department of State," compiled by Mr. John H. Haswell, Chief of the Bureau of Indexes and Archives.
 The full description of the work, as given in the estimates, shows how complete are its scope and usefulness, particularly as regards the business of this Department. It is no less valuable by reason of the historical information, which is one of its characteristic features, as a book of reference for members of Congress, for officers of the Government, and for students in American history. It has long since been recognized as such by high officials of this Department, and Secretaries of State Frelinghuysen, Bayard, and Blaine have in turn recommended its purchase to Congress.
 I wish to add my own earnest recommendation to theirs and to say that, by so doing, I am not merely seeking to secure to Mr. Haswell a remuneration for his work. I sincerely believe the acquisition of the Historical Register to be for the public interest.
 I am, sir, your obedient servant,
 JOHN W. FOSTER.
 Hon. CHARLES F. CRISP,
 Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I submit also the recommendations of Secretary McCulloch and of Secretary Frelinghuysen, contained in House Executive Document 110, Forty-eighth Congress, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, January 21, 1885.

SIR: I have the honor to forward herewith an estimate of appropriation received from the Secretary of State for \$6,000 to purchase the manuscript of the work entitled "The Chronological History of the Department of State and the Foreign Relations of the Government from September 5, 1774, to the present time," compiled by John H. Haswell.

Very respectfully,

H. MCCULLOCH,
Secretary.

The honorable SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, Washington, January 19, 1885.

SIR: I have the honor to request that, under the act passed July 7, 1884, you recommended to Congress an appropriation of the sum of \$6,000 to enable the Secretary of State to purchase the manuscript of the work entitled "The Chronological History of the Department of State and the Foreign Relations of the Government from September 5, 1774, to the present time," compiled by Mr. John H. Haswell, chief of the Bureau of Indexes and Archives in this Department. The subject of the purchase of the manuscript from the author for publication was presented to Congress at its last session, as will appear from the letter addressed by me on the 24th day of March last to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, a copy of which is inclosed.

I now learn from Mr. Haswell, by a communication from him of even date (a copy of which is also inclosed herewith), that he is engaged in carrying the record of the Department and the foreign service down to July 1, 1885, a period nearly two years later than was intended at the time the letter of the Department above alluded to was sent to the Speaker.

This addition makes the work a comprehensive history of every branch of the foreign relations of this country, of the treaties, the international conferences, the diplomatic and consular service, the committees of foreign affairs of Congress, and the officers of every grade of this Department from the time of the first Colonial Congress down to the very day on which the publication of the work is expected to be completed, and gives the compilation an inestimable value as a reference book to this Department, to committees on foreign affairs, and to the foreign service of the Government. In the opinion of this Department, the immediate purchase and speedy publication of this work will be of incalculable benefit, and I have the honor to recommend that such steps as are necessary to that end be taken as soon as possible. I have also to recommend that for that purpose a clause similar to the draft inclosed herewith be inserted in the proper appropriation bill. I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant.

FRED'K T. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Hon. HUGH MCCULLOCH,
Secretary of the Treasury.

To enable the Secretary of State to purchase from John H. Haswell, chief of the Bureau of Indexes and Archives in the Department of State, the manuscript of "The Chronological History of the Department of State and the Foreign Relations of the Government from September 5, 1774, to July 1, 1885," prepared by him, the sum of \$6,000 is hereby appropriated.

And the Public Printer is hereby authorized, upon the requisition of the Secretary of State, to cause to be printed and bound in cloth, for the use of the Department of State, 5,000 copies of the above-mentioned work.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, Washington, March 24, 1884.

SIR: Mr. John H. Haswell, chief of the Bureau of Indexes and Archives in this Department, has compiled a chronological history of the Department of State and of the foreign relations of the United States from the time of the organization of the first Colonial Congress, in September, 1774, down to the present time. In it is presented a complete and accurate record of the dates of appointment and terms of service of all presiding officers of the Colonial Congress, of Presidents of the United States, of Secretaries of State, under secretaries, and all officers, clerks, etc., of this Department (including those of the Patent Office previous to its transfer to the Department of the Interior), of committees having charge of our foreign affairs, and of all officers connected with the foreign service of the United States, either diplomatic, consular, political, or special, as well as the dates of presentation and terms of service of all representatives of foreign countries accredited to this Government.

A brief synopsis of every treaty, convention, protocol, or agreement between the United States and a foreign Government, and the cause, nature, and result of every international tribunal and commission in which this Government or its officers took part, together with the names, character of the duties, and terms of service of all officers connected with them are given.

The work has been compiled by Mr. Haswell with the greatest regard for completeness and accuracy—about twelve years having been consumed by him (outside of his regular duties at the Department) in its preparation—and he has succeeded in arranging its contents in such a form as to facilitate in the highest possible degree a reference to any particular subject or to the official history of any individual, thus insuring its value as a handbook of reference. Many important facts in the early history of our foreign relations not hitherto known have been discovered by the author in his exhaustive researches among the Government archives, and are here presented for the first time; and his work is of especial value because it completes the imperfect records of the early period of this Department, many of which were destroyed during the war of 1812.

Two of the Assistant Secretaries of State and the examiner of claims have examined the work and recommend its purchase for publication in the full belief that it will be a valuable handbook of reference to the heads of the Executive Departments of the Government, and in the certainty that it will be invaluable to the Committees of Foreign Affairs of Congress, the Secretaries of State and their assistants, and to officers in the foreign service of the Government.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant.

FRED'K T. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Hon. JOHN G. CARLISLE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, Washington, September 26, 1883.

SIR: I have gone over, with the aid of Mr. Haswell and with some care on my own part, that gentleman's rare and valuable compilation of the officers, employees, and events of the Department of State, including our foreign service, diplomatic and consular, from the earliest steps of the colonists toward independence up to the present year.

Mr. Haswell's unpretentious work shows both skill and industry.

Commencing with the Continental Congress in 1774, he has given a bird's-eye view of the men and events of which he treats up to the present year; Presidents and Vice-Presidents of the United States; Secretaries of State and Assistant Secretaries; all the officers and clerks who have ever been in the Department; all our ministers abroad, general and special; all consular officers of every grade who have been in the service of the Government; the date and character of all treaties and conventions concluded between the United States and foreign powers; all commissions and arbitrations established under claims conventions or to which this Government was a party.

This, though its chief, is by no means its only value. It is interspersed with pertinent and rare scraps of history, which to the curious scholar, the historian, or the gentleman of leisure will be found most interesting and valuable.

To all the Executive Departments of the Government it would prove to be a most valuable book of reference; to this Department it would be almost invaluable, and should be on the tables of the Secretary and his assistants.

Such a work, even imperfectly done, would be useful, but one of the chief merits of Mr. Haswell's performance is in the accuracy, exactness, and completeness with which he has accomplished his laborious task.

I hope some way may be found to make the work available for use, and at the same time to remunerate Mr. Haswell for what must have cost him many years of labor.

With great respect, etc.,

HENRY O'CONNOR,
Examiner of Claims.

Hon. FREDERICK T. FRELINGHUYSEN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
BUREAU OF INDEXES AND ARCHIVES,
Washington, January 19, 1885.

SIR: I have the honor to again respectfully call your attention to my work, "The Chronological History of the Department of State and the Foreign Relations of the Government from 1774 to the present time," and to inform you that I am now engaged in completing the compilation down to July 1, 1885, a date nearly two years later than was intended when I had the honor to present the subject to you in March last. I think that you will agree with me that the additional labor thus entailed merits some additional compensation, and I have the honor to respectfully request that the proper steps be taken with a view to purchasing my work and appropriating for such purchase the sum of \$6,000.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant.

JOHN H. HASWELL,
Chief of Bureau of Indexes and Archives.

Hon. FREDERICK T. FRELINGHUYSEN,
Secretary of State.

While this proposition may be subject to the point of order, yet it will be seen by reference to these various letters and documents that the purchase of this work will be of immense advantage to the State Department, to the ministers plenipotentiary of this country to foreign countries, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to every member of both Houses of Congress, in the consideration of all questions affecting our relations with foreign governments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For freight on bullion and coin, by registered mail or otherwise, between mints and assay offices, \$9,000.

Mr. DOCKERY. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

On page 41, after line 12, insert:

"For contingent expenses of the Bureau of the Mint, to be expended under the direction of the Director, namely, for assay laboratory, chemicals, fuel, materials, and other necessities, \$750."

Mr. DINGLEY. That amendment is proper.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read to and including line 24, page 50 of the bill.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

On page 48, line 22, after the word "thousand," add the words "five hundred," so as to read "\$4,500."

