

Merriam, Milliken, Mills, Morrison, Myers, Neal, Niblack, Niles, O'Brien, O'Neill, Hosea W. Parker, Parsons, Pelham, Perry, Phelps, Pierce, Thomas C. Platt, Poland, Randall, Rice, James C. Robinson, Milton Saylor, John G. Schumaker, Sener, Sheldon, A. Herr Smith, Southard, Standford, Storm, Swann, Thornburgh, Townsend, Tremain, Vance, Waldron, Wells, Whitehead, Whitehouse, Whitthorne, Charles W. Willard, Willie, Ephraim K. Wilson, Wolfe, Woodford, and John D. Young—101.

NOT VOTING—Messrs. Adams, Albright, Ashe, Barnum, Barry, Bass, Bland, Blount, Cessna, Clayton, Clinton L. Cobb, Curtis, Davis, DeWitt, Elliott, Farwell, Robert S. Hale, Hays, Hendee, Hersey, George F. Hoar, Holman, Hubbell, Jewett, Kendall, Loughridge, Luttrell, McJunkin, Mitchell, Moore, Negley, Nunn, Potter, Read, Robbins, William R. Roberts, Ross, Scofield, Henry J. Scudder, Isaac W. Scudder, Sloss, William A. Smith, Snyder, Stanard, Stephens, St. John, Stone, Sypher, Taylor, Charles R. Thomas, Todd, Waddell, Wilber, John M. S. Williams, Wood, and Pierce M. B. Young—36.

So the bill was passed.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. I move to amend the title of the bill, so that it will read as follows: "An act to provide for a just and equitable distribution of the moneys paid in pursuance of the award made to the United States by the commissioners at Geneva under the treaty of Washington."

The amendment to the title was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the title was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of their clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, with amendments; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (H. R. No. 1706) to authorize the opening of Wight street through the grounds of the United States Marine Hospital at Detroit, Michigan.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. No. 693) to change the time for holding the circuit and district courts of the United States for the western district of Wisconsin at Oshkosh.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. GARFIELD. I desire to give notice that immediately after the reading of the Journal to-morrow, I shall call up the sundry civil appropriation bill.

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

Mr. DAWES. Let us go to business on the Speaker's table for a few moments, to dispose of some matters that will not give rise to debate.

Mr. LAMISON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill in relation to errors in prize-lists be taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. RANDALL. I have moved to adjourn.

Mr. DAWES. I desire to give notice to the House that, with the consent of the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. GARFIELD,] I shall move to go to business on the Speaker's table, to dispose of matters that will not give rise to discussion, to-morrow, immediately after reading of the Journal, for a short time only.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I hope that we shall have an evening session to-night, to enable the Committee on War Claims to make some reports.

Mr. GARFIELD. I move that the House adjourn.

The SPEAKER. A motion to adjourn was made and is now pending.

The question was taken on Mr. RANDALL's motion, and it was agreed to; and accordingly (at five o'clock and five minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following memorials, petitions, and other papers were presented at the Clerk's desk, under the rules, and referred as stated:

By Mr. COBB, of Kansas: The petition of members of the Delaware tribe of Indians who have become citizens of the United States, that patents be issued to them for their lands and all restrictions removed from the same, and that they be paid the proportion of money held in trust by the United States for them, to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DUNNELL: The petition of grange organizations in Martin County, Minnesota, for the passage of the bill to aid in the construction of the Continental Freight Railway, to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. FARWELL: The remonstrance of tobacco manufacturers of Chicago, Illinois, against any amendment of the internal-revenue laws which will permit growers of leaf-tobacco to sell to consumers without license or tax, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, the petition of citizens of Chicago, Illinois, for the passage of the bill to aid in the construction of the Continental Freight Railway, to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. HAYS: The petition of citizens of Alabama, for the establishment of certain post-routes in said State, to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HYDE: The petition of grange organizations in Sullivan and Chariton Counties, Missouri, for the passage of the bill to aid in the construction of the Continental Freight Railway, to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. PACKARD: The petition of grange organizations in Jasper County, Indiana, for the passage of the bill to aid in the construction of the Continental Freight Railway, to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, the petition, with accompanying papers, of James P. Gillespie, praying that he be paid the sum of \$26,545.33 claimed by him as informer in revenue cases, to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SENER: The petition of Jacob Sparrow, of Gloucester County, Virginia, for compensation for seizure of schooner John Hamilton by United States steamer Daylight during the late war, to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: The petition of grange associations in Wood County, Ohio, for the passage of the bill to aid in the construction of the Continental Freight Railway, to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, the petition of druggists of Perrysburgh, Ohio, for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicines, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, the petition of wholesale grocers and druggists of Toledo, Ohio, for the passage of the bill to define a gross of matches, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, the petition of tobacco manufacturers of Toledo, Ohio, against permission to growers of leaf-tobacco to sell to consumers without tax or license, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, the petition of members of the Order of Stars and Stripes, for the equalization of soldiers' bounties, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRAIT: The petition of grange organizations in Carver County, Minnesota, for the passage of the bill in aid of the construction of the Continental Freight Railway, to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. THOMAS, of Virginia: The petition of citizens of Franklin County, Virginia, for increased mail facilities, to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILSON, of Iowa: The petition of citizens of Poweshiek County, Iowa, of similar import, to the same committee.

Also, the petition of grange organizations in Tama County, Iowa, of similar import, to the same committee.

By Mr. WOLFE: The petition of the grange organization in Adams-borough, Indiana, of similar import, to the same committee.

IN SENATE.

THURSDAY, June 11, 1874.

The Senate met at twelve o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. BYRON SUNDERLAND, D. D.

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a memorial of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and a memorial of citizens of Toledo, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the law permitting growers of leaf-tobacco to sell \$100 worth of their crop at retail to consumers without license or tax; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SCOTT presented a memorial of workingmen of Barre Furnace and Forge, Pennsylvania, praying Congress to restore the 10 per cent. duty on iron and steel and to provide for free banking; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of merchants, importers, bankers, and business men of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, protesting against the passage of the twenty-ninth section of the tariff and tax bill which imposes a tax on all sales of stocks, bonds, gold and silver bullion, coin, and other securities; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MORTON presented a memorial of citizens of Indianapolis, Indiana, protesting against the passage of a law permitting growers of leaf-tobacco to sell \$100 worth of their crop at retail to consumers without license or tax; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TIPTON presented the petition of Jacob Bogert, praying compensation for loss of the steamer Pocahontas while in the United States service; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. MCPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. No. 7) for the creation of a court for the adjudication and disposition of certain moneys received into the Treasury under an award made by the tribunal of arbitration constituted by virtue of the first article of the treaty concluded at Washington the 8th of May, A. D. 1871, between

the United States of America and the Queen of Great Britain, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had concurred in the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

- A bill (H. R. No. 280) granting a pension to Ann Crane;
- A bill (H. R. No. 1045) for the relief of B. W. Harris, late collector of internal revenue for the second district of Massachusetts;
- A bill (H. R. No. 1706) to authorize the opening of Wight street through the grounds of the United States marine hospital at Detroit, Michigan;
- A bill (H. R. No. 1753) to authorize medals commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the first meeting of the Continental Congress and of the Declaration of Independence; and
- A bill (H. R. No. 2208) authorizing the President to reinstate George M. Book on the active list of the Navy.

BILL RECOMMENDED.

Mr. HOWE. I move that the bill (H. R. No. 1322) for the relief of George S. Gustin, late a private of Company D, Seventy-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteers, be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs. I make this motion after consultation with the chairman of that committee.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post Roads, to whom was referred the memorial of certain mail-route agents, asking a change in the law regulating the compensation of route agents, asked to be discharged from its further consideration; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred a petition of citizens of the United States, praying that the money-order system be extended to every post-office in the United States, asked to be discharged from its further consideration; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred a resolution of the Legislature of California, relative to the mail route from Sebastia City to Lake City in that State, asked to be discharged from its further consideration; which was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 2979) abolishing the office of appraiser of imported merchandise, appointed under the act of July 14, 1870, and acts amendatory thereof, at certain places, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 867) to amend section 35 of the act entitled "An act to reduce internal taxes, and for other purposes," (the purpose of which he stated was to create Rochester, New York, a port of entry,) reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 3594) to amend section 35 of the act entitled "An act to reduce internal taxes, and for other purposes," reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 118) explanatory of the ninth section of the act of July 13, 1866, concerning deposits in savings-banks, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 3256) to repeal so much of the act approved May 8, 1872, entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1873, and for other purposes," as provides for the employment of persons to assist the proper officers of the Government in discovering and collecting moneys withheld, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. PATTERSON, from the Committee on Territories, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 435) to enable the people of Colorado to form a constitution and State government, and for the admission of the said State into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, reported it without amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Patents, to whom was referred the memorial of John Young, of Amsterdam, New York, praying for an extension of his patent for an improved washing and wringing machine, reported adversely thereon, and asked to be discharged from its further consideration; which was agreed to.

Mr. OGLESBY, The Committee on Pensions, who considered at their last meeting House bill No. 2218, granting a pension to Sarah Summerville, and who reported from that last meeting the bill adversely, have again had the same under consideration, it having been since recommitted, and instructed me to now recommend the passage of the bill and we adopt the House report.

Mr. FERRY, of Michigan, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 3175) for the relief of J. E. Ingalls, postmaster at Denmark, Lee County, Iowa, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon; which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. PRATT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 804) equalizing pensions of certain officers, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon; which was ordered to be printed.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was recommitted the

bill (H. R. No. 2791) granting a pension to Franklin Stoner, reported it without amendment.

Mr. PRATT. The Committee on Pensions, to whom was recommended the bill (H. R. No. 3016) granting a pension to Ira Douthart, have reconsidered the bill and have come to the conclusion that the bill ought to pass, and they have directed me to report it back and I ask that the matter be now passed upon.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Objection is made, and the bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. PRATT. I am instructed by the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 2670) granting a pension to Mary S. Howe, to report it without amendment and recommend its passage. The committee do not submit any written report of their own in this case, but adopt the report of the House committee.

Mr. ALLISON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 3606) granting a pension to Mary E. Grosvenor, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon, which was ordered to be printed.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 1947) granting a pension to George Holmes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon, which was ordered to be printed.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 1275) granting a pension to William D. Boyd, of Johnson County, Kentucky, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon, which was ordered to be printed.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 1234) granting a pension to Mary S. Prince, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the petition of Captain Jonas P. Levy, praying compensation for losses sustained in consequence of his expulsion from Tabasco by the Mexicans at the commencement of the war between the United States and Mexico in 1846, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was ordered to be printed, and the committee were discharged from the further consideration of the petition.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom were referred the bill (S. No. 47) in aid of the execution of the laws in the Territory of Utah, and for other purposes; the bill (S. No. 58) in aid of the execution of the laws in the Territory of Utah, and for other purposes; the bill (S. No. 266) for the protection of society in the Territory of Utah, and for other purposes; and the bill (S. No. 267) in aid of the execution of the laws in the Territory of Utah, asked to be discharged from their consideration; which was agreed to, and the bills were postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 3097) in relation to courts and judicial officers in the Territory of Utah, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. INGALLS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following petitions, asked to be discharged from their further consideration; which was agreed to:

A petition of citizens of Oregon, and Washington Territory, praying to be allowed a pension for services rendered the Government during the Mexican war; and

A petition of Rev. N. Newton Glazier and others, praying for an amendment to the pension laws.

Mr. INGALLS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 3338) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to revise, consolidate, and amend the Army and Navy pension laws," approved March 3, 1873, reported it without amendment.

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 2653) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to suspend work upon the public buildings, reported it without amendment.

Mr. BOGY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 3528) providing for the sale of the Kansas Indian lands in Kansas to actual settlers, and for the disposition of the proceeds of the sale, reported it without amendment.

Mr. GORDON, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 2887) to prevent the introduction of contagious or infectious diseases into the United States, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, reported a bill (S. No. 922) abolishing the office of appraiser of imported merchandise, appointed under the act of July 14, 1870, and acts amendatory thereof, at certain places; which was read, and passed to a second reading.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 899) to constitute Montgomery, in the State of Alabama, a port of delivery, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom were referred a letter from the Secretary of War, recommending the enactment of a law authorizing the transfer of the Fort Dalles military reservation at Fort Dalles, Oregon, to the Secretary of the Interior to be disposed of for cash under existing laws, and a letter from the Secretary of War asking authority to sell the military reservation at Camp Cady, California, reported a bill (S. No. 923) to provide for the disposition of useless military reservations; which was read, and passed to a second reading.

Mr. SCOTT. I am instructed by the Committee on Claims, to whom

was referred the bill (H. R. No. 2797) making appropriations for the payment of claims reported allowed by the commissioners of claims under the act of Congress of March 3, 1871, to report the same back with several amendments and to recommend its passage. I desire in connection with this report to state that I would be glad if I could have the consent of the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill on Monday next after the termination of the morning hour.

Mr. SARGENT. I will not object if it does not interfere with the appropriation bills.

Mr. SCOTT. While upon the subject of reports I would ask for a moment the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce. I have presented a number of petitions in favor of what is commonly known as the steamboat bill passed by the House at this session, and I am daily in receipt of a large number of letters inquiring as to probable action upon that bill. As it is now before the Committee on Commerce, I think it proper to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether we may expect a report upon that bill at this session in time for action upon it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will state to the Senator from Pennsylvania that that bill has been up several times for examination before the Committee on Commerce, but they have not yet been able to agree upon a report upon the bill. I am in hopes the committee will be able to report before the close of the session, but they are not ready to do so at this time.

Mr. SCOTT. I would express the hope, in view of the fact that a similar bill was reported in the last Congress and failed because of want of time to consider a report of a committee of conference and in view of the fact that thirty-five sections of the bill are really a re-enactment of the existing law, that the Committee on Commerce may find time to report it, so that we may have action upon it at this session.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope so.

Mr. SARGENT. Was any understanding or order made in reference to the bill reported from the Committee on Claims?

Mr. EDMUNDS. No, sir.

Mr. SARGENT. I wish to except from any understanding or order the appropriation bills. The Committee on Appropriations have been patient with their bills for several days past, but they have work to bring to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. EDMUNDS. There was no understanding about it.

ARTICLES FOR CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 3601) to admit free of duty articles intended for the international exhibition of 1876, to report the same back without amendment, and recommend its passage; and as the object of this bill is manifest on its face, and there is some reason for haste, I ask for its present consideration.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Before objecting, I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio how the other committees of this body are going to get up bills to which there is really no objection and which the public interests require and which can be passed in a minute if we get at them, if we take up private bills or bills that are reported from his committee and others, and pass them at once when they are reported? If any way can be pointed out by which the other committees can get hold of the Calendar and put through things which the public interest requires and which will not cause debate, then I do not want to object to this. But if the effect of this every day is to be that the business is preferred which comes last, then a good many of us have been acting on the wrong supposition in getting our bills on the Calendar. I speak in all seriousness, because I wish to have an understanding as to how we can get on.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think there ought to be a day when unobjected cases can be taken up and promptly disposed of, and when if objection is made to a bill it ought to be put over. This is a matter that everybody understands in the whole breadth and length of it. As a matter of course, we ought to allow articles for this purpose to come in free.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I have not the least objection to this bill, and I can say the same of a dozen bills reported from one committee that I know of besides others heretofore, some of which relate to private interests and some to public interests, and to which the Senator and everybody would say "amen" if we could only get at them. But how are we to get them through?

Mr. SHERMAN. The members of the Senate having them in charge ought to call them up or have a day set aside for their consideration.

Mr. EDMUNDS. How can I call them up if the reports of to-day take up the whole morning hour? I do not object in this particular instance, because we have taken as much time as it would occupy to pass the bill; but I hope I shall not be thought unfair if I say that for the rest of this morning, in the hope of getting to the Calendar, I shall object to everything out of order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill reported by the Senator from Ohio?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It allows all articles which shall be imported for the sole purpose of exhibition at the international exhibition to be held in the city of Philadelphia in the year 1876 to be admitted without the payment of duty or of customs fees or charges, under such regulations

as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but all such articles as shall be sold in the United States or withdrawn for consumption therein at any time after such importation shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed on like articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of importation; and in case any articles imported shall be withdrawn for consumption, or shall be sold without payment of duty as required by law, all the penalties prescribed by the revenue laws shall be applied and enforced against such articles and against the persons who may be guilty of such withdrawal or sale.

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

ASSAY OFFICE AT PORTLAND, OREGON.

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont. The Committee on Finance have directed me to report the following resolution, and I ask for its present consideration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be instructed to inquire and report at the next session of Congress as to the necessity of an assay office at Portland, Oregon, and if there is such a necessity whether a construction of the same or purchase from the owners of the present private assay office in Portland, as aforesaid, would be most expedient; and also as to the expediency of removing or abolishing the assay office at Boise City, Idaho.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SHERMAN asked, and by unanimous consent obtained, leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 924) donating condemned cannon to the city of Massillon, Ohio, for monumental purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred, with the accompanying papers, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

FISH AND FISHERIES.

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

Resolved, That the report of the commissioner on fish and fisheries for the years 1873-'74 be printed.

MAIL SERVICE WITH JAPAN AND CHINA.

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

Resolved, That the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads be instructed to inquire whether any further legislation is necessary to secure the transportation of the additional semi-monthly mail between San Francisco, Japan, and China.

CLERKS OF COURTS.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. No. 752) to compel the performance of certain duties by clerks of courts and other officers of the United States.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The first section provides that if any clerk of any district or circuit court of the United States shall willfully refuse or neglect to make any report, certificate, statement, or other document required by law to be by him made, or shall willfully refuse or neglect to forward any such report, certificate, statement, or document to the Department, officer, or person to whom by law the same should be forwarded, the President of the United States is empowered, and it is hereby made his duty in every such case, to remove such clerk so offending from office by an order in writing for that purpose. Upon the presentation of such order, or a copy thereof authenticated by the Attorney-General of the United States, to the judge of the court whereof such offender is clerk, such clerk shall thereupon be deemed to be out of office, and shall not exercise the functions thereof, and such judge, in the case of the clerk of a district court, shall appoint a successor; and in the case of the clerk of a circuit court the circuit judge shall appoint a successor. The person so removed shall not be eligible to any appointment as clerk or deputy clerk for the period of two years next after such removal.

The second section declares that if any clerk or other officer of the United States mentioned in the preceding section shall willfully refuse or neglect to make or to forward any such report, certificate, statement, or document therein mentioned, he shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$1,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, in the discretion of the court; but a conviction under this section shall not be necessary as a precedent to the removal from office provided for in section 1.

The Committee on the Judiciary proposed to amend the bill in section 1, line 17, by inserting before the word "judge" the word "district."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in section 2, line 1, after the word "clerk," to strike out the words "or other officer of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the same section, line 9, before the word "precedent," to insert the word "condition."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. BOREMAN. I should like to have some explanation from the Senator from Vermont in regard to the neglects or failures that this bill is intended to remedy. I do not understand the purpose exactly.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The purpose of the bill is to punish the unlawful non-performance of their duties by clerks of the circuit and dis-

strict courts, whereby they fail to report to the various Departments to which they are required and to the Attorney-General the state of the business on their dockets and the amount of funds, public and other, that have been received and are on deposit, the amount of moneys that have been received by them for fees, &c., the law fixing the limit of their fees and declaring that the balance shall be paid into the Treasury. It is found in many districts, I am ashamed to say for the honor of the judicial department of the Government, that the clerks absolutely neglect this duty, pocket all the fees they can get, and let the Treasury go empty. Now we propose that any clerk who willfully undertakes to cheat the Government in that way by not making honestly the reports the law requires of him shall be turned out of office.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed. The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to compel the performance of certain duties by clerks of courts of the United States."

SENATOR FROM ALABAMA.

Mr. BUCKINGHAM. I ask the Senate to take up the bill (S. No. 154) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain tribes of Indians in the northern superintendency," approved June 10, 1872.

Mr. HAMILTON, of Maryland. I very much desire that we should conclude the business we had up in yesterday's morning hour. I must object to taking up that bill at this time.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will submit the question on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. HAMILTON, of Maryland. The resolution which was up yesterday should be disposed of this morning.

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

The motion was not agreed to.

Mr. HAMILTON, of Maryland. I move now to proceed to the consideration of the resolution in the case of Mr. Sykes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chief Clerk will state the question.

The CHIEF CLERK. The original resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Francis W. Sykes, late contestant from the State of Alabama, out of the appropriations for compensation and mileage for Senators, the sum of \$3,374.80, being the salary of a Senator from the 4th day of March, 1873, to the 28th day of May, 1874, inclusive.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. CARPENTER] proposed to amend by striking out "\$3,374.80, being the salary of a Senator from the 4th day of March, 1873, to the 28th day of May, 1874, inclusive," and inserting "\$3,000." It is now proposed to amend the amendment by striking out "\$3,000" and inserting "\$6,500."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment to the amendment, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CONKLING. Although an amendment is not now in order, for convenience I give notice that when it is in order I shall offer an amendment the substance of which is that the actual expenses necessarily incurred both by Mr. SPENCER and Mr. Sykes in the recent contest for a seat in the Senate be paid, which expenses shall be presented, itemized, and verified by the oath of said SPENCER and Sykes respectively, and the amount audited by the Committee of the Senate on Contingent Expenses.

The yeas and nays were taken on the amendment of Mr. HAMILTON, of Maryland, to the amendment of Mr. CARPENTER; and resulted—yeas 25, nays 32; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Alcorn, Anthony, Bayard, Boggs, Conover, Cooper, Davis, Goldthwaite, Gordon, Hager, Hamilton of Maryland, Johnston, Kelly, Logan, McCreery, Merrimon, Morton, Norwood, Patterson, Ramsey, Ransom, Saulsbury, Stockton, Thurman, and Tipton—25.

NAYS—Messrs. Allison, Boreman, Boutwell, Buckingham, Cameron, Carpenter, Chandler, Conkling, Cragin, Edmunds, Ferry of Michigan, Frelighuysen, Gilbert, Hamilton of Texas, Hamlin, Harvey, Howe, Ingalls, Mitchell, Morrill of Maine, Morrill of Vermont, Oglesby, Pease, Pratt, Sargent, Sherman, Sprague, Stewart, Wadleigh, Washburn, Windom, and Wright—32.

ABSENT—Messrs. Brownlow, Clayton, Dennis, Dorsey, Fenton, Ferry of Connecticut, Flanagan, Hitchcock, Jones, Lewis, Robertson, Schurz, Scott, Spencer, Stevenson, and West—16.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CONKLING. I now offer as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the resolution the proposition which I send to the Chair, which is to pay the actual expenses necessarily incurred in this contest, to be audited by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion made by the Senator from Wisconsin to insert \$3,000 is now in order, and should be first put as it is in the nature of a motion to perfect the resolution.

Mr. CONKLING. I would inquire if I may of the Senator from Wisconsin whether he is not willing to accept this amendment?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Perhaps being in the chair I cannot withdraw the amendment; but I will put the question to the Senate. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The question being put, the amendment was declared to be rejected.

Mr. CONKLING. Now I offer the amendment which I send to the Chair as a substitute—

Mr. SARGENT. I am in favor of the amendment moved by the

Senator from Wisconsin. I should like to have a division on the question.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will submit the question again on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin to insert \$3,000.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ANTHONY. I should like to know what is the alternative proposition. This is to give \$3,000.

Mr. CONKLING. I will say to the Senator that my proposed amendment is to pay to each of these parties the expenses actually incurred in this contest for counsel fees and otherwise, to treat them both alike and indemnify them both against their actual expenses, whether they be more or less.

Mr. ANTHONY. My experience of the profession of which my friend is so brilliant an ornament is that we had better pay \$3,000 than pay counsel fees.

Mr. CONKLING. But the present proposition is to pay the contestant a sum arbitrarily fixed which may be more or less than his expenses, and to pay nothing to the holder of the seat. My suggestion is this: the contestant being the moving party, the occupant of the seat having been declared by the Senate entitled to it, the contest not having been made by him but forced upon him, if expenses are to be paid it is at least as equitable that he should be indemnified as it is to indemnify the moving party who, of his own option and accord, made the contest, and who the Senate has declared was not entitled to the seat. In other words, if I may be allowed the analogy, if some defeated competitor of the Senator from Rhode Island should come here to contest his seat, thus casting upon him the duty of defending the seat, and he does so, and the Senate adjudges that he was entitled to the seat and bound to maintain and defend his title, if expenses are to be paid, it would be capricious to say that the contestant alone shall be paid and the Senator himself shall shoulder the burden which has been imposed upon him. My amendment proposes to pay both alike whatever they have expended in money in fairly conducting the contest.

Mr. SARGENT. I certainly desire in matters like this to do that which is equitable; but I think we are setting a new precedent entirely; we are taking a new departure. I believe it is the fact that never in this body or in the other House has an instance heretofore occurred where we have paid to the successful contestant the expenses of his contest. If this is so, and I think I am entirely accurate in so saying, we ought to hesitate before starting such a new rule. I do not believe that we had better take the departure at this time, certainly not off-hand as is proposed by the amendment and without the report of a committee. I therefore hope that the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, which probably is about the amount of cost to the party who was unsuccessful in making his contest, will be adopted. I believe that it is right that where a person comes to contest a seat in good faith (and it is assumed in this case that the contest was in good faith) that he should be reimbursed his actual necessary expenses. I do not think, however, that we ought to pay him the salary of the whole term, or a large proportion of the whole term; but that there should be simply an equitable adjustment in his favor of the actual expenses of his contest. Believing that \$3,000 will probably cover this, I vote for that amendment.

Mr. CONKLING. How about the other party to the contest?

Mr. SARGENT. My answer is that it never has been done from the foundation of the Government to the present time, and I am not disposed to charge the Treasury under a new rule without the report of a committee and without more time for consideration than we are likely to have in the morning hour. Therefore I am opposed to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I ask that the amendment of the Senator from New York be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, (Mr. ANTHONY in the chair.) The suggested amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. The amendment of the Senator from New York is to strike out all after the word "resolved" in the first line and to insert:

That the actual expenses necessarily incurred both by Mr. SPENCER and Mr. Sykes, in the recent contest for a seat in the Senate, be paid, which expenses shall be represented, itemized, and verified by the oath of said SPENCER and Sykes respectively, and the amounts audited by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, the Senate has at this session, on recommendation of the Judiciary Committee, postponed indefinitely I believe—certainly we so recommended, and I think it was postponed indefinitely by unanimous consent—a bill to pay a judge of the supreme court of the District of Columbia the expenses and counsel fees that were incurred by him in defending himself against a wrongful suit brought by some person whose name in the course of his judicial duty he was obliged to strike from the rolls. He did it in good faith. He was sued. He defended himself in order to defend the majesty of the law, as it is stated by himself and his friends, and succeeded. He was right. But we determined that we could not pay a judge of the United States who defended himself from wrongful suits brought by citizens of the United States against him in the performance of his duty; that that was one of the risks which a judge took when he took the office, just as we all take our own

risks when we take any office, of defending ourselves against any illegal assaults of other persons. If in the exercise of our duty, in carrying out the will of the Government, we commit a private wrong against a man, which is right as between us and the Government but which is wrong as to him, then we are to be indemnified; the citizen gets his redress and we get our indemnity for all the cost and trouble to which we have been subjected. Everybody can understand that.

Upon what principle, therefore, is it, applied to this case, that we are to say that a person holding the office of Senator shall be entitled to be paid out of the public Treasury for his expenses and counsel fees in defending his right to perform the duties that the law has authorized him to perform? I do not see how we can do it unless we overset all the distinctions that have hitherto been thought to be wise in such respects. I am not saying at this moment that we ought to pay the counsel fees of the other man either; but I am now merely speaking of the case of the person who is rightfully here as a Senator. Suppose that you, sir, or I should happen to be sued by somebody for some remark made as a Senator; suppose one of us should happen to be sued for some remark made in the debate yesterday which if said out of this Chamber would subject us to an action unless we could prove that it was true. I do not make exactly the proper definition, but I will not take the time of the Senate to define precisely where the law of libel begins and ends in respect to a charge that might be made. We defend on the ground that the Constitution protects us for words spoken in debate. At the end of the lawsuit we succeed. The person who sued us in his own county found a judge and a jury who decided in his favor. We had to take it to the Supreme Court. By and by we succeed. Is it to be said that the Senate is to turn around and say that the Treasury has got to indemnify everybody for the expense he is put to in defending himself in the exercise of his legal rights? We cannot do that. It appears to me it is a very dangerous step to take. It appears to me it does not stand on sound principle. Therefore I move to strike out that part of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment of the Senator from New York is not yet before the Senate. The question is on the amendment to insert \$3,000.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I beg pardon of the Chair. I asked that the amendment might be read, and I supposed that the amendment which was read was pending. If not, I withdraw my observations.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The observations will be in order when that amendment is reached.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Now, I should like to have the amendment which is pending read.

Mr. MERRIMON. Mr. President, I think the proper measure of compensation is what the contestant would have been entitled to if he had been admitted to a seat as salary, and I believe that he is so entitled upon principle as well as justice and according to precedent. It will not be denied that it is necessary that contests in some cases should be made, not simply in the interest of the contestant, but in the interest of the public as well. It is true there might be a case in which a party would contest when there was no reasonable ground for it. In such a case he ought not to have any compensation at all. But where there is reasonable ground for contest, in the interest of the contestant himself and in the interest of the public as well, there it becomes necessary that he should attend Congress for the purpose of seeing the right established, of seeing the voice and will and judgment of the people at the ballot-box or through the Legislature effectuated. His presence is necessary; his efforts are necessary in that behalf.

In this case it is not denied that there was reasonable ground for contest. The Senate has been told by Senators of the committee who investigated this matter, of both sides of politics, that there was reasonable and proper ground for contest. There was great doubt in the minds of the committee how they should decide. They did, however, decide in favor of the Senator who now occupies the seat; so that that question is out of the way.

It appears then that this contestant ought to have been here, that he ought to have made the contest, that he ought to have done exactly what he has done. If that is so, pray what is the reason why the measure of his compensation is not exactly that which he would have received if he had been admitted to the seat which is now occupied by the sitting Senator? If he receives that compensation, if that is his measure of compensation, he is upon exact equality with the Senator who occupies the seat. The Senator who occupies the seat has been at the expense of this contest. That was his misfortune. The contestant has been at the expense of this contest. It was his misfortune that he happened to be at that expense for his own interest as well as that of the public. He is entitled to the compensation he would have received if he had been here as a member. The sitting member is entitled to the compensation by reason of the law which gives it to him. They are upon an exact equality. This is principle, this is justice, this is according to every precedent I believe that has been set in the history of the Government; and therefore I say the proposition of the Senator from Maryland is the true and just and equitable one, and the one which accords with the precedents set by the Government from the earliest period of its existence.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. SARGENT] well says that this is a new departure. It is a departure from the precedents, but the Senate has already departed from the

precedents by voting down the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Maryland, which would give to this contestant what would have been his salary if he had been seated on the first day of the term, as he claimed the right to be. I said yesterday all that I desire to say upon that subject, and will only briefly refer to it again.

It seems to me that the idea of compensation by the rule of salary is an unjust one. It is conceded that such have been the precedents. We are departing from precedents wherever we think the public good requires it. We yesterday changed the revenue laws which had existed for eighty years, because the public good required it. We are certainly at liberty to change the precedents in the Senate if right reason requires it. The principle on which we are proceeding—

Mr. SARGENT. Allow me to remind the Senator that the point of my objection is that this is not the report of any committee; it is not done with deliberation, but hastily during the morning hour. When we slaughtered the revenue law, as I am sorry to say we did, it was after long investigation by a committee.

Mr. CARPENTER. There is nothing about this matter that needs examination by a committee. The whole subject is patent to observation. It is conceded that the precedents are in favor of paying the salary. What is the right principle to be adopted? It certainly is to indemnify the contestant if he has made a contest in good faith. The rule of salary may do it and a great deal more, or it may utterly fail to do it. It is therefore not a proper rule. Hence it seems to me that the more correct and fair way is to say that he shall have his expenses whatever they may be. They may exceed what he would be entitled to as a salary; they may fall short; but whatever they are, they ought to be paid. And it is the principle of indemnity which has been recognized all through the precedents, although the rule of damages, so to speak, has been a vicious one; it has been one that had no relation to the damage actually suffered. It was an inflexible rule, having no relation to the end in view. It seems to me, therefore, there can be no question that the rule suggested by the amendment of the Senator from New York is the proper one as to the contestant.

Is there any objection to applying it to the Senator whose seat has been contested? The Senator may be and probably is at much less expense. He is here attending to his duties, and he has no expense of coming here; but if he has been compelled to subpoena witnesses at his own expense, if he has employed counsel, his claim stands, so far as I can see, in just as high an equity as the contestant's. The compensation which he receives as a Senator is not to indemnify him for this contest. If it is right to compensate, that is to indemnify, the contestant, it seems to me it is equally so to compensate the Senator who is seated, and I can see no reason why both should not be paid the reasonable and necessary expenses they have been subjected to in contesting this election.

It is not merely a question of private right; it is a question which the people of the whole country are concerned in; and if we once set the opposite rule and say that no man who makes a contest for a seat shall be indemnified unless he succeeds, in half the instances in which contestants have succeeded, it is very likely a contest never would have been made. To require a man to come from Georgia or Louisiana and contest a seat in this body in Washington and then pay him nothing unless he happens to succeed, will discourage very much the investigation of these cases which ought to be investigated. I see nothing whatever in the suggestion that it will provoke contests. If there is a reasonable doubt about any man's seat, it should be contested. If not, the contest is in bad faith and will not be compensated. The public good requires that really doubtful cases should be settled. No man should sit in this Chamber save with a perfect title, and if there is doubt about any man's title I will always vote to investigate it.

Mr. ALCORN. Mr. President, it is very hard for me to realize the facility of the Senator from New York in proposing the amendment which he has submitted to the resolution which was originally introduced, and I rise (for I wish some information on this subject) to know whether it is with the consent of the Senator from Alabama that he here applies to the Senate and asks that he shall be compensated for the expense incurred by him in defending his title to a seat in this body?

Mr. CONKLING. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. ALCORN. Certainly.

Mr. CONKLING. Propriety perhaps would restrain the Senator from Alabama, if he were present, from responding to that question. In his absence justice requires that I should say that I have never exchanged a word with the Senator from Alabama touching this amendment. He would not be entitled by decorum of parliamentary law to vote upon it. I did not feel bound to consult him. In short, I do not think he has anything to do with the judgment of the Senate on this point.

Mr. ALCORN. So I supposed was the fact of the case; and I suppose that the Senator from New York in no event, if he were situated as the Senator from Alabama is situated to-day, would accept from the Government of the United States compensation for the expenses that he had incurred in defending his title to a seat in this body; nor do I suppose there is a single Senator on the floor of the Senate to-day who would allow himself to be placed in the humiliating attitude of coming here and asking the Senate for compensation for expenses of this sort, contrary to all precedent and to every usage that has characterized this Government from its foundation down to the present time.

The contestant from Alabama stands in a different attitude. All precedent authorizes him to come here and ask that he may be treated as those have been treated who have come here before and who have gone away from this body unsuccessful in the contests they have made for seats in the Senate. For fruitless cases, contests that are made for the purpose of annoyance, for the purpose of protracting and harassing, there should be no compensation made; but in a well-founded case like the present, the Senate has never refused to make compensation to the unsuccessful contestant.

Now, sir, the principle of compensation is fixed. It is not the purpose of the Constitution to make compensation to Senators and Representatives here for anything more than their expenses; and we go forward upon the idea that the mileage and salary we receive is no more than a compensation for the expenses that members of Congress are put to when they come here. That compensation is made to the person who holds his seat, to the successful contestant. He holds these expenses that are guaranteed to him by the usages of this body and by the law of this body; but the unsuccessful contestant claims no more than his expenses; and the best way to arrive at what his expenses are, without defrauding him on the one hand or permitting the Government to be wronged on the other, is to take that compensation which in the judgment of the nation is sufficient for the expenses of a Senator and give him that for his expenses, no more and no less. You have the judgment of the nation that this is a fair compensation for expenses, and that is what he asks, without itemizing his account.

If the Senator from Alabama, the successful contestant, is tacked on here, I shall vote against the resolution as unjust, however hard it may operate upon the unsuccessful contestant here.

Mr. MORTON. I deem it to be my duty to move to postpone the present and all prior orders and proceed to the consideration of the report of the conference committee on the currency bill.

Mr. EDMUND3. We can finish this matter in ten minutes.

Mr. MORTON. I think not.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Indiana moves to postpone the pending and all prior orders and proceed to the consideration of the conference report to which he has referred.

Mr. ALCORN. If no one else desires to debate this question—

Mr. MORTON. It will be debated further.

Mr. ALCORN. Then I have nothing to say.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator will suspend for a moment. The Chair will state that through inadvertence he allowed the expiration of the morning hour to pass. By unanimous consent given yesterday the Chair was to call up as the unfinished business at the expiration of the morning hour to-day the bills reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. The Chair did not observe when the morning hour expired and did not make the call. The Chair makes this announcement, and will now put the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LOGAN. Before the motion is put, I desire to say that although I am very anxious to have the business attended to which the Senate was so kind as to give me to-day for the purpose of considering, yet I think I cannot with propriety resist the motion made by the Senator from Indiana, inasmuch as this conference report has been made to the Senate by the unanimous consent of the Senate committee, and it being upon a subject that has been before Congress ever since the commencement of the present session, I deem it more worthy of the time of the Senate than the bills that are reported from the Committee on Military Affairs. For that reason, with the statement that I shall ask, subsequent to the action of the Senate on this report, for the same courtesy that was extended to me before, I will yield to this conference report, and think it proper to do so.

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

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. No. 529) to authorize an appointment in the Inspector-General's Department;

A bill (S. No. 533) granting a pension to Uriah W. Briggs;

A bill (S. No. 624) to authorize the issuance of patents for lands granted to the State of Oregon in certain cases;

A bill (S. No. 658) granting a pension to Martin V. Jackson;

A bill (S. No. 693) to change the time for holding the circuit and district courts of the United States for the western district of Wisconsin at Oshkosh;

A bill (S. No. 142) for the relief of Nathaniel McKay, assignee of the builders of the steamer La Portena, Edward Everett, F. W. Lincoln, Azalia, and N. P. Banks;

A bill (S. No. 793) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to change the name of the schooner Jennie Spear to that of Santa Rosa; and

A bill (S. No. 870) giving the assent of Congress to the acceptance by the officers of the United States ship Monocacy of silver medals presented to them by the King of Siam.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. No. 876) to amend the law relating to patents, trade-marks, and copy-

rights, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. No. 3672) authorizing the board of commissioners of the Soldiers' Home to sell the property belonging to the Soldiers' Home, situated at Harrodsburgh, Kentucky, and known as Harrodsburgh Springs property; and

A bill (H. R. No. 3517) supplementary to the third section of the act entitled "An act to divide the State of Virginia into two judicial districts."

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. No. 3073) to amend section 19 of the act approved August 18, 1856, entitled "An act to regulate the diplomatic and consular systems of the United States."

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. No. 1009) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes; and it was thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. HAMLIN, it was

Ordered, That Peter Campbell have leave to withdraw his petition and papers from the files of the Senate.

THE CURRENCY—FREE BANKING.

The Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. No. 1572) to amend the several acts providing a national currency and to establish free banking, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report has been read.

Mr. MORTON. I ask to have it read again.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be again reported.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. No. 1572) to amend the several acts providing a national currency and to establish free banking, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend, and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the House recede from their disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same, with an amendment as follows:

Strike out all of the amendment after "that," in the first line, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The act entitled "An act to provide a national currency secured by a pledge of United States bonds, and to provide for the circulation and redemption thereof," approved June 3, 1864, shall be hereafter known as "the national-bank act."

SEC. 2. That section 21 of "the national-bank act" be so amended that the several associations therein provided for shall not hereafter be required to keep on hand any amount of money whatever by reason of the amount of their respective circulations; but the moneys required by said section to be kept at all times on hand shall be determined by the amount of deposits, in all respects as provided for in the said section.

SEC. 3. That section 22 of the said act, and the several amendments thereto, so far as they restrict the amount of notes for circulation under said acts, be, and the same are hereby, repealed; and the proviso in the first section of the act approved July 12, 1870, entitled "An act to provide for the redemption of the 3 per cent. temporary loan certificates, and for an increase of national-bank notes," prohibiting the banks hereafter organized a circulation over \$500,000; and the proviso in the third section of said act limiting the circulation of banks authorized to issue notes redeemable in gold coin to \$1,000,000; and section 6 of said act, relating to the redistribution of twenty-five millions of circulating notes, be, and the same are hereby, repealed; that every association hereafter organized shall be subject to, and be governed by, the rules, restrictions, and limitations, and possess the rights, privileges, and franchises, now or hereafter to be prescribed by law as to national banking associations, with the same power to amend, alter, and repeal provided by "the national-bank act."

SEC. 4. That every association organized, or to be organized, under the provisions of the said act, and of the several acts amendatory thereof, shall at all times keep and have on deposit in the Treasury of the United States, in lawful money, of the United States, a sum equal to 5 per cent. of its circulation, to be held and used for the redemption of such circulation; which sum shall be counted as a part of its lawful reserve, as provided in section 2 of this act; and when the circulating notes of any such associations, assorted or unsorted, shall be presented for redemption, in sums of \$1,000, or any multiple thereof, to the Treasurer of the United States, the same shall be redeemed in United States notes. All notes so redeemed shall be charged by the Treasurer of the United States to the respective associations issuing the same, and he shall notify them severally, on the 1st day of each month, or oftener, at his discretion, of the amount of such redemptions; and whenever such redemptions for any association shall amount to the sum of \$500 such association so notified shall forthwith deposit with the Treasurer of the United States a sum in United States notes equal to the amount of its circulating notes so redeemed. And all notes of national banks worn, defaced, mutilated, or otherwise unfit for circulation shall, when received by any assistant treasurer or at any designated depository of the United States, be forwarded to the Treasurer of the United States for redemption as provided herein. And when such redemptions have been so reimbursed the circulating notes so redeemed shall be forwarded to the respective associations by which they were issued; but if any of such notes are worn, mutilated, defaced, or rendered otherwise unfit for use they shall be forwarded to the Comptroller of the Currency and destroyed and replaced as now provided by law: Provided, That each of said associations shall reimburse to the Treasury the charges for transportation and the costs for assorting such notes; and the associations hereafter organized shall also severally reimburse to the Treasury the cost of engraving such plates as shall be ordered by each association respectively; and the amount assessed upon each association shall be in proportion to the circulation redeemed, and be charged to the fund on deposit with the Treasurer: And provided further, That so much of section 32 of said national-bank act requiring or permitting the redemption of its circulating notes elsewhere than at its own counter, except as provided for in this section, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. That any association organized under this act, or any of the acts of which this is an amendment, desiring to withdraw its circulating notes, in whole or in part, may, upon the deposit of lawful money with the Treasurer of the United States in sums of not less than \$9,000, take up the bonds which said association has on de-

posit with the Treasurer for the security of such circulating notes; which bonds shall be assigned to the bank in the manner specified in the nineteenth section of the national-bank act; and the outstanding notes of said association, to an amount equal to the legal-tender notes deposited, shall be redeemed at the Treasury of the United States, and destroyed as now provided by law: *Provided*, That the amount of the bonds on deposit for circulation shall not be reduced below \$50,000.

SEC. 6. That the Comptroller of the Currency shall, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, cause the charter numbers of the association to be printed upon all national-bank notes which may be hereafter issued by him.

SEC. 7. That the entire amount of United States notes outstanding and in circulation at any one time shall not exceed the sum of \$382,000,000, which shall be retired and reduced in the following manner only, to wit: within thirty days after circulating notes to the amount of \$1,000,000 shall, from time to time, be issued to national banking associations under this act, in excess of the highest outstanding value thereof at any time prior to such issue, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to retire an amount of United States notes equal to three-eighths of the circulating notes so issued, which shall be in reduction of the maximum amount of \$382,000,000 fixed by this section; and such reduction shall continue until the maximum amount of United States notes outstanding shall be \$300,000,000; and the United States notes so retired shall be canceled and carried to the account of the sinking fund provided for by the second clause of section 5 of the act approved on the 25th of February, 1862, entitled "An act to authorize the issue of United States notes, and for the redemption and funding thereof, and for funding the floating debt of the United States," and shall constitute a portion of said sinking fund. And the interest thereon computed at the rate of 5 per cent. shall be added annually to said sinking fund. But if the surplus revenue be not sufficient for this purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to issue and sell at public sale, after ten days' notice of the time and place of sale, a sufficient amount of the bonds of the United States of the character and description prescribed in this act for United States notes to be then retired and canceled.

SEC. 8. That on and after the 1st day of January, 1878, any holder of United States notes to the amount of fifty dollars, or any multiple thereof, may present them for payment at the office of the Treasurer of the United States, or at the office of the assistant treasurer at the city of New York; and thereupon he shall be entitled to receive, at his option, from the Secretary of the Treasury, who is authorized and required to issue in exchange for said notes an equal amount of either class of the coupon or registered bonds of the United States provided for in the first section of the act approved on the 14th of July, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," and the act amendatory thereof, approved the 20th day of January, 1871, which bonds shall continue to be exempt from taxation as provided in said act: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of the Treasury in lieu of such bonds may redeem said notes in the gold coin of the United States. And the Secretary of the Treasury shall reissue the United States notes so received either in exchange for coin at par, or with the consent of the holder, in the redemption of bonds then redeemable at par, or in the purchase of bonds at not less than par, or to meet the current payments for the public service; and when used to meet current payments an equal amount of the gold in the Treasury shall be applied in redemption of the bonds known as five-twenty bonds.

SEC. 9. That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize any increase of the principal of the public debt of the United States.

And the Senate agree to the same.

O. P. MORTON,
JOHN SHERMAN,
A. S. MERRIMON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
HORACE MAYNARD,
C. B. FARWELL,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MORTON. I call attention to the fact that there is a misprint; that the word "value" used in section 7 should be "volume;" so that it will read "in excess of the highest outstanding volume." It is right in the engrossed copy.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The correction will be made in the print if there be no objection. The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the report of the committee of conference.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, the Senate is so entirely familiar with this subject, there not being a topic in this report that has not been discussed time and again in the hearing of all, that I shall content myself with a simple statement of the changes that have been made by the committee of conference in the bill as it passed the Senate, premising, however, this remark, that this bill is the result of concession and compromise; of a yielding of something on both sides, of a sincere desire to present a measure that should be substantially satisfactory to the country and furnish a settlement of this question, realizing that there is an earnest, and I will say an intense, desire in every part of the United States that such a settlement ought to be had before the adjournment of Congress.

The first change that I shall notice in the bill as it passed the Senate is in regard to the reduction of the legal-tender notes. The bill as it passed the Senate provided that for every \$100,000 of national-bank notes which should be issued under it, \$25,000, or 25 per cent. of greenbacks, should be retired and canceled. In the bill as presented to the Senate by the report of the Finance Committee, 50 per cent. reduction was proposed. The Senate disagreed to that and made it 25. We have made it 37½ per cent. or three-eighths, just dividing the difference between the report of the Committee on Finance and the bill as it passed the Senate.

As the bill passed the Senate, the legal-tender notes thus to be retired were to be retired by the issue of bonds. That is to say, the Secretary of the Treasury was to sell bonds and thus obtain enough legal-tender notes in that way to make the 25 per cent. reduction, which notes were to be canceled. We have changed that by carrying those notes to the account of the sinking fund, so as to avoid the issue of bonds, but preserving the theory of the sinking fund as it now stands by requiring interest at the rate of 5 per cent. to be calculated on the amount to be added to the sinking fund, so that the effect upon the sinking fund is not changed and the theory of it is preserved. But in the contingency that the sinking fund shall not be sufficient, there being a failing of revenue, to retire and account for all the notes that might have to be retired under the provisions of this act, the report provides that for the balance over and beyond

the sinking-fund bonds shall be issued and sold in order to procure the requisite amount of greenbacks to be retired.

We strike out of the Senate bill the third section which, in effect, required the reserves upon deposits to be kept in the vaults of the home banks, making a change of the law in that particular. We strike that out and leave the law as to the reserves on deposits to stand just as it does now and has existed ever since the creation of the national-bank system. In that respect we make no change. The provision in the bill as it passed the Senate requiring the banks to retain one-fourth of their coin interest is stricken out. Reserves on circulation are abolished entirely. The committee was unanimous on that point. The bill still provides as it did before—and in that respect there is no change—that each bank shall keep an amount of legal-tenders equal to 5 per cent. of its circulation in the Treasury for the redemption of such of its notes as may be presented to the Treasury for redemption, and also the worn-out, mutilated, and defaced notes. The only change we make in regard to that is that that 5 per cent. shall be counted as a part of the reserve on deposits. So that in effect the reserves on deposit which the banks are required to keep at home are diminished 5 per cent., and the reserves on circulation abolished entirely.

I might state that that was thought to be a measure which would perhaps afford immediate relief if it were necessary, as a net calculation will show that these provisions taken all together will set free about twenty-six and a half millions of legal-tender notes which the banks are now required to keep in their vaults, and put that additional amount in circulation.

Mr. CONKLING. That is the reserve on circulation, \$26,000,000?

Mr. MORTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. Allow me to ask the Senator from Indiana whether the reserve at home and in the Treasury here is to be in legal-tenders or national-bank notes?

