

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

APRIL 1, 1880.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALLACE, from the Select Committee to Inquire into Alleged frauds in the late Elections, submitted the following

REPORT:

Your special committee to inquire into alleged frauds in the recent elections was directed, by the authority given it, "to inquire whether in the year 1878 money was raised by assessment or otherwise upon Federal office-holders or employes for election purposes, and under what circumstances and by what means; and, if so, what amount was so raised and how the same was expended, and, further, whether such assessments were or not in violation of law," and now reports the result of its labors upon that branch of the duties assigned to it.

This subject is regulated by the act of Congress approved August 15, 1876, section 6, which is in these words:

SEC. 6. That all executive officers or employes of the United States not appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, are prohibited from requesting, giving to, or receiving from, any other officer or employe of the government, any money or property or other thing of value for political purposes; and any such officer or employe who shall offend against the provisions of this section shall be at once discharged from the service of the United States; and he shall also be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not exceeding five hundred dollars.

The President of the United States, by the following order, also prohibited *assessments* for political purposes on officers or subordinates of the government:

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, June 22, 1877.

SIR: I desire to call your attention to the following paragraph in a letter addressed by me to the Secretary of the Treasury, on the conduct to be observed by the officers of the general government in relation to the elections:

"No officer shall be required or permitted to take part in the management of political organizations, caucuses, conventions, or election campaigns. Their right to vote and to express their views on public questions, either orally or through the press, is not denied, provided it does not interfere with the discharge of their official duties. No assessments for political purposes on officers or subordinates should be allowed."

This rule is applicable to every department of the civil service. It should be understood by every officer of the general government that he is expected to conform his conduct to its requirements.

Very respectfully,

R. B. HAYES.

We have examined a number of witnesses as to the practice under this statute and order. Their testimony is now reported to the Senate, and an abstract thereof appended to this report.

It will be observed that the statute forbids any employe of the government (not confirmable by the Senate) from requesting, giving to, or receiving from any *other* employe thereof, any money for political purposes.

This statute being a penal one, it would seem that the way to evade its penalties, if desired, was to have the employé of the government give his money to some one who was not such. The order of the President only prohibited *assessments*, as such, and does not touch the class of cases named in the statute. The former strikes at voluntary gifts for political purposes between employés; the latter forbids demands of money for political purposes by chief from subordinate.

Your committee reports that both the letter and the spirit of the statute have been violated, and that the plain meaning of the order of the President has not been obeyed. The late Secretary of the Senate (Mr. Gorham), who was an employé of the United States, but was not appointed by the President, was at the same time secretary of the Republican Congressional Committee, and while holding both of these places he issued and sent to employés of the government printed circulars, asking for, and urging the necessity of making, contributions of money for the advancement of the Republican cause in the political campaign of 1878.

The first of these circulars was in these words:

HEADQUARTERS OF THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE, 1878,
1319 F STREET, NORTHWEST, WASHINGTON, D. C.,
Washington, D. C., May 27, 1878.

SIR: This committee, charged with laboring for the success of the Republican cause in the coming campaign for the election of members of Congress, call with confidence upon you, as a Republican, for such a contribution in money as you may feel willing to make, hoping that it may not be less than \$—.

The committee deem it proper, in thus appealing to Republicans generally, to inform those who happen to be in Federal employ that there will be no objection in any official quarter to such voluntary contribution.

The importance of the pending struggle cannot easily be exaggerated. That the Senate is to be Democratic after the 4th of March, 1879, is very nearly a certainty. In view of this, the election of a Democratic House of Representatives would precipitate upon the country dangerous agitations, which would inevitably add to present distresses. Foremost among their schemes the opposition already announce their intention to attempt the revolutionary expulsion of the President from his office.

If, by the presentation of three candidates for the Presidency in 1880, the people should fail to choose, the House must elect, each State delegation casting one vote.

From what is now known, and with the growing dissensions in the camp of the enemy, the committee have good reason to enter upon their work with courage.

Please make prompt and favorable response to this letter, and remit at once, by draft or postal money-order, to "Sidney F. Austin, esq., treasurer, &c., German-American National Bank, Washington, D. C."

By order of the committee.

GEO. C. GORHAM,
Secretary.

That clause of this circular which declares that "there will be no objection in any official quarter to such voluntary subscription" was proved to have been submitted to President Hayes, who approved the same, and the reference here made was to him and his action.

A copy of this circular was sent to every person in or out of the United States holding an office with a salary exceeding \$1,000. The amount inserted in the blank was usually one per cent. on the salary. All of the postmasters, revenue and customs agents, clerks, and employés of the United States of every character were called upon or notified of this request for money to aid in the advancement of the Republican cause. The whole sum received by the Republican committee in the summer and fall of 1878 for these purposes from Federal officials was \$93,000, and the whole sum received from all other sources was \$13,000, making the campaign fund of the Republican National Committee amount to a total of \$106,000. Persons were sent into nearly every executive department of the United States, with the knowledge of the head thereof, to

obtain money from the clerks and others there employed, and the books in which the subscriptions were made were headed in several instances by the chief of the department before presentation to the subordinates.

When there seemed to be a neglect of the first circular, or those agreeing to give were slow in payment, other circulars were sent to them. These were in this language:

HEADQUARTERS OF THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, July 11, 1878.

DEAR SIR: Since sending you circular under date of May 27, we have ascertained that the rules of your department render difficult your absence during office-hours, and that you are unable to call at the bank where contributions are received. We have, therefore, arranged with the treasurer, Mr. Austin, to attend at the German-American National Bank from 4 to 5 o'clock p. m., to receive contributions from those in your department who have not already responded. If more convenient the amount can be transmitted by mail to Sidney F. Austin, treasurer Congressional Republican Committee, as above.

Respectfully yours,

GEO. C. GORHAM, *Secretary.*

MR. —, DEAR SIR: There appears to be due upon your subscription to our campaign-fund the sum of four dollars. We have regarded your subscription as a debt of honor, voluntarily incurred by you, and, relying upon its payment, have taken it into the account in the conduct of our work. We earnestly request immediate payment, and Mr. N. B. Fugitt will be in attendance at these headquarters (second floor) daily from 10 o'clock a. m. till 6 o'clock p. m., to receive and receipt for such moneys.

Respectfully,

GEO. C. GORHAM, *Secretary.*

This mode of obtaining money for political purposes was also adopted and carried out in 1876, when 2 per centum upon the amount of the salary of the official or subordinate was demanded by the Republican committee.

In addition to this sum of \$106,000, the Republican State Committees of some of the States were authorized to collect, and did collect, moneys for political purposes from the Federal officials within those States. The amount of this your committee could not learn. It was charged that moneys were collected from ladies in government employ, and from those receiving less than \$1,000 per year, and such seems to be the fact, but it was denied that any such authority was given to any collector of money by the officers of the Republican organization.

Authority was given to these collectors of money for political purposes to enter the departments in Washington during business hours and solicit moneys from the employés, and the subscription books prepared by the committee were presented to the subordinates, who subscribed therein and placed his amount opposite his name. These books were produced before your committee, and the commission of the bearer of the book was in these words:

To whom it may concern:

Henry M. Baker, esq., of this city, is duly authorized to solicit subscriptions by the Republican Congressional Committee in the various departments of the government, and it is hoped that every facility will be afforded him in the prosecution of his labors.

JAY A. HUBBELL,

Chairman Finance Committee, Republican Congressional Committee.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 5, 1878.

The sum collected from subordinates and employés in the Interior Department alone was \$3,247. The Treasury, the Departments of Justice, War, Navy, and the Agricultural and Printing Department each were visited by these collectors and moneys obtained in large amounts for political purposes.

Inquiry was made as to the amount of money received by the Democratic National Congressional Committee in 1878, and it was found

to be a total of \$4,695, collected from members of Congress and private citizens. This money was shown to have been all expended on printing, stationery, and salaries of clerks employed in distributing documents.

The campaign fund of \$106,000, collected by the Republican committee, of which this \$93,000 collected from employes of the United States was part, was expended as follows: \$24,500 for documents and postage; \$12,000 for employes, folders, &c.; and about \$8,000 for printing, stationery, rent, &c. The remainder was sent to persons in the States to be used in the close Congressional districts, to aid in the elections of the Republican candidates for Congress. It seems to have been distributed as follows:

Maine, \$5,000; New Hampshire, \$1,750; Vermont, 3d district, \$500; Connecticut, 3d district, \$1,000; New Jersey, 1st district, \$1,500; 2d district, \$500; 5th district, \$500; Pennsylvania, 17th district, \$1,500; Maryland, 6th district, \$1,250; West Virginia, 2d district, \$350; 3d district, \$500; Virginia, 2d district, \$1,000; 4th district, \$1,300; North Carolina, to three districts, \$1,300; South Carolina, 1st district, \$1,000; 5th district, \$600; State at large, \$200; Florida, 1st district, \$500; 2d district, \$1,000; Alabama, 4th district, \$500; Tennessee, 1st district, \$500; 2d district, \$500; Missouri, 2d district, \$500; 3d district, \$500; 7th district, \$100; 10th district, 1,000; Ohio, to nine districts, \$9,300; Indiana, to State central committee, with recommendation that it be distributed as follows: 1st district, \$2,000; 4th district, \$1,000; 6th district, \$1,000; 8th district, \$500; 10th district, \$500; cannot say whether or not the distribution was made as recommended; Illinois, 18th district, \$250; Michigan, \$5,000; Iowa, \$5,000; Wisconsin, \$1,500; Oregon, \$2,000; Colorado, \$1,000. Total, \$53,900.

Political manipulation of employes of the United States was also shown by the testimony of Harry Cobaugh and others in public employ. His official position is captain of the watch in the Treasury, and in the fall of 1878 he furnished to the Republican State committee of Pennsylvania a list of the names and residences of the clerks in that department who were voters there. The Republican State committee then furnished to him railroad tickets from Washington to the place of residence of the clerk and a return ticket, and if resident in Philadelphia, a receipt for the payment of his taxes, free of charge. The headquarters of the person furnishing these tickets were kept in the room of Mr. Cobaugh in the Treasury Department, and employes of other departments were supplied with tickets and tax receipts therefrom. One hundred and three male clerks or employes went from the Interior and Post-Office Departments to Pennsylvania in November, 1878, without formal leave, for the purpose of voting, and free transportation was furnished to all of them. The employes, clerks, and subordinates in the Executive Departments from the States of New York, Ohio, Indiana, and New Jersey were also sent home to vote in the same manner.

Your committee believe, and so report, that the practice of collection of money from employes of the United States in the manner disclosed by this testimony is contrary to law and is exceedingly vicious in its tendency. An order against assessing clerks is issued, but it is followed by a circular from the head of the political organization in sympathy with those who hold the power to dismiss from employment persons who do not pay when called upon, which asks for money from them for political purposes. They are visited by an agent of their party, during business hours, under the eyes of their superiors, whose names head the list, and they thus "voluntarily" subscribe. A payment or subscription under such circumstances is a virtual assessment, and the continuance of the practice ought not to be tolerated. The receipt of money by Mr. Gorham or Mr. Hubbell, both of whom were officials of the United States, from other employes thereof, was a violation of the statute of 1876.

Your committee believe, and so report, that the collection of moneys in any amount, but especially in so large a proportion of the whole as is

here disclosed, from persons in the public service, to perpetuate the rule of those in power, is contrary to the spirit of our governmental institutions, and in direct antagonism to freedom of choice by the people.

Your committee think that the statute of 1876 is in practice a dead letter, and respectfully report the following bill :

A BILL to prohibit officers and employés of the United States from contributing money for political purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall not be lawful for any person holding any office under the United States, or any employé thereof, to contribute or pay to any committee or person, or into any fund, any money, property, or valuable thing for any political purpose whatsoever, or to pay any assessment or percentage upon the income or emoluments of his office or position for any political purpose, or to give, lend, advance, or pay any money, property, or valuable thing with the intent, or with the assent, permission, or understanding that the same may be applied to or for any political purpose whatsoever, or to himself or herself apply the same to any political purpose. No head of a department or other superior officer shall himself collect, or permit or allow any other person to collect or receive, from any officer or employé in his department or under his supervision, or from any other officer or employé whatsoever, any assessment, percentage, contribution, gift, loan, or advance of any money, property, or valuable thing with the intent, understanding, or permission that the same shall or may be used for any political purpose.

SEC. 2. That any person who shall violate any provision of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months, and, in the discretion of the court, by a fine not exceeding five thousand dollars, and on conviction shall be forever thereafter disqualified from holding any office of honor, profit, or trust under the United States. Any officer of the United States who shall violate any provision of this act shall, in addition to such imprisonment and fine, be deemed and taken to have vacated the office by him held.

APPENDIX.

ABSTRACT OF THE TESTIMONY.

GEORGE C. GORHAM, Secretary of the United States Senate in 1878, secretary of the Republican Congressional Committee in the same year, was engaged in the active duties of the committee. Mr. Hale, the chairman, was in his own State. The committee were opposed to assessments for the purpose of obtaining funds. Prepared the circular of May 27, 1878, and submitted it to the committee, and it was by them authorized to be issued. These circulars sent to employés of Interior Department, but to no other department. None sent to employés of Senate. No money received from assessments. The amount of money received by contributions from Federal officeholders was about \$93,000 in 1878, for the purposes of the Congressional campaign of that year. Issued the circular of July 11, 1878, and had it addressed to those to whom the previous circular had been addressed; Sidney J. Austin, the treasurer of the committee. The third circular, which names Fugitt, was also issued by him, and sent to those who had voluntarily subscribed but had not fully paid. Issued in August probably. Money subscribed was not payable in installments. Blank was left in the first circular in which to insert the sum we thought he ought to subscribe. Usually one per cent. on his salary. This was a suggestion in reply to what would be likely to be asked us as to the amount each one should subscribe, and we would insert about one per cent. on the year's salary. There were \$13,000 in addition to the \$93,000 subscribed to our campaign fund. This \$13,000 was contributed by private persons, and this sum, \$106,000, constituted the campaign fund of the Republican party for that year. Henry Baker was appointed to collect money in the Treasury Department, &c. He was to visit the department with a book and solicit subscriptions for the campaign. Fugitt was employed as a clerk of my committee; he visited other departments to collect moneys. Directed that no lady should be asked to subscribe. Some of them were indignant because not called on to contribute their "mite." Don't remember their names. If the circular of May 27, 1878, was not sent to every civil officer who received over \$1,000 a year, my orders were not obeyed. I ordered that to be done. Send abroad to consuls. I took the names from the Blue Book. My object was to reach every man in office. Responses from collectors of customs, postmasters, and other officers was very general; more so than ever before, I am told. In 1876, we re-

quested two per cent., and 1878 one per cent., but we got three-fourths as much as in 1876.

One member of our committee, I believe, submitted the second clause of the circular of May 27, 1878, to the President, and it was approved by him.

In all the other departments, save the Interior, there were special agents detailed to collect sums of money from the various employes, it being understood that no interference would be made by the several heads of those departments.

The instructions of Secretary Gorham were explicit that circulars asking for contributions of money for campaign purposes should be sent to every employé receiving one thousand dollars or upwards per annum, *whether in or out of the United States*. Heard that one gentleman was discharged from the Sixth Auditor's Office for refusing to respond to the demands of the collectors of this election fund, assigning as a reason that he was a Democrat and was opposed to the principle of political assessments. Gorham had about 15 clerks, and if occasion demanded he sent any or all of them on these errands of collection.

Out of the sum collected in this manner about \$25,000 was expended for documents and postage; about \$12,000 for employes, folders, and incidental expenses; about \$8,000 for furniture, rent, and stationery. The balance, some \$55,000, was sent to the States, to individual speakers, and to Congressional districts.

About \$13,000 was raised in New York by Hale, coming from wealthy friends as contributions. In addition to the appeal to officers receiving over \$1,000, an appeal was made to the country postmasters for such sums as they felt willing to contribute.

The intention of the circulars was that at least one per cent. of the salary should be handed over, and more if they felt willing to do so.

The exception of the Interior Department in the sending of circulars instead of individual collectors was in deference to the understood hostility of Mr. Schurz to personal appeals to any of his employes.

Contributions from Senators were about \$100 each, and from members of Congress about \$50 apiece. There were some exceptions, but this was the intention and expectation of the collecting committee. The great bulk of the money collected for election purposes came out of the employes of the government through these solicitations. Of the sums sent into Congressional districts about \$5,000 was sent into the State of Indiana; about \$9,000 into the State of Ohio; in Pennsylvania (principally to one district) \$1,500; \$1,000 into Colorado; \$1,000 into Tennessee.

The State committee of Pennsylvania was allowed to call upon Federal office-holders direct for contributions in behalf of the Republican party for the cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburg.

Think over \$80,000 was collected outside of Senators and Representatives.

No direct appeal was made from the national committee to Federal office-holders in New York City.

New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburg, and Cincinnati were allowed to use the fund collected from Federal officers in their respective cities.

Wisconsin was allowed to retain the amounts collected within her State of Federal office-holders.

In Ohio one-sixth of the fund was placed in the Congressional committee's hands, one-sixth to the State committee, and the other two-thirds they could use according to their best judgment in and about Cincinnati.

Gorham's committee aided nineteen Southern districts and fifty-eight Northern districts. The average to Northern districts was \$712.

"There must have been many times the sum we collected used throughout the country first and last."

The subscription in the Post-Office Department was headed by Thomas J. Brady, Second Assistant Postmaster-General.

In the Treasury Department, by John Sherman, Secretary of Treasury.

In the Agricultural Department, by William G. Le Duc, Commissioner.

Subscriptions were made in the Government Printing Office.

The Librarian of the Senate was employed and paid for getting up a text-book for the campaign. In addition to his salary as librarian (\$2,220), he received \$250 for aiding the committee with information as above.

HENRY M. BAKER, formerly special agent of the Treasury Department, was engaged to collect subscriptions of the departmental employes.

With his subscription-book, headed by John Sherman and the heads of the bureaus, he presented himself to all the subordinates.

Some subscriptions were taken from lady clerks, aggregating some \$200 in all.

With the Blue Book as a guide, he went to every clerk and employé whose salary exceeded \$1,200.

NATHANIEL B. FUGITT, occupying a temporary appointment in the Post-Office Department, was sent to collect the sums subscribed to Mr. Baker. His authority came from Congressman Hubbell, of Michigan, member of the committee.

It was understood that *one per centum* of their salaries was expected from each subordinate receiving over \$1,200, and from those under, what they chose to pay.

Fugitt was on the "Republican" newspaper here at the time he was put to collecting these subscriptions, and still holds an honorary position in connection with it. Was at headquarters from 10 to 6 daily to receive money subscribed, and gave receipt.

Circulars were sent to all Federal officers whose salaries exceeded \$1,000, and the Blue Book was taken as a guide for reference.

Some subscriptions were sent in and taken from ladies.

Ralph J. Squire, assistant messenger in War Department, aided in distributing circulars asking contributions.

At the time he distributed these circulars he was in the receipt of a salary of \$840 per year. He refused to contribute to the election fund, and his salary was reduced to \$720 per year by Congress afterward.

Knows of others receiving circulars whose salaries were less than \$1,000.

F. A. G. Handy, clerk in the post-office at Richmond, Va., received a circular, refused to respond, and was discharged soon afterwards. Attributes his discharge to the fact of his not responding to the assessment. Another clerk was put in his place within ten days from his discharge.

Regarded the sum asked for as an assessment for party purposes, and believed it was expected that he should pay the sum assessed; not doing so, he was discharged.

Gorham recalled. States that upon re-examination he finds that circulars were sent out to employes in receipt of less than \$1,000.

John G. Thompson testifies to being a member of the Congressional national committee—Democratic. Was here a portion of the time, and in Ohio for the balance. Worked for the success of the party when not engaged in his official duties of Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives.

Duncan S. Walker, secretary of the Democratic Congressional committee. Held his office at "Riggs's" House and one of the rooms at the Capitol.

Amount of fund collected by the committee for campaign purposes was \$4,695.06, and all by volunteer contributions.

Documents were to be furnished at cost to the committees or individuals where they were able to pay for them; when not able, they were given gratis.

No money was collected from employes of the government in the departments, and only one employe of the House of Representatives contributed to the fund, and he did so of his own volition.

This money was expended in distributing documents, for printing, and collecting political information for the benefit of the several State committees.

Number of documents sent out by the committee, 1,031,700; 500,000 of which were sent by express, balance by mail and to individuals.

Money was tendered the employes of the House who aided in sending out documents, but they all refused any compensation.

Amount expended for documents alone was \$2,550.

Total amount expended by committee was \$4,073.25.

No unfrankable matter was sent out by committee under frank. Postage or expressage was paid on all such documents.

Total cost of folding House documents for the year 1878 was \$20,598.25—which includes the cartage, material, labor, and everything else.

This is, in round numbers, about one-fifth, or 20 per cent., of the cost for folding documents under the Republican administration of the House of Representatives for the eight years prior to the Democratic ascendancy in said House of Representatives.

The documents sent out by this committee might have been folded at the House folding-room free of cost to the committee, had the request been made by any member of Congress, provided it was matter that came under proceedings of Congress.

Of the money sent out by the Democratic committee not one dollar was sent into any Congressional district. It was expended for labor and documents entirely.

James E. Harvey. Evidence substantially same as General Walker's.

It was expected that Democratic members of Congress should contribute \$50 apiece; but it was not realized to any considerable extent.

Sidney F. Austin, assistant cashier of the German-American National Bank, acted as treasurer and disbursing agent of the Republican committee.

Received \$105,802.92, and disbursed all of it except \$6,114.25, which was in the bank when it failed or closed up.

Thinks he received amounts in sums of less than \$10 of individuals. These sums were paid by postmasters, clerks, and employes of the government.

Remittances were frequently inclosed in circulars transmitted by Gorham, soliciting money.

John D. Defrees. Money was collected from the Public Printing Office, over which he presides. Made subscription himself; headed the list, and allowed a clerk to go

through the department and solicit money from the employés. Had asked the men himself to contribute to this fund.

Henry M. Baker recalled. Total number of those who subscribed in the Treasury Department was 909. Total of lady subscribers, 23. Amount collected of them, \$115.

James R. Cook collected the amounts subscribed at the Government Printing Office. Does not know whether the sums paid by the employés were subscribed by them or put down for them by others.

Payment was made in sums varying from one dollar up to eight dollars each by clerks.

He went into one of the side rooms, and the employés came to him and paid the amounts each was expected to hand over.

Does not know who circulated the book (and does not show the book that identification may take place under the signatures).

Michael F. Daly was assessed \$7.20, 10 per cent. on his salary; is watchman in Surgeon-General's office.

Harry A. Cobaugh, captain of the watch in the Treasury Department, furnished a list of Pennsylvania voters to the State central committee of Pennsylvania, and supplied them with transportation to the points nearest their homes, that they might vote the Republican ticket. The number was from 75 to 100.

These tickets were furnished by a Mr. Russell, of Philadelphia, who came here for that purpose. The tickets were furnished without any charge to the employés who used them.

Tax receipts were handed those voters who hailed from Philadelphia. Russell made his headquarters for the distribution of transportation and tax receipts at the room of the captain of the watch. From this point employés from the War Department were also furnished with transportation and tax receipts.

Was allowed leave of absence without deduction of pay for a number of days sufficient to go home and return. Others on the watch were also permitted to go at the same time.

Resides in Washington, with his family. They have never resided anywhere else; but he votes in Pennsylvania, and is permitted to do so so long as he votes the Republican ticket.

On the list furnished the State central committee there was the name of one Democrat. There was no tax receipt or transportation furnished to him.

William W. Burke, employed in the Interior Department, is from Philadelphia; had charge of the list of Pennsylvania voters in that department. There were 103 Pennsylvanians employed in that department. A list was sent to Mr. Russell, of Philadelphia, for authentication and correction. He subsequently came on and furnished transportation and tax receipts to the Republican voters of that department.

Has been engaged in looking after and getting transportation for Pennsylvania voters ever since 1870. Voters went home to other States on leave and transportation being furnished. New York, New Jersey, Ohio, and Indiana voters were granted leave.

William G. Russell was connected with the Republican State central committee at Philadelphia. Was in charge of Pennsylvania voters here in the District to have them sent home to vote.

Lists were furnished him from the departments by Cobaugh, of the Treasury; Burke, of the Interior; Captain Tanner, of the War and Navy; Mr. Kerr, of the Government Printing Office.

Handed transportation and tax receipts paid to all Philadelphians whose names were on the Republican lists.

Has provided transportation for Pennsylvania voters in three other elections previous to 1878. Is now holding clerkship in the Register's Office of the Treasury Department; salary \$100 dollars per month.

Mr. TELLER, from the Select Committee to Inquire into Frauds in the Recent Election, submitted the following

VIEWS OF THE MINORITY:

The Select Committee of the Senate to Inquire into Frauds in the Recent Election, on the first day of April submitted a report on political assessment. The committee cite the following section of the statute and complain of its violation. The statute is as follows:

SEC. 6. That all executive officers or employés of the United States not appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, are prohibited from requesting, giving to, or receiving from, any other officer or employé of the government any money or property or other thing of value for political purposes; and any such officer or employé who shall offend against the provisions of this section shall be at once discharged from the service of the United States; and he shall also be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not exceeding five hundred dollars.

The testimony fails to show any violation or evasion of the statute of 1876.

Hon. Jay A. Hubbell, a member of Congress, was chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Republican Congressional Committee. Hon. George C. Gorham was secretary of the committee, and also Secretary of the Senate. On the 27th of May, 1878, the committee issued the following circular:

HEADQUARTERS OF THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE, 1878,
1319 F STREET, NORTHWEST, WASHINGTON, D. C.,
Washington, D. C., May 27, 1878.

SIR: This committee, charged with laboring for the success of the Republican cause in the coming campaign for the election of members of Congress, call with confidence upon you, as a Republican, for such a contribution in money as you may feel willing to make, hoping that it may not be less than \$——.

The committee deem it proper, in thus appealing to Republicans generally, to inform those who happen to be in Federal employ that there will be no objection in any official quarter to such voluntary contribution.

The importance of the pending struggle cannot easily be exaggerated. That the Senate is to be Democratic after the 4th of March, 1879, is very nearly a certainty. In view of this, the election of a Democratic House of Representatives would precipitate upon the country dangerous agitations, which would inevitably add to present distresses. Foremost among their schemes the opposition already announce their intention to attempt the revolutionary expulsion of the President from his office.

If, by the presentation of three candidates for the Presidency in 1880, the people should fail to choose, the House must elect, each State delegation casting one vote.

From what is now known, and with the growing dissensions in the camp of the enemy, the committee have good reason to enter upon their work with courage.

Please make prompt and favorable response to this letter, and remit at once, by draft or postal money-order, to "Sidney F. Austin, esq., treasurer, &c., German-American National Bank, Washington, D. C."

By order of the committee.

GEO. C. GORHAM.
Secretary.

On June 5 Mr. Hubbell authorized Henry M. Baker to collect money for the committee. Mr. Baker was not an employé of the government,

and had not been since 1874. He was furnished with the following as evidence of his authority :

To whom it may concern :

Henry M. Baker, esq., of this city, is duly authorized to solicit subscriptions by the Republican Congressional Committee in the various departments of the government, and it is hoped that every facility will be afforded him in the prosecution of his labors.

JAY A. HUBBELL,

Chairman Finance Committee, Republican Congressional Committee.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 5, 1878.

Mr. Baker called on the male employés of the government, and in a few instances on the lady employés also; but that fact coming to the knowledge of Mr. Gorham, he ordered it discontinued, and ordered the money returned to the ladies. Some contributed cash, some subscribed an amount to be paid in the future, and some did neither. None were pressed to pay, and those who paid and those who did not fared alike. On the 11th of July the committee issued the following circular, which explains itself:

HEADQUARTERS OF THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, July 11, 1878.

DEAR SIR: Since sending you circular under date of May 27, we have ascertained that the rules of your department render difficult your absence during office hours, and that you are unable to call at the bank where contributions are received. We have, therefore, arranged with the treasurer, Mr. Austin, to attend at the German-American National Bank from 4 to 5 o'clock p. m., to receive contributions from those in your department who have not already responded. If more convenient, the amount can be transmitted by mail to Sidney F. Austin, treasurer Congressional Republican Committee, as above.

Respectfully yours,

GEO. C. GORHAM, *Secretary.*

Subsequently the committee appointed Mr. N. B. Fugitt, who was not an employé of the government, to collect the unpaid subscriptions, and the following note was sent or handed to those who had not paid their subscription:

Mr. ———, DEAR SIR: There appears to be due upon your subscription to our campaign-fund the sum of four dollars. We have regarded your subscription as a debt of honor, voluntarily incurred by you, and, relying upon its payment, have taken it into the account in the conduct of our work. We earnestly request immediate payment, and Mr. N. B. Fugitt will be in attendance at these headquarters (second floor) daily from 10 o'clock a. m. till 6 o'clock p. m., to receive and receipt for such moneys.

Respectfully,

GEO. C. GORHAM, *Secretary.*

The total amount collected by the committee from all sources was \$106,000. From the office-holders in Washington, and elsewhere, including Senators and members of Congress, the committee realized \$93,000 of the \$106,000. Much of this was collected from persons not receiving the circular. Of this amount the committee paid for political documents, postage, rent, furniture, to employés, &c., about \$44,000; \$53,900 was distributed to the various Congressional committees in sums from \$250 to \$1,500; the average being \$700 to a Congressional district. The money was sent to the committees of the several Congressional districts, or to the State central committee, for such distribution. The balance of the money remained unexpended. Mr. Gorham, the secretary, appeared before the committee and exhibited his books and accounts freely, and fairly testified as to the collecting and expenditure of the money. He also testified that the circulars were not secret circulars, and that no effort was made to conceal from the public the knowledge that the committee was collecting and expending this money,

and that there never was the slightest pressure on any person to contribute.

The committee has not been able to show that any pressure was made on the employes, or any one of them, to induce them to contribute to this fund, and while it does appear from the testimony taken that while some did refuse to contribute, not one was discharged for so refusing.

The committee, in what is called an abstract of testimony, printed with the report, but which is in fact a misrepresentation of the testimony, say that "Mr. Gorham said he had heard that one gentleman was discharged from the Sixth Auditor's Office for refusing to respond to the demands of the collectors of this election fund, assigning as a reason that he was a Democrat and was opposed to the principle of political assessments."

This is what Mr. Gorham did say :

By the CHAIRMAN :

Q. Do you know of any case in the Treasury Department in which any persons were dismissed from office for not complying with the circular?—A. I do not, nor do I believe any such case exists.

Q. Do you know of any case in any of the departments in Washington in which men who failed to respond to your circular were dismissed within thirty days?—A. Do I know of my knowledge?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. I do not.

Q. Have you heard of any such case?—A. I have heard of a single man who was removed from a department, and that man did not subscribe; but whether that had any connection with his removal I do not know, and nobody connected with our committee promoted any report about it or any change.

Q. What was the politics of that man?—A. He said he was a Democrat.

By Mr. KERNAN :

Q. Which department was he in?—A. I think he was in the Sixth Auditor's office. This is only hearsay, for that is what you ask for. I do not know that he ever was there, for my own part. I heard that Mr. Waddell, who was a cousin of the commander of the Confederate cruiser *Shenandoah*, had a place in the Sixth Auditor's office, and that he was asked for a subscription, and he said he was a Democrat and did not propose to contribute anything to buy a club to beat his brains out with. I do not know whether he said so or not. That is what was said to me. I was told a month afterward that he was not there, but I am told he was put in some other place, and he is in office and has been all the time, and that he is a clever man.

So it appears if punishment was inflicted on this Democrat, who refused to contribute, his only punishment was a removal from one position to another, which, for aught the committee knew, was at his request, and was in fact a promotion. The committee did not care to call him, and as he was in the city of Washington it is fair to suppose the committee knew no advantage could be obtained by his presence. The committee must be driven to great straits to attempt to torture such a case into one of political persecution for a failure to contribute. Again, in the so-called abstract, the committee say :

Ralph J. Squire, assistant messenger in War Department, aided in distributing circulars asking contributions.

At the time he distributed these circulars he was in the receipt of a salary of \$840 per year. He refused to contribute to the election fund, and his salary was reduced to \$720 per year by Congress afterward.

It is difficult to see why the committee should have thought this worthy of mention. Squire is still in office as a watchman. Can it be that the committee hoped to make it appear that to punish him for his failure to contribute Congress cut down his salary from \$840 to \$720 per annum; and that the Democratic House of Representatives originated that provision in the appropriation bill for this reduction at the invitation of some Republican who was plotting to punish Squires?

