

he will find that those claims stand upon just the same terms as the others. The committee is right; the distinction which the Commissioner of the General Land Office seeks to make between the last claims and the two first is purely imaginary. The title to the one is just as good as to the other.

Mr. RIDDLE. Are we under no obligations in regard to those claims?

Mr. HOLMAN. Under no obligations? All the acts of Congress under the treaty up to 1860 were for the purpose of furnishing facts to Congress. I move to strike out the enacting clause of this bill.

Mr. FORT. I would like to say just one word.

Mr. HOLMAN. If the gentleman will renew my motion to strike out the enacting clause, I will withdraw it for the present.

Mr. FORT. I will do so. I see that in the eleventh section of the act of 1824 there is a provision which meets this exact case; a provision that where any lands belonging to these claimants under any grant, concession, or survey have been sold by the United States the claimant shall have the right to enter upon any other lands then subject to entry. This act of 1824 makes it lawful for the claimant to file his petition before the proper court, and to set up and maintain his right to the land; and if the land has been sold by the United States (as the gentleman from Missouri claims was done in this case) it is provided that the claimant shall have other lands in lieu of those sold.

In view of the provisions of this act of 1824, which cover the exact state of facts alleged to exist in this case, I can see no reason whatever for the passage of this bill.

Mr. BUCKNER. The act referred to by the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. FORT,] as read by himself, provides that where a party makes claim under a grant, concession, order of survey, or permission to settle, then he shall be authorized to go into court and prosecute his claim. But the act of 1860, as I have said time and again, enlarged the rights of these parties by providing that any party who had any written evidence of title from the French government prior to the cession should have his claim confirmed.

Mr. HOLMAN. Does not my friend concede that the act of 1860 in its enlargement of the rights of these parties went far beyond the rights which they had possessed under the treaty with France?

Mr. BUCKNER. No, sir.

Mr. HOLMAN. Certainly it did. The act of 1812 comes up fully to the requirements of that treaty.

Mr. BUCKNER. How does the gentleman know that?

Mr. HOLMAN. Because the act uses the very terms which are employed in the treaty, as the gentleman will find by making the comparison.

Mr. BUCKNER. Does the gentleman want to repeal the act of 1860?

Mr. BLAND rose.

Mr. HOLMAN. As the gentleman [Mr. BLAND] is a Representative from Missouri, I will of course withdraw my motion if he will renew it.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have but a few words to say. As this bill was first reported I do not know that I should have opposed it. It seems that the Government, according to the claim set up here, has sold lands belonging to private parties, has derived the benefit of this sale, and the money has gone into the Treasury of the United States. But by an amendment to this bill it has been provided that the land scrip to be issued in lieu of the lands which have been sold by the Government shall be located nowhere but in the State of Missouri. I hope my colleague [Mr. BUCKNER] will not submit to such an injustice as that amendment would entail upon our State. As this money went into the Treasury of the United States, all the lands of the Government should be responsible for making this reimbursement, not the lands of the State of Missouri alone. The United States having obtained the benefit of this sale and the money having gone into the Treasury, these claims should be settled from the common fund. Hence, I say that I hope my colleague will not insist upon the passage of this bill in its present form, which would perpetrate a great injustice upon the State of Missouri and her lands.

Gentlemen say that these lands are worth nothing. I say that they are. In my district there are large quantities of land still subject to pre-emption and homestead entry; and the people of my State would not look with favor upon a measure which would concentrate those lands in the hands of private parties or monopolies. As a Representative of the people interested in those lands, I protest against this bill in its present form as an injustice toward them and toward the State of Missouri.

With the amendment struck out I would not oppose the bill, for in that form it may be just; but there is great injustice in compelling the State of Missouri to refund to the Federal Government moneys which should come from all the States of the Union and not from one State alone. I hope the bill will not pass as now amended, for it would be a gross injustice to a large portion of the people of Missouri, an injustice which they would resent and ought to resent upon this floor.

Mr. HOLMAN. I now renew my motion to strike out the enacting clause.

The question being taken on agreeing to the motion, there were—ayes 71, noes 21; no quorum voting.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. BUCKNER and Mr. HOLMAN were appointed.

The House divided; and the tellers reported ayes 78, noes not counted.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. SAVAGE. I move the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker *pro tempore* having resumed the chair, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar had had under consideration a bill (H. R. No. 819) to confirm certain land claims in the State of Missouri, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment striking out the enacting words.

Mr. HOLMAN. I demand the previous question.

The previous question was seconded and the main question ordered.

Mr. BUCKNER. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is, Shall the enacting words be stricken out?

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLMAN moved to reconsider the vote by which the enacting words were stricken out; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF AN EMPLOYÉ.

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

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be directed to pay out of the contingent fund the funeral expenses of Lawrence J. Riley, late an employé of this House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted in the following cases:

To Mr. STEVENS indefinitely after the 23d instant;

To Mr. WALLACE, of South Carolina, for ten days on account of important business; and

To Mr. HATCHER indefinitely.

Then, on motion of Mr. SAVAGE, (at three o'clock and twelve minutes p. m.,) the House adjourned until Monday next.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. J. H. BAGLEY: Protest of the people of Coe-wee-skoo-wee and Delaware districts, Cherokee Nation of Indians, against the establishment of a United States territorial government over the Indian country, to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CRAPO: The petition of Abiel Cadding, a soldier of the war of 1812, for a pension, to the Committee on Revolutionary Pensions.

By Mr. HANCOCK: Papers relating to the claim of the heirs of David G. Burnet, deceased, for timber taken from his lands in Texas by United States troops stationed at Fort Lincoln in the year 1849, for building purposes, to the Committee of Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS, of Virginia: The petition of M. G. Harman, of Augusta County, Virginia, for payment of rent due by contract for the use of stables in Fredricksburgh, Virginia, by the United States troops in 1865-'66, to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, the petition of Adam Lushbaugh, of Augusta, Virginia, for compensation for property taken by United States troops, to the same committee.

By Mr. McDILL: The petition of citizens of Los Angeles County, California, against the passage of House bill No. 3364, to the Committee on Public Lands.

IN SENATE.

SATURDAY, July 22, 1876.

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

THE JOURNAL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senate will come to order, and the Secretary will read the Journal of yesterday.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Before the Journal is read I should like to hear the first rule read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will read the first rule.

The Secretary read as follows:

1. The presiding officer having taken the chair, and a quorum being present, the Journal of the preceding day shall be read, to the end that any mistake may be corrected that shall be made in the entries.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will call the roll of the Senate.

The Secretary called the roll, and thirty Senators having answered to their names,

Mr. HOWE, (at eleven o'clock and twenty minutes a. m.) Has the Sergeant-at-Arms been directed to request the attendance of absent Senators?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair has requested the Sergeant-at-Arms to invite all Senators who are in the building to be present, but there has been no order.

Mr. HOWE. I move that that direction be given.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Wisconsin moves that the Sergeant-at-Arms be directed to request the attendance of absentees.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Sergeant-at-Arms will execute the order.

Seven more Senators having entered the Chamber,

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*, (at eleven o'clock and twenty-five minutes a. m.) There is a quorum present. Shall further proceedings under the call be dispensed with? The Chair hears no objection. The Journal of yesterday will be read.

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. DENNIS presented the petition of Mrs. Elizabeth Barrett, of Washington, District of Columbia, praying for a pension as the widow of a soldier of the war of 1812; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present the petition of Manning M. Kimmel, of Hopkins County, Kentucky, praying for the removal of his political disabilities. A bill for the removal of Mr. Kimmel's political disabilities has already passed the House of Representatives, and I present this petition in pursuance of the custom of the Judiciary Committee of this body, requiring regular petitions. I move the reference of this petition to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CRAGIN. I present additional papers in the case of Albert Grant, of Washington, District of Columbia, in relation to his claim, which was reported upon adversely by the Committee on Claims. In connection with this additional evidence, I move that the motion postponing indefinitely the bill (H. R. No. 3182) for the relief of Albert Grant be reconsidered, and that it be recommitted with these papers to the Committee on Claims. As I understand, the chairman of the committee is willing that the bill shall be recommitted.

Mr. WRIGHT. This case has been called to my attention, and there seem to be some additional facts and some references to judicial records that were not before the committee at the time the bill was considered. In view of all the circumstances, I shall not object to a recommitment. I am not prepared to say that there is anything in the case as now presented that by any possibility will change the action of the committee, but I think it fair under all the circumstances that the case should be recommitted.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire moves that the vote by which the bill was indefinitely postponed be reconsidered.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill with the papers now presented will be referred to the Committee on Claims, if there be no objection.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CRAGIN, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 7) to provide for the sale or exchange of a certain piece of land in the Wallabout Bay, in the State of New York, to the city of Brooklyn, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. BRUCE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 1236) granting a pension to Harris B. Lovell, late a private in Company C, One hundred and twenty-second Illinois Infantry Volunteers, 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 (S. No. 370) to amend an act approved March 3, 1873, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act granting a pension to Captain Henry M. Scott,' approved April 9, 1872," submitted an adverse report thereon; which was ordered to be printed, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 1499) granting a pension to Mrs. Lydia Johnson, of De Witt County, Illinois, submitted a report thereon; which was ordered to be printed, and the committee was discharged from the further consideration of the bill.