Mr. MORTON. Legal-tenders.

Mr. DAVIS. In both cases?

Mr. MORTON. There is no change made in the law as to the character of the reserve at all. It stands just as it did before, except this 5 per cent. of legal-tender notes that is required to be kept in the Treasury shall be counted as a part of the reserve which the banks are required to keep on their deposits.

Mr. THURMAN. Will the Senator allow me to make an inquiry?

Mr. MORTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. THURMAN. He estimates that twenty-six and a half millions will be set free by repealing the law requiring the reserve to be kept on circulation. I ask whether, in estimating that amount of twenty-six and a half millions, he goes on the hypothesis that in fact the banks will keep no reserve? Would it be safe for a bank to do business without keeping anything to redeem its circulation?

Mr. MORTON. The reserve on circulation I believe, has been regarded from very nearly the first establishment of the national banking system as illogical and unnecessary. The notes are secured by the bonds of the United States. Practically the banks are called upon for redemption very seldom, because there is no occasion for it; there is no inducement for it, and the banks are not practically required to keep on hand legal-tender notes for the redemption of their own bills. That is one of the complaints made that no form of redemption is required, and the 5 per cent. in the Treasury has been presented as a remedy for what was regarded as a defect in the system.

Mr. THURMAN. I infer from what the Senator says that his estimate of twenty-six and a half million includes the entire reserve and goes on the theory that the banks will keep no reserve in respect to circulation.

Mr. MORTON. The banks are not required under this bill to keep any.

Mr. THURMAN. And in practice they will keep no reserves. It is on that theory that the Senator proceeds?

Mr. MORTON. They will keep 5 per cent. in the Treasury of the United States, and are required to do that, and can keep as much as they choose. I will state, from what little knowledge of banking I have, that practically the banks are in the receipt of legal-tender notes in the course of their daily business enough to protect themselves from any bills of their own which may be presented for redemption without being required to set aside any fund for that purpose. I have often heard that stated by national bankers.

Mr. DAVIS. The reports of the country banks generally, which this would particularly affect, show that more than the reserve required by law is kept in their vaults; and they have to do that for self-protection. A check drawn on them to-day for \$10,000, or any other amount, must be paid on presentation; and they must also keep enough there to redeem any of their own notes that may be presented to them. The law requires 15 per cent., which is usually kept. Of course there are some instances with some banks where it is not kept.

Mr. MORTON. That is on the deposits, where their notes may be required to be paid in legal-tenders; but so far as redemption is concerned I believe the reports show that the banks are very seldom called upon for redemption, because there is scarcely any inducement to do it, though now and then legal-tenders may be required for a particular purpose.

Mr. BOUTWELL. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Indiana whether the estimate he makes that the reserve now held

against the circulation amounts to twenty-six and a half millions is the result of an estimate made by the committee from the data in the Department?

Mr. MORTON. That is not the estimate of the committee. I give it as my own, and I will state the basis of it. I may not be entirely accurate.

Mr. BOUTWELL. If there be \$354,000,000 in circulation and the reserve to meet that is only twenty-six and a half millions, that would be about 7 per cent.

Mr. MORTON. I will state how I understand it. The law requires that the country banks, those outside the redemption cities, shall keep 15 per cent. of reserve. Two-fifths of that amount they are required to keep in their own vaults. Two-fifths is 6 per cent. The other three-fifths in practice they are allowed to keep in the redemption cities, and practically they keep it in New York, and that is in use chiefly in the stock market. Therefore in counting what would be set free I take no account of the three-fifths they keep at New York, but I take account of the 6 per cent. that they are required to keep locked up in their own vaults under the law, if they comply with it. In regard to banks in the redemption cities, they are required to keep 25 per cent. reserve on circulation and 12½ per cent. of it, or one-half, they are required to keep in their own vaults. The other half they may keep in some other redemption city. Therefore I count the two-fifths in that case or 6 per cent., and I count 12½ per cent. in the other case, and taking into consideration how much circulation is issued by the country banks and how much is issued by the banks in the redemption cities, I came to the result of about twenty-six and a half millions. It may not be entirely accurate, but I give the basis of my calculation, and in that I leave out entirely the amount they have been required to keep in the redemption cities, and they have been required to keep it there and get interest upon it as a deposit. They are allowed now to bring that home so far as the reserves on circulation are concerned, and can loan it to the people where they live at a greater percentage than they get by sending it to a redemption city and merely getting interest on it as a deposit. There is another advantage to the people around the bank not obtained by them before.

The bill first passed by the Senate provided that on the 1st of July, 1878, the holders of legal-tender notes should have the right to present them at the Treasury and receive in exchange for them at par a 4½ per cent. bond. The time has been changed. The original bill as reported by the Committee on Finance put the time of this conversion at the 1st of January, 1877. The Senate thought that was too soon and changed it to the 1st of July, 1878, making it a year and a half longer. In the compromise we have again changed the time, and we have put it on the 1st of January, 1878, being three and one-half years off. There was a number of reasons given for this. I can only state that in putting the time off to the 1st of January, 1878, instead of the 1st of January, 1877, we thought we were acting at least upon the safe side; that even if it should turn out that specie payments, so-called, could be resumed on the 1st of January, 1877, there were grave doubts whether the time was not too short, and whether the change would not be too sudden; and it was thought to be safer and better, and that but little inconvenience could come from it, to put the time off until the 1st of January, 1878.

The theory of the bill is that the greenbacks will gradually approach to par, that the change in value will be about at the rate of 3½ per annum, will be so small and so gradual as to occasion no jar, no derangement in business, no disaster, will go on so gently that no interest in the country will be severely or dangerously affected by it. If the time had been fixed sooner, the change would be more abrupt, and great apprehensions were entertained, as has often been expressed on this floor, that serious disasters would result from it.

We have put the maximum amount of greenbacks at \$382,000,000, which is now the amount in circulation. This was in the Senate bill. We have added to that clause a provision that they shall not be retired except as provided in this bill.

We have changed the character of the bond into which the holders of legal-tender notes have the right to convert them on the 1st of January, 1878. As the bill passed the Senate the bond was made a 4½ per cent. bond. This bill provides that those notes may be converted at the option of the holder into any one of the three bonds provided for by the act of 1870. That act provided for a 5 per cent. bond running ten years, a 4½ per cent. bond running longer, and a 4 per cent. bond running still longer. This bill authorizes the holder of the greenback to convert his greenback into any one of these three bonds at his option.

The theory of the bill proceeds upon the ground that a 5 per cent. bond into which he has a right to convert his legal-tender note will be at par in gold on the 1st of January, 1878. It has been continually argued by the Senator from Ohio, the able chairman of the Finance Committee, and by many others, that a 5 per cent. bond was at par throughout the world. It was argued on the floor here by Senators that a 4½ per cent. bond would be at par on the 1st of January, 1878, and I believe Senators generally took it for granted that a 5 per cent. bond would be at par at that time. If so, then the legal-tender notes which are authorized to be converted into that bond at par will themselves be worth par, because whatever may be converted into a bond at par must and will be naturally equal to that bond. If therefore a 5 per cent. bond is at par on the 1st of January, 1878, the legal-

tender notes will have gradually approached par, and if equal in value to the gold coin in the Treasury, will be equivalent to gold and can be used as an equivalent for gold by the Treasury of the United States.

The concluding clause of the eighth section we have changed from the Senate bill, although I do not think it has been changed so as to affect the meaning very much. As it stood before it said that—

The Secretary of the Treasury shall reissue the United States notes so received, or, if they are canceled, shall issue United States notes to the same amount, either to purchase or redeem the public debt at par in coin or to meet the current payments for the public service.

It has been changed to this form:

And the Secretary of the Treasury shall reissue the United States notes so received either in exchange for coin at par, or, with the consent of the holder, in the redemption of bonds then redeemable at par, or in the purchase of bonds at not less than par, or to meet the current payments for the public service; and when used to meet current payments an equal amount of the gold in the Treasury shall be applied in redemption of the bonds known as five-twenty bonds.

Mr. President, I have now gone over the changes that have been made by the committee of conference as I remember them. There may be some verbal changes that it is not material to call the attention of the Senate to, and as I have no desire to take up time or to make a speech, I shall not say anything further.

Mr. CONKLING. I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana a question before he concludes. If it will not be inconvenient, I wish him to take the eighth section of the report—I refer to that which precedes the proviso—and read it so far as may be necessary to enable him to explain precisely what it means.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator calls my attention to the first clause of the eighth section:

That on and after the 1st day of January, 1878, any holder of United States notes to the amount of fifty dollars, or any multiple thereof—

I believe we made the bond smaller so as to bring it more nearly within the reach of everybody. We make it a fifty-dollar bond, or any multiple thereof—

may present them for payment at the office of the Treasurer of the United States, or at the office of the assistant treasurer at the city of New York; and thereupon he shall be entitled to receive, at his option, from the Secretary of the Treasury, who is authorized and required to issue in exchange for said notes, an equal amount of either class of the coupon or registered bonds of the United States provided for in the first section of the act approved on the 14th of July, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," and the act amendatory thereof, approved the 20th day of January, 1871, which bonds shall continue to be exempt from taxation as provided in said act: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of the Treasury in lieu of such bonds may redeem said notes in the gold coin of the United States.

What is the particular point?

Mr. CONKLING. I wish the Senator to state what the option is there referred to and what the presenter of notes is to receive?

Mr. MORTON. The option is as to the character of the bond. He may prefer a ten-year 5 per cent. bond, or as an investment he may prefer a 4½ per cent. bond running longer, or he may prefer a 4 per cent. bond running still longer. Men sometimes differ upon those points. This was put in there for the purpose of meeting that view.

Mr. CONKLING. What is he to receive? Where is the provision here under which he is to receive anything and what is he to receive?

Mr. MORTON. "An equal amount of either class of the coupon or registered bonds;" that is, an amount equal to the greenbacks, the legal-tender notes, that he presents. He is to receive bonds equal in amount to the notes which he presents, provided they amount to fifty dollars or a multiple thereof.

Mr. CONKLING. Then if I understand the Senator the words "entitled to receive" refer to an equal amount of either class of bonds?

Mr. MORTON. Yes; bonds equal in amount to the legal-tender notes he presents.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the only hesitation I had in signing this conference report was the fear that those Senators who with me had voted steadily for securing and maintaining a specie standard as soon as practicable would not be entirely satisfied with the report. So far as my own judgment goes, and from my knowledge of the whole history and progress of this bill, I am entirely content with the report. I believe it is a fair compromise and will secure what those who have voted with me have all along contended for, the maintenance of a specie standard and specie payments after the 1st day of January, 1878. I regarded the establishment by Congress, especially by the concession of all parties and all parts of this Congress, of this policy of a specie standard on and after the 1st of January, 1878, as so important that I was very willing to yield on all minor points; and now in the brief remarks that I shall make on this bill I wish to call the attention of the Senate mainly to the points which affect that primary and fundamental condition.

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask the Senator a question before he goes on further, that I may understand him?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The Senator speaks of coming to the specie standard, the specie basis of payment, in 1878. Do I understand this report aright, that that specie payment in 1878 is to be at the option of the debtor, the option of the Government, and not at the will of the holder of United States notes?

Mr. SHERMAN. I will answer that in the progress of my remarks.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Very well.

Mr. SHERMAN. Now, let us examine this bill. The eighth section provides:

That on and after the 1st day of January, 1878, any holder of United States notes to the amount of fifty dollars or any multiple thereof, may present them for payment at the office of the Treasurer of the United States, or at the office of the assistant treasurer in the city of New York, and thereupon he shall be entitled to receive at his option from the Secretary of the Treasury an equal amount of either class of the coupon or registered bonds of the United States, provided for in the first section of the act approved on the 14th of July, 1870.

In other words, this confers, as plainly as the English language can do it, upon the holders of all these notes the right to present them on a day named and thereafter and receive an equal amount of the gold bonds of the United States of the character described in the act of 1870, known as the refunding act, and of which already some \$300,000,000 have been sold under unfavorable circumstances at par in coin. It authorizes any holder of a note to receive that which during the history of our country, during nine-tenths of its existence, has been equivalent to coin, which by the market value of our securities to-day is equivalent to coin, which in the ordinary course of events, probably as long as our flag shall wave over a united country, and probably at all times except in a state of war, will be at par with the specie standard, or equivalent to gold coin.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Do I interrupt the Senator by asking a question?

Mr. SHERMAN. O, no; I will answer it with pleasure.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I wish to ask the Senator, merely for information, whether any holder of greenbacks hitherto in respect to these new five per cents could not turn those greenbacks into 5 per cents, they being at par, at any time by going and buying them?

Mr. SHERMAN. He could not. The holder of United States notes might buy these bonds, but the notes would only be received at a depreciation, that is, the notes would not be received at par for an equal amount of bonds. He could not take a given amount of greenbacks and present them and receive an equal amount of bonds in exchange.

Mr. EDMUNDS. If the bonds were only at par?

Mr. SHERMAN. But that is not the condition of values. Since the war the bonds have been above par in greenbacks.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The Senator misunderstands me. I am speaking of the new 5 per cents into which they are entitled to turn the greenbacks in 1878. The Senator thinks \$300,000,000 of them have already been disposed of at par.

Mr. SHERMAN. At par in coin.

Mr. EDMUNDS. So that the holder of the greenback so far could not get his pay on his dollar unless he paid up the premium difference between that and the coin. Is that it?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir. Now, the holder of greenbacks might present them to the Treasury of the United States in payment of a bond, but he would only be allowed for his greenback about eighty-nine cents or its equivalent in gold in payment of that bond. If he will present coin, he can buy the bond at par; if he presents greenbacks, he would have to present \$1.11 and a fraction over, according to the present standard value of the currency. The object of this section is to advance the value of that greenback to the standard of gold.

Now, Mr. President, the point upon which we had the most difficulty in this matter was not as to the phraseology or meaning of these words, but first as to what should be done with the notes received by the Treasury of the United States for bonds? That was one of the great points of controversy in the committee of conference, and another was the time for redemption fixed in this section. If these notes must be reissued at once when they were received under the mandatory provision of the bill as it stood when it was sent from the Senate to the House, it might be that the Secretary of the Treasury would be compelled to reissue these notes at a time when there was a glut in the market and no need of currency, and thus depreciate the value of the note. On the other hand, it was urged with considerable force that if the bill stood as it was reported from the Committee on Finance and the power to reissue these notes was simply a discretionary power with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary might abuse that power, or would have too great a power over the currency of the country; that he might refuse to issue and reissue these notes under circumstances when the public weal demanded it. Therefore there was, on the one hand, a danger that the compulsory feature of the section as it was sent by the Senate to the House might compel the reissue of these notes imprudently, and on the other hand that the absolute power in the Secretary to issue these notes at his pleasure or to refuse to issue them might confer upon him a dangerous power. The committee of conference, in my judgment, have made a wise and correct compromise. They have defined the purposes for which alone these notes may be reissued, and the power to reissue being thus limited and defined will inevitably maintain them at the standard of par in gold or par in bonds.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The Senator, unfortunately I think, as it might mislead, has used the term "may reissue." As I read it, the bill says the Secretary of the Treasury "shall reissue the United States notes."

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; he shall reissue. It is mandatory; but the purposes for which that issue may be made are clearly and distinctly defined. What are they?

And the Secretary of the Treasury shall reissue the United States notes so received either in exchange for coin at par—

That is the ordinary process on which a Bank of England note is

issued. It is never issued except for gold at par. Anybody who presents coin or bullion at par can get a Bank of England note. So it is with our coin certificates issued daily. They are nothing but paper money issued on a deposit of coin—

or, with the consent of the holder, in the redemption of bonds then redeemable at par—

The whole of the five-twenty bonds, \$1,000,000,000 of them, are now redeemable at par, and this section authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to reissue these notes in the payment of those bonds to any one willing to receive them instead of coin. So when the ten-forties mature they will be redeemable at the pleasure of the United States at par in coin, or, with the consent of the holder, in United States notes at par—

or in the purchase of bonds at not less than par, or to meet—

Here is the clause upon which criticism is most likely to be made, but I think it is fairly met by the language used:

Or to meet the current payments for the public service; and when used to meet current payments an equal amount of the gold in the Treasury shall be applied in redemption of the bonds known as five-twenty bonds.

We all know now that we have a surplus of nearly one hundred millions of coin revenue. The revenues in coin reach the sum of two hundred millions. We have to pay for interest on the public debt one hundred millions, leaving one hundred millions which may now be sold for currency or may be applied to the purchase or payment of bonds. If, therefore, one hundred millions of notes flow into the Treasury under the operations of this bill and one hundred millions of 5 per cent. bonds are issued in the redemption of the notes, then the notes shall be reissued under these circumstances, for the payment of current expenses, and the coin used directly to pay the bonds commonly known as five-twenties, and this makes a rapid refunding of the public debt in pursuance of the express provision of the law of 1870.

Hitherto by means of a syndicate of bankers, and at a large cost, we have sold three hundred millions of 5 per cent. bonds for coin and with this coin have paid three hundred millions of 6 per cent. bonds. And we have sold the surplus gold for our own notes at large depreciation, and thus have supplied the deficiency in our currency revenue. Under this bill the surplus gold is at once applied to the payment of 6 per cent. bonds now redeemable, and our deficiency in currency revenue will be supplied by currency coming into the Treasury for 5 per cent. bonds. It is scarcely probable that the conversion of notes into 5 per cent. bonds will reach fifty millions a year; but to whatever extent it is carried, even to the whole amount of our 6 per cent. bonds, or \$1,000,000,000, it will furnish an easy, simple mode of converting our 6 per cent. bonds into those bearing a less rate of interest, and that without cost, syndicate, or mystery.

But, sir, the great object accomplished by this section is that our notes after January, 1878, will no longer be dishonored, depreciated, daily sold at 10 to 15 per cent. below par in coin though they are payable in coin. These notes will then be at par with 5 per cent. bonds, and thus in effect be made par in coin and will be received and paid out as coin.

Again, Mr. President, if my construction of this section is correct, here is an absolute pledge by the United States of America, made now after a long controversy, a pledge that is not likely to be broken, that on the 1st day of January, 1878, we shall have reached the specie standard under provisions by which that specie standard can be maintained. I consider it of the very highest public importance to have that declaration made. Now, sir, why should it not be made? And here I come directly to the point mentioned by the Senator from Vermont. He says there is not the right on the part of the holder of the notes to demand coin. That is true. The option is with the Secretary of the Treasury to issue either the bonds or to pay in coin. The option is with the holder of the note to demand either kind of bonds; but it is at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury to pay either in bonds or in coin.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Is that the way the greenback reads?

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator asks me if that is the way the greenback reads. If we cannot pay absolutely in coin, ought we not to do the next best thing? Because we cannot pay in coin absolutely at a day named, shall we therefore refuse to give to the holder of those notes any promise to pay him in the future?

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask the Senator a question right there?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. EDMUNDS. How can the Senator say that if we cannot pay in coin we can pay in the next best thing, when he has just stated that we have \$100,000,000 of surplus coin every year which we can use to take up the five-twenty bonds? If we mean to keep the faith of the Government, why do we not use that to pay the notes that are promises to pay on demand?

Mr. SHERMAN. Simply because under the operations of our laws, as they are now administered, we must sell the gold to pay our current expenses.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Then we should increase the public debt if we did not redeem the bonds.

Mr. SHERMAN. Here is the position in which we are placed: Gentlemen who demand specie payment literally without conditions or qualifications insist upon that which is unattainable at this moment

and are not willing to accept that which is attainable, and which is equivalent to it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. If the Senator is speaking of me, he is mistaken. I will define my position. I beg the Senator not to define it in that way, because it is not correct.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator is inclined to catechise me as I go along with a simple explanation of this report.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I did it with the consent of my friend. I certainly would not have interrupted him without his consent.

Mr. SHERMAN. Now to come back to this section: it does provide what all who have voted with me have been contending for, a specie standard at as early a day as practicable. Here you have that equivalent; and if perchance this is not the full specie standard, what is to prevent Congress from adopting the requisite measures hereafter when the assent of Congress can be obtained for the accumulation of coin, or for taking any other step necessary to actually maintain coin redemption on and after the 1st of January, 1878? I appeal to Senators who have a grave responsibility upon them, is it not now advisable to secure the declaration of a public policy to make what we aim at in that way as sure as the march of time?

Mr. EDMUNDS. We have made that declaration three times already, if the Senator will pardon me.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. BOUTWELL. I was about to ask the Senator why he does not propose the redemption or the conversion of United States notes into bonds at an early date, as on the 1st of January, 1875 or 1876?

Mr. SHERMAN. Having secured by the concessions made the fixed policy of a specie standard—because it must be remembered in this matter that these are concessions made by both Houses—then the question came up on the point of time. Now, sir, I believe—

Mr. SARGENT. I should like to ask the Senator one question in connection with the remark he has just made. I should like to know by whom that concession has been made. This House and the other House by a majority are inflationists, using that word for convenience, and I should like to know who made the concession when both Houses agreed on that point? Who has conceded?

Mr. SHERMAN. I say that the majority of both Houses have largely conceded to those who believe that it is our primary obligation to maintain a specie standard.

The question then came up with regard to the point of time. The Senate had fixed as the time the 1st day of July, 1878. The House had agreed to that date. Neither of those measures allowed the conversion of greenbacks into a bond bearing 5 per cent.; and neither of them contained the provisions I have read in regard to the reissue of notes. Now, when this, as I may say, immutable specie standard was conceded and the question came on the point of time, I insisted upon fixing the 1st day of January, 1877, as the day of redemption.

Mr. BOUTWELL. In asking the question I did not intend to express any opinion. I desire to know upon what ground the committee agreed to 1878 rather than January 1875 or 1876, or some earlier date.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will state that to the Senator. It is manifest that if you were to fix the 1st of January, 1875, for the redemption of the bonds, you would at once appreciate the value of your notes 11 per cent. That would give but six months, and that would pile upon the debtors in this country upon contracts made on existing values an additional burden of 11 per cent.

Mr. BOUTWELL. That is the reason, as I understand the Senator. Now, then, we are in the presence of a condition of things which we can comprehend. That condition being such that we do not dare to take the step now which this committee advise us to take three years hence, I ask the Senator from Ohio and the committee what knowledge they now have with reference to the condition of things that will exist in 1876 or 1877 on which they base the opinion, which is at the foundation of this bill, by which they advise the Senate and the country to take a step they do not dare to take now because they know it goes upon a basis which it is not in the power of any man to foreshadow; that is, we are asked to do in 1878 a thing which we dare not do to-day, upon the assumption of a different condition of things then from that which exists now. I ask for the evidence on which that difference rests.

Mr. SHERMAN. Is the Senator from Massachusetts opposed to coin redemption on the 1st of January, 1878, or to legislating in that direction?

Mr. BOUTWELL. I will express my opinion about that when I come to address the Senate on the subject.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then I hope the Senator will allow me to express mine.

Mr. BOUTWELL. But I ask for the evidence which influenced the committee to advise a measure based upon a condition of things in 1877 or 1878, which measure they do not dare to advise upon a condition of things which actually exists before their eyes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts now discloses that he does not think this country can reach specie payments on the 1st of January, 1878, and therefore this bill is too operative for him to indorse, because, forsooth, it may create trouble at that time.

Mr. BOUTWELL. If the Senator will state the reasons which govern him, I will undertake to tell the Senator the reasons that govern me.

Mr. SHERMAN. I state the reasons now, that I believe the United States of America have the power to redeem and the ability to redeem in two years from this time. I believe that if the word were spoken and the fiat made all the timid fears of these gentlemen who are afraid to take an affirmative policy on anything of this kind would be dissipated like the idle wind. But when I cannot have it done in two or three years, I am willing to do it in three years and a half. I wish to pledge the faith of the United States that it shall be done at the earliest day I can name, and not to fritter away the golden opportunity now. I do it upon my faith in the power, the wealth, the integrity, and the ability of the United States to redeem it. And more than all, upon my confidence in the sincerity and good faith of those who join me in making the pledge contained in this bill, and upon my knowledge that no such pledge made by Congress in the name of the people has ever been violated.

Now, Mr. President, to come back to the point of time, here was a tender point. When this section was so modified as to secure a fixed plan of resumption, simple and effective, and the question of time came up, I insisted for more than a week upon the 1st of January, 1877, mainly because I thought the administration that had made the pledge to redeem these notes in coin at the earliest day practicable should redeem that pledge within their allotted period. I would be glad to do it in that time. I wish Congress would join now in hastening this day. I believe the time fixed is too remote. But, sir, when the great object was attained by these modifications, was I to haggle about the time or to stand upon that?

But now I will state to the honorable Senator in direct answer to his question that I believe we can maintain this resumption from and after the 1st of January, 1877; but some of the ablest and best business men of this country, including members of both Houses of Congress, Senators and members, feared that if the attempt was made too soon we would meet the same fate that was met in England when after the great wars with Napoleon they attempted to resume, and resumed too soon, and then the time was postponed too far. There was therefore some strength in the argument that to fix too early a day might defeat the very object had in view. If I had my way in all this matter, I would fix the time as originally proposed by the Committee on Finance, the 1st of January, 1877. I think within two and a half years we could undoubtedly reach the specie standard and maintain it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly; but all these questions cut up what I intended to be a brief explanation, very much.

Mr. EDMUNDS. If the Senator is unwilling to yield to a question, of course I will not press it. I beg him not to do it against his will.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will answer it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I wish to inquire, speaking of what England did, whether they waited as long as we have already waited in the first place, and in the second place, that I need not interrupt him by another question immediately, whether when they did come to resume it was a resumption like this at the option of the debtor, the government, instead of saying that the money should be paid on demand of the person who held the paper?

Mr. SHERMAN. It must be said to the honor of the English people that they brought about absolute redemption I think in about six or seven years after the war with Napoleon was over. But, sir, we have not done it, and I am sorry for it. For years I have been struggling to fix a time when resumption should be brought about; but we have never yet got a majority of Congress to come to the point of fixing a time; and now when a majority of both Houses are prepared to fix a day when they will resume specie payments, we are met, forsooth, by those who want to resume specie payments sooner or on some different terms, and are not satisfied with what is practicable and attainable, but wish to attain something more. Senators, defeat this measure, which pledges the faith of the nation, which has never been violated, to a particular policy and to a day which is fixed for the resumption of specie payments, and when will you bring about this hoped-for result? At the beginning of this Administration, in March, 1869, we promised to pay the United States notes in coin at as early a day as practicable. We have never been able to fix the day. Now here is a proposition in which the time, the place, and the manner are fixed; and because forsooth there are some details in it that do not suit or because the time is too remote, there is hesitation about adopting it.

When I consented to this report I yielded my own convictions on the point of time, because I believed the time ought to have been fixed on the 1st of January, 1877. But when after several consultations it was perfectly manifest that unless I would yield that question of time it was not possible to secure the great result, the declaration of public policy contained in this bill, I signed the report, and I stand by it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The Senator has not answered my second inquiry, perhaps he has not come to it; and that is, what manner of redemption it was that the English people, to whom he referred, came to when they did come? He answered the first question by stating that they did come to it in six or seven years. We have been ten years already. Will the Senator say what manner of redemption it was, whether it was this method or an absolute redemption?

Mr. SHERMAN. I am not to be diverted into a recital of English

history. The Senator knows very well that they redeemed in coin; and I would be very glad indeed if we could get Congress now to declare that the redemption in coin should be absolute. Can you do it? Will you therefore refuse any practical measure which produces the same result because you cannot persuade others to agree with you in every particular? In my judgment that ought not to be the guiding motive of Senators.

Now, sir, I believe that the object I have stated will be accomplished by this bill. As for the minor details of the bill they have been agreed to by both Houses of Congress. The modifications of the banking act are not very material. So far as they go they make the banking system free, and they contain that section of the House bill which makes redemption by banks in legal-tender notes immediate, positive, decisive. It requires the banks to place in the Treasury of the United States a fund amply sufficient in the opinion of the Treasurer of the United States to maintain this resumption. All the details of this bill as to national banks are in perfect harmony with the wishes of both Houses of Congress, with the reports of the committees of both Houses, and even with the views of the majority of those who are in favor of specie payments.

There was one point upon which there was some controversy, and that was the degree in which legal-tender notes should be retired as bank-notes were issued, and, as the Senator from Indiana properly says, upon that point a compromise was made. How else can you attain it? What reason can you give for one particular per cent. rather than another particular per cent.? When there was a difference only as to the degree, not as to the principle, after some hesitation we agreed to divide it, and made it 37½ per cent.

Now, Mr. President, there is but one fear that I have ever entertained, or that has ever been suggested to me by those who voted with me, in regard to the merits of this bill. It has been said to me over and over again, What security have you that this eighth section of the bill which provides for specie payments on the 1st of January, 1878, will not be repealed? Will not another Congress come in and sweep that out of the way? Having secured free banking, will not the people hereafter by their Senators and Representatives violate that stipulation of the law and remove and obliterate this public policy? I say in the name of the people of the United States, no, never; they never have done such a thing; they never will do such a thing; there is no danger of their doing it. Remember, Senators, here is a positive pledge to a particular class of public creditors to give a specific bond for an admitted debt past due and at a time fixed by law. When was such a pledge of the United States ever violated? When was such a pledge ever broken? I am glad to see this bill voted for by persons on all sides, of all political parties. There is the pledge. It is not the indefinite promise to pay at the earliest day practicable like that of March, 1869. The condition of that pledge rested upon diverse views of public policy. But here the time is fixed; the terms are easy; our ability to issue the bond and to pay the interest stipulated for is conceded. It is not a party pledge, but is the pledge of the whole nation to pay a debt contracted for the salvation of the nation. To impute a purpose to violate this pledge as a mere means to secure free banking is to stamp all who participate in it with dishonor.

As to whether the national banking system shall be retained as the fixed policy of the United States, or whether it shall be swept away, or as to what form our currency may assume hereafter, those are questions for the future; but as for the pledge now made in this law that the holder of the United States note, if he presents it on and after January, 1878, shall receive that which is equivalent to coin, that is immutable as the laws of the Medes and Persians; it is written on the conscience and public faith of the nation; and I do not have any fear about it. If a future Congress would violate this section, that same Congress would have the power to pass any law they chose on the subject. If they would violate this public faith, would they not also issue an unlimited amount of greenbacks or do any other wild and disparaging thing dishonoring the public faith? If you can impute to a Congress hereafter that they would violate the public faith, would they not without such a pledge of the public faith pursue a policy more dangerous? What has checked the reissue of United States notes at this session except that pledge contained in the law of 1864 that the limit should not exceed \$400,000,000? There it stood as a bar. Now when you get this stipulation in your laws, have you not secured the substance and are you afraid of a shadow?

As to free banking under this bill, that is a question every Senator will decide for himself. It seems to me it can do no harm to make the privilege now enjoyed mainly in the Eastern States open to all. Whether banks will retire under one provision, or whether banks will be organized under another, is a matter of opinion on which each can act for himself. Now, sir, I again appeal to the Senate. You may defeat this bill if you please; but if you do, you send this question home to the people and they will engage in all their primary assemblages in the discussion of these questions that have divided us for six months, questions that have been so difficult of solution here that able bodies of picked men are not able to harmonize their views with all the pressure of public opinion upon them in order to be able to agree upon a policy. If you defeat this bill, you send these questions, the most difficult of all in political economy, among the masses, to divide the people of the United States, perhaps to divide them into

sectional parties over these complicated and contending questions. Congress was made to solve such questions. Congress ought to do it. Congress must do it in the end. And now, sir, when we have a bill which substantially secures the results at which we have aimed, is it wise to turn our backs upon it merely because it does not go so fast or so far as we would desire?

Mr. BUCKINGHAM obtained the floor.

Mr. DAVIS. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will answer it if the Senator from Connecticut will yield.

Mr. BUCKINGHAM. I will yield for a moment.

Mr. DAVIS. I incline to favor this compromise; but there are one or two points in regard to which I should like to have information. The first question is, What difference, if any, it makes in the amount of tax now levied on national banks, which amounts to about 1 per cent.?

Mr. SHERMAN. Not the slightest; it will not affect it at all.

Mr. DAVIS. I do not understand whether the 5 per cent. that is ordered by this bill to be kept in the Treasury is to be taken from the 6 per cent. that is required by the country banks to be kept at home, or the 9 per cent. required by law to be kept in the redemption cities.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is a part of the whole reserve. The Senator understands this business. The part deposited in New York will probably be transferred to the city of Washington. It is a part of their deposits just as the same sum deposited in New York would be. It is counted as a part of their reserve.

Mr. DAVIS. It must be one or the other, as the Senator must admit. It must come off of that at home or that in New York.

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS. Now the question is: Which will it come off of, or will it be taken from the 15 per cent. retained at home before?

Mr. SHERMAN. I should think it might come off here as part of the reserve. That is a question of division in arithmetic to which my attention has not been directed. My impression is that it would be a part of the reserve.

Mr. DAVIS. It would probably be left to the Secretary to decide.

Mr. SHERMAN. To the Comptroller, I suppose.

Mr. DAVIS. One further question. The Senator from Indiana named twenty-six and one-half millions that is now held as reserve for circulation as the probable amount that would be put in circulation under this bill. Does the Senator from Ohio make the same calculation?

Mr. SHERMAN. That is a question upon which perhaps I would differ with the Senator from Indiana, because the amount of currency reserve held by the country banks is now 6 per cent. of their circulation, and the amount in the cities is two-fifths of 25 per cent.; that would be about 12½ per cent. The amount of currency reserve in the cities is 12½ per cent., and in the country banks 6 per cent. I should have to compute the proportion the city banks bear to the country banks before I could answer the question entirely. The Senator from Indiana says he has made that computation, which I have not. I take it, so far as that is concerned, every bank would undoubtedly maintain a reserve, even if the law no longer required it. They would maintain whatever reserve they deemed to be necessary and take the hazard and the risk of not having money enough on hand to pay every call.

Mr. DAVIS. That I understand; but my impression is that it will be a considerably larger amount than the Senator from Indiana named, and in that way I think it will be better than he has anticipated.

Mr. BUCKINGHAM. Mr. President, I understand from the Senators who have spoken on this question that this report is a concession, a compromise; that is, that men who have opposite views with regard to the course which the Government ought to pursue with reference to the currency have conceded their extreme views and harmonized in this measure. I fully believe it to be a report which manifests concessions. It appears to me to be a concession of every financial principle which has been advocated on this floor which can be of any value. Here are men in favor of a resumption of specie payments and they have been in earnest, presenting their views with a great deal of force, and here comes in a report which says in regard to that measure that it may be delayed until 1878, and when that time arrives the Government shall or not, at its pleasure, redeem its currency in coin. Here is a concession—not that we will demand specie payment to-day, not that we will demand it in 1875 or 1876, but in 1878 if it shall be perfectly convenient for the Government to pay, not otherwise.

Here is also a concession on the part of those who are in favor of inflation or of free banking equally wonderful to me. What is conceded here? The bill provides for free banking. It opens the door perfectly free and wide enough for people to enter in and engage in the business of banking. Whosoever will may do so; but be it known to every Senator that there can be no organization of men to establish a bank unless there shall be in connection with it a reasonable prospect of remuneration. Now, upon what terms can men enter into this business with a reasonable prospect of profit? If I go into the market to-day and buy you bonds, I must give \$1.12 or \$1.15 for each dollar; but it has been proved here repeatedly that the profit to men engaged in banking, on the currency which they receive, is only from 1½ to 2 per cent. per annum. That having been asserted and proved so repeatedly upon this floor, I shall regard it as an es-

established fact. But here you provide that men may go into market and buy their bonds and pay \$1.12 or \$1.15 for them, and at the end of three years and a half those bonds are to be at par. Now, suppose by obtaining currency and engaging in this business, you can make the highest amount of profit which has been proven, which would be 2 per cent. per annum, in the three and a half years you will have made 7 per cent., but you will have lost on your bonds another 7 per cent. This is the concession, the compromise which this report suggests has been made! I challenge any business man, I challenge any man who knows anything about dollars and cents, to engage in free banking under this bill with the prospect of making money, unless he shall be convinced that the Congress of the United States will not be true to its promises, that when the time shall come when we anticipate, as the Senator from Ohio does, a positive and complete redemption, that day will be postponed, as I believe it will be, if you agree to this compromise.

I am in favor of specie redemption. I think it is the duty of this Government to redeem its promises. Just as I think it is my duty, if I have made a promise to pay, when the time comes for me to pay according to my promise, to make any pecuniary sacrifice that my creditor shall demand in order to meet that promise, so I believe this Government is under obligations equally sacred and equally binding. But there has been delay after delay in keeping promise of the Government; and being under these peculiar circumstances I have believed and I still believe that we would come nearer fulfilling our promise than we have yet done if we would convert our legal-tender notes into an interest-bearing bond. This bill proposes to do that. When? Not to-day when the debt is due, but three years and a half hence; not to-day when you ought to meet your obligations, but at some future time when some contingency may arise which will make it exceedingly inconvenient for the Government.

I believe that the Government is as well able to exchange bonds bearing interest for the greenbacks to-day or on the 1st of July or the 1st of January next, as it will be on the 1st of July or the 1st of January, 1878; and I can see no injustice in it. Although the Senator from Ohio made a suggestion which he thought would be embarrassing, yet I can see no injury to come from it.

There is another point in this report to which I will briefly refer. Our banking law now provides such a system of redemption that bank-notes and legal-tender notes are of equal value in all parts of the country. We have never had such a system before, and in that respect we have never had a system so valuable; and in saying this I do not mean to say that the redemption to-day is of any special value. I do not appreciate perhaps as I should the great advantage of exchanging a bank-note for a legal-tender note; but I do appreciate the present system of redemption which, if we adhere to it, will, when we come to a specie basis, place the mercantile and the commercial interests of this country in regard to exchanges on a higher plane than they have ever stood before.

But what does this report propose? It proposes that the banks shall redeem at their counters, and there shall be no other system of redemption except with the sub-treasury. Therefore this system of central redemption, where every bank-note can be redeemed with whatever you promise to redeem it with and can be of equal value, the moment you put this bill into operation and come to a specie basis, that moment you depreciate the value of a bank-note in proportion to its distance from its center or from the bank.

Let me illustrate this if I can. To-day a note issued by a bank in the city of Washington is just as good in the city of Saint Louis as a note issued by a bank there; but if you break up this present system of redemption and require that that note shall be redeemed only at its own counter or in the city of New York, you depreciate the value of that note in the city of Saint Louis; you impose a tax upon the mercantile community which they would not bear otherwise. Is that wise? In one sense it is. In one sense it is right and proper that a man should pay exchange just as much as he should pay freight; but, sir, no man and no set of men in the commercial community can pay these exchanges without an immense cost. But will it not be a burden to some parties? Yes, it will be a burden to the banks if they are required to do it. Then will it not be an act of injustice to require it of the banks, to charge it to them as a part of the consideration by which they shall pursue a banking business? Why? Because they can do this business cheaper than any other association of men or any other men; and it is but fair, they receiving the privileges they do from the Government, that they should in some way compensate the community for these privileges.

I might, if I had time, perhaps say a little more on this report. I regret that I can see no possible good to result to any class of men if it should be adopted by the Congress of the United States. I cannot see that it promotes expansion if any one wants expansion; I cannot see that it leads directly to specie payments; but it seems to me that it postpones the day about as much and about as far as from the present hour to the beginning of 1878.

Mr. FLANAGAN. Mr. President, I am opposed to this bill, and propose to submit a few reasons for my conclusion. It is said by my distinguished friend from Indiana, [Mr. MORRIS,] for whose opinions I have the very highest respect, whether I am with him or against him on any measure, that the country wants a settlement of this great question. Surely upon that branch of the subject between him and myself there is no issue. The people do want a settlement. They

simply demand, however, that which is due to them and has been for many years by solemn law. They want a settlement; they want gold for the paper that they are holding. That is the settlement which they want.

But my friend says that in theory this matter will all work out harmoniously and delightfully by the 1st day of January, 1878. What evidences have we of that, except that which I have already announced my confidence in, his declaration, and I suppose the country at large will indorse to a very great extent his declaration in most instances; but this is one of the cases where the people are not so readily disposed to compromise. We are told by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, whom I have been following so closely and with a great deal of pleasure since this question was first introduced into the Senate, that the proposition now is to compromise. Compromise what? Is there any unsettled question between any parties? He who holds a five-dollar note, or a thousand-dollar note if you please, holds that which represents money that has been long due; and now, by way of compromise, these learned gentlemen propose to tell him that payment is to be deferred until 1878. What a beautiful compromise!

My friend says the theory of the bill is that by the 1st day of January, 1878, we shall have no jar, no difficulty. Then it is, I suppose, his idea that whoever lives to see that day will enjoy the millennium; all will be bright and easy; gold will flow in great abundance, and there will be no trouble with an American citizen on the subject of currency. We have no evidence justifying that in the past history of the country. When will that convenient season come? It is said by every Senator who has addressed the Senate on this subject that the Government has the ability to do that which it has solemnly pledged itself by law to do, at any time. If so, there is no necessity for deferring it; and the Senator is not here, if I understand the question, who is ready to say that the Government is not prepared just as well to put this proposed machinery into operation upon the 1st of January, 1875, as the 1st of January, 1878, by redeeming the indebtedness in bonds bearing 5 per cent. interest.

But then we are told, by way of giving it a beautiful sugar-coat, if you please, in section 8:

That on and after the 1st day of January, 1878, any holder of United States notes to the amount of fifty dollars, or any multiple thereof, may present them for payment at the office of the Treasurer of the United States, or at the office of the assistant treasurer at the city of New York; and thereupon he shall be entitled to receive, at his option, from the Secretary of the Treasury, who is authorized and required to issue in exchange for said notes an equal amount of either class of the coupon or registered bonds of the United States provided for in the first section of the act approved on the 14th of July, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," and the act amendatory thereof, approved the 20th day of January, 1871, which bonds shall continue to be exempt from taxation as provided in said act.

Why not make provision at an earlier day? There is no objection to it. The claims of parties holding the indebtedness of the United States will be no more sacred upon that day than they are now. The notes are due. Why not make preparation to redeem them? And if they are to be redeemed in bonds paying interest, why defer that time? It is *ex parte*. The parties holding the notes may not be willing to do that, and you have no just right to require them to postpone their claims.

Provided, however, That the Secretary of the Treasury in lieu of such bonds may redeem said notes in the gold coin of the United States.

There is the gold feature. It is very modestly approached, to say the least. To illustrate, where is the individual who would prefer to shell out gold instead of paper? What Secretary of the Treasury shall we expect to find in office who would do likewise? Upon such occasions small birds fly; they always do. You may go into executive session this evening, and it is all secret, and nothing is to be known, *pro or con*, as to what you have been doing, and yet before you leave the Senate door what you have done is being published in New York and sent broadcast throughout the country. Now if peradventure the Treasury should be prepared to pay out a little gold, who would get it? The laborer in the country? Do you suppose one of these dollars would ever get down to Texas? Never, under God Almighty's heaven, through that channel. New York would have every one of them. The men there would know the "dots," and they would have their demands on hand and they would realize on them.

What a beautiful idea to talk to me about a compromise and a resumption of coin payments! It is a burlesque upon common sense to me, with all due respect for distinguished friends who advocate it. It is a simple, plain proposition, and no man who has any idea of business can thus have the wool pulled over his eyes, for it amounts to that. It might inconvenience some person presenting his money to a very great degree. I recollect an anecdote told of old Stephen Girard in his day. There was a merchant in the city of Philadelphia who was disposed to make a run upon Girard's bank, and he had secured some \$100,000 of Mr. Girard's paper. He very promptly made known to Mr. Girard the object of his visit when he presented himself. By the way, however, I should say that one of those little birds that I have been alluding to had flown toward Mr. Girard previously, and therefore he recognized the business of his visitor instantly and was as well informed of his intention as the man himself was. He asked Mr. Girard if he would be so kind as to cash a small amount of his paper. Mr. Girard promptly replied, "O, yes; certainly, sir." "Well," said the gentleman, "it is a very small amount." "It does not

matter," says Mr. Girard, "about that; what is it?" "Only \$100,000." He had come to the conclusion that Mr. Girard would tender excuses, such as not being prepared to meet \$100,000, but he turned to his clerks at once and told them, "Count out that money to the gentleman." The clerks began to roll out the kegs of round dollars, and as soon as he saw them the visitor began to back out. Said he, "O, never mind, Mr. Girard; I am not particular about it this morning." "Well," said Girard, "I want to close up this transaction and it must be settled now. Here is the money that you have demanded." The party had no cart there; he had no way of disposing of it; he had no guard there to protect it; he was in a very serious difficulty, and then he begged the old banker for mercy. The money was there and he was very well aware of it.

Mr. MORTON. If he had greenbacks he could have carried them off in his pocket.

Mr. FLANAGAN. I will come to that. Girard's bank was certainly as good as greenbacks. My friend ought to have reflected on his greenback proposition that if he himself should present a large amount of greenbacks at the counter of the Treasury they might pour out the gold upon him whether he expected it or not. He may have had no idea of that when he signed his name to this report. But then they might do so, and thereby he would be seriously interfered with and unpleasantly situated, having more gold than he could control. One hundred thousand dollars at the day I speak of was more than equal to a million at this time.

But in looking over the happy names that are to be found to this article, I cannot but be amused, even if it were a pure accident, at how appropriate they are. I find the name of my distinguished friend from North Carolina [Mr. MERRIMON] here. He having gotten this concession and compromise is as merry as a sixteen year old belle having just received a beautiful bouquet from her distinguished lover. He is perfectly happy. I am rejoiced to see him thus pleased on all occasions. But there are other gentlemen who figure very conspicuously. For instance, here is the name of "C. B. FARWELL." Mr. FARWELL is a distinguished gentleman. I have nothing to say against him. I appreciate his action and his purity of integrity because when he signed his name to this report he handed out his hand and said, "Farewell, Gold; that is the last I will ever hear of you. Farewell, Gold." [Laughter.] That is very appropriate indeed. But, sir, I do not see another distinguished name, a member of the committee from Pennsylvania, [Mr. CLYMER.] Mr. CLYMER declines to give us the benefit of his name here. Mr. CLYMER was not so good a squirrel for climbing as to commence climbing this morning after gold, because we can see already in the reports from New York that gold is beginning to go up and he would have to go, I know not how many rounds of the ladder, whether thirty-three, fifty, or one hundred, to reach and get in proximity to the gold question. Therefore Mr. CLYMER very sensibly concluded to remain precisely where he was. I compliment him for doing so, and I for one determined on this occasion to stand by him. I should like to make his acquaintance. He is a man of good sense. No unnecessary climbing for him. [Laughter.] His name is nowhere.

Resumption! Some of our friends have said: "Certainly you will go with us for this. You are for resumption, are you not?" Surely I am for resumption; but I am sincere in that resumption. Talk not to me about resumption under this! It may be done in 1878 say you! Why, we shall be further off from it then if it is not done now than we are at this time. There is no doubt about that. Who is it that is going to cease to operate his spindles in the cotton and woolen factories, in his leather operations, in the various machineries that are so successfully employed now in the American Union? According to the history of the world is it to be expected that all the parties who are thus interested and participating in the great enterprises of the day will be successful? If so, then indeed that happy millennium that the distinguished Senator, my friend from Indiana, has portrayed in this matter may be realized in 1878. But we do know that such will not be the fact. That is demonstrated, and we shall be further from resumption then than we are now beyond a doubt.

My distinguished friend from Connecticut, who sits close to me, [Mr. BUCKINGHAM,] is for free banking. I have no particular objection to that. But he is so much delighted with the idea of free banking that he does not see anything else in this thing. He is very well satisfied. I think that heals all his wounds to a considerable extent. I congratulate him; I am gratified that it suits some of our friends; but be it remembered that all the people of the United States do not propose to embark in banking. If they did, there would be a perfect failure. There are thousands and thousands of laboring, toiling men who are earning their subsistence by the sweat of their brow. I have seen nothing here that tends toward the protection of one of these individuals; not an iota. They are simply told that they may per possibility get the sight of a gold dollar about the 1st of January 1878. The large money-dealers who have bonds and are able to get hold of them at that day are to be protected. They are looking to their interests very carefully. They will thereafter receive 5 per cent. on their greenbacks turned into bonds; but what is the poor man to receive? Is he to be protected to the thousandth part of a fraction directly or remotely? Not a word of it. You prey upon him unmistakably just as a large fish does upon a small one in the mighty waters of creation. The large eat the small fish, and there is no end of them. So under this the rich men grow fat and large, and the

poor man toils for a subsistence that you try to wring from him. That is not the kind of legislation that I am in favor of.

If this Government owes this money, as we know it does, there can be no successful answer to the proposition that it should honestly and faithfully come up to the work and vindicate the character of the nation and its ability by making good your solemn pledge; and until you have done that, you never will satisfy the American people. I care not whether a man be a democrat or whether he be republican, or what he be politically; he demands the amount you owe him at your hands.