Mr. DOCKERY. We have passed that paragraph, and I object to returning to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has read down to line 24, on page 50.

Mr. MEYER. I hope the gentleman will not raise that objection.

Mr. DOCKERY. I should be very glad to oblige my friend, but I am constrained to object to returning to paragraphs which have been already passed over.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection being made, it will not be in order to return to the paragraph.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the gentleman will have an opportunity to explain his amendment.

Mr. MEYER. The Clerk has been reading so rapidly that he passed the paragraph before my attention was called to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized if he desires to make some explanation.

Mr. MEYER. I observe that the salary of the assistant treasurer at New Orleans is the lowest in the scale. This salary was fixed originally under the Revised Statutes of the United States at \$4,500. It is true that the salaries of assistant treasurers at other subtreasurers have also been reduced; but I do think that the assistant treasurer at New Orleans, one of the most important points in this country, with its vast commerce and transac-

tions, is entitled to \$4,500, which is the lowest salary paid to any other subtreasurer in the United States.

In fact an application has been made by the assistant treasurer for increased force to aid him in properly conducting his business, and owing to the very large increase of work he really needs two additional clerks; but I do not ask for that, feeling the necessity of economizing in all the expenditures of the Government; but I do not think it is fair and just that the assistant treasurer at New Orleans should be paid less than any other assistant treasurer in the country. The salary was originally fixed at a higher rate; and there is now no good reason why it should not be at least \$4,500.

Mr. DOCKERY. I fully recognize the efficiency and activity that my friend from Louisiana manifests in behalf of his constituents; but we have passed this paragraph—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. DOCKERY. And I am constrained to object to returning; and then, further, this is an increase of salary, which the present condition of the Treasury will not justify.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mint at Carson, Nev.: For salary of superintendent, \$3,000; for assayer, melter and refiner, and coiner, at \$2,500 each; assistant assayer, assistant melter and refiner, and assistant coiner, at \$2,000 each; chief clerk, at \$2,350; cashier, bookkeeper, and weigh clerk, at \$2,000 each; abstract clerk and register of deposits, at \$1,500 each; assayer's computation clerk, at \$1,200; in all, \$29,550.

For wages of workmen and adjusters, \$30,000.

For incidental and contingent expenses, \$20,000.

Mr. BARTINE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 9, page 53, strike out "thirty" and insert "sixty;" so that the paragraph will read:

"For wages of workmen and adjusters, \$60,000."

Mr. BARTINE. Mr. Chairman, there are four mints in the United States. One at Philadelphia, one at New Orleans, one at San Francisco, and one at Carson, Nev. The one located at Carson is the only mint in the United States that is situated anywhere near a mine—either gold or silver. The Committee on Appropriations has for some reason cut down the regular appropriation for the working force of the Carson mint just one-half while leaving the appropriations for the other mints substantially the same. Now, I can see no good reason, Mr. Chairman, why the working force of the Carson mint, the only mint located anywhere near a gold or silver mine, should be thus reduced while the others are kept upon a full working force.

Now, two years ago, Mr. Chairman, this same identical action was taken by the Committee on Appropriations. At that time I offered the same identical amendment; and I had no better or stronger, no more energetic coadjutor in helping me to pass my amendment than the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY]. I wish to say, in addition to this, that the conditions are identically now what they were then. The question now is exactly the same as then; and I expect the gentleman to show his consistency by accepting this amendment.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I will say that we are only following the precedent established at the time referred to by my friend from Nevada.

Mr. BARTINE. But, still my friend will remember—

Mr. DOCKERY. His party was then in power.

Mr. BARTINE. I understand; but the Committee of the Whole voted down the Committee on Appropriations, and my amendment carried.

Mr. DOCKERY. Yes, I know; but it was restored somewhere along the line, because it only appears at \$30,000.

Now, I want to say in reply briefly, because I do not wish to detain the House, that this is the only mint in the United States now engaged in coining standard silver dollars. Under the act of July 14, 1890, an indefinite appropriation is made for the coinage of standard silver dollars; so that the result of this action is simply to remit that mint to the indefinite appropriation carried by the act of July 14, 1890, and not in any way hamper and retard the coinage of the mint.

Mr. BARTINE. I would not object to this proposition at all were it not for the fact that I know as well as I am talking at this time that if the appropriation for the force at that mint is reduced the authorities will regard it as an intimation that the House of Representatives does not desire this mint to be operated. To reduce the appropriation as it now is to \$30,000 will practically close that mint.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, in reply to my friend—

Mr. BARTINE. I am not through.

Mr. DOCKERY. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. BARTINE. The \$30,000 that is appropriated will just about cover the operation of the refinery and assay office of the Carson mint, and I am perfectly confident that if this amount is appropriated the coinage department will be closed.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in reply to my friend, that the Director of the Mint was before the committee, and he stated, in reply to our inquiries, that he had ample authority under the act of July 14, 1890, to supply any deficiencies that might arise by reason of a reduction of this amount.

Mr. BARTINE. Will my friend answer this question: Why cut down the appropriation for the working force at the Carson mint practically one-half, leaving the other mints just as they stand?

Mr. DOCKERY. For the reason that the other mints are not coining standard silver dollars—

Mr. BARTINE. Is not that a reason why the appropriation for the other mints should be cut down and that for Carson City allowed to remain?

Mr. DOCKERY. We can not reduce the amount allowed at the other mints without crippling them; but this Carson City mint comes under the provision of the act of July 14, 1890, giving it the benefit of an indefinite appropriation.

Mr. BARTINE. But the gentleman's present position is directly opposed to the argument which he himself made two years ago. He then agreed with me that the reduction of the appropriation meant practically the closing of this mint. I regard this cutting down as an act of injustice, and I do not think it ought to be done.

Mr. DOCKERY. The policy was inaugurated then—

Mr. BARTINE. But the House did not sustain it. The appropriation was made for \$60,000 that year, and was carried through.

Mr. DOCKERY. That was for 1891. The appropriation for 1890 was \$60,000; for the fiscal year 1891, \$30,000; and for the fiscal year 1892, \$60,000.

Mr. BARTINE. My friend will permit me to say that the appropriation for last year was passed by this House at \$30,000 and was increased in the Senate to \$50,000; and in that shape it stands at the present time.

Mr. DOCKERY. The appropriation for the current year is \$50,000; for the fiscal year 1892, \$60,000.

Mr. BARTINE. Exactly.

Mr. DOCKERY. I hope we shall have a vote. The appropriation in the bill as it stands will not in anywise cripple the operations of the mint at Carson City.

Mr. BARTINE. To use my friend's own argument, it is an attempt to make a showing of economy where there is no economy in fact.

Mr. DOCKERY. Admitting that for the sake of the argument, it follows that the original proposition advanced by the gentleman from Nevada necessarily fails.

Mr. BARTINE. I am only turning my friend's argument against himself.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. BARTINE, it was rejected, there being ayes 28, noes 76.

The Clerk read as follows:

That so much of section 9 of the act entitled "An act to amend section 5352 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in reference to bigamy, and for other purposes," approved March 22, 1882, as authorizes the President to appoint a board of five persons to exercise certain powers and duties prescribed in said section, be, and the same is hereby, repealed; and the said board is hereby abolished, and all powers and duties conferred upon said board are hereby imposed upon and shall be discharged, without additional compensation, by a board hereby created, to be constituted of the governor, chief justice, and secretary of the Territory of Utah.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out this paragraph. A provision of exactly this character was inserted in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill a year ago, but was not assented to by the Senate and therefore did not become law. It is desirable that attention should be called to precisely what is here proposed. It is proposed to abolish the board that was created by the act of 1882 known as the Edmunds act. A board to consist of five members, not more than three of whom were to be members of any political party—a purely nonpartisan board—was created by that act.

The powers of this board are very great. It exercises not only the power of registration, but the power of certifying the election of members of the Legislature. Of course if the pending provision of this bill should prevail and become law, this commission would very speedily consist of persons of one political party. The principle upon which the board was originally established, that of a nonpartisan commission, would be overthrown. In addition to that there might be some conflict in reference to certain duties of the commission, if the governor were a member, as the reports of the board on some matters are made to the governor.

I desire simply to call the attention of the Committee of the Whole to the character of this legislation. It seems to be in the direction in which we are gradually traveling—the overthrowing of the legislation of 1882 and succeeding years, which was considered so important at the time and the necessity for which, it seems to me, has not entirely passed away. For the purpose

of bringing this matter to the attention of the Committee of the Whole I have moved to strike out the provision.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope my friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] will not press his motion. There is reason to believe that at this time the Senate will acquiesce in this proposition. I think it may be stated confidently that the Senate will not now object to it. The provision is one of importance for this reason: The present commissioners are nonresidents of the Territory entirely—

Mr. DINGLEY. That is a matter entirely within the discretion of the President who makes the appointments.