FLOYD C. BABCOCK.

Mr. HOWE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill No. 516.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. No. 516) for the relief of Floyd C. Babcock. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Floyd C. Babcock, of Oconomowoc, Wisconsin, \$556.55, to compensate him for services rendered by him while acting as deputy United States marshal, in the Indian country, in arresting and transporting four murderers to Fort Smith, Arkansas.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment in lines 5 and 6, to strike out "\$556.55" and insert "\$332.65."

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us hear the report read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. There is no report, the Chair is informed.

Mr. WRIGHT. There is a report in the case, a House report, which has been adopted by the Senate committee.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Perhaps the Senator from Iowa can explain the case without a reading of the report.

Mr. WRIGHT. It appears by the House report that the bill passed the House for the sum of \$556.55. The report of the committee of the House was for the sum that is named in the amendment, but by some strange oversight the House passed the bill for the larger amount and paid no attention to the report of the committee. I suppose it was an oversight. We adopted the report of the House committee, and inserted the amount recommended by them. It seems this person was a deputy marshal. He was in the Indian country and was advised there had been a murder of a white family. There was no commissioner there who could issue process, but at the request of persons who knew of the murder, and he himself knowing something of it, he started after the murderers and succeeded in arresting them. They were indicted and two of them were convicted and executed. About the same time a murder was committed by another person. He was unable to get process, but succeeded in arresting the murderer, and he was tried, as I now remember. The Department of Justice, inasmuch as he acted without process, declined to make any allowance or pay to him. The testimony is full, showing that the amount now given by this bill is a reasonable sum and is justly due.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Did the Department of Justice recommend that he be paid?

Mr. WRIGHT. They recommend that he be paid, and state that they would have paid him, but for the lack of process.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the reading of the report will be dispensed with. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

RANDALL BROWN.

Mr. WRIGHT. There is a little bill reported from the Committee on Claims in favor of one of the employes of the Senate. It has passed both Houses, as I remember, and there have been two reports in favor of it. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill No. 890.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. No. 890) for the relief of Randall Brown, of Nashville, Tennessee. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Randall Brown \$1,500 for property taken by the rebel forces while the same was being used by the Government of the United States, to be shown upon proofs and vouchers.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should like to hear the report read in that case.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Claims, June 29:

Mr. JAMES WILSON, from the Committee on War Claims, submitted the following report:

The Committee on War Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 890) for the relief of Randall Brown, of Nashville, Tennessee, having had the same under consideration, report:

That the said Randall Brown is a colored man, resident of Nashville, Tennessee; that, during the late rebellion, in the year 1863, he was the owner of three teams, wagons, &c., and was employed with said teams, wagons, &c., on the forts then being constructed for the defense of Nashville by the Quartermaster's Department of the United States Army, with a promise or guarantee of protection against capture by the enemy; that, during the month of July, 1863, while engaged with his teams in hauling wood to Overton's Station, on the Tennessee and Alabama Railroad, on the 3d of July, the rebel forces made a raid upon the hands engaged in hauling wood to said station, taking them prisoners and capturing several teams, among others the teams, wagons, &c., of the said Randall Brown.

The committee are of opinion that the claimant was entitled to the protection pledged him, and that the capture of said horses, wagons, &c., was without fault or negligence on the part of the said Brown; that the said horses, ten in number, were worth the sum of \$125 each, the price paid for horses for the military service of the United States at that time; that the wagons and harness were worth the sum of \$250, and these facts are clearly established by satisfactory evidence.

Your committee, therefore, report back the foregoing bill with the recommendation that the same be amended by inserting in line 5 the word "five" in place of "six," and that as thus amended the bill do pass.

The Senate committee adopts the foregoing report, with the additional statement that at the time claimant's property was taken he was still in the employ of the Government under the contract that guaranteed him protection.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The latter statement is the important point, that he was still in the employment of the Government, and I was going to ask the Senator from Iowa about that.

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

CORRECTION.

Mr. DAWES. Mr. President, I do not want to tire the Senate with the repetition of matters about figures; but if there is anything to

be made by making statements full of errors, I think it is worth while that these statements should be followed by an explicit denial of them. I find in the RECORD of this morning in what purports to be a speech delivered elsewhere by Hon. WILLIAM HARTZELL—delivered in the House of Representatives this RECORD says on Thursday, July 20, 1876—the same table which was shown here yesterday to be without the slightest foundation. This makes the fifth time that this table has been spread upon the RECORD, although the first time it appeared it was followed by the demonstration that there was no truth in it. I wish to read from this RECORD and then to make a statement.

In this connection—

I read from the third page of this morning's RECORD—

In this connection permit me to present two additional tables, one showing the increase *per capita* of taxation and the other showing the increase of civil offices.

After this first table, with which I have nothing to do at the present time, follows this statement:

The following statement of the number of employes borne upon the civil list of the United States from 1859 to 1875, inclusive, is compiled from the Biennial Register.

It is called first "a list of civil officers" and then it is called "a list of employes" in which it is stated, taking a portion of the table that was commented upon here yesterday, that the civil officers of the Government have increased since 1859 from 44,527 to 94,119 in 1875, that they increased from 57,605 in 1871 to 86,660 in 1873, more than 30,000 in two years, and from 1873 to 1875 they increased to 94,119, making more than 8,000 increase during the last period of two years.

I have to say, sir, that this is neither a correct statement of what the Biennial Register shows, nor a correct statement of either the increase of the civil officers of this Government or of the civil employes of the Government. Whichever term it goes by it is equally false and without foundation; and if the Senate will pardon me for troubling it every time this re-appears in the RECORD, it will be only from a feeling that, if anything is to be made by piling up tables of figures that have no foundation upon which to rest, it is quite worth while, when they can be demonstrated as this can be to have no foundation in fact, that that demonstration should follow the table as often as it appears.

WASHINGTON MONUMENT.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I move to take up the bill making appropriation in regard to the Washington Monument reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. No. 982) providing for the construction of the Washington Monument was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It appropriates \$100,000 to continue the construction of the Washington Monument in the city of Washington. Before any portion of this sum shall be expended, the proper officers of the Washington National Monument Society, incorporated by the act approved February 26, 1859, entitled "An act to incorporate the Washington National Monument Society," are to transfer and convey to the United States in due form all the property, easements, rights, and privileges, whether in possession, or in action, or in expectancy, belonging to the corporation, for the uses and purposes set forth in the act of incorporation; and the charter is so amended as to authorize the executive officers of the corporation to make the transfer and conveyance in consideration that the United States agree to complete the monument. The construction of the monument is to be under the direction and supervision of the President of the United States, the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, and the Architect of the Capitol, and in accordance with the laws regulating contracts and the construction of public buildings by the Treasury Department; and detailed reports of the expenditures are to be annually submitted to Congress.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, I do not rise for the purpose of attempting to defeat the passage of this bill; but the subject having been referred for the last two or three years to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I should deem myself derelict in duty if I were not to present the action of that committee. They have attempted on several occasions to come to some agreement with the officers and trustees of the corporation which now claims the control of this monument, but without success so far as to induce them to abandon the control of the monument or the character of the structure.

I may say that there is some doubt in relation to the foundation of this monument. The original excavation for this vast structure was, as I understand, but eight feet below the surface; that is to say, they have dug down for a solid foundation no deeper than they would for an ordinary dwelling-house in this vicinity, when they originally proposed to put up a monument about six hundred feet high. It would seem obvious that that is not a sufficient depth to secure a firm and enduring foundation. Why, some of our public buildings erected for the use of the United States Government have had their foundations in various cities go down to the extent of thirty feet in order to secure a firm base.

Then I have ascertained from a report of the engineer upon this subject that the base is now six-tenths of an inch out of level, which, of course, will carry the top of the monument considerably away from a perpendicular line, and as I have been informed by the former

Supervising Architect of the Treasury there is a difference now, at the present height, of four inches from being plumb. Whether this has increased in the last few years or not, I am not able to say, but my point is this, that before anything of additional weight and height shall be put upon this structure it shall be thoroughly examined by competent engineers, so that the great risk of putting the additional amount of weight on the top shall be done under proper authority.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will ask my friend if his attention has been called to the report of the board of engineers on this subject?

Mr. MORRILL. I have it here.