Tell me not that it will prostrate the republican party if this compromise is not effected and accepted. I say if the republican party is to be perpetuated upon a platform of bankruptcy, it is time that it was disrupted and let others take hold of it who are capable and honestly disposed to do that which is beneficial to this mighty nation. If there be any republicans, I am one of them; but I am no republican at the expense of the honor of this great nation. I am opposed in every sense of the word to this compromise. Indeed there is no compromise in it. I am reminded of a little occurrence that illustrates this matter to me very well, to say the least of it. About fifty years ago there was a very distinguished lawyer living in Kentucky by the name of Haggin. I have no doubt the Kentucky Senators who sit right behind me knew him and can recollect the anecdote. Haggin lived in Lexington, Kentucky, one of the leading members of that bar, and that bar at that day was scarcely rivaled. The great Clay, Bledsoe, John Rowan, and a host of other distinguished men that the reader of American history is familiar with belonged to that bar. Haggin was a member, and a prominent member, of that bar. He was informed that there was a widow lady living in the neighborhood who had about \$2,000 to loan. The money would be convenient to him and he applied to her for it. He was above suspicion, and she very readily brought out the \$2,000 and handed it over to Mr. Haggin. Haggin drew his note for it at twelve months after date, but at the bottom of the note he added a few little words: "Provided"—just about like this beautiful little play is here that the Secretary of the Treasury may do so and so—"Provided the said Haggin is not to be hastened." [Laughter.] When the note fell due, that happy period when my friend [Mr. MORTON] says everything will be perfectly lovely, with no difficulty in the world, so that we shall be all right, it was not exactly so with Haggin. Mr. Haggin was not ready to respond. The lady called upon an attorney and instituted suit. Upon the trial Mr. Haggin pleaded "there is a qualification which was part and parcel of the note I made that I am not to be hastened." The judge, however, did not see it in that light. The judge ruled that the gentleman was to be hastened. Frequently thereafter when the lawyers through the State were riding in company—and I take it for granted my friend behind me [Mr. MCCREERY] was with them occasionally—a horse would lag behind and the rider would spur it on, and the others would say to him, "You know he said he was not to be hastened," [laughter,] and then how the rider popped the spur into him and brought him up! Now pop the spur into the Union and make the Union come up to an honest declaration of the Congress of the United States to pay this money that is due, as the said Haggin had to do.

I think I will try a further illustration, and then I believe I shall yield the floor. I want to tell an Irish anecdote, and if I cannot draw from the Irish upon whom can I draw, because I claim to have come from that source myself and therefore I may speak of an Irishman. An Irishman had conceived the idea that he could act upon the theory that really he could train his horse to live without any subsistence, giving him proper care and attention otherwise. He was going to solve a great problem as he considered. Very well; he put his horse up in pretty good condition, and his neighbors came in very regularly and interrogated him, "How are you getting along?" Well, now, I can see some of my neighbors coming to some one near me. Here is one that I love as well as any of you here, my friend on the right, [Mr. FERRY, of Michigan.] I can point out distinguished friends sitting around in different portions of the Senate who come regularly to the seat of my friend from Indiana, [Mr. MORTON,] who is the keeper of the horse now in training, and they ask, "How are you getting along with your experiment?" "O, first rate, doing most elegantly; I will succeed; no doubt about that; theory tells me so; give him plenty of good kind words and I suppose some little rubbing, but no food; no gold, certainly not, but plenty of greenbacks." [Laughter.] My friend loves to play with the word greenbacks. Gentlemen continue to visit him and they get favorable responses regularly; but finally, just about, as it were, the first day of 1878, they all come up with a great deal of anxiety, "How does he get along?" "O," says he "he was getting along very finely, but he died last night." [Laughter.] Here is my friend's theory, and there is his practice. He will tell all his friends who approach him now that it is working elegantly; no doubt about success; but when January 1, 1878, arrives, the horse dies and there is an end of it. That thing will not do. [Laughter.] This is the history of this case. This proposition cannot live; there is nothing in it. There is no substance based upon theory. Nothing under the sun known to man that has ever been realized is able to support the doctrine that in 1878 you will be willing to do that which you should do in 1875 if this theory ought to prevail. Therefore I am opposed to it.

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

Mr. CONKLING. Let us have the yeas and nays on that question.

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont. I am quite satisfied that the committee of conference in relation to this bill have endeavored to do the very best thing practically possible, and I am ready to accord to them some spirit of self-sacrifice; but not believing that the bill they report is a bill which is to satisfy anybody in its practical operations, I shall not be able to vote for it.

In the first place, the theory adopted here is to retire 37½ per cent. of greenbacks for every dollar that is issued of national-bank notes; that is to say, there is to be \$37.50 of the greenback currency retired for every \$100 on new national-bank currency that shall be issued. That is, on the face of it, an expansion of the currency to a very large amount. Let us see what it amounts to. It is proposed in the first place that we shall reduce the amount of legal-tenders outstanding from the present \$382,000,000 to \$300,000,000, and then stop. That is, we are to retire \$82,000,000 of the greenbacks, and how much are we allowed to issue of the national-bank currency? That would amount to \$219,333,000. On the theory of this bill that amount would be issued, less the 5 per cent. that is to be retained in the Treasury of the United States for redemption, which would leave practically as the issue of the national banks \$203,367,000, and there would be retired \$82,000,000 of greenbacks. Then after that the scheme of free banking is unlimited. You may then proceed up to the amount of a thousand millions if it is possible to induce anybody to enter into the business, as I do not think it would be.

But there are other features of this bill. It is proposed that in 1878, January 1, the greenbacks shall be converted at par into bonds at the option of the holder. What will be the effect of that? Clearly it would have the effect to appreciate the value of the greenback to a certain extent, but it would also have the effect of depreciating the value of the bonds of the country. If these greenbacks, when so redeemed by bonds, were to be canceled and retired, I should have no objection to the proposition; but here is a provision made by which they may be perpetually reissued, and it is made imperative that they shall be reissued. Consequently this amount of greenbacks that may be so repeatedly reissued will have a very damaging effect in depreciating the value of our national bonds.

But, Mr. President, the friends of this bill I think deceive themselves if they suppose they are going to get much of free banking or expansion of the currency under it, except what occurs from the release of reserves. The proposition is that in January, 1878, greenbacks may be exchanged for bonds at par. What capitalist, what banker, would go into the market now and buy bonds at 15 or 18 per cent. premium for the purpose of going into the business of banking, when by waiting three and a half years he could have his bonds at par, and then there was almost an absolute certainty if he invested his money in banking at the present time that there would be a positive loss of 15 or 18 per cent. or whatever the premium on bonds now is, as the consequence of entering upon it?

I do not desire to discuss this question at any length; but there was one thing said by the Senator from Indiana in his opening remarks in relation to this matter, that this was to be a final settlement of the currency question. I should like to know of the Senator, when he comes back here at the next session and finds that free banking is not the practical result of this bill or that it does not work much in that direction, whether the question will not be again opened? I do not think it will be settled at all by this bill. Besides, if we are to resume specie payments in 1878, it seems to me that there is a plan and there are many plans by which the end might be reached much earlier and with less distress to the country, as certainly the Government might furnish the gold by issuing its bonds in exchange for gold almost at any time and pay it out for greenbacks. Under the conviction, therefore, that this bill is in theory one of almost indefinite expansion and that the result will disappoint even the friends of the bill, that free-banking to any extent will not be the consequence which will follow and that it is not likely to secure specie resumption, I shall be compelled to vote against it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I cannot vote for this report. There is no doubt of the sincere and honest effort of the committee to come to a satisfactory arrangement; but I think that those who believed that an expansion of our paper currency is necessary to promote the business interests of the country, when they secured that by the report by providing for free banking or at least supposed they secured it, should have given to those who differ with them and want resumption a measure which would lead to specie payments, and this especially as the desire to come to specie payments is common to those who are in favor of and to those who are opposed to a greater expansion. There is no doubt of a common desire, however we may differ as to measures, in the Senate and in the House with all parties to reach the great desideratum, specie payments. But so far from the measure proposed bringing us to specie payments, it positively enacts that we shall not in any event reach that result before 1878. Far better run the chance of coming to specie payments without than with this bill. Up to 1878 this bill provides, and it is a provision in which all who engage in free banking have an interest, so that it would be unjust to repeal the law, that there shall not be specie payments. No one under the bill would purchase United States bonds at 1.15 if they were not assured that they were not to be reduced

to par in greenbacks earlier than 1878. And when we reach that year the bill provides we shall not then resume specie payments, but that then the return which the bill-holder is to get is to be not money but bonds.

Suppose that under the law the \$382,000,000 Government currency is funded in bonds, what is the result? This nation, after delaying specie payment until 1878 and after investing the vast amount of United States notes in bonds and being liable perpetually for the interest on such bonds, is then by this law obliged, not in time of war, not from any exigency, not when there is any excuse for it, but is then obliged by the force of this bill and from no other necessity to reissue those promises again, and thus to place the Government in exactly the same situation that it is now as to specie payments, excepting that we will have gone to an expenditure and liability which, applied to the accumulation and obtaining of gold, would bring us to specie payments in a year.

That, Mr. President, is not all. If we had adopted the policy of accumulating gold we should be brought to specie payments without any contraction, because that process would bring all the hoarded coin of the country into circulation and produce a healthful expansion—

It is said we cannot get the gold. There never was a more patent error. Why, we are told here to-day that the annual surplus gold coming to the Government is \$100,000,000. That, I suppose, is a mistake; our annual surplus gold is about \$44,000,000. The whole amount is \$180,000,000, and the expenditures for interest and diplomatic salaries by the Government is about \$136,000,000 in gold.

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont. We have eighty-one millions on hand and part of that belongs to depositors.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We have but \$50,000,000 on hand that belongs to us. Then for the purposes of this accumulation, so as to commence specie payment, we have the products of the mines which yield us sixty or seventy millions, of which perhaps one-half goes abroad. There is in the country \$150,000,000 which is hoarded. England, too, stands ready at a low rate of interest to help us in the accumulation of gold, because it is the interest of England from two considerations to aid us: first, because her people hold our securities, and, second, because England knows that while our currency is below par it operates as a prohibition against her manufacturers coming here. There is no trouble in accumulating gold sufficient for resumption. And what in that event would be the result? If the United States notes amount to \$400,000,000, how much gold would we require? In 1838-'39, in 1858-'59, after the banks of the country had suspended they resumed without one of them having to resume with more than 33 per cent. of their issue. But the nation could resume much more securely with even less than 33 per cent. The Government would be more favorably situated as regards resumption than the banks, for two reasons: first, great wealth of the nation is a constant security that payment will be made, and, second, the United States notes being necessary to the banks as a reserve would not be sent to the Treasury for redemption.

Mr. President, if we should adopt the policy of making the United States notes convertible rather than redeemable, and there is a broad difference in those two words, we would have established in the country a measure which would give us all the benefits of a national bank without any of the disadvantages. Our country would possess all the benefits which England and France derive from their national banks, and from the extent of our territory we need those advantages more than any other country. Six months after we resumed probably \$50,000,000 on deposit in the Treasury would make and preserve \$300,000,000 of United States notes constantly convertible into gold, and the nation would have the advantage and profit of floating \$250,000,000 without the payment of interest, while at the same time we would have kept our faith to the bill-holders by making our notes always convertible into gold. We would have a currency that would resist panics, that would remain in the country, that would be uniform throughout the length and breadth of the land, that would be a great convenience to the banking business of the nation; but instead of that we are told here that we must postpone specie payments until 1878, then have bonds, then reissue the greenbacks again, and so on *ad infinitum*. Mr. President, I do not doubt that we are in a vastly better situation without adopting any financial measure than we would be should we adopt this.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New York calls for the yeas and nays on the question of concurring in this report.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I do not intend to say more than a few words on the report now pending before this body. It seems to me that it bristles all over with objectionable features; and I do not share with the Senator from Ohio his confidence that the legislation may not be changed before the 1st of January, 1878, so as to entirely annul the redemption features of the pending bill. I do know one thing, that the inflation is immediate, that the redemption is very remote. Sir, I do not believe that it is to the advantage of any class in this country that the price of the greenbacks shall be elevated by any such method as is proposed in this bill. Gentlemen talk about the resumption of specie payments. It is utterly impossible to resume specie payments and keep that resumption permanent with the great volume of paper currency now afloat. Specie will not remain with us as long as the price of everything that is produced, as long as

the price of everything that we manufacture and of everything we raise here is so much higher than the prices of the same commodities and the same materials in every other portion of the world. You may make your greenbacks redeemable in bonds, and then again issue the greenbacks, but it will be all in vain. When an inflated currency is in a country, when prices have risen in proportion to that expansion, contraction is the only remedy for it, and specie payment can never be maintained without a contraction of that currency.

Sir, all the evils that have been complained of heretofore with regard to this irredeemable currency that we have will be just as active when you shall make the greenbacks convertible into bonds as they are to-day. It makes very little difference whether gold rates at \$1.12 or \$1.03 so long as your paper is not immediately convertible into gold; all the grievances we complain of, all the hardships upon the workers of this country upon the constant fluctuation that is robbing them day by day of the fruits of their labor, will be just as active as ever.

This bill will have the effect to raise by a small percentage the value of the greenback. It will have the effect also to degrade the bonds of the United States to a small extent. In any event it can never bring back specie payments, because the greenback will bear no just relation to prices here except to the price of bonds. The bonds again will have to be negotiated abroad perhaps for gold. There will be no gold among the people of the country, the greenback will not be convertible into gold, and all the fluctuations that we have complained of heretofore, aggravated perhaps by the increased volume of paper money, will be felt after this redemption shall have taken place.

In the next place, what will be the proposition to get back to specie payments after the 1st of January, 1878? How can it be done? Admitting that gold will not remain in the country when the price of everything is at so high a point as to drive it out, then the problem will be presented to this body and to the country, how can we get an unvarying standard of value; how can we return to and maintain specie payments? Everybody will see then that it must be by contraction. That contraction, with prices raised as this additional volume of currency which this bill contemplates will cause them to rise, will make the revulsion ten times greater than it would be to return to specie payments to-day. Between this and the 1st of January, 1878, the country will have suffered a great deal more than it would suffer by returning to specie payments within a year or within six months. You inflate money that can neither be hoarded nor exported, and you leave the largely increased volume of currency to float the property of the country and to effect its exchanges. Of course, property must rise, and we shall be further off on the 1st day of January, 1878, than ever. It seems to me that the bill travels in a circle.

Taking this bill section by section, there are objections all through it. Take section 8. Omitting to read the first part of the section, it provides "that the Secretary of the Treasury in lieu of such bonds may redeem said notes in the gold coin of the United States. And the Secretary of the Treasury shall reissue the United States notes so received either in exchange for coin at par, or, with the consent of the holder, in the redemption of bonds then redeemable at par, or in the purchase of bonds at not less than par, or to meet the current payments for the public service; and when used to meet current payments an equal amount of the gold in the Treasury shall be applied in redemption of the bonds known as five-twenty bonds."

It seems to me it takes all the gold we have in the Treasury to pay our current expenses. I see no provision here made for the hoarding of gold needed to purchase bonds in lieu of the greenbacks which shall be reissued after bonds shall have been exchanged for them. And what will be done? Suppose that the exigencies of the country require that the greenbacks received for bonds shall be reissued, and in accordance with the provisions of this bill they are used for the current expenditures and there is no gold in the Treasury; there is no proposition here to accumulate gold, and there may be none in the Treasury at that time to meet this provision of the bill.

So I say, Mr. President, without entering into a detailed statement of the many objectionable features of this bill, that I believe, first, that after this bond redemption shall have taken place the country will be as far from specie payments as it was before. I believe that not only will it be as far from specie payments, but that it will be much more difficult to resume specie payments after such redemption than it would be to-day. I believe that the debtor class will be as clamorous then as they are now in the presence of redemption. The only way, it seems to me, to restore this country to prosperity is to restore the standard that the world uses to measure values. The only way we can export products from this country and enjoy foreign trade is to make the prices of commodities in this country bear some reasonable relation to the prices throughout the world. Instead of raising the value of greenbacks by arbitrary measures like this, the easiest and the most sensible measure is to reduce the volume of the greenbacks so that their value shall approximate to the price of gold and at the same time reduce the inflated prices now ruling, so that we shall be able to deal with the rest of the world without dealing at disadvantage, as we are now doing. Do what we will, the country is still operating upon a gold basis. The greenback manifestly rests upon the gold to-day. The average hope and confidence of the people that it will be ultimately redeemed measures the value of the greenback to-day; but instead of returning to specie payments, which I believe it is easy to do within two years without any great danger to any

interest, we are using this sharp cimeter—gold—to cut our bargains. But we have wound paper all around its edges, so that we hack and cut, and every time a bargain is divided some other people get the greater half in the division.

We should be on the road to prosperity, if instead of this bill it were possible that the present volume of greenbacks and bank-bills could be left afloat until the year 1878 or 1877 or any other time that this body could agree upon, and if the legal-tender clause could be repealed and people should commence to think correctly on this subject, and should remember day by day when they see the quotations in the commercial and financial markets that gold is \$1.12 one day and \$1.08 another, that it means simply that greenbacks have been fluctuating, and that it is a solecism, that it is doing violence to the language to say that the par of the world is above par, or that the par of the world, which is gold, is below par. We should accustom ourselves to saying what is the truth, that paper is above or below par, as the case may be. Then it would be well if people would make their bargains payable in gold or on the basis of gold, and then pay in the paper of the country just what that paper will bring in the market, for it is worth no more nor less by the legal-tender clause being added to it. I do not think that the legal-tender clause added to it makes it worth 1 per cent. more than it would be worth without it, even though you make no proposition for the redemption of the greenbacks. But let all contracts and debts now outstanding, before such plan be agreed on, be paid in greenbacks. I would get the people accustomed to make their bargains in gold, and by having it so that it could pay debts contracted you would find that gold would flow into the country and that prices would come down to where they really belong.

I had not intended to say a word about this bill, but I simply rose to protest against its passage, believing that it is full of surprises, believing that the friends of the bill do not and cannot fully know what its effects will be, though at the same time believing that they have acted entirely in good faith, and that they have probably done the best they could to harmonize conflicting opinions. But, sir, I believe that evil and only evil will spring out of its passage. I am opposed to any proposition, come in whatever form it may, that attempts to override what God himself has made for money, that attempts to make money a commodity and to make commodities money. I believe there is a vast and wide difference between the functions of the two, and that any departure from this plain truth will punish the country that so departs. I believe the sooner we come down to a purely gold standard the better it will be for the country. I believe that when we do so come down we shall have entered upon an era of prosperity which will be unbroken for a century. I believe that we shall enter upon an era of prosperity that in a very few years will make this God-favored land the clearing-house for all the world. Standing as we do half-way between Asia and Europe, the exchanges of the world will be effected in our markets. But as long as we use the present irredeemable, inflated, redundant currency we drive the world's instrument of commerce—gold—from our midst, and it will be found impossible for us to compete successfully with any other nation for the world's commerce.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. President, the arguments of Senators from the gold-producing States seem, when condensed, to be very much like that of the tanner in a town council, who insisted that for the purposes of fortification there was nothing like leather. With them gold, gold, seems to be the only thing on earth that is of any value. The Senator who has just taken his seat called it God-made money. Sir, I think that a new doctrine. I can find nowhere within my reading that God has pronounced that the only legal-tender of a country shall be gold. [Laughter.]

The Senator speaks of the repeal of the legal-tender act as being the thing which will bring to this country prosperity. I think most of the Senators here agree with me and the people of the country agree with me in insisting that the legal-tender of this country shall not be confined to any particular metal or substance at all. Gold is not, as he says, the legal-tender the world over. In one country gold is legal-tender, in another it is silver, in another it is lead, and in some wampum, as my friend the Senator from California [Mr. HAGER] suggests. It is whatever has been decreed by the sovereign power of the country to be legal-tender.

As to the fact that the greenbacks or the bonds of this country represent the average hopes and fears of the people, there is some truth in that. I was astonished at the speech made by the Senator at a former time, in which he spoke of the fact that some Senator—I do not remember what one—had alluded to our legal-tender currency in terms of enthusiasm as having been "battle-born;" and he said that at that time the rebellion might have been better suppressed by borrowing gold. Sir, it was an ill-advised time to talk about borrowing gold when the thunder of the enemy's cannon shook the windows of the Senate Chamber. When you might hear at any time with the windows and doors of the lobbies open the sound of the bugle from our own troops rallying to meet the assaults of the enemy, it was a poor time to talk about going into the world's market to buy gold. We should have been spurred; and, sir, I think that the law authorizing the issue of the greenbacks was a large factor in the problem of saving the country and restoring the national power, and I do not think that the people of this country will look with any favor upon the project of repealing the legal-tender act. I do not think that either myself or the Senator from Nevada, or probably any of us who

are now sitting in this Chamber, will be here when that act is repealed. I think, too, that this discussion having continued the whole session, there having been many conflicting interests to be reconciled, the conference committee have agreed upon what will give the most satisfaction to the country and satisfaction to a very large majority of this Congress. I believe that the report of the conference committee will be agreed to, and that it will be a very practicable and satisfactory solution of the financial question.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, when this report was made, and this morning when the question was about to be put to the Senate on its adoption, I supposed it would elicit but very little discussion. I am sure that I did not purpose saying one word in reference to it. After the report was printed and I examined it, it was with some hesitancy that I came to the conclusion that I should support it, but having some features in it that I have persistently advocated as well as some that I have opposed and it being as I believe and as was said by the Senator from Ohio, the chairman of the Committee on Finance, a fair compromise between the two conflicting ideas here in reference to a contraction or expansion of the currency, I came to the conclusion that I should support it as a compromise fixing definitely the position of the banking system in this country, and at the same time arranging the conflicting opinions of friends in this Chamber and concentrating them upon this settlement of the question. But I must confess that I have been somewhat surprised in finding arrayed against this measure of compromise many persons who persistently on this floor for day after day and week after week, ay for month after month, have advocated the very proposition itself that is contained in this compromise measure and a proposition that I have as persistently opposed.

When we are told that this measure runs in a circle, and that it is not a measure that is agreeable to those who advocate specie payment, I witness the fact that to many it is not agreeable, and while I witness that fact I stand amazed and surprised at the arguments made here against the measure by the very men who persistently voted for this portion of it before. When the Senator from Ohio reported the first bill to the Senate it contained the very provision that is contained in this conference report, with verbal changes only. What was it? That the greenbacks should be retired on a 5 per cent. bond. What other difference? Merely a change of six months in time, no change in principle whatever. The very principle adopted by the chairman of the Finance Committee, and voted for by every Senator who has advocated specie payments on this floor, is the same principle contained in this report to-day; but to-day we find it denounced, and why? Because it will prove destructive to the great interests of this country. How is it that they have so readily and so recently ascertained the fact that it will prove destructive to the interests of the country, when many so recently advocated it as the only palliation for the great difficulties in the finances of the country at this time and as the proper step in the direction of specie payments which all desire so much?

Now, sir, I wish to say to Senators on this floor who have been in the habit of denouncing Senators who have advocated different measures that have been before Congress as "inflationists" and as Senators who desired to demonetize silver and gold and as opposed to specie payments, I want to say to them now once for all that I know no man in the Senate Chamber who has ever opposed specie payments. The only thing we have said or argued was that we could not hurriedly undertake to adopt a return to specie payments, because the specie did not exist in the country for the redemption of our promises to pay, and the tenor of the arguments has been, however unfortunate the expression of the idea may have been, that the country should come to specie payment gradually, and that when the time should come nobody would oppose it. But, as I said, an argument was made to show that we could come to specie payment not only gradually but in a much shorter time than many of us believed the capacity and ability of the country would justify. This proposition was argued, was reasoned, and opposed in this Senate Chamber on account of the times and on account of the mode and the manner of arriving at the result.

I do not wish to discuss the character of money. I do not wish to examine as to the character of money that "God designed," as the Senator from Nevada says, should be a circulating medium, or that France or England or Germany or Russia or China or any other country desires. That question has been argued before, and it is an unfit question to be argued here to-day. The only question before the Senate to-day and that ought to be before the country is, is this a fair measure; is it such a measure of reconciliation between conflicting ideas in reference to this question as we can stand upon and as we can maintain before the country, or as will be satisfactory and beneficial to the country—not as a political question but as a financial question and a question of benefit to the interests of the communities of the different States?

My friend from Vermont with his usual ingenuity makes a two-edged speech. He first says there is, I forget how many millions of inflation as he calls it in this bill or increase of the currency. If he will pardon me, I will ask him to give me the figures he relied upon as to the amount.

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont. Two hundred and eight millions, deducting the eighty-two millions of greenbacks.

Mr. LOGAN. How much would that leave? I have not time to calculate.

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont. One hundred and twenty-six millions.

Mr. LOGAN. Now I appeal to the Senate and I ask their attention for a moment while I examine the argument of my friend from Vermont. He first appeals to what is called the contraction element in the Senate—I do not wish to use such a term as that except as a mere term of designation—and he says that it will be expansion to the amount of one hundred and twenty-six millions. Why? Because he says banks will be established and that much more currency will be afloat in the country. But mark the change, and how sudden it was, in the ten-minute speech of my friend from Vermont; he sat down with the conclusion expressed to the Senate that there would be no banking under it at all. That is strange reasoning. He reasons to one side that it will increase the currency, and then turning to the other side he tries to deter them from voting for it because he says it will not increase the currency. That was the argument!

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont. The Senator from Illinois does not wish to misstate me?

Mr. LOGAN. Certainly not.

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont. My idea was that the theory of the bill was expansion. I did say that I thought practically there would be no new banks under it to any great extent, and certainly not as many as I think would withdraw under the privilege granted here to all banks to reduce their circulation to \$50,000.

Mr. LOGAN. The statement was made in such a manner as to be perfectly understood by every Senator in this Chamber that the first point in the Senator's argument was that it was inflation, and the second point, and his appeal to the other side, was that we could have no banking under it. That was the conclusion of the Senator's argument, and he cannot get away from it. Of course an argument like that may be very eloquent and very entertaining, but at the same time, to intelligent men, it is very amusing. It is about as amusing, and about as logical, and about as correct as the statement I have heard of being made once on the witness-stand. One neighbor had sued another for breaking a kettle that he had borrowed from him. He called him up and charged the jury that he was liable for so much; he had borrowed the kettle and broken it, and he was liable for damages. He (the defendant) was called on the stand, and said to the jury: "Gentlemen of the jury, I will state to you that when I borrowed the kettle it was broken; in the second place, I will state to you that it was sound when I returned it; and in the third place that I never borrowed the scoundrel's kettle at all." [Laughter.] That is the kind of argument which was made to a jury, and that is the kind of argument my friend uses here in the Senate Chamber in reference to this bill: First, it is expansion; and, secondly, it is contraction—singular in its operation, I am sure.

And then our friend from Massachusetts [Mr. BOUTWELL] is opposed to this measure. He finds fault with it, too, because it will ruin the country; it is impossible to get to specie payments in this way! I do not blame him for making this argument. Nobody will blame him for it, because it is the only one probably that came to his mind at the time; for it is a well-known fact that our friend, the ex-Secretary of the Treasury and the highly respected Senator, to-day is opposed to anything being done in respect to this question and only wishes things left alone. He is in favor of standing still, neither moving forward or backward, to the right or the left, but standing still as a stock or stone and moving not at all. That has been his argument in the Senate for months. Of course he would make that argument, for he thinks it is the one that probably would be the strongest to find its way into the minds of certain gentlemen here who suspect generally the effect of this provision of the bill; at least that is my theory about it. The Senator said, not in speech but in questioning the Senator from Ohio on the floor, that instead of good results it would produce bad results.

Then, last but not least, comes our favored Senator from the gold mining region, [Mr. JONES,] always pleasant and humorous, kind and good-natured; feeling as though there was nothing that the earth should give forth except the yellow-tinted coin that it might jingle in the pockets of the many. He finds nothing that Moses admires, but is willing that some Aaron should be leader in this great land of ours and make it bow down to the golden calf and become its worshiper. Sir, the people of this country do not worship gold; they worship their God, but they do use gold as a medium of exchange.

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. LOGAN. Certainly.

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont. The Senator from Illinois is a very frank-spoken Senator. He has criticised somewhat my conception of this bill. I now desire to ask him what he thinks will be the effect of it as to expansion or contraction?

Mr. LOGAN. I will try to tell the Senator as near as I can what I think the effect will be. That was what I rose for. I will do it before I sit down; and if I should get so tired that I desire to sit down without noticing it, I hope he will call my attention to it again, because I shall certainly give my opinion about it. I desire now to answer one remark of my friend from Nevada, to whom I very gladly listened. He says the only road to specie payments is contraction

Mr. President, I will say there is no doubt of one thing. You certainly can contract to specie payments; there is no question about that. If there were \$100,000,000 of gold in this country, and you contract the currency of the country down to \$100,000,000, then of course you have specie payments, because you have enough specie to redeem the \$100,000,000. If that is what the Senator means, I certainly agree with him that such contraction would bring specie payment and ruin also. I should like to know what the Senator does mean when he says the only remedy is contraction? If contraction is the only remedy, you have to contract down until the faith of the country and the gold unite, and until it bloats your money in the country without any person asking, "Does the redeemer of this money live?" It is only in that way. There must be gold enough in the country or silver or whatever the redemption may be in, with the faith of the people based on the ability of the Government to redeem the amount of the money it has, before you have gold redemption in that way.

Mr. JONES. Will the Senator allow me to explain?

Mr. LOGAN. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. I mean by contraction that whenever you shall have reduced the volume of what you call money to that amount which would circulate in the country if the currency were purely metallic, prices throughout the country will also shrink at the same time, and gold from all parts of the earth will flow in to buy your commodities, and we shall have plenty of money throughout the country when that sort of contraction takes place, and specie payments cannot be maintained without it.

Mr. LOGAN. That is a very nice theory; but I am going on the theory that we have got to have the money to redeem ourselves, because we are the ones who are bound to redeem the United States notes; we must rely on ourselves. If we contract the currency and contract the prices of your commodities at the same time down to such a low point that there is a great profit in purchasing them, of course the people will bring gold and silver to buy them. If you shrink the price of corn down to ten cents per bushel, everybody would run to buy corn to speculate on; but I do not think the farmer would make much profit by that. If you contracted wheat down to twenty-five cents a bushel the same result would follow. But who profits by it? The man with the gold profits by it, and the farmer is the man who becomes wrecked in his property and in his interests.

My friend from Nevada would profit hugely under a contraction of that kind, because he has gold uncounted and untold, and if the price of commodities were reduced until a penny would purchase the amount that five pennies buy now, instead of being worth ten he would be worth his fifty millions. That is the difference, the opulent would increase their riches, the impoverishment of thousands of unfortunate persons would be produced, although having the same light of heaven shining on them and the same desire for prosperity that my friend from Nevada has.

But my friend says that this will increase the price of greenbacks and will reduce the price of bonds. I should like to ask him a question right here. If to-day greenbacks were appreciated up to the value of gold, would not the price of bonds depreciate? Would they not go down?

Mr. JONES. No.

Mr. LOGAN. They would not? Why? A bond to-day is worth 115 in greenbacks. If the greenback goes up to gold, that excess is stricken off, and your bond is worth only the same in gold that it is in greenbacks. Hence the argument is self-destructive. The very moment you put greenbacks up to gold, of course your bonds are brought to that standard.

But then my friend says section 8 is very objectionable. Why? Because section 8 provides that the greenbacks shall be redeemable in 1878 in a 4 per cent., 4½ per cent., or 5 per cent. bond, or in gold. Well, if they are redeemable at that time in gold, and we can come to redemption at that time in gold, and we believe we can—my friend says we can come to redemption in two years—then if we are able to come to it in two years, and we propose to do it in three and a half years, how is anybody injured by that? If we can come to it in two years, can we not come to it in three and a half years?

Mr. JONES. Never, under this bill.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not know why. The bill says the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay with gold or bonds, redeem the greenbacks. I presume the Senator means that the only way to come to specie payment is to repeal the legal-tender act and burn up the greenbacks. Is that the idea?

Mr. JONES nodded assent.

Mr. LOGAN. Exactly. So my friend from Nevada thinks that the only way is to repeal the legal-tender act and burn up the greenbacks. There is the proposition, and right there I enter issue with my friend from Nevada. If you repeal the legal-tender law, by that act you repeal the contract which is written right on the back of the bill that it shall be received for all dues in this country save duties on imports and interest on the public debt. It is payable and receivable for all debts and all dues except interest on the public debt and duties on imports, and that is stamped upon the bill itself. It is a contract between the people and the Government that these bills shall be a legal tender for all debts and all dues save and except only the interest on the public debt and duties on imports. There is a contract made between the Government and bill-holder. Now I want

you or any other Senator to tell me with what kind of face you can say before this country that men who would vote to legalize \$40,000,000 of greenbacks that the law authorizes and has authorized, will repudiate the bonded debt when it does not affect bonds, and will turn around and repeal the law which exists as a contract between the Government and the bill-holder that it shall be receivable for all debts and dues.

Mr. JONES. Will the Senator allow me a word?

Mr. LOGAN. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. Of course the greenbacks would be burned up only after the Government had redeemed them.

Mr. LOGAN. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. And I would never repeal the legal-tender act so far as obligations now in existence are concerned, and therefore it could not affect the contract the Senator refers to at all.

Mr. LOGAN. But if you repeal the legal-tender act and then burn up the whole amount of the issue, what difference does it make to the debtor? You do not interfere with prior contracts, but you burn the money, and he must pay in gold the same as if the contract was made subject to repeal.

I say to-day, right in this Senate Chamber, that you will not repeal the legal-tender act, although you think you will. The people of this country will not fill this Chamber or the other with men who will repudiate that contract between the people and the Government, and you will find that you will fail when you attempt to do it. When you tell me that you will repeal the legal-tender act and burn up the legal-tender notes, I tell you you will burn up \$382,000,000 of values in this country, and you reduce to that extent by \$382,000,000 of values the property of the people of the United States of America. That is exactly the result. O, but you say you redeem them with gold and you put the gold in circulation. If it goes into the hands, then, of speculators and is hoarded, as it will be, you take that much from the circulation of the country. My own judgment is that the legal-tender notes should not be destroyed.

Mr. JONES. Will the Senator permit me one word?

Mr. LOGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONES. When a man buys his own property is there anything to prevent his burning up his own property. Suppose he puts his note that he has paid into a stove and destroys it, is any value destroyed?

Mr. LOGAN. I understand that a man can burn up his own note and nobody objects to it; but if he burns his own house he is guilty of arson the same as if he burns his neighbor's house. There is no object in this burning up of legal-tenders. My theory is that they ought not to be burned up at all and ought not to be canceled except to the extent that this bill does it. Why? Because your law provides that they are made the medium of redemption for the national-bank currency of this country, and until you have gold sufficient for the redemption of the national-bank currency as well as the currency of your own Government, it would be bad faith to destroy one dollar of the amount that is necessary to float the circulation of the country for which they are the means and medium of redemption.

Mr. President, my friend from Vermont asked me what benefits are to be derived from this bill. I think I can tell him some. In the first place this bill opens the door and lets every association in this country have the same privileges that existing banking associations have at present. It does one thing: it strikes down a monopoly that is in antagonism with republican institutions. There is no theory upon which a monopoly of this kind can be maintained before an independent people; and whenever a man argues in this country that one man alone shall have the right to bank, he argues against the theory upon which this Government has been founded against the rights of an independent people. This monopoly is a great one and odious to the American people. This bill strikes down that monopoly, and does give the people of each State the same rights that the people of other States have. It does that, and in doing that it accomplishes a great good for and to the people of this country.

What else does it do? It performs the office that my friend from Nevada desires should be performed, of retiring \$82,000,000 of the greenback currency. That \$82,000,000 of greenback currency is to be in accordance with his theory destroyed; that is to say, it is canceled and the amount is credited to the sinking fund of the Government thereupon, while 5 per cent. interest is charged on the books and turned into the sinking fund, and in that way you save the Government from selling an interest-bearing bond to the public and taking for that the amount and putting it in the sinking fund. It adds to the amount that is redeemed 5 per cent. on the books, and that is credited to the sinking fund. Even in that there is a great change, a beneficial one, and one that is very advantageous in this particular.

There are two advantages. Let us see what the third is. You say you want to return to specie payments; you say the way to return to specie payments, or you have said so at least, is to take a step in that direction. This is a step in that direction, and you gentlemen who have denounced us here as inflationists (a term that you use in perversion of the true sense and meaning of what we advocated) have talked about the resumption of specie payments, and said we were opposed to it. Now we have tendered to you a proposition that is a step in the direction of specie payments, and in fact declares in favor of specie payments, and when you record yourselves against it, I tell you the tables are turned, and we shall see who are for specie pay-

ments and who are not in the legitimate and proper way, and in a way by which we would arrive at it instead of jumping clear off the roof of the house into the cellar. One grand Sam Patch leap is the way my friend from Nevada wishes to return to specie payment; he wishes to repeal the legal-tender act, to take effect one year from now; then he wants to redeem the balance of the greenbacks the year after and burn them up. Then I presume he wants a law passed declaring that no bill shall circulate of a less denomination than ten dollars, and in that way to have no currency in the country at all except that which comes from some of the gold mines that he or some other good friend owns.

Mr. JONES. I beg pardon, I have made no such statement here.

Mr. LOGAN. The Senator has not stated it on the floor to-day, but I hope he will not deny that that is his favorite proposition. The statement has been made to the country over his own signature that he indorsed such a proposition, not to let the people of this country have anything less than a ten-dollar bill, and if they cannot get it, let them go without money. No, sir; the poor boy who goes to buy his loaf of bread must have the penny in his pocket; he cannot have anything of a paper character to purchase it. If a poor woman wants to buy five dollars' worth of goods of any kind, she must have the gold or the silver from the Nevada mines. We cannot afford to let her have a five-dollar bill. It is contrary to the theory of our wealthy friend, who deals in gold and silver alone.

You talk about repealing the legal-tender act, about burning up \$382,000,000 of legal-tenders and then depriving the people of this country of having any money less than a ten dollar-bill. What is the result of this? What would be accomplished? In a year the result is bankruptcy, sheriff's sales, constable's sales. The rich men take possession of the poor men's property. The majority of the people become beggars as they were once in England, and a few landed-estate gentlemen obtain control of the whole property of the country. That is just what it means, and I tell you, gentlemen, when they go before this country with propositions like this, for the destruction of every interest in the country except the interest of the bondholder, or the wealthy merchant, or the rich banker, or the rich miner, they will find a voice coming from the hard-fisted yeomanry of this land that will make them shake and tremble in their boots.

Now, Mr. President, I am anxious, as I said, for this bill to be agreed to because it settles this question. If it is not agreed to, the whole question is then left open.

Mr. THURMAN. Will my friend allow me to ask a question?

Mr. LOGAN. Certainly.

Mr. THURMAN. He says, if I understand him, that if this bill be passed it will settle this question. What question does he mean when he says it will settle this question?

Mr. LOGAN. I will explain what I mean. I mean it settles this finance question.

Mr. THURMAN. The question of what kind of currency we shall have? Is that the idea of the Senator?

Mr. LOGAN. We would have the same kind of currency that we have now.

Mr. THURMAN. That it will settle that, so that there will be no question about the currency then to be disposed of?

Mr. LOGAN. No power on earth can settle this matter so that there will be no question left open at all about the currency. I do not mean that; nobody would expect such a thing. I mean it settles this question that we have been debating here in the Senate, that we of the republican side have disagreed upon, and that you on the democratic side have disagreed upon.

Mr. THURMAN. Does it do that?

Mr. LOGAN. I think it does.

Mr. THURMAN. Will the Senator allow me to read a few resolutions adopted by the grangers in his State yesterday?

Mr. LOGAN. I have read them and know what they are.

Mr. THURMAN. I think my friend after reading these resolutions will come to the conclusion that not one of those hard-fisted farmers for whom he spoke would vote for this bill.

Mr. LOGAN. Very well; those hard-fisted farmers the Senator speaks of have departed quite as far from his platform in those resolutions; so that he can take nothing by that move. He has nothing to expect from that source on the platform on which he has been standing all winter. So far as those resolutions are concerned, they cut no figure in this debate. I am speaking about the question before this Congress. I do not suppose any question, whether of finance or anything else, could be settled so as to suit every man in the country, or every party in the country, or every community of the country. I expect no such thing; but this bill will settle this question so far as this Congress is concerned and so far as this discussion is concerned.

Mr. THURMAN. May I ask, does it settle it with the Senator himself so that he will go back to his State and oppose the platform of the grangers' convention?

Mr. LOGAN. "Sufficient unto the day"—

Mr. THURMAN. "Is the evil thereof."

Mr. LOGAN. Yes. [Laughter.] I tell the Senator whenever I go on the stump I am about as independent a man as he is, and I take my own course. I do not propose to say what is settled with me or what is settled with anybody else. I say this bill, if passed, settles this vexed question here in Congress; and that is all we are trying to settle. So far as grangers are concerned and republicans are concerned

and democrats are concerned, my friend from Ohio can settle his difficulty with them himself and need not call upon me. I will try to settle my own.

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont. The Senator from Illinois requested me to remind him if he should forget it to answer the question which I proposed pretty soon after he first rose to speak, and that was, whether he thought this bill would promote expansion or contraction.

Mr. LOGAN. I did not understand that to be the question. I understood the Senator to ask what advantages would be derived from this bill. But I can answer his last question, for I have nothing to conceal. I think this bill would give a small increase of currency. I do not think it would give any large amount; but I do think that many people in my State and in other States would bank under this bill; but I do not presume that it would increase the currency to any frightful extent, and have never thought so. I did not think so at the time the bill was before the Senate and was being discussed. I never have thought so.

But, Mr. President, as I have said, the passage of this bill would settle, in the first place, the question of monopoly so far as banking is concerned; second, it would settle the discussion of this vexed question here in Congress; third, in my judgment it would restore confidence to the people. Being settled for the time at least, business would go on smoothly and would revive all over the country. I believe that to be true. If I did not I would not advocate the bill.

The bill is not a satisfactory bill to me. I have said so all the time; but I will concede my opinions so far as any one else will on a distracting question that divides communities or parties or peoples. I am always willing to do that for the purpose of settling it, for the reason that I do not think I made the world by a great deal, and hence I do not think I know all that is known in it. I am willing to take the opinions of other men, as well as to be guided by my own opinions. When I find experienced men, business men, men of great intellect and learning willing to concede their opinions for the purpose of compromise, and they believe this is a good measure, one at least from which benefits will be derived, I am willing to say that I will abandon for the moment the opinions that I have had in reference to this question for the purpose of making this settlement.

My friend from Ohio was very anxious to know what my position was in reference to the grangers. The grangers have not inquired of me as to my opinion; but I will say to him that this bill would settle a question in his State as well as it would settle one in mine. It would settle a question between him and his friends as well as between me and my friends. We do not all think alike. We cannot all think the same way. If I thought I was as great a man as the Senator from Ohio is thought to be, probably I would think in the same line as he does; but yielding that palm to him, and desiring not to measure strength of intellect with a man of such a gigantic frame of mind, I am free to say that I might defer to him on some questions. But, sir, I think it would be well enough sometimes for some of the great minds in this country to stoop and consider the thoughts of men whom they look upon as lower in the scale of thought than themselves. We may sometimes learn wisdom from the weak and the feeble, sometimes from the ignorant, and we often do. Some of the greatest managers and maneuverers of this age or any other have taken lessons and learned much wisdom from men whom they consider much their inferiors. I could appeal for proof of this statement to one of the greatest marshals who lives to-day—General Sherman. He learned many things of great value on the field from the private soldiers as he passed by, hearing their views and opinions. It would be well for many men sometimes to stoop to take lessons from those whom they wish to control, and whom they do sometimes influence and control.

Now, sir, I desire to appeal to our friends on both sides of this Chamber and ask why not act in a spirit of concession? Why not let us act one with another here as though we were mortals of generous impulses and kind natures? Why not act one with another here as though each and every one of us did not think that he alone made up this mighty hemisphere? Let us consider that other men think for themselves, that other men have minds, thoughts, and judgment in matters of business as well as of public policy. Let us agree that we all may be wrong at times, and that it is not only good for the community for concessions to be made, but it shows a generosity among men who are wont to act together when they can.

I have said that I believed this bill would settle this vexed question. I believe it would be better for the left of this Chamber if it was settled, so far as their little feuds are concerned, and better for the country. I know it would be better for us all around, not as a question of politics, but to take a great disputed question, a cause of aggravation, from this arena. Let it go back settled to the people and let them conform to it, because in my judgment they would do it.

Now, Mr. President, let us for a moment cast our eye over this country. But a short period has elapsed since we could hear the hum of the busy spindle on the many little rippling streams in New England and all over the land. But a short time since we could see the curling smoke rising heavenward from a thousand furnaces and the blaze coming forth all over this land. We could hear the trip-hammers and the machinery at work all through Pennsylvania and in many places in my own State. We could hear the car-wheels turning out and the railroad iron pouring forth from the iron manufactories and rolling-mills almost everywhere, producing millions and mak-

ing wealth for our land. We could hear the discussions between the people in reference to their prosperity, in reference to their wealth, in reference to the growth and the mighty onward march of this great American people. We could see, as our flag was unfurled, the bright and gleaming faces of men and women, as they shouted "hallelujah" to that flag that is now held up and borne and bears sway throughout this land once dissevered and disunited. Thank God, it has now become one united whole! Happiness and peace reigned everywhere.

To-day what does the eye witness and the ear hear? You hear of the smoke ceasing, of the fires growing dim over the land. You hear of bankruptcy in furnaces, in rolling-mills, and manufactories everywhere. You hear of the foreclosure of mortgages. You hear of some of the best men in the Northwest and other portions of the Union being sold out for a mere pittance; and why? Because the business interests of this country are disturbed; they are in commotion; the elements of business are in confusion; they are in turmoil. In my judgment this bill would prove a salve, and would smooth the ruffled surface, and give prosperity again to this country; it would restore confidence to the people, and confidence among the people is worth more than money. That is one of the needs to-day.

But if you refuse to adopt this report, you throw us again upon a boisterous sea of confusion in the business of this land. You compel us again to plow the mighty billows of distress and misfortune until we pass through the turmoil and excitement of another election to send a Congress here to do what? To quarrel over this same question just as we have quarreled over it for five months. That will be the result, in my judgment, if you refuse to adopt this compromise that is made here between these committees. If there is a Senator here who is not willing to defer to the views of other Senators sufficiently to adopt this compromise, that Senator is willing to go back into the bitter strife that exists in our various communities on this subject, and to go through the same tumult and confusion that we have all witnessed and deprecated often.

Hence I appeal to the good intentions of Senators and to their generosity and to that yielding spirit that ought to belong to man, for us to yield our opinions sufficiently in conferring together to agree to this proposition and settle this question once for all.

Mr. THURMAN. Mr. President, I hope my friend from Illinois did not conceive the idea that the question I put to him manifested any want of respect either for him personally or for his judgment.

Mr. LOGAN. Not at all, my dear friend.

Mr. THURMAN. I certainly cannot say that I have ever underrated either his talent or his ability. I am not accustomed to do that in respect to any man, and certainly not in respect to a gentleman with whom my relations have always been most kind.

But when he said the passage of this bill would settle this question, I was anxious to know what question he meant. If he simply meant that it would settle the question what shall the Congress of the United States do at this present session, then I grant that the passage of the bill would settle that, for after the passage of the bill nothing more would be done on this subject at this session. But if that were all that the bill were to effect it would be a very small matter, and I conceived therefore that he meant it would settle this vexed question of the currency not only in this Congress but with the people of the United States. If the bill would have that effect, if it would have the effect to cause people to stop talking about what kind of money they will have and go to work and earn money, it would be a very powerful recommendation of this measure.

But will this bill, if you pass it, have that effect? Will it stop discussion on the currency question? Will it bring all the people to one mind? Ifancy it will have no such effect, and the reason is very plain. There are in this country a set of men, and events show that they are growing very fast, who insist that the precious metals shall be demonetized, that the gold basis, as it has been called, shall be utterly abolished, that gold and silver shall be a mere article of commerce, and that the currency of this country shall consist in paper alone. That being the case, what is to be that paper currency? Here is a division of opinion. One set say it ought to consist of bank paper and bank paper alone. The other set say it ought to consist of Government obligations alone, greenbacks alone. There is where they split.

Now, which side is likely to be the stronger on that question? Which side, at least, is likely to produce the most excitement on that question? We have heard the Senator from Illinois to-day speak about this bank monopoly, and he said very truly that it was not the less a monopoly because it might be in the hands of two thousand men. It is a monopoly if its benefits are confined to those who alone have the pecuniary means to avail themselves of the benefit of the law. Therefore that argument will not be diminished against monopoly and against the existence of the national banks, or at least their function of issuing paper money, which is the only function they have that is not possessed by every one in this community—every private banker can do everything that the national bank can do except issue his promissory notes. This cry against them of monopoly instead of ceasing by the passage of this bill which looks to making bank paper the only paper currency in the country, will be increased perhaps tenfold. The consequence will be that the other school of currency men, those who insist that the only paper currency shall be Government currency based on the credit of the Government, will insist on that, make their platforms on that, nominate their candidates on those platforms, and go to the country for a decision. There is no avoiding it.

The real question that this country has to settle, and that it may take some years to settle, that cannot be avoided by any legislation we may adopt here, is the question whether or not you will demonetize the precious metals and have a wholly irredeemable paper currency in all time to come, or whether you will have that currency of specie or specie-paying paper which the experience of all commercial nations for hundreds of years has said is the only safe currency for the country.