Mr. HOLMAN. But they have always been appointed from outside the Territory; and I presume they would be outsiders under the incoming Administration. This is an anomaly under our present system of Government. No Territory should ever be placed so entirely under outside government as is the Territory of Utah. The governor, the chief justice, and the secretary are local to the Territory; they live there; they are not identified with the Mormon population—

Mr. DINGLEY. They are only residents for the time being—while they occupy the offices. They were not appointed originally from the Territory.

Mr. HOLMAN. But they are all now regarded as permanently belonging to the Territory. I have so understood from the Delegate from that Territory.

Mr. DINGLEY. My chief objection to this proposed legislation is that under its operation a board which has heretofore been nonpartisan will become at a very early date a partly partisan body. It seems to me the nonpartisan character of this board should be preserved.

Mr. HOLMAN. Well, there is no politics in this, as my friend from Maine knows, and the duties of the commission are now very unimportant.

Mr. DINGLEY. They have all the duties with reference to the registration of voters and the certification of the elections.

Mr. HOLMAN. Oh, they have only a general sort of supervision. They visit that Territory about once a year—a mere junketing trip; and the duties performed by them ought to be performed by local officers. It is not right to have such a system of alien government there.

It seems to me that this change can be made very well at this time, and would be decidedly better and more in harmony with our general system of government than the appointment of five men selected from other sections of the Union to go there and perform duties that are local in their character. I do not think that there is anything whatever in the partisan question. In view of the action of the President of the United States recently the Government will undoubtedly soon consider the propriety of changing the form of government and giving that people at least local government, subject to the control which the Government exercises over all the other Territories.

I think there is a general sentiment in favor of local government, even laying aside the question of the admission of Utah as a State, but that the Government should still retain such control over it as a Territory that would prevent the revival of polygamy. This provision in the bill is a step in harmony with our general system, and I hope the gentleman from Maine will not insist upon his motion.

Mr. DINGLEY. But, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if there is to be a change of policy with reference to Utah it should not begin just at this point. If the time has come when there can be an entire change of policy with regard to the government of Utah, that is one thing. But we have enacted what is known as the Edmunds act; it is on the statute books, with all of the provisions supposed to be necessary to secure its enforcement, this being one of them. Now, we should either repeal that act or carry it out in its entirety.

Mr. HOLMAN. Oh, no; not repeal it. I think the Edmunds act should remain in full force.

Mr. DINGLEY. But here is a proposition now which entirely changes its character.

Mr. HOLMAN. No; I think not. We do not affect that act, except as to the appointment of these local commissioners—a new commission. I think it is an entirely safe and prudent change and one that will meet the approbation of the whole country.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to my friend from Maine on this point, that as chairman of the Committee on Territories I have had occasion within the last two years to investigate this question very thoroughly, and during the last session of Congress a great deal of testimony was taken in the committee with regard to the necessity of continuing longer in force this Utah Commission.

The statement which was made by both Gentiles and Mormons, Democrats and Republicans alike, was to the effect that the commission was no longer of any practical use whatever to the peo-

ple of the Territory of Utah. It was objected that it was an alien body of men drawing salary of \$5,000 a year from the Territory, and performing no other duty save and except a junketing trip once or twice a year out to the Territory under the pretense of supervising the registration of voters.

As to the provisions of the Edmunds act creating that Commission and requiring its continuation, that act merely authorized the creation of a commission as a temporary expedient. The Commission, by the Edmunds act itself, was only to continue until the Territorial Legislature of Utah could provide other necessary machinery and means at home by the election of a home commission to supervise and attend to this question of registration and the supervising of elections.

But the governor of that Territory, who has absolutely autocratic power, so that he can not be overridden by the Legislature—the governor and his friends have seen fit to defeat any legislation enacted by the Territorial Legislature of Utah since the adoption of the Tucker act to take the place of this Commission by the establishment of a home commission.

The Commission, however, is not needed now. It is simply—and has been all along—to supervise the registration and count the votes. The only use for the registration at all was to keep off the registration books the names of polygamists, those men living in violation of the provisions of the Edmunds-Tucker act.

But your President, by a recent proclamation of amnesty, himself declares that there is no longer in practice or theory any polygamy in existence in the Territory of Utah, and it is therefore unnecessary to continue this Commission a single day or a single hour longer in life, since the only function it had to perform has ceased to exist. We ought to let the clause stand as it now stands in the bill, and abolish the Commission by abolishing the salaries.

Mr. DINGLEY. But the gentleman from Tennessee should bear in mind that this Commission is continued. The proposition in this bill simply legislates the present members out of office, but a new commission is created by the act, consisting of the governor, the chief justice, and the secretary of state.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Exactly; but a local commission.

Mr. DINGLEY. But that will be practically a partisan commission.

Mr. WASHINGTON. No; a local commission, consisting of the governor, secretary of state, and the chief justice.

Now, those men will perform their duties, I apprehend, until the next Territorial Legislature can enact a law, which they will do, creating a home commission by Territorial law to discharge those duties. As to their being entirely partisan under this act, of course as the matter now stands the governor, chief justice, and secretary are all three Republicans.

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes.

Mr. WASHINGTON. But I apprehend and hope that very soon after the 4th of March they will all three be Democrats.

Mr. DINGLEY. Undoubtedly.

Mr. WASHINGTON. That will not change the status of affairs, so far as parties are concerned, from that which now exists practically, because we will have three Democrats composing that Commission, whereas to-day you have three Republicans and two Democrats, and the three Republicans out-vote the two Democrats every time.

Mr. DINGLEY. But the Commission to-day consists of three Republicans and two Democrats?

Mr. WASHINGTON. And the two Democrats are absolutely powerless.

Mr. DINGLEY. There would be, after the 4th of March, three Democrats and two Republicans, and that there would be no objection to; but now you propose—

Mr. WASHINGTON. We do not want all five. We only want three.

Mr. DINGLEY. Now you propose to change the law so they will all be Democrats.

Mr. WASHINGTON. We are entirely willing to trust the registration and supervision of the counting of the votes to three Democrats, appointed from the citizens of that Territory.

Mr. DINGLEY. Will the gentleman be willing to add a provision that not more than two of them shall be members of the same political party?

Mr. WASHINGTON. I would not, for this reason: I do not propose to undertake to hamper the gentleman whose election to the Presidency of the United States was announced here to-day before the American people, in the selection of officials in the Territory of Utah; because I hope the next House of Representatives will proceed to do justice by the Territory of Utah and pass an enabling act, if this Congress refuses to do it, so as to allow her to come into the Union within the next twelve months, and to assume the position among the other States which she is entitled to before the country.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move to strike out—but before that motion

is put I propose to amend the provision by adding at the end of line 17, on page 60, the words "not more than two of whom shall be members of the same political party." We will then have a commission organized precisely as it is now.

Mr. DOCKERY. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and the amendments thereto be considered as closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] asks unanimous consent that debate on the section and amendments be closed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY].

The question being taken on the amendment, the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. DINGLEY), there were—ayes 37, noes 78.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the motion made by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] to strike out the item.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of publication of Records of the Rebellion: For one agent, \$2,000; four clerks of class 4; three clerks of class 3; two clerks of class 2; three clerks of class 1; three copyists; two pressmen and compositors, at \$1,200 each; one compositor, \$1,000; two copyholders, at \$900 each; two assistant messengers; two watchmen; and one laborer, at \$800; in all, \$31,780.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ascertain something about this paragraph. I move to strike it out. It is something I do not know anything about, and it occurs to me it is rather unnecessary.

Mr. DOCKERY. What is the item to which the gentleman objects?

Mr. MILLER. The item for the publication of the Records of the Rebellion. I do not understand why we should go to this expense of paying out \$31,000.

Mr. DOCKERY. I will state to my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. MILLER] that this appropriation is made in pursuance of law, which requires the publication of the Records of the War of the Rebellion, and this force of clerks prepare the manuscript for publication.

Mr. MILLER. For the sake of finding out, I would like to know how long that has been in existence?

Mr. SAYERS. It will be completed in two years under the law. We passed a bill here three days ago appropriating \$175,000 for the publication of that record.

Mr. MILLER. I withdraw my *pro forma* amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses of branch offices at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, Savannah, New Orleans, San Francisco, Portland (Oregon), Portland (Maine), Chicago, and Port Townsend, including furniture, fuel, lights, rent and care of offices, car fare and baggage in visiting merchant vessels, freight, express, telegrams, and other necessary expenses incurred in collecting the latest information for the Pilot Chart, and for other purposes for which the offices were established, including \$1,000 for rent of New York office, \$13,000.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out \$13,000 and insert \$14,500.