Again the committee in its abstract says:

F. A. G. Handy, clerk in the post-office at Richmond, Va., received a circular, refused to respond, and was discharged soon afterwards. Attributes his discharge to the fact of his not responding to the assessment. Another clerk was put in his place within ten days from his discharge.

Regarded the sum asked for as an assessment for party purposes, and believed it was expected that he should pay the sum assessed; not doing so, he was discharged.

Mr. Handy did substantially so testify, but on cross-examination admitted that he was discharged on the first day of May, 1878, and that ten days before he was discharged he was notified that he would be; and that it was necessary to reduce the expense of the office. Now the circular was not issued until the 27th of May; it is therefore impossible that Mr. Handy could have been discharged for failure to contribute, and he so admitted. He did not, however, say that another clerk was appointed in his place in ten days, but says that he heard that another clerk was appointed, and thinks it was about one month after his discharge. He also stated that a clerk in the Richmond post-office received a circular, and refused to contribute, and was not removed. This does not appear in the so-called abstract.

The abstract also contained the following: "Michael F. Daley was assessed \$7.20, 1 per cent. on his salary; he is a watchman in the Surveyor-General's office." There is nothing in the testimony to support the statement that Daley was assessed. He said he received the circular, paid no attention to it, and is still in office. He was called by the majority. The so-called abstract also contains the following:

Nathaniel B. Fugitt, occupying a temporary appointment in the Post-Office Department, was sent to collect the sums subscribed to Mr. Baker. His authority came from Congressman Hubbell, of Michigan, member of the committee.

When did Mr. Fugitt occupy a temporary position in Post Office? The committee certainly intend that it shall be understood that he occupied such position at the time he was sent to collect such subscriptions. Mr. Fugitt swore he did not at that time occupy any position under the government, and not for months after that time.

The abstract contains the following: "John G. Thompson testified 'that he worked for the success of the party when not engaged in his official duties as Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives.'" What he did say was that he "was Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives, chairman of the Democratic committee of Ohio, a member of the Congressional committee, and that he was the most of the time after the adjournment of Congress in Ohio, organizing to defeat the Republican party; that he came on here to see that payments were properly made, and that everything was in order."

Concerning the testimony of Duncan S. Walker, secretary of the Democratic Congressional Committee, the committee, in the abstract, say he held his office at the Riggs House and one of the rooms of the Capitol, &c. Mr. Walker testified that a portion of the time he occupied a room at the Riggs House, and subsequently for a period in the other side of the Capitol (House side); that he occupied the rooms of the Committee on Agriculture, and also used the room of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads and the Committee on Printing in which to fold documents to be distributed by the committee; that he used the employés of the House to fold documents, &c.; that no pay was given to such employés for the additional labor imposed on them by the committee. It also appears by his testimony that some portion of the government stationery, that is, envelopes, were used by the committee.

The committee collected money from those who were willing to con-

tribute, and if it did not call on the employés for contributions of cash, it did call on them for labor, quite as valuable to the employé, if he worked in his own time, as cash; and if he did not work in his own time, it was the use of the time of the employés that belonged to the government, and not to the employés. So the services were rendered without compensation to the government or the employé. All this the majority have overlooked, or at least have omitted from the "*abstract*."

The committee in the report complain that the employés of the government from Pennsylvania and other States were allowed to go home to vote, and in some instances were furnished transportation by their political friends. The committee, however, fail to notice the fact clearly proved, that both Democrats and Republicans were thus allowed to go home to vote, and both had transportation furnished by their political friends. Perhaps the committee thought because the number of Democrats was less than the number of Republicans, the *crime* on their parts was altogether too small to notice. It is unfortunate that the committee should overlook so many things, and should have misconstrued the testimony, for it gives the report the appearance of an attempt, on the part of the committee, to conceal the facts and create an impression on the public mind not warranted by the testimony.

The committee constantly use the word "*assessment*," even when referring to the testimony of witnesses who declared there was no "*assessment*." The use of the word "*assessment*" by the committee, as applied to the contribution, is a perversion of the testimony. It is an attempt to cause it to appear that there was an authoritative declaration as to how much should be paid, and that a failure to pay would subject the party refusing, or neglecting to contribute, to some inconvenience or danger of loss of position. Mr. Gorham testified that the employés were apt to ask "What will be fair, or what ought I to give?" and to meet such cases the committee thought a suggestion of about 1 per cent. on the yearly salary would not be excessive, and so suggested in the circular, it being the intention to call on those only who received \$1,200 or upwards. In a few instances, by mistake, those receiving less than \$1,200 were sent the circular.

All the testimony shows that no attempt was made to compel payment, and non-payment did not even call for reproof from the committee or any one else. Mr. Gorham also testified that he was not aware that the refusal of any one to contribute was ever made known to those having the authority to remove, or influence to secure it to be done; and the committee, with the fullest opportunity, after an existence of over one year with its present majority and present chairman, could not find one man who had been discharged for failure to contribute, nor one man who had been coerced into payment, or even urged to pay.

If assessments were made, as the committee would fain have it appear, it is strange that among all those who have been discharged since that time no one could be found who claimed that he had been pressed into payment or discharged for non-payment. Either the testimony did not exist, and therefore could not be had, or the committee has not done its duty. We all know that the committee has been diligent in its efforts to find this kind of testimony. No one familiar with the conduct of the committee can blame it for a failure to produce that kind of evidence. The committee say the receipt of money by Mr. Gorham or Mr. Hubbell, both of whom were officials of the United States, from other employés thereof, was a violation of the statute of 1876. The statute of 1876 was not intended to prevent contribution for political purposes by the employés of the government, but to prevent a certain class of government

officials, designated in the statute, who had the power of removal, to extort money from their subordinates for political purposes, under the penalty of dismissal if they refused.

Neither Hubbell nor Gorham were within the class designated by the statute. The statute says, "Executive officers, or employés of the United States not appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate." The word "executive" qualifies the word employés as well as officers; as Hubbell and Gorham were neither executive officers, nor executive employés, it is somewhat difficult to see on what grounds the committee find them guilty of a violation of the statute. The statute declares that such officer or employé, guilty, &c., shall be discharged. Will the committee say that Hubbell could be discharged, or even Gorham could be discharged? Gorham could have been removed by a vote of the Senate, but not discharged, and Hubbell could neither be removed nor discharged.

The committee also say:

Your committee believe, and so report, that the collection of moneys in any amount, but especially in so large a proportion of the whole as is here disclosed, from persons in the public service, to perpetuate the rule of those in power, is contrary to the spirit of our governmental institutions, and in direct antagonism to freedom of choice by the people.

Your committee think that the statute of 1876 is in practice a dead letter, and respectfully report for adoption the following bill:

A BILL to prohibit officers and employés of the United States from contributing money for political purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall not be lawful for any person holding any office under the United States, or any employé thereof, to contribute or pay to any committee or person, or into any fund, any money, property, or valuable thing for any political purpose whatsoever, or to pay any assessment or percentage upon the income or emoluments of his office or position for any political purpose, or to give, lend, advance, or pay any money, property, or valuable thing with the intent, or with the assent, permission, or understanding that the same may be applied to or for any political purpose whatsoever, or to himself or herself apply the same to any political purpose. No head of a department or other superior officer shall himself collect, or permit or allow any other person to collect or receive, from any officer or employé in his department or under his supervision, or from any other officer or employé whatsoever, any assessment, percentage, contribution, gift, loan, or advance any money, property, or valuable thing with the intent, understanding, or permission that the same shall or may be used for any political purpose.

SEC. 2. That any person who shall violate any provision of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months, and, in the discretion of the court, by a fine not exceeding five thousand dollars, and on conviction shall be forever thereafter disqualified from holding any office of honor, profit, or trust under the United States. Any officer of the United States who shall violate any provision of this act shall, in addition to such imprisonment and fine, be deemed and taken to have vacated the office by him held.

This is in short a proposition to prohibit any employé, or person holding office under the Government of the United States from contributing money or other things of value for political purposes, either with reference to national political questions or those of the States. It is based on the theory that the use of money (contributed by a certain class of citizens, office-holders) in a political campaign is a crime, while money contributed by a non-office-holder and used for the same purposes is not a crime. It is not the purpose for which it was contributed or used that determines the question whether such contribution or use was or was not a crime, but the class of men who contribute that determines the question under the proposed bill. It makes a new crime, not heretofore known to the criminal code of the States or of the United

States. It is to punish an act that may be of itself not only harmless, but probably beneficial to the country. A representative government depends for its stability on the intelligence of its citizens, with reference to the fundamental difference between such a government and all others. The citizen who does not know the difference between a representative government, "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people," and all other governments is not prepared to defend such a system of government against the attempts of the advocates and friends of other systems when they attempt, as is usually the case, to subvert and overturn such government by insidious approaches and by loud professions of attachment to the very government they are anxious to destroy.

The people can be educated on political questions by the press, and by the speeches of its well-informed citizens. Freedom of speech is essential to the very existence of a free people, and the freedom of the press is fully as essential to the welfare of republics as that of free speech. Every citizen has the right to contribute his money to procure public speakers to address the people on political questions, and he has the same right to contribute his money to employ the press to do the same thing. The press will reach more people than will be reached from the political rostrum. It is absurd to say we will not trammel the freedom of speech, but we will say that a certain class of citizens cannot contribute to the legitimate expense attending the exercise of the right of free speech, and they shall not contribute money to put the press in motion to send out political documents to teach the political ideas they may entertain. If this bill shall pass, no man holding a public office can be connected with the public political press; he cannot contribute to pay the ordinary and perfectly legitimate expense of a political meeting. This class of citizens cannot contribute money for the printing and distribution of political documents; cannot contribute money to form and support a political club or society for the dissemination of the most wholesome political tenets concerning the rights of man. The establishment and support of a reading-room stocked with political works would be a crime; and must be treated in the same way that the contribution of money to corrupt the voters and destroy the purity of the ballot. Why should this class of citizens be deprived of a privilege conceded to all others? Is there more danger from the contributions of men in office than from those who are striving to get in? Is the duty of the office-holders any less than that of those not in office? If the latter may contribute money to be used in advancing his political sentiments, why may not the others? If the one may by means of the distribution of public documents seek to convince the people of the wisdom or folly of a policy sought to be applied in the administration of the government, why may not the others? If the one may expend his money for that purpose, why not the others?

This bill is indefensible on any principle; it is abhorrent to all ideas of right; is in violation of the rights of the people granted to them by the organic law of the land; is in violation of those rights recognized by all English-speaking people independent of constitutional or statutory law. The principle sought to be established is a pernicious one, and if aimed at an existing evil is tenfold more dangerous than the evil complained of; for it is but the commencement of a system of degradation to be imposed on citizens of the United States, simply because they hold offices under the government; we shall soon be asked to prohibit the office holders from participating in the national and State elections. The arguments used to support this bill can with equal propriety be

used to support the latter proposition. We shall be asked, as a logical sequence, if the bill become a law to close the mouth of the office-holder, as well as his purse. The use of money in political campaigns for some purposes cannot be too severely condemned; if used to corrupt the vote or to falsify the returns, or in any way set at naught the will of the people, its use is a crime, not against the voter corrupted or defrauded alone, but against the whole people of the United States, and one calling for the severest punishment; but if, on the other hand, it is used for the purpose of diffusing political information among the people, to incite them to diligence in the examination of the claims of candidates for political favors, and to excite them to a careful consideration of the merits and demerits of the political parties seeking to administer the affairs of government, then its use is a public blessing, and in our present state of society, when the people are to be reached mainly through the press, indispensable to the perpetuity of the republic; and whether its use is a blessing or a curse has nothing to do with the class of men who contribute it. Against the corrupt use of money in political campaigns all honest men must protest, and those who contribute money for such purposes as well as those who contribute money, having reason to suppose it will be so used, should be severely punished.

This is not a bill to prevent the use of money for corrupt purposes, but to prevent a free discussion among the people of political questions. It is true it does not say that officials shall not discuss political questions; it allows that to be done, under some conditions, and in one way; but it does prohibit such official from discussing political questions in the most effective way, that is, by the agency of the press, unless they can find men who are willing to publish their ideas for nothing. They cannot put in the usual form of political pamphlets their ideas, because they must expend money to pay the expenses of paper and printing, and that will be a violation of the law.

The purpose of the bill of the committee is not to prevent the contribution of money to enlighten the people on political questions, but to secure a monopoly of such instrumentalities to men who are seeking office and assailing those who hold office. It should be entitled a bill to compel all political information to be paid for from a single bond.

This is not the first effort that has been made to prevent the officials of the United States from exercising all the rights of citizenship, but it is the first time that this proposition has come from members of the political party now in majority in both branches of Congress. It was attempted in 1791, by a proposition in the House of Representatives not exactly like this, but in principle very similar to it. It was lost by a decisive vote, and among those voting against it was James Madison. This attempt was again made in the Senate in 1838, and again in 1839 in the House of Representatives. The bill introduced into the Senate in 1838 did not prohibit the contribution of money, but did prohibit the participation of government officials in political affairs, and is not different in principle from this bill, and the objections urged against that by prominent Democrats may with propriety be urged against this, and we commend those arguments to the majority of the committee. The bill was as follows:

A BILL to prevent the interference of certain Federal officers in elections.

To the end that the great powers given to the officers of the Federal Government, and other persons employed in its service, may not be used for the influencing of elections, which ought to be free and incorrupt:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That from and after the first day of April, in the year one thou-

sand eight hundred and thirty-nine, no marshal or deputy marshal, no postmaster or deputy postmaster, no receiver or register of a land-office, or any of their deputies or clerks, no surveyor-general of the public lands, or any of his deputies or assistants, no collector, surveyor, naval officer, weigher, gauger, appraiser, or other officer or person whatsoever concerned or employed in the charging, collecting, levying, or managing the customs, or any branch or part thereof, no engineer, officer, or agent employed or concerned in the execution or superintendence of any of the public works, shall, by word, message, or writing, or in any other manner whatsoever, endeavor to persuade any elector to give, or dissuade any elector from giving his vote for the choice of any person to be elector of President and Vice-President of these United States, or for the choice of any person to be a Senator or Representative in the Congress of the said United States, or for the choice of any person to be governor or lieutenant-governor of any State, or of any person to be a representative or member in the legislative department of any State of this Union, or for the choice of any person to serve in any public office established by the law of any of said States; nor shall any such officer or person intermeddle in any of the elections above mentioned, or use any means with intent to influence or control the same, otherwise than by giving his own vote; and every person offending therein shall forfeit the sum of five hundred dollars; one moiety thereof to the informer, and the other moiety thereof to the United States aforesaid, to be recovered, with costs of suit, by any person that shall sue for the same, by action of debt, bill, or plaint in any of the district or circuit courts of the United States; and every person convict, on any such suit, of the said offense, shall thereby become disabled and incapable of ever bearing or executing any office or place of trust whatsoever under the said United States.

This bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, then composed of the following Senators: Messrs. Grundy, Morris, King of Georgia, Niles, and Clayton.

On the 21st of January, 1839, the committee reported the bill adversely, and it was considered in the Senate on several days. Not only was it opposed by members of the committee—mostly Democrats—but by such distinguished Democrats as Calhoun, Buchanan, and others. The statement is made in the *Globe* that Buchanan spoke three hours against the bill. Calhoun also spoke against the bill. It was defended, as this will be, by a claim that the officials were controlling the elections, and by the power intrusted to them as officials, were destroying the purity of the ballot.

On this subject the committee in reporting on the bill, use the following language:

What, then, is the mischief which this bill is designed to prevent? It assumes that the great powers given to the officers of the Federal Government, and others employed in their service, may be used for the influencing of elections, and corrupting their freedom and purity.

That elections ought to be pure and incorrupt is a principle admitted by all, and no language can be too strong to express the abhorrence felt by the committee against any attempt to destroy this freedom and purity. He who is guilty of either, by bribing or corrupting voters, violating the ballot box, or setting at naught its voice, forging or suppressing returns, or disobeying the laws enacted for securing any elective right, is guilty of treason against Republican institutions, and ought to be regarded by all as a dangerous foe to liberty.

Speaking of the value of the elective right, the committee said:

The value and the advantages of this right, so far as respects the public, depend upon the knowledge of public measures, and of the qualifications of candidates for public trust, and, consequently, upon the equal and unrestricted freedom of discussing their comparative merits and demerits. The citizen who, by the choice of his fellows, is distinguished by being selected to perform official duties and trusts, is not thereby elevated above them, nor degraded below them. He parts with no rights of citizenship, but remains an equal among equals; still connected with them by the strong and enduring ligaments of mutuality of rights and privileges. Under our constitution, the people, not the government, possess the sovereignty; and the doors of office can be opened only by the powerful charm of the public voice, and no degrading sacrifice of any of the privileges of citizenship, or any separation from the community of rights, feelings, and interests, which bind the people to the government, is required.

The object of our institutions is the protection of the equal rights and privileges of all—the few as well as the many. The spirit of despotism is widely different; erected

upon the destruction of the rights of man, its main object is to protect the few against the many. Hence the policy of separating its officers from all sympathy of feeling and interest with the many, by attaching to office attractive distinctions and seductive privileges, which create a distinct class, and elevate them above the mass, or by degrading them by unnatural mutilations, below their fellow men, prepare them to become fit instruments of arbitrary power. Despots who surround their thrones with *eunuchs* and *mutes*, act upon the latter principle, and are impelled by the instinct of fear to resort to unnatural and unjust means to retain what is unjustly acquired. Happily our institutions, resting upon the just foundation of popular rights, neither demand nor will admit of the mutilation of the person or the privileges of citizenship as a prerequisite for office. Under the existing laws a citizen of a State does not, by accepting any of the offices under the Federal Government, forfeit any of the rights and privileges which belong to him as a citizen of a State.

The object of the bill is to render what is lawful and praiseworthy, and in strict conformity with both the letter and spirit of our institutions, for all citizens, criminal in a particular class who have been honored by the confidence of the people of the whole States. It is not to punish a crime *malum in se*, but to create a new crime. It is not to punish bribery and corruption, the robbery of the ballot box, the suppression or forging of returns, or usurpation or neglect of official duty in giving effect to the will of the majority in elections, or the improper use of official power, but the use of *persuasion* or *dissuasion*, of *intermeddling* to control or influence voters by means that are lawful and right in others. Every citizen ought to qualify himself by study, conversation, and every other means of acquiring knowledge, to understand the theory and principles of our institutions, and to ascertain the best mode of administering them in their true spirit, so as to promote the greatest good of the greatest number, and to render himself capable of discharging any trust that may be conferred on him by his fellow-citizens. It is as well his inherent right as his duty to discuss and promulge freely the measures of any administration, and the character and conduct of those who support or oppose it, as well to control them by the censorship of public opinion as to subject them to the test of the Constitution. In doing so he may win the confidence of his fellow-citizens by his declared opinions, or may become identified with some great principle which conciliates their support. All this is innocent and praiseworthy, even if the motive is the acquisition of office, because it promotes the public good. Can it be wise, or even just, to punish as a crime, when a citizen attains office, what was patriotic and praiseworthy while he was seeking it? Yet why should office seeking and office holding thus be separated by arbitrary enactments, which bestow honors and confidence upon the one, and penalty and ignominy upon the other, for doing the same act?

Freedom of speech, or free discussion, does not mean public speaking alone, but includes the use of the press as well; which, however free and independent, cannot in the nature of things be supported without money. Therefore, to deprive an official of the right to use his money is to prevent him from appealing to the public through the press. We therefore commend the foregoing to the committee.

The Judiciary Committee of 1839 further said:

The most dangerous and destructive assaults upon human rights have been made from fortresses erected for their defense. It deserves serious consideration, whether a law like this bill could ever be carried into execution at this day, and under our free institutions—a law which prostrates the freedom of thought, of action, of speech, and of the press, so far as respects a large portion of the most intelligent, respected, and meritorious of our citizens. The great body of the functionaries whom this bill would affect have been honored by the selection of the people, to discharge responsible duties, for their honesty, capacity, and fidelity to the Constitution. The habitual reviler of republican institutions, and of the capacity of the people for self-government, may in vain attempt to fix a stigma upon all officers who derive their appointments from the people, for the purpose of thus gradually undermining their confidence in the government of their choice, but the people will always be found true to themselves, and will never submit to the execution of a law which deprives their fellow-citizen of his inherent, common, and equal rights, simply because they had distinguished him by their favor and preference.

The committee concluded their report on the bill:

Under every aspect that the committee have been able to view the provisions of this bill, it appears to them that they are unjust, unequal, impracticable, impolitic, tyrannical, and unconstitutional; that it is founded on an assumption of power by the Federal Government, not granted by the Constitution, and destructive of the rights of the several independent States composing the Union, and of the constitutional rights

of the citizens of those States, and that its provisions are of a most alarming and dangerous tendency—not called for by any existing mischief, and would not afford the appropriate remedy if such mischief existed. They therefore respectfully report the said bill without amendment, and recommend that the same should not be passed.

In the Twenty-sixth Congress, 1839, Mr. Bell, of Tennessee, introduced a bill in the House of Representatives on this subject. The following extract from it will show that it was based on the same principle as the bill proposed by the committee:

Be it enacted, &c., That from and after the 1st day of July next, no officer, agent, or contractor, or other person holding any office or employment of trust or profit under the Constitution and laws of the United States shall, by the contribution of money or other valuable thing, or by the use of the franking privilege, or its abuse, or any other official privilege or function, or by threats or menace, or in any other manner, intermeddle with the election of any member of either House of Congress or of the President and Vice-President, &c.

This bill was discussed in the House, and on the question, "Shall the bill be rejected?" the ayes were 108, and the nays 53.

This bill was ably discussed by Mr. Brown, of Tennessee, a noted Democrat of that day. He said, "From 1791 to 1833, with the exception of the alien and sedition laws, no attempt was made to force such legislation on the country. During that long period the people were contented that every citizen, whether a public official or not, should enjoy his constitutional rights; that the assumption of office was but the assuming of new duties and liabilities for the public good, and should therefore be attended with no sacrifice or destruction of his rights as a free citizen of the great Republic."

We believe that experience has demonstrated that there is no danger either to the purity of the ballot, or the stability of the government, from the persons holding public offices under the Government of the United States, and the bill cannot be defended on the ground that there is more danger from the contribution of money from government officials than from private citizens. We suppose the committee would hardly deny the right of private citizens to contribute money to be used for political purposes, unless such money was to be used for corrupt purposes.

The committee say this bill is proposed, because the law of 1876 is a dead letter. This, however, is not intended to take the place of the act of 1876, or remedy the evil sought to be reached by that act. That was to prevent the superior official from extracting money from the inferior official for political purposes. This bill proposed by the committee is to deny to all officials of the United States the right to contribute money for a lawful purpose.

What did the committee find in its investigation that calls for this bill? It cannot, with any show of truth, be claimed that any official contributed money against his will. Neither can it be pretended that the money contributed was used for any illegal purpose. No man was prevented by its use from exercising the right to vote as his judgment dictated he should. This money was expended only to acquaint the people with the true state of the controversy going on between the two great political parties, and to instruct the voters in the duty they owed to the government and themselves. We repeat again, that for this purpose the use of money is not only legitimate but indispensable to the very existence of a free government.

The committee might have found on its files evidence of great abuses in connection with the election of 1878. It might have found that very many citizens were murdered in cold blood, because they attempted to vote as their judgment and conscience directed they should.

The committee might have found on its files testimony, practically uncontradicted, that in very many sections of the country, not only that class of citizens called "freedmen" but white citizens, who sympathized with them politically, were frequently denied the privileges of a free and fair ballot, and, when this was allowed, the manipulation of ballots and the falsification of returns silenced their voice at the polls as effectually as if they had not been allowed to vote, and that in many sections of the country it was the constant practice of the Democratic military clubs to attend all the political meetings of their opponents armed with small arms, rifles, and frequently accompanied by cannon, and to demand a division of time with their opponents, and if this was refused—and frequently when it was not—to *break up the meeting by violence, often attended with murder*. That such violence was not the result of an accidental collision between two parties entertaining different views, but was in pursuance of a plan of electioneering adopted by the Democratic party in several States, and apparently approved by its leading men, both in public and private life, in said States.

That tissue ballots, used only to defraud the majority out of their choice, seen only after the polls were closed, were in common use, and frequently, if not always, finding their way into the ballot-boxes by the hands of the officials sworn to honestly receive and truthfully count the ballots; thus often determining the election contrary to the legally expressed will of the majority.

That at many polling places the recently enfranchised and timid voters found themselves on election-day surrounded by an armed mob of turbulent men, who denied the right of the new-made citizens to vote as they pleased, and if by show of force they were not deterred from so voting, force was used to compel them to desist from voting, and thus the voice of the majority was silenced, and not infrequently less than a fourth of the population held in terror the less aggressive majority. Polling places were closed, election districts changed, ballot-boxes destroyed after the ballots were cast, fraudulent ballots substituted for the legal ones, returns changed or destroyed; this, and many other things of like character, were done to defraud the majority of the people of their choice of public servants. In short, the committee had on its files uncontradicted testimony to show that tricks, subterfuges, manipulation of the ballots, falsification of the returns, force, violence, fraud, forgery, perjury, ballot-box stuffing, and murder were resorted to in many sections of the country during that election to defeat and set at naught the will of the people. Yet to correct these evils, directed not simply against the purity of the ballot, but against the very existence of the ballot, the committee appear to have no concern. Was it because the political party that has profited by these wrongs is the party to which the majority of the committee belong, and the same party that so recently attempted to repeal all laws that had for their only object the protection of the purity of the ballot and the safety of the voter? Such anxiety to save the people from the evils of political assessment by a party that has steadily refused to consent to any legislation that will prevent the intimidation of voters, the making of false returns, and the various frauds so recently practiced to secure the triumph of that party, subjects the committee to a well-grounded suspicion of a desire to make political capital, and to prevent the active and intelligent officials of the government from contributing to the success of the party that has honored them with office, rather than to correct evils now existing, or that there is reason to fear may exist in the future.

A political party that has as one of its leading articles of faith the doctrine that the Government of the United States is powerless to protect its voters at the polls from violence or fraud, and has never refused to appropriate to itself the result of frauds of the basest sort, taking no steps to prevent a repetition thereof, will hardly be able to deceive the people and distract their attention from the real purpose of such party by the cry of danger to our institutions from the contribution of government officials, to be used in a legitimate manner and for a legitimate purpose. If the object of the bill proposed by the majority was to prevent the corrupt use of money by government officials or private citizens, the minority would cheerfully join in urging its passage, for we are not ignorant of the past history of the country on this subject. We do not want to see repeated the history of the administration of James Buchanan, when it was proved by the testimony of the contractor holding his contract from the President that he had contributed within four years one hundred thousand dollars for political purposes, and much of it for the corruption of the press and the voters of the State of Pennsylvania. We would avoid the repetition of such a disgraceful chapter as that, and therefore we offer for a substitution for the bill offered by the majority the following, and hope the committee will be pleased to accept this, as accomplishing what it professes to desire, the preservation of the purity of the ballot and the independence of the voter:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 1. That it shall be unlawful for any person in the service of the United States, whether such person holds an elective office or holds his position in the service of the government by appointment, and having clerks or other employes of the United States under his charge or control, to levy or aid in levying from such clerks or employes any assessment for any political purpose whatever; and any officer or appointee who shall violate any of the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof in any court of competent jurisdiction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000, and imprisoned for a term not exceeding one year, in the discretion of the court: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall be so construed as to prevent any and all officers and employes of the United States from making such voluntary contributions for political purposes as they may see fit.

"Sec. 2. That if any candidate for Representative in Congress or other person shall pay, give, or cause to be paid or given, either directly or indirectly, any money or other valuable thing to or for the use of any person or persons with the intent and purpose corruptly to influence the vote or political action of such person or persons at any election at which Representatives in Congress or Presidential electors are voted for, such candidate or other person so offending shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof by any court of competent jurisdiction shall be fined in any sum not more than \$5,000, and be imprisoned in the penitentiary, at hard labor, for a term not more than five years, and shall, in the discretion of the court, stand committed until such fine and the costs are paid.

"Sec. 3. Any person who shall either directly or indirectly accept or receive to or for his use any money or other valuable thing as the price, consideration, or inducement paid, offered, or promised to corruptly influence or control the vote or political action of such person at any election at which Representatives in Congress or Presidential electors are voted for, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, on conviction thereof by any court of competent jurisdiction, be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000, and imprisoned not more than two years.

"Sec. 4. Any person or persons who shall by menaces, threats, intimidation, or violence made or offered on the day of or within thirty days preceding any election at which Representatives in Congress or presidential electors are voted for, with the intent or for the purpose of influencing the votes of citizens having the legal right to vote at said election, or for the purpose of preventing or hindering such citizens from voting, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof in any court of competent jurisdiction shall be fined in any sum not more than \$1,000, and shall be imprisoned for not more than three years, and, in the discretion of the court, shall stand committed until the fine and costs are paid."

"Sec. 5. If any person shall attend any public meeting held for the discussion or consideration of political questions with reference to the election of members of the House of Representatives, or the election of Presidential electors, armed with deadly

weapons for the purpose of disturbing such political meeting, or shall in any way hinder or disturb the free discussion of or consideration of political questions at such meeting, such person shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof in a court of competent jurisdiction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding one thousand dollars, and imprisoned for a term not exceeding one year, in the discretion of the court."

HENRY M. TELLER.
S. J. KIRKWOOD.
GEORGE F. HOAR.
H. W. BLAIR.

TESTIMONY
BEFORE THE
SELECT COMMITTEE
TO
INQUIRE INTO ALLEGED FRAUDS
IN THE
LATE ELECTIONS,
CONSISTING OF
SENATORS WALLACE (CHAIRMAN), BAILEY, GARLAND,
McDONALD, KERNAN, TELLER, CAMERON OF
WISCONSIN, KIRKWOOD, AND HOAR.

POLITICAL ASSESSMENTS OR CONTRIBUTIONS.

WASHINGTON, *March 26, 1879.*

The CHAIRMAN offered in evidence section 6 of an act of Congress approved August 15, 1876, as follows:

SEC. 6. That all executive officers or employés of the United States not appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, are prohibited from requesting, giving to, or receiving from, any other officer or employé of the government, any money or property or other thing of value for political purposes; and any such officer or employé who shall offend against the provisions of this section shall be at once discharged from the service of the United States; and he shall also be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not exceeding five hundred dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. I now offer the order of the President under date of June 22, 1877, as follows:

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, June 22, 1877.

SIR: I desire to call your attention to the following paragraph in a letter addressed by me to the Secretary of the Treasury, on the conduct to be observed by the officers of the general government in relation to the elections:

"No officer shall be required or permitted to take part in the management of political organizations, caucuses, conventions, or election campaigns. Their right to vote and to express their views on public questions, either orally or through the press, is not denied, provided it does not interfere with the discharge of their official duties. No assessments for political purposes on officers or subordinates should be allowed."

This rule is applicable to every department of the civil service. It should be understood by every officer of the general government that he is expected to conform his conduct to its requirements.

Very respectfully,

R. B. HAYES.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The history of the United States of America is a story of a people who have built a great nation out of a wilderness. From the first settlers to the present day, the United States has been a land of opportunity and freedom. The story of the United States is a story of a people who have built a great nation out of a wilderness. From the first settlers to the present day, the United States has been a land of opportunity and freedom.

The story of the United States is a story of a people who have built a great nation out of a wilderness. From the first settlers to the present day, the United States has been a land of opportunity and freedom. The story of the United States is a story of a people who have built a great nation out of a wilderness. From the first settlers to the present day, the United States has been a land of opportunity and freedom.

The story of the United States is a story of a people who have built a great nation out of a wilderness. From the first settlers to the present day, the United States has been a land of opportunity and freedom. The story of the United States is a story of a people who have built a great nation out of a wilderness. From the first settlers to the present day, the United States has been a land of opportunity and freedom.

TESTIMONY.

GEORGE C. GORHAM sworn and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. What official position did you occupy during the year 1878?

—Answer. I held the office of Secretary of the Senate of the United States.

Q. What official position did you occupy toward the Republican organization?—A. I was secretary of the Republican Congressional Committee, I suppose, although chosen by the executive committee as secretary of the executive committee.

Q. In connection with that organization, what were your duties—their general scope, I mean?—A. To carry on the correspondence of the committee. The duties were not very well defined. While the committee was in Washington I always sought to receive directions from the executive committee, but I was left alone here during most of the campaign, of course with the tacit understanding that I was to act in their stead, to respond to letters, and to take such action on behalf of the committee as seemed best to me, consulting when I could.

Q. Did you so act?—A. I did.

Q. Were or were you not the chief executive head of that committee during most of the summer and during the fall of 1878?—A. I always considered Mr. Hale the head; but he was in his own State. If you mean as to active duties, I was engaged in the active duties of the committee.