I was rejoiced to hear my friend from Illinois say that there was no man on the floor of the Senate who was not in favor of a resumption of specie payments. I am glad to hear that; but that will be strange news to a great many people in Illinois. It will be very strange news to the three thousand grangers who assembled in convention at Indianapolis in Indiana yesterday, and who passed this resolution, as reported in the papers:

They declare the gold-basis fallacy should be abandoned, call for an unlimited issue of Government currency, and the withdrawal of all bank and local currency.

That is the resolution of three thousand grangers in convention assembled in Indiana and who passed other resolutions and nominated a State ticket. How was it in the Senator's own State? Their platform "demands the repeal of the national-bank law, and favors the issue of Government notes, interchangeable for bonds bearing a low rate of interest." That is the platform upon which they go. It is what is familiarly called the Kelley bill—a currency which is never to be paid, but is simply to be interchangeable for bonds of the United States at a lower rate of interest, under the idea that by such a currency you may reduce the rate of interest to as low a figure as you please. The bill to which I alluded I believe makes the rate of interest 3.65 percent; but with equal logic it might have made it $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent. The logic of it would be that you may by making a bond convertible into currency and the currency reconvertible into a bond fix the rate of interest in a commercial country simply by fixing the rate of interest that the bond shall bear; for if a man has a bond, all he has to do is to go and get the greenbacks for the bond, paying $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest only. All he has got to do is to turn it into greenbacks, and his money costs him but $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent. So the logic of it is that it is in the power of legislation absolutely, by means of this convertible bond, to fix the rate of interest just as low as you please. That is the favorite idea with a large and growing party in this country, that you are to have that wholly irredeemable currency, except redemption in the bonds of the United States, which signifies a perpetual debt of the United States. That is the favorite idea with them, and the passage of this bill, instead of satisfying them, will only put a measure upon your statute-book which they will antagonize and oppose with all their might and strength, and sooner or later you will find that the only safety is to go back to those sound principles which have the indorsement of the experience of the world for more than three centuries, and which have the approbation of every sound and clear-headed writer on this subject that ever took a pen in hand.

The passage of this bill will not therefore settle this question at all. On the contrary, this bill will be looked upon as pledging the Government to perpetuate this bank monopoly, as it is called. It will be looked upon as a bill antagonistic to everything but the interests of the banks. It will be looked upon as a bill which pledges itself to maintain and perpetuate the national-bank system; and, instead of giving peace to the country, it will only be a fresh brand thrown into the fire to increase the conflagration that already exists.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President—

Mr. THURMAN. I was not done; but the Senator looks so inviting and is apparently so full on this subject that I will stop. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEWART. Thank you. Mr. President, I have been reading this finance bill, and I do not know certainly whether I understand it or not. I do not know whether it is such a bill as anybody can understand. Perhaps it is owing to my want of intelligence; I do not know about that. I think somebody ought to be able to explain it and state distinctly what it means. I have not heard anybody do that, and I do not believe anybody can.

The first portion of the bill is intended to secure free banking. That may be very well, but if it succeeds, it will secure inflation undoubtedly. If that first part of the bill can be executed, without regard to the eighth section, we shall have plenty of paper money. Now, at first sight my friend from Connecticut [Mr. BUCKINGHAM] came to the conclusion that the free-banking part of the bill could not be executed, for the reason that bonds would be brought down to the value of greenbacks in 1878, and therefore, they being at a premium now above greenbacks of some 10 or 12 per cent., a person having greenbacks could not afford to buy the bonds and go to bank with them. That would be true if the eighth section could be executed. But suppose the eighth section cannot be executed at all and will not enhance the value of greenbacks or depreciate the bonds, then there is no impediment in the bill to free banking and on a very extended scale. Is not that so? If it was not for the eighth section, there would be plenty of inflation in this bill. I believe anybody will agree that it is entirely unlimited.

Mr. THURMAN. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him for one moment?

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

Mr. THURMAN. I simply wish to deliver a small codicil to my last will and testament that I want to go into the record. A great

deal has been said about the want of currency in this country, and about that being the cause of all our troubles. I hold in my hand a manual of railroads in the United States, a book compiled with great care, and I find that since 1866 there have been built and put into operation in the United States 30,277 miles of railroad. The number of miles in operation in 1866 was 36,827. The amount now in operation is 67,104, being an increase of 30,277 miles in eight years. And yet it is said that a country that can build in eight years nearly as many miles of railroad as it had before built in fifty years is suffering for want of currency!

Mr. STEWART. That is a very good commentary upon the present condition of things. But, as I was about to remark, it will be agreed on all hands that if it were not for the eighth section this would be an unlimited inflation bill. If there was no impediment in that, anybody could bank that pleased; there is no limit to the bank-notes that might be put out.

Now, let us examine the eighth section, and see what the operation of this bill will be.

That on and after the 1st day of January, 1878, any holder of United States notes to the amount of fifty dollars, or any multiple thereof, may present them for payment at the office of the Treasurer of the United States, or at the office of the assistant treasurer at the city of New York; and thereupon he shall be entitled to receive, at his option, from the Secretary of the Treasury, who is authorized and required to issue in exchange for said notes an equal amount of either class of the coupon or registered bonds of the United States provided for, &c.

That would be the 5 per cent. coupon bonds that have been negotiated heretofore. Now let us stop right there. There is a positive provision for redeeming your legal-tenders and returning to specie payments. Let us see how we can do that. That part of it could be executed if there was not anything else in the section; but hear now what the Secretary has got to do in case he does that—not "may" but must:

Which bonds shall continue to be exempt from taxation as provided in said act: *Provided—*

Now look at the proviso: First, the Secretary may redeem in 5 per cent. bonds the legal-tender notes that are presented. That he can do if there is no impediment in the way of doing it—

Provided, however, That the Secretary of the Treasury in lieu of such bonds may redeem said notes in the gold coin of the United States.

That is, he may do that if he has got the gold and is able to do it. Nobody supposes he has got the gold, or is going to have it, to do any such thing. He is not required to buy the gold, and nobody supposes there is anything in that clause. That part of it is merely ornamental, embroidery, a flourish. Now comes what he "shall" do:

And the Secretary of the Treasury shall reissue the United States notes so received either in exchange for coin at par—

That we know he cannot do, for they will not be at par. He cannot get gold at par for United States notes.

Mr. SHERMAN. How do you assume that?

Mr. STEWART. How do I assume that? Because right on your statute-books you have got a repudiation of these greenbacks. You require your duties to be collected in gold. You have made no provision for the retirement of the greenbacks, and of course they will not be at par. You cannot get gold for them. That part of the section is entirely ornamental or embroidery—

or, with the consent of the holder, in the redemption of bonds then redeemable at par.

Everybody knows that cannot be done, because the gold-bearing bonds will be above par. What else can he do with it then?

Or in the purchase of bonds at not less than par.

Of course he cannot purchase the bonds, for the bonds are above par in greenbacks and will be until the greenbacks are respected, until the Government will receive them for all its claims. As long as the Government dishonors them, it is all nonsense to talk about their being at par; so that the Secretary cannot buy any bonds, and therefore that is all ornamental entirely and has no meaning:

Or to meet the current payments for the public service.

That he may do. He can pay them out just as quick as he chooses. There is no doubt about that. Now, if you stop right here the bill will be executed and there will be no doubt about it. All that will be necessary then will be to see that you have public expenses enough. Then you can go on building railroads to the moon if you please; you can do anything you have got a mind to do, because the country would have no place to put these bonds and they will come just as fast as you put them out in order to get the gold upon them. You can put them out for all sorts of projects and multiply your debt until your gold bonds are swamped, until the credit of the Government is entirely undermined and the gold bond will not be good for anything, and thus destroying the credit of the Government. You eventually lead to repudiation.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator has voted for this very proposition in substance not less than a dozen times.

Mr. STEWART. That shows my want of intelligence, that is all. [Laughter.] If I ever cast any vote of that kind I did not know it. But here is a provision that will trouble the Secretary of the Treasury to execute the law:

And when used to meet current payments an equal amount of the gold in the Treasury shall be applied in redemption of the bonds known as five-twenty bonds.

It all depends upon his being able to do that. An equal amount

shall be applied to the redemption of the bonds of the United States known as the five-twenty bonds. What is the effect of that? You say that the surplus of gold is about forty millions a year.

Mr. SHERMAN. One hundred millions.

Mr. STEWART. Well, what would be the effect of this? You would have five thousand millions coming in, because they will come in just as fast as they can run them in and run them out. As long as gold bonds are worth more than currency they would come right back. You would have five or six hundred millions as fast as you could get them out.

Mr. SHERMAN. Allow me to correct the Senator at this point. He will see that the Secretary cannot pay out the notes so received except for current expenses, &c. In the first place those current expenses are limited by the actual appropriations by Congress. No money can be paid out of the Treasury except in pursuance of an act of Congress, and it is to be presumed that the Senator from Nevada among others would take care how it goes out. As a matter of course it is confined to the payment of ordinary expenses.

The Senator also admits here that we have a surplus revenue; in our present condition a very small surplus, but we have it. Our revenue amounts to \$200,000,000 in gold, and \$100,000,000 in paper money, in round numbers. Our currency expenses amount to about \$150,000,000. Consequently the Secretary has got \$100,000,000 currency revenue flowing in from taxes, and \$100,000,000 surplus gold revenue after paying the interest account. Now I should like to know how much would be paid out in the course of a year under that clause? The whole amount of currency expenses being \$150,000,000, and you have, from other sources, \$100,000,000, how much could be paid out?

Mr. STEWART. You could pay out \$100,000,000, exactly the surplus gold, and that is exactly the amount, because you have got to pay out all you receive in. That is the way to execute that section. In the first part of the section you say to all the world: "Come forward with your greenbacks and you shall receive gold," and then when they come forward you give out bonds for them; and when you have paid out \$100,000,000 of bonds you have got to pay out \$100,000,000 of gold, and when you have paid out \$100,000,000 of gold you have got no more surplus. You cannot receive any more, and have got to repudiate. In the first place you promise to receive them all, and then you show you can receive but \$100,000,000 a year, and that same \$100,000,000 is paid right out and comes back again the next year. That is all there is of it. The \$100,000,000 are paid again and they come back the next year, and if you could receive all that would come there would be a constant flow; you cannot name the number of millions that would go through as long as the bond is worth more than the greenback. As long as the bond is worth more than the greenback people will be clamoring for the bond, and according to your own showing you can receive only \$100,000,000 of them. When you have received that \$100,000,000, and that is gone out again, you have \$400,000,000 clamoring at your door and no capacity in the Secretary of the Treasury to receive them.

Mr. LOGAN. Why did you not discover that before?

Mr. STEWART. I discover it here now. I am ignorant of finance, I know. I claim no knowledge about it.

Mr. LOGAN. I ask why did the Senator so strongly support that proposition when the Senator from Ohio reported it in his bill and we opposed it? It was a good thing then; how does it come to be so bad now? You voted for it time and again.

Mr. STEWART. I do not remember ever doing anything of the kind. I never saw a proposition of this kind before. If there has ever been such a proposition that I have voted for, I acknowledge myself very stupid. I never saw such a proposition, and my vote for it cannot be produced, I think.

Here is a provision whereby you say to the world, "Come on with your greenbacks and we will redeem them," and you can only redeem \$100,000,000; and you go on putting these out again till you have the \$400,000,000 all out again. You will have a row of men all the way from New York to the Treasury jamming each other to get there first. [Laughter.] And the man who gets there first will get the bonds and the rest will not get any. There is no contraction because the \$400,000,000 go right out again. You have a little bait in it for a year so as to get the fish around. That is all. You drag the bait in the water and bring them all around again.

There is no possible way of executing the first clause of the section, because you cannot redeem all the notes. You are limited in your redemption of notes to what gold you pay out for the redemption of bonds. Then the only effect of this section is this: the gold that you pay out goes in redemption of five-twenties, and the bonds that you lay in are so much refunding of the debt. That is all there is of it. The operation of it will simply be the refunding of the five-twenties that the Government has a right to redeem, being now due, into a 5 per cent. bond as far as it has any operation. I do not believe it is going to affect the price of bonds so as to prevent free banking, because this kind of a promise which has got to be repudiated every day will not have a tendency to raise the price of your bonds and men can buy them with greenbacks cheap enough for banking purposes. There is nothing in the eighth section but what goes right again into circulation. You go in and come out at the same hole you went in.

Mr. FERRY, of Michigan. I should like to ask a question, if the Senator will allow me to do so.

Mr. STEWART. Yes, except a question about my financial record, for I have none. Any question about this bill I will try to answer.

Mr. FERRY, of Michigan. I ask the Senator whether he has not complained of the irredeemability of United States notes?

Mr. STEWART. I have.

Mr. FERRY, of Michigan. I would ask the Senator, then, what his plan would be to remedy that irredeemability?

Mr. STEWART. To redeem them.

Mr. FERRY, of Michigan. In what?

Mr. STEWART. In money.

Mr. SHERMAN. Where will you get it?

Mr. STEWART. Earn it. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERRY, of Michigan. The Senator has so far categorically answered my questions, but I still pursue him. The Senator says that he is opposed to the greenbacks because they are not redeemable. He says to remedy that irredeemability he would redeem them in coin. Now, this section provides that the Secretary of the Treasury in his option shall redeem them in coin, and if the Secretary has coin there will be no bonds issued. Now, I ask the Senator, if the Secretary of the Treasury holds that option, what complaint can he make of the section which gives him the right to issue coin instead of bonds?

Mr. STEWART. Gives him the right? Ah! It says he "may" do one thing and he "shall" do another thing.

Mr. FERRY, of Michigan. The Senator from Nevada is not to escape the point of my question in that way.

Mr. STEWART. I do not want to escape it or you.

Mr. FERRY, of Michigan. I confine him to the phraseology of the clause which he has so facetiously criticised. The committee did put in the word "may" that the Secretary of the Treasury might hold the option; when he found that he had coin, he could use the coin instead of the bond. The reason why they left the option with the Secretary of the Treasury was that there might not come a time when by the failure of coin on hand the United States notes would still be irredeemable as they now are in the judgment of the Senator from Nevada. It was to make that very irredeemability cease that the committee provided that either in coin or bond the Secretary should have power to redeem. He has the right to use coin if there be coin in the Treasury. Thus the irredeemability of the bill is to cease and the notes become redeemable, and thus at par in coin in the judgment of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. STEWART. I wish I had as good language to answer you as the bill uses. Let me read it. I do not believe anybody can state it equal to that:

Provided, however, That the Secretary of the Treasury in lieu of such bonds may redeem said notes in the gold coin of the United States. And the Secretary of the Treasury shall reissue—

That he must do—

the United States notes so received.

Those reissued are not redeemed. It is not paying a debt to give your note again for it; it is just changing it; you keep out just as many notes that are not redeemed.

Mr. FERRY, of Michigan. What are they to be issued for?

Mr. STEWART. Reissued for the purpose of getting more out—for the purpose of inflation. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERRY, of Michigan. After the Senator has got through his laugh, let me ask how is he to get the issue out unless something goes in?

Mr. STEWART. You can get out one hundred millions a year by this bill and take just that amount in, and there is just as much paper out not redeemed at the end of the year as there was at the beginning. Certainly he cannot get it out unless he shall get something in. You provide for one hundred millions coming in, and that he shall put it out again. He shall put out the amount he takes in, so your bill says. That balances the books perfectly; there is no trouble about it. [Laughter.] This bill is automatic entirely.

Mr. LOGAN. Allow me to ask the Senator a question. Suppose we had no paper currency, but only gold—

Mr. STEWART. I wish that supposition was true. [Laughter.]

Mr. LOGAN. In all candor, I desire to ask would the Senator object to the Secretary issuing gold in any quantity at any time on that basis?

Mr. STEWART. No; then you can have any quantity that you can get and pay for.

Mr. LOGAN. I am not talking about buying and paying for anything; but the Senator would not restrict the Secretary in paying out gold?

Mr. STEWART. No.

Mr. LOGAN. Now if the greenback is redeemed in gold and thereby becomes as good as gold, what is the difference between issuing that and gold, if it is worth gold and is much more convenient than the gold?

Mr. STEWART. Everything is very convenient here.

Mr. LOGAN. It is very easy to laugh; but if you do not believe in restricting gold when paper is equal to gold, I ask you upon what policy you restrict the paper?

Mr. STEWART. Do you speak of restricting paper when gold is behind it?

Mr. LOGAN. When it is redeemed in gold and put out and our

bonds taken in, and it is redeemable in gold again the next day, and is thus equal to gold, I ask what is the difference between buying bonds with it and buying them with gold?

Mr. STEWART. I supposed everybody knew that the Government was going to collect revenue in gold so as to pay the interest on the bonded debt and meet expenses. When you adopt a system by which the Government keeps out its \$400,000,000 of paper, or whatever it is, and there is just as much paper circulation besides as the banks choose to keep out, and you do not receive the greenbacks for all taxes but repudiate them for the purpose of collecting gold, when you keep out the full amount of greenbacks and take off the limit on your national banks—I did not think anybody supposed greenbacks would ever be equal to gold under such a system. I did not suppose that would be a question that could be raised under this bill. This is a bill for unlimited expansion, and it seems to me the working of it to keep up unlimited expansion is entirely automatic. I do not think it needs comment; I think it explains itself.

This shows the difficulty in attempting to reconcile things that are perfectly irreconcilable. It is laid down in the books that things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other. That is one of the axioms; and this is a proposition to try to disprove that axiom. I know of only one mathematical mode of doing it, involving one formula in mathematics, and that is the proposition (whenever it may occur in mathematics) which involves dividing nothing by nothing. There you produce an indeterminate quality by a purely mathematical rule. I can prove here by mathematical rule of algebra that 2 is equal to 4 if you allow me to so arrange the proposition that I shall have in it somewhere nothing divided by nothing. This attempt to make a piece of paper that is worth nothing something valuable, to make it like gold when it does not represent gold, is idle, and you cannot do it. You may fix up all the propositions you please, but the real thing is, when you come down to it finally—I do not care how much you discuss it or how many resolutions you pass; they do not make any difference; you must come to the same conclusion that all other people have—that gold is recognized as the universal standard of value. It is the measure that must be used. It is the measure by which your wealth must be tested; and whether it be pennies or millions matters not; it is the measure that must test all wealth. The wealth of the United States is tested by the same rule. It has been and always will be the touchstone of measurement; and when you depart from that and try to figure up any other measure which the world does not recognize, you get into confusion. Attempting to reconcile them it is idle to talk about. It is idle to talk about compromising on any other measure of value; the world will not accept it. We have the experience of every nation that has tried it; and it has been tried in almost every civilized nation. The art of substituting something else for money has been tried in Europe and it has failed everywhere. The only way that we can have honest dealing is to use an honest measure. The only way that we can determine what is the value of a man's labor is to measure it by an honest measure. That is what the granger needs; that is what the laboring man needs. He needs that his toil shall be measured by no uncertain measure. He wants it measured by that measure which will tell him the truth. When he has worked and earned a dollar, he wants a dollar in money with the purchasing power of a dollar in money with which he can buy bread. That is his due. If you give him anything else, you give him a false measure with which jugglers can operate and he is cheated. All your contrivances to evade the universal measure of value are cheating the unwary and robbing the public and leading them to false expectations. It is the greatest sin that can be committed to teach the American people that money can be printed not earned. That doctrine may take for a time. There may be organizations of men who will be deluded by it; but they have got to be disappointed, and a sore disappointment it will be to them. Do not let us try to deceive the American people; do not let us try to make them believe by some hocus-pocus of legislation that we can give them something of real value, we can give them a measure of value that is better than the universal standard of mankind. Do not deceive them in that regard. Let them know the facts now. They are a brave people and they will meet the issue. Every device you resort to will embarrass them; every hope you hold out that you can relieve them by these devices will be a sore disappointment and they must suffer for it. They are suffering now. They are suffering now by the devices already in operation. All the shaves and all the tricks of the money-dealers come ultimately upon labor; it has to pay for them. When millions can be accumulated by means of these devices in the commercial centers, those millions are drawn directly from labor, and the laboring man is compelled to take an uncertain measure of value, and when he has got a dollar and expects to buy what will feed his family and obtain the value of a dollar, he gets something at an inflated price that leaves him to starvation. He sends you a petition for more money, not because he has not had enough, but because what he got did not have the capacity to buy his bread; and so it will go on. A dollar in the laboring man's hands should have the full capacity to buy a dollar's worth. Do not call anything else a dollar. Let him understand it.

This is not a new question. It has been discussed by abler men than we are in a former generation; it has been discussed here; and it was after a severe struggle decided that the laboring man was

entitled and that the producers of this country were entitled to have their products and their labor measured by a correct rule. Apply no other.

Mr. BOUTWELL. Mr. President, hardly anything remains for those who are opposed to this measure except to protest and record their votes against it. Before I proceed to state the views I entertain, I desire to ask the honorable Senator from Indiana if either the committee or he himself has made an estimate which he will submit to the Senate and to the country of the probable increase of bank circulation that will be the result of the passage of this bill.

Mr. MORTON. I have made no estimate on that subject, and the committee made no calculation in regard to how fast this circulation would be taken up.

Mr. BOUTWELL. The Senator represents a section of the country where as it is understood the necessity exists for an increase of banking capital and circulation, and I think when we are called to pass upon a measure which offers, we may say, speaking in general terms, unlimited facilities for the increase of bank circulation, the committee, whose advice we are to follow if we move in that direction at all, should favor us with an opinion upon the question, which is really the vital question in determining what ought to be done.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me, as I have had some curiosity on that subject, to give him the result of the calculation I have made on that very question?

Mr. BOUTWELL. I should be glad to have it, and I hope also we shall have the benefit of the judgment of the committee as well.

Mr. SCOTT. I am not assuming to answer for the committee, but as the interrogatory was put and the same question struck me, I made this calculation. The act of 1870 authorizes the issue of \$54,000,000 additional bank currency. It took four years say in round numbers to get out that in the States which by the terms of that law were authorized to apply for it. I put it in round numbers at \$14,000,000 a year, although that is a little more than it was. Of course this would authorize the issuing of national bank currency in all the States, not simply these which have a deficiency; and in order to retire the \$32,000,000 provided for by this bill, it would require the issue of \$18,666,666.66 of national bank notes. If we say that double the amount each year will be issued under this bill that was issued during the time the deficient States were authorized to take out the \$54,000,000, it would take about seven and a half years to issue the \$218,000,000 which would be required for the purpose of retiring the \$23,000,000. This is the only direction in which I made this calculation, and if this be any basis for the calculation, would be the result upon the experience with reference to the \$54,000,000.

Mr. BOUTWELL. If the Senator from Indiana will give us the benefit of his opinion on that point, I shall be exceedingly obliged to him.

Mr. MORTON. I will try to do so before this debate is over. I am not prepared to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. BOUTWELL. A good deal of the ground has been occupied in times past, and I do not propose to go over it again. If this bill be not calculated to increase the volume of currency in the country, then I suppose it is not calculated to answer the expectations of those who favor it. For one, I am opposed to any increase in the volume of paper money. We to-day, I think, settle the question whether the resolutions of the grangers of Illinois, which I may say without disrespect either to the Senator who referred to them or to the Senate were rather contemptuously introduced to our notice, are to be the policy of the land. We are at a point where the roads separate. If to-day, when there is confessedly a volume of paper currency greater than the wants or the interests of the country require or justify, we have not the power to resist an increase in the volume, how is it to be expected that either we or our successors, when this volume shall have been increased and the difficulties under which we labor and which gave rise to the public sentiment that is expressed by those resolutions of Illinois are augmented, shall be able to resist the demand that will be then made? If while the difficulties are few they cannot be overcome if when the obstacle is slight it cannot be removed, how are the difficulties to be overcome when they are multiplied, or the obstacles to be removed when they are increased? The difficulty to-day is that we have paper money which is not of equal value with coin. And now if this bill mean anything, if it contain any policy for the future, it is a policy of expansion; and a policy of expansion is detrimental to every interest, and especially injurious to the laboring people of the country.

While I have stood and stand to-day, if I may so assume, the opponent of a specific movement in any direction with reference to the volume of currency, I am persistently, and I mean to be continuously opposed, under any and every condition of things, and against any and every manifestation of public sentiment in this country, to any increase in the volume of paper money until it is made equivalent in value to coin; and on no other foundation can the industry and the policy of this country rest. While I concede to those who differ in opinion entire honesty of purpose, I feel for myself that history teaches nothing, that principle is of no consequence, that our own bitter experience during the war has been lost upon us and upon the country that we represent, if now in time of peace we embark upon a policy of inflation. If this policy is in obedience to a public sentiment, it is a misdirected public sentiment which we in our places, as the representatives of the country, should meet upon principle and either correct or fall beneath its misguided power.

The bill in its unmistakable features, about which there can be no difference of opinion, lets loose a portion of the reserve heretofore held by the banks and not available for circulation or for business purposes, and does increase the volume of paper money for business purposes. If we stand where we are, I believe it is the judgment of the honorable chairman of the Committee on Finance that the progress toward the equalization of paper and coin is $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum. It certainly is something. If we stand where we are without increasing the volume of paper money the progress toward resumption is something. If we accept this bill we turn our faces and the policy and the power of the country in the opposite direction. Does any man doubt that? We have a certain volume of paper money and it is below par. Why? Because there are too many dollars of paper now; for no other reason. The credit of the country is well established; it is respected at home and abroad; and when we find a United States note nominally a dollar, of less value than a dollar of gold, we know it is because there are too many of those paper dollars in proportion to the coin and the business of the country. But if you hold the volume of paper where it is, with the increase of population and business and the increase of uses to which money is applied you gradually work out by slow degrees the problem that we are called to consider—the equalization of the value of paper and coin. But by this bill according to the admission of the chairman of the committee the first effect is that you increase the volume of paper money for practical purposes twenty-six and a half million dollars, and you have just to that extent, upon the admitted and unquestioned policy of this bill, departed so far from the opportunity to resume specie payments.

What next? Here is an opportunity for increasing the volume of paper money through banks to the extent of \$1,100,000,000. We shall be told, and told with truth, that the people of this country will not avail themselves of this opportunity to that extent, that they have not the means of doing so. Very well; but they have the means of doing something. You give them the opportunity. You say that it is lawful to do it. By your act you say that it is a wise thing, that it should be done, because it is a reflection upon the judgment of Congress to say that it would pass a law providing that certain things may be done and believe at the same time that it was unwise for the people, to whom the opportunity is given, to do those things which Congress has authorized to be done. Therefore this bill goes to the country with the sanction of Congress that it is wise to increase the volume of paper money, that it is judicious, that it is a policy that Congress approves. It is a step which is certain to be taken by a number of people; how many no man can say; how rapidly no one can predict, but the direction we know; it is in the direction of postponing the time when it will be possible to resume specie payments; and just so far as the opinions, or the interests, or the necessities, or the caprices of the people may lead them in that direction, this Congress becomes responsible to the country and to the world for the effects of this policy.

Mr. President, I am not an alarmist; but I do believe that in this measure, if it be enacted into a law, are the germs of a growth whose fruit in less than four years shall poison every branch of industry, which shall paralyze every enterprise, which shall lay low every undertaking, and that confusion and panic and distress will wait upon the people of this broad land. I know, if I can be certain of anything in the future, that an increase in the volume of paper money, based upon a condition of things when it is less valuable than gold, pursued by a multitude of people with purposes united but whose power when combined cannot be predicted, must end, as every such enterprise has ended, in stimulating speculation, in leading people to embark in hazardous and disastrous enterprises, in panic, in the depression of industry, in the prostration of business, in the bankruptcy of commerce and commercial men.

It may be said that these things will not happen because the opportunity you give the people will not be accepted. That is no excuse for us. At this moment we are bound to deny to the people an opportunity to do that which if done must end in injury to them.

If you look at the details of this bill, and especially to the eighth and ninth sections, I think it must be seen that it is fraught with evils from which the country cannot escape. I have before commented upon a proposition submitted by the Senator from Ohio similar to the provisions contained in the eighth section of this bill. I concur in a good deal that was said by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] in reference to that section.

When the Senator from Indiana [Mr. MORTON] was presenting to the Senate this morning the views of the committee, I inquired of him why the day for the transfer or the conversion of United States notes into United States bonds was postponed until the year 1878, and the answer I received was that the difference now between the value of notes and bonds was so great that the country could not bear the shock of the opportunity to convert them immediately.

Mr. MORTON. Not "notes and bonds." "Notes and coin," I said.

Mr. BOUTWELL. I tried to ascertain from the honorable Senator what grounds he had for believing that in 1876 or 1877 the difference would be less, and I failed to obtain from him any answer to that inquiry. I am prepared to say that just to the extent that the free banking provisions of this bill are used by the people, just to that extent will it be more difficult in 1875, more difficult still in 1876, more difficult still in 1877, and more difficult yet on the 1st of January, 1878, to do the thing that is proposed in this bill. The Senator

from Ohio tells us that if this bill be passed, the faith of the country is to be pledged to this policy and that no Congress sitting here between now and 1878 can without a violation of the public faith repeal this statute. If that doctrine be accepted, this country is to be put into a financial strait-jacket in the year 1878 on the 1st of January, for if the difference between coin and paper shall remain what it is, or if the difference shall widen under this policy of expansion, as I have no doubt it will, then we are met by the doctrine on the one hand that this statute is not to be repealed because the public faith has been pledged to it and we are to be compelled to accept results in 1877 and 1878, magnified by the policy growing out of the free-banking system, results greater than those which would be apprehended if this policy were immediate, and the policy if immediate is so revolting that even the committee dare, not ask Congress and the country now to accept it.

But, sir, this eighth section has in its consequences more disastrous even than any to which I have called attention. It transfers the financial power of this country, under the iron rule of this eighth section, not to be repealed, not only from the Treasury Department, but from Congress, and not only to Wall street in the city of New York and to speculators and jobbers on this continent, but to speculators and money-changers throughout Europe. If the difference in 1877 between greenbacks and coin be what it now is, and the credit of the country shall be maintained, as I have no doubt it will be, and 5 per cent. bonds shall be at par in coin, there will come a time—I cannot say when; it will come early or late in proportion to the difference between coin and paper—but there will come a time when that difference, whether it be 1 per cent. or 10 per cent. or 20 per cent. or 30 per cent. will be an inducement to the people to gather up greenbacks, because on the 1st day of January, 1878, these greenbacks can be converted into coin bonds, which coin bonds in the markets of this country and of Europe are worth par in gold. And when that time arrives, let those who have been responsible for this measure take heed that day. When the people of this country, stimulated by greed and helped by the financial power of Europe, shall gather up greenbacks for the purposes of speculation and withdraw them from circulation, let those take heed when the banks without the means of redemption, the volume of the paper and the volume of their liabilities immensely increased, tumble one after another because they have neither gold nor greenbacks with which they can respond to the demand of the people upon them. When you invite the money-power of the world to combine for the purpose of making gain out of your policy, and the chairman of the Finance Committee says that in the presence of these dangers that policy shall never be changed, let men take heed who this day become responsible for this measure, which, if adhered to, has all these woes and more for the people of this country. But I know perfectly well that when that day approaches there will be a public sentiment that will demand the repeal of this measure, because men will see that they cannot stand the shock when the money-power of the world is combined for the prostration of our financial policy.

That is what the section contains. It is an invitation to the world to get gain by prostrating our financial policy, by gathering up the basis on which your banking system rests, and holding it for three, six, or twelve months as a means of gain, knowing that on the 1st of January, 1878, those notes can be converted into gold-bearing bonds, and that those gold-bearing bonds are worth par in all the markets of the world.

Mr. FERRY, of Michigan. Will the Senator allow me to ask a question? I regret to interrupt him, because I have been interested in hearing what he is saying; but I want to put this question: Whether or not the same influences will not be at work if the greenbacks are redeemable in coin on the 1st day of January, 1878, instead of in bonds?

Mr. BOUTWELL. Certainly; but I have never advocated naming any particular day when the greenback should be retired in coin.

Mr. MORTON. Allow me to suggest to the Senator that his argument proves that to come to specie payments at any time and under any circumstances would be utterly ruinous. He has overturned his own position.

Mr. BOUTWELL. No, sir; it does not prove anything of the sort.

Mr. MORTON. I think it does clearly.

Mr. BOUTWELL. We went on from June, 1869, when gold was at 40 per cent. premium, and we reduced it from 12 to 14 per cent. by gradual and certain processes, by the improvement of the credit of the country, by restricting the volume of paper money, by developing the resources and industries and business of the country. If you will pursue that policy you can go on until coin and paper will become the equivalent of each other, and there will never be a moment when a man can say that he may make money by hoarding greenbacks, for he can never say when the greenback will be equal to coin.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts, then, how comes it that from the 1st of April, 1870, to this hour the value of greenbacks has not appreciated a single cent?

Mr. BOUTWELL. I will tell the Senator from Ohio. There are three reasons for it, for one of which the Congress of the United States is responsible; the other two were due to circumstances beyond the control of the country. On the 15th of April, 1870, the Franco-Prussian war opened. It made a great demand on England and consequently upon this country, for coin. It withdrew coin from the country, and its tendency naturally was to widen the difference between coin and

paper, and therefore during that year we were unable to make progress in the right direction for there were unnatural and unexpected causes operating by which coin was drawn from the country.

The second great fact was that when the treaty of Paris was made and France agreed to pay five milliard francs, or \$1,000,000,000, in coin as indemnity, the means of doing that were drawn largely from England. The deposits of one sort and another in this country, debts due from this country to England, were drawn upon, and we were obliged to contribute to the means by which France paid the indemnity that Germany exacted.

Then there was another consequent reason. Germany, stimulated by the fact that she had obtained large quantities of coin from France, resolved to demonetize silver and substitute gold in its place, and the consequence was that, to the extent of about \$150,000,000, gold was substituted for silver in Germany.

All these causes operating together kept the quantity of coin in this country at a low point, drew from us the products of the mines, and during that period and even up to this time we have not recovered from the effects of the Franco-Prussian war.

Mr. SHERMAN. There is one other question I should like to ask.

Mr. BOUTWELL. But I have not answered this yet. The other circumstance was this: under the revenue system which existed in 1870, and previous thereto, when the receipts of the Treasury were largely in excess of the expenditures, the Secretary of the Treasury was able to accumulate during the summer months a large surplus of paper money in the Treasury, and use it in the autumn in the purchase of bonds for the relief of the business of the country, affording facilities for the transportation of the crops from the West to the East, so that during one season the accumulation, without notice to the country, except through the monthly reports, reached the enormous sum of thirty-eight and a half million dollars. This sum of money so accumulated in the Treasury was, with reference to the volume of currency in circulation, precisely as though the volume of currency in the country had been reduced; it was withdrawn from active business; it was piled up and hoarded in the Treasury; it was a resisting power against the spirit of speculation in the city of New York. But when Congress, against the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury, reduced the revenues of the country, and compelled the Government to manage its business with the slightest surplus, that power departed, and when that power departed the accumulation which had formerly rested in the Treasury during the summer months passed to Wall street, in the city of New York. The panic of last September was more clearly due to those facts, all having their origin in the policy of Congress by which the revenues of the country were reduced than to any and all other circumstances combined.

Mr. SHERMAN. The other question I wish to ask the Senator is this: whether or not the rapid fall of gold from the passage of the act of March 18, 1869, up and prior to the 1st of April, 1870, amounting to some twenty-odd per cent., created any real stringency or trouble in the country? Did the rapid appreciation of greenbacks, nearly 20 per cent. in one year, have that effect?

Mr. BOUTWELL. I am not aware that it did.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then, if in one year the rapid appreciation of greenbacks 20 per cent. in market value did not create any perceptible trouble, but the people adapted themselves to the changed value of gold and paper, I ask the Senator whether in his judgment the appreciation of paper money from eighty-nine cents to one dollar will really in the course of four years create any stringency or hard times?

Mr. BOUTWELL. If you could distribute it over the four years, probably not; but what I assert in reference to this measure is that it not only does not distribute the difference between coin and paper over four years, but by the increase of banking facilities and the increase of the volume of paper your whole policy tends to widen that difference, so that when you reach 1877, instead of there being a margin of 11 per cent., it is more likely that the margin will be twice as great, and then you propose to jump that margin in a given period of time regardless of the consequences to the business of the country. This is a process which is fraught with disaster. If to-day you do not dare to assume the responsibility of mastering this difficulty by next January or by the January after, how can you assume that when the difference is greater than it is to-day you will have the courage or the capacity to overcome the difficulty three years hence?

Mr. SHERMAN. One more question I wish to ask the Senator; and that is whether he does not believe that sagacious business men, capitalists who invest their money in banks, will take the condition of the law and base their calculations upon it rather than the mere amount of paper money afloat? When they take the established fact, which he admits to be an established fact, that four years or three and a half years hence the United States will stand by this pledge, will not business men adapt their business to it?

Mr. BOUTWELL. I do not accept that "established fact;" I do not consider it so. I have not the least idea that the country will stand by this bill. I think when you pass this bill, you stir up elements of discord in every part of the country. Instead of its being a measure of conciliation, it is a measure fraught with discord. Is there any demand in the country for this particular measure?

Mr. FERRY, of Michigan. Before the Senator passes from that I should like to put a question to him. The Senator stated, as one of the strong influences which had contributed to prevent the approach

of greenbacks to coin, the fact that Congress had by the reduction of the tariff lessened the duties and thus prevented by a lessening of the revenues the possibility of that approach. Now, I wish to put to the Senator a question, and I ask him to answer it, as he will, frankly, why prior to the panic, when we were under a condition of prosperity under that same reduced tariff, every month revealed the fact that the public indebtedness was being lessened by the application of the surplus revenue toward the liquidation of the public debt?

Mr. BOUTWELL. Of course.

Mr. FERRY, of Michigan. If that were the fact, and gold was gradually running down until it reached the point of 9 per cent. premium, lower than it has been since the panic, I ask why that should be a circumstance in the argument of the Senator to fortify himself when the question is put to him why the country does not resume at this time or next year?

Mr. BOUTWELL. The Senator must know very well that the full effects of the reduction of taxes were not immediately felt, and that for some time after the passage of the bill the revenues were sufficient to more than meet the ordinary expenses, and furnished something every month for the reduction of the public debt; but from the 1st of July last to the present moment the total reduction of the public debt is less than \$4,000,000. During the last summer there was very little decrease made.

Mr. FERRY, of Michigan. The Senator will remember that each month up to the panic there was a gradual reduction of the public debt. Since the panic there has been a very little reduction. Each month I think without exception prior to the panic showed a reduction until the aggregate amount during President Grant's administration approached nearly \$400,000,000 in liquidation of the debt.

Mr. BOUTWELL. For the purposes of the argument which the question of my friend from Michigan contains, he has confounded events and times that are quite distinct. Up to the 4th of March, 1873, the decrease of the public debt had been very large, and during each preceding summer of General Grant's administration the Secretary of the Treasury was able to accumulate large balances; but during the last summer he was not, in consequence of the reduction of the revenue, and to that fact the panic in a large degree was due.

But I wish now to call the attention of the Senate and especially of the honorable chairman of the committee to the eighth section in another aspect. The proviso is that "the Secretary of the Treasury in lieu of such funds may redeem said notes in the gold coin of the United States." The first provision, however, is that on and after the 1st day of January, 1873, the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue 4, 4½, and 5 per cent. bonds for such greenbacks or United States notes as may be presented. Then—

The Secretary of the Treasury in lieu of such bonds may redeem said notes in the gold coin of the United States. And the Secretary of the Treasury shall reissue the United States notes so received either in exchange for coin at par, or with the consent of the holder, in the redemption of bonds then redeemable at par, or in the purchase of bonds at not less than par, or to meet the current payments for the public service; and when used to meet current payments an equal amount of the gold in the Treasury shall be applied in redemption of the bonds known as five-twenty bonds.

Then the ninth section says this shall not be construed to authorize an increase of the principal of the public debt. The effect of this measure considered altogether is this: "The Secretary of the Treasury shall reissue the United States notes so received either in exchange for coin at par"—I assume that to be impossible—"or with the consent of the holder in the redemption of bonds then redeemable at par." The bonds that will be redeemable at par at that time will be 6 per cent. five-twenty bonds and no others. If a 5 per cent. bond is made, as it will be made by this eighth section, the equivalent in value of coin, is it possible that anybody will surrender a 6 per cent. bond for United States notes?

Mr. SHERMAN. I will ask the Senator now whether that very thing has not been done?

Mr. BOUTWELL. It has been done undoubtedly in some cases.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is, 6 per cent. bonds have been under the operation of the funding act surrendered for 5 per cent. bonds.

Mr. BOUTWELL. Not surrendered. The credit of the country was in the first place carried up to the point when we could sell a 5 per cent. bond at par in coin, and having made that sale we then took the coin and gave notice to the holders of 6 per cent. bonds that they must present them and exchange them and stop the interest, so that they became valueless as an investment. The bonds were due.

Mr. CAMERON. I desire to interrupt the Senator from Massachusetts to ask him to give way—

Mr. BOUTWELL. No; I will close in five minutes.

Mr. CAMERON. I want an executive session. There is a great deal of executive business to be done.

Mr. BOUTWELL. In a few cases this has been true, where there were registered bonds, and in some instances of a peculiar sort of coupon bonds, but generally registered bonds, where for some reason that was peculiar to those bonds they were not merchantable, they have been returned voluntarily to the Treasury, but the amount of these is so small that they are not worth consideration in a question of public policy. You cannot find persons when a 5 per cent. bond is made worth par in coin who will voluntarily surrender a 6 per cent. bond, principal and interest payable in coin, and take United States notes, which at best are only convertible into a 5 per cent. bond.

Mr. SHERMAN. As this is an interesting point and the Senator has had experience, I will ask him whether with \$20,000,000 of gold in the Treasury—and there are now \$50,000,000 of surplus revenue—in case the notes were flowing into the Treasury for bonds and the bonds were issued, there would be any difficulty in the Secretary of the Treasury paying with the gold on hand the 6 per cent. bonds, calling them in by numbers and names, just as the honorable Senator did when Secretary, and supplying the deficit in the revenue by the greenbacks thus received for the bonds, and whether that is not the refunding act carried out?

Mr. BOUTWELL. To some extent he might undoubtedly do that, but when you come to deal with the whole volume of United States notes that is an impossible thing.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then my friend from Massachusetts comes to the fallacy of my friend from Nevada, that the Secretary of the Treasury is not compelled to use these notes except for certain purposes. The law expressly provides that these notes shall be paid out for such and such purposes, and when they are paid out for current expenses, then the gold which is relieved from the ordinary uses of the Treasury is to be used to pay an equal amount of 6 per cent. bonds.

Mr. BOUTWELL. But you cannot call in the 6 per cent. bonds under three months.

Mr. SHERMAN. We shall have plenty of time to repeal that provision of the law in four years. The Secretary of the Treasury can count upon the amount of his revenue accruing month by month, and he could make a call three months ahead if it be necessary to give three months' notice.

Mr. BOUTWELL. But the Senator from Ohio does not pretend that the surplus gold would be sufficient to meet such a demand as would be made on the Treasury for 5 per cent. bonds under this system if there should be any margin between the value of bonds and the value of paper.

Mr. SHERMAN. Not at all; because this very act when it takes effect will leave no margin between the paper and bonds, because you can convert the paper into bonds. You might as well say that a bank which only had a reserve of one-tenth of its circulating notes was certain to be broken because you might suppose all the notes would come in together.

Mr. BOUTWELL. Then the Senator from Ohio does not admit that if you go on increasing the volume of paper money the difference between paper and coin, other things remaining the same, will widen.

Mr. SHERMAN. Upon the question of how much paper money will be issued under this act, I leave the Senator himself to state his own fair impression; I will not stop to discuss that. Whether this bill will largely increase the paper money, I will not discuss now.

Mr. BOUTWELL. The hour is late. I suppose that the purpose of the committee is that this question shall be ended to-night, though I do not know about that. I have said in substance what I desired to say and I have said it chiefly for the purpose of putting myself upon the record against this measure, a measure which I sincerely believe is fraught with greater evils to this country than any that has ever been presented to the Senate with a prospect of being adopted and made the law of the land.

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

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Before putting the question on that motion, the Chair will ask the indulgence of the Senate to present the House bills on his table for reference.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. No. 3672) authorizing the board of commissioners of the Soldiers' Home to sell the property belonging to the Soldiers' Home situated at Harrodsburgh, Kentucky, and known as Harrodsburgh Springs property, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. No. 3517) supplementary to the third section of the act entitled "An act to divide the State of Virginia into two judicial districts" was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following bills, prepared in the form prescribed by the two Houses; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*:

A bill (H. R. No. 1215) to revise and consolidate the statutes of the United States in force on the 1st day of December, A. D. 1873;

A bill (H. R. No. 2879) revising and embodying all the laws authorizing post-roads and in force on the 1st day of December, 1873; and

A bill (H. R. No. 3349) to revise and consolidate the statutes of the United States, general and permanent in their nature, relating to the District of Columbia, in force on the 1st day of December, in the year of our Lord 1873.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. CARPENTER. I am instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary to report a bill, and I do it at this time for the purpose of having it printed. I give notice that I shall ask the Senate to consider it to-morrow in the morning hour, as it is very important that it should be disposed of.

The bill (S. No. 925) to determine the jurisdiction of the circuit

courts of the United States, and to regulate the removal of causes from State courts, and for other purposes, was read, and passed to a second reading.

GENEVA AWARD.

On motion of Mr. THURMAN, the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. No. 7) for the creation of a court for the adjudication and disposition of certain moneys received into the Treasury under an award made by the tribunal of arbitration constituted by virtue of the first article of the treaty concluded at Washington the 8th of May, A. D. 1871, between the United States of America and the Queen of Great Britain, were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

On motion of Mr. CAMERON, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After thirteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and the Senate (at six o'clock and eight minutes p. m.) adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, June 11, 1874.

The House met at eleven o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Mr. PLATT, of Virginia, obtained the floor.

PROPERTY OF SOLDIERS' HOME.

Mr. DURHAM. I ask unanimous consent to introduce and have passed a bill authorizing the board of commissioners of the Soldiers' Home to sell the property belonging to the Soldiers' Home, situated at Harrodsburgh, Kentucky, and known as the Harrodsburgh Springs property.

Mr. GARFIELD. If it will not occasion debate I will make no objection.

The bill was read for information.

The first section authorizes the board of commissioners of the Soldiers' Home to sell to the board of trustees of the Widows' Home and Orphans' University of the Independent Order of Odd-Fellows the property belonging to the Soldiers' Home situated at Harrodsburgh, Kentucky, upon such terms as may be prescribed by the sanction of the Secretary of War.

The second section provides that after the said property shall have been sold and the purchase-money paid to the said board of commissioners they shall have full power to convey the said property to said purchasers, the board of trustees of the Widows' Home and Orphans' University of the Independent Order of Odd-Fellows by and for and in behalf of the United States, and that when the said deed shall have been properly acknowledged the United States shall be divested of title to said property, and the trustees of the Widows' Home and Orphans' University of the Independent Order of Odd-Fellows shall be invested with full title to the property.

No objection being made, the bill (H. R. No. 3672) was read a first and second time, ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DURHAM moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

JUDICIAL DISTRICTS OF VIRGINIA.

Mr. HUNTON. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 3517) reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, being a bill supplementary to the third section of the act entitled "An act to divide the State of Virginia into two judicial districts."

Mr. PLATT, of Virginia. I must object to yielding for that purpose.

Mr. HUNTON. I hope my colleague will not object.

Mr. PLATT, of Virginia. Gentlemen who object to the passage of that bill are not in their seats.

Mr. HUNTON. They have withdrawn their objection. I saw Mr. STOWELL, and also the gentleman who made the objection on the subject.

Mr. PLATT, of Virginia. Very well; I withdraw my objection.

The bill was read.

The first section provides that the following provisions shall be added to the third section aforesaid:

The judge of the district court for the eastern district of Virginia shall be, and he is, authorized to appoint a clerk of the district court to be held in Alexandria, whose duties shall be governed by the laws now in force, and whose office shall be kept in Alexandria, in such room or rooms as the said judge shall designate in the building now used as custom-house, post-office, and court-room; and that the clerk so appointed shall perform the duties of clerk of both circuit and district court, to be held in Alexandria, as provided by said third section, and shall be entitled to all fees and emoluments appertaining to said office.

The second section provides that the clerk appointed as aforesaid

shall keep the records and files of all cases thereafter brought within the subdivision thereafter named, and certify the same in manner already provided for by law; and that the subdivision referred to, over which the said courts shall have jurisdiction, shall contain the following counties of Virginia, namely: Culpeper, Fauquier, Prince William, Fairfax, Loudoun, and Alexandria; and that all process upon parties or *in rem*, residing or being in said counties, shall be made returnable to the said courts held in Alexandria, or the clerk's office, in manner and form now provided for.

The third section provides that all acts or parts of acts which are not consistent with the act are hereby repealed; and the act shall be in force from its passage.

No objection being made, the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUNTON moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DAWES. I move that the House now proceed to the consideration of business on the Speaker's table, with a view to dispose of matters that do not give rise to debate.

Mr. RANDALL. What does the gentleman mean by that?

Mr. DAWES. I mean that if any matter comes up to which any gentleman objects it shall remain upon the table.

The SPEAKER. The proposition is merely to dispose of matters on the Speaker's table to which unanimous consent is given.

Mr. GARFIELD. I am willing to yield to allow that to be done for a little while, reserving the right to interrupt that business at any time.

TESTIMONY ORDERED TO BE PRINTED.