I desire to call the attention of the committee not only to this reduction, but to the character of this work somewhat. These are branches of the Hydrographic Office established in Washington. The work of the Hydrographic Office itself is in large part the publication of charts for navigation, which are issued, not only for the Navy, but for the merchant marine of the country. For the purpose of collecting the information that is needed for the issuance of the hydrographic chart it becomes necessary to maintain branch offices. They are maintained at New York, Boston, Baltimore, Portland, Oregon, and some other places.

Now, the Hydrographic Office has found it impossible to establish two or three branch offices provided for in prior appropriation bills simply because the appropriations were insufficient. They asked for \$18,000, and \$14,500 was appropriated last year. Now, the effect of cutting this down to \$13,000 will be to close some of these branch offices; and if gentlemen find that the Hydrographic Office in many of these places is closed, and that offices provided for on previous appropriation bills are not established, of course the reason of it will lie right here in the amount of this appropriation.

My own judgment is that it is not wise to cut down this amount \$1,500, for it must close at least one, if not two, of these offices. I think this is a service of great importance to the country at large, primarily, of course, to our Navy, but secondarily and especially to the merchant marine of the country. Commanders of vessels in this country largely rely on these pilot charts, and the information must be obtained in these branch offices. I have made this motion simply for the purpose of bringing this matter to the attention of the House and asking an expression on this vote, and with a view that gentlemen may understand why any

of these branch offices shall be closed—that it is entirely due to the reduction of the appropriation.

Mr. DOCKERY. Let us have a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. DOCKERY. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 17, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For surveyor-general of the Territory of New Mexico, \$2,000; and for the clerks in his office, \$5,000; in all, \$7,000.

Mr. JOSEPH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 92, line 10, after the word "thousand," insert the words "five hundred;" so that it will read "\$2,500."

Mr. DOCKERY. I suggest to my friend that he withdraw that amendment, as the office now stands on equal footing with all others.

Mr. JOSEPH. I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. BURROWS. Have it fixed over in the Senate.

Mr. DOCKERY. By no means.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of the Solicitor of the Treasury: For compensation of the Solicitor of the Treasury, \$4,000; assistant solicitor, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$2,000; three clerks of class 4; three clerks of class 3; four clerks of class 2; one assistant messenger; and one laborer; in all, \$26,180.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask on what page the Clerk is reading. I have an amendment I want to offer on page 102. I have been trying to keep track of the reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send up his amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, by inserting after line 8, on page 102, the following:

For pay of assistant attorneys temporarily appointed and employed by the Attorney-General to appear for defendants in cases where settlers on public lands within the limits of any railroad grant and holding United States patents for those lands who are cited to appear in court by any railroad company or corporation claiming such lands, \$5,000.

Mr. HOLMAN. A point of order.

Mr. DOCKERY. I am constrained to submit a point of order.

Mr. BOWERS. I think I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri submits a point of order.

Mr. BOWERS. Have I not five minutes on the amendment? Can I be taken off the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has five minutes on his amendment unless a point of order be made against it. A point of order takes the gentleman off the floor. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] submits a point of order.

Mr. DOCKERY. If the gentleman from California will hear me—

Mr. BOWERS. Then I will speak to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. DOCKERY. If the gentleman from California will give me his attention for just one moment I will state that I have no desire to prevent the gentleman from making a statement and I will therefore reserve the point of order.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, some years ago, when Mr. Lamar was Secretary of the Interior, certain railroad lands within railroad grants were restored to the public domain in California. They were advertised as being within the public domain and subject to entry. The Government by its publications induced people to go onto those lands and to purchase them; it sold the lands to those people and issued its patents for them, and those settlers have gone to work and with their hands have built up farms and homes, relying upon their patents signed by the President of the United States.

Within a few weeks past the Southern Pacific Railroad Company has cited the men holding these Government patents to appear in the United States courts in San Francisco to defend their title against the claims of the railroad company, and to show cause why they should not be required to give up their farms and turn them over to that railroad company. Now, sir, it seems to me that something has been omitted from this bill. When an item of \$750 was put in at another point in this bill, the gentleman in charge said that it had been omitted, and I think there has been something omitted here, Mr. Chairman. I tell you, sir, that the act which among honorable men in the ordinary walks of life is considered dishonest and dishonorable is none the less dishonest and none the less dishonorable when committed by the Government of the United States.

I hold, sir, that it is the duty of the United States Government to defend the titles of these settlers against this attack. These men have been called into court, and to many of them it is ruin. They are not able to bear the expense. The man who has gone onto the public domain as a settler and has built up

a little farm with his hands is not generally able to hire learned and expensive lawyers to go into court and defend his title. As to the Government of the United States, if its patent is not good for anything we ought to know it. That patent is the primary foundation of title to more than half the homes in the United States. If the patent of this Government carries no guarantee of title with it we are in a very bad condition in this country.

I claim, Mr. Chairman, that justice towards these men requires that if the Government sold them lands that did not belong to it, it should not only make restitution, but it should pay the damages sustained by the men it has deceived. I see here that the Attorney-General has appointed and employed attorneys to represent Indians in this country when the titles to lands which they claimed were in jeopardy. Here is (Executive Document No. 193) the statement of the Attorney-General:

(6) The claim of the firm of Bronson & Wells, now represented by Wells, Monroe & Lee, special assistant attorneys at Los Angeles, Cal., in the matter of the Mission Indians, under appointment of Hon. Benjamin Harris Brewster, Attorney-General of the United States, of June 26, 1883, upon the recommendation of Hon. H. M. Teller, Secretary of the Interior, they being appointed special assistant United States attorneys in all cases affecting the interests of the Mission Indians in California touching their rights to certain lands in jeopardy.

The exhibit sets forth in detail the character of the services. For the services rendered from July 6, 1883, to January 14, 1886, the charge was \$2,000. It was recommended to Congress for appropriation April 22, 1892. (See Exhibit F, being House Ex. Doc. No. 201, Fifty-second Congress, first session, reference being made to page 3, line 11, and to pages 30 and 31.)

The last two accounts are presented for the second time for the consideration of Congress at the request of the claimants.

Very respectfully,

W. H. H. MILLER,
Attorney-General.

The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Now, I believe that a white man, a white settler, is as good as an Indian. I don't know what this House thinks about it, but that is my opinion. What are your district attorneys for if not to defend titles in such cases? It will be noticed that this amendment applies only to the cases of settlers upon lands within railroad grants. I want to read one or two lines from a letter which I received yesterday. The writer says:

PARKFIELD, MONTEREY COUNTY, CAL., January 27, 1893.

DEAR BROTHER: At last the Southern Pacific Railroad Company has commenced suit to rob me, with many others, of the land the Government invited us to settle on, and for which we hold patents.

I went into San Miguel the other day, and when I was coming out I met the United States marshal, who served a subpoena on me, to show cause, before the court in San Francisco, as to why I should not surrender to the Southern Pacific Railroad Company my land. I will have to file an answer on or before the 6th day of February. The subpoena, which is dated December 28, 1892, was not served on me until the 25th day of January, 1893, nearly a month after it was issued. It gives me only about ten days to file an answer.

Now I am not able to fight the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, and I think it the duty of the United States Government to defend us, as it declared the land open for settlement. This was done under the Cleveland administration. We took the land in good faith, and have our patents signed by President Harrison, and have paid taxes on it ever since we "proved up." This land was said to belong to the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad Company, and was declared forfeited by Secretary Lamar.

There has been a similar case decided in the United States Supreme Court at Washington, about a month ago, and the United States Government defended it. The land in that case was near Los Angeles. The court decided that the Southern Pacific Railroad Company had no right to any land granted to another company, and declared forfeited.

What I want is for Attorney-General Miller to notify the United States district attorney for the northern district of California to defend these cases. If the United States Government does not stand by us in this matter by defending the patents it has given us, then it will stand in the position of a repudiator of its agreements and the betrayer of the rights of its subjects into the hands of a soulless railroad monopoly.

I think the railroad company is trying to drive us into paying for the land, as it knows we are unable to stand the expense of a suit against it. The case, if contested, will probably be carried to the Supreme Court of the United States, and it is the duty of the United States Government to look after the interests of those it has got into trouble.

I am unable to see of what use it is to have a patent if the railroad company can set the patent aside and drive us from the land we have paid for and made improvements upon.