Q. Was there any resolution or direction of the committee in regard to the assessment of Federal office-holders for the collection of funds for use in the committee?—A. There was a unanimous opinion against assessments by the committee. No member of the committee favored assessments.

Q. What was done in regard to collecting money from Federal office-holders in the departments and elsewhere?—A. I formulated a circular in May, at a meeting of the committee, and submitted it to them, and the circular as finally issued was in accordance with the opinion of the executive committee, and was by them authorized.

Q. Is that the circular (exhibiting)?—A. (Examining.) That is it. I should like to make an additional statement that the signature is printed from a wood-cut, and was not attached by myself, actually, but was authorized by me:

HEADQUARTERS OF THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE, 1878.
1319 F STREET, NORTHWEST, WASHINGTON, D. C.
WASHINGTON, D. C., May 27, 1878.

SIR: This committee, charged with laboring for the success of the Republican cause in the coming campaign for the election of members of Congress, call with confidence upon you, as a Republican, for such a contribution in money as you may feel willing to make, hoping that it may not be less than \$16.

The committee deem it proper, in thus appealing to Republicans generally, to inform those who happen to be in Federal employ that there will be no objection in any official quarter to such voluntary contribution.

The importance of the pending struggle cannot easily be exaggerated. That the Senate is to be Democratic after the 4th of March, 1879, is very nearly a certainty. In

view of this, the election of a Democratic House of Representatives would precipitate upon the country dangerous agitations, which would inevitably add to present distresses. Foremost among their schemes the opposition already announce their intention to attempt the revolutionary expulsion of the President from his office.

If, by the presentation of three candidates for the Presidency in 1880, the people should fail to choose, the House must elect, each State delegation casting one vote.

From what is now known, and with the growing dissensions in the camp of the enemy, the committee have good reason to enter upon their work with courage.

Please make prompt and favorable response to this letter, and remit at once, by draft or postal money-order, to "Sidney F. Austin, esq., treasurer, &c., German-American National Bank, Washington, D. C."

By order of the committee.

GEO. C. GORHAM,
Secretary.

Q. To whom were these circulars sent in the city of Washington?—
A. They were sent to the employés in the Interior Department; not to the Treasury Department; I think not to the War nor Navy Departments; not to the Attorney-General's Office; not to the Post-Office Department; indeed, I do not recollect of their being sent to other than the employés of the Interior Department. It may have been in some particular instance, however. You speak of the city of Washington?

Q. Of course. Were circulars of this character sent to employés of the Senate?—A. No, sir; nor any other kind of circular.

Q. Can you give the committee the amount of money received from assessments during 1878 upon Federal office-holders in the city of Washington?—A. We never received any money whatever from assessments.

Q. Well, from contributions under this paper?—A. We never received any money from assessments from any source.

Q. Did you receive any money under this circular from Federal employés, and if so, how much?—A. I should be unable to say what responses the appeal met with in this city. I could not say that. I could probably ascertain it with some little trouble by an examination of the books. I had a clerk who made some check or sign opposite the names of those who contributed. I should have to have him look that matter up.

Q. What is the total amount received and shown upon your books, under this circular, here and elsewhere from Federal office-holders?—A. You say under the circular?

Q. Well, by contribution from office-holders?—A. I should think it would be very nearly correct to say \$93,000. That is about the amount as near as I can state it, and I have tried to make it up. No, I must qualify that if you please. I have made an incorrect answer. I was stating to you the entire amount of contributions; and they were not solicited by circular entirely; but the Senators in Congress and the members of the House responded, and all the employés of the government in this city nearly responded without any circular being addressed to them whatever.

Q. Do I understand your answer, then, to cover all contributions?—A. I meant to include all contributions from persons holding official position of any kind from Senator downward. That amount was about \$93,000, whether in response to circular or not.

By Mr. KEERNAN:

Q. I understand that was during the summer and fall of 1878?—A. Eighteen hundred and seventy-eight.

Q. For the purposes of the canvass?—A. Of the Congressional campaign of that year.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is this a copy of an additional circular issued by you? [Handing a paper to witness.]—A. [After examining.] Yes, sir. That was personally issued. I consulted nobody about that. That was for the accommodation of clerks and at the suggestion of the treasurer that he would remain there after office-hours, so that they might call on him without neglecting their duties.

Q. Read the circular.—A. I will read it:

HEADQUARTERS OF THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, July 11, 1878.

DEAR SIR: Since sending you circular under date of May 27, we have ascertained that the rules of your department render difficult your absence during office-hours, and that you are unable to call at the bank where contributions are received. We have, therefore, arranged with the treasurer, Mr. Austin, to attend at the German-American National Bank from 4 to 5 o'clock p. m., to receive contributions from those in your department who have not already responded. If more convenient the amount can be transmitted by mail to Sidney F. Austin, treasurer Congressional Republican Committee, as above.

Respectfully yours,

GEO. C. GORHAM, *Secretary.*

As I say, this was addressed to those to whom the previous circular had been addressed and not to the others.

Q. Who was the treasurer of the committee?—A. Sidney F. Austin.

Q. Of this city?—A. Of this city; assistant cashier of the German-American National Bank. That was his place of business, at which he remained for the accommodation of people.

Q. (Exhibiting.) Here is another circular. Please read that and state whether that was authorized by you?—A. It is.

MR. ———. DEAR SIR: There appears to be due upon your subscription to our campaign-fund the sum of four dollars. We have regarded your subscription as a debt of honor, voluntarily incurred by you, and, relying upon its payment, have taken it into the account in the conduct of our work. We earnestly request immediate payment, and Mr. N. B. Fugitt will be in attendance at these headquarters (second floor) daily from 10 o'clock a. m. till 6 o'clock p. m. to receive and receipt for such moneys.

Respectfully,

GEO. C. GORHAM, *Secretary.*

That was issued and sent only to those who had themselves voluntarily subscribed, signing their names for certain amounts. To such who had not paid fully that was sent.

Q. Can you give us about the date at which that was issued? It does not seem to be dated.—A. I do not recall it. It would have been some time in August, probably, but I do not know. It was after we thought considerable time had elapsed, and gentlemen who had subscribed had allowed the matter to rest, and we took this method of reminding them that if they meant what they had said, and if their signatures were good for the amount they had volunteered to give, we should like to have it. We had trusted their honor in the matter, and had already incurred expenses on account of it.

By Mr. BAILEY:

Q. I ask whether the subscriptions were payable by installments?—A. No; there was a tacit understanding that they were to accommodate themselves about it. They were allowed to do what was most convenient to them.

Q. But this is a circular addressed to persons stating that they owed \$4?—A. That might have been the particular person's unpaid subscription. The subscribers were allowed to consult their own convenience.

Many would say, "I should like to pay half of it at one time and half of it at another," and that was done; or this man may have paid \$4 less than his subscription, and have said, "I will pay the other at some future time," like any private obligation.

Q. Did any considerable number pay just \$4 less?—A. I do not remember. There was a blank left and that was put in; the amount was not printed in. There was a blank, and my clerk, who had the subscription-book, could look and see what was due from each person—the exact amount.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What percentage upon the salary of the employés was inserted in the blank in the first circular offered in evidence?—A. What would about equal one per cent. There was no precision about it; but, in general, the idea was to insert a suggestion as to the amount. As we were always apt to be asked, "What would be fair?" or "What ought I to give?" and as an answer to that question would be asked so much, we inserted an amount about equal to one per cent. of a year's salary.

Q. One per cent. of a year's salary or 12 per cent. of a year's salary?—A. One per cent. of a year's salary. I should like to state, also, in addition to a former answer in relation to the \$93,000 collected from the sources named, that \$13,000 more was collected from other sources, making a total of \$106,000, as near as I can get at it, which constituted the whole Republican campaign fund of that year.

Q. Who was appointed to solicit contributions or to receive contributions in the Treasury Department?—A. I would state here, if it has not been stated, that a finance committee of three gentlemen of the committee was appointed at an early meeting to direct the manner of collecting the money, and that they appointed Mr. Baker.

Q. What was his full name?—A. I think Henry Baker.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Q. To visit the Treasury Department?—A. To visit the Treasury Department and solicit subscriptions—ask the persons who chose to give to so state in a book.

By Mr. KERNAN:

Q. Have you got the book?—A. I have the book, I think. I presume I have it at my house. I brought nothing here. He was authorized to request employés in the Treasury to give, if they felt willing, to aid in the campaign.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Was a man named Fugitt employed or authorized?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was his name?—A. N. B. He was clerk of my committee; Baker was not; and when I was left in charge I called upon him generally.

Q. What one of the departments did Mr. Fugitt visit?—A. I think Mr. Fugitt visited the Post-Office Department, I think the Agricultural Department, and I think the Sixth Auditor's office of the Treasury. Baker, I think, did not visit that, and Fugitt did; but I am not sure. He may have gone to other places in the city. He was generally the man I relied on to go. I think I sent him up to the Navy Department.

Q. Were Mr. Baker's visits soliciting contributions at the Treasury interfered with by the rules of the department, do you know?—A. I never heard anything on that subject.

Q. Did you, or any one else to your knowledge, ask an exception in

favor of Mr. Baker, allowing him to go through the Treasury Department?—A. I have no knowledge of any immunity being asked for him that was not granted to the opposite committee. I do not know anything about that.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Q. What opposite committee?—A. The Democratic committee. I know of no privilege that our committee had that the Democratic committee could not have had at the Treasury Department.

Q. You know of no Democratic committee making any application?—A. I do not. I did not mean to so state. I only meant it a strong way to state that I knew of no such exceptions.

Q. You say there was a list of these subscriptions obtained by Mr. Baker. Have you ever seen it?—A. I have had it. Undoubtedly he delivered it to me. I presume I had it.

Q. Have you that book?—A. I have no doubt that I have it, but I am not able to say positively.

Q. Can you produce it for the committee?—A. I think I can.

Q. You will do so?—A. I will. That excepts the Sixth Auditor's Office, which is in the Post-Office building.

Q. And you will produce any other books you may have covering these subscriptions in the departments in this city?—A. I will.

Q. Were these contributions solicited from all in the Treasury Department?—A. Our direction was that no lady should be asked for a subscription.

Q. And were there subscriptions received from ladies?—A. There were two or three ladies quite indignant at the exemption who came down to the committee-room and said they had as good a right as anybody and would not be prevented from contributing their mite, and I said, "Very well"; I was too polite, I hope, to try to oppose a lady's will in such a matter.

By Mr. KERNAN:

Q. Do you remember the names of the indignant ladies?—A. I do not now. They would be very proud to have their names published. I can get them, I presume.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Were there any other persons employed than Mr. Fugitt and Mr. Baker in any of the departments? If so, what were their names?—A. I had about 15 clerks, and I might send a man here or there on an errand or a message. I can hardly tell you. Mr. Cook may have been sent on some occasions, but very rarely. Substantially, Mr. Baker and Mr. Fugitt did all that work.

By Mr. BAILEY:

Q. Do you mean fifteen belonging to the executive committee?—A. Fifteen employes in all in the Republican committee room.

Q. That is what I mean; in the Republican committee room?—A. All told, high and low; besides the folders, I used to call on one man or another. Mr. James R. Cook, as I say, may have been sent out sometimes on some messages, but I do not know whether he ever took any subscriptions.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Were any of these circulars sent by mail?—A. A great many.

Q. Were any of them delivered by government messengers?—A. I do not know. How do you mean?

Q. I mean messengers in departments here?—A. I have no knowledge of any such thing. No circular was ever sent from the committee rooms that I know of except by depositing it in the post-office, postage paid, and all were delivered in the usual way.

Q. Were they not delivered in the War Department by Mr. Cranmer?—A. I do not know of any such thing; I do not know that they were sent to the War Department. I will say in that connection that it is pretty difficult for me to remember each detail and how the business was done in every department. I will say that the manner of asking for subscriptions differed in the different departments, and as to whether we finally sent circulars to the War Department or not in any way, I cannot state with any certainty; I do not remember. I have no data that I can get on that point.

Q. Do you know the name of the collector in the Agricultural Department?—A. I think Mr. Fugitt; that is my recollection.

Q. Were contributions received, part of this \$93,000, from any of the navy-yards of the country?—A. Not to my knowledge. Individuals were undoubtedly addressed, but money was received from there in no other way than it could be said it was received from the Treasury Department.

Q. Was this circular sent to the navy-yards and post-offices of the country generally?—A. If it was not sent to every civil officer who received over \$1,000 a year, some of the clerks neglected their duties, because that was my instruction.

Q. Your instruction was to send it to all the Federal employes receiving over \$1,000?—A. It was.

By Mr. KERNAN:

Q. In the country or out of the country?—A. Everywhere in the world. I took the list from the Blue Book.

Q. Such as consuls abroad?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BAILEY:

Q. Foreign ministers?—A. I am not so sure about that; there would be some exceptions, of course. I would not send a circular to Cabinet ministers, and probably not to foreign ministers. I am pretty sure I did not.

By Mr. KERNAN:

Q. But to all the other employes of the government?—A. That was my object, to have it reach every man who was in office.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Was circular No. 3 sent to all persons in the list who had agreed to contribute and had not contributed up to the date of its issue?—A. As I intended, it was sent only to those who had signed their own names to a subscription list, and not to others. It was to those who had written a promise to pay and had failed to meet it.

Q. Were the responses to the leading circular (circular No. 1 I shall call it), from the collectors of customs and postmasters and so on in the leading cities in the country, in the form of subscriptions?—A. Very generally; more so than ever in the history of the party, I have been told. Fifty per cent. more in number contributed, probably, than did in 1876. I mean by that to say that in 1876 the request was for two per cent., and in 1878 the request was for one per cent., and although we only asked for half as much, we got three-quarters as much.

By Mr. BAILEY:

Q. Was it because of the effects of "civil service reform" that you got

more?—A. I suppose that the moment the contributions became voluntary and no man felt obliged to give anything he felt more liberal; and persons did respond with more generosity on that account, because they felt under no pressure to give if they did not choose to do so.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you know of any case in the Treasury Department in which any persons were dismissed from office for not complying with the circular?—A. I do not, nor do I believe any such case exists.

Q. Do you know of any case in any of the departments in Washington in which men who failed to respond to your circular were dismissed within thirty days?—A. Do I know of my knowledge?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. I do not.

Q. Have you heard of any such case?—A. I have heard of a single man who was removed from a department and that man did not subscribe; but whether that had any connection with his removal I do not know, and nobody connected with our committee promoted any report about it or any change.

Q. What was the politics of that man?—A. He said he was a Democrat.

By Mr. KERNAN:

Q. Which department was he in?—A. I think he was in the Sixth Auditor's office. This is only hearsay, for that is what you ask for. I do not know that he ever was there, for my own part. I heard that Mr. Waddell, who was a cousin of the commander of the Confederate cruiser Shenandoah, had a place in the Sixth Auditor's office, and that he was asked for a subscription, and he said he was a Democrat, and did not propose to contribute anything to buy a club to beat his brains out with. I do not know whether he said so or not. That is what was said to me. I was told a month afterwards that he was not there, but I am told that he was put in some other place, and he is in office and has been all the time, and that he is a clever man.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. A good officer?—A. I do not know about that. I never heard what he knew about official duties. He is what the Southern people call "a clever gentleman," and has been well taken care of by the administration at all times.

Q. Give us the general use of the \$93,000 collected.—A. I expended a few hundred dollars less than \$25,000 for documents, envelopes, and postage, I think; about \$25,000 the documents cost us.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. Does that include postage?—A. I think it does include postage. I can refer to a memorandum with your permission, as I supposed you would ask me about that.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

The WITNESS. About \$24,500 for documents and postage. That does not include all postage, but postage on documents. Then about \$12,000 for employés, folders, &c., and for furniture, stationery, rent, and general expenses (which it would be difficult to get at in detail, though I have the vouchers), about \$8,000. That would leave \$55,500, \$54,000 of which was sent to the States where we thought best to send it, and \$1,500 was given to speakers for their expenses.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Was it sent to the States or to the Congressional districts?—A. In

some cases to State committees, in some to Congressional committees, and in some cases the candidates were requested to select which organ should disburse it. Sometimes in that way it was sent to the candidates themselves. Then there was about \$6,000 unexpended, \$5,700 of which is in the unfortunate German-American National Bank. We have about \$300 on hand, and I believe we are not in debt. I suppose these statistics will all be interesting.

Q. Was any contribution sought by you from the national banks?—A. I will say in reply to that that Mr. Hale visited New York in September for the purpose of soliciting aid. You ask me if the national banks were called upon. I have reason to believe that he did not call upon any national bank, but he did call upon some of our foremost Republicans, men of wealth, to meet together and subscribe something and get others to do it; and it resulted in raising about \$13,000. There may have been some men connected with national banks, perhaps, in that number.

Q. I ask as to banks directly.—A. Never an application to a bank.

By Mr. GARLAND:

Q. Did the \$13,000 come from officials?—A. No, sir; that was outside of officials. That was from wealthy friends in New York City, who were brought together at a meeting by Mr. Hale and who contributed that.

Q. The circular was sent out to the postmasters, and to different officials in the different States?—A. Very thoroughly.

By Mr. KERNAN:

Q. As I understand, Mr. Gorham, the committee intended to send it to all the civil officers of the government?—A. Who received over \$1,000 salary; and then I thought the postmasters would feel slighted, because many times in a small town a postmaster of small pay is selected by his neighbors and friends and recommended because of his prominence, and I thought they would feel slighted; and so postmasters were asked, without reference to their salary, and they were very kind in responding.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Q. I see that in the first circular sent out there is inserted in the blank left in the printed circular "sixteen." That was done by the committee, I suppose?—A. Yes, sir; by my order.

Q. And this was a \$1,600 clerkship?—A. That would indicate that that particular circular was addressed to a person whose salary was \$1,600.

Q. Was that blank filled up by your direction in all cases where these circulars were sent out, with one per cent. of the amount of the salary that the person addressed received?—A. When it was filled up at all.

Q. It was generally filled up, was it not?—A. Not in the case of postmasters who received under \$1,000, and I think not in the case of persons who received over \$2,500 or \$3,000; I made some such rule as that. I said "Gentlemen who receive pay of that size will probably contribute a great deal more than one per cent., and I will not insert anything; I will simply leave it to their own generosity."

Q. But in the cases of persons receiving salaries ranging from \$1,000 to \$2,500, there was inserted one per cent. of the amount of those salaries as the amount that the parties were expected to contribute?—A. No, not exactly that they were expected, but that was the amount that, if the person addressed felt at a loss to know what would be considered the fair thing for him to do, if he wanted our opinion he could have it, to give

whatever he was willing to give; but that if he asked, as they generally would, "What amount ought I to give?" I would say, "Well, if you give us \$16 out of \$1,600 it will be satisfactory and considered generous."

Q. No; the circular is "for such a contribution in money as you may feel willing to make, hoping that it will not be less than \$16"?—A. We did hope that strongly.

Q. That sum thus inserted was the one per cent. upon the salaries of government officials from a thousand up to two thousand five hundred dollars?—A. Yes; in many cases where the salary was above two thousand and five hundred dollars I left it blank, because I thought it likely the committee would be advantaged by that.

Q. Where the salary was above two thousand five hundred dollars, you hoped a larger sum would be contributed than the one per cent.?—A. I thought likely if we did not name any sum they would give us more than they would if we did.

Q. You said these circulars were addressed to the employés of the Interior Department?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And not to the employés of other departments here?—A. I do not say positively that they did not go anywhere else, but in the main that is correct. To the War Department the chairman asked if they were delivered by a certain person. I do not know that they were not sent there. I am unable to say.

Q. But you know they were sent particularly and specially to the employés of the Interior Department?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you state why it was that discrimination was made in sending these circulars?—A. I will. It was in deference to the ascertained wish of the heads of the departments. We would not send a solicitor into any department where we were requested not to, and although I never came in contact with Mr. Schurz myself, I was given to understand that he was unwilling that any one should represent the Republican committee by soliciting subscriptions in his department.

Q. You understood that the Secretary of the Interior was unwilling that a personal solicitor should come into his department to solicit subscriptions from the employés in that department?—A. I was so informed.

Q. And therefore these circulars were sent?—A. Therefore I addressed them by circular through the mail.

Q. And in the other departments you sent agents to make this solicitation personally?—A. Wherever I thought it would not be disagreeable to the department, I sent solicitors.

Q. Among those agents was Mr. Baker?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who was not connected with your committee?—A. Excepting as an employé.

Q. And was employed simply in this capacity?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What percentage was paid to him for his collections?—A. No percentage. I fixed his compensation after he had performed his services. There never was any agreement with him whatever as to what it should be. The committee had scattered; the gentlemen who employed him had left the city.

Q. That hardly answers the question.—A. I will answer further. I fixed his compensation at \$750 for him.

Q. How long was he employed in going through the Treasury Department and making these solicitations, and what amount did he collect?—A. He collected between seven and eight thousand dollars, according to my recollection.

Q. And out of the general fund you paid him \$750?—A. Yes, sir; I think that is the amount.

Q. What length of time was he engaged in making these collections?—A. I should have to refer to my settlement with him. I really do not remember. I suppose that he must have continued there three months, but I will endeavor to see with some precision if I can.

Q. Do you recollect at what time he was first employed to go there?—A. Not exactly; but about the middle of May, probably.

Q. It did not, of course, occupy all his time during those three months to go through the Treasury Department and collect this money?—A. I rather think he gave us the best part of his time. I do not think the time was worth anything to him outside of that. It was a very perplexing thing.

Q. Then he was quite persistent in his solicitations in that department?—A. I never had any opportunity to know the manner of his solicitations.

Q. He gathered out of it, you say, about how many thousand dollars?—A. He presented a book to individual employés, and they wrote their names down and wrote a sum of money opposite which they were willing to give the committee.

Q. And that amounted to how much?—A. I think between seven and eight thousand dollars was subscribed. He also collected the most of it.

Q. Did that not embrace the female clerks in the Treasury Department?—A. It did not.

Q. In the Sixth Auditor's Office?—A. It did not. I will make a statement in reference to that, if you please, as it is a matter of some consequence. The committee directed, and I think it was upon my own suggestion perhaps, but without any dissent from any member, that no lady should be asked for any money, and that none should be received from any lady. I even went so far as that. When the circular was addressed, if we found in the Blue Book "L. E. Brown," or "W. J. Smith," there was nothing to indicate the sex of the employé, and where we found that circulars had reached ladies without our intending that they should, I directed the treasurer, Mr. Austin, not to receive any contribution from any lady who might come, but to apologize when she should come, and explain the reason of the mistake. I recollect that Mr. Baker had something to say one day about it, and expressed a contrary opinion from that of the committee on the subject, and I was much afraid from his manner that he was pursuing his own idea instead of obeying the orders of the committee, and I told him that we did not desire anybody's opinion on the subject; we had decided that no lady was to contribute.

Q. Do you say that no ladies in the departments in Washington contributed to this fund except those who did so voluntarily and because they earnestly desired to do it?—A. I say so far as we could avoid it. I do not know of any ladies contributing at all myself excepting those who came into the room and paid it in my presence; I know nothing of any others.

Q. You do not know how many of these contributions came from female clerks, then?—A. I do not know that any did.

Q. You do not know but what they did?—A. I do not know that they did not. So far as Mr. Baker is concerned, I should be perfectly willing to say that I was certain none came from the solicitations of any person unless Mr. Baker may have done it, and up to the time he had this conversation with me he may have presented it to them. I think he did.

Q. Mr. Baker's agency extended to the Treasury Department?—A.

Yes, sir. He could collect nothing except from persons who had subscribed, but he may have presented the book. I fear that he did present the book to some ladies before I knew it, and until I forbade it; but he never had the authority of the committee to do it nor my authority.

Q. When he made you his return did you ask him if any of these contributions had been from ladies?—A. I do not think I did.

Q. If any such had been from ladies, you did not direct that the money should be returned to them?—A. I think I did to Mr. Austin.

Q. But to Mr. Baker?—A. I do not recollect. I do not know that I gathered from him that he had got any from ladies or that there was anything which happened to require any attention on the subject. I thought he was merely giving his own view to me that they ought to give, and I told him he should not ask it; I would not permit it. I may have neglected to ascertain whether he had done it up to that time.

Q. In giving that view, it indicated, you say, that he was pursuing a course in reference to these solicitations differing from the views of the committee?—A. I thought he was arguing with me that it ought to be done.

Q. But you did not ask him whether any of these contributions had been made by ladies?—A. It would be very difficult to go back and recollect the conversation. My own mind was satisfied that our rule had not been violated to any extent that was worth any discussion at all; that he had been admonished. I do not think he had made his collections then. He had been making solicitations for collections. I do not know that he had collected a dollar when we had this talk. He had got the names and was instructed from that time not to take money from ladies.

Q. You think Mr. Fugitt was soliciting in the Post-Office Department, including the Sixth Auditor's Office?—A. I think so.

Q. You also think he solicited in the Navy Department?—A. I think he tried to; I do not think he made any headway there. The Secretary was away and I believe his assistant was averse to having anything done, and I do not think we did much there.

Q. Were the employés not just as willing to make voluntary contributions in the Navy Department as any others?—A. I think they would have been if Mr. Hogg had been willing to have them asked the question; but I believe he threw some obstruction in the way, and as there were so few there, and as I had not had the arrangement of it, I let it go.

Q. So you think they were denied the privilege of making that contribution through Mr. Hogg?—A. I understood Mr. Hogg threw obstacles in the way, which made it not worth while to pursue the matter, and I dropped it.

By Mr. BAILEY:

Q. I understand that altogether the subscriptions to your fund amounted to about \$106,000?—A. Yes, sir; as near as I can get it.

Q. Of which \$93,000 came from the officers?—A. From Senators, Representatives, and others.

Q. How much of that came from Senators and Representatives?—A. I cannot state it now. I think that their subscription was pretty general. There were, as we know, thirty-nine Republican Senators, and they gave, as a general rule, \$100 apiece. There may have been some exceptions; I do not remember. The Republican members of the House gave us \$50 apiece.

Q. All of them, or only a portion?—A. The great body of them. The intention of all was to do it. There may have been a case here and there where it was not convenient.

Q. All the remainder of the \$93,000 came from those in the civil service of the government?—A. Yes, I think so.

Q. And from all the Republican party outside of those who were employed you received but \$13,000?—A. That is all. I am sorry to say that was all we got from them.

Q. Then your treasury—I mean the treasury of the committee—was recruited chiefly from the employés of the government?—A. It would appear so from my last answer.

Q. And they bore the expenses of the Republican campaign chiefly, with the exception you have named?—A. That would be the inference from the last question and answer.

Q. Were these circulars addressed alike to Democrats and Republicans who were in the service of the government?—A. We made no distinction.

Q. Did Democrats as well as Republicans respond by subscribing money?—A. I really am unable to say. I could not know whether a man was a Democrat or not unless he wrote an offensive letter back, which was the case in some instances.

Q. Do you not know that some Democrats were constrained or felt themselves constrained to make subscriptions to this fund?—A. I do not know what they were afraid of or what kind of force it would require to agitate them, but to my knowledge there was no reason for anybody being afraid of that thing.

Q. Do you not know that some of them responded by paying money?—A. I do not recollect now. If I am asked as to any particular case, I will give all I know about it. I think there was a general trepidation lest giving would endanger a man's place rather than refusing to give.

Q. Notwithstanding that trepidation you raised about \$93,000?—A. Yes, sir; the patriotism of Republicans cannot be restrained.

Q. You had \$6,000 left over what was necessary?—A. We should have been glad to have had several hundred thousand dollars more. The \$5,700 was prudently kept in reserve till the last few days, but the bank that we had deposited with broke and we did not disburse that amount.

Q. So your bank failed as well as your efforts?—A. Our efforts were attended with moderate success.

Q. How many employés of this committee were men connected with the public service?—A. Not one that I am aware of. I can bring you a list of all of them.

Q. It is not necessary.—A. I never used the service of any government employé.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Q. In the disbursement of this fund can you state to what Congressional districts any part of it was sent and how much?—A. I could do that.

Q. We should like to have it.—A. I can say, for instance, that about \$5,000 went to the State of Indiana, with a suggestion from me to the State committee of what districts I thought it had better be sent into; but I really cannot remember now which they were. They were those that we called, in common parlance, the close districts.

Q. Have you any memorandum by which you can tell me to what districts in my State the money was sent?—A. I think so. I will try to do so. I have it not with me.

Q. You can find it?—A. I will try.

Q. I think it will be interesting in that State.—A. I shall be very happy to furnish the information.

Q. And, as to other Congressional districts in other States, I should like the same information.—A. I will try to furnish it. Five thousand dollars was the amount sent to Indiana, and about \$9,000 to Ohio.

By Mr. GARLAND :

Q. Will not your books show the whole matter?—A. My check-stubs will show. I made the checks generally payable to myself and indorsed them.

By Mr. McDONALD :

Q. Please make a statement of the amount disbursed to the different States for election purposes and to the different Congressional districts as far as you can designate them?—A. I will do so.

By Mr. BAILEY :

Q. Do you recollect how much you sent to the city of Cincinnati?—A. I cannot now state. I say in general terms that \$9,000 was sent into the State of Ohio, and I believe that there was another thousand sent; I think the suggestion was made by me where I thought it ought to go, but that was not binding on the chairman of the State committee, and I should not be able to say that it went into any given districts in Indiana or Ohio.

By Mr. McDONALD :

Q. But you can give us your suggestions as to districts?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BAILEY :

Q. Have you any recollection of sending any into Tennessee?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. With any directions as to using a portion at Memphis?—A. I sent none whatever except for use in Mr. Houk's district and Mr. Pettibone's. I call that Mr. Pettibone's district, though he was not elected. He was a candidate.

By the CHAIRMAN :

Q. How much to Pennsylvania?—A. I think Pennsylvania received from the committee, in all, \$1,500. That went into one Congressional district.

By Mr. TELLER :

Q. How much to Colorado?—A. One thousand dollars only went to Colorado.

By Mr. BAILEY :

Q. Do you remember how much was sent to Tennessee?—A. One thousand dollars; \$500 to each of the two districts I named.

By the CHAIRMAN :

Q. Do you know anything about the assessment of Federal office-holders by State committees?—A. O, no; I know nothing about that more than I read in the newspapers.

Q. Nothing of your own knowledge?—A. Nothing. There were cases in which we waived the collections in favor of State committees.

Q. In addition to the assessments made by your committee were there no assessments made by State committees on Federal office-holders charged in the Blue Book to be from specific States?

Mr. CAMERON. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that you do not use the word "assessments."

The CHAIRMAN. I stand corrected.

A. I should make a false statement if I said I made any assessment at any time, because I did not.

Q. (By the chairman.) Then were there any demands made, to your knowledge, by any State committee upon Federal office-holders, or was there any contribution made by Federal office-holders to your knowledge in behalf of State committees, in addition to those which were made to your committee?—A. I do not know anything about that. I know in some cases we allowed ours to go to the State committees, which was equivalent to having it come here and sending it back again; but I know nothing of additional contributions.

Q. Did that money come through you or through the State committees?—A. I mean that I agreed that I would not call upon gentlemen in some localities. I said, "Let that go to the State committee instead of letting it come here and be sent back; let it go there in the first instance."

Q. Was not the State committee of Pennsylvania allowed to call upon the Federal office-holders from the State of Pennsylvania for contributions in behalf of the Republican cause in the State of Pennsylvania?—A. Upon some Federal office-holders, yes.

Q. Was the money thus received from them in addition to the amount that you received?—A. No, sir.

Q. Was it a part of the \$93,000?—A. No, sir; let me understand you. The office-holders they called upon we did not, and the office-holders we called upon they did not.

Q. This amount received, then, in Pennsylvania would be in addition to the \$93,000?—A. It would be in addition to the \$93,000, but not an additional subscription from the individuals. \$93,000 came to our own treasury, in addition to which some officers who had not contributed to us, and were not called upon to do so, or if called upon it was relinquished, paid their contribution to the State committees, and that would be in addition to the gross sum.

Q. Do you know the name of the agent from the State of Pennsylvania who came here to make that call?—A. No man came from the State of Pennsylvania here to make any such call.

Q. Through whom, then, was the call made?—A. It was my own arrangement with the chairman of the State committee of Pennsylvania. In a personal conference with him that suggestion was made by me, and agreed to as being fair and reasonable.