Mr. SENNER. Pending the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I ask unanimous consent that the testimony reported by the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, which has not already been printed, be printed for the use of the Attorney-General's Department.

There was no objection; and the order to print was made.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. DONNAN. I ask unanimous consent to make a brief personal explanation.

Mr. GARFIELD. How long?

Mr. DONNAN. Not more than five minutes.

There was no objection, and the leave was granted.

Mr. DONNAN. I was not present at the session for debate only that took place on the evening before last, and consequently I did not hear the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. STORM,] a very small portion of which, I am informed, was actually delivered, about the Government Printing Office. I ask that the paragraph I have marked in that speech be read at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Learning that such abuses did exist, early in the session I introduced a resolution on the subject, and had it referred to the Committee on Printing, of which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DONNAN] is chairman. Before this committee the Congressional Printer, Mr. Clapp, was requested to appear; this he declined to do, on the grounds, as I have been informed, that he was an officer of the Senate, and was responsible to that body alone. Owing to this refusal to appear and testify before the House Committee on Printing my resolution failed, and the committee reported a joint resolution, and have in pursuance of that resolution taken some testimony, and have just made report to this House. I have refrained from speaking upon this subject until that report was made. The day of adjournment not being far off, I feel it to be my duty to call the attention of the House to the subject now, so that it can, should it see fit, correct existing abuses by proper and necessary legislation.

Mr. DONNAN. In relation to these statements, I should rather say misstatements, I desire to say first, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has not during this entire session introduced and had referred to the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman any resolution under which we could summon the Congressional Printer before us to give testimony. Second, the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not seem to be aware of his action. He introduced a resolution which I hold in my hand, and which was of itself a concurrent resolution. Instead of that resolution failing before the committee as he alleges, the committee reported favorably upon it and promptly, simply enlarging its scope so as to authorize the committee to send for persons and papers. That resolution so enlarged they reported to the House and the House passed it, and it was sent to the Senate. Third, the House Committee on Printing has not had any resolution referred to them upon motion of any member under which they could summon the Congressional Printer to appear in relation to abuses in the Congressional Printing Office. Fourth, the subject which was examined by that Committee on Printing was under a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Maine, [Mr. FRYE,] relating solely to the comparative cost of printing the debates of Congress at the Government Printing Office and in the Globe office. The committee have restricted their examination to that subject and have reported upon that subject and upon that only. Fifth, the Congressional Printer has not refused at all, when summoned, to appear before the Committee on Printing, nor has he alleged to that committee that he is responsible solely to the Senate.

I deem it proper and prudent to say further that in the next paragraph of the gentleman's speech he makes what I was about to term an indecent allegation against the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing on the part of the Senate. He says:

It is clear that the chairman of that committee in the Senate either cannot or will not see anything wrong in the present Public Printer, or the system under which he is acting.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not desire to prevent the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DONNAN] making any explanation he may deem proper; but he must inform him that it was grossly unparliamentary to allude to the chairman of the Senate committee.

Mr. DONNAN. I deemed it proper to refer to the charge in order to repel it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman was entirely out of order in doing so.

Mr. DONNAN. I simply wish to add that I presume these misstatements have arisen more on account of ignorance than in any intention on the part of the usually courteous gentleman from Pennsylvania. It is alleged in one of the morning papers that he is a member of the Committee on Printing. That is not the fact. Had he been a member of the Committee on Printing, I feel assured that he would not have allowed himself to be drawn into such gross misstatement of fact.

Mr. STORM. I ask consent to have a moment to reply to what has been said by the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. DONNAN.]

Mr. GARFIELD. I ask that the time allowed the gentleman be limited.

Mr. RANDALL. Let him have the same length of time as was occupied by the gentleman from Iowa.

No objection was made.

Mr. STORM. I am not responsible for what any city newspaper may call me. The fact that a city paper says that I am a member of the Committee on Printing is a mistake of the paper, not of mine; I have never said so.

I will say this, that whatever mistakes there may be in my remarks in regard to the refusal of the Congressional Printer to appear before the Committee on Printing, I have been led into those mistakes by what the chairman of the Committee on Printing himself told me. All I know about the refusal of the Public Printer to appear before that committee I gathered from the gentleman from Iowa himself. He said to me that he could not get the Congressional Printer before the committee under my resolution; that he would be compelled to report the resolution in another form before he could do so.

Mr. DONNAN. For the simple reason that it was a concurrent resolution. The gentleman must have misunderstood me if he understood me as giving any other reason.

Mr. STORM. The gentleman said so himself.

Mr. DONNAN. I said that the House Committee had no authority to summon him under a concurrent resolution.

Mr. STORM. All I have said about the subject has been from information which I have gathered from the gentleman from Iowa himself. If he has changed his base since he gave me that information, it is not my fault.

Mr. DONNAN. I have not changed one particle. I said it was simply for the reason that we could not summon him before us on a concurrent resolution adopted only by the House; it must be adopted by both Houses.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The House has directed that business on the table shall be gone through with *seriatim*—

Mr. RANDALL. I did not understand that that was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Did not the gentleman understand that business to which there was no objection should be taken up?

Mr. RANDALL. No, sir; I did not understand even that.

Mr. ELDREDGE. There is objection to the arrangement unless the civil-rights bill is excluded.

The SPEAKER. The proposition was to take up the bills *seriatim*, and that only those should be disposed of to which there was no objection.

Mr. ELDREDGE. Then I make no objection to the arrangement.

Mr. DAWES. That was the proposition.

Mr. ELDREDGE. I simply wanted that understood.

Mr. PLATT, of Virginia. I wish it understood that after this business is disposed of I shall be recognized for the business on which I am now on the floor.

Mr. GARFIELD. I give notice that as soon as we dispose of this business I shall insist on proceeding with the sundry civil appropriation bill.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SYSTEM.

The first business on the Speaker's table was the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. No. 3073) to amend section 19 of the act approved August 18, 1856, entitled "An act to regulate the diplomatic and consular systems of the United States."

The amendment was read, as follows:

Strike out all after "that," in line 1, down to and including "agent," in line 7, and insert "no ambassador, envoy extraordinary, minister plenipotentiary, minister resident, commissioner to any foreign country, chargé d'affaires, secretary of legation, assistant secretary of legation, interpreter to any legation in any foreign country, consul-general, consul, commercial agent, consular pupil, or consular agent, shall."

Mr. RANDALL. I rise for the purpose of asking a question. If I understand this amendment it involves an additional outlay from the Treasury.

Mr. BANNING. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. RANDALL. In such a case would a point of order—

The SPEAKER. There is no necessity of raising any point of order, because a single objection leaves the bill where it is. No bill can be acted on without unanimous consent. That ought to be plain enough. Is there objection?

Mr. SENER. Unless this bill can be read I will object.

The SPEAKER. Objection being made, the bill will be returned to the Speaker's table.

COMMISSION OF ARMY OFFICERS.

The next business on the Speaker's table was amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. No. 3166) to correct the date of commission of certain officers of the Army.

The amendments of the Senate were read, as follows:

Strike out the preamble, in these words:

Whereas a vacancy of major in the Quartermaster's Department existed on the 18th day of January, 1867, to which Captain William Myers, of the Quartermaster's Department, was entitled to be promoted under the laws then in existence, but from which he was excluded by reason of an appointment in said department erroneously made: Therefore,

At the end of the bill add as a new section—

Mr. GARFIELD. I object.

GEORGE M. BOOK.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. No. 2208) authorizing the President to reinstate George M. Book on the active list of the Navy.

The amendment of the Senate was read, as follows:

Strike out all after "provided," in line 4, and insert:

That he shall first be ordered to, and perform, actual sea duty on some cruising vessel of war for the period of one year; and if at the expiration of such period of duty he shall be pronounced by proper naval authority to be no longer incapacitated for active service in any respect: And provided further, That he shall not receive any extra pay for the time he was on the retired list, and not on active duty prior to his restoration under this act.

There being no objection, the amendment was concurred in.

ANN CRANE.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. No. 280) granting a pension to Ann Crane. The amendment of the Senate was read, as follows:

In line 8 strike out "fifteen" and insert "eight."

There being no objection, the amendment was concurred in.

B. W. HARRIS.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the Senate amendment to the bill (H. R. No. 1045) for the relief of B. W. Harris, late collector of internal revenue for the second district of Massachusetts.

The amendment of the Senate was read, as follows:

After the word "sums" insert "not to exceed \$346.53."

There being no objection, the amendment was concurred in.

CENTENNIAL MEDALS.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the Senate amendment to the bill (H. R. No. 1753) to authorize medals commemorating the one-hundredth anniversary of the first meeting of the Continental Congress, and of the Declaration of Independence.

The amendment of the Senate was read, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That medals, with appropriate devices, emblems, and inscriptions, commemorative of the centennial anniversary of the Declaration of Independence be prepared at the Mint at Philadelphia for the centennial board of finance, subject to the provisions of the fifty-second section of the coinage act of 1873, upon the payment of a sum not less than the cost thereof; and all provisions, whether penal or otherwise, of said coinage act against counterfeiting or imitating of coins of the United States shall apply to medals struck and issued under the provisions of this act.

There being no objection, the amendment was concurred in.

PROCEEDINGS IN MANDAMUS.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (H. R. No. 1273) to regulate proceedings in *mandamus*, which was returned from the Senate with amendments.

The amendments were read.

The SPEAKER. Shall these amendments of the Senate be concurred in?

Mr. ASHE. I object to that bill.

WIGHT STREET, DETROIT.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (H. R. No. 1706) to authorize the opening of Wight street through the grounds of the United States marine hospital at Detroit, Michigan, returned from the Senate with the following amendments:

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

That the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized and directed to cause Wight street, in the city of Detroit, Michigan, to be increased in width fifty feet in that portion of said street adjacent to the marine-hospital grounds of said city: *Provided*, That George Jerome, John Owen, and C. H. Buhl, of said city, shall be appointed appraisers to ascertain and report to the Secretary of the Treasury the damages resulting to the United States by using a strip of land from the marine-hospital grounds aforesaid for that purpose, and that the Detroit Transit Railway Company of said city shall pay into the Treasury of the United States the amount of damages ascertained and reported as herein provided.

Amend the title so as to read:
A bill to authorize the widening of Wight street through the grounds of the United States marine hospital at Detroit, Michigan.

There being no objection, the amendments of the Senate were concurred in.

ENGRAVING FOR PROFESSOR BAIRD'S REPORT.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the following concurrent resolution of the Senate:

Resolved, (the House of Representatives concurring,) That Spencer F. Baird, United States commissioner of fish and fisheries, be authorized to have the engraving for his report executed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Public Printing.

The SPEAKER. That concurrent resolution, under the law, will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

The next business on the Speaker's table was a concurrent resolution from the Senate that the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and they are thereby, instructed to adjourn their respective Houses *sine die* at twelve o'clock noon, Monday, June 22, 1874.

Mr. MAYNARD. Is it in order to refer that concurrent resolution?

Mr. KASSON. I object to it.

The SPEAKER. It will then go back to the Speaker's table.

SENATE BILLS.

The SPEAKER. House bills with Senate amendments having been disposed of, the Chair, under the order of the House, will now call up the Senate bills on the Speaker's table for reference by unanimous consent, as well as to be otherwise disposed of.

RAILROADS IN THE TERRITORIES.

The next business on the Speaker's table was an act (S. No. 378) to provide for the incorporation and regulation of railroad companies in the Territories of the United States, and granting to railroads the right of way through the public lands.

Mr. MCCRARY. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Mr. CLYMER. I move that it be referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

The SPEAKER. That is an objection of itself, and the bill will remain on the Speaker's table.

SAINT PAUL AND PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY.

The next business on the Speaker's table was an act (S. No. 486) to extend the act of March 3, 1873, entitled "An act for the extension of time to the Saint Paul and Pacific Railway Company for the completion of its road."

Mr. RANDALL. I object.

ABSALOM BAIRD.

The next business on the Speaker's table was an act (S. No. 529) to authorize an appointment in the Inspector-General's Department; which was read a first and second time.

The bill and preamble were read. The preamble recites a vacancy of lieutenant-colonel in the Inspector-General's Department of the Army originated on the 13th of June, 1867, to which Major Absalom Baird was entitled to be promoted under the laws then in existence, but from which he was excluded by reason of another appointment in said department previously made; and that an act of Congress approved June 8, 1872, was passed with the intention of rectifying this wrong, but has failed to secure to Major Baird his just rights. The bill authorizes the President to nominate and promote Absalom Baird to be lieutenant-colonel and assistant inspector-general, to date from June 13, 1867; but no pay or allowance shall be made to him for any time prior to the passage of the act.

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

Mr. COBURN moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

BISHOP & CO.

The next business on the Speaker's table was an act (S. No. 272) for the relief of Bishop & Co., bankers, of Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands; which was read a first and second time.

On motion of Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont, the bill was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PHILIP S. WALES.

The next business on the Speaker's table was an act (S. No. 745) for the relief of Philip S. Wales, medical inspector in the United States Navy; which was read a first and second time.

Mr. SCOFIELD. The Committee on Naval Affairs rejected that bill, and I move that it be laid upon the table.

Mr. COX. I object to the action.

Mr. SCOFIELD. Then I move that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

CHANGE OF NAME OF A SCHOONER.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 793)

authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to change the name of schooner Jennie Spear to that of Santa Rosa.

There being no objection, the bill was read three times, and passed.

LOUISA H. HASELL.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 91) for the relief of Mrs. Louisa H. Hassell.

The bill was read.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. Let that bill go to a committee.

The bill was read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

CAROLINE M. PURVIANCE AND FRANCIS WYETH.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 644) for the relief of Caroline M. Purviance and Francis Wyeth.

The bill was read.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. Let that bill also be referred.

The bill was read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

ROBERT M. AND STEPHEN A. DOUGLASS.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 660) referring the petition and papers in the case of Robert M. and Stephen A. Douglass, in so far as the same relate to cotton seized, to the Court of Claims.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Let the bill be referred to the Committee on War Claims.

Mr. KELLOGG. I object to the reference. I do not object to the bill being considered now.

The bill remained on the Speaker's table.

GERMAN EVANGELICAL CHURCH AT MARTINSBURGH.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 709) for the relief of the trustees of the German Evangelical church, of Martinsburgh, West Virginia.

The bill was read.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Let the bill be referred to the Committee on War Claims.

Mr. HAGANS. I object to the reference.

The bill remained on the Speaker's table.

SAMUEL S. POTTER.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 786) for the relief of Samuel S. Potter.

The bill was read.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. Let that bill be referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill was read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

COMPULSORY PILOT-FEES.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 675) to relieve ships and vessels from compulsory pilot-fees in certain cases.

Mr. RAINEY. I object.

The bill remained on the Speaker's table.

ALEXANDER HENDERSON.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 828) for the relief of Alexander Henderson.

The bill was read.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. Let that bill be referred.

The bill was read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

POTTAWATOMIE INDIANS.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 218) to enable the Secretary of the Interior to make final settlement with the Pottawatomie Indians of Michigan and Indiana under treaty stipulations existing with them.

Mr. RAINEY. Let that bill go to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PACKARD. I object to the reference.

The bill remained on the Speaker's table.

CIVIL RIGHTS.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 1) supplementary to an act entitled "An act to protect all citizens of the United States in their civil rights, and to furnish the means for their vindication," passed April 9, 1866.

Mr. GARFIELD. I hope gentlemen will not object to that bill being considered as read three times and passed.

Mr. RANDALL. I object.

Mr. GARFIELD. Mr. Speaker, is not that bill considered as passed? Mr. ELDREDGE. The gentleman is very anxious about it. He will have to wait a little.

The bill remained on the Speaker's table.

TEXAS PACIFIC RAILROAD.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 732) supplementary to the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Texas Pacific Railroad Company, and to aid in the construction of its road, and for other purposes."

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. I think that the bill had better be referred.

Mr. SAWYER. Then let it go to the Committee on the Pacific Railroad.

The bill was read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on the Pacific Railroad.

RELIEF OF CONTRACTORS.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 141) for the relief of certain contractors for the construction of vessels of war and steam machinery.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. Let that bill go to the Committee on War Claims.

Mr. KELLOGG. I object to the reference.

The bill remained on the Speaker's table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of their clerks, informed the House that the President *pro tempore* had appointed Mr. PRATT a member of the committee of conference on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. No. 2694) for the relief of Benjamin W. Reynolds, in place of Mr. ALCORN, excused.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House was requested, the bill (H. R. No. 3171) to amend the customs-revenue laws and to repeal moieties.

MOIETIES UNDER CUSTOMS LAWS.

Mr. ELLIS H. ROBERTS. I ask that the bill in relation to moieties just returned from the Senate with amendments be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and printed.

Mr. WOOD. I suggest to the gentleman that he add "with leave to report at any time."

The SPEAKER. That leave attaches to the bill. Leave was granted to the committee to report at any time, and that leave holds until the final disposition of the bill.

The bill was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

TEXAS PACIFIC RAILROAD.

Mr. MYERS. I would inquire what was done with the bill in relation to the Texas Pacific Railroad?

The SPEAKER. It was referred to the Committee on the Pacific Railroad.

Mr. MYERS. I should have objected to it, but on account of the confusion which prevailed in the Hall I did not hear what was going on.

Mr. HOUGHTON. I should have objected also.

Mr. SYPHER. There were two motions made for its reference, and if the gentleman had desired to object he could have done so.

Mr. RANDALL. It makes no difference practically.

The SPEAKER. That is true; the bill can only be reached by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. RANDALL. In either event.

SAINT CROIX AND BAYFIELD RAILROAD COMPANY.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 654) to extend the time for the completion of a railroad from the Saint Croix River or Lake between townships 25 and 31, to the west end of Lake Superior, and to Bayfield, in the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. SPEER. I object to that bill.

Mr. SAWYER. I think there can be no objection to it.

Objection being made, the bill remained on the Speaker's table.

JAMES S. DAY.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 277) making an appropriation for the payment of \$792.46, due the late James L. Day, of Connecticut, for transporting the mails over post-route No. 8151.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. I think that bill should be referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Mr. STARKWEATHER. I object to its reference.

Objection being made, the bill remained on the Speaker's table.

EDMUND M. RANDOLPH.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 443) to provide for the payment of legal services rendered by Edmund M. Randolph to the United States.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. I think that bill should go to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LUTTRELL. This bill has passed the Senate and has been before the Committee on the Judiciary of this House, and I hope the House will pass it. My friend from Massachusetts [Mr. BUTLER] can explain the bill.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. The bill has been passed by our committee once.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. Not this bill?

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. Yes; the same bill.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. Then I withdraw my objection.

The bill was read.

Mr. RAINEY. I object to the bill.

Objection being made, the bill remained on the Speaker's table.

HAZING AT THE NAVAL ACADEMY.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 849) to prevent hazing at the Naval Academy.

Mr. RANDALL. I object to that bill.

Mr. ARCHER. The Committee on Naval Affairs are unanimously in favor of the bill.

Mr. RANDALL. I think it vests too much power in the Superintendent.

Objection being made, the bill remained on the Speaker's table.

PUBLIC PARK AT MACKINAC.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 28) to set apart a certain portion of the island of Mackinac, in the Straits of Mackinac, within the State of Michigan, as a national park.

Mr. STARKWEATHER. I object to that bill.

Objection being made, the bill remained on the Speaker's table.

NATHANIEL M'KAY.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 142) for the relief of Nathaniel McKay.

Mr. RANDALL. I think that bill should take the same course that bill No. 141 took as the numbers are so near, and I object to its consideration.

Objection being made, the bill remained on the Speaker's table.

LANDS NEAR NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 313) to confirm the purchase by the executive department of three acres of land, more or less, in the vicinity of Nashville, Tennessee, known as the site of Fort Houston, and to donate and convey the same to the Fisk University for educational purposes.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. That bill should be referred to some committee.

Mr. HARRISON. I object to its consideration.

Objection being made, the bill remained on the Speaker's table.

AMERICAN FORK RAILWAY COMPANY.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 332) granting to the American Fork Railway Company a right of way through the public lands for the construction of a railroad and telegraph.

Mr. ORR objected to the bill, and it remained on the Speaker's table.

SIERRA IRON COMPANY.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 514) granting to the Sierra Iron Company a right of way through the public lands for a railroad and telegraph.

Mr. RAINEY objected to the bill, and it remained on the Speaker's table.

LANDS GRANTED TO THE STATE OF OREGON.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 624) to authorize the issuance of patents for lands granted to the State of Oregon in certain cases; which was taken up and read a first and second time.

The preamble states that certain lands have heretofore, by acts of Congress, been granted to the State of Oregon to aid in the construction of certain military wagon-roads in said State, and there exists no law providing for the issuing of formal patents for said lands. The bill provides that in all cases where the roads in aid of the construction of which said lands were granted are shown by the certificate of the governor of the State of Oregon, as in said acts provided, to have been constructed and completed, patents for said lands shall issue in due form to the State of Oregon as fast as the same shall, under said grants, be selected and certified, unless the State of Oregon shall by public act have transferred its interests in said lands to any corporation or corporations, in which case the patents shall issue from the General Land Office to such corporation or corporations upon their payment of the necessary expenses thereof; provided that this act shall not be construed to revive any land grant already expired, nor to create any new rights of any kind, except to provide for issuing patents for land to which the State is already entitled.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. I think that ought to go to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Committee on the Public Lands have examined this bill. It provides for nothing but issuing patents for lands which have already been granted.

The bill was then read a third time, and passed.

URIAH W. BRIGGS.

The next business on the Speaker's table was a bill (S. No. 533) granting a pension to Uriah W. Briggs.

The bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Uriah W. Briggs, of Gorham, New Hampshire, late captain of Company F, Seventeenth Maine Volunteers.

No objection was made, and the bill was read three times, and passed.

HANNAH W. SUMNER.

The next business on the Speaker's table was a bill (S. No. 615) to

increase the pension of Mrs. Hannah W. Sumner, widow of Major-General Edwin V. Sumner, who died March 21, 1863, while in command of the Department of the West.

Mr. RUSK. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

No objection was made; and the bill was accordingly taken from the Speaker's table, read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

MARTIN V. JACKSON.

The next business on the Speaker's table was a bill (S. No. 658) granting a pension to Martin V. Jackson.

The bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Martin V. Jackson, late a first lieutenant in Captain N. J. Roscoe's Company, Second Regiment of Kansas State Militia.

No objection being made, the bill was read three times, and passed.

THOMAS SMITH.

The next business on the Speaker's table was a bill (S. No. 690) granting a pension to Thomas Smith.

Mr. RUSK. Let that bill be referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

No objection being made, the bill was accordingly read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

EXAMINATION OF BOUNTY-LAND WARRANTS.

The next business on the Speaker's table was a bill (S. No. 763) to exempt military bounty-land warrants and the lands obtained thereby from sale or execution, or by virtue of any order or decree of court.

Mr. BARBER objected to the bill, and it remained upon the table.

PENSION BILLS.

The following bills were taken from the Speaker's table, read a first and second time, and, on motion of Mr. RUSK, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

A bill (S. No. 767) granting a pension to Andrew J. Lasley;

A bill (S. No. 768) granting a pension to John S. Long;

A bill (S. No. 814) granting a pension to Ebenezer W. Brady; and

A bill (S. No. 874) granting a pension to John Colahan.

PATENTS, TRADE-MARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS.

The next business on the Speaker's table was a bill (S. No. 876) to amend the law relating to patents, trade-marks, and copyrights.

The bill provides that no person shall maintain an action for the infringement of his copyright, unless he shall give notice thereof by inserting in the several copies of every edition published, on the title-page or the page immediately following, if it be a book; or if a map, chart, musical composition, print, cut, engraving, photograph, painting, drawing, chromo, statue, statuary, or model or design intended to be perfected and completed as a work of fine arts, by inscribing upon some visible portion thereof, or of the substance on which the same shall be mounted, the following words, namely: "Entered according to the act of Congress, in the year —, by A B, in the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington;" or, at his option, the word "copyright," together with the year the copyright was entered, and the name of the party by whom it was taken out, thus, "copyright, 18—, by A B."

The second section provides that for recording and certifying any instrument of writing for the assignment of a copyright, the Librarian of Congress shall receive from the persons to whom the service is rendered, one dollar; and for every copy of an assignment, one dollar; said fee to cover in either case a certificate of the record, under seal of the Librarian of Congress; and all fees so received shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

The third section provides that in the construction of this act the words engraving, cut, and print shall be applied only to pictorial illustrations of works connected with the fine arts; and no prints or labels designed to be used for any other articles of manufacture shall be entered under the copyright law, but may be registered in the Patent Office; and the Commissioner of Patents is hereby charged with the supervision and control of the entry or registry of such prints or labels, in conformity with the regulations provided by law as to copyrights of prints, except that there shall be paid for recording the title of any print or label not a trade-mark three dollars, which shall cover the expense of furnishing a copy of the record, under the seal of the Commissioner of Patents, to the party entering the same.

The fourth section repeals all laws and parts of laws inconsistent with the foregoing provisions.

The fifth section provides that this act shall take effect on and after the 1st day of August, 1874.

Mr. CONGER. I am instructed by the Committee on Patents to ask that this bill be passed with an amendment which I will propose.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. Can that be done?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. (Mr. WHEELER.) Only by unanimous consent.

Mr. FRYE. This bill has already been examined by the Joint Committee on the Library and also by the Committee on Patents, and they recommend its passage.

Mr. CONGER. The Committee on Patents propose to amend the bill by increasing the fee to be paid for recording the title of any print or label not a trade-mark from three to six dollars.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That will require unanimous consent. Mr. CONGER. I ask consent for that purpose, and that the bill, as amended, be then passed.

No objection was made, and the amendment was agreed to, and the bill, as amended, passed.

THOMAS HUGHES.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 875) for the relief of Thomas Hughes.

The bill was read.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. I think that bill ought to be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Let it remain where it is.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be returned to the Speaker's table.

DANIEL S. MERSHON, JR.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 134) for the relief of Daniel S. Mershon, jr.

Mr. LAWRENCE. That bill should go to the Committee on War Claims.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. I think it should be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be returned to the Speaker's table.

NAVAL MONUMENTS.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 711) providing for the completion and location of the naval monument.

The bill was read.

Mr. KILLINGER objected, and the bill remained on the Speaker's table.

JOHN W. TRUITT.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 877) granting a pension to John W. Truitt; which was read a first and second time, and, on motion of Mr. RUSK, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

LIVANNA INGRAHAM.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 536) granting a pension to Livanna Ingraham; which was read a first and second time, and, on motion of Mr. RUSK, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

G. B. TYLER AND E. H. LUCKETT.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 844) for the relief of G. B. Tyler and E. H. Lockett, assignees of William T. Cheatham; which was read a first and second time, and, on motion of Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont, referred to the Committee on Claims.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE POTOMAC, EASTERN BRANCH.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 758) to authorize and provide for the construction of a substantial iron and masonry bridge and of a causeway across the Anacostia or Eastern Branch of the Potomac River, at or near the site of the present navy-yard bridge.

Mr. RAINEY objected, and the bill was returned to the Speaker's table.

JOHN M'HARG.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 452) for the relief of John McHarg, late collector of internal revenue for the fifth collection district of New York; which was read a first and second time, and, on motion of Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont, referred to the Committee on Claims.

JOHN T. SMITH.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 448) for the relief of John T. Smith; which was read a first and second time, and, on motion of Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

MEDALS FOR OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES SHIP MONOCACY.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 870) giving the assent of Congress to the acceptance by the officers of the United States ship Monocacy of silver medals presented to them by the King of Siam; which was read a first and second time.

The bill gives the consent of Congress to the acceptance by the officers of the United States ship Monocacy of the silver medals presented to them by the King of Siam on the occasion of the recent interchange of civilities between His Majesty and the officers of said ship representing the United States.

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

MARGARET E. ALEXANDER.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 41) granting a pension to Margaret E. Alexander, widow of Edwin A. Alexander, deceased, late a private of Company K, Eighth Regiment of Indiana Volunteers, known as the Thirty-ninth Indiana Regiment; which was read a first and second time, and, on motion of Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

VAN R. MORGAN.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 325) to remove the political disabilities of Van R. Morgan, of Virginia.

Mr. RAINEY objected, and the bill remained on the Speaker's table.

JOHN JULIUS GUTHERIE.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 252) to remove the disabilities of John Julius Guthrie.

Mr. RAINEY objected, and the bill remained on the Speaker's table.

HAYTIAN BRIG MARGARETTA.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 535) for the relief of the owners of the Haytian brig Margarettta or their legal representatives; which was read a first time, and, on motion of Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont, referred to the Committee on Claims.

UNITED STATES NAVY.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 716) for the better government of the Navy of the United States; which was read a first time, and, on motion of Mr. ARCHER, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, SALT LAKE CITY.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 677) to incorporate the First Presbyterian church of Salt Lake City, in the Territory of Utah; which was read a first and second time.

Mr. O'NEILL. I hope that this bill will be passed now.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. I move the reference of the bill to the Committee on the Territories.

The bill was so referred.

AMENDMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION ACT.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 460) to amend an act entitled "An act to make appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1872," approved March 3, 1871; which was read a first and second time.

Mr. KASSON. If the bill be read I think there will be no objection to passing it.

Mr. RANDALL. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill was so referred.

C. L. STEPHENSON.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 906) for the relief of C. L. Stephenson, of Virginia, of his political disabilities.

Mr. RAINEY objected, and the bill was returned to the Speaker's table.

DISTRICT COURTS IN LOUISIANA.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 88) for the better organization of the district courts within the State of Louisiana.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. This bill ought to be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MOREY. I object to the reference.

The bill was returned to the Speaker's table.

ERRORS IN PRIZE-LISTS.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 907) authorizing correction to be made in errors in prize-lists; which was read a first and second time, and, on motion of Mr. ARCHER, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

UNITED STATES COURTS IN WISCONSIN.

The next business on the Speaker's table was the bill (S. No. 693) to change the time for holding the circuit and district courts of the United States for the eastern district of Wisconsin at Oshkosh; which was read a first and second time.

Mr. SAWYER. I hope that this bill will be passed now.

The first section of the bill provides that the time of holding the circuit and district courts of the United States for the eastern district of Wisconsin, at Oshkosh, be on the second Tuesday of July of each year instead of the first Monday of July, as now provided by law; and that all recognizances, indictments, writs, process, and other proceedings, civil and criminal, now pending in either of said courts, may be entered, heard, and tried at the time fixed by the bill for holding such courts.

The second section provides that this act shall not interfere with the terms of such courts appointed to be holden at Milwaukee, in that district, nor with the power now possessed by the judges of such courts to order special terms of the same as now provided by law.

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE.

Mr. SENNER withdrew his objection to taking from the Speaker's table an amendment of the Senate to the bill (S. No. 3073) to amend section 19 of the act approved August 18, 1856, entitled "An act to regulate the diplomatic and consular systems of the United States."

The amendment of the Senate was read, as follows:

Amend so as to make the bill read as follows:

That no ambassador, envoy extraordinary, minister plenipotentiary or minister resident, commissioner to any foreign country, chargé d'affaires, secretary of legation, assistant secretary of legation, interpreter to any legation in any foreign country, consular-general, consul, commercial agent, consular pupils, or consular agent shall be absent from his post or the performance of his duties for a longer period than ten days at any one time, without the permission previously obtained of the President. And no compensation shall be allowed for the time of any such absence in any case except in cases of sickness; nor shall any diplomatic or consular officer correspond in regard to the public affairs of any foreign government with any private person, newspaper, or other periodical, or otherwise than with the proper

officers of the United States; nor, without the consent of the Secretary of State previously obtained, recommend any person at home or abroad for any employment of trust or profit under the government of the country in which he is located; nor ask or accept, for himself or any other person, any present, emolument, pecuniary favor, office, or title of any kind from any such government.

The amendment was concurred in.

NATHANIEL M'KAY.

Mr. RANDALL withdrew his objection to taking from the Speaker's table the bill (S. No. 142) for the relief of Nathaniel McKay.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DAWES. That committee has already acted on the bill and recommend its passage.

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

Mr. DAWES moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

THOMAS HUGHES.

On motion of Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, by unanimous consent, the bill (S. No. 875) for the relief of Thomas Hughes was taken from the Speaker's table, read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is entitled to the floor on a motion in reference to the business of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. PLATT, of Virginia. Not wishing to antagonize the business of the Committee on Appropriations, I have had a consultation with the chairman of that committee, and now move, with his concurrence, that there shall be a session on Monday evening next at seven and a half o'clock for the consideration of bills from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to be considered in the House to the exclusion of all other business.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. Let them be considered and discussed in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PLATT, of Virginia. I do not know whether I can accept that amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the proposition that on Monday next at seven and a half o'clock there shall be a session for the consideration of business from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. PLATT, of Virginia. What I wish is to have the bills considered in the House without being liable to points of order.

The SPEAKER. And that is the only way in which it can be done, that the bills shall be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, which will give five minutes, *pro* and *con* until the House orders the previous question.

Mr. PLATT, of Virginia. That is just what I want, and I move to suspend the rules for that purpose.

The motion was agreed to, (two-thirds voting in favor thereof) and an evening session was ordered for Monday evening next for the business of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole to the exclusion of all other business.

ENROLLED BILL.

Mr. HARRIS, of Georgia, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported they had examined and found to be truly enrolled an act (H. R. No. 1009) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes; when the Speaker signed the same.

WASHINGTON NATIONAL MONUMENT.

Mr. ELDRIDGE. I move to suspend the rules and adopt the following resolution:

Resolved, That it shall be in order to move an amendment to the sundry civil appropriation bill in Committee of the Whole providing for an appropriation of \$75,000 to aid in the completion of the Washington national monument by the one hundredth anniversary of American independence, with the proviso that the Washington Monumental Association be required to convey to the United States reservation No. 3 in the city of Washington, on which the monument now stands.

Mr. WARD, of Illinois. I object.

The question recurred on seconding the motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. WARD of Illinois, and Mr. ELDRIDGE were appointed tellers.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 106, noes 55.

So there was a second.

Mr. ELDRIDGE demanded the yeas and nays on the motion to suspend the rules.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 148, nays 85, not voting 56; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Adams, Archer, Arthur, Ashe, Atkins, Bass, Beck, Berry, Bland, Bowen, Bradley, Bright, Brown, Burrows, Roderick R. Butler, Caldwell, John B. Clark, Jr., Freeman Clarke, Clymer, Comingo, Cook, Cox, Creamer, Crittenden, Crossland, Crouse, Curtis, Darrall, Duell, Dunnell, Durham, Eames, Eden, Eldredge, Foster, Freeman, Frye, Giddings, Glover, Hagans, Eugene Hale, Hamilton, Hancock, Harmer, Benjamin W. Harris, John T. Harris, Harrison, Hatcher, Hathorn, Joseph R. Hawley, Gerry W. Hazelton, Hendee, Hereford, George F. Hoar, Hodges, Hooper, Hoskins, Houghton, Howe, Hubbell, Hutton, Hynes, Jewett, Kelley, Kellogg, Kendall, Knapp, Lamar, Lansing, Lawson, Leach, Lofland, Lowndes, Luttrell, Magee, Marshall, Maynard, Alexander S. McDill, MacDonough,

McLean, Milliken, Mills, Monroe, Morrison, Myers, Nesmith, Niblack, Nunn, O'Brien, Hosea W. Parker, Isaac C. Parker, Parsons, Pelham, Pendleton, Perry, Pike, James H. Platt, jr., Thomas C. Platt, Poland, Purman, Randall, Ransier, Read, Rice, Richmond, Ellis H. Roberts, James C. Robinson, Milton Saylor, John G. Schumaker, Seuer, Lazarus D. Shoemaker, Sloan, Sloss, George L. Smith, H. Boardman Smith, J. Ambler Smith, Southard, Speer, Standford, Starkweather, Storm, Swann, Christopher Y. Thomas, Thornburgh, Todd, Townsend, Tremain, Vance, Wallace, Wheeler, White, Whitehead, Whitehouse, Whiteley, Whitthorne, George Willard, Charles G. Williams, John M. S. Williams, William Williams, William B. Williams, Willie, Wilshire, James Wilson, Wolfe, Wood, Woodford, and John D. Young—143.

NAYS—Messrs. Albert, Averill, Barber, Barrere, Begole, Bell, Biery, Blount, Bromberg, Buckner, Buffinton, Bundy, Burchard, Cain, Cannon, Cason, Amos Clark, jr., Clements, Stephen A. Cobb, Coburn, Conger, Corwin, Crooke, Crutchfield, Danford, Dawes, Dobbins, Donnan, Field, Fort, Garfield, Gooch, Gunckel, Henry R. Harris, Havens, John B. Hawley, John W. Hazelton, E. Rockwood Hoar, Hunter, Hurlbut, Hyde, Kasson, Killinger, Lawrence, Loughridge, Lowe, Lynch, Martin, James W. McDill, McJunkin, McNulta, Merriam, Neal, Orr, Orth, Packard, Packer, Page, Pierce, Potter, Pratt, Rainey, Rapier, Ray, James W. Robinson, Ross, Sawyer, Henry B. Saylor, Henry J. Scudder, Shanks, Sherwood, Small, A. Herr Smith, John Q. Smith, Sprague, Stanard, Stone, Strait, Strawbridge, Tyner, Waldron, Walls, Jasper D. Ward, Wells, Charles W. Willard, and Jeremiah M. Wilson—85.

NOT VOTING—Messrs. Albright, Banning, Barnum, Barry, Burleigh, Benjamin F. Butler, Cessna, Clayton, Clinton L. Cobb, Cotton, Crocker, Davis, DeWitt, Elliott, Farwell, Robert S. Hale, Hays, Herndon, Hersey, Holman, Lamson, Lamport, Lewis, McCrary, McKee, Mitchell, Moore, Morey, Negley, Niles, O'Neill, Phelps, Phillips, Robbins, William R. Roberts, Rusk, Scofield, Isaac W. Scudder, Sessions, Sheats, Sheldon, Smart, William A. Smith, Snyder, Stephens, St. John, Stowell, Sypher, Taylor, Charles R. Thomas, Waddell, Marcus L. Ward, Wilber, Ephraim K. Wilson, Woodworth, and Pierce M. B. Young—56.

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the rules were not suspended.

MONUMENT TO THE MOTHER OF WASHINGTON.

Mr. MAYNARD. I desire to say that the Committee on the Washington Monument, to whom was referred the subject of completing the unfinished monument to the mother of Washington, have examined that question, and if this resolution had carried we would have asked that a very small appropriation should be made to finish that long-unfinished work. But taking the vote just given as an expression of the sense of the House I shall not now press that.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. GARFIELD. I move that the rules be suspended and that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. COX. I ask unanimous consent to report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs a bill agreed to unanimously by that committee with reference to ocean telegraphs.

Mr. ALBRIGHT. I object.

Mr. COX. The gentleman objects before he knows what it is. I move so to suspend the rules that I may have leave to report this bill. It is the first time I have asked for a suspension of the rules this session. I am authorized by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which has had no show hitherto.

Mr. GARFIELD. I insist on my motion.

The SPEAKER. It is the duty of the Chair in a conflict as to the order of business to give preference to public business so far as to submit to the House a motion for its consideration.

Mr. COX. This is a general public bill.

The SPEAKER. It is not technically public business.

Mr. COX. It is a bill to regulate the whole ocean telegraph business of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will see that the gentleman is recognized upon his bill. Meanwhile he must submit to the House the motion of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GARFIELD. Pending the motion to go into Committee of the Whole, I move that when the House shall resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the bill the first reading be dispensed with, and that the committee shall proceed to consider the bill by paragraphs for amendment under the five-minute rule.

The motion was agreed to.

The question being taken on the motion that the rules be suspended and that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the special order, the motion was agreed to.

MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATION BILL.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, (Mr. DAWES in the chair), and proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. No. 3600) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the House the first reading of the bill and all general debate thereon have been dispensed with.

Mr. GARFIELD. The Committee on Appropriations, as in other cases, have submitted a printed report in connection with this bill, giving all the documents and vouchers relating to it not found in the Book of Estimates. It is Report No. 636, and gentlemen can get it by sending to the document-room.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill by paragraphs for amendment, and read the following:

Public printing and binding:

For the public printing, for the public binding, and for paper for the public printing, including the cost of printing the debates and proceedings of Congress in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, \$1,645,507.66; and out of the sum hereby appropriated,

printing and binding may be done by the Congressional Printer to the amounts following, namely:

For the Court of Claims, \$10,000; for the Department of State, \$25,000; for the Treasury Department, \$325,000; for the War Department, \$100,000; for the Navy Department, \$75,000; for the Interior Department, \$225,000; for the Agricultural Department, \$20,000; for the Department of Justice and the Attorney-General's office, \$10,000; for the Supreme Court of the United States, \$25,000; for the supreme court of the District of Columbia, \$5,000; for the Post-Office Department, \$175,000; and for both Houses of Congress, \$650,507.66; and the amounts herein designated for the several Executive Departments may be distributed to the Bureaus thereof at the discretion of the head of each Department, who shall certify such distribution to the Public Printer; and wages paid to printers and binders in the employ of the Government shall not be above the average price paid for similar work in the cities of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore.

Mr. MYERS, and Mr. HAWLEY of Connecticut, rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] has the floor.

Mr. HAWLEY, of Connecticut. I offer the following amendment:

Strike out from line 34 to line 37, as follows:

And wages paid to printers and binders in the employ of the Government shall not be above the average price paid for similar work in the cities of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore.

Mr. COBURN. I rise to a question of order. I wish to inquire of the Chair whether that clause would not be subject to a point of order, inasmuch as it changes existing law?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. COBURN. I should like to have the law read before the point of order is decided.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the clause is simply a limitation on the appropriation. It is upon that ground that the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. HAWLEY, of Connecticut. I move to strike out that clause, because I prefer to leave the settlement of this question to the Public Printer and the printers. I do not think it wise to attempt to bind the Public Printer by any fixed rules. If he is fit to hold his place he ought to be capable of employing these thousand men and of negotiating with them as to their proper wages. I think there is reason in the claim made by the printers, that they ought not to be confined to the average prices paid in the three cities named in this paragraph. I think so because, in the first place, it is more expensive to live here than in Baltimore and Philadelphia, and probably New York. In illustration of this, let me mention that there are printers who now work here in this city who pay \$140 a year for a commutation ticket, making their homes in Baltimore, because they can pay for a commutation ticket and can live cheaper in Baltimore than in Washington.

Moreover you want to have a class of workmen above the average to do this work. There is a large portion of it which is difficult and requires very capable workmen; as for example, as any printer will know, in the work of the Coast Survey, the Nautical Almanac, (astronomical work,) the Observatory printing, the work of the Smithsonian, the Ordnance Department, the Land Office, the Signal Office, the geological and botanical work, the catalogues of the library. All this is very difficult printers' work. The men have to correct their own work, and ought to have a much higher price for it than the average wages in those cities. They earn it.

Every hour of lost time is deducted. Of course that is all well enough, and we find no fault with it; but I am trying to get at what their wages are as compared with those paid in New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. In Philadelphia and Baltimore they get eighteen dollars a week, and in New York twenty-one dollars a week, and here twenty-four dollars a week. I think that is only a reasonable price. Here they work one-fifth less hours than they do in those cities, and their pay will consequently be one-fifth or 20 per cent. less; so that if you reduce their pay down to the average of these cities, it will amount to but \$15.20 a week. But, Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to state this matter in five minutes.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MYERS. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. HAWLEY, of Connecticut. I have not talked five minutes; I have only talked three minutes. I have had my watch in my hand all the time; I commenced at fourteen minutes past one o'clock, and it is now just seventeen minutes past one.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state his point of order.

Mr. MYERS. I rose to make the point of order before the gentleman from Connecticut got the floor, but was not recognized.

Mr. HAWLEY, of Connecticut. I claim the floor on the ground that my time has not expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that the gentleman's five minutes had expired.

Mr. MYERS. If I do not lose the right to make the point of order, I am willing to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state his point of order.

Mr. MYERS. My point of order is that the lines which my friend from Connecticut moves to strike out change the existing law and are not in order, and I send the law to the Clerk's desk to be read.

Mr. GARFIELD. The point of order comes too late even if it were well taken.

Mr. MYERS. I rose before the gentleman from Connecticut offered his amendment, and I ask that the law be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point of order comes too late. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] has moved an amendment to strike out these lines and has spoken on that amendment. He thinks that he spoke only four minutes; but the Chair thinks he spoke five minutes.

Mr. HAWLEY, of Connecticut. No; I spoke only three minutes; there is no mistake about that.

Mr. MYERS. I do not waive my right to raise the point of order; but I want the law read.

Mr. HAWLEY, of Connecticut. Only a portion of my time had expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that the gentleman's time had expired, and the gentleman from Ohio is entitled to the floor.

Mr. GARFIELD. I yield two minutes of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut, [Mr. HAWLEY.]

Mr. HAWLEY, of Connecticut. Printers here who work by the hour get sixty cents per thousand ems, and they work at all hours in the night or day. Now the printers in New York who work on morning papers get fifty-five cents per thousand ems; but the printers here work more irregularly than in New York. The general body of the printers here work by the week at twenty-four dollars a week. If you paid them by the piece they would earn much more money. The work which is done so irregularly in this Public Printing Office upon the RECORD must be done by the piece. I say then that because the work done is of a higher class and requires a higher class of workmen, and because the expense of living is so much greater here, it is not just to pass this bill and arbitrarily cut down the pay of these men. Let the Public Printer make his bargain with them as he best can.

It is said that the printers' union here have dictated too high terms. Sir, the terms under which these men are working were made ten years ago, when the printers in the Government employ did not constitute a majority of the union and these terms were agreed upon then by a Government Printer, being a lower rate than the printers at that time demanded. The rate has not been changed by any arbitrary action of theirs within a short period as might be inferred.

Mr. GARFIELD. I simply desire the House to understand the merits of this question as well as I can state them in three minutes. There is a union here known as the printers' union, and another corresponding union known as the binders' union, and one of their rules is that they shall control the number of apprentices allowed to learn their trade, and after the limit fixed by them is reached no one in the United States can be permitted to learn that particular trade and any employer who employs a greater number of apprentices than they allow is thrown out of relations with the union. Thus they limit the number of persons who can be employed in their particular craft.

In the next place, it is a rule of the printer's union that any chapter of the union may fix the rates of wages, the rates of pay, within the city where the chapter is located. It so happens that in the city of Washington a majority of all the printers and binders belonging to the union are employed at the Government Printing Office. Therefore, when these employes of the Government vote for any particular figure or rate of pay, that governs not only the pay in the Government Printing Office where they are employed, but the pay for all the printing, public or private, done in this city.

Mr. HAWLEY, of Connecticut. It takes a two-thirds vote to fix the rate of pay.

Mr. GARFIELD. Let it be so.

Mr. HAWLEY, of Connecticut. And the present rate was fixed ten years ago.

Mr. GARFIELD. In 1864, when gold was \$255, and when a dollar in paper here in Washington was worth just thirty-eight cents in gold, and when the prices of everything had reached their top figure, the rate of wages which the Government Printing Office is now paying was fixed. I would not, by any legislation or otherwise, deprive this very worthy class of citizens of all the pay which they ought to receive. I would not do anything that in the slightest degree would damage their business interests as laboring men. But is it fair to the whole class of persons who are compelled to employ this class of workmen, and to have printing or binding done and pay for it—is it fair that the Government Printing Office should establish rates of pay or allow those rates to be established independent of its own will, and have those rates govern all the printing and binding done in this city outside of the Government printing establishment?

Furthermore, is it fair that the rate of pay in this city of Washington should be established at from 15 to 20 per cent. higher than it is in Baltimore, Philadelphia, or New York?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GARFIELD. Allow me a moment more. If it is thought that, for certain reasons, there ought to be a higher rate of pay given here than in those cities, then provide that the rate of pay shall be not more than so much in excess of the average in those cities. But, at any rate, let us, as one of the parties concerned, be consulted about the rate of pay which we shall give to these our employes.

Mr. HAWLEY, of Connecticut. The Government Printer has full power over that matter now.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. I am somewhat surprised at this special legislation against a body of citizens. Whenever Congress goes to work to fix the rate of interest which bonds of the Govern-

ment shall bear, those bonds having been bought at thirty-eight cents in gold on the dollar, and Congress by intervening legislation having raised the value of those bonds to 116—when Congress shall establish a lower rate of interest to be paid on these bonds, then I shall be more willing to fix the wages of the printers and the other laborers of the country at a lower rate than is now paid here. But when it is permitted to capitalists to come together and organize for the purpose of protecting their own capital, and they can come to Congress and obtain the passage of laws for that purpose, I for one can see no objection to the printers, and the binders, and the carpenters, and the shoemakers, and all the other different classes of workmen, organizing together for their own protection against capital. And I was sorry to hear my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, say that this law meant that these men should not organize for their own protection.

Mr. GARFIELD. O, no; not at all. They have a perfect right to organize, and we have a perfect right for our own part to pay what wages we please.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. Yes, they have a perfect right to organize, and then we have a perfect right by congressional legislation to prevent their deriving any benefit from that organization.

Mr. GARFIELD. O, no.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. Then what is this legislation for?

Mr. GARFIELD. It is to prevent their getting higher wages than is paid to others of the same craft for the same work.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. I am willing that they should organize and get more pay if they can in the Government Printing Office. I am willing for several reasons; the first is this: they should have higher pay in Washington than anywhere else, because there is no other place in the country where these men have to pay so high rates of rent and board as in Washington. While perhaps a man can live here cheaper, leaving out the rent, than he can in some other cities, yet there is no place where the item of rent is so high as it is here.