Now, what I want is for you to see the Attorney-General, or get someone else to see him, and request him to instruct the district attorney at San Francisco to defend our rights to the land the Government has deeded to us, which we accepted in good faith. The Attorney-General can, if he chooses, notify the United States district attorney for the northern district of California by telegraph to defend my case. I will have to retain a lawyer at San Francisco on or before the 6th day of February or go myself and file an answer to prevent the case from going by default. Just now I am very busy, and it will cause me an expense that at this time it will be hard for me to meet. Please let me know if you meet with any success.

I want to get the case put off as long as possible, and if this Administration will do nothing perhaps Mr. Cleveland will.

The railroad company wanted the United States Government to give other land for this, but the Land Commissioner declined. The railroad then applied to the Secretary of the Interior, who decided against it. And now we are left to fight for our homes against the monopoly as best we can. Inclosed please find circular explanatory of our case.

Your affectionate brother,

GEORGE E. CRANE.

J. H. CRANE, Esq., Washington, D. C.

P. S.—There are three cases set for trial which come up before the United States circuit court at San Francisco February 6, 1893, to wit: Southern Pacific vs. George E. Crane; Southern Pacific vs. R. E. Smith; Southern Pacific vs. W. L. Smith.

Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the sense of honor, to the sense of

justice of members of this House not to make a point of order against an amendment of this kind. You have put in a provision here, after the point where I desire this amendment to come in, to provide additional furniture for some of the best furnished rooms in Washington. You spend your money recklessly everywhere else, but it seems that when the poor settler upon the public lands, who has taken up those lands and paid his money for them upon the faith and the assurance that the Government owns the land, then when his deed is attacked and his title called in question you are unwilling to come to his defense. I hope the gentleman from Missouri will not make his point of order against this amendment.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CAMINETTI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from California have time to complete his argument.

Mr. DOCKERY. Does the gentleman desire five minutes more?

Mr. BOWERS. I do.

Mr. DOCKERY. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California be allowed to proceed for five minutes longer.

Mr. BOWERS. I thank the gentleman and the committee. Now, Mr. Chairman, this seems to be an item of as much importance as any other contained in this bill, an item that should receive the consideration of this body. It is of a great deal more importance than much of the stuff that we have had here for several days, and upon which we have wasted our time.

I tell you, you can afford a few minutes' time when it comes to the consideration of the rights of the settlers upon the public domain. I find in this bill a provision where the Attorney-General proposes to pay a large amount for the employment of lawyers to defend the titles of the Indians. Then, in the next paragraph, under the heading "Department of Justice," I find a provision "for furniture and repairs, \$500," and another "for law books for library of the Department, \$1,000."

Now, I propose that when they buy those law books they buy books treating upon the rights of American citizens on public lands which the United States Government has sold them, for which it has taken their money and issued patents. We had better buy some such books instead of buying books ninety-nine out of one hundred of which treat upon the rights of corporations, which seem to be regarded as the most sacred rights in the city of Washington and in Congress. I think that the House can well afford to insert this appropriation of \$5,000 for the purpose contemplated by my amendment. Here you have on the same page an item for shoeing horses.

Why, Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you that many of the men and women whose money you took for those lands have gone barefooted while they were building up their homes which you now propose to allow to be taken from them in the courts by a railroad company to which you have already given millions of acres.

Do justice, though the heavens fall. I would not like as a member of this honorable body to get up and make a point of order against a proposition of this kind. If this matter is to go out on a point of order, I give you due notice, gentlemen, that I will make the most of it that I know how. If you give me a fair vote upon it, all right. I will submit it to the majority and not make any delay.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, if this were an individual matter I should certainly be disposed to give a good deal of consideration to the powerful and persuasive appeal of my good friend from California. But having this bill in charge as the organ of the committee, I am constrained, under the rules, to submit points of order when any proposition is presented that is not in order. Now, I will say that I have no doubt—

Mr. BOWERS. Does the gentleman make a point of order?

Mr. DOCKERY. Wait a moment. I have reserved the point of order. I do not question the merit of the claim presented by the gentleman from California. I would be disposed to accept without any investigation his statement on a matter of this kind, but if the gentleman will reflect a moment he will see that this is a salary bill. His proposition must be either a claim or a deficiency. If it is authorized by law, it belongs on the deficiency bill; if not authorized by law, it is a claim.

Mr. BOWERS. You say this is a salary bill?

Mr. DOCKERY. This is a bill providing salaries.

Mr. BOWERS. Does horseshoeing come under salaries? Does an appropriation for the library of the Attorney-General's office come under salaries?

Mr. DOCKERY. I want to say in entire seriousness that this is a salary bill; and in addition to salaries there are incidental expenses provided for which are legitimate and proper and germane in connection with salary appropriations.

I say to my friend in all kindness that as I understand the rules—perhaps I am in error, the Chair can pass upon the question—

he should have offered his proposition, if it is authorized by law, as an amendment to the deficiency bill. If it is not authorized by law it is a claim. I have no doubt that in any event, whether it is authorized by law or not, it is a meritorious proposition; but I am constrained under the rules to submit a point of order.

Mr. BOWERS. Some other way of presenting the proposition might have been a better way if one could ever get at that way. You have so many ways of getting at propositions that the very smartest of you are puzzled often as to which is the best way or the right way under the rules.

Mr. DOCKERY. I would not be understood as reflecting in any wise on the judgment of the gentleman from California. I have stated the view which I take of this proposition; but I am quite willing to submit to the decision of the Chair.

Mr. BOWERS. I wish to be heard on the point of order, if the gentleman makes a point of order.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. He does not make any point of order.

Mr. BOWERS. Then let us have a vote on it; that is all I want.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken and sustains it.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. BOWERS (interrupting). I understood the gentleman did not make any point of order.

Mr. DOCKERY. Oh, yes; I made a point of order.

Mr. BOWERS. I understood you reserved a point of order, but did not make it. I gave notice that I wanted to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. DOCKERY. I made the point of order just now.

Mr. BOWERS. Ah! after leading me to suppose it was not to be made. I asked that the gentleman would not make it. I made the proposition that I be allowed to have a vote on the amendment, which was all I desired.

Mr. DOCKERY. Let me state to the gentleman from California [Mr. BOWERS] that he is laboring under a misapprehension. I know he does not desire to do me any injustice. I reserved the point of order in order that the gentleman might present his statement to the House. Then a moment ago I stated to the Chair in the presence and hearing of the whole committee that I must insist on the point of order. I have no doubt that the gentleman from California failed to hear that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri announced that he insisted on the point of order; and the gentleman from California took his seat. The Chair, not understanding that the gentleman from California wished to be heard on the point of order, sustained it.

Mr. BERGEN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BERGEN. I did not hear any point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri. I understood the gentleman to say that he was going to submit a point of order, but he did not submit it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the position. The gentleman from New Jersey says he did not hear the point of order. The Chair did hear it. The gentleman from Missouri submitted the point of order and stated that he insisted upon it.

Mr. BERGEN. Will the Chair kindly state the point of order submitted by the gentleman from Missouri?

The CHAIRMAN. Why, the gentleman from Missouri clearly stated it and argued upon it. First, he said that there was no law authorizing the claim; that if it was in order at all it should have been submitted on the deficiency bill, but that as presented here it was simply a claim, which was not in order on this bill.

Mr. BERGEN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Missouri stated that he was going to submit a point of order, but the gentleman did not state what his point of order was. Now, when he states his point of order it is time enough for the Chair, I think, to decide the question, I submit in all deference to the Chair. But until he makes the point of order, the simple fact of announcing that he is going to do so does not make such a question of order as would warrant the Chair in ruling upon it and taking the gentleman from California off the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. But the gentleman from Missouri did submit the point of order.

Mr. BERGEN. I have asked the Chair what point of order he made?

The CHAIRMAN. And the Chair stated what the point of order was. The gentleman from New Jersey says that he did not hear the point of order made. Now, the Chair would have heard the gentleman from California, because the Chair understood the gentleman to say that he desired to be heard on the point of order. But after the point of order was made the gentleman from California took his seat and made no remarks. The Chair, therefore, ruled on the point of order, understanding that the gentleman did not desire to submit any remarks on that question.

Mr. BERGEN. Will the Chair bear with me for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BERGEN. I think the gentleman from California clearly announced in advance that if there was a point of order to be made on the amendment he wished to be heard on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so stated.

Mr. BERGEN. And I listened attentively to hear the point of order of the gentleman from Missouri, and in my judgment the gentleman failed to make any.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is correct. The gentleman from California did say that if the point of order was to be made he wanted to be heard. The gentleman from Missouri made the point of order, and the gentleman from California resumed his seat. He did not claim the floor to be heard, and the Chair ruled on the question presented.

Mr. BERGEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri what his point of order was?