Mr. SHERMAN. Very well.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds have been unanimous for several years in relation to a change in this structure by which a thing of beauty could be put up, and at much less expenditure, and for this purpose I have sought the assistance of various architects, and I have here, if any gentlemen have curiosity to see them, the various plans that have been presented by architects showing that we might put up a triumphal arch that would be a proper monument for our greatest and earliest military hero, George Washington, and it would be something that would be entirely unique in this country, and probably if it be not put up in this place it never will be anywhere. I have some plans with different degrees of ornamentation, and of course costing somewhat in proportion to the size and character of the structure. One of them was sent to me from Florence, Italy, by an artist upon seeing some account of the proposition in the newspapers that there was to be a triumphal arch or that the question was mooted. These are generally designed for the purpose of having an equestrian or other statue of Washington upon the top.

Mr. President, let me say a word in relation to this monument, and I am not disposed to ridicule it. If it is put up at all, the only distinguishing characteristic about it will be its immense height, and that will be all that there is to recommend it. It is to be in the form of an Egyptian obelisk. Now, what is the true character of an Egyptian obelisk? I will not ridicule this proposed monument as the late Horace Greeley did, and call it a "pumpkin with a stick stuck into it;" but a real obelisk should be made from one stone large enough for the whole structure. What is this? It is a series of blocks with a hole in the center, making nothing but a huge chimney, and after all it is no more an object of admiration than a chimney for a huge factory or a shot tower.

Mr. President, there is another defect in this bill I fear. There have been not less than three, and I do not know but more, plans on the part of this corporation. It is true they surrendered their powers in 1858 or 1859, but nothing was done by Congress, and they then got an act of incorporation, I think in 1859, and resumed their powers. The first plan of the structure involved an expense of something considerably over a million of dollars, and the design then was as it is stated in the report:

The design embraces the idea of a grand circular colonaded building two hundred and fifty feet in diameter and one hundred feet high from which springs an obelisk shaft seventy feet at the base and five hundred feet high. This will be constructed first.

The vast rotunda, forming the grand base of the monument, is surrounded by thirty columns of massive proportions, being twelve feet in diameter and forty-five feet high, elevated upon a lofty base or stylobate of twenty feet elevation and three hundred feet square, surmounted by an entablature twenty feet high, and crowned by a massive balustrade fifteen feet in height.

The terrace outside of the colonade is twenty-five feet wide, and the *pronaos* or walk within the colonade, including the column space, twenty-five feet. The walks inclosing the *cella*, or gallery within, are fretted with thirty massive *antæ* (pilasters) ten feet wide, forty-five feet high, and seven and a half feet projection, answering to the columns in front, surmounted by their appropriate architrave. The deep recesses formed by the projection of the *antæ* provide suitable niches for the reception of statues.

And so it goes on in the most elaborate fashion for a whole page. At some time subsequently it was proposed to narrow the base to fifty-five feet square and to run up the obelisk to six hundred feet high. Now there is a different plan that is brought here for our consideration, I suppose, which proposes that the structure shall go up to four hundred and eighty-five feet high and to omit the colonnade at the foot. It is now one hundred and sixty feet high, and, with the base, about one hundred and seventy-four feet high. Here are three or four plans presented by this company, and here is a bill proposing to complete the structure without saying anything about under which plan or what it shall cost. It seems to me that that is going it blind, and instead that it ought to be particularly described under what plan the work is to proceed, or at least that the whole expense should be limited. I would much prefer that the commission authorized here should be allowed to put up any other structure that they might think more worthy of the Father of his Country and more worthy as an object of art.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The morning hour has expired.

Mr. MORRILL. I suppose the Senate will allow this bill to be completed.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think we had better do that. This bill is reported by the Committee on Appropriations, and might as well be disposed of now.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not object, provided it is completed within a reasonable time. Therefore I will make it subject to a call for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The consideration of the bill will be continued subject to a call for the regular order.

Mr. MORRILL. It was the judgment, as I have heretofore intimated, of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and of every architect or artist with whom I have ever conversed that it would be far more creditable to our country to put up a triumphal arch than to continue this heathen mythological monument. Let me say here that over the front door of the monument, as a matter of decoration, what do we now find? We find the sun and a couple of wings, representing in Egyptian hieroglyphics Osiris and Isis, or the sun and moon, as much as to say that the Father of his Country was a believer in the sun and moon. I suppose the artist who put on this supposed it to be a decoration instead of being a heathen mythological sign.

Mr. President, if the corporation that hold this monument now in their custody consent to abandon it, it seems to me that the Government of the United States ought to be left free to select their own style and character of a monument, and select one that we know in the outset will not cost more than a given and fixed sum. I have ascertained that we can complete an arch anywhere from \$300,000 to \$500,000, just in proportion to its amount of ornamentation; that there is enough in the huge pile of marble to construct it with the exception of such pieces of marble as would have to be decorated for the moldings or for any other purpose in the way of pilasters or columns. But if this bill is to pass, I propose to offer the amendment which I send to the Chair; and I leave it for the good sense of the Senate to do whatever they think best. If they think it best to finish this, and I would rather do this than do nothing, but I think it would be preferable to do the other thing and that it would be far less expensive to the United States, and when done it would be unquestionably a thing of which the country might be proud and entirely worthy of Washington, as this monument that is proposed I think will utterly fail to be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. MITCHELL in the chair.) The amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] will be read. The CHIEF CLERK. The amendment is to add to the bill:

SEC. 2. That before any work shall be commenced upon said monument a plan for its full completion shall be made and approved by the President of the United States, the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, and the Architect of the Capitol, and that the ultimate cost of the same shall not exceed the sum of \$600,000.

SEC. 3. That prior to commencing any work on said monument an examination shall be made as to the foundation of the proposed monument in order to thoroughly ascertain whether it is sufficient to sustain the weight of the completed structure; and if the same shall be found insufficient or defective, or if the base shall be found out of level, the persons authorized to continue the construction of the monument under the first section of this act may make any change in the form and style of the structure which they shall agree upon, not to exceed the limit as to cost, mentioned in section 2 of this act, and which they shall judge will be equally appropriate as a national monument to Washington.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will detain the Senate but a moment. I supposed that this question of the construction of the Washington Monument was settled by the unanimous action of both Houses of Congress on the 5th day of July. I supposed that we had made up our minds to complete the Washington Monument as it is now proposed, and that that was settled by the unanimous vote of Congress on a resolution which I believe was sanctioned by almost everybody who spoke on the subject. The only doubt expressed by the people was that in some way or other our promise would be like the other promises which have been made before in regard to the Washington Monument. I am sorry to see any opposition made to this bill. Now let me answer in a minute or two all that was said by the Senator from Vermont.

In regard to the examination of the foundation, I hold in my hand an official report signed by Captain Marshall, of the Engineer Corps, and approved by General Humphreys, giving in detail the statement of the engineer that the foundation is ample. They have suggested certain modifications, and these modifications have been adopted. I have here also the plan of the present corporation, which is without means to execute it. Here is the authentic plan signed by John B. Blake, secretary, showing a shaft exactly similar to Bunker Hill monument. The Senator from Vermont ridicules the plan of this monument. It is an exact copy of the Bunker Hill monument, magnified many times. There cannot be anything so strangely absurd in it when the Bunker Hill monument is regarded, I believe, as the best monument in the United States to commemorate revolutionary events. Here is the monument, [exhibiting plan,] and it is completed now to the height of one hundred and seventy-four feet. The proposed height is four hundred and eighty-five feet. The foundation is eighty feet square, eight feet below the surface, and seventeen feet above the surface. There is an artificial structure seventeen feet above, making altogether twenty-five feet for foundation. The monument was commenced July 4, 1848; the cost so far has been about \$230,000; and there is required to complete the structure, including the terrace, about \$350,000, of which there is a detailed estimate in the document before me, being the report of the Select Committee on the Washington Monument of the House of Representatives, where these details are all given.

Unfortunately this work is now in the hands of a corporation created by Congress and subject to be repealed by Congress, and that corporation has not any means whatever to complete it. There have been complaints made that money heretofore given by private subscription to aid in the Washington Monument has been diverted or wasted in expenses, and the United States now have by solemn vote

undertaken to complete this monument which will cost, it is said, \$350,000, or about one-fifteenth part of the amount we propose to expend in a single year on the improvement of rivers and harbors.

Whatever may be said about the arch or the plan of an arch, let us complete one monument first before we complete another. This monument has been promised by several votes of Congress. First, in 1783 Congress resolved that the people of the United States would erect a monument to Washington. In 1799 Congress again resolved that the people would erect a marble monument in Washington to commemorate George Washington, and from that time to this abortive efforts have been made to carry this promise into effect.

I hope that now by a unanimous vote this attempt to fulfill the promise we made on the 5th of July will be made. If the Senate think it advisable to adopt the proposition of the Senator from Vermont, I do not know that I shall have any objection to it, except that it authorizes three men to change entirely the plan of this improvement. I do not think that power ought to be invested in any one. We ought to finish it according to the plan proposed, agreed upon, adopted years ago, and now finally after some modifications agreed upon by those who are intrusted with this work. But if the Senate think it proper to make the amendment I shall make no objection. I am willing to take the vote upon it. As to the examination of the foundation by a board of engineers, I have no objection at all, though that has already been done. Without detaining the Senate, I ask a vote on the proposed amendment and hope we may carry the proposition, whatever it is, that we agree upon by a unanimous vote.