Then there is another reason. It happens that almost two-thirds of all the printers and binders in Washington are in Government employ. They are but intermittently employed. If we vote the publication of a large number of books, then they are employed right on until those books are printed. If we decrease the number to be published, then their work is stopped. And when the work in the Government Printing Office is stopped, there is nobody else to employ them, and they must leave; they must pack up their household effects and go away to some other place to find work, or else wait here until they are called back to the Government Printing Office by some further order of Congress for the publication of documents. In fact Washington is only a winter watering place for these printers and binders. When Congress goes away in the summer nothing is done. All classes of artisans have to lie over from one session to another. And this is what makes rents so high during the session; we have to pay for six months what elsewhere would be the rent for a year. If Government work stops there is no redress for these men. In New York City, for instance, when work stops in one private establishment the printer can go to another, or a third, or a fourth, or a fifth; but there is substantially no business of this kind done here. When Government work stops here, the poor artisan must travel from city to city seeking work, or he must wait until the time for work comes around again. Therefore we ought to pay higher rates than are paid in other cities. For these reasons, I hope this provision will be struck out of the bill.

Mr. MYERS. As I understand, this provision has been put in the bill by the committee because certain outside parties in this city want to pay less to their employes than they are now paying. Now we have on the statute-book a law with which the provision reported in this bill conflicts. I wanted, therefore, to make a point of order upon the provision, but was prevented from doing so. I will, however, read the provision of existing law:

It shall be the duty of the Congressional Printer to contract with persons in that employment at such prices as are for the interest of the Government and just to those employed.

The printers' union fixes four dollars a day as the price to be paid in this city. It is a little higher than the prices paid in other cities where, it is true, living is not so high. But does the Government lose anything by it? No, sir. The printers are allowed sixty cents per thousand ems; the work is measured off; and whether they work eight hours a day, or more, or less, they receive at the end of the month their pay for the work they have done.

Now, this is really not an attempt to benefit the Government, but an effort of outside printers who wish to pay their employes less than they are now paying them. The price fixed by the union in this city is four dollars a day, because the cost of living is higher here than in other cities. It would be unjust and contrary to the spirit of the law to attempt to make Congress the medium for legislating as to the price to be paid by private employers. If you reduce the price to three dollars a day you will get just three dollars' worth of work, measured by the thousand ems. That is a clear statement of the case; and it is the whole case.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. DONNAN. I renew the amendment. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] insists that this provision should be stricken from the bill for the reason that the work required by the Government of its printers in this city is peculiar work for which higher

wages would be paid in the cities named. Now, I suggest to him that the provision of the bill is that the wages of these persons in the employment of the Government shall not be "above the average price paid for similar work in the cities of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore"—"similar work." Therefore the entire argument of the gentleman on this point falls to the ground.

It seems to me that the objection to the argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BUTLER] is that it leaves Congress in respect to its printing work in the power of the printers' union. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] makes a similar mistake. He undertakes to tell us that this matter makes no difference to the Government, because these men are paid by the thousands ems, and therefore whether they work more or fewer hours the Government loses nothing. The gentleman is entirely mistaken in his theory. The trouble lies in fixing the price per thousand ems. The price now fixed, sixty cents per thousand ems, is from 25 to 50 per cent. higher than the price in the cities named. Now, I insist that it is our duty to the Government to see that some certain fair price shall be fixed. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says the matter should be left where it now is—in the hands of the Congressional Printer; that he can control it. No, sir; the great difficulty is that the printers control him. They have a union which embraces a majority of all the printers in this city; consequently the price at the Government Printing Office controls the price paid for printing throughout the city. So long as you maintain the price at sixty cents per thousand ems this union controls not only the Congressional Printer but also all others employing printers in this city; because if the Congressional Printer deems it unfair to the Government to employ printers at sixty cents per thousand ems, every printer in the city belonging to this union, and of course standing by its rules, will decline to work for the Government, and thus the Congressional Printer, who is obliged to get work executed for Congress, is left helpless.

Mr. MYERS. I state it as a fact that before the present arrangement was made many of these printers received thirty or forty dollars a week; now they can make but twenty-four dollars a week.

Mr. DONNAN. I do not know what their present pay amounts to; I only know that they are receiving from 25 to 50 per cent. higher wages than printers are receiving for similar work in the cities of Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York. I hope, therefore, that the Committee of the Whole will stand by the proposition submitted in the bill. I do not believe there is any material difference between the cost of living in this city and the cost in the cities named. There is at any rate no difference corresponding with the difference made by the printers' union in the price of work. I submit a table exhibiting the comparative prices of coal, provisions, &c., in the cities of New York and Philadelphia as compared with Washington:

Commodities.	New York.	Philadelphia.	Washington.
Flour, per barrel	\$9 00@12 00	\$10 00@11 00	\$8 00@11 00
Coal, per ton	7 00@ 7 50	7 00@ 8 00	8 00@ 10 00
Coffee, green, per pound	20@ 30	35@ 45	27@ 40
Coffee, roasted, per pound	30@ 45	40@ 55	30@ 45
Ham, per pound	15@ 20	15@ 17	16@ 18
Beef, per pound	8@ 30	20@ 25	8@ 20
Fresh pork, per pound	10@ 12	14@ 15	10@ 13
Butter, per pound	30@ 45	40@ 60	35@ 50

If, in the judgment of the Committee of the Whole, 5 per cent. should be added in consideration of the average difference in the cost of living, then let that limitation be specified; but let us not maintain the present prices, which are from 25 to 50 per cent. higher than those prevailing in neighboring cities; a system not only expensive to the Government, but to all other printing establishments in this city.

Mr. COBURN. What is the price paid in other cities?

Mr. DONNAN. I have a schedule at my room and had intended to have it here; but the prices paid by the Government in this city are from 25 to 50 per cent. higher.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I wish to inquire whether a printer working eight hours a day at the present rates receives as much pay as a first-class clerk in one of the Departments?

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. Why should he not?

Mr. DONNAN. I presume he receives as much working eight hours a day as he did formerly working ten hours a day.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I do not believe that a printer ought to get less than a first class clerk.

Mr. DONNAN. I hope we shall not longer continue the present expensive system.

Mr. KELLOGG. I ask for the reading of a petition which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

We, the undersigned practical printers in the city of Washington, respectfully petition your honorable body to stay further proceedings in relation to fixing by law a scale of prices for work performed in any and all mechanical establishments carried on by the Government of the United States; because we hold it to be class legislation, in that it takes the side of capital against labor; that it would establish a bad precedent for the national Government to enact by law a standard of wages for the skilled labor of its citizens; that it would be unfair and unwise to pass a

law which would, we believe, in principle, array the General Government against the toiling millions of the nation. Labor should be free to fix and regulate its value on the principles of justice, to be determined from time to time by the employer and employed.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield the remaining portion of my time to my colleague.

Mr. HAWLEY, of Connecticut. I want to give emphasis to this point. The work of these men is exceedingly irregular. Just now we may be ordering great volumes printed, making extraordinary demands on the Government Printing Office at a time. While they now may work all the night through and on Sundays, yet a few weeks or months hence there will not be work enough or quarter enough for them all. It is not right to calculate their earnings for a year upon the basis of their possible earnings for a day when they have plenty to do. We must recollect here are men with families to support who while they have a great deal to do at one time have but very little to do at other times. If you wish to make a law that they shall have only the average wages of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, then put into the bargain a guarantee that they live as cheaply and have as steady work as they might have in those cities.

I wish to call the attention of the House to the law of July 20, 1868, which is still upon the statute-book:

That all laws and parts of laws that regulate the prices of labor in the Government Printing Office be, and the same are hereby, repealed; and it shall be the duty of the Congressional Printer to contract with the persons in that employment at such prices as are for the interest of the Government and are just to those employed.

That is a correct law. It is now the law, and this is really an irregular attempt to repeal existing law, an attempt made in a way discouraged by our rules.

The prices paid here are not too high. The daily morning papers of New York pay fifty-five cents a thousand when men work through the night, or fifty cents when part of the work is done in the afternoon. You pay on the RECORD sixty cents. On regular book-work, for a regular fair day's work that may last all the year round, a compositor gets in New York from forty-six to fifty cents a thousand. Here compositors have irregular work, it may be by day, it may be by night, there may be none at all; and the pay is not higher than it ought to be. A first-class printer in New York gets from twenty-five to thirty dollars a week, and it is not too high to pay these printers here twenty-four dollars a week. The average in New York is twenty-one dollars. These men claim twenty-four dollars, and they ought to have it. If they cannot show each night that they have set up four dollars' worth they lose in proportion. Mr. Clapp, the printer, says that if all the work were paid for by the piece it would have cost \$250,000 more. The Senate report says the work is from 25 to 50 per cent. better and cheaper than it was under the contract system. I have some practical knowledge of this matter, employing some printers myself. Sometimes the printers' union fights us, sometimes we fight it; but we make out to arrange terms for ourselves. I do not think Congress ought to step in and interfere with such bargains. If I cannot without the help of special statutes on my side agree with the boys and carry on my business, then I will quit it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HALE, of Maine. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BUTLER] has claimed here to speak for the printers, for the laboring men, as other gentlemen have. They have, as it seems to me, made a mistake men sometimes do make of speaking not for a class but for the loudest of a class—for those who clamor the most.

Now, the committee in this clause of the bill have not sought, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, to antagonize the interests of printers as laboring men, but to make them equal. It does not believe and I do not believe in a privileged printing bureau in Washington to the disadvantage of printers elsewhere. What we seek is to put them all on a level. There is no reason why the printer in the Government Printing Office here should fare better than the printer in the gentleman's town or my town or in any large city.

What is the fact with reference to the privileges the printers enjoy here in the Government Printing Office? In the first place they have the eight-hour rule, and that is a great advantage. In the New York establishments, in the Philadelphia establishments, in the Baltimore establishments, with hardly an exception, the ten-hour rule prevails. When a printer gets into the Government Printing Office he gains two hours.

Now, so far as inequality of work is concerned the observation of the committee is not different here in the Government Printing Office from private establishments.

The proof, sir, that the printers here enjoy special privileges is that the Public Printer to-day can get printers from the district represented by the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. BUTLER,] from the district represented by the gentleman from Connecticut, [Mr. HAWLEY,] and from my own State to come here. I myself have had applications—I presume other members have had applications to get printers into the Government Printing Office, because it is what is called a soft place. They are glad to come here. Now, if it be a hardship to work here, if the cost of living be greater than elsewhere, if the privileges enjoyed by the printers in the Public Printing Office are not apparent, why is it that the tide is constantly setting toward Washington? I do not believe that the printer finds that it costs

any more to live here in Washington than in Philadelphia or New York. I do not know how it may be as to Baltimore. Then they have the further privilege that the eight-hour law gives.

What the committee sought here was to put these printers on an average footing with others. It is a fact that for every printer you take on here and put into the Government Printing Office out of every half-dozen that apply, you aggrrieve five men where you only please one. The hardship is not that of the printer who has got the place he wants, who will not go out until he is turned out. Who ever heard of any body leaving the Government Printing Office and going to another city? I never did, and I say that we should speak here not for the printer alone who is in the Government Printing Office, but for the half-dozen others that cannot get in. It is a privileged class, and in speaking for the printer here we should bear in mind that there are other printers just as worthy with families to support in and out of printers' unions outside of the city of Washington as there are in the Government Printing Office.

Mr. DUNNELL. I desire to say a word or two in support of the amendment to strike out these lines. I am opposed to this attempted legislation. It seems to me that a single class has been selected in this matter that ought the least to have been selected. You have here in Washington in the employ of the Government a large number of employes. We have \$900 clerks, \$1,200 clerks, \$1,400 clerks, \$1,600 clerks, and \$1,800 clerks. No attempt has been made in this Congress to cut down the pay of any of these employes. They are to all intents and purposes laborers, laboring for the support of themselves and families. No attempt has been made, I say, to reduce their compensation. But there is selected for a reduction in their salaries a class of laborers who can the least endure it.

I do insist, Mr. Chairman, that it is more expensive to live here than it is in the other cities that are named. I dislike this style of legislation, that we shall fix a scale of compensation by saying that we shall pay here as much as is paid to this class of workmen in the cities of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. The old law is the correct one, that we shall pay what is a just, fair, and reasonable compensation to these employes. If you go to the printing office in the morning, you will find that all the workmen are at their places and at their desks precisely at the proper hour, whatever that hour may be. They are there all the time that they should be there. There is no shirking in the printing department of this Government. But go on the street any time up to half-past ten o'clock and you will find fourteen and sixteen hundred dollar clerks in the street. And go up the avenue any time in the day and you will find every class of clerks leaving the Departments from two and half-past two to three o'clock. These clerks in the Departments work from four hours and a half to six hours a day. We have never attempted to cut down their pay a single mill in this Congress. Now, here are workmen who work by the day and the night, working with their hands and their minds, and it is proposed to cut them down and make them, and them alone, the sufferers by this legislation.

I protest against striking at these men and these women who work in the printing department. They are the hardest worked employes in the Government to-day. You may go to the department and watch their labor. I know some men there who have said to me that they have never toiled in their lives as they have toiled in that department, many of them working night after night until morning. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FOSTER] says to me, "Why don't they leave?" That is no argument at all. Why may we not ask everybody else to leave? They are here with their families and they are poor, living from hand to mouth. And why should we tell those men to leave? They are entitled to a just compensation for their services.

Mr. BASS. I desire to say a single word.

The CHAIRMAN. No further debate on this amendment is in order.

Mr. BECK. Is an amendment to the amendment in order?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not.

Mr. BECK. What is the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. To strike out the last word.

The question being taken on the amendment to the amendment, it was not agreed to.

Mr. BECK. I move to strike out the two last words, and I do it for the purpose of saying that I do not think there is much to be made by striking down the pay of the employes in this particular business. The difficulty lies in ordering the printing itself. We are appropriating by this bill \$1,645,507.66 for printing. So long as that large sum is allowed to remain in the bill, and that amount of money is expended for printing, of course the expenses of the Government cannot be kept down by pinching the workmen who perform the labor. The large amount of printing authorized and provided for is the source of all the wrongful expenditure.

How is that money spent? It is spent for publishing all sorts of documents in the various Departments, whatever they see fit to publish, and when printed they put their franks upon them and send them out as electioneering documents all over the country. The abolition of the franking privilege has not stopped this abuse nor curtailed it. It is being done to-day, and republican Senators and Representatives are being furnished with electioneering documents under the frank of the heads of these Departments as freely as they were before the pretended reform was inaugurated by abolishing the franking privilege.

A very remarkable debate occurred the other day—I cannot say

where, it would be out of order to state the place, but among distinguished republican gentlemen—in which these abuses were being set forth by one member, when another rose in his place and used this language:

Mr. LEWIS. Allow me to make a suggestion to the Senator from Mississippi. He says the franking privilege was abused in the franking of political documents. I say that abuse has not been abolished yet. I have now in my room plenty of documents, not on Government business, but electioneering documents, franked with the official stamp upon them by officers of the Government.

The gentleman to whom that remark was made replied thus:

Mr. ALCOCK. But, sir, how stands the fact to-day? You say to the people of the country "The franking privilege has been abolished." The fact stands out that it is not abolished; that every Executive Department of the Government to-day exercises the franking privilege, and there is no check on any of those Departments for the abuses that will necessarily grow up in the service, and actually to-day the abuses that may occur under the privilege which is now vouchsafed to the Departments are greater if anything than at the time the privilege was regulated under the old régime. The member of Congress to-day is denied the privilege of franking documents, it is true; but the Agricultural Department, the State Department, the Post-Office Department, all the Departments of the Government, send out their franks. They have them printed at the expense of the Government, and all they have to do to send a document to the limits of the nation is simply to put upon it a stamp which they have by the thousands and tens of thousands at their command. If you have a document that emanates from any of those Departments and you desire to have it go to your constituents without charge to you, you can send it to one of the Departments I presume, without having tried the matter, with your compliments to its head, and request him to send it, and he will put his stamp upon it and send it away. I know that is the case with regard to seeds, &c. The Commissioner of Agriculture sends out those seeds. So far as I was concerned, when the seeds came to me I sent them back to him and asked him to send them to my constituents. Why? Because he had a roll of stamps in his hands and could send them without charge, whereas if I were to send them I would have to pay the postage on them.

Both these gentlemen avowed, and nobody contradicted them—both being leading members of the republican party—that they are to-day furnished with electioneering documents with the stamp of the Departments upon them; not on official business, not on Department business, but to be sent all over the country for partisan purposes. You are pretending to the country that you have cut off great abuses by abolishing the franking privilege, when the reverse is admitted to be true. You must either stop this printing altogether, or limit it by law to special departmental work. The abuse is admitted to be horrid now. Both of those gentlemen day before yesterday, in the debate from which I have read and which can be found in the RECORD of the 9th of June, showed that this is the fact; both being leading republican Senators.

Mr. HOSKINS. I rise to oppose the amendment, and I do not propose to detain the committee over a minute and a half. But I do desire to call the attention of the committee to one fact. I am entirely in accord with the gentleman who moves to strike out these lines, for this reason if for no others: The clause as inserted by the committee says that the price paid shall not be above the average price paid in the cities of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. Now, in the cities of Philadelphia, New York, and Baltimore there are different grades of printers; but in the Government Printing Office here I understand that none but first-class printers are employed, and if a man who is not skilled in his business gets in there he is immediately removed, and his place is filled by a first-class hand. Thus it will be seen that the average price in those three cities would not be the average price of skilled workmen, but the average price of a miscellaneous class of persons employed there, many of whom get different wages. If you pay to the printers in the Government Printing Office the average price of skilled workmen in the three cities named, you will pay them the full price paid now. I am therefore in favor of striking out these three lines inserted by the committee. I yield what time I have remaining to my colleague from the Buffalo district, [Mr. BASS.]

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I concur with the remarks made by my colleague who has just taken his seat. It seems to me that if you impose upon the Congressional Printer the duty of determining what the average price of this class of labor is, as between the three cities of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, you are imposing on him a task somewhat difficult for him to perform. How is the price established at the present time? As I understood from one gentleman who has addressed the House, the same price is paid now in the Congressional Printing Office that has been paid there for years. Why is it that to-day we propose to reduce the prices paid these men for their services? Has any special emergency arisen within the last few months to call for any reduction of their pay? I am not aware that it is so claimed. This price is fixed by the Congressional Printer according to the best of his ability and skill. It is determined, somewhat, I understand, by the typographical union. That union establishes prices for the government of the persons who belong to that organization. Now, if the Congressional Printer were required to fix a different scale of prices, to determine an average price, to be arrived at upon a computation of the prices paid in New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, and to pay the average so ascertained, then next week we might have a strike of the printers in this city. If the private employers in the city are paying the same prices that the Government Printing Office is paying these printers to-day, then if the Government Printing Office reduces the price of its printers, the office would be emptied, and the town would be filled with men thrown out of employment.

The trades union representing the printers represents thousands of men all over the country. This is the first attempt on the part of Congress to strike a blow at labor organizations as they exist in every

city and almost every hamlet in the United States. I am opposed therefore to the proposition of the committee and in favor of striking it out.

The question was taken on the amendment to the amendment, and it was not agreed to.

Mr. STORM. I move to amend by adding to the portion of the paragraph it is proposed to strike out that which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Congressional Printer shall furnish in his annual report a detailed statement of all printing and binding done by him for Congress and the different Departments of the Government; and he shall also state in said annual report the quality and price of all paper used in each item of printing and binding: *Provided*, That from and after the close of the present fiscal year the Congressional Printer shall print no records of cases pending in the Court of Claims or in the Supreme Court, unless the United States shall be appellant or plaintiff in error therein; but in cases wherein the United States is not appellant or plaintiff in error, the record shall be printed, under the direction of the court, at the cost of the party bringing such record into court, which cost in the Supreme Court shall be taxed as any other costs in the case.

Mr. GARFIELD. I raise the point of order that the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STORM] proposes to change existing law in regard to printing.

The CHAIRMAN. If it does not change the law it is entirely useless; if it does change the law, then it is out of order.

Mr. STORM. It is simply a limitation upon the appropriation made in this paragraph. It does not strike out the appropriation for the printing of the Supreme Court or the Court of Claims. It simply provides that wherever private parties are the litigants the United States shall not pay the cost of printing the records in those cases. Whoever heard of taxing the Government for printing the records of cases between private parties in suits in United States courts?

Mr. GARFIELD. It has always been done in the United States court here.

Mr. STORM. It has not. The rule has only recently been adopted. The chief justice of the Court of Claims, in order to prevent fraud as he said, made an order that the records in these cases should be printed by the Congressional Printer.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman understand that his amendment requires the Congressional Printer to do anything which the law does not require him now to do?

Mr. STORM. I maintain that the law does not now require that he shall print the records in cases where private parties only are interested. My amendment is only a limitation on this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the amendment to require the Congressional Printer to do something that the law does not now require him to do. If so, then it is a change of existing law, and is not in order.

Mr. STORM. It is not a law, but simply an order made by the chief justice of the Court of Claims. I maintain that my amendment does not change existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. DONNAN. I move to amend the last portion of the paragraph by inserting before the word "average" the words "more than 5 per cent. above," so that it will read "shall not be more than 5 per cent. above the average price paid for similar work," &c.

Mr. GARFIELD. I am not authorized by the Committee on Appropriations to accept any amendment that they have not been consulted upon. But for myself I can well understand that there is a certain amount of truth in the proposition that the cost of living is higher in Washington than it is in other cities; just how much higher I do not know.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. Is it just 5 per cent. higher?

Mr. GARFIELD. I say I do not know. I admit also that in the printing office here there is probably required more night-work, and there is probably less steady work than in most of the printing offices of the country. And if we were wise enough to know what difference all these relations make between the three cities named here and the city of Washington, I should be very willing to fix a rate accordingly. In order that no injustice may be done, I will say that I see no reason why we might not limit the price to be paid to 5 per cent. above the average price paid in the cities named. The Government Printer would not be obliged to give that price; he may pay the average, and not pay 5 per cent. above the average.

I think the rights of both parties, those of the contractor and of the employed, should be considered here. And I think that the rights of printers outside of Government employment should be considered, as well as the rights of those employed by the Government. When gentlemen undertake to say that a raid is being made against the interests of labor, they ought to be reminded that they are making a raid against everybody outside of this particular preferred class. It is a raid against the many in favor of the few. I propose that we deal fairly and justly with the whole class of people known as printers and binders; and it is not dealing fairly with them to take a few of their class and give them the special advantage of Government employment here at advanced rates of pay, sowing discontent in all the ranks of that employment in all other cities of the United States. This is the reason every member of Congress is beset by printers from private offices throughout the country to find them places in this capital.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. It is now admitted that the pro-

vision in the bill is wrong because the committee themselves desire to amend it, so as to fix a higher rate. Now why not leave the whole question to be regulated by natural law? My objection to the proposition is that it is the entering-wedge of an attempt to fix the rate of wages by law. That never has been done in this country; it never ought to be done; I trust that we shall not begin here any such effort. That is the ground upon which I oppose this, as a raid upon all laboring men; because if we can fix the pay for printers why not for bricklayers, why not for carpenters, why not for cabinet-makers, why not for all laboring men?

A MEMBER. We fix it for Congressmen.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. We do fix it for Congressmen because that is a constitutional privilege we have; but there are a great many of us who dare not fix it at what we think we ought to have.

Mr. RANDALL. I echo that.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. But we have a right to do justice to these men; and I am willing to take the odium of voting that their pay shall not be cut down. By rejecting the proposition in this bill we neither cut down nor raise their pay. We leave the Government in this matter to deal with citizens as citizens deal with each other. We merely say that we will not throw the great weight of the Government sword into the scale as against the laboring man by saying that he shall receive only so much.

The answer is not to be made "If these men do not like this rate of pay let them leave the Government employment and go away." They cannot go away. They are tied here as was Gulliver in Lilliput by every hair of their heads. The church and all other social influences are around them as they are around us. If they go away they must tear up everything by the roots. A man who is fixed here must, when his employment ceases, stay here until he can get employment again.

Nor is it any answer to say "We have authorized eight hours as a day's labor instead of ten." That measure was either wise or unwise. If wise, these men have a right to it; if unwise, let us repeal it for all Government work; but let us not strike down the printers and book-binders in Washington alone, while in all other Government work eight hours' labor is the rule and the pay given is the same paid by other employers in the same city.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. DONNAN, it was not agreed to; there being—ayes 16, noes not counted.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the true way to manage labor and to insure a fair compensation to the laborer is to have it free, not to cramp it by legislative restrictions. The law at present leaves this labor free. It authorizes the Congressional Printer to employ persons at such prices as are for the interest of the Government and just to those employed. That is the basis upon which every man employs his hands. It is the true basis, the reasonable basis. If it happens that there are not in this city enough printing-offices to attract printers in large numbers so as to bring down the price of work to a level with that paid in Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York, that is not the fault of the Government. The Government, therefore, should not take advantage of anything of that kind. It should not undertake to prescribe any special terms as to labor here, which we all know may necessarily be dearer than elsewhere. This is a peculiar city; it is not a city of manufactures or commerce or trade. It is a city whose population is made up largely of Government employes—just that kind of population that does not bring down the prices of labor—just that kind of population that carries up the price of living in every branch. We all know as a matter of fact that living is higher here than it is in neighboring cities. I suppose that statistics, if they should be examined, would abundantly sustain this position.

Something has been said here about the eight-hour law. Now, in my judgment that law will be in effect repealed by the proposed provision of this bill, because this provision authorizes the Congressional Printer to fix the price of labor at the average of other cities named; and in making the calculation he will doubtless include the hours of labor as well as the rate of pay per day or by the thousand ems, whatever it may be. I believe that by this means the eight-hour law will be indirectly swept away. I do not think it can be fairly argued in favor of the proposition that under the eight-hour law the printers in this city receive equal pay with those who work ten hours in other places. I believe they are not paid by the day, but rather by the thousand ems.

I see nothing in this provision that can in the end result to the advantage of the Government. These men, many of them, come here from distant States—from all parts of the country; they have to pay their traveling expenses; they may not be employed here permanently; they may, like the door-keepers or clerks of this House, or like members of Congress themselves, be occupied here during only the sessions of Congress. All these men cannot be employed the year round. The same argument upon which we base increased pay for our clerks, door-keepers, and other employes beyond what would be paid for the same class of employment elsewhere—that they are here but a part of the year, and that any arrangements they might make for doing business elsewhere are broken up—that very same argument applies in favor of these printers. If they had regular employment from one end of the year to the other the case would be different; but large numbers of them are employed only a part of the year, and when thrown out of employment they must necessarily seek it elsewhere.

Mr. MARSHALL. Is an amendment in order at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana moved a formal amendment; does he withdraw it?

Mr. COBURN. I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. MARSHALL. I desire to move an amendment in the thirty-first line, so it will read "not more than 6 per cent. above the average price paid."

I do it, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of saying I think the clause which it is proposed to strike out is misunderstood by a considerable portion of the members of the committee. It is an attempt on the part of the Committee on Appropriations to reform what is now a most glaring abuse. I am opposed, and I think the House ought to be opposed, to placing this establishment on any other than business principles. If it is intended to make it a separate Bureau, and give fixed salaries to the employes of that Bureau, then it would be proper to do so; but I imagine it has been the purpose of Congress to place this establishment on strictly business principles.

What is the condition under which labor in this establishment is employed at the present time? The Government has no control whatever of the price to be paid. What is the price to be paid? That price is determined by the men in the employ of the Government. The price paid is absolutely within their own control. It is known to every man here who has any information upon this subject at all that there is nothing upon earth to control the price paid at the Government Printing Office except what may be determined by these men themselves who are in the employ of the Government.

What is the result of all this? Instead of being employed on business principles, these men are put in that office through the influence of members of Congress. Printers are gathered here from all parts of the country, for they think this is a favored establishment and the Government is paying here more than in other business establishments of the country. As a consequence they are put in there by their members of Congress of the dominant party by favoritism.

What is the result of that? They claim the right when elections take place in the districts from which they come that they shall be sent home to vote, and they are sent home to vote through the influence of their member of Congress at the expense of the Government. These printers go home and vote at the public expense for the member of Congress who put them in the Government Printing Office.

Mr. COBURN. Does the gentleman from Illinois mean to say that these printers are sent home at the expense of the Government? What evidence has he for that assertion? I understand they are not sent home at the expense of the Government.

Mr. MARSHALL. It appeared in evidence before the Committee on Appropriations and is beyond question that these men are granted leave of absence for ten days and they get their expenses and their pay during all the time they are absent at home voting for the member of Congress who placed them in their positions.

Mr. COBURN. I think the gentleman from Illinois is entirely mistaken.

Mr. HAWLEY, of Connecticut. It has not been so in my State, and I never heard of it in reference to any other State.

Mr. MARSHALL. Nevertheless these clerks here do get their expenses paid when they are sent home and elections are to be held in the districts from which they come.

Mr. HAWLEY, of Connecticut. I am inclined to believe that such is not the case.

Mr. LAWRENCE rose.

Mr. MARSHALL. I cannot yield if it is to be taken out of my time, as I only have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be taken out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. MARSHALL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have only stated what is the fact, and what has been proved to be the fact before the Committee on Appropriations. It is a notorious fact that the clerks of the Departments have the same privilege of going home at the expense of the Government. They get leave of absence through the influence of the men who put them in position. This is all wrong. It is an abuse which has grown up in the Government and ought to be corrected. As this is not a Bureau, but a mere business establishment; it certainly ought to be corrected here.

If the amount fixed by this clause in the appropriation bill is not sufficient, then put it up not exceeding 6 per cent. in addition to the average of what is paid to employes in private establishments in New York, Boston, and Philadelphia. I wish to have the price fixed, and not left within the control of the men employed there. It is not now within the control of the Government Printer. There is here a printers' union which fixes the price, and a majority of that printers' union are men who have come here from all parts of the country. They have fixed the price to be paid by publishers in this city and this breaks down the business of these private printing establishments, which is a gross wrong to them.

If you are not paying enough by these appropriation bills, then let us name an adequate amount so that at least this Government establishment shall be based on something like business principles. Do not let it any longer remain one of those cancerous ulcers which are eating into the body-politic. It is an injustice as it is now and the object of the Committee on Appropriations is to correct the abuse. I must say of the majority of the members of the Committee on Appropriations in this House that instead of reproach they deserve credit for attempting to correct this, as they have a great many other

abuses during the present Congress. For myself I feel it to be my duty to appear here and try to uphold the hands of that committee and the efforts it has made to correct here what is no doubt a monstrous abuse. If the committee does not regulate here what the price shall be it will leave it in the hands of the employes of the Government to determine how much the Government shall pay them, and it will surely injure as it has done the regular business of this city and elsewhere throughout the country.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 70, noes 61; no quorum voting.

The CHAIRMAN ordered tellers, and appointed Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. HAWLEY of Connecticut.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported—ayes 78, noes 75.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOSKINS. I move to strike out all after the word "paid" in line 35, and in lieu thereof to insert "for similar work done in the city of Washington."

Mr. Chairman, if we are to fix the price for these printers in the Government Printing Office by some schedule or some direct and definite law, to which I am opposed, I propose that it shall be fixed, so far as my vote is concerned, by the price of such labor here in this place where they are obliged to do their work. In my mind there is no sense in regulating the price of the labor of these printers, who are skilled artisans, by what the price may be in other cities of the Union. These men are obliged to live here in the city of Washington, and not in the cities of New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore; nor can they live in those cities; they must reside here.

The chairman of the committee has yielded the whole point when he admits, as he has done, that the cost of living here is greater than in the three cities named. And if it be more expensive to live here in Washington than in those other cities, the rates of wages these men should get, so long as it is conceded that they ought to be first-class workmen, should be somewhat in proportion to the cost of living here. Their rates of wages should have reference to the cost of living in the place where they are employed.

Now, I desire to say a word or two on another point which I have heard raised on this floor, that if these men are not willing to take the price now paid by the Government Printer, which I believe is at the rate of fifty cents an hour, others will. In answer to that suggestion I will say that there is not a member of this House, representing a congressional district where a hundred men could not be found willing to take his place for the pay he is now getting. I propose to treat these men fairly, not giving them what we give ourselves, but a fair compensation for the labor they are expected to do. And I believe if the Public Printer is a man fitted for the place he occupies the law should remain as it now is, allowing him to pay such compensation as in his judgment is fitting and proper for the services which these men are rendering.

I am opposed, Mr. Chairman, to the whole provision contained in these four lines. But if we are to have this provision, let us establish the price with reference to the prices paid in the place where these men do their work.

Mr. GARFIELD. This is a proposition to pay them 6 per cent. more than they ask.

Mr. CONGER. If this were a proposition the exact nature of which any member of this House could understand or which could be ascertained by any sort of calculation, I would vote for it. But I venture to say that if this provision be adopted the Congressional Printer, if he executes the law, will be required to spend at least two-thirds of every month in the year in these cities of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore examining all the rates of pay for similar kinds of work in those cities in order that he may be able to establish the rates for Government employes here. Who doubts that proposition? In saying two-thirds of every month I may be saying too much. The Congressional Printer, if he was active and worked nights, might have to spend only half of each month in finding out what were the rates of wages for similar work in each of those cities. Therefore I say this proposition of the committee is entirely impracticable.

Mr. GARFIELD. It is the same principle as is adopted in relation to the navy-yards and wherever you employ expert labor, that the workmen shall be employed at the average price paid for similar work.

Mr. CONGER. The gentleman's argument is in favor of the amendment of my friend from New York, [Mr. HOSKINS;] because in the case he refers to the work is paid for according to the price paid for similar work in the town or city where the navy-yard is. I submit that the proposition of the committee is utterly impracticable.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have not heard, nor has anybody pretended, that the Congressional Printer has paid improper rates for work since he has had the public printing in charge. Nobody suggests such a thing. He hires men, the best he can get, under his responsibility to this Government and knowing that he is watched by those who have attacked or may attack him here, for the Congressional Printer has not escaped an attack upon this floor any session of the House since I have been a member of Congress. He hires men, as he is bound to do in the interest of the Government, for the lowest price for which he can obtain them to do the work well. And the work must be done well if it is done at all. Does anybody complain? Do the printers,

do the public, do the democrats, do the republicans of this House ever complain that the Congressional Printer has not paid these men just the wages they earn, no more, no less?

Mr. DONNAN. He pays them just what they ask.

Mr. CONGER. He pays them just what he considers is right, watched as he knows he is by the eagle eyes of every member of this House and exposed to every kind of attack.

Mr. MYERS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. No further debate on this amendment is in order.

Mr. GARFIELD. I call for a vote.

Mr. MYERS. Is an amendment to the amendment in order?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not.

Mr. MYERS. I would like to have the privilege of saying a word or two on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. No further debate on it is in order.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. HOSKINS to the amendment, there were—ayes 49, noes 65; no quorum voting.

Tellers were ordered under the rule; and Mr. HOSKINS and Mr. GARFIELD were appointed.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported ayes 16, noes not counted.

So the amendment to the amendment was not agreed to.

Mr. GARFIELD. I now ask unanimous consent that all debate be closed on the pending paragraph.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The question being upon the motion to strike out the last clause of the paragraph as amended, it was put; and on a division there were ayes 75, noes not counted.

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed the reading, and under the heading "For life-saving stations" read as follows:

For one hundred and two keepers of stations, at \$200 each, \$20,400.

Mr. RANDALL. I find that the number of these keepers appropriated for last year was fifty-four, and now there is a provision for one hundred and two. Why is this increase?

Mr. HALE, of Maine. The gentleman is mistaken as to the number appropriated for last year. He puts it too low. But the increase, such as it is, has been made by acts of Congress that have provided for additional keepers, and the appropriation here is simply to provide for them. The committee have not gone beyond the provisions of law.

The Clerk read as follows:

For building a steam revenue vessel for the Pacific coast, \$125,000.

Mr. CONGER. I move to amend that clause by striking out "a" and inserting the words "an iron;" so that it will read:

For building an iron steam revenue vessel for the Pacific coast, \$125,000.

I wish to say one word in reference to that amendment. The expense of building an iron vessel now for this service is very little greater than that of building one of wood. An iron vessel of this description is much more fitted for the service. It will last three or four times as long as a wooden vessel. The Government has made the experiment in regard to vessels of this class and have had opportunities of comparing the length of time which an iron vessel will last in this service with the time that a wooden vessel will last. A wooden vessel lasts only one-third as long as an iron vessel, so that you would have to build three vessels of wood during the same time that one of iron would last. An iron vessel is better fitted for this service on the Pacific coast, and I think it is wise policy to build all these vessels of iron unless the disparity in price between iron and wooden vessels is great, which it is not. I think they can be made for exactly the same price, although formerly it cost something more to build an iron vessel than a wooden one. I therefore offer this amendment, and desire to test the sense of the committee upon it.

Mr. HALE, of Maine. One of the Senators who represents the State of Oregon appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and asked for an appropriation for the construction of this steam revenue vessel, and we concluded to give it to him. The gentleman from Michigan on my right, who seems to represent the Pacific coast here in the House, comes up here and asks what neither the Department nor the Senator from Oregon who appeared before the committee did ask. Undoubtedly he knows more about their wants than anybody who appeared before the committee.

I do not fully agree with him as to the merits of wood and iron vessels; but I do not want that question precipitated upon the House. It is not stated in this clause which the committee put in the bill whether this revenue-cutter shall be of wood or iron. It will be in the discretion of the Department who have built dozens of these vessels in years past, and who know the merits of wood and iron, and who know whether an iron cutter is better in the waters of Oregon than a wooden cutter, and who know also if it is the reverse and that a wooden cutter is better, to determine which it shall be. In incorporating the clause into the bill the committee left the matter open. They provided only for a steam revenue-cutter. Now, I do not see why the gentleman should force the House here by his amendment to provide that this vessel shall be constructed of iron in case the Department prefer to build it of wood. Is not the gentleman willing to trust the Department with the interest of the Government in this

respect? I am a wooden-vessel man; but although I had the preparation of this part of the bill, I did not pretend to put in that which would carry out my own theories about ship-building and tie down the Department to a wooden vessel. Is there any more fairness in the proposition of the gentleman from Michigan, to tie them down to an iron vessel, than there would have been if I had tried to tie them down to a wooden vessel? Let us leave the clause as it is, and then if the gentleman has any argument either to the Department or to his constituents in Oregon for iron vessels, let him make it, and perhaps they will build this vessel of iron; but leave it, at least, in the discretion of the Department.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman moves to amend his own amendment.

Mr. CONGER. No, sir; I move to strike out the last word of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not germane to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CONGER. It is; it proposes to perfect the amount to be appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] says ironically that I know more about this than he does and more than some others do. The gentleman need not have made that statement ironically; the House knew it without his saying so. The point of the irony fails because of the truth of the remark.

Mr. HALE, of Maine. Who knows it?

Mr. CONGER. The gentleman knows it, and if he is as honest as I am he will say what he thinks. The gentleman has not made one single objection to the force of the argument which I used for the construction of an iron vessel, because he cannot do so. He cannot give any good reason why this clause should not be amended as I have proposed. He says that in preparing this clause he left it so that the Department should not be bound to a wooden vessel, requiring to be rebuilt in ten years. In that the gentleman exercised his usual good sense. But I go a step further, and ask that this bill shall provide for an economically built vessel which will last. Last year after full discussion Congress directed vessels of this class to be built of iron. Those vessels have been so built, and are found to meet exactly the demands of the service. They are the best kind of ships, and the most economical, and we ought to look at that consideration. The gentleman has no interest in this vessel; it is not going to the coast of Maine.

Mr. HALE, of Maine. Nor is it to go to the Michigan lakes.

Mr. CONGER. Nor is there any iron manufactory in my district. But I thank God I can rise above anything that pertains merely to the coast of Michigan or the coast of Maine.

Mr. HALE, of Maine. O, the gentleman can fly very high.

Mr. CONGER. Yes; and I can go horizontally, too, and look at the whole country spread before me and its interests. Now, if there is any objection to this, any reason why this amendment should not be adopted, then let the gentleman arise in his place and state it. I withdraw the formal amendment to the amendment.

The question was upon the amendment of Mr. CONGER to insert the words "an iron" before the words "steam revenue vessel."

Mr. BURLEIGH. I hope this amendment will not be adopted. It is known that many iron ships navigating the ocean have been lost in consequence of the variation of the compass on board the ships. A revenue-cutter is continually running along the coast from headland to headland. It is very necessary that the compasses on ships shall be reliable, and it is almost impossible to rely on a compass on an iron ship. I hope this amendment will not be adopted.

The amendment was not agreed to, upon a division ayes 31, noes not counted.

The following was read:

National currency:

For paper, engraving, printing, express charges, and other expenses of making and issuing the national currency, \$110,000.

Mr. MERRIAM. I move to amend the clause just read by adding to it the following words: "to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury."

The amendment was agreed to.

The following was read:

For expenses in detecting and bringing to trial and punishment persons engaged in counterfeiting Treasury notes, bonds, national bank notes, and other securities of the United States, and the coinage thereof, and for detecting other frauds upon the Government, \$125,000.

Mr. RANDALL. The same addition should be made to this paragraph which was made to the last. There has been a great deal of scandal concerning the manner in which this money has heretofore been expended. We ought to have some officer held directly responsible for the honest expenditure of this money.

Mr. GARFIELD. There is no objection to putting in the words indicated; it does not change the law. This money is now expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill, and read the following:

For payment of the necessary expenses incurred in defending suits against the Secretary of the Treasury, or his agents, for the seizure of captured or abandoned property; and for the examination of witnesses in claims against the United States pending in any Department; and for the defense of the United States in the Court of Claims, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney-General, \$30,000.

Mr. COX. I want to go back to the paragraph in relation to the expenses of the courts of the United States.

The paragraph referred to was as follows:

JUDICIARY.

For defraying the expenses of the courts of the United States, including the District of Columbia; for jurors and witnesses and expenses of suits in which the United States are concerned, of prosecutions for offenses committed against the United States; for the safe-keeping of prisoners; and for the expenses which may be incurred in the enforcement of the act relative to the right of citizens to vote, of February 28, 1871, or any acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, \$3,000,000.

Mr. COX. I want to have a bill of particulars.

Mr. GARFIELD. I object to going back.

Mr. COX. I could not stop the Clerk as he was reading.

Mr. GARFIELD. I did not want to stop him.

Mr. COX. He went on with a momentum that was terrific.

Mr. GARFIELD. I object to going back.

Mr. COX. Then the people will go back on your bill.

The Clerk read the following:

For this amount, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the amount of three several judgments rendered by the circuit and district court for the southern district of Ohio, against Reuben H. Stephenson, the surveyor of the port of Cincinnati, \$1,016.86.

Mr. DUNNELL. I move to strike out this paragraph. I would like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARFIELD] to state how these judgments were obtained, whether they have been before the Committee on the Judiciary, and in what manner they came before the Committee on Appropriations. These claims usually go first to the Committee on Claims or to some other appropriate committee. Now we know nothing about this matter.

Mr. GARFIELD. These are regular judgments of a court. The Secretary of the Treasury forwarded a letter to the Committee on Appropriations, saying that so much money was needed to pay these judgments, and showing what the judgments of the court were. This appropriation is reported upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury. The matter was referred to a sub-committee of the Committee on Appropriations and that sub-committee have found that these are regular judgments of the court, and there is nothing left us to do but to pay these judgments.

Mr. DUNNELL. I would ask the gentleman from Ohio why interest is not allowed in this case when it is allowed at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum in the very next case following this in this bill? We are not in the habit of allowing interest on these claims. Why is it not allowed in this instance when it is allowed in the next?

Mr. GARFIELD. We follow the judgment of the court itself. The gentleman will find on pages 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the report of the committee a full statement of the facts in this case, together with all the papers bearing upon it. On page 7 is the letter of the Attorney-General; that is followed by a letter from the Solicitor-General; then there is another letter from the Attorney-General, addressed to the United States attorney at Cincinnati; then follow a series of letters concerning the judgment provided for in the next paragraph of the bill.

Mr. DUNNELL. What reason can be given for allowing interest in the one case and not in the other?

Mr. GARFIELD. No other reason than that we have followed the judgment of the court.

Mr. DUNNELL. I withdraw my motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the introduction of shad into the waters of the Pacific States, the Gulf States, and of the Mississippi Valley, and of salmon, white-fish, and other useful food fishes into the waters of the United States to which they are best adapted, \$17,500, to be expended under the direction of the United States commissioner of fish and fisheries.

Mr. HARRIS, of Virginia. I move to amend this paragraph by making the appropriation \$50,000 instead of \$17,500. It has been shown in the report of the United States commissioner on the subject how important fish are as an element of human food; and in view of that fact an appropriation of \$17,500 seems almost a mockery. Some thirteen years ago a few black bass were thrown into the Potomac from the water-tank of a passing train; and now not only this river but all its tributaries for many miles up are filled with the finest bass fish imaginable, furnishing food for thousands of people. If gentlemen will reflect for a moment on the number of persons in the United States with whom fish is a main article of food, they will see the importance of this question. The whole country is waking up to the importance of the culture of fish, for the interest of the rich and the poor. I hope, therefore, that \$50,000 will be appropriated, to be expended by the commissioner of fish for the purpose indicated in the bill.

Mr. GARFIELD. I rise to oppose the amendment, and ask for a vote.

Mr. KASSON. What was the estimate?

Mr. GARFIELD. The estimate was \$17,500. Let us stand by that.

Mr. FRYE. Let me say a single word. Seventeen thousand five hundred dollars will furnish more food fish for the rivers of this country to-day than \$50,000 would have furnished five years ago before the United States commenced this work. At that time we paid forty-five dollars a thousand in gold for the eggs of salmon and trout. To-day, by the help of the United States, through these appropriations, we

are getting such eggs for four dollars a thousand, and sending them over the country.

Mr. KASSON. Does the gentleman consider this appropriation sufficient?

Mr. FRYE. I am inclined to think it is. The States, led on by the United States, are now doing this work themselves to a very large extent.

Mr. HARRIS, of Virginia. This appropriation is for "the introduction of shad into the waters of the Pacific States, the Gulf States, and of the Mississippi Valley, and of salmon, white-fish, and other useful food fishes into the waters of the United States to which they are best adapted." Now, how can \$17,500 be sufficient to supply the whole country from east to west? It would cost almost that amount to transport upon the railroads of the country the person who attends to this business, saying nothing of the cost of buying the fish.

The amendment of Mr. HARRIS, of Virginia, was not agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the thirteen crippled and disabled soldiers now in the employment of the Door-keeper of the House of Representatives, from July 1 to December 7, 1874, \$9,653.20.

Mr. KELLOGG. I move to amend by adding after the paragraph just read the following:

To enable the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay for extra clerical services in the Committee on War Claims, rendered necessary by reports of the commissioners of claims, \$500.

The amendment has the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on War Claims. It was necessary to have these clerical services in order to prepare the papers of the southern claims commissioners as reported to us for the action of the House. It was impossible for the regular clerk of the committee to do all this work; and we had detailed from the office of the commissioners of claims a clerk, Mr. Everett, who I may say is a relative of Edward Everett, and who was serving at a salary of \$1,200 a year. But instead of being occupied during only the usual hours of labor, from nine a. m. to three p. m., he has been obliged, while detailed for service in connection with our committee clerk, to work almost regularly the whole day and evening up to ten o'clock in preparing papers and completing the proofs in connection with the report of the commissioners. He has also been required to examine cases previously reported whenever any precedents or other information were called for. Over four thousand cases have been reported to Congress from that commission since its organization. I trust there will be no objection on the part of the Committee on Appropriations to this amendment. I admit that the person who will receive this money is now drawing a salary of \$1,200; but since the 1st of January he has been occupied every day and as late as ten o'clock at night. He is as faithful a clerk as there is in the service or employ of any committee of this House.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAYNARD. I move to amend by adding after the amendment just adopted the following:

That an amount sufficient for that purpose is hereby appropriated to enable the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay from the date of the salary-repeal act of January 20, 1874, the additional sums required to restore the salary of the assistant disbursing clerk, the principal engrossing clerk, and the clerk to the Committee on Appropriations to the rate of compensation each received the day prior to that date.

This amendment provides for three old and most efficient servants of the House, gentlemen who have been here for many years, the disbursing clerk, Mr. Bailey, and the chief engrossing clerk, Mr. Strohm, who have been here some twenty years and whose character for fidelity is as familiar to the House as the Clerk's desk, and the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations. We raised their salaries to what we thought was right when we were attempting to adjust the salaries of the various officers of the House, but by the repeal of the salary act last January we cut them down. It seems to me they should have no less than we gave them by our former legislation, and it is no more than right we should restore them to what we gave them at that time. They are men who have given a life-time almost to our service here. If well-doing can entitle them to consideration, well-doing certainly abundantly entitles them. I do not wish to protract the debate but submit the proposition to the fair consideration of the House, and I hope there will be no objection to it.

Mr. GARFIELD. I rise to make the point of order on the amendment that it changes existing law.

Mr. ARCHER. The gentleman's point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late, as the proposition has been debated.

Mr. MAYNARD. It is, it seems to me, somewhat ungracious in my friend from Ohio to make a point on this amendment even if he could make it.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 20, noes 55; no quorum voting.