Q. What was it?—A. I said that we could not contribute largely unless we had contributions. There had been in the first instance, when we put our circulars out, in a general way, the usual pressure from local sources for all the money that could be raised throughout the country generally, as there always is, and I said, "Well, this committee is organized to carry on a certain portion of the work and we must have some money, and what will we do?" I finally suggested some arrangement of that sort. In Pennsylvania I said that I would be entirely willing to forego requests made upon the officials in Philadelphia and in Allegheny County if the committee would not interfere with reference to others that we might call upon in the State. I suppose Mr. Quay would not object to that statement; I have no objection to mentioning it. It was my own proposition. There was no solicitation by him about it; the interview was of my own promotion, because there had been a little pres-

sure for local aid, and I did not want it to conflict with our raising money for the necessary purposes of our committee.

Q. Then any amount that was sent by you to the State of Pennsylvania during the campaign was in addition to what would be received, if anything, from the office-holders in the State of Pennsylvania by Mr. Quay and his committee?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In other words, the \$93,000 received by you contained no money received from Federal office-holders in the State of Pennsylvania?—A. Yes, it did. It contained all the contributions from Federal office-holders in the State of Pennsylvania except in Allegheny County and the city of Philadelphia.

Q. Was the same thing pursued in regard to Maryland officials?—A. Some contributions had been made and were not returned there. At a certain time in the campaign, on the solicitation of some of the State committee of Maryland, my recollection is that I said, "You are very welcome to the sum not already collected, whatever may have been subscribed or will be received." It is rather a dim recollection, but I think I turned over to them at some time the balance of contributions from that State.

Q. Anything received there by them, then, would also be in addition to the \$93,000?—A. Yes.

Q. Can you fix anything near the amount they received?—A. No, sir; but I think it was inconsiderable.

Q. Do you know the amount received by the Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania from office-holders in Philadelphia and Allegheny?—A. No; I do not think we ever had any statement. I intended to have, in order that the men might be credited on our books with having contributed, but I do not remember having received it; I am not sure.

Q. In the communication between you and Mr. Quay was the amount to be collected or to be asked as a contribution fixed at the sum which you asked from the Federal office-holders here?—A. He very well knew what we were doing. I do not know what he chose to do himself. He knew what we were doing.

Q. Were there contributions received from the officials of the Senate?—A. Yes.

Q. At what percentage?—A. I am not sure whether any mention was made to them of any, and I do not think there was uniformity about it. I think the employes in my own office gave in this same proportion we have been speaking of, and I am inclined to think that the subordinates of the Sergeant-at-Arms gave even more. It seems to me they did, but I will not be certain about that.

Q. Was that a general thing with the employes of the Senate?—A. Yes, sir; it was very willingly given. I wish to call the attention of the committee to the fact that I was not an "executive officer or employé of the United States," who is forbidden by law to solicit subscriptions.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Q. You were Secretary of the Senate?—A. I was a legislative officer at the time. As the statute has been put in, I did not know but that the public mind might in some manner be misled.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are you an employé of the United States?—A. I am not now.

Q. Were you?—A. I was not an executive officer or employé.

Q. The statute says, "officers and employés of the United States."—

A. I was not an "executive officer or employé of the United States."

Q. You were not appointed by the President?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. HOAR:

Q. I should like, without designating by my question the particular form of answer, to have you state in regard to the absolute publicity or otherwise of this proceeding, and any fact which is in your knowledge bearing upon the question of the entire voluntariness of the subscription. I did not hear the first part of your evidence, and I therefore ask you to state, if you have not stated as fully as you desire, in regard to these two points.—A. In regard to the first point, as to the publicity, I will state that at the meeting of the executive committee, at which I presented this form of circular, I said, "This circular is written for publication, and I will not be willing to sign any circular that you are not willing to see published in any paper in the land in the next three days"; so that it was fully understood that that would be public.

Q. Was it in fact made public immediately?—A. I do not know that I took any trouble about that, to immediately publish it myself.

Q. But do you know as a fact that it was well known?—A. I do not know how soon I knew it was well known. I only mean to say that I had not the slightest objection to its publication. It was sent at once to persons many of whom would be unfriendly to us, and would necessarily publish it, and we had every reason to believe that it would be at once published, and we expected it to be. And as to the other matter of the voluntariness of the contributions, I will say that we were so guarded in that matter, and so desirous to have no phrase used that could by any possibility be construed into any coercive language, that very important sources outside of the committee were consulted as to whether this or that language would be objectionable in that connection; and the language was modified (not in regard to the voluntariness, because all that was done in regard to that was in my own language). To be more explicit, letters were received, one in a special case, asking whether to contribute would be any violation of the President's civil-service order, and I submitted that to the committee. I said, "I will not solicit subscriptions from any person if his compliance will do him personal harm, and I want to know how that is." Means were taken to ascertain whether or not the appointing power would regard our circular as in violation of the principle of voluntary contribution, and the result was that the assurance was made by the committee upon authority, that there would be no objection in any official quarter to voluntary contributions. There never was the slightest pressure on any person in the United States to contribute.

Q. So far as you know and believe, was the fact of any person's refusal to subscribe made known to any person who had authority or influence to secure his removal?—A. No, sir; not that I have any knowledge of.

Q. Or belief?—A. I believe not.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Q. What sources outside of the committee were consulted in regard to the first circular and its tone in reference to the request for contributions?—A. We were very desirous of consulting the proprieties of the matter, to not call on the appointees of the President for contributions in any manner that would be distasteful to him—

Q. What authorities outside were consulted?—A. I was making that statement—and therefore one member of the committee was selected to present this to the appointing power, and I presume he acted upon

knowledge, and he made a slight modification of the language which referred to the matter.

Q. Then this circular, as published, was presented to the President?
—A. I do not think the whole of it was. I think this portion of it was; of course, I do not know the fact, but I believe it to have been submitted by one member of the committee to the President: "The committee deem it proper, in thus appealing to Republicans generally, to inform those who happen to be in Federal employ that there will be no objection in any official quarter to such voluntary contribution." This was the part submitted. In the original I had written to the effect that "voluntary contributions would be approved by the Executive Department," and that was modified and a written memorandum returned by the member of the committee who made the inquiry, and these were the words that were substituted: "That there will be no objection in any official quarter to such voluntary contribution." These words I understood to have been approved by the President.

Q. Was not the entire circular, as it is there, with the modification you have suggested, presented at the same time?—A. I do not believe it was. I may be incorrect in my recollection, but as it was in manuscript and I did not want to stop to copy the whole, I think I copied that paragraph alone, as I did not want the circular to be issued in a form that would meet the disapproval of the President in this respect, and that that was the part submitted. My impression is that the residue of it was not.

Q. That the rest of the circular was not submitted?—A. I think not, but I am not certain.

Q. Was it submitted to any of the heads of departments?—A. O, no. I do not think anybody had anything to do with it at all outside of our committee except in that one particular as to how the Executive branch of the government would view this soliciting of contributions.

Q. How the phrase should be put in reference to the Executive mind?—A. Yes, sir; what assurance we could give a man that he would not be turned out of office if he contributed to the success of the Republican party. We wanted some assurance of that sort, and we wanted to put it in language that would not be distasteful to the Executive, and therefore the matter was referred to one of the committee, who brought this report: that this language would not be indecorous or distasteful.

Q. You did not send this circular to the papers for publication?—A. I do not think I did.

Q. Did it not first appear in the public prints through the Democratic paper of this city, the Post?—A. I do not remember that indeed.

Q. Was not that the first time that it came before the public?—A. I do not recollect.

Q. Did you ever see it in the public prints before you saw it in the Post?—A. It would be impossible for me to say when I first saw it, but I presume it may have been in some opposition paper. I do not remember.

Q. Do you not know that it got to the public by some of those parties to whom it was addressed sending it to the Democratic committee?—A. No; I do not know that. Indeed, I never did understand how it was published or where it was published first.

Q. It was not published by any agency of yours or your committee?—A. No; nor was the publication prevented by our agency nor any effort made to prevent it.

Q. Of course, after it went out, you could not very well prevent its

publication?—A. As I said, it was written for publication. That is the reason why I put a little stump speech in the middle of it against the party to which I was opposed.

Q. Do you say it was written for publication or written so that it would do no particular harm if it was published?—A. It was written with full knowledge that it would be published, and, therefore, was intended for the public eye.

Q. You supposed that in sending out some seventy thousand of these circulars to the different office-holders of the country some of them would hand one over to your political opponents?—A. I do not think we sent so many as seventy thousand to get \$93,000 back.

Q. Were there not very nearly that many circulars sent out?—A. I do not know how many; I suppose not half that number, at a guess.

Q. Thirty thousand, then?—A. Probably.

Q. In sending out this circular to all the office-holders of the United States who were drawing salaries of a thousand dollars and upwards, taken from the Blue Book, some one of these or more might send the circular to your political adversaries; and, therefore, you drew it with that care that if it was published you thought it would do no harm? Is not that the fact?—A. The fact is, I think—

Q. Answer the question.—A. The question is so long—

Mr. TELLER. He cannot answer it in the language you put it.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly he can; and he can explain afterwards.

Mr. McDONALD. He has already told us he put a stump speech into this circular.

Mr. TELLER. You have no right to put the exact language in his mouth.

Mr. McDONALD. I have a right to ask a categorical answer to my question.

Mr. TELLER. If I was the witness, I should not answer it in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The witness must answer categorically, and he can explain afterwards.

The WITNESS. I will answer the question as I understand it. Let it be read by the stenographer.

The question was read to the witness, as follows:

Q. In sending out this circular to all the office-holders of the United States who were drawing salaries of a thousand dollars a year and upwards, taken from the Blue Book, some one of these or more might send the circular to your political adversaries; and, therefore, you drew it with that care that if it was published you thought it would do you no harm? Is not that the fact?—A. I do not think either "yes" or "no" would be a true answer to that question, and I must give a true answer.

Mr. McDONALD. Now make your speech in reply to that.

A. I have no desire to make a speech. I supposed that any Democrat who would seek office under the administration would be very likely to endeavor to injure the party if he could find any manner of doing it. Then I supposed there would be Republicans who perhaps might like to make some pretext for not giving anything, and those two classes of people would be very likely to publish it. So that in some sort the question of the Senator can be answered in the affirmative. But I also say that the circular was written not exclusively with the idea that an enemy might publish it, but circulating twenty or thirty thousand copies of it among friends it could hardly be deemed confidential, and it was of no consequence that it should be, and therefore I wrote as I would if I was holding a conversation in public instead of in my private room with

one person. I perhaps wrote the language more with reference to the public eye than I would write a private letter.

By Mr. HOAR :

Q. If a Democrat, with whom you were on friendly and confidential terms, had asked you what you were doing, would you have shown the circular to him?—A. I would have shown the circular to any Democrat in this room without any hesitation.

By Mr. BAILEY :

Q. Were these circulars sent out generally to the Republicans in the country?—A. We had no roster of the Republican party, but we had of those who happened to hold official positions.

By the CHAIRMAN :

Q. You sent it to all who held official positions?—A. Generally.

By Mr. McDONALD :

Q. You did not communicate the contents of that to any Democrat before it appeared in the public prints?—A. I do not recollect of doing so. The fact is my time was almost exclusively occupied with Republicans at that period, and I cannot swear that I had any conversation of any kind with any Democrat.

By the CHAIRMAN :

Q. Give me an approximation now, as near as you can, of the amount of the \$93,000 received from Federal office-holders, that was received from Senators and Representatives; the total?—A. An estimate?

Q. As near as you can?—A. If that was going to be followed by asking what particular members or Senators did not give, I should not like to say anything about that.

Q. I have no such purpose.—A. I should think we must have collected \$3,000 in the Senate, perhaps, and we had 136 or 137 Congressmen, and I suppose we collected \$6,000 there. We must have got between nine and ten thousand dollars.

Q. Then of the \$93,000, \$84,000 was collected from Federal office-holders other than members and Senators?—A. Some of the Cabinet contributed, and men in high station—foreign ministers.

Q. I simply wanted to get at the question as between the Representatives and Senators in Congress and other Federal officials?—A. I think probably over \$80,000 was collected outside of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Do gentlemen desire to ask further questions?

Mr. TELLER. As Mr. Gorham is to appear with some documents, we can ask him then any question we desire to ask.

By the CHAIRMAN :

Q. Tell us whether the city of New York was given in charge to the State committee of New York?—A. It was not.

Q. Did the Federal officials there make the contribution directly to your committee?—A. Those that did it at all, as far as I know. I do not know what they may have done to the local committee, but I had no arrangement of that kind except in one county in the State—I do not recall the name of the county—where an old member asked me to let the county committee collect, and I did so.

Q. The only arrangement you remember now which you had with a State committee was in the State of Pennsylvania, so far as the city of Philadelphia and Allegheny County were concerned, and the State of Maryland?—A. I do not know that I can say that. I think the Federal

officers in Cincinnati sent nothing to us, but I do not know that they turned it over to the State committee.

Q. Had you any arrangement with the State committee of Ohio?—A. No. I had a suggestion from one of the Federal officials in Cincinnati that they would like to be excused from contributing to our committee and they would contribute there, and I said, "Certainly, it is all right."

Q. How was it in Illinois; did the Federal officials in Chicago contribute towards this \$93,000?—A. I had no arrangement to the contrary. We got all we could; we got from those who chose to give. I do not recollect that we received anything from the collector at Chicago, William Henry Smith.

The CHAIRMAN. I have no further questions at present.

WITNESS. I wish to add that if in answering any question I have involuntarily responded to any inquiry as to "assessments," I simply meant to refer to "voluntary contributions."

Mr. McDONALD. You can look over the testimony.

WASHINGTON, March 27, 1879.

GEORGE C. GORHAM recalled.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Please state any corrections you desire to make in your testimony of yesterday.—Answer. In regard to amounts retained in States, I wish to add that in the State of Wisconsin, at the request of the chairman of the State committee, I think I remitted to him the collection of all the contributions that were made from Federal officers there. To the best of my recollection they were all understood to be retained within the State of Wisconsin. In Cincinnati, I stated yesterday that I did not know whether any went to the State committee. I have found since then a memorandum which I made. The arrangement I made there, by the suggestion of one of the leading Federal officials, was this: that they should meet together and contribute as they pleased, and that they should send one-sixth of the amount collected to the Congressional committee here; that they should give one-sixth of it to the State committee, and the remaining two-thirds they should use according to their own judgment in the locality of Cincinnati. Furthermore, in Lucas County, Ohio, we agreed that all contributions collected within that county might be used in that county.

By Mr. CAMERON:

Q. That is the county in which Toledo is situated?—A. I believe so. In Nevada, when I went over in November, I found the Federal officials had some contributed funds on hand, and that there were some debts to be paid in the campaign, and I authorized the expenditure of that money in discharge of the obligations of the campaign. I do not know what the amount was; I think nearly a thousand dollars—some hundreds of dollars, at any rate.

Again, I was asked yesterday whether any persons responded through fear, and I wish to add to my answer to that question that no pressure was brought to bear upon any person by or with the knowledge or consent of the committee or of myself, and I do not know of any collector using any words or manner that would indicate a desire to use pressure upon any person. If any such case existed—if any collector did this—

he exceeded his authority and was acting in violation of the known wish of the committee and of its officers.

I was asked yesterday if the civil officers of the government bore the main burden of the campaign, and I replied affirmatively. What I mean to say is that they did bear the main burden of that portion of the campaign that the Congressional committee had in charge. Of course I do not mean to be understood that the campaign throughout the United States was conducted by this committee; it was only an auxiliary. State and Congressional committees conducted the campaign.

A great deal has been said about generalship and leadership. The Congressional committee never assumed any such attitude. They aided where they could the State and Congressional committees. We raised some money and used it to the best advantage. We aided nineteen Southern districts only, and fifty-eight Northern districts, and the average to each Northern district was \$712. We aided seventy-seven districts in all, and there were two hundred and twelve districts to which we rendered no aid whatever; so that the campaign could not have been conducted by us, and the Federal officers could not have borne anything like the larger portion of the burden. They bore the burden that I have stated. We sent not a dollar into New York or Massachusetts, and nothing worth speaking of to Pennsylvania or Illinois—those great States. I suppose there must have been many times the sum we collected used throughout the country from first to last.

By Mr. KERNAN:

Q. In New York in any of the Congressional districts were the local men allowed to receive contributions?—A. I stated yesterday that there was one county where that was permitted, in the interior of the State. I now forget which county; but an old member of Congress wrote me that in his county he would like to have the county committee permitted to make the collection, and I wrote to him that it would be all right if he advised it. That was the only exception in New York.

Mr. KERNAN. You cheated New York.

The WITNESS. We thought they had a pretty easy fight, any way, and it would be a waste of money to send it there.

I have a statement that was requested to be made of the districts to which sums were sent, Mr. Chairman. The Senator from Indiana, Mr. McDonald, requested it. I can give it, or wait until he comes in.

The CHAIRMAN. You can leave the statement, and he can cross-examine as to it when he comes in.

The WITNESS. It is a memorandum from which I can make my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

The WITNESS. This list which I present shows the States to which money was sent, and where it was not sent to the State at large it shows the districts to which it was sent, excepting that in the State of Indiana. I did not send it to the districts, but to the chairman of the State committee, with a recommendation that the districts be aided to the extent named in this memorandum. As to the State of Ohio, I thought I could have stated to what districts I recommended that the money should go, but I cannot find the memorandum. I am quite sure the aid was confined to nine districts, and that those nine districts were those which were conceded generally to be pretty closely contested. That was the aim, but I cannot state the districts. There were nine. I know that Mr. Neal's was one, Mr. Butterworth's was one, Mr. Young's was one, but beyond those I do not believe I can go.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. There was no money sent to the State of Georgia?—A. None.

Q. Are there any other corrections you desire to make?—A. No, sir.

Q. You have the book of subscriptions in the Post-Office Department?—A. I have it here (producing a book).

Q. By whose name is the subscription headed?—A. Thomas J. Brady.

Q. What is his official position?—A. Second Assistant Postmaster-General.

Q. You have the book of collections in the Treasury Department? (Book produced.) By whom is it headed?—A. By John Sherman.

Q. What is his official position?—A. Secretary of the Treasury.

Q. You have the book of subscriptions in the Agricultural Department? (Book produced.) By whom is that headed?—A. By William G. Le Duc.

Q. What is his official position?—A. Commissioner of Agriculture.

Q. You have the book of subscriptions in the Sixth Auditor's Office?—A. This is it. (Book produced.)

Q. By whom is it headed?—A. By J. M. McGrew.

Q. What is his position?—A. He is the Sixth Auditor of the Treasury, or Auditor for the Post-Office Department. There was a book of subscriptions by persons in the Attorney-General's Office, which I do not find. The clerk in charge will continue the search for it. I am unable to produce it this morning. If I am able to find it, I will bring it.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. What was the average aid furnished to districts?—A. We aided nineteen southern districts with an average of \$663 to a district; we aided fifty-eight northern districts, with an average of \$712 to the district, making in all seventy-seven districts, with an average of \$700 to the district. We rendered no aid whatever to two hundred and twelve districts. There are four districts in California that have not yet voted. That makes up the total of all the districts of the country.

Q. You sent \$1,000 to Colorado. To whom was that sent?—A. To Governor Routt.

Q. For the central committee?—A. I knew him best. It was intended to be used for the campaign there.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Q. Can you give the aggregate amount received from the Post-Office Department and from the Treasury Department?—A. I said yesterday that Mr. Baker collected seven or eight thousand dollars from the Treasury Department employés.

Q. And from the Interior Department?—A. It would take me a good deal of time to figure up those amounts. I think a fair estimate of the collection in the Treasury, all told, would be twelve to thirteen thousand dollars.

Q. And in the Post-Office Department?—A. I cannot make that readily.

Mr. TELLER. Do you mean from all the postmasters?

Mr. McDONALD. No; here in the Post-Office Department, in the city of Washington.

The WITNESS. I see a footing here of \$1,909, and I judge it to be correct. I suppose \$1,909 is the footing of the subscriptions of the men who signed in the Post-Office Department.

By Mr. HOAR:

Q. You mean by "the Post-Office Department," what we call "the

General Post Office?"—A. The General Post Office. I suppose it went all through the building.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Q. As to the Interior Department, have you any data by which you can state the amount collected there?—A. I had books in which all the names were entered of those to whom circulars were sent, and then those who responded were checked off; but I never have looked through them myself. I could get at it.

Q. Can you furnish any approximate statement of the amount received from the employes of the Interior Department?—A. I cannot this morning. I will make the best endeavor to do it before you get through your deliberations, if you wish.

Q. I should like to have that information with these other facts.—A. As to the Sixth Auditor's Office, I see——

Q. That is in the Treasury?—A. I am not certain whether that was included in the total collections of the Treasury. Here is \$2,100 subscribed in the Sixth Auditor's Office. The Agricultural Department is not footed up. I will have the statement of the Interior Department made up if I can do so.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is there a book connected with the Interior Department?—A. No; not exactly. There is a book in which all to whom the circular was sent, except postmasters, are recorded, and the treasurer gave receipts for moneys received in response. The stubs of his receipt-books were used to check off in our record the names of those who contributed, and I presume I can in that manner ascertain, with considerable trouble, if it is desirable. It might be two or three days' work of one of my employes in the committee, but of course I will do it if it is desired and it is important enough. It will cause me considerable trouble.

Mr. McDONALD. I want to know.

The WITNESS. I will make endeavor to ascertain the amount.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Were there subscriptions made in the Government Printing Office?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the same form as in the other departments of the government?—A. I have forgotten. I think we were a little dilatory about that, and I really should have to consult Mr. Fugitt about that; but we got money from there. They were a little indignant that they had been neglected, and we sent somebody down to give them an opportunity.

Mr. McDONALD. I wish to ask Mr. Gorham another question. You spoke yesterday of the amount expended in documents, some \$25,000. Was there any part of the fund expended upon the newspaper press?—A. No, sir. That was one thing that I was exceedingly sound on. I thought that all the papers that were worth being printed could sustain themselves. I do not think we ever gave a dollar to any newspaper in the country.

Q. (By Mr. McDONALD.) In the preparation or compilation of these documents, were any of the government clerks employed?—A. Yes, sir. I wish to say in that connection, as I intended to have done before, that there is a very talented gentleman who was in my own office, who is librarian of the Senate, and I blocked out some material that I desired him to work up. He did so, very much to my satisfaction, in the form of a "Text-book for the Campaign," and for that I paid him what I thought we could afford, though it was but a slight compen-

sation. That did not interfere with his duties as Senate librarian, which were not very onerous during the recess.

Q. Was anything deducted from his salary on account of this employment and payment?—A. He was never employed at any time when he had anything else to do.

Q. But his salary?—A. What salary?

Q. Was he paid a regular salary as librarian of the Senate?—A. Certainly.

Q. Was anything deducted from that salary?—A. For what reason?

Q. Because of the compensation that he received for compiling these documents?—A. I have never violated any law by withholding salary from any officer. I have always paid the clerks their salaries of course, as provided by law.

Q. Then he got, in addition to his salary that he was drawing as Senate librarian, the compensation that you paid him for compiling a text-book?—A. Undoubtedly he got some money from me for compiling the text-book, and he undoubtedly got his salary for services performed as librarian.

Q. Full salary from the government?—A. Certainly.

Q. Now, can you tell us how much that compensation was that was paid to him?—A. I can; \$250.

Q. Two hundred and fifty dollars for compiling a political text-book that was printed, and published, and circulated by your committee?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was that the only document that he worked upon or compiled?—A. It was the only one so far as I know. I may have sent to him at times to send me some memorandum for my own use, but nothing of any consequence.

By Mr. HOAR:

Q. As far as you know, the relation of this gentleman to this text-book that he compiled, that was paid for, was precisely as Mr. Spofford's relation to Spofford's almanac which he compiles?—A. Just the same; the same as though Senator McDonald should be paid a fee for arguing a case in court in Indiana, in addition to his salary as a Senator. None of my clerks usually worked at night in the Senate during recess, and he found ample time, as he is an industrious man, to do all his work and do it well for the Senate, and also to earn money outside.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. It did not interfere with his duties in the Senate?—A. No sir, not at all; there is no more faithful officer.

(The memorandum produced by the witness was ordered to be appended to his testimony, and is as follows:

Maine, \$5,000; New Hampshire, \$1,750; Vermont, 3d district, \$500; Connecticut, 3d district, \$1,000; New Jersey, 1st district, \$1,500; 2d district, \$500; 5th district, \$500; Pennsylvania, 17th district, \$1,500; Maryland, 6th district, \$1,250; West Virginia, 2d district, \$350; 3d district, \$500; Virginia, 2d district, \$1,000; 4th district, \$1,300; North Carolina, to three districts, \$1,300; South Carolina, 1st district, \$1,000; 5th district, \$600; State at large, \$200; Florida, 1st district, \$500; 2d district, \$1,000; Alabama, 4th district, \$500; Tennessee, 1st district, \$500; 2d district, \$500; Missouri, 2d district, \$500; 3d district, \$500; 7th district, \$100; 10th district, \$1,000; Ohio, to nine districts, \$9,300; Indiana, to State central committee, with recommendation that it be distributed as follows: 1st district, \$2,000; 4th district, \$1,000; 6th district, \$1,000; 8th district, \$500; 10th district, \$500; cannot say whether or not the distribution was made as recommended; Illinois, 18th district, \$250; Michigan, \$5,000; Iowa, \$5,000; Wisconsin, \$1,500; Oregon, \$2,000; Colorado, \$1,000. Total, \$53,900.)

WASHINGTON, *April 1, 1879.*

GEORGE C. GORHAM recalled.

By the CHAIRMAN :

Question. What do you wish to state ?—Answer. I was mistaken in regard to the amount of money sent to the State of Maine. There never was but \$3,000 furnished from the committee to that State.

By Mr. TELLER :

Q. Instead of \$5,000 ?—A. Instead of \$5,000, according to the statement I made before. The mistake came from my trusting to my recollection, which seems to have been at fault. The amount was drawn by Mr. Hale, and disbursed under his direction, and does not, therefore, appear on the check-stubs from which I made my statement.

By the CHAIRMAN :

Q. Did no other money go to Ohio than the \$9,300 named ?—A. No, sir. We are liable to forget a trifle in a great many details, but I am quite confident about that.

Q. Who took that money to Ohio ?—A. That was deposited here in this city to the credit of Mr. Robinson, the chairman of the State central committee, with the exception of a single district.

Q. Did or did not Mr. Hale, chairman of the committee, take money to Ohio from your committee ?—A. He did not.

Q. Do you know whether any moneys, independent of the \$9,300, went into Mr. Warner's district in Ohio ?—A. I know of none from any source.

By Mr. TELLER :

Q. Was there any application made by the central committee or by any Republican from Colorado for any money ?—A. None to my recollection. I recollect of no application whatever from the State of Colorado ; but it was my own anxiety for the result there that prompted me to send a little.

HENRY M. BAKER sworn and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN :

Question. When were you connected with the Treasury Department ?—Answer. I resigned to take effect on the 1st day of July, 1874, since which time I have not held any office whatever under the government.

Q. Who was then Secretary of the Treasury ?—A. Mr. Bristow had come in a few days before, perhaps about the 1st of June.

Q. What positions had you held up to that time in the Treasury Department ?—A. I had been a clerk, simply.

Q. In what office ?—A. I had been in the Third Auditor's office, the office of the Commissioner of Customs, and the Secretary's office.

Q. Were you in the Special Agents' Division at any time ?—A. Yes, sir ; for the last three years.

Q. What was your post in that division ?—A. I was the next in rank under the supervising special agent ; I was a clerk, but was at times acting as supervising special agent.

Q. During your occupancy of these positions, did you become conversant with the minutiae and workings of the Treasury Department ?—A. I think I did considerably in the various places in which I was. I was there long enough to do so.

Q. What State are you from?—A. New Hampshire.

Q. What were you employed to do during the past year in regard to collections, contributions, or assessments, in the Treasury Department?—

A. I was employed by the Union Republican Congressional Committee to take such subscriptions from persons in the Treasury Department as they might see fit to give.

Q. Were you in the habit of going to the Treasury on that business?—

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When did you begin?—A. I began on the 5th day of June, 1878.

Q. What did you continue to do; receive subscriptions?—A. I continued to receive subscriptions until those who were present in the department had had an opportunity to subscribe if they wished to, and I received payments of such subscriptions as they saw fit to make up to I believe the 10th day of September—some time in September, at least—when I turned over the books and matters to the secretary of the Congressional committee, and from that time until about the 11th of October, when I made a final settlement with the committee, I simply answered such questions as they might wish to know about the minutiae of things.

Q. What days in the month were you usually at the Treasury Department?—A. No given days. I went whenever it was convenient to myself and generally right along until I got through with the business.

Q. Did you make it a point to go there on the 15th and 30th?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you in all cases receive the moneys contributed from the parties themselves?—A. No, sir; they were frequently sent by others, by clerks in the same room; I do not know possibly but in some instances by the messenger.

Q. Did you or did you not receive moneys from the paying officers?—A. No, sir; not a dollar excepting their own personal contributions.

Q. Was there nothing ever handed you by chiefs of divisions for persons in their rooms?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did or did not the chiefs of divisions in the Secretary's office and the heads of bureaus assist you in obtaining these moneys?—A. I do not think they did anything that could be called assistance. I generally went to the chief of the division first, and he did as he pleased about subscribing, and then I said I wished to pass along to the other clerks, and he said very well, or something of that sort. That was the extent of it.

Q. Had you subscription books?—A. I had one subscription book.

Q. By whom was it headed?—A. It was headed by John Sherman, Secretary of the Treasury.

Q. Did you present this book to each clerk, asking a subscription?—A. Yes, sir; the subscriptions were all made in one book.

Q. Had you receipts prepared for parties?—A. I had.

Q. [Handing paper to witness.] Is that your signature to that receipt?—A. That is my signature.

Q. Is that the form in which your receipts are made?—A. That is a mutilated form.

The CHAIRMAN. The name is out.

The WITNESS. I will give you a blank form [handing paper].

[The paper handed to the witness by the chairman is as follows:

No. _____	Washington, D. C., _____ 1878.
Received from _____	
_____ Dollars,	
as his contribution to the campaign fund of the Union Republican Congressional Executive Committee.	
H. M. BAKER, For the Committee.	

The form produced by the witness is as follows:

No. _____	Washington, D. C., _____ 1878.
No. _____	Received from _____
Date, _____ 1878.	_____ Dollars,
Name, _____	as his contribution to the campaign fund of the Union Republican Congressional Executive Committee.
Amount, \$ _____	_____
\$ _____	For the Committee.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. To the blank which I showed you your signature is put?—A. It is a genuine signature.

Q. From whom did you receive these blanks?—A. I ordered them printed myself.

Q. Under whose directions?—A. No one's.

Q. Who paid the expense of printing these?—A. It was paid out of the contributions; that is, I paid it from money I collected, which was allowed me in the settlement.

Q. Then it came out of the fund you collected?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you visit all the rooms of the Treasury Department?—A. All of the rooms of the Treasury Department proper, I think, unless some were omitted by mistake, excepting the Sixth Auditor's office.

Q. That is in the Post-Office Department?—A. It is in the Post-Office building.

Q. Did you visit the rooms where there were ladies employed?—A. Ladies are employed in a great many of the rooms where gentlemen are employed.

Q. Did you receive subscriptions from them?—A. A few of them gave subscriptions.

Q. Did you receive them without any hesitation?—A. I received the money whenever they volunteered it.

Q. And put it in your books?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It went into the general fund?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What amount was received in the Treasury Department from lady subscribers?—A. I do not know accurately; I should say possibly \$200.

It may have been not much over \$100, or it may have come up to that figure.

Q. Did you or did you not receive subscriptions or moneys from clerks in the department who had less salaries than \$1,000?—A. Not knowingly, and I think not in any instance less than \$1,200. Excuse me; there was one messenger who came to me and said he wanted that I should take \$5, I think, from him. I said the committee did not wish subscriptions from messengers or any one receiving less than \$1,200, but he wanted the money paid and wanted a receipt for it, and I gave it to him. He came to me and insisted upon it.

Q. At what hours did you visit the rooms?—A. Whenever it was convenient to myself after the department was open.

Q. During office hours, I suppose?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. From whom did you get authority to solicit those subscriptions during office hours?—A. My authority to solicit subscriptions do you mean?

Q. To enter the Treasury Department and go around among the clerks during business hours with a subscription book—from whom did you receive that authority?—A. I do not know that I had any specific authority in relation to the matter from any officer of the government.

Q. Is it usual in the Treasury Department to allow people to go through the department with subscription books during business hours?—A. I do not know anything about it. I know people used to come when I was in the department occasionally with subscription books for the sale of books sold by subscription and so forth. What their rules are now I do not know.

Q. Had you a written appointment from the secretary of the Congressional committee?—A. No, sir.

Q. You had no such authority?—A. No, sir.

Q. You never produced to any clerk in the department a written authority from Mr. Gorham?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever produce a copy of the circular which we call No. 1?—A. No, sir; I think I never had a copy of it. I never produced it to any one, at any rate.