Mr. MORRILL. A single word, Mr. President, in relation to the unanimous approval of the proposition on the 5th of July. There was not a word of discussion, and I must say that I did not comprehend what was before the Senate, coming in at the door just as it passed, until after it had passed. I merely, however, desire to call the attention of the Senate to what I have stated in regard to the uncertainty of the foundation, and I will read from the engineer's report:

The weight of that portion of the shaft already completed approximates 58,705,000 pounds, and of the foundation itself 21,565,800. The bed of the foundation has therefore borne for eighteen years, without signs of weakness or failure, the weight of 80,270,800 pounds, and while there is no apparent reason to believe that it will not bear the additional weight of 67,095,000 pounds yet to be placed upon it, there is only negative proof of its security: and it would therefore be culpable to attempt to complete the obelisk on the present plan until a thorough examination of the nature of the subsoil and its capacity to resist compression makes it certain, as far as human mind can foresee, that the monument will be as enduring as is the material of which it is composed.

Mr. SHERMAN. What does the Senator read from?

Mr. MORRILL. From the report of William L. Marshall, first lieutenant of engineers.

Mr. EDMUNDS. What date?

Mr. MORRILL. Under date of February 19, 1873.

The weight of the entire shaft, if reared to the full height of 600 feet, allowing 170 pounds to the cubic foot of masonry, will be 125,800,000, bearing upon a base of 2,400 square feet. The pressure is, therefore, about 26 tons per superficial foot, or less than one-eleventh the crushing weight, supposing that the strength of the material does not exceed that of ordinary sandstone for building purposes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Ought not the Senator to state that the very suggestions contained in this report have been adopted by General Humphreys, and are incorporated in the plan on which they are working now? The modifications have been made.

Mr. MORRILL. This report goes on:

Owing, however, to the faulty manner of cutting and laying the blocks of the marble facing of the obelisk an undue pressure is thrown near the exterior edges of the joints. The chippings and splintering of the blocks from this cause may become aggravated as the weight of the obelisk increases, thus marring the appearance of the monument.

I only desire to call attention to this to show that the intimation I gave was not without sufficient authority, and I am not aware that any thorough examination has ever been made since 1873, the date of this report.

Mr. SHERMAN. I desire to call attention to the fact that this same officer in a letter to General Humphreys, dated Washington, District of Columbia, April 20, 1874, page 11 of this official document—this new board having adopted nearly all the suggestions contained in the previous report—makes an official statement that the foundation is ample and secure.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us hear a part of it, if you please.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will read it:

These modifications will reduce the additional pressure from 57,000,000 pounds to 22,000,000 pounds, or about one-third the entire weight of the obelisk as originally proposed. The additional pressure upon the foundation will be 1.8 tons per superficial foot instead of 4½ tons.

The stability of the shaft at this joint will not be reduced, and the structure will be of more elegant proportions when its height is seven times instead of eleven times its base.

The dimensions of the shaft, if so modified, will be 55 feet square at base, 38.33 feet square at top, and 437.8 feet from apex to base of foundation.

Herewith is inclosed a rough sketch, drawn to a scale of one inch to twenty feet, showing the relations between the shaft as originally designed, the portion now built, and the shaft as proposed above, with a plan for a terrace at its base 200 feet square at top, 17 feet high, terminated by slopes of two-thirds; with grass plots and paved walks, and ascend on the east and west sides by plain stone steps 24 feet wide.

The approximate cost of completing the shaft to four hundred feet and the terrace at its base is—

38,749.9 cubic feet marble facing, at \$3.25.....	\$125,937 17
5,013 cubic yards brick-work, at \$16.....	80,208 00
30,004 cubic yards embankment, at 40 cents.....	12,001 60

4, 136 square yards flagging, at \$7.29.....	\$29, 779 20
3, 896 linear feet curbing, at \$3.25.....	12, 672 00
2, 847 square yards sodding and sowing, at 85 cents.....	2, 419 95
250. 4 cubic yards backing for steps, at \$11.....	2, 754 40
1, 478 4 cubic feet cut-stone steps and coping, at \$4.....	5, 913 60
Iron roof and stairway.....	39, 000 00
Total.....	310, 685 92
For obelisk.....	\$245, 145 17
For terrace.....	65, 540 75
	310, 685 92

So that the very recommendations of the engineer have been adopted in this plan that I have, and this is the plan. [Exhibiting.]

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, I am a little afraid that the amendment of my colleague, if adopted, would defeat the object we have in view. The persons who now control this monument are a corporation, and they have the rights that belong to a corporation to whom grants have been made. Even if we have the power, as I have no doubt we have—I think it is contained in the act—to alter, amend, or repeal the incorporating act, and if we were to repeal it, all the property that is there would still be theirs if they did not owe any debts. Now, as we have understood, the larger part of these gentlemen, and the people who have contributed the money so far as it has been contributed for the structure, are wedded to the idea of not taking down anything that has been started for the honor of Washington, so that I suspect that you would find this corporation would decline to transfer its property to the United States on the terms of the amendment.

My colleague states, and truly undoubtedly, that the base is now out of level by six-tenths of an inch as a fact. Supposing that to be the fact, as I have no doubt it is, then this amendment provides that if the persons charged with the completion of the monument find that to be a fact, then instead of going on with this monument they are authorized to go on with anything that they like with that material; that is the short of it. I do not think we shall get ahead at all with that provision. I should be quite willing to vote for a provision which said that these gentlemen having charge of the work, if they found that the base was so out of level as to furnish reasonable ground of fear that the greater weight upon it would still more displace it, and make the structure insecure, should report to Congress for further directions. That would be one thing; but to say that upon the existing facts—for that is what it amounts to—because the base is out of level by half an inch, this corporation is to turn over this structure to a commission to do what it likes with it, to make a triumphal arch, which certainly would be a very fine thing, it never will do it, because I have very good reason to believe (for I have interested myself in my humble way about this business for some years and early in this session introduced a proposition which went to my colleague's committee to complete this monument) that instead of the monument going on under that amendment nothing will be done about it. These gentlemen will not convey, they cannot be got to do it, as I now understand; and they merely represent that feeling which the people who contributed the money have, and are not standing upon any obstinate notions of their own that this obelisk to the memory of one of the chief founders of this Republic should not be taken down, but should go on. With the bill in the shape my colleague proposes, we shall find ourselves next year just as we are now.

I do think, therefore, that the true thing to do is to take the bill as the Senator from Ohio has introduced it, and if it should turn out at the next session of Congress on an inspection (which, of course, the President of the United States and the other people in charge would feel bound to make as a mere matter of ordinary discretion) that the foundation is so insecure that the monument cannot be carried any higher, they would take no desperate steps to run it up in order to see it fall, but they would endeavor to see carefully what the situation is, and then we can decide what may be done.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, I withdraw the proposition which I first presented and offer this instead as additional sections—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, leave will be granted.

Mr. SHERMAN. A verbal amendment has been suggested to me in the variation of legal phraseology which I should like to have adopted first. I move to make lines 14 and 15 read:

Belonging to the said corporation to the uses and for the purposes set forth in said act of incorporation.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It is a mere technical change.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This amendment will be made, if there be no objection. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] offers an amendment, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the amendment proposed by Mr. MORRILL, as follows:

SEC. 2. That before any work shall be commenced upon said monument a plan for its full completion shall be made and approved by the President of the United States, the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, and the Architect of the Capitol, and that the ultimate cost of the same shall not exceed the sum of \$600,000.

SEC. 3. That prior to commencing any work on said monument an examination shall be made as to the foundation of the proposed monument, in order to thoroughly ascertain whether it is sufficient to sustain the weight of the completed structure; and if the same shall be found insufficient or defective, or if the base should be found to be out of level, then the further continuance of the work shall not be authorized by anything herein contained until the further action of Congress.

Mr. LOGAN. I did not hear the bill read. In whose charge is this work to be?

Mr. SHERMAN. The bill provides that it shall be in charge of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, the Architect of the Capitol, and the President of the United States, and it must be done under the laws regulating the construction of public buildings of the Treasury Department under contract. I will say that if it is true that the foundation is six-tenths of an inch out of level I do not think that would impair very much the strength of the foundation. But the Senator alleges a fact which would at once put a stop to the work; and on the statements of the Senator himself it could not go forward at all. Besides he speaks of its costing \$600,000. Is that the cost from the beginning or only the cost from this time forth?

Mr. MORRILL. I only propose these sections, not for the purpose of embarrassing the bill, but of perfecting it. If the bill is to pass it certainly ought to be limited as to the amount that the United States shall become responsible to pay. I propose that the United States shall not be responsible for more than \$500,000.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think that is more than enough.

Mr. MORRILL. I doubt whether it can be completed for that sum, certainly not for less, whatever the engineers and architects may say.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is only an invitation for them to spend \$600,000. We have the report of the engineers that it will cost but \$310,000.