Mr. MAYNARD. I demand tellers, for it is manifest the committee have failed to apprehend the nature of the amendment.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. MAYNARD and Mr. GARFIELD were appointed.

Mr. MAYNARD. I hope gentlemen of the committee will examine the amendment, and they will see it is just and ought to be passed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported ayes 26, noes not counted.

Mr. MAYNARD. I do not ask for any further count. So the amendment was rejected. The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Clerk of the House to pay to the widow of David B. Mellish, late a member of this House, a sum equal to the salary of a member of Congress from the date of the death of said Mellish to the date of the election of his successor, \$2,288.

Mr. WOODFORD. I desire to offer the following amendment:

Strike out in lines 209 and 210, on pages 9 and 10, the words "to the date of the election of his successor, \$2,288," and insert in lieu thereof the words "to the end of the Forty-third Congress, \$3,698."

I desire simply to state the amendment I offer is in accordance with the direction of the House given to this committee a few days since, and I send the following extract from the RECORD to be read:

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARY OF THE LATE MR. MELLISH.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent to submit the following resolution for adoption at this time:

"Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, directed to cause to be paid from the contingent fund of the House to the widow of David B. Mellish, deceased, late a member of this House, a sum equal to the amount of his salary as a member of this House from the date of his death to the end of the Forty-third Congress."

Mr. GARFIELD. I suggest to the gentleman to ask authority for such a provision to be put on the deficiency bill, which will be up for consideration in a few days. We cannot pay that out of the contingent fund of the House very well without having trouble with the accounting officers of the Treasury. If he will just ask consent of the House to let it be put on the deficiency bill I think it would be better.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. I will do so.

No objection being made, leave was accordingly granted.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts, moved to reconsider the order just made; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. WOODFORD. Now, by inadvertence of course, the Committee on Appropriations have omitted to do that which the House unanimously directed, and of course they will be glad to have this opportunity to make the correction and carry out the suggestion of the honorable gentleman from Ohio, chairman of that committee. That is all I think I need say to the House.

Mr. GARFIELD. It seems, Mr. Chairman, ungracious to oppose anything which appeals so much to the sympathies of gentlemen as this does, but the same day on which this proposition was sent to the Committee on Appropriations a law was passed providing that hereafter, in the case of the death of any member, his pay should be delivered to his widow or heirs up to the date of the election of his successor. This will disarrange the law for the future. In this case it is trice the language of the resolution read seems to indicate another rule, but the resolution itself authorizes the Committee on Appropriations to put it in. It did not ask them to bring it in the very language of the resolution. There were no directory words in the resolution itself. It was sent to the Committee on Appropriations, and at the time this Committee on Appropriations had this matter under consideration they believed it their duty to look over the precedents, and they found, so far as the history of cases will show, that in no case has the pay of a deceased member been continued to the end of the Congress to which he had been elected.

Mr. STARKWEATHER. I think the chairman of the committee is mistaken, as it appears there was the case of Mr. Speer, of Georgia, whose pay was given to his family up to the end of the Congress to which he was elected.

Mr. GARFIELD. It is true they paid his family up to the end of the session, which in that case happened to be the end of the Congress; but the language of the resolution did not say end of the Congress but the end of the session, which of course was tantamount to the end of the Congress in that case.

Mr. STARKWEATHER. Let me correct the gentleman. Mr. Speer, of Georgia, died in May or June during the recess between the first and second sessions. His successor was chosen in the fall, but Mr. Speer's family were paid his salary till the close of that Congress, which was on the 4th of March following. It was an exceptional case, I admit.

Mr. GARFIELD. It seemed to the committee that it would be very unwise to set a precedent which might be applied to the case of a member who died in the first week of a Congress. The committee were influenced in making the recommendation they do by the desire to avoid just such a precedent as that, and by the consideration also that for a proper and wise reason gentlemen here, members of Congress—and I would not have named it but for this discussion—have contributed out of their own funds or authorized the Sergeant-at-Arms to pay over to the widow of Mr. Mellish twenty-five dollars each. I think several thousand dollars have been raised in that way. And the Committee on Appropriations thought it desirable that the individual sympathies of members of the House should be shown in that form rather than we should set a precedent which would be inconvenient hereafter by providing for this payment to the end of the Congress.

Mr. CROOKE. I rise to a question of order. Is it in order to refer to the individual action of members of the House?

Mr. GARFIELD. I was in order in what I said. I only regret that the offering of this amendment should have made it necessary for me to have said it. I hope the House will not set a precedent in this case which would be a bad precedent to follow hereafter.

Mr. CONGER. When the House was considering the bill fixing the mode of payment in the case of the death of a member I rose in my place and moved an amendment which would have excepted the case of Mr. Mellish from the operation of that law, as the records I presume will show. When I offered that amendment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARFIELD] and other gentlemen suggested that the case of Mr. Mellish would be provided for by a separate provision in an appropriation bill; and upon that suggestion I withdrew the amendment. I believe it was the judgment of the House at that time, although it did not come to a vote, that that case should have been excepted from the law; and I withdrew the motion to except the case from that law on the express understanding, and which was agreed to by the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. BUTLER,] that he would prepare the resolution, which immediately afterward received the sanction of the House. Under these circumstances this case cannot be made a precedent, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. RANDALL. I think this is such a case as has never before occurred in the history of the country; nor is it likely I hope ever to occur again. This gentleman came to his death from overwork in this House and in his home while preparing himself for the discharge of his duties here, directly under our own eyes; and he was taken from here to the insane asylum. He has left his wife penniless, and I think it is the smallest matter in the world that the United States shall contribute something as a mark of distinction due under the circumstances of his death, on account of the way in which he discharged his public duties, an honest sense of duty being one of the most prominent features of his character, so far as I had an opportunity of observing them. I do not think, sir, that our action in this case should be governed by any general law. It should be made an exception to all general laws and all general rules upon this subject.

I hope, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOODFORD] will prevail, so that the widow of this man who was stricken down here almost right under our eyes may receive his salary to the end of the term for which he was elected.

The question being taken on Mr. WOODFORD's amendment, it was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For postage-stamps for the offices of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives, and the Secretary of the Senate, \$100 each, and for the Postmaster of the House, \$50; \$350.

Mr. GARFIELD. There should be \$250 appropriated for postage to the Sergeant-at-Arms. He has a large amount of correspondence in transacting his accounts, and this appropriation is necessary to reimburse him for his expenditures in that way. I offer the following amendment:

Add to the paragraph the following:

And for amount already expended by the Sergeant-at-Arms for postage the sum of \$250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Postmaster-General to pay for twenty thousand copies quarterly of the Official Postal Guide, to be compiled and published under contract not to extend more than five years, to be made with parties doing said work at the lowest rate, \$30,000.

Mr. GARFIELD. I offer the following amendment:

In line 227 strike out "\$30,000" and insert the words "not exceeding \$30,000."

The amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

To pay W. T. Clark the balance due him for payments made on account of the purchase and repair of furniture for the post-office in the United States custom-house at Galveston, Texas, during the fiscal years ending the 30th day of June, 1872 and 1873, \$1,573.58, or so much thereof as may be found due him by the proper accounting officers of the Treasury.

Mr. WOOD. I move to strike out that paragraph, and I make the motion for the purpose of getting some explanation from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations with reference to this extraordinary appropriation. This gentleman, W. T. Clark, was lately postmaster at Galveston, Texas. He is reported to be a defaulter. We have no reason to believe that he has yet been able to settle his accounts. At any rate, whether he has done so or not, a postmaster has no right to create an obligation which the Government is bound to pay. He cannot purchase furniture for his office and then have an appropriation to pay for it inserted in a regular appropriation bill, unless it goes through the regular course in the proper Department of the Government. Now, I want to know from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, as I find no reference to this appropriation in the report presented with this bill, whether the Postmaster-General recommends this appropriation, whether there are any documents by which it can be sustained, whether there is any precedent for an appropriation like this being put into an appropriation bill to pay obligations incurred by a postmaster who is in default to the Government?

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

Here the committee rose informally; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of their clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, the bill (H. R. No. 3601) to admit free of duty articles intended for the international exhibition of 1876.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed a bill (S. No. 750) to compel the performance of certain duties by clerks of courts of the United States; in which he was directed to ask the concurrence of the House.

MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union then resumed its session.

Mr. GARFIELD. I ask my colleague on the committee from Indiana [Mr. TYNER] to answer the question of the gentleman from New York, [Mr. WOOD.]

Mr. TYNER. Mr. Chairman, when the proposition was made in the Committee on Appropriations to provide this appropriation for the benefit of Clark, late postmaster at Galveston, I went to the Post-Office Department, and to the Auditor of the Treasury for that Department, to inquire into the condition of his accounts. I was there informed that the accounts of Clark had been fully settled, that so far as his accounts as postmaster were concerned they did not show the balance of a single dollar due to the Government of the United States.

This appropriation is intended to cover certain expenses that were incurred in the post-office at Galveston for furnishing the building in which the office was kept, which is a Government building, and I believe the Secretary of the Treasury has recommended the payment of this amount.

Mr. WOOD. Where is the document?

Mr. TYNER. I would say to the gentleman that the accounts are those that can be settled solely by the Treasury Department, and do not enter at all into the accounts of the Post-Office Department. So far as the Post-Office Department is concerned, I am informed not only at that Department, but by the Sixth Auditor of the Treasury, that there is no balance against Mr. Clark.

Mr. LOUGHRIDGE. If the gentleman will yield to me for a moment I have here a letter which I desire him to have read as a part of his remarks.

Mr. WOOD. I desire to say that it is generally understood, and I believe that it cannot be disputed, that this man Clark never intends to return to Galveston, so that if any persons there have furnished the Government with furniture for this office, he is not the proper person to pay it for them to get the money. I hope therefore that the gentleman will, at least, consent to an alteration of this paragraph so as to provide that the Government shall pay the parties who are entitled to the money.

Mr. TYNER. In answer to that I will say that I do not know about the intentions of Mr. Clark. He may intend to return to Galveston or he may not. I never talked with him on the subject. I have no objection to the appropriation being properly guarded.

Mr. SPEER. I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from New York as follows:

Strike out the paragraph in the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following:

To enable the Postmaster-General to pay the balance due on account of the purchase and repair of furniture for the post-office in the United States custom-house at Galveston, Texas, during the fiscal years ending the 30th day of June, 1872 and 1873, \$1,573.58, or so much thereof as may be found due by the Sixth Auditor of the Treasury: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be paid until vouchers properly receipted from the parties who actually furnished the goods shall be filed with the said Auditor: *And provided further*, That no part thereof shall be paid to W. T. Clark until the final adjustment of his accounts with the Post-Office Department.

Mr. RANDALL. I suggest to my colleague that the latter part of that amendment is unnecessary.

Mr. SPEER. Yes, it is; he may have the vouchers. I think if the committee have listened carefully to the reading of the amendment they will agree that it is a very proper amendment. It has been charged in the newspapers that this man Clark is a defaulter to the Government. Whether that charge is true or not I do not pretend to say; but it is further charged, and I believe that charge to be true, that he has left Galveston and does not intend to return there again.

He claims to have appropriated a certain amount of money in furnishing the post-office building at Galveston. I believe him to be at this time an irresponsible man. Hence my amendment provides, not that the articles which he furnished should not be paid for, but that the parties from whom he bought them shall be paid for them. If this man, W. T. Clark, has actually paid the bills for the articles, then my amendment provides that he shall be paid upon the final settlement of his accounts with the Post-Office Department.

I am not here to speak for the Postmaster-General, but I have been informed this day by him that the accounts of Mr. Clark are not yet closed at the Post-Office Department. Therefore if this amount shall be paid to him now, and if he were to produce to the Post-Office Department the original receipts of the parties from whom he bought this furniture, and get the money from the Government, it might hereafter turn out upon the settlement of his accounts that he was indebted to the Government more than the amount here appropriated.

Mr. LOUGHRIDGE. The gentleman has no right to rise here and say that this gentleman is indebted to the United States.

Mr. SPEER. I did not say that he was; I said it might turn out so on the final settlement of his accounts.

Mr. LOUGHRIDGE. The gentleman might say that in regard to any claim before Congress. We have here the word of the gentleman

man from Indiana [Mr. TYNER] who has had charge of the post-office appropriation bill, and who himself went to the Treasury Department to ascertain the facts. He states that the Postmaster-General told him, and I say that he told him in my presence, that Mr. Clark did not owe the Department a single farthing. Now, I do not see what right, when here is an honest claim recommended by the Department, the gentleman has to get up here and say that it is stated in the newspapers that this gentleman is a defaulter, and then spread upon the record an insult to the claimant by saying that this amount shall not be paid him until his accounts are settled by the Department. Here is a claim covering many items, some thirty or forty of them—many of them quite small. They have all been paid by Mr. Clark, but this amendment would require him to go back and obtain receipts from the parties from whom he bought them.

Mr. SPEER. If they have been paid my amendment will not hurt him.

Mr. LOUGHRIDGE. I ask the Clerk to read a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury upon this subject.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1874.

SIR: General W. T. Clark, the postmaster at Galveston, Texas, incurred without authority from this Department an expenditure of \$2,585.52 in the year 1872, in the purchase and repair of furniture, &c., for the post-office under his charge, and when bills were presented to this office they were disallowed, because the expenditure had not been previously authorized by the Department and for the further reason that the amounts paid by the postmaster were exorbitant. As, however, it appeared from the reports of the custodian that the expenditures were necessary for the proper transaction of the work under the charge of the postmaster, a special agent of the Department was instructed to inspect the work and review the bills therefor, making a report to this office. In the report made by the special agent he valued the work at \$1,738.60, but his estimate therefor not being in detail, and there being no appropriation from which the amount could be properly paid at the date of the same, payment was suspended. Subsequently the superintendent of repairs employed by the Department to repair and remodel the building was instructed to investigate the matter and report to this Department. His report nearly coincided with that of the special agent, he valuing the work at the sum of \$1,873.58, which report was accepted by the Department, but as the expenditure was incurred in the fiscal year of 1872-73, and the appropriation to which the work was properly chargeable—"furniture and repairs of furniture for public buildings"—being exhausted, the entire amount could not be paid. The postmaster has presented with his account for the work receipted bills from the parties to whom the payments were made, and one of said vouchers was paid, namely, one in favor of J. Kerslake, amounting to \$454, as presented by the postmaster by the sum of \$300, for which amount the public creditor granted a receipt in full for all the material and labor supplied by him, that being the amount recommended by the special agent and the superintendent of repairs. The balance now remaining due under the superintendent's report is \$1,573.58, for which amount a special appropriation should be made in order to properly pay the same; and I have the honor to request that an appropriation of said amount, or so much thereof as may be found due by the proper accounting officers of the Treasury, may be made during the present session of Congress for the relief of said postmaster.

Inclosed please find a statement of the original bills, with the amounts allowed by the special agent and superintendent of repairs referred to above.

Very respectfully,

WM. A. RICHARDSON,
Secretary.

HON. JAMES A. GARFIELD,

Chairman Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

Mr. LOUGHRIDGE. I submit that we might just as well put upon a general appropriation bill a proviso that before the gentleman is paid his salary he shall be required to bring a receipt from the tailor in town from whom he bought his coat, or from his landlady that he has paid his board bill. That would be just as appropriate as it is to put his amendment upon this provision. This item was sent to the Secretary of the Treasury, he has indorsed it as correct, having sent two special messengers there to examine the account.

Mr. SPEER. I saw the Postmaster-General within the last half-hour, and he suggested the last proviso to the amendment which I have offered. The Secretary of the Treasury says that these goods were purchased for the use of the post-office, but he does not pretend to certify that the accounts of the postmaster with the Post-Office Department have been settled. What motive can the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LOUGHRIDGE] have for rising here and attempting to defeat an amendment which has for its purpose and object only the protection of the interests of the Government? Does he stand here for the purpose of securing to this man, Clark, what is not due him, before his account with the Government is settled, compelling the Government to pay him, when perhaps at this very hour he may be in debt to the Government? My amendment is in the line of honesty and justice to the Government, and not in the line of favoritism to a man who has not been a faithful public officer.

Mr. LOUGHRIDGE. The gentleman is mistaken in his insinuation. I simply know this gentleman. I throw back the insinuation of the gentleman; it is unfounded, and he has no right to make it. It is unfounded and ungenerous.

Mr. SPEER. It is justified by the gentleman's position.

Mr. LOUGHRIDGE. No, sir; it is not.

Mr. SPEER. Coming here as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, whose duty it should be to protect the Government, the gentleman pleads the cause of a man who stands in a most doubtful attitude before the country as a public officer. I make no insinuation, but leave the gentleman where he places himself.

Mr. TYNER. I move *pro forma* to amend by striking out \$73.58. I make this motion for the purpose merely of submitting a brief statement. The statement I made a few minutes since in regard to this matter corresponded precisely with the information I had obtained at the Post-Office Department, namely, that the accounts of

the postmaster at Galveston, so far as settled, did not show a balance due from him to the Government. But since this matter has come up in the House I, too, have had a conversation with the Postmaster-General, in which he has stated that recent developments indicate that when the account shall be finally settled there may be and probably will be a balance against this man Clark. Now, I do not want to be regarded as the champion of Mr. Clark on this floor, nor would I have appeared in this debate at all but for the fact that when the matter was brought before the Committee on Appropriations I objected to providing for this payment until information could be obtained from the Post-Office Department. After I had made inquiries and had made my report to the committee, they agreed to embody this appropriation in the pending bill. But after the statement of the Postmaster-General my judgment, looking over the whole ground, is that the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPEER] ought to be adopted.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FARWELL. I move to amend by inserting after the amendment just adopted the following:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of the appropriation already made the duly audited bills of Thomas H. Robb and Richard H. Savage, late United States commissioners upon the Mexican boundary, for balances due to them, the sum paid not to exceed \$943.50 to each of said late commissioners.

I desire only to say that the Committee on Appropriations understand this amendment and do not object to it.

Mr. BECK. I rise to oppose the amendment. I want to know whether or not it is recommended by the Committee on Appropriations or how it comes here?

Mr. HALE, of Maine. It is not recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BECK. Is there any law by which this appropriation is authorized? I hope it will not be adopted unless there is some recommendation from some committee, or unless we have some satisfactory information in regard to it. I would like to know how these balances arose and where they came from.

Mr. HALE, of Maine. If the gentleman will permit me, I will tell him. The Committee on Appropriations did not put this item in the bill for this reason: The gentlemen named here were Texas boundary commissioners; they were paid at certain rates per day fixed by law. At a certain time the appropriation for one year ran out, and they came home here to Washington. Soon afterward a new appropriation was passed by Congress, and they went back to Texas and set to work again. They made claim (and that is what this item covers) for certain days' time and certain expenses of office rent during the interval when they were here between the two appropriations. The Secretary of State, in whose Department the matter came, declined to allow these payments. There was an issue between him and the commissioners. His books show that according to his manner of keeping the account the commissioners have received pay for all the time that he says they were employed. They, on the other hand, claim that during the days intervening between the two appropriations they were at work preparing their report, were obliged to hire an office, and incurred some other incidental expenses. That is the point involved; and it is one of conflict between the commissioners and the State Department.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. How old is this claim?

Mr. HALE, of Maine. It arose only the year before last. The Committee on Appropriations in providing for the expenses of the different Departments of the Government did not feel authorized so to act as to antagonize the State Department's method of book-keeping in the administration of a certain fund. We had provided the appropriation; it had passed into the hands of the Secretary of State, and the committee, I repeat, did not feel authorized on its own responsibility to embody in the bill a clause which should interfere with the Secretary of State in the administration of that fund. This is the reason the appropriation was not inserted in the bill.

Mr. BECK. Was not this subject up two or three years ago?

Mr. HALE, of Maine. No, sir.

Mr. BECK. How old is the claim?

Mr. HALE, of Maine. Gentlemen will remember that the Texan commission first started in the season of 1872, and closed its labors about September, 1873. I think that this claim covers the last days of 1872. It has never been before Congress heretofore.

Mr. BECK. I had an impression that it had been rejected heretofore.

Mr. HALE, of Maine. We have had before us, of course, the appropriations for the Texan commission, and have had discussion upon those appropriations. But I do not remember that this appropriation has ever been up before.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, is not this amendment liable to the point of order that it proposes to make appropriation for a claim not provided for by law?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to the opinion that after the amendment has been debated on both sides the point of order is made too late.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I move to strike out the last word. It is proposed now to disregard the books of the State Department, and without any evidence at all except the simple statement of these commis-

sioners to pay their claims. I think that ought not to be done. I do not believe private claims simply on the statements of the claimants themselves, without any evidence at all laid before the House, should be paid in opposition to the books of the State Department, and especially when it comes in an appropriation bill of this sort where it is not legitimate business. I withdraw my amendment to the amendment.

Mr. FARWELL's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCCRARY. I move to insert the following:

That the proper accounting officer shall allow and pay to Eunice Barcus whatever sum may be found to have been due to her step-son, Henry Barcus, as bounty or arrears of pay as a private of Company K, Eighth Regiment Iowa Veteran Volunteers, at the time of his death, and in accordance with his last will and testament, and the sum required for this purpose is hereby appropriated.

Mr. STORM. I make the point of order on that amendment that it provides for an appropriation not required to be made by law.

Mr. MCCRARY. I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to withdraw his point of order for a moment.

Mr. STORM. I will withhold the point of order until the gentleman makes his statement.

Mr. MCCRARY. This is the case of a soldier who died in the service, having made a will giving to his step-mother the amount due to him as arrears of pay and bounty. He left no heirs whatever. He had been raised by his step-mother and had no other person he desired to leave his pay to. Under the statute the Department does not recognize the will, and will not pay the arrears of pay and bounty to this step-mother unless authorized so to do by Congress. That is the whole case, and I hope my friend from Pennsylvania will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. STORM. There are two objections to it. In the first place, there is no heirs now entitled to these arrears of pay and bounty. That is one objection. In the next place, this is a bad place, in an appropriation bill, to come in with a provision like this to pay bounty in the case of a single soldier.

This, like all other similar cases, should come in in a general bill and not be inserted in an appropriation bill. There are thousands of cases of soldiers who are entitled to bounty, but they should all come in together, and not one favored at the expense of others.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MCCRARY. I hope the Chair will reconsider his decision. The amount to pay this bounty and arrears of pay is already provided for by law. It is due under the laws of the land, and an appropriation has been made for it. This is only a provision directing its payment according to the last will and testament of this soldier.

Mr. STORM. Who would get this under the law?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the law now provide this money shall be paid in accordance with the proposed amendment?

Mr. MCCRARY. If it is not paid under the last will and testament of this soldier it cannot be paid at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair inquires of the gentleman from Iowa whether he can suggest any law which requires the payment of money as provided for in this amendment.

Mr. MCCRARY. My friend from Pennsylvania, I am sorry to say, is not willing to listen to reason or humanity.

Mr. STORM. There is no reason in the gentleman's argument, and I wish to say to him that it is only fair all these soldiers shall stand on the same footing, and not one favored at the expense of another.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair decides the amendment to be out of order.

Mr. GARFIELD. I offer the following amendment on my own individual motion and not as coming from the Committee on Appropriations.

The Clerk read as follows:

That there shall be paid to Major-General O. O. Howard, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$7,000, to reimburse him for the expense he incurred in defending his official conduct as Commissioner of Freedmen's Affairs.

Mr. SPEER. I make the point of order that this is an appropriation of money not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio state there is any law authorizing this appropriation of money?

Mr. GARFIELD. I am not certain whether there is any law for that or not. I call the attention of the Chair, however, to the fact that it proposes an appropriation of money to enable an officer of the Government to reimburse himself for defending his official conduct. I am not clear in my mind that is not a proper appropriation for carrying on the official functions of Government. I leave it to the wiser judgment of the chairman.

Mr. SPEER. Does the gentleman know of any other alleged criminal whose expenses were asked to be paid by the Government?

Mr. GARFIELD. I will suggest that during the war we did pass a law which I believe is now upon our statute-books, to indemnify officers of the Army for prosecutions instituted against them.

Mr. SPEER. This was not a prosecution brought against General Howard for anything he did as a soldier.

Mr. GARFIELD. I think this will come under that law.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will direct attention to the particular law to which he refers the Chair will give his decision on it.

Mr. GARFIELD. I understand from the chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws that that provision is still contained in

the revised laws, and this amendment therefore which I have moved is plainly within the law of the United States under which officers thus prosecuted are indemnified for their expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will entertain the amendment at the time the gentleman from Ohio will call his attention to the law under which he holds it in order.

Mr. HALE, of Maine. Let the right of the gentleman from Ohio to offer the amendment be reserved until he can direct the attention of the Chair to the law he has referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will reserve his decision till then.

Mr. GARFIELD. If there be no objection, I desire to make this general statement. This subject was not before the Committee on Appropriations. But I desire, in asking the attention of the Committee of the Whole and of all gentlemen who hear me on this proposition, to appeal to that Anglo-Saxon sense of fair play that I believe exists in the breast of every man without regard to party affiliations. Here is an officer who has undergone a series of most searching examinations into his official conduct. For years he has had a most difficult duty, with the largest responsibility thrown upon him, the largest discretion being intrusted to him, and after all the work has been done and all the examinations into his official conduct have been made, the highest military court on this continent, after long and patient investigation, have reached the unanimous conclusion that his official career in all matters investigated by the court has been pure and worthy in every respect. That, as I understand, was the unanimous decision of the court.

Mr. RANDALL. Does the gentleman say that it was the "unanimous" judgment of the court?

Mr. GARFIELD. I do say it, and I have the highest official authority for saying it.

Mr. SPEER. I wish to ask the gentleman a question. Did he ever propose any appropriation to reimburse President Johnson for his expenditures in defending himself when impeached for the faithful discharge of his duties?

Mr. GARFIELD. General Howard has passed through the fiery ordeal of a public trial, and has been reduced almost to penury by the expenses of defending himself upon that trial. He has been compelled, in the proper defense of his own cause, to use up almost his entire fortune. Under such circumstances it seems to me to be a matter of fair and simple justice that the United States should say that the expenditure thus made shall be a part of its own expenditure, that the defense of the official character of its own servant shall be at the expense of the Government in whose service his work was done. And in this connection I call attention to a clause in the bill we have just passed for payment of the necessary expenses incurred in defending suits against the Secretary of the Treasury or his agents for the seizure of captured and abandoned property, &c.

Mr. ARCHER. That is under a special act.

Mr. GARFIELD. It may be under a special act, but I would simply say that there is a strict analogy between the two cases.

Mr. SPEER. I shall repeat the question which I addressed a moment ago to the gentleman from Ohio. Did he ever propose to pay the expenses of President Johnson when his party attempted to impeach him, and when the judgment, I believe, of the whole civilized world was that he was innocent?

Mr. GARFIELD. I believe he was not acquitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill, and the right of the gentleman from Ohio to offer his amendment will meanwhile be reserved until he shall cite the law to which he has referred.

Mr. BECK. When that amendment comes up I propose to offer as an amendment to it what I send to the desk. I offer it in that same line of Anglo-Saxon fair play of which the gentleman has spoken.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment to the amendment will be reserved until the amendment is considered.

The Clerk read as follows:

That for printing the preparatory circulars, and for printing and binding at the Government Printing Office the report on life-insurance statistics made, under authority of the eighth international statistical congress, by William Barnes, in accordance with plan of publication adopted at said congress, under the direction of the Secretary of State, any unexpended balance of an appropriation for the above purpose, made in the act of March 3, 1873, is hereby continued and rendered available.

Mr. KELLOGG. I offer the following amendment:

At the end of line 250 add the following:

To enable the President of the United States to perfect and put in force such rules regulating the civil service as may from time to time be adopted by him, with authority to allow such compensation for special services under the act of 1871, to persons already in the service of the Government, as he may deem proper, \$25,000; which sum shall include any balance of appropriation for the same object of any previous fiscal years remaining unexpended at the close of the current fiscal year.

I ask consent to have a passage read from the President's message.

Mr. STARKWEATHER. Let me ask my colleague to reserve his amendment for the present and offer it at some future point in the bill.

Mr. KELLOGG. I have examined the bill thoroughly and do not see any place where it would better come in. It would not come in among light-houses or anything of that kind. I have waited until we reached the end of the miscellaneous items. I have sent all over the Capitol for my colleague on the committee, who is absent from the Hall, the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. BUTLER;] I think he will be here before my amendment is disposed of.

Mr. STARKWEATHER. Some members of the Committee on Appropriations who have given attention to this subject are not present just now. I ask my colleague to allow his amendment to be pending. When they are here he can again offer it for discussion.

Mr. BECK. I make the point of order on the amendment that a specific appropriation was made for a specific purpose in connection with the civil-service commission, and that this is creating new powers not granted by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BECK] point out what new powers are created by this amendment which are not granted by law?

Mr. BECK. As I understand it, provision is made for the payment of new commissioners, such as the President may see fit to employ. I think the civil-service act limits the amount to a certain sum to be paid for a certain number of persons.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be again read.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. So much of this amendment as refers to unexpended balances may or may not be a change of existing laws. The Chair is not able to state.

Mr. GARFIELD. I hope the gentleman from Connecticut, [Mr. KELLOGG,] in accordance with the suggestion of his colleague, will allow his amendment to be reserved as pending for the present.

Mr. KELLOGG. Before that is done I ask that a passage from the President's message be read, and also a section of the law.

Mr. PLATT, of Virginia. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asks the gentleman from Connecticut to point out what portion of unexpended balances will be affected by this amendment.

Mr. KELLOGG. If the point of order is insisted on I shall strike out that part of the amendment relating to the unexpended balances. There is now some \$10,000 of the appropriation of \$25,000 last year unexpended, and I made the amendment cover only \$25,000 including that amount. I ask for the reading of the President's message, and also of the law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BECK] insist on so much of the point of order as relates to the unexpended balances?

Mr. KELLOGG. If gentlemen insist upon it, I am willing that this matter shall lie over.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut will suspend his remarks. Does the gentleman from Kentucky insist on so much of his point of order as relates to the unexpended balances?

Mr. BECK. I do; but I have not yet been able to get the statute to see what the law is. I understand, however, that the gentleman from Connecticut proposes to let the amendment lie over.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut insist on the consideration of his amendment now?

Mr. KELLOGG. I should prefer that it shall be considered now.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a simple question, and the gentleman must answer yea or nay.

Mr. KELLOGG. I will consent, on the appeal of my colleague [Mr. STARKWEATHER] and of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that it shall be considered as pending here at this point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the amendment being considered as pending?

Mr. PLATT, of Virginia. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman from Connecticut must take his election, either to withdraw the amendment or to press it.

Mr. KELLOGG. I hope there will be no objection to its being considered as pending at this point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut must respond to the Chair.

Mr. KELLOGG. I ask consent that the message of the President be read.

Mr. PLATT, of Virginia. I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Then is there any objection to the amendment being considered as pending and the committee's proceeding with the consideration of the bill?

Mr. WARD, of Illinois. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman from Connecticut must either press his amendment or withdraw it.

Several MEMBERS. Withdraw it.

Several other MEMBERS. O, no; press it.

Mr. KELLOGG. I shall not withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the opinion of the Chair that so much of the amendment as refers to unexpended balances is in conflict with existing law, and is therefore out of order.

Mr. KELLOGG. I modify my amendment by striking out that part of it.

The amendment, as modified, was read, as follows:

To enable the President of the United States to perfect and put in force such rules regulating the civil service as may from time to time be adopted by him, with authority to allow such compensation for special service under the act of 1871 to persons already in the service of the Government as he may deem proper, \$25,000.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I ask the gentleman from Connecticut to allow me to offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. KELLOGG. I will at the proper time.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Let it be read now. I do not think the gentleman will have any objection to it.

Mr. KELLOGG. Well, let it be read then.

The Clerk read the amendment proposed by Mr. LAWRENCE, as follows:

Add to the proposed amendment the following:

And it shall be the duty of the civil-service commission to report to the President, to be transmitted to Congress at its next session, a bill or plan for the reorganization of all the Departments of the Government so as to equalize salaries, and as far as practicable to reduce the expenses, and increase the efficiency thereof.

Mr. KELLOGG. I object to that amendment. That work has already been done in part. Now, I ask that section 9 of the law be read, the time taken in its reading not to come out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to understand the gentleman from Connecticut in respect to his time?

Mr. KELLOGG. I ask that what I send up be read, not to come out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under what rule?

Mr. KELLOGG. By unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BARBER. I object.

Mr. BECK. I desire to say that I withdraw my objection, now that the gentleman has withdrawn that part of the amendment in relation to unexpended balances, because I believe the amendment is now in accordance with the law.

Mr. WARD, of Illinois. With the withdrawal of the objection of the gentleman from Kentucky, I want to know the status of the amendment. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. What is the present condition of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut offers the amendment to the bill which has been read at the Clerk's desk. The Clerk will read it again if the gentleman desires it.

Mr. WARD, of Illinois. O, no.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is entitled to five minutes to speak in favor of the amendment, and he will proceed.

Mr. KELLOGG. I have no time to state in detail what has been the action during the past year of the civil-service reform commission. I can only say this at the outset, that I beg my friends here, whether they agree with me in this matter of civil-service reform or not, to give me their attention for the few minutes allowed me under the rule.

I say this: that notwithstanding all that has been said in the newspapers and on this floor in derision of this attempt at reform, no man can read the report of the civil-service commission, showing what they have done during the last year, if careful and unprejudiced attention is given to it, without being satisfied that much good has already been accomplished. I admit that their work was crude and unsatisfactory when they first started; that many of the questions which they propounded to applicants were useless, perhaps I might say they were worse than useless in some cases. But that was owing to a great extent, perhaps, to the fact that it was an untried experiment, and time was needed to correct the errors and imperfections of a new system in the matter of appointments. I believe the President and the commissioners appointed by him have tried in good faith to improve upon the old system of appointments. In the early part of it, at the head of the commission, we had a man, Mr. George William Curtis, of New York, a polished gentleman and scholar, who is too much of a poet perhaps and altogether too fine a writer to be a very practical man in this business. He looked for perfection in the outset of the scheme, and became disgusted perhaps because he could not bring the system to perfection at once. It is possibly true that during the first part of this reform there were some questions used in the examination of candidates that naturally brought upon it the derision to some extent of the press and of the country. But if gentlemen have taken the pains to read the report of last year, they will have found that it has been during that time a most laborious commission. A very excellent man, Mr. D. B. Eaton, of New York, is at the head of the commission, honestly and faithfully striving as I believe to make our civil service better than it is. In that he has my hearty sympathy; and I say that in anything which he and his associates can do to elevate and improve the civil service of the country they ought to receive support from us without distinction of party. This civil-service commission, although it may not have accomplished all that has been hoped from it by its friends, has done much already to improve the service. The call for a reform in the civil service was an expression of the aspiration on the part of the American people for something higher and better in this matter than we have heretofore had in this country.

Now, so far as the claim which is often made here, that members of Congress should have the settlement of all this matter of offices without regard to these or any other examinations as to character and fitness for office, I say for myself that the worst curse which as members of the House we can have here is the disposition of patronage, which comes to us under the old system. For one, I almost shudder when I hear of a proposed change in a post-office in my district. I always hope that all the officers in my district will live to the end of my term. I would rather, ten times over, never hear of the resignation or removal of an officer in my district than be obliged to select a successor from among my friends. I am just so good-natured as this, that I would prefer to help all my friends who desire a place,

if I had the power. Gentlemen must know that one can never be selected for an office worth having without disappointing ten or a dozen others, and making more enemies than friends whenever you are obliged to recommend an appointment. I do not shrink from the responsibility when it is placed upon me by request of a Cabinet officer or otherwise; but I have no desire to assume any more of this sort of responsibility than I am obliged to do under the present system. The less place-hunting we have to do the better it is for us as law-makers.

The framers of our Constitution placed the appointing power in the hands of the Executive, excepting some classes of inferior officers, subject to the confirmation of the Senate; and it was not designed that this branch of the legislative department of the Government should select the officers under the Executive; and the less we have to do with it the better it is for ourselves and our constituents, for we shall thus have more time for the discharge of our legislative duties, and avoid the vexations that will come to us if obliged to make these selections.

Now in regard to the reform inaugurated under the present system, we have the almost unanimous concurrence of the members of the Cabinet and of the heads of the leading Bureaus in the Departments of the Government that it has produced a great deal of good so far in bringing more intelligent men and a better class of men into the civil service of the Government. I admit that still further improvement is needful. But what I look upon in this matter of examinations as chiefly of importance, is that you secure competent men to enter the civil service in the first place. When you come to promotions, I admit that a higher ratio or standard should be given to men who have filled their offices and performed their duties well.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. E. R. HOAR. I rise to oppose the amendment, and yield my time to the gentleman from Connecticut, [Mr. KELLOGG.]

Mr. KELLOGG. I say that if you will look into this report, you will find that there is almost a unanimous concurrence on the part of Cabinet officers and heads of Bureaus that there has been a great deal of good already accomplished. When you come to the matter of examination for promotion, then I say that efficiency and good conduct should stand much higher than a mere proficiency in literary attainments, or an examination by questions and answers. And that is the tendency of the system now being adopted. More weight is to be given to good conduct, efficiency in the service, and an aptness for the duties of the service, when you come to the matter of promotions in the civil service. I would give much more weight to the fact that a man having been tried had proved himself an efficient, faithful clerk, on a question of promotion, than I would to the mere correctness of his answers on an examination. But these examinations have been made of more practical character than they were at the outset, and will be improved still more if you allow the work to be continued. I have no time to read from the report the testimony of members of the Cabinet and of heads of Bureaus to show that a good work is being accomplished, but I will give a few extracts from the report:

The First Assistant Postmaster-General reports, "That, in my opinion, the application of these rules, judged in the light of their collective and general result, has been in a marked degree beneficial to the public interests. Under the system of examinations prescribed we have, in the first place, secured more competent and reliable persons for appointment; and, secondly, greater zeal and industry in the discharge of duty and more earnest application in mastering the details of any work or position assigned, attributable, I doubt not mainly, if not entirely, to the fact that promotion was by the rules made the reward of the most faithful and capable; and, thirdly, greater concern for the service and pride in its success, due largely to the conviction that continuance in it depended not so much on what is called influence or supposed necessities of party policy as merit and efficiency. The protection afforded by the system has tended in no small degree to encourage the feeling of individual responsibility, which in its turn develops manliness and force of character."

1. The Comptroller of the Currency states that, so far as the rules apply to male clerks, "the results have been a higher and better grade of clerks than under the old system." Though there was some inconvenience from delay in procuring clerks promptly, he says, "I am satisfied that this and all other inconveniences which might be enumerated will disappear after the plan shall have been fully matured. I have no doubt that the public service will be purified * * * by the * * * continuance of the system." He favors making promotion depend on the head of the Bureau.

2. The Register of the Treasury says of the rules that, "so far as I have had an opportunity of judging of the effects, they have, in my opinion, been promotive of good results, and calculated to elevate the standard of clerical ability and efficiency." He thinks that heads of Bureaus should have greater control over promotions, and that certain duties could be performed by a class of women having less attainments than the rules demand. He hopes that experience may so perfect the rules as to "commend them to the favor and support of intelligent citizens of all parties."

3. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue says that "the application of the rules referred to, so far as this office is concerned, has been satisfactory, and in my opinion furnishes an intelligent and capable class of clerks for the public service."

4. The Second Comptroller states that "the appointees to this office under the system of competitive examinations have given entire satisfaction, and I am of opinion that, as a class, the persons who have entered the service under the civil-service rules are superior in point of ability to those obtained under the former mode of examination and appointment."

And the same or similar testimony is given in the report by most of the heads of the different Bureaus.

I hope my friends, even if some of them do not think much of the cause I am advocating, will think enough of me to give at least a little attention to what I may say upon this subject, for it is no more than fair and right to give this subject a candid attention before you strike at it. In the little time that is left me about all I can state further is the action of the committee upon this matter. In the first

place, the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, by a very fair majority, voted to recommend to the Committee on Appropriations to put in this bill \$25,000 for this purpose, as recommended by the President in his message referred to our committee. That was communicated to the Committee on Appropriations. I know that some of them were in favor of it, but I am very sorry to say a majority were not in favor of it and they voted it down, and for that reason it does not appear in the bill. Upon that committee rests the responsibility of rejecting the appropriation asked for in the President's message, and not upon the committee of which I happen to be chairman.

At a subsequent meeting of the Committee on Civil Service Reform, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BUTLER]—and I am very sorry the gentleman from Massachusetts is not here; he was here when we began, and I presume he will be here yet—made a motion to rescind that resolution, which was voted down by a tie vote. Then a sort of nondescript resolution was offered by him, saying in terms that we were in favor of no appropriation to carry on the experiment further as it has been carried on. Now, we do not any of us propose to carry it on exactly as it has been carried on. It has improved under the light of experience. Mr. Eaton, the head of the commission, is doing his utmost to perfect the rules for a more efficient service. They have organized five different districts in the country, so that the applicants shall not all be obliged to come here to Washington for examination. Every effort is being made to treat the whole country fairly in this matter of examinations and appointments. Now, when we have a law for this appropriation, a law by which we call upon the President to employ these officers; when we have adopted this principle in our platforms, it is not my idea of good faith to turn around as soon as we can and endeavor to destroy every good thing we have put in our party platforms.

Some of us seem to be trying this experiment upon nearly every good thing we had in our party platforms two years ago on both sides of the House, the return to specie payments and all our other pledges; but there is something higher than party platforms in this question. There is a settled desire and determination of the American people to make our civil service better and nobler; and I warn my friends on both sides of the House that they cannot satisfy the demands of the people by any such ill-advised action as refusing this small appropriation which the law you have enacted calls for. Make the appropriation to meet the law you have enacted while it stands upon your statute-books; or else repeal the law like men, and take the responsibility of your action home to your constituents and settle it there.

[Mr. CREAMER addressed the Committee of the Whole. His remarks will appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. RICE. I wish to make a motion.

The CHAIRMAN. No further amendment is in order.

Mr. RICE. Then I wish to say a word.

The CHAIRMAN. No further debate is in order.

The amendment to the amendment was disagreed to.

Mr. RICE. I wish to propose that hereafter the President of the United States shall be placed under the guardianship of the gentleman from New York who has just taken his seat.

Mr. CREAMER. The gentleman is right, for he should be placed under the guardianship of somebody.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. I make the point of order that it changes existing law.

Mr. WOODFORD. I move *pro forma* to strike out the last word.

My friend and colleague from New York apparently objects to the fitness of the Executive mainly on the ground that before the war he had only been educated to drive a team of mules.

Mr. CREAMER. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. WOODFORD. We set him at that task in the autumn of 1868 and again in 1872. He drove the mules so well that each time the driven team went home, while he went into the White House. He certainly drives well.

Now, I am perfectly aware that the question under discussion is one which does not apparently affect the sympathy or enlist the thoughtful attention of very many gentlemen in this House. The most of you have very few Federal offices in your districts. But kindly bear with me for a moment, while I attempt to speak of the practical results of that which is a very practical question, deeply affecting the party and efficiency of the administration of governmental affairs in the great cities and here where the great Departments are located.

In the custom-house at the port of New York there are more than fourteen hundred officials, deriving their appointment from the Treasury Department or directly from the Executive. In the post-office at New York there are more than seven hundred officials. In the navy-yard, at the city of Brooklyn, where I live, there are, when the yard is full, more than two thousand employes. Thus there are over two thousand in New York City, and over two thousand in Brooklyn.

For well-nigh one and a half generations this enormous mass of appointments has been largely regarded as so much capital or stock in trade for the dominant party, and has been largely used to reward political services and accomplish partisan results. This has been equally done by whichever party was in power at the time. Political leaders have sought on the one hand to serve the public, while on the other they have been careful to control the party organization. Whenever these interests have been antagonistic the public service has gone to the wall, and the party necessity has had the center of

the road. This has been the result alike under both parties and all administrations.

There are in the State of New York one hundred and twenty-eight assembly districts. It is believed that shrewd politicians, whether of the democratic or republican schools, when in possession of Federal power, when in control of the patronage and the appointments of the navy-yard, the post-office, and the custom-house, can practically control the delegations from at least one-quarter of the assembly districts in the State political conventions and thus necessarily have potent voice in making the nominations of rulers of that great State.

Mr. HOSKINS. Will my friend from New York allow me to ask him a question, and that is whether, under the operation of the civil-service rule, these offices have not all been filled by the party in power precisely as they were before?

Mr. WOODFORD. I was coming to that in one moment; but will suggest in reply to my colleague that the republican has always claimed to be the party of the school-house. Our republican candidates ought therefore to have passed the examining boards and to have shown themselves competent. If they have had equal chance, I am not surprised that these offices have been filled under the new system from the party in power.

But a truce to jest and pleasant reply. I ask gentlemen to realize the effect of this condition of things upon any and all parties. The necessary and inevitable evil is more than this. The direct and logical effect of this enormous patronage is to create factions within parties and to feed factions instead of strengthening parties. Certain leaders are found to have great influence with the appointing power. These men are naturally courted and followed by those who being out of office want appointments, and by those who being in office seek to keep their places. This injures the public service by substituting faithful political labor for faithful performance of official duty. It demoralizes the manhood of the office-holder by compelling or inducing him to consult the will of his official chief instead of his own conscience, and to serve the purposes of a faction instead of the higher interests of a nation through the agency of a party. This is the old idea of "To the victors belong the spoils," carried out to its logical result and bearing its logical fruits.

Here in Washington, you have yourselves seen the evils of this thing. You have seen with each new administration the corridors of the Capitol, the corridors of the hotels, crowded, literally swarming with people coming from every part of the Union in order to secure appointments or employment. It has been and to-day is a burden on you, their Representatives, keeping you from your natural and proper duties and making you suitors for Executive favor and brokers in departmental appointments. It is a strain upon the very system of our government, already become severe and each year growing more severe and dangerous. Our President, when he came into power, saw the evil and sought to remedy it.

Right here let me also say that if it takes great political wisdom for the party in power to use its patronage shrewdly, it takes great courage for a party in power to reform or squarely to attempt to reform its own abuses. The President saw this evil, and in harmony with his request and of our own free motion this civil-service commission came into being.

I am not here to defend that commission for all it has done, or the Administration for all the appointments that have been made. But I am here to say this: if that commission fails, its failure will depend not only on itself and on the President, but largely on you and on me.

The President has been largely left to stand alone. The prominent politicians of each district all over the land have besought and pestered him to yield here, and yield there, to ease up on this rule, to serve this deserving candidate, and overlook that rule to oblige that influential friend. We have ourselves in many instances stood in the way and made the path of this reform very difficult alike to the President and to the heads of the several Executive Departments. We have put "civil-service reform" into platforms and convention resolutions. We have spoken of it on the hustings. Our editors have praised it in the press. Thoughtful citizens, conscious of the growing evils of partisan patronage, have approved our purpose, and been sadly disappointed at our performance. Let us acknowledge the facts and remedy our own shortcomings.

This reform has done much good. Under many difficulties, in the face of much opposition, against many temptations, the civil service of the Federal Government at New York City has steadily improved under the present Administration in all its clerical and subordinate departments. There have been wrongs by special agents of the Treasury, there have been many evils of which I have spoken freely both here and elsewhere, and yet in the face of these things I am bound as matter of simple truth and justice to say that the morale and efficiency of the customs and postal service at the cities of New York and Brooklyn have steadily improved under the operation of the "civil-service reform."

If the effort has not been altogether a success, still it has not been altogether a sham or a failure. We have assumed the responsibility of attempting this reform. We must make it a success or accept for ourselves and our party the responsibility of the failure. We have the power; ours then is the duty. We cannot deceive the people. Do not let us try to do so, even if we can.

Let us vote this appropriation. Then, instead of secretly opposing and hindering, let us help by sincere effort and friendliest advice to

make the experiment each year more practical and more efficient. In one word, let us each in his own district and in his own place of power or trust squarely live up to this reform ourselves, and so help our President and all the heads of Departments to enforce it to the welfare of the public service.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SOUTHARD. In 1871, as I understand, this civil-service commission was established. It was the insignia on the republican flag in the campaign of 1872 that the party had attempted to reform itself. It was the boast and the pride of stump orators during that campaign, and at the hustings we heard the fair pledges of thorough and sweeping reform.

In 1871, \$10,000 I believe was voted to pay the expenses of this commission; in 1872, \$25,000; and in 1873, \$25,000 more. And this civil-service reform was thus built up in theory, but in practice there have been no real reformatory results. The same "spoils of office" that were so much deprecated still exist in all their colossal proportions. Although in 1871 this began under what were claimed and considered to be such favorable auspices, yet in the campaign of 1872, right in the city of Washington, notwithstanding that the civil-service rules prescribed that there should be no assessments upon clerks in the Departments or elsewhere, the agent of the national republican committee went into the Post-Office Department and there solicited and obtained, under the eye of the officers of that Department, subscriptions from the clerks. This was done not only here but in other cities throughout the country, reaching Chicago and other points. So much a failure was the civil-service reform in practice, that the chairman of the commission, Hon. George W. Curtis, appointed by the President himself, was compelled by a sense of honor and a sense of justice to himself to resign his commission. This he did in the spring or summer of 1873 because of the open and reckless violation of the rules prescribed by that commission. We have merely a theory for which a large appropriation is made year by year, while the practical results are barren of good, and the system establishes nothing but the fact of simulation.