Mr. DOCKERY. I stated clearly that the proposition was not authorized by law, and further that if it was authorized by law it was a proper item for the deficiency bill in my judgment. If there was no authority or law for it, it was in the nature of a claim, and could not be in order on this bill.

Mr. BERGEN. What is the point of order?

Mr. DOCKERY. Why, that it was not authorized by law.

Mr. BURROWS. By existing law.

Mr. BERGEN. I did not understand that the gentleman made the point of order to the Chair that it was not authorized by law.

Mr. DOCKERY. I did, and the record will so indicate. I further stated that it was not germane to this bill, for this is a salary bill.

Mr. BERGEN. The gentleman made that statement, but after that, as I understood him, he simply argued on a point of order which was not stated.

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman is mistaken. The point of order was clearly stated to the Chair.

Mr. BOWERS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment following the other, which will allow me to make a proper explanation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out the word "hundred," in line 9, on page 102.

Mr. BOWERS. I hardly think the gentleman from Missouri will make the point of order against that amendment; and now I wish to say a word in relation to the other matter.

My friends know that I am very deaf; but I made a proposition to the gentleman from Missouri that if there was to be a point of order raised I wished to reserve my right to speak on it. I asked first if he would allow me a vote on the merits, and if he would that I would not press the matter. I understood that that proposition was accepted, and I sat down and heard no point of order. I was in ignorance of his intention to make a point of order. I supposed we would take a vote when I sat down. That is all I wanted.

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman states that he did not hear my statement. What course does the gentleman desire to take?

Mr. BOWERS. I wish to speak on this amendment for five minutes.

Mr. DOCKERY. There is no objection to that.

Mr. BOWERS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I find that it is proposed to appropriate \$500 for furniture in the Attorney-General's Office. I have been there. It is a well-furnished room. I do not think any one in that room would suffer if they did not get \$500 more. A little further down we have got \$500 for tiring wagons and shoeing horses; a salary bill, I suppose.

Now, suppose that this is liable to a point of order? Is this a deliberative body? If we find out that we have made a mistake, as the gentleman in charge of this bill found awhile ago that he had left something out, there was no objection to slipping in an item of \$750, increasing the appropriation. Is that good law if you put it in there? Now, if I get in this appropriation, which every one of you knows is just and right, will it be good law as against your rules? I appeal to you to rise above the rules that want you to commit a wrong, and do right. I will follow these bills until we knock out enough so that we can get \$5,000 for this purpose out of these useless appropriations.

In the bill that follows this you have appropriated \$200,000 for indefinite purposes, over \$50,000 of which is for junketing purposes and for sleeping-car fare, entirely unnecessary; but when it comes to appropriating \$5,000 for the benefit of these settlers whose money you have taken, you say you can not do that. The great United States Government says to the settlers, "Oh, yes, we told you this was our land. We sold it to you. We have got your money. Now, help yourselves if you can. We will let our courts and these railroad companies harass and ruin you." That is substantially what you say to these men. I appeal to you to do right on this subject. I will bring it before you day after day until you will wish you had put in that little \$5,000.

The question being taken on the amendment offered by Mr. BOWERS, the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it. On a division (demanded by Mr. BOWERS) there were—ayes 41, noes 44.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOWERS. I desire to offer another amendment.

The amendment was read as follows:

Amend by striking out lines 10 and 11, on page 102, and inserting the following words in lieu thereof:

"For law books treating upon the rights of settlers on public lands and upon lands once granted to railroads and afterwards restored to the public domain, for library of the Department, \$200."

Mr. BOWERS. Now, Mr. Chairman, the item in the bill reads: "For law books in the Department, \$1,000." Now, I want less law books purchased, but those that are purchased I want to be of use to the yeomanry, to the men who have built up this country, and who are paying us for meeting here. For that \$200 I want books purchased that treat upon the rights of citizens of the United States, whose money the United States has taken, and sold them lands; and I want it defined by the laws of this country whether they have any rights as against railroad companies or not. I want it defined whether a United States patent carries any guarantee of title to land, which is of any moment or worth at all. If it does not, the sooner that is decided the better, and the Government ought to stop issuing patents if they are not worth anything.

Now, I submit that this is in the line of economy and reform. It cuts the appropriation \$800; and for \$200 I think you can get more law books than there are printed upon the subject that I have suggested, but you might have to appropriate \$50,000 to get all the books that would show you what are the sacred rights of corporations. Your law shelves are full of them. I tell you, Mr. Chairman, we should turn and look at the other side of this question once in awhile. I hope this amendment will prevail.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BOWERS) there were—ayes 21, noes 58.

Mr. BOWERS. No quorum.

Mr. DOCKERY. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. RICHARDSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXPENSES OF WHISKY TRUST INVESTIGATION.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM], chairman of the subcommittee to investigate what is known as the whisky trust and other trusts, desires to call the attention of the House to the fact that while the expenses of that investigation were ordered to be paid out of the contingent fund, there was no provision for the advancement of any money to pay necessary expenses. In order to enable the committee to execute the order of the House, the gentleman offers the resolution which the Clerk will report, and asks for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, now authorized to investigate and report on the Distilling and Cattle Feeding Company known as the whisky trust, be authorized through its chairman, and upon the approval of the Committee on Accounts, to draw on the Clerk of the House for the expenses of said investigation, in sums not exceeding \$500 at any one time.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On February 6, 1893:

An act (H. R. 8956) establishing a fog signal at Tibbets Point, Lake Ontario, New York.

On February 7, 1893:

An act (H. R. 8602) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mobile River by the Chicago, Mobile and Gulf Ports Railroad Company.

An act (H. R. 10063) to amend "an act authorizing the construction of a high wagon bridge across the Missouri River at or near Sioux City, Iowa," etc.

An act (H. R. 5752) to amend an act approved August 6, 1888, entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Alabama River."

On February 8, 1893:

An act (H. R. 1795) to increase the pension of A. J. Copenhaver, late a soldier in the Mexican war:

An act (H. R. 5012) to increase the pension of Thomas Enloe; and

An act (H. R. 9433) granting a pension to Mrs. Ann Mercer Slaughter.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 7625) for relief of certain settlers on public land in the Tucson land district in Arizona; and

A bill (H. R. 8340) to amend an act establishing a court of private land claims, and to provide for the settlement of private land claims in certain States and Territories, approved March 3, 1891.

It also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions; in which concurrence of the House was requested:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed of the reports of the Smithsonian Institution, and of the National Museum, for the year ending June 30, 1892, in two octavo volumes, 10,000 extra copies, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 5,000 copies for the use of the Smithsonian Institution, and 2,000 copies for the use of the National Museum.

It also announced that the Senate had passed the following concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 6,000 copies of the House Report No. 2300, on the sweating system, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,000 copies for the use of the House.

It also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 203) for the examination and allowance of certain awards made by a board of claims to certain citizens of Jefferson County, Ky.;

A bill (S. 373) for the relief of the heirs of Daniel Donovan.;

A bill (S. 1344) to make payment to Samuel J. Haynes of money erroneously and by mistake paid on his homestead entry;

A bill (S. 1730) for the relief of A. P. H. Stewart;

A bill (S. 1808) for the recognition of Henry C. Hill as captain and aid-de-camp on the staff of Maj. Gen. B. F. Butler, United States Volunteers;

A bill (S. 2142) for the relief of M. S. Hellman, of Canyon City, Oregon.