Q. Did you receive money from the ladies of the counting division of the Secretary's office—the loan division, I believe, it is called—where they count bills, and so forth?—A. I would not definitely say without reference to the book; but my impression is that there was no money received from that division from any lady. As I said before, no money was received from any persons that did not get a salary of \$1,200 or more, and I think there was none in that division of that description who volunteered any money.

Q. Did you receive any moneys from the ladies in the Register's Office?—A. I cannot definitely say without reference to the book.

Q. Have you not the book?—A. I have not. I turned over that to the secretary of the committee, and I have not seen it since, on or about the 10th of December. There may have been one or more instances in the Register's Office, but the book was not presented to them in the Register's Office, as a rule. If they got it, they asked for it.

Q. Did you receive subscriptions from the ladies in the stamp division of the Internal Revenue Bureau?—A. I did from some divisions of the Internal Revenue Bureau, whether stamp or not I do not know. I do not know the subdivisions.

Q. Did you receive any money from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing?—A. I received two subscriptions from the Bureau of Engrav-

ing and Printing. One was by the Chief of the Division, and the other by his deputies.

Q. Nothing from the ladies there?—A. No, sir; nor from any other of the employés of the bureau.

Q. I should like very much to have you examine that book and give us the names upon it that you recognize as those of lady clerks?—A. If you have the book I will do so.

Q. Mr. Gorham has the book. Mr. Gorham will furnish you the book for examination.—A. I am at the service of the committee.

Q. Can you give us the sum total collected by you in the Treasury Department?—A. \$7,502.25.

Q. What amount of that did you retain for your services?—A. I retained none of that for my services. I presented a bill, which was subsequently paid, for \$750. That money was deposited to the credit of the committee entire or paid to the members of the committee.

Q. Did you go with a book to any other department?—A. No, sir.

Q. During the campaign did you make any collections from any other sources than those in the Treasury Department?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you, to any clerks there, tell them that their assessment was a specific sum and ask them to pay it?

Mr. CAMERON. One moment. Did you ever tell any clerk that he was assessed at all?

The CHAIRMAN. I will put it in this form: Did you, when you went to call on them with the book, tell them that the assessment was a specific sum, and demand that they should pay it?—A. I do not think I ever used the word "assessment" in connection with the subscriptions at all; I never made a demand upon any of them; it was entirely voluntary on their part so far as I was concerned and so far as I know.

Q. (By the CHAIRMAN.) Who obtained the subscription of Secretary Sherman at the head of your book?—A. I did.

Q. When you obtained it did he give you leave to go through the Treasury Department to see the clerks and heads of divisions?—A. I do not think he said anything about it. I understood, in a general kind of way, that I was permitted, but I do not think it was ever mentioned between us in any form or manner.

Q. Do you know who took charge of the collections in the Treasury Department after you left?—A. I do not know, further than that I understood that Mr. Fugitt did. I turned everything over to the secretary of the committee; he made the arrangements subsequent to that.

Q. How did these people to whom you went to collect money know that you were authorized to collect?—A. That is a matter which I intended to call to your attention before I closed. I said in my testimony that I had no authority from the secretary of the committee; I had not, but I had authority from the chairman of the finance committee, Mr. Hubbell, of Michigan. That written authority I showed whenever anybody wanted it.

By Mr. KERNAN:

Q. Have you got it here?—A. I have [producing a paper].

The CHAIRMAN. I will read it.

To whom it may concern:

Henry M. Baker, esq., of this city, is duly authorized to solicit subscriptions by the Republican Congressional Committee in the various departments of the government, and it is hoped that every facility will be afforded him in the prosecution of his labors.

JAY A. HUBBELL,

Chairman Finance Committee, Republican Congressional Committee.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 5, 1878.

Q. (By the CHAIRMAN.) Who is Mr. Hubbell?—A. He is a Representative in Congress from Michigan.

Q. (By Mr. KERNAN.) He was a member at that time, I presume?—A. I understood him to be so.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Did you call on the Surgeon-General's Office for subscriptions?—A. Not what is technically known as the Surgeon-General's Office. I called in the office of the Supervising Surgeon of the Marine Hospital Service, which is part of the Treasury Department, but not the Surgeon-General's Office, which is a part of the War Department.

Q. You called on that part of the Surgeon-General's Office which is connected with the Treasury Department, I understand?—A. They are distinct entirely.

Q. What amount of money did you collect from this branch in addition to the \$7,500?—A. It was included in that.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. Had you any arrangement with the committee as to what you should be paid for your services?—A. No, sir; I was informed by Mr. Hubbell that my services would be paid for, but no percentage or amount was ever mentioned till I presented my bill, which was paid.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. When you called upon parties with your book and there was any slowness about subscribing, did you discuss the subject with them?—A. If they asked any questions I answered them.

Q. Suppose they declined, would you press it upon them?—A. No, sir; I passed on to the next one.

Q. Did you make any memorandum as to having called on parties who declined to subscribe?—A. I may have made a note simply for this purpose—

Q. Did you make the note?—A. I may in some instances have made notes, because people would be out from the department at a given time on leave of absence, or on account of sickness, or something of that sort, and I wished to present an opportunity to every one to subscribe, and I made memoranda, which I subsequently tore up, so that I need not visit a person a second time, and especially that he need not feel that he was pressed.

Q. What list did you take in going through the department?—A. No list whatever, excepting the subscription.

Q. Did you have the Blue Book to ascertain the employés?—A. I did.

Q. Did you follow it in endeavoring to see each person employed in the respective bureaus and divisions?—A. That was my usual course.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. Each person, you mean, having a salary of the sum stated?—A. Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Were these your instructions from your employers?—A. No, sir; I had no instructions further than to take up a subscription. The rest was left to my good judgment, if I had it.

Q. Were you instructed to see all who were in public employ in the department in reference to subscriptions?—A. No, sir; in talking with Mr. Hubbell on the matter, it was stated that none receiving less than

\$1,200 a year were to be given the opportunity to subscribe at all. All under that were omitted altogether.

By Mr. BAILEY:

Q. You say that the instructions were not to give the opportunity to any who had salaries of less than \$1,200?—A. There were no written instructions. When the authority was given me we had a general talk.

Q. I supposed from the expression you used that "the opportunity was given them to subscribe," it was regarded as a favor that you conferred on them?—A. I did not discuss the ethical part of it all.

Q. You spoke of "opportunity"; did Mr. Hubbell speak of giving them an "opportunity"? Is that his language or your own?—A. I think it probable he used that language. What I mean by that is that the book would not be presented to those receiving less, which in itself stated it to be a voluntary subscription.

Q. Then you mean simply that the book was not presented when you say the opportunity was not given?—A. Precisely.

Q. Did you state to them in any way the sum that was expected to be subscribed by each?—A. Sometimes people would ask me what was generally given, and I said that the ordinary subscription would average about 1 per cent.

Q. Was it not your endeavor to get 1 per cent. from each of them?—A. I did not endeavor one way or the other.

Q. Was not that your instruction?—A. I had no instructions.

Q. Was it not intimated to you that it was expected that each would desire to subscribe 1 per cent.?—A. I think Mr. Hubbell said the committee would like 1 per cent., or about that, or something of that sort.

Q. Did you take no method of communicating to the people to whom you gave this opportunity the sum that Mr. Hubbell would like to receive from them?—A. No, sir; I do not know that I mentioned Mr. Hubbell's name to any of them.

Q. It was the general understanding among them that each would be permitted to give 1 per. cent.?—A. They were permitted to give what they pleased. Some gave not one-half of one per cent. and some gave more than one and a half per cent.

Q. Your employment was limited to subscriptions in the Treasury Department?—A. No, sir; my authority was, as has been read, in the various Departments; but it was understood, I think, that I was to go to no other. I was asked if I wished to go to any other, and I said that was all I had time to attend to.

Q. Did you go out among the citizens at all?—A. No, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. (Handing circular No. 1 to witness.) Did you see any of these?—A. I saw at the room of the committee some of these, with the exception that the blank was not filled.

Mr. TELLER. What are those circulars?

The CHAIRMAN. The Gorham circulars.

The WITNESS. I made use of none of them.

Q. (By the CHAIRMAN.) Did you receive from clerks in the Surgeon-General's office whose salaries were less than a thousand dollars, subscriptions?—A. Not that I am aware of. You mean the Supervising Surgeon of the Marine Hospital Service.

Q. Have you been residing in Washington since you were in the Treasury Department?—A. I do business here. My legal residence is in New Hampshire.

NATHANIEL B. FUGITT sworn and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Where are you employed?—Answer. In the Post-Office Department.

Q. How long have you been there?—A. Since the last day of January, 1879.

Q. In what business were you previous to that time?—A. Immediately before, I was in no business. I had been with the Congressional committee during the fall and the first part of December. Before that I had been at the National Republican newspaper office, and before that I was in business in this city.

Q. Were you engaged in 1878 in making collections in the departments for the Republican committee?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When did you get charge of that business?—A. I went into the employ of the committee on the 27th of May, I think, and it was probably the last part of June that I commenced that work. I am sure I made my first collection the last week in June or the 1st of July.

Q. In what department did you begin?—A. I began in the Department of Agriculture, I think.

Q. Upon whom did you first call?—A. Upon the persons whose names I found in the memorandum-book that was handed me.

Q. Did you not obtain subscriptions?—A. No, sir; I never asked for any.

Q. Had these subscriptions been already made?—A. They had been already made.

Q. Your duty was simply to collect?—A. To ask these gentlemen if it was their pleasure to hand the money over to me.

Q. Whose name headed that list in the Agricultural Department?—A. Mr. Le Due, I believe.

Q. Did you collect the moneys that were upon that book in that department?—A. I collected a portion of them.

Q. Who authorized you to collect?—A. Mr. Gorham.

Q. What amount of money did you collect in that department?—A. I do not remember.

Q. Can you not fix the amount in some way?—A. I could if I saw the book. I have in that book a memorandum of what I collected from those gentlemen.

Q. Tell us what department you went to next?—A. I went to the Post-Office next, I believe.

Q. Did you obtain subscriptions there or collect in that department?—A. I collected.

Q. Was that your business generally?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Not to obtain subscriptions, but to collect?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Upon whom did you call there?—A. I called first on General Brady, I believe, or General Hazen, I do not know which. It may be that I commenced at the Sixth Auditor's office in the same building. I do not remember exactly.

Q. Did you collect moneys from any of the ladies in the Sixth Auditor's office?—A. Not in the Sixth Auditor's.

Q. Did you in any part of the Post-Office Department?—A. I did from two or three in the dead-letter office. That was before I understood that I was not to collect from ladies. After that I avoided them.

Q. Did you or did you not find their names on the subscription-book?—A. Their autographs were on the subscription-books, or what were supposed to be their autographs.

Q. What department of the Post-Office Department are you in now?—

A. I have a temporary appointment, and am detailed for duty in the office of superintendent of railway mails.

Q. Can you give us the amount collected there?—A. I cannot.

Q. Can you tell us what department you next went to?—A. I went to the Attorney-General's Office—Department of Justice.

Q. Is this the book you had with you (exhibiting a book)?—A. (Examining.) Yes, sir. Mr. Gorham asked me for it the other day, but I could not find it at the time, so I brought it to-day.

Q. Please give the terms of the subscription that you presented there, so that it may be taken down.—A.:

The undersigned agree to pay the several sums set opposite our respective names towards defraying the expenses of the Republican Congressional Committee.

May 15, 1878.

Q. Whose name heads the list in that department?—A. S. F. Phillips.

Q. What is his position in the department?—A. I believe he is Solicitor-General. But I did not receive his subscription; it was paid before I got the book, and several of them were paid before I had the book.

Q. What is the date of your authority from Mr. Gorham?—A. October 29.

Q. Please read it.—A.:

N. B. FUGITT, Esq.:

Please call on the gentlemen whose names appear on this and preceding page for their subscriptions.

Yours, truly,

GEO. C. GORHAM.

Q. Can you give us the amount you received in the Department of Justice?—A. No, sir; I have no memorandum of that. (Examining book.) I think \$115, but I am not sure.

Q. Did you collect all that is on the book?—A. No, sir.

Q. What department did you go to next?—A. I went to no more. That was the last.

Q. Did you not go to the Treasury Department at any time?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you go to the Government Printing-Office?—A. Yes, sir; but I did not collect anything there.

Q. Had you subscriptions there?—A. No, sir; I merely went to the Printing-Office to make an inquiry in regard to the list. I had no list in my possession at any time.

Q. Do you know of any money having been paid from there to the fund?—A. Not officially.

Q. Can you tell us the amount of money collected, as a whole, by you?—A. I cannot. I did not know that I should ever be investigated about, and did not trouble myself to remember it. I suppose, however, somewhere about five or six thousand dollars probably; I do not remember exactly; I would not like to swear to the exact sum.

Q. Was there any fixed amount, a *pro rata* upon the salaries of the people who were called upon, collected by you?—A. Of course not. I merely asked for what was on these books.

Q. Did you learn in the process of collection whether there was any fixed percentage?—A. I believe the idea was to ask for one per cent., if anything was asked for at all, or rather that they should contribute one per cent. if it was their pleasure to do so. The subscriptions were generally less than that, though.

Q. Was there any refusal in either of the departments that you called upon, of parties who had subscribed, to pay?—A. No, I do not remem-

ber any downright refusal. Some said that since they had subscribed they had had sickness. One fellow said he had had a roof put on his house, and he wished to withdraw, or some such remark as that. In such cases they were generally withdrawn.

Q. When were you connected with the "Republican" newspaper here?—A. I was on that paper when I joined Mr. Gorham's force. I still have an honorary connection with it.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. When you mention the amount of money you collected, you mean what you collected yourself, in person?—A. What came into my hands from these gentlemen. A great many of them came to me.

Q. You do not refer to any who came into the office while you were in the office?—A. Some money may have been paid into my hands in the office of the committee.

Q. You received some in the office as clerk?—A. I say this five or six thousand dollars includes all that came into my hands, whether it was handed to me in the various departments, or whether it was brought to me and paid to me at the office of the committee—everything. There was a large sum paid me by gentlemen whom I had never called upon.

Q. Who came in and volunteered?—A. It came in from different departments. Some of the gentlemen I never found at all; but they looked for me.

Q. You do not say what the amount was?—A. No, sir; but I suppose five or six thousand dollars. I am sorry that I did not trouble myself with the exact amount.

Q. It might have been more, I suppose; you do not say it was not more?—A. I do not think it was over \$6,000; but I am not sure.

Q. You have no memorandum of it?—A. Not of the entire amount; I do not think I could make it up.

Q. It all went to Mr. Gorham, whatever you collected?—A. Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Did you send out this circular No. 3 (exhibiting circular No. 3 produced by Mr. Gorham)?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is the circular telling parties to call on N. B. Fugitt?—A. I presume it is the same. It reads very much like the one I sent. It reads to the same effect.

Q. Do you know the date at which that circular was sent out?—A. I think the 1st of October.

Q. Was that after you had been around the departments?—A. Of course, for I commenced going the latter part of June.

Q. Then this was an effort to clean up the dregs?—A. I had my hands full, that was about the amount of it, if you will excuse that phrase; I could not get around to some of these gentlemen. Some of them would say, "It is not convenient for me to pay; I wish you would come the 1st of the month, or the middle of the month," and so on. They crowded me.

Q. Was not this an effort to force the collection of the subscriptions?—A. I am not competent to give it any such interpretation.

Q. Was it the last circular that was sent to those who had made their contributions?—A. I think so. I do not remember any after this.

Q. Were there any calls to pay you after that was sent out?—A. I received money as late as certainly a month after that; a month and a half, possibly.

Q. What number of those subscriptions which had been made upon these books was left unpaid when you closed?—A. I cannot tell you.

Q. Can you give us anything near the percentage of the amount?—

A. I cannot.

By Mr. TELLER :

Q. Whose composition was this circular No. 3?—A. I would not undertake to fix that upon anybody.

Q. You do not know?—A. On my oath I cannot say that I know.

Q. Did you write it?—A. I did not compose it.

By the CHAIRMAN :

Q. Were you at the headquarters daily from ten to six to receive and receipt for the moneys subscribed, according to this circular?—A. I was supposed to be there.

Q. Did you give receipts?—A. I did.

Q. Have you a form of the receipt you gave?—A. I have.

Q. Is it the same form that Mr. Baker had?—A. Yes, sir; I used the same book a great part of the time.

Q. By whom were these receipt-books prepared, by the committee?—

A. Of course, I did it as their employé.

Q. In sending out these circulars, numbers 1, 2, and 3, did you aid?—

A. I did in the first; I have never known them by numbers before.

Q. The circular of the 27th of May, 1878, you aided in sending out?—

A. I did. Circular number 2 I had nothing to do with.

Q. To whom was circular number 1, of May 27, 1878, sent?—A. It was sent to those who happened to be in Federal employ.

Q. Was it not the intention to send it to all in the country who were in Federal employ?—A. Not to all.

Q. To all except those who had salaries less than a thousand dollars?—A. There were certain exceptions made on account of their salaries. We did not send it to all because we presumed from the size of the salaries a great many of them got that it was not worth while; that they would not be able to pay anything.

Q. From what did you direct the circulars?—A. From the Blue Book.

Q. State now to whose names in the Blue Book you sent; was it to all whose salaries were over a thousand dollars?—A. We sent to all whose salaries were over a thousand dollars.

Q. To whom did you send the circular of the 1st October that you sent out yourself? To all who had not paid?—A. To all those who had not brought in their subscriptions, or had not paid them to me when I called.

Q. Did it include any to whom you had sent the first circular who had not responded?—A. The first circular was not used in this city to the best of my knowledge. I have no official knowledge of its use in this city. I only know as far as my experience was concerned.

Q. The circular of the 27th of May, 1878, was sent, then, to Federal employés outside of the District of Columbia?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Circular No. 3, of the 1st of October, sent by you, was sent to those who had made subscriptions within the District, and had failed to pay. That is the fact?—A. Yes, sir; I think that is the truth.

Q. Had you general charge of this collection business?—A. I was commissioned to do simply what I have stated, only as far as those departments were concerned.

Q. I only want to get, by that preliminary question, the fact as to what amount of the subscriptions made within the District were unpaid?—A. I cannot tell you that. It would take me a day or two, with access to the books, to find that out.

Q. Who made the collections in the Government Printing Office?—
A. I do not know, officially.

Q. Do you know at all?—A. No, sir; I do not. Excuse me for my emphasis. I think a man by the name of Cook made them. The money did not come into my hands at all, either directly or indirectly. I have never seen it either in making the deposit of it or in any way. I presume Mr. Cook went out there.

Q. Have you seen the subscription-book of the Government Printing Office?—A. Not to my recollection.

By Mr. CAMERON :

Q. What instructions, if any, did you receive from Mr. Gorham or from any member of the Republican Congressional Committee in reference to making collections from women employed in the departments at Washington?—A. I was told not to collect. I called on these ladies in the Dead Letter Office, not knowing they were ladies until I saw them, because there was no prefix indicating sex to their names. When they handed me the money I did not consider that I had any choice; in fact, I do not know that I hesitated at all; but when I reported to Mr. Gorham that I had received money from those ladies, he said that must be stopped, he did not expect ladies to contribute.

By the CHAIRMAN :

Q. You did not return the money?—A. I did not, but I was instructed to do it. That is the only crime I committed, I believe.

By Mr. TELLER :

Q. By whom were you instructed to return it?—A. By Mr. Gorham. It was in small sums and I confess I failed to do it.

By Mr. CAMERON :

Q. After that did you make any such collections?—A. After that ladies sent me subscriptions and I returned them. I had them sent back to me a second time and then I kept them. When they insisted upon it I retained them.

Q. About how many did you receive in that way, or what amount?—
A. I cannot tell you; not a great amount. I think you will find very few subscriptions, as far as my duties went, from ladies. I never asked any, never sent a circular to a lady that I knew was a lady.

By Mr. BAILEY :

Q. For what reason did you decline to give the ladies the opportunity and the privilege of subscribing to the fund?—A. Because Mr. Gorham told me they were not expected.

Q. Why were they not expected?—A. That is rather between you and him; I cannot answer that.

Q. I believe it was regarded as a privilege and a very high one to be permitted to subscribe to this fund?—A. There is a question of gallantry here.

Q. Was it discussed in the committee?—A. I was never present at any meeting of the committee. I do not know. I know Mr. Gorham said the ladies were not expected to subscribe, and that I should not ask any more of them for money. In fact he instructed me on that matter when I had made a mistake. I sent one or two circulars to ladies not knowing they were ladies; and he instructed me when the money was sent in, to return it, which I did, and it was sent back to me again.

Q. You denied to the ladies their rights?—A. I would not like to have that fixed on me right here.

RALPH J. SQUIRE sworn and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. What official position did you occupy last year?—Answer. Assistant messenger in the War Department.

Q. Did you deliver to the clerks in the War Department and those employed there any circulars last year?—A. A lot of circulars were thrown on the desk, and given to the messengers as they came along to take to the parties to whom they were addressed.

Q. Do you know what the contents of those circulars were?—A. Only by the one I got myself.

Q. Is this the one? [Exhibiting circular No. 1 to the witness.]—A. [Examining.] That is it.

Q. This is the circular of May 27, 1878, which we have called circular No. 1, signed by George C. Gorham; were copies of it left there for all the clerks of the department?—A. They were left there. They came through the mail by the mail messenger for the War Department and the mail messenger for the Adjutant-General's Office. They did not know where to send them, and so they came and threw them on our tables to be delivered to the messengers of the different branches as they came along.

Q. To whom were they directed, generally?—A. Principally to the clerks and messengers.

Q. Was there one directed to yourself?—A. It was directed to me.

Q. This is the envelope? [Producing an envelope.]—A. It is.

Q. Directed to you?—A. Directed "R. J. Squire, War Department, City."

Q. How long have you been employed in the War Department?—A. Since 1866.

Q. What is the amount of your salary?—A. At one time I was in the general service.

Q. Last year?—A. Sixty dollars a month; \$720 a year.

Q. How much were you asked to pay by this circular sent to you?—A. At that time when they came I was getting \$70 a month, \$840 a year, but was very soon cut down afterward.

Q. How much were you required to pay by this circular?—A. Eight dollars and forty cents.

Q. Did you pay it?—A. I did not.

Q. Did you sign any paper for it?—A. I did not.

Q. How long after this was served on you was it that your salary was reduced?—A. Not a great while. I do not recollect exactly the time I received this; but it was reduced the first of July.

Q. What are you receiving now?—A. I am receiving the same pay; \$720 a year.

Q. Sixty dollars a month?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you see circulars of this description in the hands of other messengers and doorkeepers about the War Department?—A. The same description.

Q. How many of those did you see?—A. I cannot tell you; lots of them; I did not count them.

Q. Were they or were they not in the hands of men whose salaries were less than a thousand dollars?—A. Certainly; mine was less.

Q. Do you know of any others of them that were in the hands of men whose salaries were less than a thousand dollars?—A. Most all the laborers and messengers got them, and assistant messengers; and their salaries were all less than a thousand dollars.

Q. Do you know whether they were paid?—A. I do not know of the men that paid. I cannot tell you.

Q. What official position did you occupy previous to last year in the War Department?—A. Messenger.

Q. Where do you live?—A. Seven hundred and twelve, Twenty-second street, northwest.

Q. Did you aid in collecting any money in the War Department?—A. I did not.

By Mr. GARLAND:

Q. When did you first get the information that your salary was reduced?—A. It was reduced the first of July.

By Mr. KIRKWOOD:

Q. At the commencement of the new fiscal year?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. GARLAND:

Q. How did you get the information first; by what sort of an order or notice did you get the information that your salary was reduced?—A. I saw it in the Congressional reports, the proceedings of Congress.

Q. That was the first information you had of it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When did you first draw your reduced pay of \$60 a month instead of \$70?—A. I think the 31st of July.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. You first saw it in the Congressional Record?—A. I saw it in the proceedings of Congress.

Q. Your salary was then reduced by the action of Congress?—A. By the action of Congress.

Q. All the messengers were reduced in the same way, I suppose?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And other employes in the War Department by the same method, by an act of Congress?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was your pay in September, 1877?—A. I forget exactly. I was in the general service, and was taken out of the general service and put into the civil service.

Q. When were you changed from the general service to the civil service?—A. I forget the date. It was the end of the fiscal year. Whether it was 1876 or 1877 I cannot tell you.

Q. What was your salary when in the general service?—A. The salary was about \$80 a month, counting everything.

Q. What is the general service?—A. In the general service they get—the commissary—they get a dollar a day compensation as messengers—

Q. You were then substantially in the Army?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now you are not in the Army?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. KIRKWOOD:

Q. Did your salary not then substantially amount to a thousand dollars a year?—A. The pay of most of the general service men amounts to about a thousand dollars a year.

Q. Did you get a thousand dollars a year before you were transferred to the civil service?—A. I think it amounted to about that.

Q. That was in 1877?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is not that the last Blue Book that is out?—A. I have not seen the Blue Book. I cannot tell you.

By Mr. TELLER :

Q. What is the highest salary you got in the civil service?—A. \$840.

Q. You got that until it was cut down by an act of Congress?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say you do not know that any man paid anything in the War Department?—A. I do not know of a person. If they paid it is unknown to me.

Q. You did not pay yourself?—A. No, sir.

Q. You are still in the service?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BAILEY :

Q. Did any of the messengers pay?—A. I do not know.

Q. You were asked if your salary had not been about a thousand dollars. I will ask you if this assessment, \$8.40, made upon you, or this request for \$8.40, is not exactly 1 per cent. upon the salary that you had been receiving?—A. It is 1 per cent. of the salary I was getting.

Q. Do you know in whose handwriting that envelope is addressed?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. CAMERON :

Q. Were these circulars sent to the employés in the War Department by mail?—A. Yes, sir; they came through the mail. Some came in the War Department mail and some in the Adjutant-General's mail, by the two mail messengers, and they did not know where to leave them, and came and threw them on our desk, and we gave them to the messengers of the proper rooms where they were to go.

Q. Is that the usual way of distributing mail-matter?—A. Yes, sir; it is an every-day affair with more or less mail-matter that comes there.

By the CHAIRMAN :

Q. Do you know M. F. Daly in the Surgeon-General's Office?—A. Yes, sir; I have seen him. I am not much acquainted with him.

Q. Do you know anything about what his pay is?—A. I do not.

By Mr. TELLER :

Q. What did you do with that circular when you got it?—A. I read it and kept it safe.

Q. Did you show it to anybody at the time?—A. There were plenty of them flying around.

Q. Did you show it to any of the heads of the department, or make any complaint about it?—A. No complaint.

Q. When did you first show the circular?—A. When it came to me through the mail.

Q. Then you laid it away?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When did you show it again after that?—A. I do not think I have shown it for some time.

Q. Did you show it to Mr. Wallace?—A. A couple of days ago.

The CHAIRMAN. You never showed it to me?—A. No.

Q. [By Mr. TELLER.] To whom did you show it a couple of days ago?—A. I think I showed it to my partner, a man named Conlan. He is assistant messenger there in the hall with me, but he was sick. He was subpoenaed, I believe.

Q. So you showed him yours?—A. Yes, sir; I showed him mine, but he did not know what he had done with his.

Q. Whom did you notify that you had got one of them—Mr. Wallace?—A. I do not know that I notified anybody but this gentleman over here [pointing to Mr. Flanagan, clerk of the committee].

Q. The clerk of the committee?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you come down here and tell him that you had it?—A. I showed it to him.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Where? Here?—A. Since I came into the room.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. Before you were subpoenaed?—A. I guess that was the first he saw of it.

Q. To whom did you show it before you were subpoenaed to come here?—A. To no one.

Q. How did they know you had it?—A. Almost all the employés got them.

Q. You had not paid anything on it?—A. No, sir.

Q. Had not been injured by it?—A. No, sir.

Q. Had not been discharged from the service?—A. No, sir.

Q. You knew the reduction of your pay did not have anything to do with your failure to pay?—A. Well, I had my own reasons for not paying.

Q. I did not ask that. You knew that your reduction of pay had nothing to do with your failure to pay this money; did you not know that?—A. I was not obliged to pay it.

Q. But the reduction of your salary you know had nothing to do with this? Answer the question.

Mr. KIRKWOOD. Let me put it thus: Do you not know that your salary was not cut down because you refused to pay anything to this committee?—A. The act of Congress cut it down. Whatever they choose to give, we have to abide by of course.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. Why did you save this circular particularly?—A. I kept it to look at when I wanted to.

Q. What is your political party?—A. I have not much politics at all.

Q. What ticket do you vote when you vote?—A. I generally vote for the man that I think is the best.

Q. Do you not vote the Democratic ticket?—A. I do not vote very often.

Q. Do you not claim to be a Democrat?—A. No, sir; I do not.

Q. You have voted the Democratic ticket, though, have you not?—

A. I never voted more than three or four times in my life.

Q. What was your vote then?—A. I voted the straight Republican ticket.

Q. When was that?—A. The time they gave the franchise here in the District.

Q. Do you call yourself a Republican now?—A. I do.

Q. But you did not have interest enough to pay this \$8.40?—A. No; I was not Republican enough to pay that.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How long have you resided in the District?—A. Since 1866.

Q. Where did you come from?—A. From the Army.

Q. How long were you in the service?—A. I first entered the service in 1837, Second Regiment United States Dragoons; went to Florida. I went into the Third Artillery in the Mexican war, and into the Eighth Infantry on the frontier afterwards.

Q. Where were you during the war of the rebellion?—A. The first

part of it I had the good fortune to be turned over by General Twiggs to the rebels in Texas. I was two years a prisoner.

Q. After that where did you get?—A. I came to New York and then here to Washington, and when I got well enough Hancock's corps was coming up and I went into that.

Q. What regiment then?—A. The First Regiment.

Q. Of the Regular Army?—A. No; United States Veteran Volunteers.

Q. Then you were in the Federal Army, or were in prison as a Federal soldier, from 1837 to 1865?—A. Not continuously.

Q. But you were in the Army?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When were you discharged from the Army?—A. I was discharged in February, 1866, from the Veteran Volunteers. Then I came to Washington and re-enlisted in a few days in the general service.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. And staid there until 1877?—A. Yes, sir; about then. I was then transferred.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. By whose order were you transferred?—A. By General Belknap, from the general service to the civil service. I forget the date.

Q. And you have remained there since?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. KIRKWOOD:

Q. And are there yet?—A. Yes, sir.

F. A. G. HANDY sworn and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Were you in Federal employ in 1878?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. Where?—A. Richmond, Va.

Q. In what department?—A. In the post-office.

Q. When were you appointed?—A. I think it was July, 1877.

Q. Did you get a copy of this circular, No. 1, of May 27, 1878?—A. (Examining.) I got a circular, but I do not remember whether this was it or not.

Q. Was it a circular signed by George C. Gorham?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was it a printed circular?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. About what time did you receive it?—A. It was some time, I think, in the spring of 1878.

Q. How much did he desire you to pay?—A. It was about \$18, I think.

Q. What was your salary as clerk in the post-office?—A. Part of the time it was \$150 a month and part of the time \$125.

Q. Did you pay the amount called for?—A. No, sir.

Q. How long did you remain in office after you got the circular?—A. I cannot say positively in regard to that. I do not remember exactly when I received the circular.

Q. When were you discharged?—A. I was discharged about the 1st of May, 1878, I think.

Q. Can you fix these dates? Look at the circular and see its date. It is dated the 27th of May.—A. I cannot be positive about dates.

Q. Do you know if the circular, of which you obtained a copy, asking you to contribute \$18, was sent to other clerks in the Richmond post-

office?—A. Yes, sir; two or three told me they had them, and I think they showed them to me.

Q. Did they or did they not comply with the request, as far as you know?—A. I do not know. There was one lady who told me she received one. There were two ladies in there. One mentioned to me that she received a circular, and she has since told me she did not comply.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. She did not pay, as I understand?—A. No, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Can you fix the time how long after you received the circular it was until your discharge—the length of time that elapsed?—A. I cannot. It made rather an impression on my mind. I inquired why I was discharged, and was informed that it was necessary to reduce expenses, to bring the expenditures of the office within the appropriation before the end of the fiscal year. Mr. Key afterward asked me how it was that I was discharged, and I told him that that was my information, and he said he had inquired into the matter and he understood that was the cause. There was no charge against me of any kind.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. He understood it was to reduce the expenses of the office?—A. That it was necessary to bring the expenses of the office within the appropriation for the fiscal year.