Mr. MORRILL. If the Senate is willing to limit it to less, I shall go for a less sum; but I do not believe it can be completed for any such sum. It will take from thirty to fifty thousand dollars to finish up around the base.

Then, in relation to the base being six-tenths of an inch out of level, I do not know; but it seems to me that if this thing is to be run up to four hundred and eighty-five feet in height, and is four inches now out of plumb, it will be when finished like the leaning tower of Pisa. I should doubt much the prudence of completing it if it shall be found to be so much out of plumb.

I do not desire to embarrass the Senator from Ohio at all, if it is the sense of the Senate that this is such a bill as ought to pass; but I would infinitely prefer something that would cost not more than two-thirds of the money, and be, as I think, much better; but at the same time I do think that we ought to limit the amount, because otherwise the architects may go on and construct this under the first plan, the second, third, or fourth. There is no limit whatever to the ultimate expense, and certainly I think there ought to be an examination as to the foundation; for the late Architect of the Treasury, Mr. Mullett, told me he would not risk an ordinary building, such as he was putting up every day for the Government, on this foundation. The foundation ought to be examined there at least to the depth of thirty feet, to see what the nature of the ground is, or until they find hardpan.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move to amend the amendment proposed by my colleague by striking out of the last section the words:

Or defective, or if the base should be found to be out of level.

My object is to strike out these words which would seem to put a stopper, an absolute stopper, upon any proceeding at all until some further action of Congress; but I still leave the effective sense that my colleague is after. That is the test of the sufficiency of the foundation. The foundation may be defective in a critical sense and still be absolutely sufficient for the purposes for which it is designed. Of course I need not illustrate that. It may be out of level and be absolutely sufficient for the purposes.

Mr. LOGAN. If it is not out of level it is the first foundation ever put up in Washington that was not out of level.

Mr. BAYARD. In common with all my fellow-countrymen, I feel the deepest interest in the completion at the earliest moment of this memorial to the great American. At the same time, it seems to me that we have seen enough in the past to warn us of the danger of persistence in errors, errors in taste, errors in theory as to what this grand monument should be. The gentlemen who have brought in this bill and those who have framed amendments to it, do probably understand their views of this matter; but it seems to me it would be right and just that the rest of the Senate should have a little more time to comprehend the plans proposed for our approval or our disapproval. The amendments to this bill are numerous, and they have not yet been printed. I suggest that some opportunity for consideration of the amendments be given to the Senate. I do not know that I fully comprehend the object of the amendments or the object of the bill brought in by the Senator from Ohio; but if the object of his bill is to continue the present structure upon anything of a theory which we can imagine from what we see of it, I should be very sorry to see such a plan further proceed. Why, sir, I have heard no man speak of the present unfinished monument except in terms of the most positive regret, if not of absolute disrespect. It seems to have nothing in it that can either impress you with awe for its grandeur or inspire you with admiration for its beauty. I do not believe that this present structure can be continued and produce any of those emotions upon us and the generations who are to succeed us in this land and those from other lands who come here to pay their tribute of respect to the great moral excellences of the man whose virtues this monument was designed to commemorate. I do not believe that the impressions we desire to produce upon them will in any degree be assisted by the continuance of such a blot upon architecture, as I must consider this obelisk which

stands here half shorn in its height. There is in it to me nothing that is impressive, nothing that is beautiful, nothing that is tasteful, nothing that is remarkable, excepting perhaps the pious motives which induced it.

Therefore, if in this bill which I may not fully understand, or if in these amendments, which I do not fully understand, there is a proposition under any circumstances to continue expenditure upon this unfinished structure, I desire to record my vote against them. If on the contrary there shall be a scheme which shall submit the matter to those who have made art their study, to those whose professions have enabled them to obtain that which we so much lack in the hurry of the active business life which we lead in this country, and for them to present hereafter to Congress plans of an appropriate monument for this great and patriotic purpose, then I shall be very glad to assist in it, nor shall I stop upon the question of simple pecuniary amount as to this.

This is of all years the one in which this monument should be recommenced, in which some new signification should be given by the people of America of their appreciation of the virtues which called this monument into existence. But "art is long and time is fleeting;" and it is not for us in this time and hastily to be settling a matter which is to last as we trust for generations, perhaps centuries to come.

Therefore I hope that what has been presented to the Senate to-day may be put in print, may be brought up here at the earliest moment of the coming week, and that we may have the opportunity by seeing these amendments in print to understand precisely the design. As I understand it now—it may show my want of comprehension of the amendments—two architects are to agree upon plans which they are to put in some degree in execution without submission to the Senate at all. That I do not desire shall take place, for, as I have my share of responsibility, I propose to exercise my share of power in choosing the character of this monument.

Mr. SHERMAN. If my friend will allow me, I think it is the misfortune now of this Washington Monument that it has been talked of in Congress for one hundred years. We have made promise after promise, and the very moment we come to anything like the execution of the promise we are met by these delays. Now, let me give my friend from Delaware, who is a very reasonable man and I know a patriotic man, the facts. No plan is proposed. This Congress, in both Houses, by a unanimous vote declared its purpose to complete the Washington Monument; and now we propose to spend \$100,000 in doing it. There is no controversy at all about the plan. The plan is a matter fixed by the board of engineers. The corporation that has this matter in charge has adopted the plan of the board of engineers and here it is. [Exhibiting.]

Mr. BAYARD. Am I mistaken in supposing from these diagrams that we have here one proposition which is a triumphal arch and one which is a mere obelisk upon a different plan?

Mr. SHERMAN. The plan of the triumphal arch is a plan which my friend from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] takes a great interest in. That involves tearing up the monument as it is and building a new triumphal arch. Would the Senate in the second century of our history commence by tearing down the only monument that has ever been attempted to be erected for Washington, in order to construct it upon some other plan? Before that triumphal arch could be finished or half way up, a new set of men occupying our places here might say that it did not conform to the laws of taste, and they would tear it down and build up perhaps a pyramidal arch.

I hope without any further delay, as the bill creates no new plan but simply carries into execution an existing plan adopted after full consideration, that we shall have a vote.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] requires that a new plan shall be submitted. If the plan has been adopted and is a fixed thing, I do not know why we should want to adopt that amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. We do not want the amendment. So far as the plan of the Washington Monument is concerned, it has already been fixed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If there is nothing open, if the plan is fixed, the amendment ought to be voted down.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think it ought to be voted down.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I wish to say just a word in reply to my friend from Delaware, [Mr. BAYARD.] He feels the same interest in this matter that we all do; he wants the right thing; but unless we begin afresh to build a monument of our own from the bottom to the top, as a fresh work, calling it a triumphal arch or whatever might be agreed upon by the architects and the President, then I submit from the knowledge I have about it, and that we all have, if we are not to do that we must take this property and this endeavor as far as it has gone from the people who have furnished the money, and build it according to their ideas. If their ideas are so bad, so outrageous in respect of taste and art as to make the thing when completed a discredit to the United States rather than a credit to all concerned, then we ought not to do anything about completing that monument; and if we do not do anything about completing the monument, what right have we got, either moral or otherwise, to confiscate their blocks of marble there and turn them into something else? They will never assent to it. The people who have contributed the money have a deep feeling about it.

What is this monument? My friend criticises it, and well he may.

A barn may be criticised in the same manner that was half way up, or the most ornamental house which was ever built. Aside from certain flummies about it of taste, which I have not anything particular to say about, and which have long since been discarded, this monument belongs to one of the fixed classes or species of architecture. It is an obelisk.

Mr. MORRILL. A class, if my friend will permit me to say, that was in vogue fifteen hundred years before the Christian era, in the time of the Pharaohs.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Certainly; I am much obliged to my colleague, though I believe I knew that before, and I was just going to remark upon it. Like the Ten Commandments and other good things, obelisks were in vogue fifteen hundred years before the Christian era, and something like obelisks were in vogue long before the historic period. Everybody knows that. It is a question of form and grace that meets the taste and the eye and the judgment according as the eye may be naturally skillful or may be educated upon certain principles of acquired taste.