A bill (S. 2158) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark, in the City of Manchester, N. H.;

A bill (S. 2422) to amend the military record of John H. Skinner;

A bill (S. 2783) authorizing the President to place upon the retired list of the Army Sergts. Long and Connell, late of the Signal Corps, United States, survivors of the Lady Franklin Bay expedition;

A bill (S. 2966) to amend rule 7, section 4233, Revised Statutes, relating to rules for preventing collisions on the water;

A bill (S. 3024) to exempt veterans from competitive examinations in the classified service of the United States;

A bill (S. 3050) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the carriage of passengers by sea," approved August 2, 1882;

A bill (S. 3075) for the relief of Maj. Gen. George S. Greene;

A bill (S. 3081) to authorize the issue of a duplicate to Addison A. Harmer of a certificate of location of certain land therein described, which has been lost or destroyed;

A bill (S. 3113) to remove the charge of desertion standing against John W. Wacker;

A bill (S. 3147) to authorize the Gulf, Colorado and Santa Fe Railway Company to purchase certain lands for certain purposes in the Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory;

A bill (S. 3236) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to refuse applications for water connections in certain cases;

A bill (S. 3248) relating to acknowledgments of indorsements affecting real estate within the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 3309) for the relief of Catherine E. Whittall;

A bill (S. 3358) providing for the collection of fees for furnishing certificates of title to vessels;

A bill (S. 3395) to remit the penalties on gunboat numbered three, the Concord, and gunboat numbered four, the Bennington;

A bill (S. 2536) to reimburse George C. Tanner, late consul, etc., the sum of \$200 paid by him for rent of rooms;

A bill (S. 3682) to narrow California avenue within Bellair Heights, D. C.; and

A bill (S. 3811) to amend an act entitled "An act to grant to the Mobile and Dauphin Island Railroad and Harbor Company the right to trestle across the shoal water between Cedar Point and Dauphin Island" approved September 26, 1890.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. OHLIGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills

and joint resolutions of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 4758) for the relief of Charles E. Heuston;
A bill (H. R. 6914) granting a pension to Druke Nettie Barnett;
A bill (H. R. 8221) granting a pension to George W. Boyd;
A bill (H. R. 9585) for the relief of Harriett E. Niles; and
A bill (H. R. 9592) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain plans and specifications for public buildings to be erected under the supervision of the Treasury Department, and providing for local supervision of the construction of the same.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MUTCHLER. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Appropriations to submit several amendments to the pension appropriation bill and ask that they be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent of the House that 500 copies of the pension appropriation bill be printed with those amendments in it.

Mr. DINGLEY. Before that request is presented I desire to say that while a majority of the Appropriation Committee have concurred in the offering of these amendments a minority of the committee object to them. I also understand it is only proposed to have the amendments printed, but not that they shall be considered as offered at this time or pending.

Mr. MUTCHLER. That is all. Not that they be offered now, but that they be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUTCHLER]?

Mr. PICKLER. Five hundred copies are not enough.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. MARTIN objected, but subsequently withdrew his objection.

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

Mr. HOLMAN. I think the amendments ought to be printed in italics in the printed bill.

The SPEAKER. They will be printed in italics.

Mr. BURROWS. I understand that these proposed amendments are also to be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. That is part of the proposition.

Mr. BURROWS. What is the object, then, in having the bill printed?

Mr. MUTCHLER. In order that every member of the House may have a copy of the bill on his desk to-morrow.

Mr. BURROWS. But we will have the amendments in the RECORD. I shall have to object to printing the bill.

The SPEAKER. Then that part of the request relating to the reprint of the bill is objected to, but that part of the request which permits the printing of the proposed amendments in the RECORD, the Chair understands, is not objected to.

Mr. BURROWS. I will withdraw my objection to printing the bill.

Mr. HOOKER of New York. I object.

Mr. MUTCHLER. If there is objection to printing the amendments, then there is no necessity of having the bill printed, and I withdraw the request to print the bill at all.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to print the proposed amendments in the RECORD?

Mr. MUTCHLER. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. Then without objection the proposed amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. DINGLEY. I suggest to my friend from New York [Mr. HOOKER] that inasmuch as these propositions are to be offered as amendments to the pension bill when it comes up, it is desirable that we should know what they are. As I understand, it is proposed that they be printed merely, but not considered as pending.

The SPEAKER. That they be printed, but not offered?

Mr. DINGLEY. I suggest to my friend from New York [Mr. HOOKER] that it is desirable to know what the amendments are.

Mr. HOOKER of New York. If that is the object, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. MARTIN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN. If this bill be printed with the proposed amendments, does that affect a point of order?

The SPEAKER. It does not. The printing of the proposed amendments in the bill gives the amendments no status superior to what they would have if offered upon the floor. They are merely proposed amendments. Without objection the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUTCHLER] will be complied with. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Then this reprint of 500 copies of the bill with the proposed amendments in italics and the printing of the amendments in the RECORD will be ordered. The proposed amendments are as follows:

No. 1. After line 7, in line 2, insert:

"That on the 30th day of June, 1893, the Bureau of Pensions, with all of its

remaining officials and employes, and all of its records, files, and property, shall be transferred to the War Department, and shall thereafter form a part of the record and pension office of that Department; and the board of pension appeals now in the Interior Department shall at the same time be transferred to the War Department; and the Secretary of said Department shall thereafter exercise all the powers and perform all the duties under the pension laws that are now exercised and performed by the Secretary of the Interior; and the President of the United States shall designate an officer of the Army, whose rank and pay during such designation shall be that of a colonel, who shall exercise all the powers and perform all the duties that are now exercised and performed by the Commissioner of Pensions, and he shall likewise designate two officers of the Army whose rank shall not be below that of captain, who shall perform such duties as may be assigned them by the Secretary of War; and while so employed they shall receive no compensation additional to their Army pay and allowances: And provided further, That the offices of Commissioner of Pensions and first and second deputy commissioners of pensions be abolished on and after said 30th day of June, 1893."

No. 2. After amendment No. 1 insert:

"That the Secretary of War is authorized, during the fiscal year 1894, to detail, from time to time from the medical examiners in the record and pension office, for the purpose of discharging the duties in all respects heretofore imposed upon and exercised by examining surgeons of pensions; and there may be appointed by the Secretary of War an additional force of one hundred and twenty special medical examiners for the fiscal year 1894, at annual salaries of \$1,500 each, and the Secretary of War shall require that all of said special medical examiners shall be surgeons of education, skill, and experience in their profession, and shall impose upon them the powers in all respects now exercised under the law by examining surgeons of pensions; and the examination and certificate of any one of said special medical examiners, or medical examiners so detailed, in conjunction with one examining surgeon of pensions, shall have the same force and effect as those of the present boards of examining surgeons. The said medical examiners and special examiners shall be assigned by the Secretary of War to such locations within the United States as he may deem most convenient for pension applicants; and they shall receive, when absent from home and traveling on duty outside of the District of Columbia, in lieu of expenses for subsistence, \$3 per day, together with an allowance for actual and necessary expenses for transportation and assistance: Provided, that no such special medical examiner or medical examiner shall be assigned to any county, city, or Congressional district of which he may at any time have been a resident: And provided further, That the boards of examining surgeons, as now constituted, be, and they are hereby, reorganized so as to be constituted of but one examining surgeon, to be designated by the Secretary of War, acting in conjunction with one medical examiner or one special medical examiner detailed for that purpose, as above provided."

"For salaries of the one hundred and twenty special medical examiners above authorized, \$180,000. For per diem, when absent from home and traveling on duty outside of the District of Columbia, for special medical examiners or medical examiners detailed for service, as herein provided, in lieu of expenses for subsistence and for actual necessary expenses, for transportation and assistance, \$175,000; in all, \$355,000."

No. 3. In line 10, page 2, strike out "one million" and insert "three hundred and thirty-five thousand."

No. 4. In line 11, page 2, after the word "board," insert "not receiving an annual salary."

No. 5. After line 24, page 2, insert:

"That the rating of all pensions for like disabilities shall be uniform, and that all pensions heretofore granted or hereafter to be granted in pursuance of the act of June 27, 1890, shall be rated upon the inability of the pensioner to earn a living by manual labor."

No. 6. After amendment No. 5 insert:

"That from and after July 1, 1893, no pension shall be paid to any person drawing a pension under the provisions of chapter 634 of the act of the year 1890, unless he shall show that he is disabled for manual labor, and unless he shall show to the satisfaction of the Pension Office, by proper affidavits, that his annual income is less than \$600 a year."

No. 7. After amendment No. 6 insert:

"That from and after July 1, 1893, no person shall be paid a pension, under any general law, as the widow of a soldier of any war, unless said widow was married to the soldier as the widow of whom she draws a pension within five years after the close of the war in which her husband served."