Q. The Postmaster-General told you that?—A. He told me had been so informed by the postmaster.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Was your place filled?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. A clerk appointed how soon after your dismissal?—A. I cannot say positively, but I think it was within a month afterwards. I was not there, but I was informed that that was about the time he was appointed.

Q. How long notice had you of your dismissal?—A. About ten days.

Q. Another clerk got your place. What is your judgment of the reason for your dismissal?—A. I was inclined to think that it was, in the first place, because I was a Democrat, though that fact was known when I was appointed and the place was offered me. In the next place, I supposed that my failure to contribute to this fund had something to do with it. These were conjectures on my part. I have stated what the postmaster told me was the reason.

By Mr. HOAR:

Q. Are you stating your present opinion, or stating conjectures on your part?—A. I asked the reason, and it was given me, as I have stated, by the postmaster. It afterwards occurred to me that my failure to contribute in response to this circular had something to do with it. I never made any inquiries of the postmaster in regard to that, because I thought it was unnecessary and useless; but I subsequently saw the Postmaster-General in my business capacity since then, and this subject was mentioned by me, and I told him the reason that had been assigned, and he said that the postmaster had told him that that was the cause of my discharge—the necessity of bringing the expenses within the appropriation before the end of the fiscal year, and that there were no charges against me of any kind. I did not mention to him this circular at all, for I supposed he knew all about it.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. At that time did the Postmaster-General tell you that instructions had been sent to the postmaster at Richmond to reduce his expenses within the appropriation?—A. I do not remember whether the Postmaster-General told me that or not, but the postmaster told me so.

Q. I understand that, but I want to know what the Postmaster-General said. Did the Postmaster-General say anything in the conversation with you as to instructions to the postmaster at Richmond to reduce expenses?—A. I think he did, but I will not say positively that he did.

Q. Who was it that took your place as clerk after your dismissal?—A. I cannot tell you.

Q. Was the total number of clerks two months after your dismissal as great as it was before your dismissal?—A. I think it was. I am not in a position to say positively, because I do not know definitely the arrangements of the office.

Q. Do you remember the amount that was named in the circular sent to the lady in the post-office at Richmond?—A. I think she showed me the circular; I am not positive; but I do not know the amount. I think her salary was about \$800; I should suppose so.

Q. When the circular, of which this is a copy, came to you, what was your opinion of it; that it was a contribution or an assessment that was asked?

Mr. TELLER. That certainly is not a proper question.

The CHAIRMAN. It is entirely competent and I press the question.

Mr. CAMERON. We object to it.

Mr. BAILEY. I am hardly inclined to think that in a court of law this would be proper testimony, but in view of the past history of this committee and the fact that that sort of license was constantly indulged in when the other side had the majority, and indulged in every hour of our examination at New Orleans, I do think this testimony should be received.

Mr. TELLER. In other words, because we pursued an improper course when we were in the majority, it is now proposed by the present majority to continue the same improper conduct.

Mr. BAILEY. Not at all. I do not mean that.

The CHAIRMAN. I put it upon broader ground.

Mr. BAILEY. I mean simply this: That objection was made; the question was discussed; something was said as to whether we should throw open the whole case and admit testimony in the broadest manner, and it was insisted on and we yielded. We did not object very seriously to it, because we wanted a full investigation; we wanted all the facts; and constantly opinions and rumors and conjectures were received—received every hour during our examination, and with the consent of the committee and with the understanding that the purpose was to reach the truth and to reach the impression that had been made on the witnesses rather than to confine it to what in a court of law would be regarded as legitimate testimony.

Mr. CAMERON. There may have been such a discussion in the committee at New Orleans; but I must say I was not present when any such discussion took place, and I think I was present during the whole time except one half day, and that was near the close of the examination.

Mr. TELLER. Let us go on.

The CHAIRMAN. I put it on the ground that this man was in Federal employ, that he was called upon for an amount equal to one per cent. of his salary, that he was the man most concerned, and I believe it is com-

petent to ask him the question what his impression was, from his position there as in Federal employ, from the circular itself, whether it was a demand from him or a request for a voluntary contribution.

[The committee overruled the objection and allowed the question to be put.]

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Please state, Mr. Handy, what your view of this circular was when it came to you. Did you regard it as a request for a voluntary contribution or consider it as a demand made upon you for that amount of your salary because you were in Federal employ?—A. I supposed that I was expected to contribute that amount to the advantage of the party that gave me employment.

By Mr. KIRKWOOD:

Q. And you were not willing to do it?—A. I do not think I would have done it. I did not do it.

Q. Look at the circular and tell me the date of it.—A. 27th of May, 1878.

Q. If you received that paper after its date, you were mistaken in supposing that you left the office about the 1st of May?—A. About the 1st of May, 1878, I was discharged. I do not remember the date that I received the circular. I only remember to have received it somewhere about that time, as I supposed.

Q. That is a mere matter of recollection with you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When do you think the person who took your place was appointed?—A. That is a matter of conjecture with me. I think it was about a month afterward.

Q. Do you know whether or not he was appointed before the close of the fiscal year?—A. I think he was.

Q. Do you know?—A. No, sir; I do not.

Q. If you did not receive this circular until June you must be mistaken about the time when you yourself were turned out of office.—A. No, sir; I think I am correct about the time I was removed. I may be mistaken about the time I received the circular.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. Give us the time you went out.—A. The 1st of May, 1878, I think, was the time.

By Mr. KIRKWOOD:

Q. You think there was a lady in the office who also refused to contribute?—A. So she told me.

Q. She was not turned out?—A. No, sir; she is there yet, I think.

Q. How soon after you received this notice were you turned out?—A. I do not know that. I was given ten days' notice that I should be removed.

Q. How soon was that after you received this circular?—A. I do not know because I cannot fix the date I received the circular.

Q. Did you communicate to your chief there, the person who employed you, your intention not to contribute anything to this fund?—A. No, sir; I do not think I mentioned it to him at all that I had received this circular.

Q. Did you communicate to any one your intention not to contribute?—A. I do not think I did.

Q. You made no reply?—A. I did prepare a letter, but I did not send it.

Q. You did not make any reply then to the circular?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. TELLER :

Q. You say ten days before you were discharged you received notice that you would be discharged ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You must have received that then about the 20th of April ?—A. I suppose so.

Q. The reason you have mentioned was then given. Now, if none of these circulars were issued until after the date they bear, 27th of May, 1878, do you swear that you received it while in office ?—A. I give that as my impression, that is all.

Q. What do you say about it now ; were you or were you not in office when you received this circular ?—A. As I have said, I think I was in office. My impression is that I received this some time before I was discharged.

By Mr. KIRKWOOD :

Q. And before its date ?—A. It must have been before its date, because I was discharged about the 1st of May.

Mr. KIRKWOOD. Unless you are mistaken.

By Mr. TELLER :

Q. Suppose none were sent out until after the 1st day of May, then what will you say about it ? Suppose the circular was not in existence on the 20th of May, then you will admit you were mistaken, will you not ?—A. I must have been then, of course.

By the CHAIRMAN :

Q. As to the date ?—A. As to the date.

By Mr. TELLER :

Q. You were mistaken as to the fact that you received it while you were in office if that is so ?—A. If there was no circular in existence, of course I could not have received it.

Q. Do you not know as a matter of fact that you were out of office before you received this circular ?—A. Certainly I do not know it as a matter of fact, else I would say positively when I received it.

Q. Do you know as matter of fact that you were in office when you received it ?—A. I think I was.

Q. Will you say positively that you were ?—A. I cannot say absolutely ; but to the best of my knowledge and belief I was still in the office.

Q. There can be no mistake but what you went out of office on the 1st day of May ; that you ought to know, and, I suppose, do ?—A. I am pretty sure that is the date.

Q. To whom did you show this circular when you received it ? Did you ever show it to the postmaster ?—A. No, sir ; I do not think I did.

Q. Did you show it to anybody ?—A. I do not think I showed it to anybody.

Q. How long did you have this circular in your possession before you showed it to anybody ?—A. I do not remember to have shown it to any one except my brother.

Q. About when did you show it to him ?—A. Some time during the summer, after I was out of office.

Q. Did you tell anybody you had received such a circular, at the time you received it ?—A. I do not think I did.

Q. How long after you got it before you told anybody that you had received the circular ?—A. Some time during the summer, as I say.

Q. Then, if the postmaster had any notice that you had failed to re-

spond, he did not get it from you?—A. No, sir; he did not. I do not think I ever said anything to him about it.

Q. How long had you been in the office?—A. I think I was there about ten months.

Q. You are still of the opinion that you were discharged because you failed to pay this money?—A. Well, I think that had some influence in the matter.

Q. Now, suppose you did not receive this circular until after you were out of office, then what?—A. I think I did receive the circular while in office.

Q. But suppose you did not?—A. Then of course my supposition fails.

Q. Are your conjectures very valuable unless you can determine when you did receive the circular?—A. That is for you to judge. It did not make any very great impression on my mind, and therefore I did not fix the dates. I was not particular about it.

Q. You prepared a letter to send to the committee, saying you would not pay?—A. I intended to give Mr. Gorham my reasons.

Q. I understand you to say that at the time you were discharged you did not think that that was the cause?—A. When I received that circular it occurred to me that if I did not pay this money it would be equivalent to giving up my place.

Q. But when you were discharged you say you did not think it was for that cause at that time?—A. I put it in my pocket, and did not bother any more about it.

Q. You do not know whether the aggregate number of clerks was increased or decreased then?—A. I think the number of clerks is about the same.

Q. About the same, or the same—which?—A. I think it is fully the same. I have been informed that there are more now, but I do not know that. I think the clerks by the end of the fiscal year were about the same, if not more, than they were before, but I am inclined to think that the aggregate expenses were not any more.

Q. How many clerks were in that office?—A. I do not remember.

Q. Who was the postmaster then?—A. Mr. Forbes.

Q. Is he still postmaster?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. HOAR:

Q. Is this postmaster a gentleman with whom you are on friendly or unfriendly terms?—A. Friendly terms.

Q. The relations on both sides are relations of mutual respect, so far as you know?—A. Yes, sir; as far as I know.

Q. And you believe him to be a man of character and truth?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He told you that the reason was the one which he assigned?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the name of the lady who you state was asked to contribute?—A. Meara.

Q. What was her first name?—A. I do not remember.

Q. Do you know whether her name was put down in the list of the clerks in the office by her initial or by her full name?—A. I think it is written with her initial. She is a married lady, but I think her name is put down with her initial. She was probably mistaken for a man.

Q. You think that was the way she got the notice?—A. Yes.

Q. Were you a Union man during the war, or opposed to the Union?—A. I was in the Confederate army for four years.

Q. You answered the Chairman's question whether you were in Federal employ. The word "Federal" is a word commonly used to describe the national government by persons who were in the Confederate army, is it not?—A. I do not know about that. I understood him very well. He was not on that side.

By Mr. CAMERON:

Q. Where do you now reside?—A. I reside here.

Q. How long have you resided here?—A. I came here when Congress convened.

Q. What is your occupation here?—A. Correspondent.

Q. For what paper?—A. For the Richmond States, the Norfolk Virginian, and the Philadelphia North American—one Republican and two Democratic newspapers.

By Mr. KIRKWOOD:

Q. Can you give the number of employés in the post-office at Richmond?—A. I should suppose there are thirty.

Q. And a number of them, like yourself, were Democrats?—A. There were two, I think, besides myself.

Q. Had they, like yourself, been in the Confederate army, any of them?—A. I think those two were.

Q. Are they still retained, do you know?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is the postmaster himself a Republican?—A. Yes, sir.

WASHINGTON, *April 4, 1879.*

GEORGE C. GORHAM recalled.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Question. I wish to ascertain the amount that was received by you from the Interior Department in response to the circulars issued?—A. I ran my books over last night, and while I may not be exact the figures will not vary materially from this: that the total number of employés in the Interior Department to whom circulars were mailed was 732. That does not include the Printing department, which is under the Interior, nor the Capitol extension, and one or two charitable institutions, asylums, &c.

Q. But the Interior Department proper?—A. Yes, sir; and the Pension Office, 732 persons. Two hundred and seventy-two of them made contributions amounting in the aggregate to \$3,247, as I figure it. Twenty-five circulars were returned not delivered, and 435 were not responded to.

By Mr. CAMERON:

Q. Will you please give the date of the issuance of the circular which we call circular No. 1?—A. I find that it was not issued until the 27th of May; that it was not submitted to the committee by me in any form until the 10th of May; it was not agreed on by the committee until the 14th of May, and some time before the 27th it was printed; but it was not sent out until the 27th of May. My books show the employment of the persons who sent it, and that guides me. The 27th was the date.

Q. You stated it to be your recollection at that time that the understanding of yourself and the finance committee of the Republican Congressional Committee was that no circulars should be sent to employés

of the government whose salaries were less than \$1,000. What is the fact?

Mr. McDONALD. Except postmasters.

Mr. CAMERON. There were some exceptions.

The WITNESS. Since I last testified I have looked over the books for the first time in which are recorded the circulars that were sent, and I find my memory was at fault about that. I had not looked at them before. I am still confident that we had determined upon \$1,200 at first, according to the Treasury collector's statement, and then a thousand dollars; but it was all left to me. There was no authority exercised about the matter by the committee. I stated the other day in my testimony that we sent to all who received a thousand dollars and upwards, and postmasters without regard to salary. I now find upon an examination of my books that we sent to persons receiving less than a thousand dollars. The former statement was a mistake on my part, which I desire to correct.

By Mr. McDONALD :

Q. Of course you cannot know very accurately all these things?—A. I attempted to state the fact of course as it was, but having examined my record and finding the statement to be a mistake, I wish to correct it. I find where we sent circulars to persons receiving as small a salary as \$720, and it is possible I could have found where circulars were sent to those receiving less; but I do not think so. There is no point about this, but I would rather have the fact placed on the record that we sent the circulars as I have now stated.

By Mr. CAMERON :

Q. Do you desire to make any further statement?—A. Nothing.

JOHN G. THOMPSON sworn and examined.

By Mr. CAMERON :

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. My home is at Columbus, Ohio.

Q. What official connection, if any, do you now have with the House of Representatives?—A. I am Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives.

Q. How long have you held that office?—A. Going on four years.

Q. What official connection, if any, did you have with the Democratic Congressional Committee during the political campaign of 1878?—A. I was made a member of what was called the resident committee.

Q. Of what committee?—A. As I understand, of the resident committee. The Congressional committee was appointed, and then they named three persons from the District of Columbia, and I was one of those three persons.

Mr. McDONALD. The witness was not a member of the Congressional committee proper, but they were authorized to select three additional members to represent this District, and he was named as one of those three members as from the District. I was a member of the original committee myself and know the fact.

Q. (By Mr. CAMERON.) The facts are as Senator McDonald states them?—A. Yes, sir. First there was the Congressional committee, and

then they organized by appointing three persons from the District of Columbia who should act with the committee.

Q. What official connection, if any, did you have with the Democratic party of Ohio during that time?—A. I was chairman of the Democratic committee of Ohio.

Q. Are you still chairman of that committee?—A. Yes, sir,

Q. How long have you occupied that position?—A. I do not know, sir; I have been chairman ever since 1863, I think, with the exception of two years.

Q. Where was the headquarters, so called, of the Democratic Congressional Committee?—A. At the Riggs House, as I understood it.

Q. Where did they do their business, receive and fold their documents, and distribute them around?—A. I think at the Riggs House, as far as I know. I was not here very much of the time. I found they had rooms at the Riggs House.

Mr. McDONALD. I think Colonel Thompson did not meet with us at more than one meeting after the organization; and in regard to that point our secretary, General Walker, myself, and half a dozen others can give better information. Colonel Thompson was not here after probably the first or second meeting.

The WITNESS. The first meeting, I think. I was here off and on during the campaign and I found the secretary at the Riggs House when I came.

By Mr. CAMERON:

Q. Do you know whether or not they occupied a room at the Capitol?—A. I do not know.

Q. State who the secretary of the committee was?—A. General Duncan S. Walker.

Q. Can you state when he was appointed?—A. I cannot tell—some-time during the summer.

Q. Did Mr. Harvey occupy that position prior to the appointment of Mr. Walker?—A. My recollection is that Mr. Harvey was treasurer of the committee.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. Treasurer of the national committee?—A. Of the Congressional campaign committee.

By Mr. CAMERON:

Q. Do you know whether any money was collected for political purposes during the campaign of 1878 from any of the employés of the House of Representatives?—A. I do not know of my own knowledge.

Q. Have you any information derived from any of the officers of the Democratic Congressional committee or any member of that committee as to whether money was collected from any of the employés of the House of Representatives?—A. I have no knowledge of the fact.

Q. I asked you if you had any information?—A. I have no information that any money from the employés of the House was collected.

Q. What was the understanding of the committee in reference to soliciting or receiving moneys or subscriptions from any of the employés of the House?—A. I do not remember of ever hearing anything said about collecting any money or trying to obtain any money from the employés.

Q. Where were the documents that were sent out by the committee folded, so far as you know?—A. I do not know, sir.

Q. Do you know whether or not any of the employés of the House

were employed in folding those documents?—A. That I am not able to say. I do not know anything about how the work was done or who did it. I have no personal knowledge on the subject.

Q. Have any of the officers or members of the Democratic committee informed you whether or not any of the employés of the House were employed in folding or directing documents sent out by the committee or by its order?—A. I do not remember that any one has given me such information.

Q. Do you know whether any of the government material was used in folding the documents which were sent out by the committee?—A. I do not know.

Q. What were your duties generally in connection with the committee?—A. I never could tell. I was put on, although I said I could not be here and asked to be relieved.

Q. Did any officer or member of the committee apply to you for leave to use a room in the House wing of the Capitol or for leave to employ any of the employés of the House?—A. No, sir. I have not charge of the rooms there.

Q. During what portion of the summer were you at Washington?—A. Very little after the adjournment of Congress, which, I think, took place in June.

Q. That was in June. Did you remain here until the adjournment of Congress?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you go to Ohio for political purposes prior to the adjournment of Congress?—A. I do not now remember. I think our convention was after the 20th of June, after the adjournment of Congress a short time, perhaps about a week afterwards. That is my recollection. I was out there at the convention.

Q. Do you remember whether or not you went before the adjournment?—A. I do not; I think not on any political mission; I may have gone only to see my family.

Q. After the adjournment of Congress and until the reassembling of Congress, where were you generally?—A. Generally in Ohio. I went out to California after the election.

Q. What were your duties, if any, in connection with the Democratic party of Ohio during the summer?—A. I was organizing the party to defeat the Republicans if I could.

Q. Did you or did you not devote most of your time during the summer to the organization of the party?—A. Yes; being chairman of the committee, I gave it my personal attention.

Q. You at the same time were Sergeant-at-Arms of the House?—A. Yes, sir; I will say in that connection that I came on to Washington the first of the month. The payments are made to the members on the first of the month and I came on here. While my office was open here all the time by my bookkeeper and cashier, I came on here to see that the payments were all made properly and that everything was in order.

Q. Was there any deduction made from your salary when you were absent from the Capitol on account of the attention you gave to the conduct of the Democratic campaign in Ohio?—A. No, sir; there was not.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Q. You say the payments through your office are made once a month; that is, there are monthly settlements?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You were here to see to them, and all the time your office was open and there was no neglect of the public duties of the office?—A. No, sir; there was none.

DUNCAN S. WALKER sworn and examined.

By Mr. CAMERON:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. In this city, sir.

Q. What official connection, if any, did you have with the Democratic Congressional Committee during the year 1878?—A. I was secretary of it.

Q. State as near as you can the time of your appointment.—A. I think it was in May, 1878.

Q. State generally what your duties were as secretary of that committee.—A. I was the executive officer of the committee.

Q. Up to what time did you hold the office?—A. I held it up to the time that the committee became *functus officio*.

Q. Where were the headquarters of the committee during the time you held the office of secretary?—A. They were during a portion of the time at the Riggs House in this city, and subsequently, for a period, in the other side of the Capitol.

Q. In a room of the Capitol?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What room was occupied by the committee?—A. The committee occupied the Agricultural Committee room of the House.

Q. When did the committee first occupy that room?—A. I think in August.

Q. And they continued to occupy it until after the election?—A. Yes, sir; until a few days before the election.

Q. Who was the chairman of the committee?—A. Mr. Joseph C. S. Blackburn, of Kentucky.

Q. Who was the treasurer?—A. Mr. James E. Harvey, of the District of Columbia.

Q. Do you remember when Mr. Harvey was appointed? And if you do, state when and how long he occupied the office.—A. He was appointed at the same time that I was, and held the office for the same period.

Q. Was any money collected by the committee for campaign purposes?—A. There was, sir.

Q. State as near as you can the amount collected.—A. [Producing a paper.] I have here the treasurer's report, which is correct in every particular. The amount of money collected was \$4,695.06.

Q. What system, if any, was agreed upon by the committee for the collection of money?—A. There was no system agreed upon by the committee.

Q. What system, if any, was adopted, or what plan was adopted by yourself?—A. The plan adopted by the different members of the committee was to get such subscription as they could from individuals, and also to furnish the documents at cost, where the individuals and committees desiring them could pay for them.

By Mr. KERNAN:

Q. You furnished them at cost to those who wanted them and would pay for them?—A. Yes; and where they could not pay for them we furnished them without any charge. So that this fund was collected by voluntary subscriptions and from the sale of documents.

By Mr. CAMERON:

Q. Was any money collected from members of Congress?—A. Yes, sir; there were some subscriptions from members of Congress, and some of them paid money for documents.

Q. What amount generally was subscribed by members of the Senate and House?—A. All the way from two dollars and a half to \$100. There

was one subscription of \$100, and some of two dollars and a half, of \$10, of \$25, and \$50.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. Do you mean that two dollars and a half was the amount received from some members of Congress?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. CAMERON:

Q. What was the gross amount collected from members of Congress, as near as you can state it?—A. I cannot state it. I can give you the exact statement, or the treasurer can furnish it to you. I have it here by items in his very carefully-prepared account. I would have to add it up.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Harvey is here, and can give that information.

Mr. CAMERON. We do not want the names of the members of Congress who subscribed.

The WITNESS. We have the items here in detail. The amount furnished by members of Congress was \$2,689.75. I will state that these contributions were made by members in the expectation that they would receive documents for it.

Q. (By Mr. CAMERON.) Was any money collected from any of the employés in the departments of the government in Washington?—A. No, sir; we did not send them any circulars nor collect a dollar from them.

Q. Did any of the employés pay any money to you?—A. Not a single one, that I know of.

Q. Was any money collected by the committee from any of the employés of the House of Representatives?—A. There was one gentleman who was a member of the committee who subscribed and paid fifty dollars. There was no request made to any employé of the House for any subscription nor was any money received from any employé of the House, except the one I mentioned. He made a voluntary subscription of \$50. He was a member of the committee.

By Mr. KERNAN:

Q. And an officer of the House?—A. And an officer of the House.

By Mr. CAMERON:

Q. State generally how this magnificent sum that you collected was disbursed.—A. By whom it was disbursed?

Q. No, I do not ask you to state by whom it was disbursed, but state generally how it was paid out.—A. We spent it in printing and distributing documents, and also in collecting political information upon all sorts of subjects, which was applied for by candidates, or by State committees or by county committees.

Q. Please state approximately what number of documents were sent out.—A. I can get you the exact number.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. [Presenting a paper.] You can get the number here in this paper which was prepared by yourself.—A. [Examining paper.] The number was 1,031,700. About 500,000 documents were sent by express, besides the delivery to persons.

By Mr. CAMERON:

Q. Where were those documents folded, so far as they were folded at all?—A. They were nearly all of them folded by persons employed by me, and the place of the folding was in the rooms of the Committee on

Post-Offices and Post-Roads and of the Committee on Printing of the House.

Q. Were those two rooms occupied during a portion of the time for the purpose of folding such documents?—A. They were so occupied whilst we were distributing documents. I adopted the custom which had prevailed in the Capitol for years under previous administrations of the House in relation to that matter.

Q. Were any of the employes of the House of Representatives employed in folding those documents?—A. There were some who worked for the committee out of office-hours voluntarily, and some who had leave of absence and worked for the committee. There were a few right-eous men there who helped us.

Q. State as near as you can how many employes and what positions they held in the House helped you, if you are able to state that. I do not ask you for their names.—A. I can furnish you with a complete list, if you so desire, of every employe of the committee, or I can give you now a list from memory, if you desire.

Q. Perhaps the latter will be all we want.—A. Shall I make the statement now?

Q. You can make the statement now.—A. There was one one-armed soldier on the soldiers' roll who helped me; another, one-legged soldier on the soldiers' roll; another gentleman on the soldiers' roll—yes, two more on the soldiers' roll, making four who were on the soldiers' roll—no, there were five of them who helped me.

Q. That was the soldiers' roll under Thompson, not under Field?—A. It was the soldiers' roll under Field. Then I think there were two policemen, Capitol watchmen, who helped me when they were off duty. They had certain tours of duty, and when they were off duty they helped me. Those were under the employ of Captain Blackford, the chief of police here. There were a number of others who came in at odd hours and who would work an hour and sometimes two hours, and there was one gentleman who had a leave of absence, who was in the employ of the clerk, and who worked for me.

Q. That leave of absence, as you understood, was from the clerk?—A. I do not know; I presume he got it from the clerk. I know that he had leave of absence to go home, and instead of going home, he worked for me.

Q. What length of time did that gentleman work for you?—A. A month, I think.

Q. What length of time did the others whom you have named work for you?—A. It would be difficult to state. They did not work steadily; they worked when they were off duty and at odd hours. They had their regular duties to perform and worked for me when they were not employed in those duties. The principal part of my force, however, was employed by me—three-fourths of it; yes, four-fifths of it. A great many worked without pay, and others worked who were paid.

Q. Did the committee pay the employes of the House who worked for you?—A. They did not. They declined to receive any pay.

Q. Then I understand that pay was tendered to them?—A. Yes, sir; it was tendered to one of them and with the understanding that he was to speak to the rest, and he declined it.

Q. Do you say that it was tendered to all of them?—A. I did not tender it to all of them. I tendered it to the man who had charge of the other employes.

Q. You stated that they declined to receive pay. That implied that it

was tendered to them?—A. I presume he communicated my statement made to him with that desire. I know they never received anything. I presume he communicated it to them.

Q. Then, so far as you know of your own personal knowledge, pay was only tendered to one?—A. So far as I know of my own personal knowledge, pay was tendered to one who was in charge of the others, and with the understanding that he was to communicate the tender of pay to them, and I presume that he carried out his instructions.

Q. Which was the one to whom you tendered the pay?—A. If you desire names I can give them. I do not think the gentlemen who worked for the committee have any desire to have the fact concealed.

Mr. CAMERON. I do not ask for the name of this person ; but I wished to have him otherwise described.

By the CHAIRMAN :

Q. The question is what was the position occupied by the gentleman in the House to whom you tendered the money?—A. He was a mechanic.

By Mr. CAMERON :

Q. How much money, so far as you are able to state, was expended by the committee for the documents?—A. The total amount of money expended by the committee was \$4,073.25, the treasurer having turned over to his successor \$596.81.

By Mr. McDONALD :

Q. What was the amount expended for documents?—A. The amount expended for documents was about \$2,550.

By Mr. CAMERON :

Q. How much was paid for printing documents?—A. That is what I mean. The amount paid for printing documents was about \$2,550 out of \$4,073.

Q. How much was paid for folding documents?—A. The amount paid for folding documents, salaries and pay-rolls, was \$1,285.48.

Q. How much was paid for the envelopes that were used?—A. \$9.

Q. Did you purchase the envelopes?—A. I purchased some.

Q. Where were the others obtained?—A. The others were obtained from the folding-room of the House.

Q. What portion of the envelopes that were used by the committee did you purchase?—A. I have no record of the number and no means of arriving at it.

Q. Were any documents franked by the committee or sent out by the committee?—A. There were a large number of documents sent out by the committee franked.

Q. I was going to ask you whether any were sent out under the frank of members of Congress that were not parts of the Record, or speeches delivered in the House of Representatives or in the Senate?—A. Not one that I am aware of. There were a number of documents sent out which were not frankable, but postage was paid upon them.

Q. I did not ask you that; I ask if any that were not frankable were sent out under the frank of a member?—A. And in sending those out the name of the chairman of the committee was written on the envelope.

By Mr. KERNAN :

Q. I understood the question to be whether any documents were sent out under a frank that were not frankable?—A. None that I am

aware of. I gave strict instructions that nothing but frankable matter should be sent under a frank, and I watched it pretty closely.

Q. Who had the actual charge of sending out the documents?—A. I had.

Q. Who performed the manual labor, I mean?—A. These different men who were under me. I superintended it nearly every hour of the day and night when we were working.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What proportion of the documents folded were frankable documents?—A. I can state that by taking the printed list, accurately, within a hundred.

Q. I want to get at the number of documents as documents, not as pages.—A. The principal portion of the documents sent out were those which were frankable, and those were sent by mail mostly. Those that were not frankable were all sent by express with the exception of a few which were sent in the mail and postage paid upon them. They were sent to the newspapers and sent to individuals applying for them.

Q. Were the envelopes furnished by you put upon the documents that were sent out by you that were not frankable, or were they put upon documents that were frankable?—A. I do not understand your question.

Q. I understood you to say that you purchased a number of envelopes to send out documents?—A. I did.

Q. What documents were put in those?—A. The documents that were not frankable were those which were put in those envelopes, some of which I purchased.

Q. Now as to the speeches that were frankable, where were they folded?—A. They were mostly folded by me. Some few were folded, at the request of a member of the committee, in the folding room of the House, and the rest were folded by me. Those that were frankable were folded in official documents marked with the stamp of the House of Representatives.

Q. Were or were not all the documents that were folded in which envelopes and other material of the government were used frankable documents?—A. I think there were a few that were sent to newspapers, possibly a couple of thousand, that were not government envelopes.

Q. Do you mean a couple of thousand copies out of the total?—A. Yes, sir. The clerks folded a number of the first issue of a document that was not frankable, in envelopes, marked "Part of Cong. Record." When I discovered it I had the envelopes cut open. They were always reported to me, and if it was done, I had the envelopes cut open and had them stamped.

Q. In your general direction and supervision of this folding and distribution, was or was not your direction to put only those which were frankable in government material?—A. That was my instruction.

Q. General Walker, what was the total cost last year for folding House documents, as found in the report?—A. The total cost under the House of Representatives in 1878 was \$20,598.25.

Q. What was that for?—A. That includes the whole pay-roll of the folding-room, and includes the material for documents and material for folding; the whole cost, including pages, cartage, material, and everything else.

Q. Have you examined the official documents upon that subject in relation to that data for the last ten years?—A. I have done so very carefully.

Q. Can you give it all in detail?—A. Yes, sir; it is as follows:

Amount expended for folding documents, House of Representatives, during the years—

1867	\$79,842 60
1868	109,933 40
1869	99,056 39
1870	92,051 85
1871	105,278 85
1872	109,519 89
1873	107,999 36
1874	92,911 69
1875	20,822 60
1876	48,907 39
1877	28,392 23
1878	20,598 25

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire whether we have anything to do with that question under the resolution under which we are sitting?

The CHAIRMAN. Nothing except that there has been an effort to show that public documents have been folded and distributed at the expense of the House, and this is a legitimate result, or cross-examination, if you may please so to call it, upon that subject as compared with previous years.

The WITNESS. There were more documents folded for Republican members of Congress during the last campaign than there were for Democrats. I do not know anything about what the Republican committee did.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. The Democratic committee folded none whatever?—A. They did not, except a few of the Republican campaign text-books; they folded some of these.

Q. None of the envelopes which you say you took from the government store-house, which belonged to the government, were among those, were they?—A. Not that I know of.

Mr. KERNAN. I suppose that the Republican members of Congress had theirs folded in the regular way.

Mr. TELLER. The witness says that in addition to the ordinary envelope that incloses the Record he used a portion of the public property for the purposes of the Democratic committee.

Mr. KERNAN. Yes. I understand him to say it did not exceed two thousand, as far as he could state it accurately.

The WITNESS. I think it was about two thousand.

Mr. TELLER remarked that he failed to see the pertinency of the inquiry on this point as cross-examination.

Mr. KERNAN replied by inquiring whether Mr. Teller had not heard from the Democratic side the cry of "turn on the light." He desired that as to the economy of the proceeding or otherwise the fact should appear, regardless of the side it might hurt.

Mr. TELLER insisted that by going into a showing of the extra expense the committee would be transcending its authority.

Mr. KERNAN. You can do about that as you see fit.

Mr. TELLER. No; we cannot do about that as we see fit, and that is the objection that we make to your going behind the inquiry here.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You say that one of these employes aided you during his leave of absence. What is the rule of the House with regard to leaves of absence

during the summer, when the House is not in session?—A. I do not know what the rule is, but I know that leaves of absence are given for short periods.