I do not join with my colleague in condemning obelisks absolutely. There are a great many obelisks in this world that are of noble proportions and are well worthy. They are perhaps the most worthy of any of the objects that have descended to us from that long time in the Orient, both of time and geography. Therefore I shall not feel very unhappy, and I do not believe the educated people of the United States (among whom I do not count myself, but speaking my belief of them) will feel very unhappy if at the end of a hundred years of endeavor they see an obelisk, although it is a species of architecture that has existed for many thousands of years, rearing its head to the skies in commemoration of this man. I do not think obelisks in the best sense have gone out of fashion, or out of taste, or out of propriety. In certain aspects and certain situations, in the heart of great cities, triumphal arches and pyramids also please the eye; but when you take the geography of this valley of the Potomac and wish to bring to the eyes of the largest number of people at the same time that commemorative object to this man which will affect the greatest number at the same time, some lofty structure must be resorted to. I take it you are not going to have a tower; they are almost barbaric. All that you have to do then is to have what in the technical sense is an obelisk. Whether it is handsome or whether it is ugly depends upon the proportion of its breadth to its height and the degree of its tapering. While this thing, as it now stands, is ugly, when you carry it up two or three hundred feet more, whatever the distance may be, with the suitable diminution of its breadth, it will be entirely a different thing from what it is now; and from all the hills for twenty miles, for more than twenty miles, diameter around this valley, it will be the most prominent object next to this Capitol that appears to the eye of the beholder. I should be sorry to lose it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Vermont to the right of the Chair [Mr. EDMUNDS] to the amendment offered by his colleague, [Mr. MORRILL.] The amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. The amendment to the amendment is to strike out from the second section of the amendment the words:

Or defective, or if the base should be found out of level.

So as to read:

And if the same shall be found insufficient, then the further continuance of the work, &c.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] to add certain sections to the bill.

Mr. BOUTWELL. Is the proposition divisible?

Mr. EDMUNDS. Certainly; there are two sections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are two separate propositions, which are divisible.

Mr. BOUTWELL. I call for a division.

Mr. MAXEY. The first proposition is a distinct proposition as to the plan; a second branch of the amendment provides for looking into the old structure before we go on with it.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to give notice that if this bill occupies any more time I shall ask for the regular order.

Mr. EDMUNDS. You cannot get it. We will finish this bill to-day.

Mr. WHYTE. Mr. President, the amendment, as I understand it, is directly in the teeth of the bill. The bill proposes that Congress shall take out of the hands of the Washington National Monument Association, which is a private corporation, a chartered association, the monument, as it now stands, and construct it in accordance with the views of that association and the plans which it has adopted for its final completion. The proposition in the bill is that the United States shall take possession of the monument and assume its completion. The bill appropriates for the commencement of the work, when the United States has taken hold of it, the sum of \$100,000, but provides that before any of that money shall be used this corporation shall transfer to the United States the property and the work as far as it has gone. We know that to complete that column, according to the lowest estimate, will take between \$300,000 and \$400,000.

The Senator from Vermont, [Mr. MORRILL,] the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, has given this subject

great consideration. He has called it to the attention of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. We have examined it with great care, and I for one do not hesitate to express my great regret that Congress should appropriate a large sum of money to complete this monument on the plan as adopted by this association. To my taste it will commend itself solely for its height. It is to be as high as the top of the cathedral at Strasbourg, without the breadth below that spire to sustain its great height. This will be a straight shaft, with a base eighty feet wide and a height of four hundred and sixty-three feet; nearly three times as high as that beautiful monument which my own State has erected to the memory of George Washington. How much out of proportion will it be in architectural finish to the breadth of love and affection which the Father of his Country has in the hearts of the American people! It will be a single square spire, almost like the mathematical definition of a straight line, "length without breadth." It will not add to the architectural reputation of the people of the United States. It will look merely like a plain memorial shaft, exaggerated in character, such as we see in the cemeteries around the various cities of this Union. But the Senator from Vermont, [Mr. MORRILL] anxious to build a monument which will do honor to our name as a people, who have advanced in art, has proposed a triumphal arch, which will be attractive to the eye, which will make the heart of every American when he looks upon it beat with joy and inspire in us a laudable pride that here in this new century we have erected a memorial to Washington, honorable to his great name, creditable to us, and which will go down to posterity as "a thing of beauty and a joy forever."

I would be willing to vote a million dollars for such a triumphal arch as that proposed by the Senator from Vermont. When, in passing along the Champs Élysées in Paris, looking toward the sky, I have seen that magnificent triumphal arch which the French erected in honor of the grand army under the decree of the first Napoleon, while I have felt proud of my own country and proud of the memory of Washington, I hoped to see the day when we, too, would construct some splendid monumental testimonial which would, in the time to come, tell the people, and the children of the people now born and hereafter to be born, that Washington had such a hold upon our hearts that the most refined art of man had been called into requisition to devise and the ingenious hands of the famed artisans of America to execute a splendid work of art, which would be beautiful to the eye—as costly as you choose—but such a work as would do honor to the man who is first in the hearts of the American people.

I prefer the amendment because it gives us the opportunity to erect a triumphal arch. I prefer it, because you are only, in my judgment, voting five or six hundred thousand dollars in the bill to complete a structure, of which I will not say we shall be ashamed, but of which I do not think the American people will be proud.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] to add additional sections to the bill. A division has been called for, and the question will be taken on the first section proposed to be inserted.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask for the yeas and nays on the first amendment. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COCKRELL and Mr. NORWOOD. Let the amendment upon which we are now to vote be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first branch of the amendment will be reported.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That before any work shall be commenced on said monument a plan for its full completion shall be made and approved by the President of the United States, the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, and the Architect of the Capitol, and that the ultimate cost of the same shall not exceed the sum of \$600,000.

Mr. COCKRELL. I desire to ask the Senator from Ohio what amounts have been estimated to complete the monument? This amendment requires it to be constructed under a different plan.

Mr. SHERMAN. The engineer estimates it at \$310,000. The association estimates it at \$350,000.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is to finish it according to its present plan?

Mr. SHERMAN. To finish it according to its present plan.

Mr. DAVIS. Does the Senator from Ohio object to this amendment?

Mr. SHERMAN. This first amendment authorizes these three men to tear up the Washington Monument and to build a triumphal arch. It defeats the whole object.

The question being taken by yeas and nays, resulted—yeas 14, nays 33; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Anthony, Bayard, Bogv, Bruce, Cooper, Dennis, Gordon, Morrill, Norwood, Paddock, Ransom, Robertson, Saulsbury, and Whyte—14.

NAYS—Messrs. Allison, Barnum, Booth, Boutwell, Cameron of Wisconsin, Christianity, Cockrell, Cragin, Davis, Dawes, Edmunds, Ferry, Frelinghuysen, Hamlin, Harvey, Hitchcock, Howe, Ingalls, Kelly, Kernan, Key, Logan, McMillan, Maxey, Mitchell, Oglesby, Sherman, Spencer, Wadleigh, West, Windom, Withers, and Wright—33.

ABSENT—Messrs. Alcorn, Burnside, Cameron of Pennsylvania, Caperton, Clayton, Conkling, Conover, Dorsey, Eaton, Goldthwaite, Hamilton, Johnston, Jones of Florida, Jones of Nevada, McCreery, McDonald, Merrimon, Morton, Patterson, Randolph, Sargent, Sharon, Stevenson, Thurman, and Wallace—25.

So the first division of the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the second division of the amendment.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let the second amendment be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be reported.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That prior to commencing any work on said monument an examination shall be made as to the foundation of the proposed monument in order to thoroughly ascertain whether it is sufficient to sustain the weight of the completed structure; and if the same shall be found insufficient, then the further continuance of the work shall not be authorized by anything herein contained until the further action of Congress.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The word "proposed" ought to be stricken out. It seems to imply a new monument.

Mr. MORRILL. I have no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection that modification will be made.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I observe that the amendment provides for examining the foundation. That is all proper and right, but it does not specify by whom the examination shall be made.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will say to the Senator that that is provided for. The bill itself provides that this work shall be done under the direction of the President of the United States, the Supervising Architect of the Treasury of the United States, and the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I was not aware of the terms of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment inserting this additional section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is there anything in the bill limiting the amount to be expended?

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us first concur in the amendment.

The amendment was concurred in.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should like to hear the first section of the bill itself read, constituting the commission.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

That there be, and is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000 to continue the construction of the Washington Monument in the city of Washington: *Provided*, That before any portion of said sum shall be expended, the proper officers of the Washington National Monument Society, incorporated by the act approved February 26, 1859, entitled "An act to incorporate the Washington National Monument Society," shall transfer and convey to the United States in due form all the property, easements, rights, and privileges, whether in possession or in action, or in expectancy, belonging to the said corporation, to the uses and for the purposes set forth in said act of incorporation; and the said charter is so amended as to authorize the executive officers of said corporation to make said transfer and conveyance in consideration that the United States hereby agree to complete said monument. And the construction of said monument shall be under the direction and supervision of the President of the United States, the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, and the Architect of the Capitol, and in accordance with the laws regulating contracts and the construction of public buildings by the Treasury Department; and detailed reports of such expenditures shall be annually submitted to Congress.

Mr. MORRILL. I move to insert after the words "the United States hereby agree to complete such monument" the words "at a cost not exceeding \$350,000." Certainly there ought to be a limit.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Here is a monument, the plans of which are all made, the cost of which can be ascertained. It will cost \$300,000 for the specific thing we are about to do. As I understood my friend from Vermont, he proposed in his amendment \$600,000, and I think I heard him say he did not think it could be completed for that sum. The amount which we limit regulates the plan, and to insert that plan is to say that we will construct the monument according to the plan adopted.