Mr. DOKERY. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Appropriations was discharged from the consideration of the joint resolution (H. Res. 182) to pay the legal representatives of Hon. David Heaton balance of his unexpired term in Forty-first Congress; and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, memorials, and a resolution of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WALKER (by request): A bill (H. R. 10457) to create a safety fund for the redemption of the notes of insolvent national banks—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LAGAN: A bill (H. R. 10458) to legalize the form of a bill of lading known as the produce exchange steamship bill of lading for foreign shipment from the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOWERS: A joint resolution (H. Res. 201) instructing the Attorney-General to defend settlers who hold patents in ejectment suits brought by the Southern Pacific Railroad Company—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BACON: A resolution to abrogate clause three of Rule 26—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CRISP (by request): A joint resolution of the State of Nevada, relating to paying the war claims of the said State—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a joint resolution of the State of Montana, praying for the passage of a law for the free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: A joint resolution of the Assembly of Pennsylvania, asking for an appropriation for a survey to be made by the United States Government for a ship canal connecting waters of Lake Erie and Ohio River—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

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

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10459) granting a pension to Caesar Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10460) referring the claim known as the Paducah claim of Thomas M. Redd to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BACON: Petition of Local Union, No. 8, of New York, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. BELTZHOVER: Petition of 25 citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of a law by Congress, subjecting oleomargarine to the provisions of the laws of the several States—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERGEN: Petition of the Presbytery of West Jersey that Congress do not repeal the provision closing the Columbian Exposition on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petition of Hand-in-Hand Council, No. 14, Order of United American Mechanics, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to the restriction of immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BLANCHARD: Memorial of E. J. Barrett, postmaster at Alexandria, La., praying reimbursement of lost remittance of postal funds, to accompany House bill 10321—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BRICKNER: Six petitions of citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., as follows: The petition of Green Bay Turnverein, of Turnverein Humboldt, of Turnverein Bahn Frei, of Fritz Reuter Gilde No. 2, of the New Holstein Turnverein, and of the Germania Singing Society, all asking for the repeal of the act closing the World's Fair on Sundays—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. CAINE: Two petitions of associations, as follows: One of the Journeyman Tailors' Union of Salt Lake City, Utah, and the other of Salt Lake branch of the Journeyman Stone-Cutters' Association of North America, both in favor of opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Petition of citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, asking for the repeal of the silver-purchase clause of the Sherman act—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Music societies of Cincinnati, Ohio, asking for the repeal of the Sunday-closing act of the World's Fair—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. COWLES: Memorial of citizens of Crowders Mountain and Pleasant Ridge, protesting against the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Memorial of officers and members of the German American Typographical Union, No. 274, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of various druggists of New York City, against the Paddock pure-food bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DANIEL: Petition of Charles T. Hurd for the removal of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DINGLEY: Numerous petitions from the local unions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Maine, representing 2,765 petitioners, asking that the World's Fair be closed on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petition of the Franklin Association, No. 2,550, Patrons of Industry, of Fulton County, Ohio, in favor of the Hatch-Washburn antioption bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DURBOROW: Petition of 55 citizens of Chicago, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 95 citizens of Chicago, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 110 citizens of Minnesota, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 44 citizens of Dakota, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 75 citizens of Nebraska, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 75 citizens of Minnesota, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 25 citizens of Maine, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 50 citizens of Chicago, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 30 citizens of New York, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 50 citizens of Nebraska, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 175 citizens of Chicago, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 75 citizens of Chicago, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 43 citizens of Nebraska, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 74 citizens of Chicago, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, lengthy petition of citizens of Chicago, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, voluminous petition of several hundred names from Chicago, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, lengthy petition of citizens of Pullman, Ill., to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 150 citizens of Chicago, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of the citizens of Park Ridge, Summerdale, Ravenswood, and Geneva, Ill., to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of citizens of Chicago and commercial travelers, and others, from various cities of the United States, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 120 citizens of Chicago, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, lengthy petition from citizens of Superior, Wis., to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 69 citizens of Hartford, Mich., to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, voluminous petition from citizens of Chicago, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 54 employes of Schumacher & Betzel, Chicago, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of several hundred citizens of Chicago, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 131 citizens of Chicago, to open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of John C. Reynolds and many others, of West Bay City, Mich., for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 38 citizens of St. Louis and other cities for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of George Hatzfeld and 54 others, of Missouri,

for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. ELLIS: Proof to accompany bill for the relief of John M. Cranor, late first lieutenant of Company B, Seventeenth Kentucky Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROUT: Resolution of the Vermont Legislature, in favor of pensioning contract surgeons in care of Vermont troops in the late war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARMER: Petition of Radiant Star Council, No. 45, Order of United American Mechanics, of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of restricting foreign immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Petition of the Appleton Turnverein, of Appleton, Wis., in favor of opening the Columbian Exposition on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa: Resolution of the Upper Des Moines Editorial Association, of Iowa, praying for modification of the postal laws so as to grant the same rates of postage to semi-weekly and triweekly papers as are now charged to weekly publications—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of Iowa State Medical Society, of Des Moines, Iowa, favoring the establishment of a department of public health—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of Joe Davis and 100 others, of Des Moines, Iowa, asking for more stringent immigration laws—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LAGAN: Petition of the directors of the Board of Trade of New Orleans, urging the passage of an act to legalize a certain form of bill of lading, to accompany House bill 10458—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of New Orleans, La., in favor of amendments to the interstate-commerce law offered by the Board of Trade of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNER: Four petitions of associations of Brooklyn, N. Y., as follows: The petition of the Machine Woodworker's Union, No. 49; of the Schweizer Bund, of the Columbia Turnverein, and of the Germania Scheutzen Company, all asking Congress to repeal the act closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of William Van Wick and others, of Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to improving the condition of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MCLELLAN: Additional evidence in the claim of George Alcott, to accompany House bill 4305—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McRAE: Petition of the Little Rock Board of Trade, in favor of the ownership and control of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of the College of Physicians of Philadelphia, praying that Congress will establish a national quarantine, restricting immigration during the year 1893, and authorize a national commission to enforce the quarantine laws, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: Two petitions of citizens of Columbus, Ohio, one of the Leiderkranz Organization and the other the Turnverein, both for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. PAGE: Two petitions of associations of Rhode Island, one of Volunteer Council, No. 12, and the other of Ironside Council, No. 4, United American Mechanics, regarding immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PEARSON: Petition of Council No. 88, Order of United American Mechanics, located at Jewett, Ohio, in favor of restricting immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RAINES: Petition of physicians of Steuben County, N. Y., for an appropriation to defray the expenses of the Pan-American Medical Congress—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. REILLY: Resolution of the house of representatives of Pennsylvania, in favor of Senate bill 894, relating to a ship canal connecting Lake Erie and the Ohio River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the College of Physicians of Philadelphia, in favor of national quarantine—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Mebamora Council, No. 66, of Schuylkill Haven, Pa., in favor of restricting immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Council No. 220, United American Mechanics, of Mahanoy City, Schuylkill County, Pa., in favor of

restricting immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Two petitions of associations of Connecticut, one of Trumble Council, No. 29, United American Mechanics, of Willimantic, and the other of Manhanet Council, No. 47, both in favor of restricting immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SAYERS: Resolution of the Dallas (Tex.) Board of Trade, recommending the passage of a bill before Congress to increase the salaries of letter-carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Memorial of Sarah M. Peasley, in behalf of Nancy L. Morrison, to accompany bill introduced by CHARLES W. STONE—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STORER: Petition of Rheinpfälzer Saengerbund, of Cincinnati, Ohio, for the repeal of the law closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, six petitions of associations of Cincinnati, Ohio: The petition of St. Cecilia Männerchor; of the Turngemeinde; of the Journeymen Horseshoers; of the Dringen Saengerchor; of the Garfield Liederkranz, and of the Badischer Liederkranz, all for the repeal of the law closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, resolution of the College of Physicians of Philadelphia, for an exclusively national system of quarantine—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR: Resolutions adopted by the board of health of East Palestine, Ohio, indorsing the resolutions adopted by the State board of health of Ohio, requesting national quarantine and the suspension of immigration until the quarantine defenses shall have been placed in condition to guarantee protection—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Petition of farmers and laborers of Gallatin County, Ill., relative to a combination between the mills, railroads, and elevators for the purpose of depressing the price of wheat, and praying for a Congressional investigation—to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 9, 1893.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, it does not seem to me that a matter so important as the reading and approval of the minutes should take place with so few Senators present. I suggest that there is no quorum, and ask for a call of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The roll will be called.

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

Allison,	Faulkner,	Pasco,	White.
Berry,	Hale,	Platt,	
Butler,	Huntton,	Stewart,	
Call,	Morrill,	Teller,	

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Thirteen Senators have responded to their names. No quorum present.

Mr. BATE, Mr. BLODGETT, Mr. BRICE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. COCKRELL, Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GORMAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HOAR, Mr. KYLE, Mr. McPHERSON, Mr. MANDERSON, Mr. PALMER, Mr. PROCTOR, Mr. PUGH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. STOCKBRIDGE, Mr. VANCE, Mr. VOORHEES, and Mr. WOLCOTT entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. COCKRELL (at 11 o'clock and 18 minutes a. m.). Would it not be well to call the names of the absentees?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The names of the absentees will be called.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators.

After a little delay, Mr. COKE, Mr. DOLPH, Mr. FRYE, Mr. JONES of Arkansas, Mr. JONES of Nevada, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. QUAY, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. VEST, and Mr. WASHBURN entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Forty-six Senators have responded to their names. A quorum is present. The Journal of yesterday's proceedings will be read by the Secretary.

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

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF LABOR.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to