Q. For what is the leave of absence usually granted? Is it to go home?—A. It is to go home.

Q. This gentleman who got that leave of absence, as I understand you, did not go home?—A. I do not think he did go home. He was away part of the time.

Q. Were those men employed in aiding you during the session of the House or after it had adjourned?—A. No, sir; it was after it had adjourned. They were not regularly employed; they came in and helped me when they could, when they were not on duty.

By Mr. CAMERON :

Q. What knowledge have you as to the number of documents that were folded at the request of the Republicans in the House?—A. I have no personal knowledge.

Q. You stated as a fact that more documents were folded by the employés of the House for the Republicans than were folded for Democrats?—A. I stated so. I was so informed.

Q. I ask you now if you have any personal knowledge of that?—A. I have no personal knowledge of the folding of documents in the House of Representatives other than I have derived from the examination of the books, the printed documents.

Q. Then when you so stated, you spoke from information?—A. I stated so from my information from a person whose duty it is to be informed on that subject.

Q. So far as you are concerned, it is hearsay, is it not?—A. So far as I am concerned, it is merely information received from that person.

Q. Did the Republican Congressional committee have that folding done?—A. I do not know; I do not know anything about their operations personally.

Q. You do not know of the other personally?—A. No, sir.

Q. The cost of folding as you have given it for the various years during the past ten years, as I understand it, is the entire cost of folding for both parties, for everybody?—A. It is the entire cost of folding for both parties from 1867 to 1878 inclusive. It is the cost of all the employés, including the pages, and of the cartage and material, the folders' pay—really everything in the shape of labor or material that is chargeable to the folding-room of the House.

Mr. McDONALD. To the folding-room of the House?

The WITNESS. Yes, sir.

By Mr. TELLER :

Q. And that cost is occasioned by the speeches made and so forth, which they demand to have prepared for circulation?—A. It is occasioned principally by the folding of speeches; and that is what they folded for me in the very little folding that they did for me, possibly 5,000 or 6,000.

Q. What I mean is that every member, when he makes a speech, is entitled to a certain sum to have the speech printed. Then the speeches are folded without charge, are they not?—A. They are folded without charge.

Q. For instance, we will say that Mr. Blackburn, who made a speech yesterday, wants 5,000 copies of it; he pays for the printing and nothing for the folding?—A. He pays nothing for the folding.

Q. So that, the more printing there is, the more expense there is?—

A. He does not pay anything for the folding of his speech. What little folding there was was done at the request of a member of Congress, and it was official.

By Mr. McDONALD :

Q. What little folding that was done, as connected with your work, you say was done for the members of Congress in folding their speeches? —A. Yes, sir; and very little of it was done.

Q. It consisted of reprints of matter which, in their reprinted form, were circulated by you through the country, and in order to circulate those you had to have them folded?—A. Yes; we had to have them folded ourselves. The House having cut the appropriation down to \$20,000, it took all the time of the employés of the folding-room to do the folding for the House.

Q. Whatever the expense was that was incurred by them in regard to the folding was paid by this committee?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Although the matter was such as might have been folded at the public expense?—A. Although that was matter which might have been folded at the public expense. Any member of Congress, at his own request, could have his own speech folded and the speech of any other member, and that without regard to whether it was printed at the Government Printing Office, at Mr. Polkinhorn's, or at any other office, provided it was official matter, that which he is authorized by law to send through the mail.

By Mr. CAMERON :

Q. So far as you know, with regard to the folding that was done, was it not done by request of members of Congress and not by orders of the Congressional campaign committees?—A. I know nothing about previous campaigns; I know that the little folding that was done this time was done by request of members of Congress.

Q. And so far as concerns the folding that was done by the Republican committee, you do not know that it was done by request of that committee?—A. No, sir; but I presume that the superintendent of the folding-room would not fold any matter that was not for a member of Congress.

By Mr. KIRKWOOD :

Q. The expense of printing, as I understand you, covers the expense of folding the documents?—A. It covers all the expense of folding speeches, maps, documents, and books, and includes the expenses of the superintendent of the folding-room, all his employés, of the pages, the cartage, fuel, lights, and everything.

Q. That is what I understood you to say. Do you know whether it is or not the fact that, at different sessions of Congress, the number of documents ordered printed varies very materially?—A. I presume it does, naturally.

Q. Does it then follow that where the number of documents ordered printed is larger than it is at another time the expenses of the folding-room are necessarily larger?—A. I presume they would be larger where a larger number of documents is printed.

Q. And where the number of documents is smaller the expense would be smaller?—A. That would depend upon how the folding-room was run; upon the number of employés.

Q. I ask whether the expense of folding a larger number of documents would not necessarily be greater than would be that of folding a smaller number?—A. That depends upon this: They have a number of

employés on salaries, and the salaries of those employés would cost as much whether they folded few or many documents.

Q. But the material used would make a difference?—A. The material used would of course be smaller where there would be a smaller number of documents folded.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Q. As to a large amount of this matter which you had folded at the expense of the committee, could it not legitimately and properly have been ordered to be folded at the government expense by a member of Congress who was a member of the committee for which you were acting?—A. Any member of Congress on the House side or any member on the Senate side could have had it folded. This is true as to all, with the exception of three documents which were published and which were sent, 999 out of 1,000, by express, very few being sent by mail.

Q. But a large proportion of these documents which you had folded there, and for the folding of which you paid out of the funds of the committee, might properly have been folded at the expense of the government by any member of the committee who was a member of either house?—A. He could legally have done so; yes, sir.

Q. None of the members of your committee made any such order?—A. No such order was made by me, and I had no instructions to that effect.

By Mr. CAMERON:

Q. Does the amount which you have given as that of the expense of folding during a number of years past include the expense of folding the Agricultural Report and the documents from the different departments?—A. It includes all the expenses of the folding-room (there may have been additional amounts under resolutions for extra pay) running away back from 1867 down to the present day. There may be items amounting to a few thousand dollars for the employés scattered around in some resolutions of the House, but the total of them would be inconsiderable.

Q. Then it would include the expense of folding the books that were sent out?—A. Of the books, the maps, and the speeches that may be sent free under the law.

Q. Is or not the main expense incurred in the folding and sending out of books rather than of the speeches and documents?—A. That I cannot say. In looking over the accounts, I did not see any statement of that kind.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you know whether, of the money received by this committee, any portion was sent to any Congressional district?—A. Not a single dollar. It was entirely expended in labor and in the purchase of documents.

JAMES E. HARVEY sworn and examined.

By Mr. CAMERON:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. I am now residing in this city.

Q. What official connection, if any, did you have, during the year 1878, with the Democratic Congressional Committee?—A. I was the treasurer.

Q. When were you appointed, and how long did you continue to perform the duties of the office?—A. I believe I was appointed in May, and I closed my connection with the committee on March 14th of this year.

Q. You may state what amount of money was collected by the committee for campaign purposes, and state generally how it was expended.—A. The guide that I have for that is an account which I rendered to the chairman when I was relieved of my duty as treasurer, and which corresponds with my bank-book, which I have in my pocket here. [After referring to a small book:] I received in all \$4,695.06. I paid out of the money received \$4,073.25; and on the 7th of March, 1879, I gave to Mr. Blackburn, who is the chairman of our Congressional committee, a check for \$596.81, an amount which, by "scrimping," I had managed to preserve as a balance.

Q. You had more money than you needed, had you?—A. Really not more than we did need, but there were accidental circumstances that threw that balance into my hands. I may say that subscriptions were made from day to day, and we had use for the money, and consequently I came to have that balance.

Q. State generally for what purpose the money was expended.—A. The money was expended mainly for printing and for clerical services. Our secretary was the only paid officer of the committee, and there were some other persons, two other persons, who were regularly employed. Then there were the minor clerks, so to call them, who were engaged in folding documents, and so forth. My account here [referring to memorandum] shows what was paid for salary, what for printing, and what for postage-stamps. The main items upon it are salary, stamps, printing—

Mr. McDONALD. State the amount of salary.

The WITNESS. The amount of salary was one hundred dollars a month to Mr. Walker.

By Mr. CAMERON:

Q. State the amount paid for stamps.—A. I could not give you the amount paid for stamps without adding up the various items. I am running over the general items to show you what they were. [Running down list of items.] They were stamps, printing documents, clerk-hire, pages, folders, services, printing, postage stamps, expenses (meaning contingent expenses of the committee), printing documents, stationery, and so on.

(The witness not being able to give the figures, they were subsequently furnished by Gen. D. S. Walker, at the request of the committee, as follows:)

Amount paid for salary and pay-rolls.....	\$1,285 48
Amount paid for postage-stamps.....	122 46
Amount paid for printing.....	2,441 15
Amount paid for stationery and other items.....	249 16

By Mr. CAMERON:

Q. Have you any personal knowledge in regard to the folding of the documents?—A. Not except as I saw it done in visiting the committee rooms. As to the details of it, I am not prepared to speak with any confidence at all. I supposed it to be done pretty much as it was done under my own direction in 1876.

Q. Who solicited subscriptions, if any one, for the committee?—A. I suppose the gentlemen who took most interest in the cause. I did, myself, for one, and I suppose that the other members of the committee did the same thing.

Q. Was there or not any plan agreed upon by the committee for the collection of necessary moneys?—A. I think it was agreed among ourselves to make a subscription of fifty dollars apiece. I am sorry to say that that was not carried out to any great extent, as the receipts of moneys show; our people generally being unable to do that.

By Mr. McDONALD :

Q. The members of the committee, I believe, those who had charge of it, paid?—A. The members of the committee all paid.

By Mr. CAMERON :

Q. What plan was agreed upon for the collection of moneys from members of Congress?—A. We expected members of Congress on our side to contribute fifty dollars apiece, and, as I have stated, I am sorry to say they were not able to respond to the request to that effect. Our largest subscription—by far the largest—one-fourth of this amount, was from outside, from private individuals who had no connection with the committee, who were not aspiring for office, and who had nothing else but the good of the cause at heart.

Q. Have you a list of the subscriptions that were made?—A. I have. [A list was here produced and inspected by the committee.]

Q. Did the committee make an assessment of fifty dollars, or any other sum, upon members of Congress?—A. An assessment? In what sense would you employ that word?

Q. Did they agree upon an amount which they would ask members of Congress to contribute?—A. Yes, we agreed among ourselves to make a request for fifty dollars each. I think there were probably two exceptions to that rule.

Q. You regarded it as a voluntary contribution, and not an assessment at all?—A. I regarded it as a voluntary contribution, because if it had been an assessment I suppose there would have been more responses to it.

Q. Is it customary to solicit subscriptions from office-holders when the Democrats are in power?—A. I am not able to answer that question, for the reason that I am a recruit. I never was connected with the Democratic party during the time that it held power; I was an old Whig, and I went to the Democratic party as to a house of refuge.

GEORGE C. GORHAM recalled.

By Mr. CAMERON :

Question. I will ask you whether or not any of the envelopes or any of the stationery that was used by the committee was governmental stationery, or whether or not it was all purchased by the committee?—Answer. We bought and paid for every envelope we used. We borrowed 160,000 envelopes, I think it was, from the Senate folding-room, upon the express understanding that they might be returned as soon as we had had our order filled; but we never took any envelope from the folding-room of either house that was not returned. We employed our own folders and paid them, and no folding was done in either house at the request of our committee or in any other way. Any member of our committee may have ordered any, in either the House or Senate (of that I know nothing), but it was never done at the request or order of the

committee. In other words, we did not make any use of the folding-room in either house, nor of the material, nor of the folders.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Q. You were printing and circulating documents that were frankable. Where were they folded?—A. They were folded and circulated at the headquarters, 1319 F street.

Q. The speeches and documents of members of Congress that you reprinted and circulated as frankable matter were folded there, you say?—A. I had those circulated at 1319 F street by my own men and by those of Polkinhorn & Co.

Q. You say that none of those were folded in the Capitol?—A. I do not say that Senators and members did not have any of them folded for themselves, but I say that we had none.

Q. Did you not supply Senators and members with reprints?—A. I filled every order that Senators or members gave me for a document—yes, sir.

Q. And those—were they not brought here and folded?—A. They were not.

Q. None of them?—A. Not one of them. I never caused to be sent out any document that was not folded in the headquarters of the committee in F street. I had no relation with the folding department of either house in any way.

Q. But where, for instance, a member of the Senate or House ordered a given speech, one of those which were circulated as campaign documents, you had it reprinted, had you not?—A. I had it printed.

Q. You had it reprinted?—A. Reprinted, brought to the headquarters in F street, and folded there, every document, in envelopes of our own.

Q. You say that all of that class were folded there?—A. Yes, sir; all of our folding was done there, every particle of it.

SIDNEY F. AUSTIN sworn and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. What is your business?—Answer. I was assistant cashier of the German-American National Bank. I am not in any business at present.

Q. What was your position during 1878?—A. I was assistant cashier of that bank.

Q. What position did you occupy toward the Congressional committee?—A. I was the treasurer.

Q. State the aggregate amount of money that passed through your hands as such treasurer.—A. I received \$105,802.92.

Q. What did you disburse?—A. I disbursed all of that money except \$6,114.25, which was in bank at the time it closed.

Q. Have you a statement showing the subjects for which your disbursements were made?—A. Yes, sir; I paid to G. C. Gorham \$96,615.27; to Eugene Hale (chairman) \$3,000; exchange \$3.40.

Q. Did you act as collector in collecting any of this money?—A. I solicited no money, but the money that I received was sent to me and deposited in the bank.

Q. Did you receive amounts of less than ten dollars from any individual?—A. I think I did.

Q. Can you tell us how many such separate amounts of less than ten dollars?—A. I cannot. The stubs of my receipts will show.

Q. Can you ascertain and give us the amount and number of all subscriptions or payments to you which were less than \$10?—A. I can by going over my stubs, which I have not here.

By Mr. CAMERON:

Q. Did you receive any subscriptions as low as \$2.50?—A. I think not.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. By whom were these amounts paid you principally?—A. By postmasters, various other officers of the government, and clerks in the departments.

Q. Did you receive money from any others than employés of the government?—A. That I cannot say.

Q. Can you ascertain by your accounts?—A. My stubs show, in nearly all cases, the position held by the party sending the money.

Q. What I desire to have particularly is the amount of payment in each instance.—A. I have no idea of it; it did not interest me at all; I was only interested as to the amount received and to see that it was properly accounted for; I never asked any questions nor tried to know from what sources the money came.

Q. Did you give a receipt to each party who paid you money?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were those receipts handed to the parties who paid the money, or sent by mail?—A. In some cases they were sent by mail and in others handed to the parties.

Q. Is that which I now show you the form of the envelope that was sent out or returned to you with a subscription?—A. It is, of the one that was returned to me. I never saw them until they began to come to me.

[The envelope form referred to as here submitted consisted of an address in print (capital letters) as follows:

Sidney F. Austin,

Treasurer Republican Cong. Committee,

German-American National Bank, Washington, D. C.]

Q. Did you send written or printed requisitions to parties in the different departments at Washington?—A. No, sir; I did not know that any had been sent until they began to send the money to me.

Q. Is that which I now show you one of your acknowledgments?—A. It is. This is one that was sent by my clerk.

The acknowledgment, as here submitted, was as follows:

REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE,
TREASURER'S OFFICE (P. O. Box 835),
Washington, D. C., 1878.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of the inst., with inclosure, for which I send herewith receipt.

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

S. F. AUSTIN,
Treasurer.

Per D.

Q. Did you ever see the circular of the 27th of May?—A. I never saw it until I began to receive remittances; that was the first I knew of it being issued.

Q. Were remittances accompanied by the circular?—A. Occasionally the amount would be inclosed in the circular. Sometimes a letter would

be written on the last half sheet and another letter inclosed. Very few of them came back to me accompanying the circular.

Q. Were the amounts which were received accompanying the circular less in any case than the amount named in the circular?—A. I think so.

Q. Were they ever more?—A. I think that in several instances they were more.

Q. Then the amounts did not seem to be uniform, in accordance with the amount named in the circular?—A. Usually I received the amount.

Q. Did the circulars which were returned to you contain, in the blank, an entry in ink specifying the amount?—A. Not all. I don't know that any did.

Q. When did the remittances first begin to come to you?—A. Early in June. I think that my first receipts were dated June 6th for moneys received a day or two previous.

Q. Give the names of the collectors who paid to you money collected from the departments.—A. Mr. Baker and Mr. Fugitt.

Q. Did you receive money from any person employed in collecting moneys from the departments other than those two?—A. I think not. I do not remember of any.

Q. I understand you to say you sent no circular to parties asking them to contribute the amounts which were contributed by, or which had been assessed upon, them?—A. No, sir; I had nothing to do with that. My connection with the committee was merely a business connection—had nothing to do with soliciting subscriptions; and I never made a request of any one for money.

Q. Can you not ascertain and give the committee the amounts under the respective headings to which the money was applied?—A. No, sir. I paid it all to Mr. Gorham (I have his drafts; he drew upon me in large amounts), and I know nothing in regard to the disbursement of money except as I have stated.

By Mr. CAMERON:

Q. Did you mean to say that you received money only from officials?—A. No, sir; I did not so state.

Q. Was a large deposit made at any time; and, if so, from whom did you receive that deposit?—A. Yes; a large deposit was made, one of about \$13,000, I think. It was sent down to me from the office or rooms of the committee, and I sent a receipt for it to that office. I do not know from whom it came.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Can you leave with the committee the books and stubs of which you have spoken?—A. They are my vouchers. The correspondence of the stubs with my bank account shows that I received so much money; the account in my bank-book being the only one that I kept.

Q. The desired data embrace the items of totals of money received from government employes and outside sources, and all persons from whom less than ten dollars was received, of which the last mentioned is the most essential. If it is not convenient for you readily to produce the data as to all, you can confine your statement to the last.—A. My stubs have all been sent to the rooms of the committee, but I can refer to them there.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Gorham, who is present, is of opinion that he can furnish the desired information more readily than can the present witness, and will do so if called upon.

GEORGE C. GORHAM recalled.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. What statement can you make in this connection?—Answer. I have a record of all the persons to whom circulars were sent and of their responses, and can easily find out from that record the number of those who paid less than ten dollars, if that is the information that you desire. That might not include everything, but would cover the substance of the inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. It would include substantially all that we desire.

SIDNEY F. AUSTIN recalled.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. You have heard Mr. Gorham's statement?—Answer. Yes, sir; and it would include everything that my books contain, because they have been sent to the office of Mr. Gorham and the record there has been posted up from the stubs of those books.

JOHN D. DEFREES sworn and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. What is your official position?—Answer. I am the Public Printer.

Q. Were you such in 1878?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. State whether any moneys were collected by the Republican Congressional committee from your department.—A. There were.

Q. Was it done with your consent and by your direction?—A. It was done with my consent.

Q. What amount was realized?—A. That I do not know. I told Mr. Gorham that I would afford every facility to make collections, and to send somebody from his committee room to do it, which he did.

Q. There was a conversation between you and Mr. Gorham in regard to sending some one?—A. Either a note or a conversation.

Q. When was that?—A. I do not recollect the length of time, but it was before the election, while they were making collections.

Q. Whom did he send to make collections from the department?—A. I do not know the name of the man; he was a clerk, I think.

Q. Did you make a subscription?—A. I did, and paid it.

Q. Did you head the list?—A. I did.

Q. After that, did he pass through the department with the book?—A. He did; with the paper, the subscription-list, whatever it was.

Q. Was that in business hours?—A. From one to two, I think it was, which was our lunch hour. That is my recollection of it.

Q. You say you could not give us the total amount subscribed?—A. I paid no attention to it. I paid my own and allowed them to collect just as much as they could.

Q. You do not know the name of the man who came to make the collection?—A. No, sir.

Q. Were any moneys collected from your department to be used in any of the State campaigns?—A. No, sir; nothing but for the Congressional committee, to my knowledge.

Q. You heard of no such fund?—A. No, sir.

Q. How many employes are in your department; I mean the printing department generally?—A. The number varies from a thousand to fourteen hundred; the majority of them are women, however. I will state that the collection was only made, however, in what we call the composition-room. There are somewhere about 300 there. I do not know that they made collections from anybody except the compositors and pressmen.

Q. A question has been suggested by Mr. McDonald as to the number of male employes in your department.—A. It varies from 400 to 600; that is, laborers, boys, and all.

Q. Was any fund raised in your department last year to send money into Mr. Finley's district last year?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you contribute to any such fund?—A. Not a dollar.

Q. Did you contribute to any fund to send money into West Virginia last year?—A. No, sir.

Q. Was anybody employed or discharged to aid in the defeat or success of any Congressman last year?—A. None at all. I will state that this matter was entirely voluntary. I made no demand upon them.

Q. I understand you as having answered the question. Was any other than this one man sent to your department by Mr. Gorham's committee?—A. I think that he was all.

Q. You cannot give his name?—A. I do not know it.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Q. You say that the solicitations were made principally in the press-room and among the compositors?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are they salaried employes or paid by the piece?—A. They are paid by the piece and by the day; paid for what they do. There are no salaries there except for a few clerks.

Q. Excepting a few clerks, the men there are either paid by the day or paid by the piece?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. After heading this subscription-list, did you give it out among the employes among whom these solicitations were made that their contributions were to be entirely voluntary, or was anything said to them about it?—A. Yes; it was understood to be voluntary.

Q. Did you say anything yourself to the employes after heading this list; did you go to them or send any message to them?—A. Yes; I did not go to them myself, but it was understood in the office to be voluntary. I have already said that I made no requisition.

Q. But you did not personally make any communication to them on the subject?—A. Not to every one, but that was understood to be my position.

Q. You say that you made no personal communication to them on the subject?—A. Yes, not to every one; but I stated, in the room, when there were dozens of them there, that the matter was to be entirely voluntary—I made no requisition upon anybody—that they must do it of their own free accord. A great many did not do it; I never heard how many nor who they were.

By Mr. KIRKWOOD:

Q. Did you ever take any measures to find out who did not do it?—A. I did not; I never cared.

Q. You never cared who did or who did not?—A. No, sir.

HENRY M. BAKER recalled.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Can you now state the total number of subscribers in the Treasury Department, and the amount paid by them?—Answer. The total number of subscribers on the book that I have, to give it merely from a count, is 909. The total number in the Treasury Department might be definitely ascertained from the appointment clerk of that department; my own statement about that would be that, excluding the Sixth Auditor's Office, there were from 2,200 to 2,400 of the employés, and that it might not exceed 2,000. The total number of names of lady subscribers I ascertained by count to be 23. The total amount shown to have been paid by the ladies was \$115.

In reading my testimony I notice an error, a merely verbal one, in the pamphlet of testimony on the 32d page, 9th line from the bottom, where the sentence reads "10th of December." It should read "10th of October."

JAMES R. COOK sworn and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Were you connected with the Republican Congressional committee last year?—Answer. I was.

Q. In what capacity?—A. I was a clerk.

Q. Under whom?—A. Mr. Gorham.

Q. What was your business before you became such clerk?—A. I was an attorney practicing before the departments.

Q. What were you authorized to do in regard to the Government Printing Office?—A. I was requested to go down there and receive some subscriptions that had been made, which I did.

Q. Had you a book in your hands at the time?—A. After I arrived at the printing-office I took a book in my hand.

Q. With which to obtain subscriptions, I understand you to say. Where did you get the book?—A. I took the book in my hands, containing subscriptions which had already been made.

Q. From whom did you get that book?—A. I cannot tell in what room I found it or who put it in my hands. The parties there were mostly strangers to me.

Q. The subscriptions, then, had been made before you went there to collect them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what room of the printing-office did you get that book?—A. I cannot tell whether it was in the room occupied, as I understand, by the chief clerk or in Mr. Defrees's room, or where I got it. I do not know where I got it.

Q. What did the book purport to be?—A. It was a small-sized memorandum-book, as I recollect. It contained the names of the subscribers, the amount they subscribed, and nothing else.

Q. Do you remember how it was headed? Was it an agreement by the persons named to pay the sums set opposite their names?—A. I cannot tell. I do not know that I read any heading.

Q. Were amounts of money set opposite each of the names?—A. There were, as I recollect it.

Q. Were they in the same handwriting or in different handwritings?—A. That I cannot say.

Q. What is your recollection on that subject?—A. I think they were different; I should say so.

Q. Were the amounts set opposite each name different or were they the same?—A. They were different.

Q. Did you see the Government Printer, Mr. Defrees, when you went there then?—A. I did.

Q. Did he authorize you to go through the department?—A. He did.

Q. Did you see employes whose names were upon that book, or what did you do?—A. I took the book and went around through the department to where the subscribers were to be found, and, on entering the room, they all came and handed me the amounts of their subscriptions; that is, all those who did pay at all.

Q. Was any official of the department with you at the time?—A. There was a boy with me.

Q. Who was he?—A. He was a colored boy.

Q. Was he sent with you by any official of the department?—A. He was given me as a messenger by somebody there; I don't know whom.

Q. Can you not recollect who it was that told you where to go?—A. I went wherever the boy took me.

Q. Who was it that sent the boy with you?—A. I cannot recollect.

Q. Was it Mr. Roberts of the bindery, or was it the chief clerk?—A. It was not Mr. Roberts—I know Mr. Roberts; I cannot tell who it was.

Q. Was there no one of the officials of the department, no one except this colored boy, with you when you went around to make the collections?—A. He was the only one.

Q. Did you, as they paid you, check the names as you went through the department?—A. I think I checked them on the book. I took them off on a separate piece of paper.

Q. Then, at the time?—A. Then; yes, sir. I took the name and the amount paid by each.

Q. Can you tell us what was the total that was collected by you in that department?—A. I don't think I can now; I have it.

Q. Have you the book that you used at that time?—A. I have not.

Q. What became of that book?—A. I don't know.

Q. Did you bring it with you away from the office?—A. I did not.

Q. You left it there?—A. I did.

Q. Then you went there, found a book with subscriptions in it, went around and collected, and left the book there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What amount of subscriptions did you report to the treasurer as collected out of that department?—A. I did not report anything.

Q. What amount did you pay over to the treasurer?—A. Not any.

Q. To whom did you pay what you collected?—A. It was accounted for to Mr. Gorham.

Q. Who accounted for it to Mr. Gorham?—A. I did.

Q. Is there no way of getting the figures of the amount?—A. There is; I can get them by going to my house.

The witness, having promised at this point to furnish the information, subsequently handed to the stenographer the following:

APRIL 4, 1879.

In answer to the question "What was the whole amount paid you (at the Government Printing Office)?" I say, "The whole amount was two hundred and sixty-eight dollars (\$268)."

JAS. R. COOK.

In answer to the question "How many (meaning persons at the Government Printing Office) paid you less than ten dollars?" I reply, fifteen; 8 having paid \$5 each; 4 having paid \$3 each; 1 having paid \$8; 1 having paid \$2; 1 having paid \$1.

Q. Were those from whom you received money persons engaged in, or workmen in, the compositors' room of the printing office?—A. I can-

not tell that. I do not know that I knew a single man whom I saw in the office that day. I cannot tell whether they were in one place or the other.

Q. Were they dressed as men who were engaged in the department or as strangers?—A. They were engaged about the premises in the department, but whether in the composing-room or somewhere else I do not know.

Q. Did the clerks and heads of divisions there subscribe and pay?—A. I recollect one gentleman (I do not know his name, but I heard it at the time) whom I took to be a chief of a division, who paid.

Q. Of what division was he the chief?—A. I don't know. And I do not know that he was chief of any, but he impressed me as such.

Q. You thought he was?—A. I thought he was.

Q. How long have you lived in Washington?—A. Six or seven years.

Q. Where did you come from?—A. I came from Michigan.

Q. Had you ever been in the Government Printing Office before this time?—A. Yes, sir; I have a great many times.

Q. You did not know, then, any of these officers?—A. No, sir; my business has been with Mr. Helm and Mr. Roberts whenever I have been there.

Q. Can you give us the number of persons who paid?—A. I could only guess at it.

Q. Do not your books show it?—A. Yes, sir; my books show the name of every man and the amount he paid.

Q. Were any amounts received from the lady employes there?—A. I do not recollect that there were any.

Q. Can you ascertain that from the book?—A. I can.

[The witness promised to supply the information, if found.]

By Mr. McDONALD :

Q. You knew Mr. Roberts and Mr. Helm before you went there that day?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You had frequently met with them before that time?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you not remember whether it was either of them who gave you the book, when you went there?—A. It was neither of them. Mr. Helm, at that time, was not employed there. It was not Mr. Roberts.

Q. Do you remember in what office or room you found the book?—A. I do not. Whether it was handed to me in any room or in the hall, I cannot tell.

Q. You made your business known to some person when you went there, did you?—A. I did. And I think it was some person whom I first met in the hall, when I went in the building.

Q. You would not make it known to a mere messenger whom you found in the hall, would you?—A. O, not to a messenger.

Q. But to some person who was there in an official capacity?—A. I think I went into the business office; that is my impression.

Q. In that business office you made known your business to some person who seemed to be in official authority there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The book was given to you; this messenger boy was put under your charge to show you the persons whose names were upon that book and he went around with you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And when you would read a name he would show you the person?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then how did you find the person?—A. We went into a certain room and my business seemed to be announced, to be known; they seemed to know who I was and what my business was.

Q. They appeared to be advised of your coming before you came?—
A. I cannot say anything about that, but they all came to the place where I was and paid over what money they chose to pay.

Q. Did you occupy any desk or any position of that kind in the room?—A. I stood at a desk in a room where the men or persons who made payment paid me.

Q. Was that the room in which the type cases and stands were?—A. I think not, I think it was off from that room.

Q. Connected with that, however?—A. Yes, connected with it.

Q. Connected with that room in which the type stands and cases are?—A. I believe so; it might have been on the upper floor or somewhere else; I don't recollect where it was; my attention was not directed to that.

Q. When you got through with making your collections you returned the book to the same place in which you got it, did you?—A. I don't think I did; I think I left it with the messenger in the hall.

Q. You left it with this boy?—A. I think I left it with the messenger.

Q. Had you noted upon it the amounts that you had received?—A. I checked on the book.

Q. Where you did not receive the full amount subscribed did you note the fact?—A. I cannot answer anything about that; I don't recollect anything about that.

Q. You have no recollection about that at all?—A. No, not as to whether they paid less or more.

Q. Can you not recollect whether those who did pay you paid the full amount which was opposite their names, and that, while some paid it, others paid a less amount?—A. No, sir; I have no recollection of that.

Q. Can you not recollect whether you made a clean collection of all that there was on the book?—A. I know I did not. There were some who told me they were not prepared to pay on that day, but that, if I would come on the first of the month, they would pay.

By Mr. KIRKWOOD:

Q. Did you go?—A. I did not; and I only went by request on this occasion.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Q. You have no knowledge as to who it was that circulated that book among these employes and obtained the signatures which were upon it when you received it?—A. I have not.

MICHAEL F. DALY sworn and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Where were you employed during 1878?—Answer. In the War Department, the Surgeon-General's Office.

Q. What place had you?—A. A watchman's place.

Q. Are you there yet?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What building are you engaged in?—A. The Tenth street building—the Army Medical Museum.

Q. How long have you been in the employ of the government?—A. Since 1877. The 1st of August, 1877, I got that position.

Q. State, if you please, what your salary is and was during 1878?—A. Six hundred and sixty dollars.

Q. Was there any written or printed paper sent to you asking for a subscription—something like this [exhibiting]?—A. [Examining paper.] Yes, sir; for \$7.20.

Q. Is this the paper it came in?—A. That is the envelope, sir.

Q. About when did you get it?—A. I got it somewhere about last July, I guess.

Q. July of last year?—A. Yes, sir; some time along there or in June.

Q. Was that paid by you?—A. No, sir.

Q. Were you called on for it afterwards?—A. No, sir.

Q. You never paid it to anybody?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. TELLER :

Q. What was your salary in September, 1877?—A. I was getting \$60 a month then, \$720 a year.

Q. That was when the Blue Book was made?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you still in the government employ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. All the demand made was by that circular?—A. That is all.

Q. You paid no attention to the circular?—A. Not a bit.

Q. You have heard nothing about it since?—A. No, sir.

HARRY A. COBAUGH sworn and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN :

Question. What official position do you occupy in the Treasury Department?—A. Captain of the watch.