Mr. SHERMAN. Here is the difficulty. How can we tell how much this plan will cost? We have the estimate of the engineers who put it at \$310,000. How can they tell how much it will cost until completed? Suppose the cost of stone should rise next year, or the cost of labor?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I merely call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the fact that under some plans it may cost a great deal more than a million. The Senator seems to think it can be completed according to the estimate of the engineer which he holds in his hands. If so, I think it ought to be limited to that.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not care whether it is limited or not. It is said here it will cost \$350,000. That is the highest estimate proposed.

Mr. LOGAN. It will be seen by the Senate that if the proposition is adopted as the bill now reads and should not be a sufficient amount, the deed made by these trustees amounts to nothing. The proposition in the bill is that we will complete the monument, not for any particular price but according to this particular plan. Hence the conveyance will amount to nothing unless we carry out the plan.

Mr. MORRILL. There is no plan specified.

Mr. LOGAN. It is the same thing.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not care anything about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] to insert the words "at a cost not exceeding \$350,000."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I think there ought to be added to the words in constituting this commission words which would show that these three officers are to act as a joint commission, and that it does not depend upon the individual will of every one of them if they do not agree about going on. Therefore, after the word "Capitol," to save all possible question, I move to amend by inserting:

Which officers are hereby constituted a joint commission for that purpose.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection to the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.
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 providing for the completion of the Washington Monument."

ARTIFICIAL LIMBS TO DISABLED SOLDIERS.

Mr. LOGAN. I ask to take up House bill No. 1516.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the duty of the Chair to state that the morning hour having expired he will lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the bill known as the river and harbor bill, on which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. LOGAN. This will take but a moment.

Mr. ALLISON. I must insist on the regular order. It has now gone over one hour beyond the time.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I will yield to my friend from Illinois so far as I am concerned.

Mr. LOGAN. If this bill leads to any debate, I shall withdraw it. It is an act to regulate the issue of artificial limbs to disabled soldiers, seamen, and others. It is an amendment to the old act.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

Mr. LOGAN. I have been pressed a great deal about it and it has been here a great while. It will take but a moment to act upon it. If there is any objection I shall withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois to proceed to the consideration of the bill he has named.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. No. 1516) to regulate the issue of artificial limbs to disabled soldiers, seamen, and others.

The Committee on Military Affairs proposed to amend the bill in section 1, line 7, by inserting after the word "appliance" the words "or commutation therefor."

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us hear that explained.

Mr. LOGAN. The explanation is this: Almost in the words of the bill a law of this kind has existed, passed in 1870 or 1871, and the construction of it is that it only extended for five years and that therefore they cannot issue after the first issue. When the apparatus has been worn five years so that it cannot be used the next five years, there can be no re-issue. This is almost a literal copy of the bill, extending it every five years.

Mr. EDMUNDS. How does it differ from the law?

Mr. LOGAN. It does not differ at all except to change from the Secretary of War to the Quartermaster the furnishing of transportation. It is the same bill precisely except these changes and extending to every five years, which was the intention of the law.

Mr. ANTHONY. Is this commutation for the limb itself? I thought we had voted that down once.

Mr. LOGAN. No, sir; that is in the original law.

Mr. ANTHONY. Then a soldier who has lost a limb has a right to have an artificial limb or a certain sum of money in lieu thereof?

Mr. LOGAN. Yes; here is the statute:

Every person in the military or naval service who lost a limb during the war of the rebellion, but from the nature of his injury is not able to use an artificial limb, shall be entitled to the benefits of section 4788, and shall receive money commutation as therein provided.

That is, where the limb is so destroyed that they cannot use it, then we give them in lieu of that a certain amount of money. That is the law that exists now and this does not change it.

Mr. ANTHONY. I recollect we had a very long and fierce debate here on the propriety of giving a commutation for the limb, and it was very properly voted down.

Mr. LOGAN. But it was put in the law as it stands now, and the only thing that this bill does is, as I stated, to change the transportation from the Secretary of War to the Quartermaster-General's Department and to extend the time; that is to say, it gives a different construction from what the War Department gives; it allows a limb to be given every five years. That was the intention of the original law, but the construction of the Department is that it does not allow a renewal every five years.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should like to hear the bill read again.

The bill was read.

Mr. LOGAN. I move to amend the first section, so as to conform to the old law in that particular, to read:

Every officer, soldier, seaman, or marine.

So as to include only those who were regularly in the service.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think this bill gives commutation for the limb—"limb or appliance or commutation therefor."

Mr. ALLISON. While the Senator from Illinois is preparing his bill and getting it into such shape that he himself will be satisfied with, I suggest that we go on with the regular order. He can call it up again.

Mr. ANTHONY. I suggest "commutation therefor in cases where commutation is now allowed by law."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa calls for the regular order.

Mr. LOGAN. If the Senator will allow me a moment, I will say that this bill was carefully examined by the Surgeon-General and is

proposed just as it was examined and reported by the Military Committee on their construction of the law. I do not know who draughted the bill, but I examined it and I noticed that the change was that it used the word "person" instead of "soldier, seaman, or marine." I am now willing to make that change and make it conform to the original law. That is all there is of the bill. The Surgeon-General gives a construction that he cannot re-issue these artificial limbs. The commutation is the same and everything is the same, except the change I have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee in line 7, after the words "or appliance," to insert "or commutation therefor."

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move to amend the amendment after the word "therefor," by inserting "as provided by existing law;" so that the commutation will be exactly as the law now is.

Mr. LOGAN. I have no objection to that.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. INGALLS. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Illinois who reported this bill to the law of 1874, approved June 18, which declares—

That all persons who are now entitled to pensions under existing laws and who have lost either an arm at or above the elbow, or a leg at or above the knee, shall be rated in the second class, and shall receive \$24 per month: *Provided*, That no artificial limbs, or commutation therefor, shall be furnished to such persons as shall be entitled to pensions under this act.

There appears to be a conflict between this and the bill which the Senator from Illinois proposes now to pass, and I would suggest to him whether the effect of that bill will not be to repeal this provision in regard to the pension laws and thereby increase the pensions of a certain class of soldiers who are now disabled, to the exclusion of others.

Mr. LOGAN. I said I would withdraw this bill if it created discussion, but I want to say that the law has existed in this way although the pensions were given. No person is entitled to an artificial limb unless he was a soldier, unless he had done his duty properly and was properly discharged. You may call it by what name you please, if he cannot use the limb he gets commutation for it; that is to say, the price of the limb in lieu of it. The men may either take the limb or the price the limb costs in lieu of it. That is the construction of the law as it stands now. I hope the bill will pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. INGALLS. I suggest to the Senator from Illinois to amend his bill, by an additional section or proviso, to the effect that this act shall not be held to be in conflict with the act of June 18, 1874.

Mr. LOGAN. I will say to the Senator that, if the bill conflicts with it, that may be the object. I think the Pension Committee did very wrong in passing the law they did, depriving these poor men of their commutation where they cannot use the limb. They certainly get a very small pension, and I think they ought to have this limb besides. It has always been given since the law passed, and I am in favor of giving it again.

Mr. ALLISON. Let me suggest to the Senator that if I understand the law quoted by the Senator from Kansas that was an act to increase pensions in certain cases and it did increase the pensions of this class of soldiers, but it provided that if they availed themselves of this act they should not have artificial limbs in addition. Now it seems to me, if we pass the bill proposed by the Senator from Illinois, it will have the effect to decrease the pensions provided by this act if they accept the provisions of that act.

Mr. LOGAN. It will not, because the bill already provides, if you will read the amendment adopted, that according to existing laws they shall receive this.

Mr. ALLISON. The existing law is that if they have increased pensions they shall not receive it.

Mr. LOGAN. If that is the existing law, that is the end of it.

Mr. INGALLS. It is my impression, from an examination of this law and from hearing the bill reported by the Senator from Illinois read, that it is the intent by indirection to increase the pensions of this class of disabilities; that the object is to get around the law of June 18, 1874, so as to enable this class of pensioners to receive not only the increased pension but also the commutation for the limbs. While this may be right, and I have no objection to it on principle, still it is obtaining a certain result by indirection and at the same time works a manifest injustice to that class of pensioners who do not get an increase by this or by any other law.

Mr. LOGAN. The ones who get the increase are not the ones affected by it, and the Senator is certainly wrong. According to the law in reference to granting pensions, those who get the increased pensions it provides shall not have this extra limb.

Mr. INGALLS. The Senator's bill provides that they shall have the limb or commutation, irrespective of the pension.

Mr. LOGAN. But as it has been amended—I called attention to the fact a moment ago—by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont it is "as provided by existing law;" hence the existing law already depriving them as a matter of course will do it as to that class. That amendment has been adopted.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It might be better, to save all possible doubt about the words "as provided," to add "and limited;" so as to read:

As provided and limited by existing law.