A hundred millions or more of the revenues of the country are lost annually in the collection, as is stated by the civil-service commission. The major part of this, too, is in consequence of fraud or inefficiency. We lose year by year in this manner that enormous amount of money, and yet we are asked by the Secretary of the Treasury this year to increase the burdens of the people \$42,000,000 by additional taxation. This, stripped of all paraphernalia, is the vaunted reform. We have attempted to obtain practical results, and there has been built up instead simply a theory. If the civil-service report of this year be examined, you will find that it amounts simply to this one thing—no abolition of party favoritism, but ample latitude is claimed for its efficient exercise. Members of Congress are besieged by applicants for positions whom they do not care to meet by a refusal, and they are remitted to the civil-service rules. In that way the rules are a convenience. But if they see any positions that are desirable and wish their friends to fill them, that way is practically open, notwithstanding these civil-service rules. The customs department itself, to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOODFORD] has referred, and which needs reforming much more perhaps than any other branch of the civil service, is not under the control of these rules and regulations; or at least they are not put in practice there to any troublesome extent.

The theory I say of these regulations is that there shall be a genuine reform—that there shall be no political preferences, and that there shall be a simple rule which shall govern all cases upon a testing examination. But to obtain an indorsement of these rules by Congress, and to continue the system in existence, the committee put it so gingerly in their last report that it is easy to perceive full scope is left for party patronage. That the system might meet with the approval of the republican members of Congress and obtain their support, these rules are held to be so flexible that all the needed patronage and party spoils might still be secured. That is the fair interpretation of it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The question being taken on the amendment to the amendment, it was not agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. I move to amend by striking out the two last words. I desire, Mr. Chairman, in all honesty and sincerity to discuss the question as presented by the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service Reform. I understand that he did me the favor to allude to me in connection with the resolution which was passed in the committee in favor of this amendment. I was absent through sickness for one week, and in that week that resolution was adopted.

Mr. KELLOGG. The miscellaneous appropriation bill was about to be taken up, and if we were to do anything we had to do it at once. We were sorry that it had to be taken up during the absence of the gentleman from Massachusetts, but we could not help it.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. Of course it only happened so. Now, my friend is entirely mistaken in saying that this system of civil-service reform originated in the recommendation of the President of the United States. It never entered into his wildest imagination. Where, then, did it come from? The bill was passed on the 3d of March, 1871, when the President had been in office some considerable time. Who started it? It was when there was a cabal in

the Senate of the United States composed of Senators Trumbull, SCHURZ, and others for the purpose of breaking down the President of the United States in the next coming election of 1872. They looked around for means to do it, and Mr. Trumbull offered as an amendment to the light-house bill this very luminous proposition for civil-service reform, for the purpose of catching the republican party. And we here were bothered at that time with the same sort of demagogues we see at some other times, and we did not dare to vote against it in this House. It was a catch-word. Everybody was afraid to go home and state that he had dared to vote against civil-service reform, which had its origin in China and its best exemplification in Great Britain.

They have had it for a long, long time in China, and China has got on much better than we have, so that I suppose we ought to adopt the customs of the Mongolian race. Sir, it is a mere trick of a politician who had apostatized from his party, and knowing that he was dead on account of his vote on Andrew Johnson's impeachment, he tried once more to get himself alive; but this scheme did not breathe the breath of life into him or galvanize him back again into public life.

Now I am telling what you all know. What happened next? Thereupon the President, having this measure forced on him by Congress, did the best he could, and said that he would try what he could do. He appointed a set of commissioners who made certain rules which the President himself was obliged to violate at once in all matters relating to the higher appointments, simply because they were all unconstitutional; for it is the Senate that must confirm his appointments and not a body of examiners. Now these rules not only extended to ascertaining the fitness of each candidate in respect to age, health, character, knowledge, and ability for the branch of service he ought to enter, but here was an attempt to say that there should be no promotions—

Mr. KELLOGG. Those are the old rules.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. I am speaking of the old rules, the rules made under that law, and they were found entirely impracticable. If you are to have promotion now, how are you to get that promotion? Simply under the rules by examination. What did they do? Why, the first thing was that they violated a law of Congress which was not only passed for our own guidance but for the guidance of other persons. I ask the Clerk to read the joint resolution of March 3, 1865.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, &c., That persons honorably discharged from the military or naval service by reason of disability resulting from wounds or sickness incurred in the line of duty, shall be preferred for appointment to civil offices, provided they shall be found to possess the business capacity necessary for the purpose of discharging the duties of such offices.

Resolved, second, That in grateful recognition of the services, sacrifices, and sufferings of persons honorably discharged from the military and naval service of the country by reason of wounds or disease or the expiration of terms of enlistment, it is respectfully recommended to bankers, merchants, manufacturers, mechanics, farmers, and persons engaged in industrial pursuits to give them preference for appointments to remunerative situations and employment.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. So that it seems we not only passed a law by which in the Departments of the Government honorably discharged and disabled soldiers should have places, but we recommended to all persons and parties everywhere that they should give preference to such disabled soldiers.

Mr. MAYNARD. Was not the subsequent act establishing what is called the civil-service reform a repeal *pro tanto* of the preceding act of 1865, which the gentleman has had read?

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. Pardon me; no, sir. I am going right on with that, for that is one of my troubles with the civil-service reform. That law required that they should ascertain the efficiency of candidates, and then they made rules that any man who could answer certain questions in arithmetic, geography, astronomy, philosophy, technology, and history should be entitled to places.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. McNULTA obtained the floor.

Mr. NIBLACK. I hope the gentleman's time will be extended.

Mr. WOODFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts be allowed time to finish his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. No such unanimous consent can be given in committee.

Mr. McNULTA. I rise to oppose the amendment, and I yield for that purpose to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. I propose to oppose the amendment. I was about to say that answers upon all these points which I had named were to be put above blood and wounds and honorable service in the field, so that if a man had only been, what they called down South in more expressive language than we at the North used, in a bomb-proof situation during the war, and had studied in a college while his brother went into the service in the field, he would have the preference over that brother, who came back perhaps with one arm, in obtaining employment in the civil service. Now, I ask if those rules have been so construed as to repeal that law? I brought that very case up before the Treasury Department. A man with a bullet in his body, got in a charge upon a fortified place, passed at 76, where efficiency was at 70. But he was forced to stand back, and has gone home now, and is asking his friends to support him in his wounded condition, while a young man who was at the academy all

that time has taken his place. That is what I object to in this civil-service reform.

And not only that; it puts the whole civil service of the country on an entirely wrong footing. It puts in the hands of three or four examiners the power to determine who shall be appointed. How do I know that? They say that they will determine exactly and fairly. Now let me tell you what happened in the Interior Department. A clerk in that Department, more or less honest, stole the list of questions and sold them to four applicants, who studied them up and got them perfectly, so that when they came to answer them they had them correctly. They answered every question rightly. And yet, standing wholly upon questions and answers, they did not pass so high as some men who did not have the list of questions and did not answer them all fully. Why? Because they were not the favorites of the examining board. And the Congress of the United States is asked to lay down the people's power, which has been given to us in the way of recommending men to positions, and to put that power in the hands of three sub-clerks, who travel around the country in first-class cars, each one taking a whole section to sleep in, while I, on my salary, have to get along with a berth. They also charge all their expenses to Government account, take a section each of a sleeping-car, so that they may have room enough for their brains to expand and enable them to get these questions properly prepared.

Let me say one word further about this civil-service reform. In the Departments here there are from the District of Columbia alone six hundred and seventeen clerks, with salaries from \$1,200 to \$1,800 a year. They are there from this District alone, where you do not collect a dollar's worth of taxes and where the United States is every day called upon in some form or other to appropriate money to assist to support them. Yet there are other districts in this country, like the one of my friend whose time I am speaking in, which pay millions upon millions of taxes, and which have not a clerk in the Departments here, and cannot get one.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. COX. I do not antagonize this amendment exactly. Perhaps I may have to move an amendment in order to have an opportunity to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment is now in order.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. I will withdraw my amendment to the amendment.

Mr. COX. I renew the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts. He has well discussed the practice under this civil-service reform. He has indicted his own administration, at the same time that he has defended the head of that Administration against the Philadelphia platform and the action of Congress. I do not know now who is responsible for this particular conduct about civil-service reform. I only know you have authorized the appointment of commissioners, some of whom act and some of whom resign; but when you come to real practical reform it is not there.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. That is so.

Mr. SENER. There is nothing in it.

Mr. COX. I do not know but my friend from Connecticut [Mr. KELLOGG] may be able to make some little reforms here and there.

Mr. KELLOGG. I am doing the best I can.

Mr. COX. It reminds me of the French comedy of Madame Be-noiton. The one giving the name to the comedy never appears upon the stage at all, but everybody who comes before the curtain inquires very particularly for her.

The civil-service reform is a humbug of the Administration, and I am glad the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BUTLER] with his trenchant spear has pricked the bubble. Why has not there been reform in other matters besides the appointment of a few clerks here in Washington? Why do you not bring forward here something to reform the collection of your internal revenue? I could refer to facts now before me to show how utterly incompetent your men are in the internal-revenue service, and how utterly bad the internal-revenue service is in that respect. The Internal Revenue Bureau needs to be reorganized. Why do you not bring forward something that will accomplish that much-needed reform? Special allowances should be abolished. Why do you not abolish them? Some restraint should be imposed upon the employment of clerks. Why do you not propose a reform in that regard? Favoritism should be abolished. Why do you not break up that system of favoritism, which you say your civil-service reform was intended to do away with?

Neither the Secretary of the Treasury nor the Commissioner of Internal Revenue should be allowed arbitrarily to fix salaries; yet the Bureau allowances always get through here. How much of the cost of collection of internal revenue inheres to the Bureau here and how much to the collection of internal taxes? Let your Committee on Ways and Means finish their work if they have any work to do in that respect and reorganize economically and equally the cost of official work and the cost of collection.

I could show this House that it costs in some of the internal-revenue districts of the United States more to collect the revenue than the amount collected. The cost of all collections for the year 1872 was 3.98 per cent. of the amount collected, and for the year 1873 it was 4.1 per cent. The amount collected in 1872 was \$105,238,480; in 1873, \$117,329,127. The office expenses for 1873 were in excess of those for 1872. In 1873 the following extraordinary percentages were paid, according to States and Territories: In Arizona, 62½ per

cent.; in Dakota, 90½ per cent.; in Maine, 15.1 per cent.; in Mississippi, 40.9 per cent.; in North Carolina, 10.1 per cent.; in Oregon, 18½ per cent.; in South Carolina, 21½ per cent.; in Tennessee, 17½ per cent., and so on. So that it will appear, when complaint is made of the East, that whereas in the State of New York it costs 3 per cent. to collect, or over 1 per cent. below the average, and in Ohio it is more than 2 per cent. below, and in Maryland and Michigan it is about the same as the average, while in Delaware, Indiana, and Illinois it is much below. The extraordinary cost of collecting the revenue is far above the average in many of the States.

I have several tables which show the discrepancies in the collection. They are taken from a public document. I read them from the New York Tribune, January 2, 1874. In some of these districts the cost has exceeded the collections, as in the seventh district of North Carolina, which cost 102½ per cent., in Wyoming 102½, and in Dakota 110 per cent.

How does all this happen? Why has there been no attempt made by the Committee on Ways and Means or by this House to make any equalization in this regard? Why have we no reform in this particular?

Mr. MAYNARD. Has the gentleman any table showing the amount of tax collected together with the expense of the collection?

Mr. COX. I have; the statement to which I have just been referring was made up from such a table.

Mr. MAYNARD. I hope the gentleman will give that table in full in his remarks.

Mr. COX. I will do so.

Mr. MAYNARD. It would be very instructive.

Mr. COX. Gentlemen need instruction on this subject; and I especially commend this table to the gentleman from Tennessee, whose State is perhaps more derelict in this particular than any other.

The following is the table referred to.

The following tables show the amount of internal revenue collected in each district in the United States, the cost of collection, and the rate per cent. which the cost of collection makes of the whole amount. An examination of the last column will show that the percentage was increased last year over what it was the year before, while on account of the simplification of the work of the office and the more general use of stamps it should have been reduced:

Amount of internal revenue collected in each district in the United States.

Number of district.	Amount of collections.	Expense of collection.	Per cent. of cost on col-lections.	Per cent. of cost on col-lections.
ALABAMA.				
1.....	\$80,568 92	\$19,815 45	1873.	1872.
2.....	35,601 09	23,935 43	24 5-8	16 1-6
3.....	186,254 74	15,871 12	67 1-4	30 3-4
			8 1-2	60 1-3
ARIZONA.				
1.....	14,238 87	8,929 60	62 3-4	45
ARKANSAS.				
1.....	25,258 00	8,650 93	33 7-8	47
2.....	37,483 07	9,415 79	25 1-8	49 1-3
3.....	31,522 18	12,602 33	39 7-8	61
CALIFORNIA.				
1.....	1,999,273 12	76,035 45	3 4-5	2 1-2
2.....	112,908 91	76,035 45	15 3-8	11
3.....	174,218 99	22,507 14	12 7-8	10 1-4
4.....	89,643 86	19,308 97	21 1-2	26
COLORADO.				
1.....	76,274 56	15,635 97	20 1-2	28 1-2
CONNECTICUT.				
1.....	498,758 67	26,366 13	5 1-4	3 3-4
2.....	191,866 04	13,015 48	6 5-8	5
3.....	51,390 01	5,159 85	10	8 3-4
4.....	129,030 25	13,051 16	10 7-8	8 1-2
DAKOTA.				
1.....	7,154 90	6,484 80	90 5-8	110
DELAWARE.				
1.....	429,403 34	16,069 87	3 3-4	4
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.				
1.....	133,424 58	13,022 38	9 3-4	7 2-3
FLORIDA.				
1.....	143,568 30	17,934 43	12 2-3	26 3-4
GEORGIA.				
1.....	90,471 20	21,916 21	24	17
2.....	64,320 55	19,435 60	30 1-5	23
3.....	114,307 00	21,765 27	19	21
4.....	222,052 56	20,935 12	9 3-8	9 3-4
IDAHO.				
1.....	18,698 50	13,226 03	70 3-4	29 3-4
ILLINOIS.				
1.....	6,814,082 61	67,850 21	9-10	3-4
2.....	60,209 18	8,263 01	13 2-3	8
3.....	555,710 50	20,885 34	3 3-4	1 1-2
4.....	1,201,810 25	22,608 32	1 4-5	1 1-2
5.....	4,768,999 43	55,274 86	1 1-2	1
6.....	511,477 17	16,209 00	3 1-6	3

Amount of internal revenue collected, &c.—Continued.

Number of district.	Amount of collections.	Expense of collection.	Per cent. of cost on col-lections.	Per cent. of cost on col-lections.
7	\$170,305 05	\$16,115 42	1873.	1872.
8	1,805,239 29	33,738 54	9 1-2	6
9	138,624 53	10,158 03	1 4-5	2 2-3
10	66,668 67	9,296 12	7 1-3	4 1-4
11	28,127 01	6,192 09	13 3-4	13 3-4
12	442,069 11	17,160 77	23 3-4	36 1-4
13	44,010 68	11,323 61	3 7-8	3 3-4
			25 3-4	2 1-2
INDIANA.				
1	952,941 78	24,561 09	2 5-8	2 1-4
2	97,651 70	11,948 33	12 1-4	10
3	581,046 62	18,730 45	3 1-4	3 1-2
4	2,438,180 15	33,734 89	1 2-3	1 1-2
5	36,512 98	6,854 32	18 2-3	15
6	467,826 35	16,478 97	3 1-2	3 1-3
7	570,333 43	16,425 21	2 7-8	3 1-3
8	351,201 60	13,190 09	3 1-3	3 1-2
9	137,350 55	10,551 76	7 3-4	6 3-4
10	66,829 97	6,986 82	10 2-3	10 3-4
11	42,443 58	7,747 52	18 1-2	24 3-4
IOWA.				
1	118,233 85	9,856 64	8 1-2	6 3-4
2	268,518 55	13,471 02	5	5
3	412,006 68	18,512 51	4 1-2	3 3-4
4	53,371 18	7,224 34	13	19
5	55,465 34	8,018 70	14 1-2	20 3-4
6	36,001 57	7,248 89	20	27 1-4
KANSAS.				
1	104,789 67	16,386 36	15 5-8	9 1-2
KENTUCKY.				
1	193,389 99	16,143 50	8 1-4	8
2	97,907 58	22,353 43	22 9-10	9
3	118,655 87	12,908 71	10 9-10	30 3-4
4	345,055 47	50,908 70	14 3-4	6 3-4
5	1,832,197 40	43,269 36	2 3-8	1 1-2
6	1,015,776 55	51,965 94	3 1-8	1 3-4
7	924,529 12	89,438 64	9 2-3	2 2-3
8	139,020 61	24,069 57	17 1-3	21 1-2
9	101,753 69	17,282 32	16 9-10	12
LOUISIANA.				
1	1,261,368 61	46,816 08	3 5-8	3 2-3
2	26,145 44	18,021 36	68 9-10	63 1-4
3	30,146 50	14,737 53	48 2-3	49
MAINE.				
1	124,363 19	10,334 08	2 3-10	6 1-4
2	27,868 53	6,748 51	24 1-2	19 3-4
3	19,110 03	5,197 30	27 1-3	19 1-4
4	25,804 49	5,369 61	20 3-4	19 3-4
5	17,087 25	4,850 67	28 1-2	24
MARYLAND.				
1	752,086 03	28,329 62	3 3-4	5 1-3
3	1,570,063 45	39,843 87	2 1-2	1 1-2
4	95,173 95	12,980 18	13 3-5	13
5	252,160 39	19,934 06	7 4-5	4
MASSACHUSETTS.				
1	132,328 98	10,751 94	8 1-10	8
2	51,637 65	7,897 05	15 1-5	6
3	1,488,093 26	39,688 12	2 2-5	1 1-2
4	532,923 85	28,595 30	5 1-10	2 1-2
5	319,630 49	18,881 47	5 4-5	4 3-4
6	646,000 60	22,344 72	3 2-5	3
7	88,121 30	10,125 27	11 1-2	6 1-4
8	55,301 01	8,971 05	16	4 1-2
9	62,214 98	11,481 06	18 1-2	12 1-2
10	377,065 10	20,627 69	5 1-2	5
MICHIGAN.				
1	1,510,023 12	20,467 69	1 7-8	1 1-3
2	47,084 56	6,537 64	14	17 3-4
3	74,995 06	9,925 50	13 1-3	10 3-4
4	94,579 34	9,592 01	10 1-10	10
5	34,111 89	9,399 71	20 2-3	19 2-3
6	224,336 50	12,625 80	5 2-3	10 1-2
MINNESOTA.				
1	66,475 47	10,652 58	16	8 2-3
2	161,248 90	17,214 85	10 3-5	9 3-4
MISSISSIPPI.				
1	31,304 45	15,050 08	48	3 1-4
2	53,841 11	18,667 73	34 3-5	34 1-4
3	43,648 73	19,001 54	43 1-2	33
MISSOURI.				
1	2,499,577 61	39,929 75	1 3-5	1 1-2
2	71,861 39	16,200 85	22 3-5	21 3-4
3	119,562 51	12,017 97	10	6 3-4
4	212,400 45	11,443 13	5 2-5	6 1-4
5	128,197 46	16,907 45	13	13 1-3
6	376,207 02	20,555 83	7 4-5	8 1-2
MONTANA.				
1	36,173 15	15,588 07	44	48
NEBRASKA.				
1	305,273 35	223,002 88	7 1-2	13 1-2

Amount of internal revenue collected, &c.—Continued.

Number of district.	Amount of collections.	Expense of collection.	Per cent. of cost on col-lections.	Per cent. of cost on col-lections.
NEVADA.				
1	\$83,237 18	\$14,991 38	1873.	1874.
			18	57 1-2
NEW HAMPSHIRE.				
1	197,440 96	11,615 01	5 4-5	6 3-4
2	105,509 70	8,551 06	8 1-5	9 3-4
3	18,349 48	5,580 93	30 2-5	22 1-2
NEW JERSEY.				
1	150,219 76	24,750 46	15 3-5	14
2	273,948 36	14,798 32	5 2-5	8 2-3
3	518,047 90	23,670 67	4 1-2	4 1-2
4	388,786 32	18,301 81	4 3-4	6 2-3
5	1,286,048 74	27,270 38	2	2 1-3
NEW MEXICO.				
1	42,821 45	14,116 28	32 9-10	45 2-3
NEW YORK.				
1	4,065,010 61	86,524 51	2 1-10	2 1-2
2	2,445,279 48	48,921 05	2	2 1-3
3	1,961,195 36	41,547 00	2 1-10	2 3-4
4	802,156 96	30,895 00	3 3-5	1 3-4
5	1,008,082 39	32,952 51	3 1-5	2 2-4
6	534,691 70	19,893 43	3 3-4	6
7	147,964 11	13,692 27	9 1-10	13 1-2
8	200,200 25	16,103 41	6 1-10	8 3-4
9	132,978 36	9,597 68	7 1-10	13 3-4
10	1,242,673 17	19,539 02	1 3-5	2 3-4
11	226,780 20	14,811 61	6 3-5	6 1-2
12	30,224 20	5,625 95	18 3-5	19
13	29,810 35	5,786 02	19 2-5	22
14	119,447 73	12,331 43	10 1-8	7 3-4
15	44,244 36	6,217 32	14	19 3-4
16	54,500 22	6,775 54	12 2-5	10 1-8
17	294,675 66	14,582 96	4 9-10	5
18	103,207 28	11,830 78	11 2-5	5
19	412,925 26	19,276 49	4 3-5	5
20	483,665 08	18,771 43	3 4-5	4 1-4
21	116,908 30	10,401 81	8 4-5	17
22	174,199 45	10,443 85	6	7 1-2
23	157,384 42	15,654 02	9 9-10	8 3-4
24	580,277 98	20,153 79	3 2-5	4
25	80,609 73	9,561 60	11 4-5	23 3-4
26	1,546,709 64	38,142 62	2 2-5	2 1-4
27	2,230,525 18	57,482 93	2 1-2	2
NORTH CAROLINA.				
1	38,929 32	15,218 64	39 9-10	76 3-4
2	56,409 77	13,951 46	24 7-10	38
3	46,034 78	13,601 70	29 1-2	26 3-4
4	474,647 05	39,111 06	6 3-10	8 3-4
5	541,332 63	30,273 68	5 1-2	9 1-2
6	252,126 40	28,296 64	11 1-2	11 1-2
7	43,681 70	15,708 01	35 9-10	102 1-4
OHIO.				
1	7,161,277 23	70,871 82	4 9-50	1 3-4
2	1,495,458 80	37,806 41	2 1-2	1 1-2
3	699,070 56	20,651 12	2 9-10	3
4	70,012 77	9,264 59	13 1-5	5
5	468,933 45	17,494 20	3 7-10	2 3-4
6	495,343 53	20,900 83	4 1-5	3 1-4
7	38,400 17	6,558 95	17	23 2-3
8	739,219 79	22,836 53	3	2 1-2
9	1,091,836 75	21,887 74	2	1 3-4
10	575,446 63	16,271 83	2 4-5	3 1-2
11	584,395 47	17,436 94	2 9-10	3 7-8
12	42,733 79	7,212 16	16 4-5	12
13	58,070 27	11,186 57	18	15 3-4
14	95,313 47	8,222 74	8 3-5	10 3-4
15	73,119 43	10,871 01	14 4-5	11 1-2
16	198,478 48	12,087 06	6	4
17	720,189 71	24,770 92	3 2-5	3
18	63,949 93	6,798 61	10 3-5	11 1-4
OREGON.				
1	70,087 91	12,982 88	18 1-2	12 3-4
PENNSYLVANIA.				
1	1,085,956 71	42,582 35	3 9-10	2 1-2
2	1,747,700 21	50,087 15	2 4-5	2 1-2
3	324,732 43	17,724 00	5 2-5	6 1-4
4	362,640 12	16,273 79	4 2-5	5
5	53,028 11	7,519 69	14	20 1-2
6	253,907 27	16,802 60	6 3-5	5 2-3
7	284,512 19	18,260 18	6 2-5	6 3-4
8	170,200 22	15,483 29	9	9
9	147,540 79	11,684 34	7 9-10	9 1-2
10	200,123 70	14,479 00	7 1-5	7 1-4
11	36,103 51	13,684 71	3 7-10	18
12	107,916 44	13,958 37	12 9-10	11 3-4
13	220,901 51	23,991 27	9	9
14	119,920 31	21,552 76	18	10 1-5
15	52,088 90	8,896 65	17	20
16	89,088 09	14,366 66	16 1-10	10 1-3
17	114,402 75	12,847 54	11 1-5	12 1-4
18	96,495 33	12,064 73	12 1-2	10 1-2
19	549,463 76	30,822 57	6 3-5	5
20	860,651 81	26,143 13	3 1-2	2 1-2
21	469,996 94	23,124 89	4 9-10	4 1-8
22	128,015 22	21,743 96	16 9-10	9 2-3

Amount of internal revenue collected, &c.—Continued.

Number of district.	Amount of collections.	Expense of collection.	Per cent. of cost on col. lections.	Per cent. of cost on col. lections.
RHODE ISLAND.				
1.	\$287,150 81	\$18,691 22	6 1-2	4 1-2
2.	37,302 36	7,302 88	19 1-2	16 1-2
SOUTH CAROLINA.				
1.	33,607 38	12,046 03	38 1-2	14 9-10
2.	63,547 37	11,669 46	13 3-10	15 1-2
3.	72,245 64	11,977 19	16 1-2	21 3-4
TENNESSEE.				
1.	29,705 89	9,754 94	32 7-10	57 3-4
2.	51,937 43	12,896 81	24 4-5	21
3.	54,263 28	12,656 94	23 1-3	44 1-4
4.	60,234 15	20,463 92	33 9-10	26
5.	259,234 25	32,959 65	12 7-10	7
6.	19,633 83	7,567 63	38 1-2	9
7.	25,442 28	7,124 87	28	19
8.	196,765 08	16,979 39	8 3-5	11 1-3
TEXAS.				
1.	99,292 28	21,803 97	22	23 1-3
2.	47,885 03	21,311 47	44 1-2	35
3.	73,105 76	18,782 26	25 3-5	41 2-3
4.	116,446 84	25,935 15	22 1-5	45 2-3
UTAH.				
1.	51,591 95	11,167 38	21 1-2	41 1-4
VERMONT.				
1.	18,978 84	4,203 49	22	12
2.	36,611 31	5,330 85	14 3-5	22 1-2
3.	22,411 64	5,696 43	25 2-5	16 1-2
VIRGINIA.				
1.	15,868 73	10,567 28	66 1-2	50 2-5
2.	992,334 13	25,590 73	2 1-2	4
3.	3,706,240 58	26,341 83	7-10	1 1-2
4.	48,875 27	17,342 93	29 2-5	23 2-3
5.	2,246,299 28	25,708 09	1 1-10	1 4-5
6.	172,228 99	28,991 71	16 4-5	15 1-4
7.	93,867 72	13,207 96	14 7-10	13 2-5
8.	42,280 86	8,746 04	20 3-5	37 1-2
WASHINGTON.				
1.	14,792 21	11,103 32	75 3-5	63
WEST VIRGINIA.				
1.	294,343 01	13,372 43	4 1-2	5
2.	127,273 01	13,243 14	10 2-5	11 1-4
3.	33,986 16	9,444 03	27 4-5	32 1-4
WISCONSIN.				
1.	1,476,800 80	31,509 94	2	2
2.	165,516 24	16,217 50	9 4-5	9 2-3
3.	173,186 87	15,557 01	9	15 3-4
6.	71,184 80	11,292 48	15 4-5	30 3-4
WYOMING.				
1.	11,112 99	5,795 29	51	102 3-4

RECAPITULATION.

States.	Collections.	Cost of collecting.	Per cent., 1873.	Per cent., 1872.
Alabama.	\$392,424 75	\$59,692 00	19 7-10	26
Arizona.	14,238 87	8,922 60	62 3-4	45
Arkansas.	94,283 85	30,609 68	32 1-2	50 4-5
California.	2,376,044 88	135,986 27	5 7-10	4 4-5
Colorado.	76,274 56	15,635 97	20 1-2	28 1-2
Connecticut.	873,984 97	57,592 62	6 1-2	5 2-5
Dakota.	7,154 90	6,484 80	90 5-8	110
Delaware.	429,403 34	16,069 87	3 3-4	4
District of Columbia.	131,424 58	13,022 38	9 3-4	7 2-3
Florida.	143,568 39	17,934 43	12 3-8	20 3-4
Georgia.	491,151 31	84,982 20	17 1-10	16
Idaho.	18,608 50	13,226 03	70 3-4	29 3-4
Illinois.	16,607,333 48	225,075 96	1 2-10	1 8-10
Indiana.	5,742,309 71	167,210 05	2 9-10	3 1-3
Iowa.	945,597 17	64,332 76	6 4-5	6 9-10
Kansas.	104,789 67	16,386 36	15 5-8	9 1-2
Kentucky.	5,368,226 28	328,340 13	6 1-10	6 1-5
Louisiana.	1,317,660 55	79,575 02	6	6 1-3
Maine.	214,293 49	32,509 17	15 1-10	12 1-2
Maryland.	2,669,453 82	101,440 43	3 7-10	2 2-5
Massachusetts.	3,773,217 22	178,364 27	4 3-4	3 1-10
Michigan.	1,985,120 47	69,175 35	3 1-2	3 5-10
Minnesota.	227,724 37	27,867 43	12 1-4	11 3-4
Mississippi.	128,794 29	52,719 35	40 9-10	8 9-10
Missouri.	3,407,806 44	126,144 98	3 7-10	3
Montana.	36,173 15	15,588 07	44	48
Nebraska.	305,573 35	23,002 88	7 1-2	13 1-2
Nevada.	83,237 18	14,991 38	18	57 1-4
New Hampshire.	321,300 14	25,747 00	8	9 1-5
New Jersey.	2,626,051 08	108,797 64	4 1-10	4 2-5
New York.	42,821 45	14,116 28	32 9-10	45 2-3
New Mexico.	19,286,630 43	597,426 03	3	3 1-6
North Carolina.	1,453,161 74	147,760 79	10 1-20	15 1-10
Ohio.	14,671,261 95	343,059 53	2 3-10	2 3-10

RECAPITULATION—Continued.

States.	Collections.	Cost of collecting.	Per cent.	Per cent.
Oregon.	\$20,087 91	\$12,992 88	18 1-2	12 3-4
Pennsylvania.	7,545,627 28	434,373 71	5 3-4	4 4-5
Rhode Island.	324,552 17	25,994 10	8	5 1-3
South Carolina.	169,500 38	36,592 68	21 1-2	17 1-5
Tennessee.	697,307 19	120,404 16	17 1-4	13 1-10
Texas.	336,699 91	87,832 85	26	34 2-5
Utah.	51,391 95	11,167 38	21 1-2	21 1-4
Vermont.	78,001 79	15,230 77	19	16 1-5
Virginia.	7,318,015 56	156,496 56	2 1-10	3 2-5
Washington.	14,792 21	11,103 32	75 3-5	63
West Virginia.	455,602 18	36,059 60	7 4-5	7 7-10
Wisconsin.	1,686,688 71	74,576 93	3 9-10	4 1-2
Wyoming.	11,112 99	5,795 29	51	102 3-4
Grand total.	105,238,480 45	4,317,896 94	4 1-10	3 98-100

I should like to see a higher standard of official qualification. I should like to see better officers in every department of the Government; even better Congressmen. I wish I were more fit myself. I should like to see men on both sides of this Chamber a little more attentive to business, and a little more studious, though in that respect I cannot complain of my friend from Tennessee. I should like to see our President, and all the heads of Departments, good business men, as well as men of integrity. That is what the people want. The true idea of civil-service reform is honesty and capacity.

Mr. HAWLEY, of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, the fate of this measure is clearly foreshadowed by the temper of the House. Yet it is quite evident from the remarks of every gentleman who has spoken that a reform of some description in the civil service of this Government is necessary. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BUTLER] showed very clearly that the Departments have not lived up to their own good professions and to the wise legislation of Congress. The remarks of the two gentlemen from New York on my left, [Mr. CREAMER and Mr. COX,] though exaggerating the evils of which they spoke, show plainly that there are abuses.

Now, what do we mean by civil-service reform? Not any one set of phrases or regulations. We mean a steady spirit and purpose to make a better civil service, to correct acknowledged evils, to protect acknowledged improvements. If our present civil-service commissioners are not the most capable men we can get, let them be turned out and others put in their places. If their system is not the best that can be devised, point out its errors and improve that system. But instead of that, the evident disposition here is to whistle the whole affair down the wind, to sneer at the phrase "civil-service reform," to refuse any appropriation for carrying it on, to abandon the whole measure. And what next? Shall we return to the spoils system in all its deformity and infamy? Will any man avow that design? Will any man say that upon the incoming of the next administration, if it should be a democratic administration, there ought to be a wholesale turning out of public servants of all classes and the putting in of new men, so that partisans might be rewarded for their party services? Is that the avowed purpose of either party? Is there any party that dares to emblazon such principles and purposes upon its banner and fight for them in the next campaign? There is no man here who, as a delegate to the next national convention of either party and a member on the committee on resolutions, would hesitate, in spite of your sneers to-day, to put into the platform of his party some such a declaration as this adopted by the republican national convention in 1872:

Any system of the civil service under which the subordinate positions of the Government are considered rewards for mere party zeal is fatally demoralizing, and we therefore favor a reform of the system by laws which shall abolish the evils of patronage, and make honesty, efficiency, and fidelity the essential qualifications for public positions, without practically creating a life-tenure of office.

Such in substance were the declarations of both parties in 1872. Both parties would make such declarations again to-day in their platforms. And when you go upon the stump you declare that the qualifications required of a candidate for office are honesty, efficiency, and fidelity; that you want such men only appointed as will pass these tests; that you want such men retained, and such only. Yet though we have had an able commission, doing their best to devise and perfect a good system of civil service, gentlemen in this House are ready to sneer at every effort in that direction and to refuse to vote money to carry on the labor.

I tell you, gentlemen, I have heretofore seen this House in a temper like this on an important subject; and I have seen it repent within six months and take the back track. I tell you, gentlemen of both parties, that if you undertake to trample this system under foot you will be sorry for it. The people of this country are determined upon a more faithful and efficient administration of the civil service, and I do not care what man, from President Grant and his Cabinet down through both Houses of Congress, may undertake to oppose this resolve of the people, he must walk the plank. No man can be sustained before the people who undertakes to maintain that party zeal and party service are to be the only or the highest test for official appointment.

Men in the past have undertaken to introduce into our official administration what Clay has denominated a "detestable system, grown

from the worst periods of the Roman republic." The worst men become the most clamorous for place and the most successful. The legislative department, usurping the functions of the executive, demanded the control of patronage. Under such a system no public officer, however faithful, knew from day to day how long he would continue in the public service, how soon he might be turned out to give place to some zealous partisan. He looked upon every associate as a possible spy. The appointing power felt at liberty at any time to make changes if more power was to be gained by the change or a more influential politician to be pleased, the object being not merely party strength even, but individual gain.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BECK. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BUTLER] in what he said, not only to-day but last year when he announced that this experiment had proved to be a humbug. That I believe was the expression—not very elegant, but very forcible. Sir, by this civil-service commission and the system which has been provided under it you are utterly unable to reach anybody except the lowest grades of clerks and employes. The Constitution of the United States provides that the President shall nominate, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of Departments.

That is a fixed, unalterable constitutional limitation. You cannot, therefore, reach anybody who has any real authority or responsibility for their acts by this civil-service commission. You only reach the subordinates, and relieve those who are responsible by enabling them to say those who prove derelict or incompetent even imposed upon them against their will.

What is the effect? Why, sir, the heads of the Departments are appointed in spite of your civil-service commission; their fitness or unfitness cannot be inquired into. All the men who are responsible to Congress and to the country are put and kept in their places in spite of it. When we come to investigate the conduct of subordinates for violations of law and seek to hold the heads of Bureaus and Departments responsible, the excuses are made by the chiefs, to whom alone we look, that these people were put there against their will, against their consent, and that they are not amenable for their misconduct, and the excuse is often reasonable and just.

I say as long as we continue to vest any commission with the power of appointing officers in spite of the President and heads of Departments they cannot be held responsible for these subordinates, so that there is no responsibility. The examiners are of course irresponsible. Besides that, the rules we have established have been so manipulated, as every man knows, so as to make appointments as strictly partisan as they were or could be made under the old system. Who ever heard of a democrat getting an office? I hope no democrat ever applied; certainly none ever obtained one, and none ever will so long as the present party remains in power. They will always find excuses of some sort to keep them out, no matter how much more competent than their republican competitors they may be. It is folly, often worse than folly, to test competency or efficiency by mere capacity to answer questions in grammar or arithmetic. Take, for instance, the men who are engaged in the life-saving stations along our coast. They are men who have been trained for years in that service until they have attained the utmost efficiency; they can man their boats, brave the storms, and save the lives of human beings in the midst of tempests. If these men are required to go before the civil-service commission to come into competition with school-masters who may not have the courage to go within a hundred feet of a wave nor the slightest qualification for that special service, yet because he knows something about geography and something about spelling the school-master will get the place to the exclusion of those who are efficient and capable to do this particular duty. I have a son not yet eighteen years of age, fresh from school—indeed there now—who can go before any civil-service commission and get any place under the rules which have been established in competition with me, which he is not competent to fill and which I am, because he can answer all the questions the examiners can ask while I could not answer half of them perhaps. Doubtless that would be the case with the sons of most members on this floor.

Sir, the only sensible rule is to let the President and the heads of the Departments appoint their subordinates, as the Constitution provides, and hold them responsible for their fidelity and good conduct. Let them fill the places with or without the consent of members of Congress, or against their consent if they see fit. Let them put men there they can rely on, and for whose acts they can be held answerable to Congress and the country.

The practical operation of the system has been simply to relieve heads of Departments from responsibility for the misconduct of their officers. It never has done any good to the Government or the people. I am tired of it, and will be glad to see the power of appointment restored to the President and heads of Departments as it was formerly. I want no middle-men, no go-betweens, no old fossils, ignorant of the services required or the qualifications demanded to determine what pet of theirs shall fill positions of honor, profit, or trust.

They are humbugs, and the system is worse than that; it is one which deprives Congress of power to punish negligence and guilt, by affording a shelter to those in authority. I in common with many good men of both parties thought at first it would work well; it has, as administered, proved to be a miserable failure.

Mr. GARFIELD. I move the committee rise. I am, however, quite willing to go on if that be the sense of the House.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 74, noes 78.

Mr. RANDALL demanded tellers.

Mr. GARFIELD. I withdraw the motion.

Mr. RANDALL. I renew it.

Mr. GARFIELD. I wish, if possible, to avoid a night session.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has already divided on the motion, and there were—ayes 74, noes 78.

Mr. RANDALL. I demand tellers.

Tellers were not ordered.

So the committee refused to rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is entitled to the floor.

Mr. POTTER. I decline to speak on the question at this time in view of the temper of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. BECK.]

Mr. BECK. I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. PLATT, of Virginia. I object to its being withdrawn.

The question being taken on Mr. BECK's amendment, it was not agreed to.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. Now, I desire to inquire of the republican party if there is one single principle in the platform put forth by the republican party when General Grant was elected for the second term which they propose to stand by?

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. Yes; we stand by our soldiers.

Mr. WILLARD, of Vermont. Yes; we stand by the soldiers. But the convention which nominated General Grant—not Mr. Trumbull, of Illinois; not Mr. SCHURZ, of Missouri; not any liberal republican, but the convention which nominated General Grant—in which every district in the United States was represented by its chosen representative, adopted this resolution as a part of their platform:

Any system of the civil service under which the subordinate positions of the Government are considered rewards for mere party zeal is fatally demoralizing; and we therefore favor a reform of the system by laws which shall abolish the evils of patronage and make honesty, efficiency, and fidelity essential qualifications for public positions without practically creating a life tenure of office.

Mr. Chairman, upon that the republican party went to the country. A similar resolution was adopted by the liberal party. A similar resolution was adopted by the national democratic convention. A similar resolution was adopted by the national labor convention. In fact, sir, every political party that assembled in that year as a national organization adopted this declaration that there was absolutely needed a thorough reform of the civil service. And the President in pursuance of the opinion of the country thus expressed—not the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Missouri, but the President of the United States—took steps to create a commission, seeking through that commission to make honesty, efficiency, and integrity a leading and chief characteristic for which the man was to be recommended for position under the Government. And now, sir, leading and influential men in the republican party denounce it and say that it is hostile to their party organization.

I ask again if there is any principle in the platforms the republican party have hitherto adopted which they are prepared to stand by, and I ask still further if as a party they propose to play fast and loose with the people in this way, if they propose to keep the word of promise to the ear and break it to the hope? If after having come into office on the platform and under the banner of civil-service reform they will now spit upon that platform and trample that banner under foot, how long, I ask, should such a party remain in power?

Mr. RANDALL. Not a day.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MAYNARD. Will the gentleman from Vermont allow me to ask him a question before he takes his seat?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. MARSHALL.]

Mr. MAYNARD. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment to ask the gentleman from Vermont a question?

Mr. MARSHALL. I prefer to go on, as I have only a few moments.

Mr. Chairman, I have heretofore voted for appropriations for the purpose of establishing and maintaining this board for regulating the civil service. I shall vote no longer for keeping up this most wretched and expensive sham and most miserable fraud on the people. It has accomplished no valuable purpose, performed nothing whatever, and has been used simply as a means of deluding the people with the hope of reform, while every species of fraud and speculation have been practiced upon them. To adopt the quotation of the gentleman from Vermont, [Mr. WILLARD,] used by him for another purpose, it has but kept the word of promise to the ear while breaking it to our hopes.

Where has there been any reform in the civil service during the last three years, since the time when this board was first established? During its existence fraud and corruption have festered in every branch of the civil service. There is no time in the history of our

Republic when fraud and violation of the law have been so rampant as during the last three years. Civil-service reform! Why, have not the henchmen of the Administration invaded the States for the purpose of controlling their elections during this time? Has it not been during this time that the Sanborn frauds and moiety swindles have been perpetrated on the country; that Federal officers have revolutionized States and trampled their rights under their unhallowed feet; that hundreds of men have been placed on the pay-rolls in the city of Washington and elsewhere without performing one hour's service for the country? Only the other day the new Secretary of the Treasury struck from the rolls a whole horde of pensioned henchmen who have been drawing pay regularly from the Treasury while they remained at home, not performing one moment's service for the country. The Commissioner of Pensions a short time ago, in making a defense of himself against charges of frauds and violations of law, admitted that he had kept men for years on the pay-rolls of his Bureau who had not been called upon and were not expected to give one moment's service to the Government—mere pensioned vagabonds or tools of those in power; thus by open robbery swallowing up the moneys wrung from the hard earnings of an overburdened and oppressed people, and all this done immediately under the eyes of the President and of this board established for the ostensible purpose of reforming our civil service.

Sir, it is unquestionably true that the people are demanding reform in the civil service. They are determined to have it. But it is as clear as sunlight that there is but one mode of reaching it. The Constitution has placed in the hands of the Executive the power and the duty of taking care of the honor and treasure of the country and the purity of the civil service. That power is there, and you cannot take it from him by any legislative enactments or so-called civil-service rules. They all amount to nothing more than a delusion and a snare to the people. I am no longer in favor of voting the people's money to keep up this useless board as a mere scape-goat on which to cast the sins of the Administration. There is but one way to remedy the evils of the civil service. The President must feel it his duty as sensitively as he guards his own honor to preserve the honor of the Republic and the rights and the money of the people. And if you have not a man in the executive chair who has that feeling, and will, sagacity, and determination to give effect to it, you may pass all the laws you please and have all the bureaus and boards on earth without accomplishing any good. You must place the responsibility where it is placed by the Constitution. The people have elected a Chief Magistrate and placed in his hands the power and the duty of maintaining and preserving the honor of the country, the revenues of the people, and the purity of the civil service. It is mere folly to attempt by shams to shift this responsibility. If he fails in the discharge of this high duty, let him be held to a strict accountability.

This failure is so gross and so palpable as to cry to the very heavens for a change. The jugglery of boards of reform will no longer delude the people. The only road to reform is by an entire change of the Administration. Put a man at the helm who feels what is due to the honor of the Republic, and who will exercise the powers vested in his hands by the Constitution, to drive from place and power all the thieves, and robbers, and speculators, and incapables, and dead-beats who are now disgracing our country and eating out the substance of the people.

The people now demand this reform. In the language of the gentleman from Connecticut, [Mr. HAWLEY,] "they are determined to have it," and they will have it in that way—the only way in which the Constitution places the power in their hands to attain it. Sir, I am most decidedly in favor of this reform. But I am not in favor of this sham, this cheat, this fraud, this delusion, by which I will not say you kept up a board of dead-beats, living luxuriously and rioting at the expense of the people, for I desire to treat these gentlemen respectfully; but I say that their services to the country have been no more valuable than if they had been a set of miserable dead-beats. I say this with all respect to the most excellent gentlemen who have been employed in this service. You may place the very best and ablest men in the country in the same position, and the result would be precisely the same. Without the efficient and enlightened support and co-operation of the Chief Magistrate their rules and examinations are little better than a farce; with an efficient Chief Magistrate their services would be unnecessary. I repeat, there is but one mode of securing this reform, and that is through the presidential office, and I fear that it never will be fully reached and made permanent and secure until a reform is made in the mode of selecting that high functionary. The Chief Magistrate should, as I think, be merely the executor of the laws, and not the head of a political party. But I cannot enter upon that subject at this time.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GARFIELD. I desire to ask the committee to close debate upon this question; but I would be glad to be permitted to say what will take me two or three minutes before the debate closes. I ask if there is any objection to closing the debate at the end of three minutes?

Mr. NIBLACK. I want to be heard a little about this matter.

Mr. KELLOGG. And I desire to be heard.

Mr. GARFIELD. Will gentlemen then agree to close debate in eight minutes?

Mr. NIBLACK. I have no objection if I get my five minutes.

Mr. POTTER. And I want the other three minutes because I gave up my time before.

Mr. GARFIELD. Will gentlemen then agree to eleven minutes, and let me have the remaining three minutes?

Several members objected.

Mr. GARFIELD. Then I move that the committee rise, for the purpose of moving to close debate.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DAWES reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had, according to order, had under consideration the Union generally, and particularly the bill (H. R. No. 3600) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. GARFIELD. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union on the special order, and pending that motion I move that all debate on the amendment pending and the amendments thereto and upon the subject-matter embraced therein be closed in fifteen minutes.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. I move to suspend the rules so as to make it in order to move as an amendment to the bill pending in Committee of the Whole to cover into the Treasury any money which is now unexpended appropriated for civil-service reform, so called.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield for that motion to be made?

Mr. GARFIELD. I yield for that motion. I want this matter to be done to death or provided for.

Mr. KELLOGG. This is a fair test; let us settle the motion now.

Mr. RANDALL. I call for the yeas and nays on the question to suspend the rules.

Mr. BUTLER, of Massachusetts. I withdraw the motion.

The question recurred on Mr. GARFIELD's motion to close debate.

Mr. E. R. HOAR. Pending that motion I move that the House do now adjourn.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. DARRALL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

An act (H. R. No. 1215) to revise and consolidate the statutes of the United States in force on the 1st day of December, A. D. 1873;

An act (H. R. No. 2879) revising and embodying all the laws authorizing post-roads in force on the 1st day of December, 1873; and

An act (H. R. No. 3349) to revise and consolidate the statutes of the United States, general and permanent in their nature, relating to the District of Columbia, in force on the 1st day of December in the year of our Lord 1873.

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

An act (S. No. 142) for the relief of Nathaniel McKay.

The question was taken upon the motion of Mr. E. R. HOAR, and it was agreed to; and accordingly (at five o'clock and twenty-five minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following memorials, petitions, and other papers were presented at the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as stated:

By Mr. HAZELTON, of New Jersey: The petition of 220 workmen in the Cumberland Nail and Iron Company's Mills, at Bridgeton, New Jersey, for the restoration of the 10 per cent. duty on iron and steel, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCJUNKIN: The petition of citizens of Apollo, Armstrong County, Pennsylvania, of similar import, to the same committee.

By Mr. MYERS: The petition of the Union Mutual Insurance Company, of Philadelphia; of the Insurance Company of the State of Pennsylvania; and of the Insurance Company of North America, claiming to be subrogated and paid for the losses paid by them, presented to the Geneva arbitrators and allowed in their award; and asserting that they benefited commerce during the war, aided to sustain the Government, and that the national honor demands that they should be indemnified, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEAL: The petition of S. O. Barker, administrator, for payment of bounty money due John H. Henderson, deceased, formerly of Company E, Twenty-third Regiment United States Colored Troops, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NIBLACK: The petition of citizens of Evansville, Indiana, protesting against the renewal of sewing-machine letters-patent, to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. RUSK: The petition of James E. Audenried, late first lieutenant Company E, Second Pennsylvania Cavalry, for arrears of pension from September 17, 1864, to May 13, 1870, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPEER: The petition of workmen of Rebecca Furnace and Mines, Blair County, Pennsylvania, for the restoration of the 10 per cent. duty on iron and steel and for free banking, to the Committee on Ways and Means.