Q. How long have you occupied a position upon the watch?—A. That position?

Q. Any position upon that watch?—A. Since February, 1870.

Q. How long have you been captain of the watch?—A. Since May, 1871.

Q. What is the watch?—A. It is the police force of the Treasury Department.

Q. How many subordinates are there under you?—A. Sixty.

Q. Where did you come from?—A. I came from Pennsylvania.

Q. You reside in Pennsylvania?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what county?—A. In Cumberland County.

Q. Were you captain of the watch during 1878?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you or do you keep a book showing the names and residences of persons engaged or occupied in the Treasury Department?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you have a list of the persons employed there previous to November, 1878?—A. We had nothing but the regular Treasury Register, issued by the department.

Q. Did you make up lists from that register of persons who were to be sent home to vote in November last?—A. No, sir; I did not.

Q. Did any person make it up and hand it to you?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you any list of these names?—A. Of Pennsylvanians?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Or of any other State?—A. No, sir; only Pennsylvanians.

Q. Whilst you were there did you at any time in 1878 send home to the local committees of Pennsylvania the names of the persons employed in the Treasury Department from Pennsylvania?—A. No, sir; not to local committees, but to the State central committee.

Q. Did you receive any communication from the State central committee asking you to do so?—A. No, sir; I did not.

Q. You did it of your own volition?—A. No, sir.

Q. At whose request?—A. At the request of Mr. Russell.

Q. Who is Mr. Russell?—A. Mr. Russell is a Philadelphian, not connected with the committee that I am aware of.

Q. Where is he employed?—A. You have him subpoenaed this morning. He is in the Treasury Department. At that time he was not employed at all by the government.

Q. He is now employed where?—A. In the Treasury Department.

Q. In what branch?—A. In the Register's Office.

Q. You communicated, you say, with the State central committee of Pennsylvania. What did you communicate?—A. I forwarded them a list of Pennsylvania voters in the Treasury Department.

Q. How many were there?—A. I do not recollect.

Q. About how many?—A. That would be a pretty wild guess. I have the list, or will get it for you. There might have been a hundred or there might have been seventy-five. I do not recollect the number any more.

Q. Were these clerks?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Employés of the department?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you get any communication in reply to the one you sent to the State committee?—A. After I forwarded the list?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was it?—A. They returned me a list for my guidance.

Q. What did that list contain?—A. My list forwarded there contained the names of all the Pennsylvania voters. They returned a list after they had forwarded my list to the different county committees and the different county committees had reported that certain parties on my list were not voters in the State, that their taxes were not paid and they were not registered, and I could not give them transportation if I had any to give them.

Q. What did you do with those lists thus returned to the State committee?—A. Those that were returned to me as not being voters of the State of Pennsylvania I notified that they could not get transportation from the committee.

Q. What did you do with those who were returned as entitled to vote in Pennsylvania?—A. I did not really do anything with them at that time. They were furnished with transportation.

Q. Did you furnish the transportation to them?—A. Occasionally I handed it out to them.

Q. What was transportation? Tell us what it was.—A. It was a railroad ticket from Washington to Philadelphia or to Harrisburg or to Pittsburg.

Q. It was a railroad ticket to the residence of the party who was entitled to vote?—A. Not exactly. We could not reach all the points.

Q. Was or was it not intended to be a ticket from Washington to the point of residence or as near as it could be reached?—A. Yes, as near as they could get to it.

Q. It was a ticket to and from?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many of those tickets were furnished in 1878?—A. To the employés of the Treasury Department?

Q. Yes, sir; to go home and vote.—A. I could not tell you that at present.

Q. You can get the list?—A. Yes, sir. I would have brought it with

me, but I thought it was lost. However, since coming up here it has occurred to me that it is in my desk.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Q. Were the parties receiving them charged anything for these tickets?—A. We charged them nothing. I do not know whether they paid anything for them or not.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Did you deliver those tickets to them without receiving anything in exchange?—A. I received nothing in exchange.

Q. Was it your business to act in the capacity of delivering these tickets to these parties?—A. Not exactly; in some cases only.

Q. Who did it in the other cases?—A. Mr. Russell.

Q. Were or were not Mr. Russell and yourself intrusted by the State committee of Pennsylvania with furnishing transportation to these men to go home to vote?—A. I cannot say that they were. I was not.

Q. Did you so act?—A. Mr. Russell did; I did not.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Q. Transportation was furnished to these parties free?—A. Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Did you furnish to anybody who went home to vote in Philadelphia anything else besides transportation?—A. No, sir; never anything else.

Q. No tax-receipts?—A. I had none at all.

Q. Did you not see tax-receipts handed to those voters?—A. In some cases I did.

Q. What did those tax-receipts purport to be?—A. They purported to be tax-receipts of parties whom I had on my list who were legal voters there and who had lost their tax-receipts or failed to pay their taxes.

Q. It was a receipt to them for taxes paid by them in the city of Philadelphia?—A. I believe so.

Q. Do you know what number of tax-receipts of that character were furnished to those voters who went home to Philadelphia?—A. I do not.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Q. Were there any furnished without charge to the parties?—A. I do not know that.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Did any of them to whom you saw them delivered give money in exchange for them?—A. I think they did.

Q. To you?—A. No, sir.

Q. To whom?—A. To Russell.

Q. Where did Russell come from?—A. Philadelphia.

Q. Was he employed in the Treasury Department at that time?—A. No, sir.

Q. Where did he make his headquarters?—A. For safety he did in my room—for the tickets.

Q. He was in your room?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That was his headquarters?—A. No, sir; not all the time. He would come in there and lounge.

Q. Was not that the place from which this political information was disseminated?—A. No, sir; I think not. I had nothing to do with any

one except the Treasury employés. I was only responsible for those, and that was all.

Q. Was not Mr. Russell's headquarters in your office in regard to the distribution of transportation and tax-receipts for Pennsylvania voters?—A. To my knowledge only so far as this: he notified the employés of the War Department that if they would come there before nine o'clock in the morning on a certain morning, he would furnish transportation to legal voters.

Q. Then he furnished notice of transportation to the War Department also?—A. He had gone there, or left word there in some way.

Q. Did any of the clerks in the War Department come over there before nine o'clock and get their transportation?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then the headquarters of the captain of the watch in the police department, before nine o'clock, was the place to which they would come to get transportation?—A. Only on that occasion, on that one morning.

Q. What morning was that?—A. I cannot tell you that.

Q. How long was it before the election?—A. I should say four or five days before.

Q. How many days' leave of absence did those voters of Pennsylvania get to go home?—A. They did not get any, that I know of; no regular leave.

Q. No regular leave was allowed to them?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did they go home, most of them?—A. They said they were going home.

Q. They started?—A. I cannot say that. We would give them transportation, expecting them to go home.

Q. How long before the election did Mr. Russell come to your place?—A. Four or five days, if I remember rightly.

Q. Did he write out notices to the voters at your headquarters?—A. No, sir.

Q. Were there any notices prepared there to be sent to the officials of the Treasury?—A. Not that I know of; I do not think there were.

Q. How do you know, then, that the War Department men were notified to come there?—A. Mr. Russell had been to the War Department the day previous, and it was impossible to see them all. They were rather anxious to get off, and he notified them that if they would come to the Treasury in the morning before nine o'clock he would furnish them transportation.

Q. Can you give us the length of time any of these clerks were absent at that election?—A. I can from the Treasury.

Q. Did you go home to vote?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where did you vote?—A. I tried to vote in Newville, but the Democrats there would not allow me. I was ruled out, being a Republican.

Q. Why? Did they say you had a residence here?—A. They claimed that, of course, but I had already sworn I had not.

Q. Are you a married man?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where is your family?—A. Here.

Q. How long have you been residing here?—A. I believe I came here in November, 1869; I came out of the Army here.

Q. You have had your family here all the time?—A. No, sir; I had no family until 1871.

Q. You were married in 1871 and have resided here since?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You still think you are a voter in Pennsylvania?—A. I am, sir; there is no doubt at all about it.

Mr. CAMERON. If you use the word "residence" for the purpose of fixing his legal domicile—

The WITNESS. I understand the Senator is not asking my legal residence. That is Newville.

The CHAIRMAN. I am asking the witness whether he staid here with his family. He says he has been here with his family since 1871. (To the witness.) How much of a family have you?—A. I have a wife and two children.

Q. (By the CHAIRMAN.) Do you own property here?—A. Do you mean a house and lot?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever vote here since 1869?—A. Never; I never attempted to vote here; never have been registered here.

Q. What day did you leave here to go home?—A. I left here on Friday or Saturday before the election.

Q. When did you return?—A. I returned, I think, on the Thursday following the election.

Q. You were gone, then, five or six days?—A. Yes, sir; that was all.

Q. Was there any deduction from your pay during your absence?—A. No, sir; I was entitled to a leave. I had not had any leave during the year.

Q. Who gave you authority to go?—A. No, one, sir; not regular authority.

Q. Under whose permission did you go?—A. I notified the custodian that I was going.

Q. Who is the custodian?—A. Mr. Pitney; or rather I asked to be excused for four or five day to go home.

Q. Did you tell him what you were going for?—A. He knew that. I do not remember that I told him.

Q. Who occupied your place in your absence?—A. I have two lieutenants.

Q. They performed your duties in your absence?—A. They performed their regular duties, but Mr. Pitney, the custodian, I suppose, was really the captain of the watch while I was away.

Q. He is your superior officer?—A. Yes, sir; if there was anything amiss it would be reported to him.

Q. Did any of your force besides yourself go home to vote?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. To what State?—A. Four or five went to Pennsylvania; I believe one or two to New York. I think that is about all.

Q. Where did these men go who went to Pennsylvania?—A. Two of them went to Pittsburg, and two or three to Philadelphia.

Q. Were they, or were they not, all provided with transportation?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. To and return?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were they absent as long as you were?—A. Yes, sir; about the same time.

Q. To what part did those go who went to New York?—A. I do not recollect that, nor am I positive that any went to New York. I think that one did, but I am not positive.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Q. What place in Pennsylvania do you say that you claim as your residence?—A. Newville, Cumberland County.

Q. How long had it been since you had been there to remain any time?

—A. I volunteered from there twice during the war, and claim a residence on that account. I was born in that county.

Q. How long had it been since you had been there for any length of time?—A. Not from the time I entered the army in 1862. I remained in the army until 1869.

Q. And you shortly afterward went into service here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And married here?—A. No, sir; I did not marry here.

Q. You went to housekeeping here after you were married?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And have been keeping house here ever since?—A. With the exception of three or four years, when I was boarding.

Q. Your family has been here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have your family ever been there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When do they go?—A. Usually every fall, when I go home.

Q. How long do you stay generally?—A. I never take more than four or five days' leave at a time.

Q. And they go with you usually?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Sometimes you go without them?—A. Not lately.

Q. When did you pay taxes there?—A. In 1876.

Q. How long before the election of 1876 did you pay those taxes?—A. In 1876, on account of their having a Democratic assessor there, I was compelled to go home in person and be registered. I paid my taxes at that time, in August.

Q. At that time you were compelled to go home and register?—A. Yes, sir. There would be no trouble in voting there if I was a Democrat. They tell me that when I go there. They say that is the objection, that I am a Republican.

Q. There was a Democratic register, and he required you to go home and register?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But when the Republican register got in he registered you?—A. That is a county in which we never have any Republican registers; they are always Democratic.

Q. Were you registered there last fall?—A. I attempted to register, and he refused to register me because I was a Republican. That was the only reason why he refused.

Q. They decided that you were not a resident there?—A. They had no right to make that decision.

Q. That is what they did decide, whether their decision was right or wrong?—A. That is what they claimed.

Q. They decided that, your family being here and you being here yourself, and never having resided there with your family, you were not a resident?—A. I did reside there; I have voted there.

Q. You had what you claimed a voting residence?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But your family never had in point of fact resided there?—A. No, sir.

Q. They had been there on visits with you now and then?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it was on these facts that they decided that you were not entitled to register or vote?—A. No, sir; not on those facts, I think.

Q. Those were the facts before them when they made that decision?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you think it was because of your politics?—A. They said so.

Q. Did they say they would let you vote if you were a Democrat?—A. Yes, sir; the election officers have told me after the election—the assessor and the gentlemen who opposed me before the polls—that if I was a Democrat there would be no trouble in voting.

Q. These men told you afterward that there would be no trouble in your voting in that case?—A. Yes, sir. I have offered to take the matter before the county court with them, and pay the expenses of both sides, but they have refused to do that in each case. They know that I am a legal voter.

Q. You can take it there if you want to do so?—A. I am going to take it there this fall.

Q. You have a right to sue them, if you are a legal voter, whether they are willing to be sued or not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You can always bring suit?—A. I know; but I always had confidence enough in the honesty of the gentlemen composing the board there, if they were Democrats, to believe that they would do justice; but they failed to do it. That is the reason why I failed to take the case to the court.

Q. You say that you sent a list to the chairman of the State central committee of employés of the Treasury Department who resided in Pennsylvania?—A. Yes, sir; the Pennsylvania residents.

Q. And that list was sent back to you corrected, some time afterward?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the corrections that they made did they note any of the persons on the list as Democrats?—A. They did in one case.

Q. Did they note him as a legal voter?—A. I believe they did.

Q. Did you furnish him transportation?—A. Not very likely.

Q. You did not furnish him transportation?—A. The gentleman had free transportation; I do not know where he got it. He did not get it from us.

Q. You did not furnish him transportation and a tax-receipt?—A. No, sir; he had free transportation. He said he had; I think he got it from the other side in some way.

Q. You did not see his ticket?—A. No, sir; I did not.

Q. It was not furnished by you?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did these persons who came over from the War Department to your room on the request of Mr. Russell get tax-receipts and a transportation-ticket?—A. No, sir; not in all cases.

Q. Did any of them get it?—A. Some of them had paid their taxes at home, and in other cases the taxes were paid by their friends, or by the county committee, I understood. That I do not know.

Q. Were any of them furnished with tax-receipts?—A. Only in some cases.

Q. In some cases they were?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. CAMERON:

Q. You say there is a Democrat on your force?—A. Not on my force; he was a clerk in the department.

By Mr. McDONALD:

Q. Is he not there now?—A. No, sir; I think he was appointed receiver of public moneys up in Idaho or Dakota last month.

Q. That is under the civil service reform?—A. Yes, sir. I would say that the gentleman was never reported as being a Democrat to the department.

Q. They reported him back as being a Democrat?—A. Yes, sir; to me on my list.

By Mr. CAMERON:

Q. Did he inform you from whom he received transportation?—A. I

understood he had a free pass on the road from here to Harrisburg. He said so, at least.

Q. Did he go home?—A. I met him, I believe, at Mechanicsburg at a Republican meeting there on Saturday night before the election.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. That is his home?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. He went home to Pennsylvania?—A. Yes, sir; I believe I saw him there. He generally went home.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Your attention to these clerks related to the Treasury Department as well as other departments?—A. No, sir.

Q. You gave no attention to the clerks from Pennsylvania in the other departments?—A. No, sir; in none of them, except in the Quartermaster's Department. The gentleman there—I do not recollect his name—who had charge was taken sick, and some three or four of them came over and applied to me for transportation.

Q. Who had charge of the Quartermaster's Department?—A. That I do not recollect.

Q. Do you know who had charge of the Interior Department?—A. Mr. Burke, I think.

Q. Who had charge of the Navy Department?—A. I do not know. I do not think we had a Pennsylvania voter in the Navy Department.

Q. You say you have lost your book?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you not a book with these names?—A. I said I thought I had lost it. I had a common memorandum book, and which I thought I had lost, but since coming up here it occurs to me that I have it. It contains a list of Pennsylvania voters in the Treasury Department, and I would be glad to give it to you.

Q. Have you not these lists of voters there from year to year?—A. No, sir; I have not.

Q. You obtained this list last year and sent it forward, and it was corrected?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you no book that shows accurately the number of Pennsylvanians in the department?—A. No, sir; I have never gone to the trouble of making up one. I know about all the Pennsylvanians personally, and I go to them and ask if they are voters, and if they say they are I take their names.

WILLIAM W. BURKE sworn and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Where are you employed?—Answer. In the Interior Department.

Q. In what branch?—A. In the Land Office.

Q. Where are you from?—A. From Philadelphia.

Q. How long have you been engaged in the Interior Department?—A. Since 1870.

Q. You are a man of family?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you have your family here with you?—A. I have my family here.

Q. Did you have charge of a list of Pennsylvania voters in the Inte-

rior Department and in the Post-Office Department to send them home to vote at the November election?—A. I had such a list.

Q. How many were upon that list?—A. I cannot tell exactly.

Q. About how many in the Interior Department and about how many in the Post-Office Department?—A. I would not like to say, Mr. Chairman. I can tell you exactly how many.

Q. I would be glad if you could give us the number. I do not want to press for the list in detail, but I want the number of voters in each of these departments, if you can give it to us.—A. I can give you the number of voters in the Interior Department, in the Post-Office Department, and in the Surgeon-General's Office on Tenth street; I know them all.

Mr. TELLER. Do you want their names?

The CHAIRMAN. Not at all. I only want the number on the list from Pennsylvania, and who were sent home to vote.

The WITNESS. I can give you the number that I sent home a year ago.

Q. (By the CHAIRMAN.) Can you do it now?—A. No, sir; not now.

Q. Can you during the day, so that the stenographer can have it?—A. I do not think I can. I can have it to-morrow morning; I can make it up to-night.

The CHAIRMAN. Send it to the stenographer to-morrow morning, if you please.

The WITNESS. Very well.

The statement was subsequently furnished, and is as follows:

There were one hundred and three Pennsylvanians who were employed in the Interior and Post-Office Departments, and including that branch of the Treasury known as the Sixth Auditor's, which is located in the Post-Office building, and that part of the Surgeon-General's Office situated on Tenth street, northwest, that were supposed to have gone to Pennsylvania for the purpose of voting at the election held in November, 1878.

W. W. BURKE.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Will you tell us whether these gentlemen reside at Philadelphia and other points in the State of Pennsylvania?—A. My list came back as Mr. Cobaugh's did, corrected.

Q. How? What were the corrections made upon your list?—A. That they were not legal voters; that they were not assessed and were not entitled to vote.

Q. You then had sent a list to the committee in advance?—A. Not to the committee.

Q. To whom, then?—A. To Mr. Russell.

Q. Where was Mr. Russell when you sent him the list?—A. He was in Philadelphia.

Q. To what place did you direct your communication to Mr. Russell?—A. I cannot tell you.

Q. Had you a communication from Mr. Russell before you sent him the list?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did he ask?—A. He asked for such a list.

Q. Had his letter the heading of the Republican State Central Committee on it?—A. I think it had, but I am not certain.

Q. Did you not send your communication to Mr. Russell at the rooms of the State central committee in Philadelphia?—A. No, sir; at his private residence. I do not know exactly his address, but I have his address.

Q. He is here and can give it. When the list came back corrected was there anything accompanying it?—A. No, sir.

Q. Who brought it back?—A. It was sent back by mail.

Q. How soon after that did you see Mr. Russell?—A. I did not see Mr. Russell until a week or ten days before the election, I think; I am not certain. I cannot specify the time exactly.

Q. Did he bring the transportation for these clerks?—A. He did.

Q. Did you go home to Philadelphia to vote?—A. I did.

Q. Did you vote?—A. I did. I always have voted there.

Q. In what precinct and ward?—A. It is the old 3d precinct of the 23d ward, I think, changed now to the second.

Q. Did you get a tax-receipt?—A. I always have a tax-receipt. I always pay my own taxes.

Q. Did Mr. Russell get you the tax-receipt?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did Mr. Russell bring other tax-receipts along with the transportation?—A. He did.

Q. Did those receipts contain the names in them of the Philadelphia voters, or was it just received from blank so much?—A. They contained the names of each individual who was assessed.

Q. Were those tax-receipts handed with the transportation to the clerk when he went home to vote?—A. I could not say as to all of them.

Q. As to any of them?—A. I handed some of them myself. I personally knew them, and I got their receipts.

Q. The transportation was a ticket from where and to where?—A. From Washington to the nearest point of their place of voting and return.

Q. When did you leave to go home?—A. I think it was on Thursday morning or Friday (I do not recollect exactly) before the election.

Q. When did you return?—A. I returned the next day after the election.

Q. Had you leave of absence?—A. I had, sir.

Q. From whom?—A. From the Secretary of the Interior.

Q. To go home to vote?—A. I did not specify in my application that I was going home to vote. I had some time coming to me, and I took it out of my regular leave.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. You had some leave of absence coming to you?—A. Yes, sir; and so did every one in the department.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Were tickets furnished to those in the Post-Office Department as well as in the Interior Department?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were or were not all the clerks employed in these three departments that you have named provided with transportation to go home to vote?—A. No, sir; they were not.

Q. All who were entitled to vote on that list?—A. All who were entitled to vote.

Q. As appeared by that list?—A. As appeared by that list. I was very particular myself in delivering the tickets.

Q. Are you registered in Philadelphia?—A. I am.

Q. As from what place?—A. Do you mean as a resident?

Q. As a resident. What is the number of your residence in Philadelphia from which you are registered?—A. I am in the rural district. I am registered from my brother's residence on the Crewstown road.

Q. You are registered as residing at your brother's home?—A. Yes, sir; from which I moved. I always lived in that precinct and always voted there.

Q. That is the old third precinct of the 23d ward?—A. Yes, sir; it is the second now.

Q. It is now the second of the 23d ward?—A. Yes, sir; you will find my name registered every year. I never neglected it and I have my tax receipts for every year.

Q. About what length of time was each of these clerks absent who was allowed to go home to vote?—A. From the Interior Department?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. Some took their leave for ten and fifteen days. They waited; they held up some of their leave until the election, and then added to it in order to have more time.

Q. About what length of time can you fix as the average of time when those were absent who went home to vote—five days or ten days? What was about the average period? I do not care to fix the time particularly, but the average.—A. I could not state the average, because I did not see their leaves.

Q. Did you get a written leave?—A. I did, sir.

Q. For how long a time was it?—A. It was for five days, I think; I am not certain. I am not positive as to that; but I think I can show you the leave.

Q. How long were you absent on leave during the summer of 1878?—A. I could not tell exactly. I had one fifteen days' leave—a regular leave—and I had a day or two besides.

Q. Would you have gone home to vote if you had not received your transportation?—A. I would, sir; I never fail to go home when I have the opportunity.

Q. This transportation was furnished here to you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you a contributor to the fund of the Congressional committee?—A. No, sir; I contributed to my ward committee.

Q. In Philadelphia or here?—A. In Philadelphia.

Q. Did you not contribute to the committee here?—A. I did not.

Q. Will you tell us, if you please, what the politics are of the precinct in which you vote?—A. I can soon do that. Since the township of Byberry has been taken from the precinct it has been Democratic from 35 to 40, but last fall we gave our representative one majority, and Dill received only two majority.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. Who is Dill?—A. The Democratic candidate for governor. The precinct is Democratic; they have the officers of the board.

Q. Had they the officers of the board at the election in November, 1878?—A. They had.

Q. Was your vote challenged?—A. No, sir; never has it been challenged. We have a Democratic assessor, too, and he always assesses me because he knows he has got to do it.

Q. Have you a list of the voters who belong to Pennsylvania in the Interior Department?—A. I think I have.

Q. Have you it with you?—A. No, sir; I have not.

Q. How long have you had charge of this subject of sending voters home to Pennsylvania from the Interior Department?—A. Ever since I have been there in fact.

Q. How many years is that?—A. Since 1870.

Q. Are you annually called on at the Congressional and State elec-

tions by the State committee to look after the voters from Pennsylvania?—A. No, sir.

Q. You furnish a list without being called on?—A. No, sir; I never furnished more than this one list, but I know them all and I am interested in getting them up and finding out whether they are going home; and that is the only way that I am connected with it.

By Mr. GARLAND:

Q. I did not understand you about the applications for leave of absence. Did they specify that they wanted to go for any particular reason?—A. No, sir.

Q. It was just a general application?—A. Just a general application.

Q. For any particular length of time?—A. For a certain specified length of time.

Q. Your leave was for five days?—A. I think mine was for five days. I am not certain; I will not say positively.

Q. Can you recollect whether the leave of the others, who went to Philadelphia, for example, called for the same length of time?—A. Some leaves called for more. Some persons went before transportation was furnished them. As I said before, they had saved up their leave until near election so as to have a longer leave, and took it out of their regular leave.

Q. What is your recollection as to the length of time that most of them claimed, who went to Philadelphia, for example? Of course it would be longer or shorter as the distance was nearer or farther, but for those who went to Philadelphia, was the leave as long as yours, which was five days?—A. I suppose that it was. Some I know did not start until Monday before the election and came back on Wednesday, and some started on Saturday.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you know of voters from the Interior Department going home to the other States to vote at the November election?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. From what other States?—A. From New York, Indiana, New Jersey.

Q. From Ohio?—A. From Ohio.

Q. Was transportation furnished to all those gentlemen?—A. I cannot tell you.

Q. As a rule? Do you know anything about it?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. Explain what you mean by saying that some of these men had saved up their leave of absence.—A. The clerks in the departments are entitled to thirty days leave in a year, and some had fifteen, it may be twenty, days to be added to that leave.

Q. Standing to their credit?—A. Standing to their credit. They knew that they would go home to the election, and they took their leave at that time so as to cover the election.

WILLIAM G. RUSSELL sworn and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. Where did you live prior to the November election, 1878?—Answer. In Philadelphia.

Q. Were you connected with the Republican State Central Committee of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As what—as clerk?—A. As clerk; yes, sir.

Q. Were you or were you not in charge of the subject of seeing that Pennsylvania voters in the departments were sent home to vote?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Had you lists of voters in the departments in Washington?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you copies of those lists?—A. No, sir.

Q. What has become of them?—A. I do not know.

Q. What did you do in connection with having these men sent home to vote? Did you write here to parties in the departments on the subject?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. To whom did you write in the Treasury Department?—A. To Mr. Coughlin.

Q. To whom in the Interior Department?—A. To Mr. Burke.

Q. To whom in the Post-Office Department?—A. I do not know; I think to Mr. Burke also in the Post-Office Department.

Q. To whom did you write in regard to the Navy or War Departments?—A. To Captain Tanner.

Q. To whom did you write in connection with the Quartermaster's Department? Was that connected with the War Department?—A. I do not know.

Q. Did you write to anybody connected with the Government Printing Office?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. To whom?—A. To Mr. Kerr.

Q. Is he engaged in that department?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was it that you wanted from these gentlemen? What did you ask for? Did you ask for lists of the voters in the departments?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you get lists in reply?—A. Yes, sir.

Mr. TELLER. You mean Pennsylvania voters?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly, I have reference to them. [To the witness:] What was then done with these lists?—A. Nothing that I know of.

Q. Were not those lists sent out to the county committees?—A. I do not know; I did not send them.

Q. Did you get those lists again? Did you ever see them again?—A. No, sir.

Q. When did you come to Washington?—A. What for?

Q. When did you come after you were employed at the November election? How long before the election did you come to Washington?—A. O, about two weeks before.

Q. What did you come here for?—A. To furnish transportation.

Q. Transportation for what?—A. For the Pennsylvania clerks in the departments to go home and vote.

Q. Who gave you that transportation?—A. The State central committee of Pennsylvania.

Q. The Republican State central committee?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did they furnish you with tax-receipts?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What number of tickets did you bring?—A. O, I do not know.

Q. About what number?—A. Indeed I could not tell you.

Q. Do you know what number of tax-receipts you brought?—A. No, sir.

Q. Where did you make your office to look after this business?—A. I did not make it in any particular place. I went to the departments and gave the clerks their tickets in the departments.

Q. Did you go to the office of the captain of the watch in the Treasury Department, and do your correspondence from that point?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you notify the clerks of the different departments to call there prior to nine o'clock in the morning to get their transportation?—A. O, in some cases where they had gone home, or where their leave had commenced before I got here.

Q. Where would they go to find you to get transportation if you could not see them?—A. I generally called to see them.

Q. You made it your business to call upon them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. At the different departments?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where would they call to find you when you did not see them at the departments?—A. I did not notify them of any point to find me.

Q. Where was it understood by them that they would find you?—A. I do not know that it was understood that they would find me anywhere. I was supposed to go after them, not they to come after me.

Q. Where did they find you to get transportation when you did not find them?—A. I suppose they found me at Captain Cobaugh's office. I was usually going through the departments.

Q. Do you know how many Pennsylvania voters were sent home from the Treasury Department?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you deliver the tickets in person?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you deliver the tax-receipts in person?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did they pay you for those tax-receipts?—A. No, sir; they were paid for already.

Q. You handed the voter a free ticket to transport him home and return, and a tax-receipt for his taxes already paid; is that it?—A. Not in all cases.

Q. As to Philadelphia?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As to Philadelphia, the tax-receipts were paid?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was the name of the voter in the tax-receipt?—A. Yes, sir; they were paid for; they were bought from the receiver of taxes before they came here.

Q. By the Republican committee in Philadelphia?—A. I suppose so.

Q. You received them from the Republican committee?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you delivered them without charge to the gentlemen who went home to vote?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you not give me the number of clerks who were sent home to Pennsylvania to vote?—A. No, sir; I cannot.

Q. Have you no lists, or copies of lists?—A. Not that I know of. After it was over it was done, and I thought it of no use to keep the lists.

Q. Have you nothing, so that if your services are called on next year you can refresh your memory?—A. No, sir; only what I know myself. I suppose I have my lists at home.

Q. Who would make you acquainted with these men? You were not acquainted with them all before?—A. I knew pretty near all of them, I guess.

Q. Do you know all the voters in the different departments who went home to Philadelphia to vote?—A. I know pretty near everybody who is here in the departments and goes home to vote in Pennsylvania.

Q. Do you know the politics of all of them?—A. No, sir.

Q. Who vouched to you for the men in the different departments being Republicans and entitled to go home and vote? Did you ask somebody whether they were all right?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did not Mr. Cobaugh advise you as to the men?—A. When I asked him he did.

Q. Did you ask him?—A. I may have asked him about some, not more than one or two.

Q. Where did you live before you came here, in what part of Philadelphia?—A. In the first ward.

Q. What employment had you in Philadelphia before you were connected with the State committee?—A. In the Midvale Steel Works, at Nicetown.

Q. Were you not a clerk in the state-house row?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what branch there?—A. In the office of the prothonotary of the court of common pleas.

Q. How long ago is it since you were in that employ?—A. Five years.

Q. When did you cease being there?—A. In 1872, or 1873, or 1874, I think; I am not certain.

Q. Were you ever in Washington before on the subject of getting voters home to vote?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. At what elections?—A. At the election before this last fall.

Q. The election before the election of 1878?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The election of 1876?—A. No, sir; that of 1877.

Q. Were you not here at the Presidential election?—A. No, sir.

Q. Were you here before the Presidential election looking out for voters?—A. I was here at Mayor Stokely's election.

Q. That was in February, 1877, was it not?—A. I guess so; I do not know.

Q. And this is the third election you have been here looking after Pennsylvania voters?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you in communication with anybody in regard to getting these voters home?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. With whom?—A. I wrote to Captain Cogaugh and Mr. Burke.

Q. To anybody else?—A. To Mr. Tanner, of the War Department, and Mr. Kerr, of the Government Printing Office.

Q. I suppose you were in communication with the State committee after you came over here, were you not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your business now?—A. I am in the Register's Office of the Treasury Department.

Q. When were you appointed?—A. On the 15th of February last.

Q. What is your monthly compensation?—A. One hundred dollars.

Q. Who is the Register of the Treasury?—A. Glenni W. Scofield.

Q. What State is he from?—A. From Pennsylvania.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. You say you brought tax-receipts. Do you mean that you brought them for all, or only for such as had not paid their taxes?—A. Such as had not paid.

Q. Was it not the fact that some had paid their taxes?—A. Yes, sir; in a great many cases.

Q. You learned before you came over who had not paid their taxes, and the taxes were paid by the local committee, I suppose?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You brought those receipts and delivered them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know about any Democrats going back from here to vote who were engaged in public employment?—A. I believe they were sending over, too.

Q. The Democratic committee furnished transportation also to the Democrats?—A. I do not know. I got hold of one of their tickets, or what purported to be one of their tickets.

Q. I suppose they have not got quite as many in Government employment here as the Republicans, perhaps?—A. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. They were too poor to send them home if they had?

Mr. TELLER. No doubt you sent them home fast enough from what I am informed, even clear over to Connecticut.

The WITNESS. Every man who was in Washington was drummed up to go home who was in Randall's district.

By Mr. TELLER:

Q. Republicans and Democrats, both?—A. Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Had you tax-receipts for anybody except Philadelphia voters?—

A. Yes, sir; Pennsylvania voters.

Q. Tax-receipts for anybody except Philadelphia voters?—A. Yes, sir; Pennsylvania voters outside of the city; a very few, though.

Q. Those tax-receipts were paid for, as I understand you, by the Republican committee?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The Republican State committee?—A. So I understood.