Then there cannot be a possible question, because if that is a limitation it is a limitation on this. I move that amendment.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not accept that amendment. It is not necessary at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LOGAN. The word "limited" there is exactly what we are trying to cure. It is limited now by the construction given to it by the officers of the law, that these men are entitled at all.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It is only as to the commutation, I will say to my friend; it does not apply to the rest of it, but is only a limitation on the commutation. If the man does not take his limb, it is to apply.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not know but that the lawyers who control by their construction the statutes of Congress would give it that construction. The Surgeon-General has given it the construction I have stated. I do not know who else has, but probably the Secretary of War has. Anyhow it is construed so that no one is entitled under existing law to the provisions in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. EDMUNDS. My amendment does not apply to the general object of the bill as a limitation upon that; but to the amendment reported by the committee about commutation, which, as it now stands modified, is "commutation therefor as provided by existing law." I propose to add after the word "provided" the words "and limited;" so that it will be:

Or commutation therefor as provided and limited by existing law.

So that the limitation only applies to the money part or commutation and that relieves the difficulty that the Senator from Kansas suggests.

Mr. INGALLS. I want to ask the Senator from Illinois a single question. The act of June 18, 1874, provides for an increased pension instead of commutation. Now I ask him whether the intention of this bill is to give the pensioner increased pension and commutation for a limb that he cannot use?

Mr. LOGAN. There is no such object at all. The law was passed without reference to the pensions. The object is just what is expressed on the face of the bill, to give the man an artificial limb who lost a leg or arm in the service.

Mr. INGALLS. He has a right to that now.

Mr. LOGAN. He had the right to it except that the Surgeon-General construed the law not to extend further than the first five years. Hence it cuts him off; and this is only to extend it every five years as the original intention of the law was. That is what the bill means, and that is all it was intended it should mean.

Mr. HARVEY. My understanding of this question is that the object of the bill proposed by the Senator from Illinois is to enable pensioners of this class to procure from the Government artificial legs at the rate that the Government arranges with certain companies to furnish them, enabling the soldier to procure the artificial limb upon much more favorable terms than he could possibly get it from the companies or the dealers, dealing with them individually. I have had some soldiers speak to me about this bill, and as I understand, having to purchase these limbs each on his individual account, they cost something like 30 per cent. higher than the rates at which the same quality of limb is provided under the arrangement of the Government with the companies. The object of this bill is to do away with the ruling that the Senator from Illinois has referred to, that after the first five years the soldier, without such legislation as is proposed, cannot secure a limb under that arrangement and must make an individual arrangement on the best terms he can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. INGALLS. I move to add as a proviso the words:

Provided, That this act shall be subject to the provisions of an act entitled "An act to increase pensions in certain cases," approved June 18, 1874.

Mr. LOGAN. The Senator is a very good lawyer, and after having the amendment made to this bill providing that it shall be subject to all limitations of the law, I presume no one knows better than he that that does bring it within the very proposition he now makes. But for some reason or other it is impossible to make a bill so plain that some one must not have an amendment put to it, not for the purpose of showing his ability or his facility in getting up laws or anything of that kind, but for the purpose of having it amended to make it so plain that he cannot even understand it himself. That is about what results from these amendments. I ask the Secretary to read the bill with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont. It does exactly what the Senator from Kansas proposes to do now.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

That every person who, in the line of duty in the military or naval service of the United States, shall have lost a limb, or sustained bodily injuries depriving him of the use of any of his limbs, shall receive once every five years an artificial limb or appliance, or commutation therefor, as provided and limited by existing laws, under such regulations as the Surgeon-General of the Army may prescribe; and the period of five years shall be held to commence with the filing of the first application after the 15th day of June, in the year 1870.

Sec. 2. That necessary transportation to have artificial limbs fitted shall be furnished by the Quartermaster-General of the Army, the cost of which shall be refunded out of any money appropriated for the purchase of artificial limbs.

Mr. LOGAN. "As provided and limited by existing law." That covers exactly the proposition the Senator from Kansas desires. If his proposition goes in I shall ask that the other be stricken out. They are both the same, and they mean the same.

Mr. INGALLS. Since reading section 4787 of the compiled laws I am more than ever convinced that while the Senator from Illinois may be entirely sincere, as I have no doubt he is, in his advocacy of this bill, it has a purpose which is not disclosed on the surface. Let me read the language of section 4787:

Every officer, soldier, seaman, and marine who was disabled during the war for the suppression of the rebellion in the military or naval service and in the line of duty, or in consequence of wounds received or disease contracted therein, and who was furnished by the War Department, since the 15th day of June, 1870, with an artificial limb or apparatus for resection, or who was entitled to receive such limb or apparatus since said date, shall be entitled to receive a new limb or apparatus at the expiration of every five years thereafter, under such regulations as have been or may be prescribed by the Surgeon-General of the Army.

Now, Mr. President, can anything be more direct or explicit than that language? What is there in that which requires the passage of this bill? The direction is explicit that within a period of every five years after the very date named in the bill, the soldier, seaman, or marine shall be entitled to the artificial limb and apparatus for resection or commutation therefor. Now, in view of the statute of June 18, 1874, there is no doubt in my mind whatever that the purpose of this bill by re-enactment is to give a certain class of pensioners an advantage over others who are not on the list. While I do not object to the increase of pensions, while I do not pretend to say that these men receive or will receive too much, what I do ask is that all classes shall be treated alike; but if you are going to increase pensions in one case, increase them in all.

Mr. LOGAN. I am very much surprised at the Senator's imputation. Why the construction has been given to this law that has been given to it, I cannot state. As I said a while ago, these lawyers or men having the power to construe statutes give a construction that might not be the construction the persons would give who passed the laws. But that is not for me to determine. They have so construed it, and that is what this bill proposes to remedy—the construction given. In reference to commutation you will find the same provision here in sections 4790 and 4791.

SEC. 4790. Every person in the military or naval service who lost a limb during the war of the rebellion, but from the nature of his injury is not able to use an artificial limb, shall be entitled to the benefits of section 4788, and shall receive money commutation as therein provided.

SEC. 4791. The Secretary of War is authorized and directed to furnish to the persons embraced by the provisions of section 4787 transportation to and from their homes and the place where they may be required to go to obtain artificial limbs provided for them under authority of law.

The bill now is almost the same language as the existing law; and it is merely to avoid that construction of the statute which has been given to it by those who have the right to furnish these limbs or apparatus. Why the construction has been given I do not know; but it has been given that these men are not entitled to artificial limbs after the first five years. The only object of the bill is to remedy that.

So far as the amendment is concerned I care nothing about it; but if it is put in, the other amendment ought to be stricken out, because they both mean the same thing precisely. The Senate having voted in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont, certainly it obviates the necessity of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas, unless it is a mere desire, as I said, to have the bill so amended that nobody can understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. LOGAN. I ask that the amendment that I suggested be made, to strike out "person" in line 3 of section 1 and insert "officer, soldier, seaman, and marine;" so as to read:

That every officer, soldier, seaman, and marine of the United States Army who in the line of duty in the military or naval service, &c.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. U. S. GRANT, jr., his Secretary, announced that the President had this day approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. No. 391) to authorize the Secretary of War to purchase a parcel of land on the island of Key West, Florida;

An act (S. No. 843) establishing the rank of the Paymaster-General; and

An act (S. No. 983) to extend the duration of the court of commissioners of Alabama claims.

CHANGE OF NAME OF VESSEL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business, being the river and harbor bill, is now before the Senate.

Mr. HAMLIN. I ask the Senate to allow me unanimous consent to take up a bill to change the name of a vessel, which will not take a minute. It is material to the man who wants it changed.

Mr. ALLISON. He can wait one day more.

Mr. HAMLIN. It will not take one minute to pass the bill. I hope the Senator will not interpose any objection.

Mr. ALLISON. If it will not give rise to any debate, I will yield.

Mr. HAMLIN. If there be one word of debate, I will move to lay it on the table.

There being no objection, the bill (S. No. 992) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue a register and change the name of the schooner Captain Charles Robbins to Minnie was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 3022) making appropriations for the construction, repair, preservation, and completion of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, the pending question being on the motion of Mr. THURMAN to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to reduce the aggregate amount of the appropriations contained in the bill to a sum not exceeding \$4,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. ALLISON. Before the Senator from Vermont proceeds, I desire to say that I shall ask the Senate to remain to-day until this bill is completed.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Would not the Senator say to-morrow? [Laughter.]

Mr. OGLESBY. I wonder if the Senator from Vermont will get through with his speech to-day.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I shall not, if I am interrupted by orations from other Senators as I was yesterday. What I had to say would have been said within thirty minutes, but I think an hour and a half was occupied by my little speech being filled up with padding by the speeches of other Senators; and my only consolation is that what they said was so much better than what I could have said that the country will believe—which I am always looking to of course—that it was all my speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, seriously speaking I am rather sorry that when a bill of this importance—for it is very important—is before the Senate, we should find ourselves at this moment with a scant quorum. I take it for granted that we have one; otherwise I could not go on at all.

When I left off last evening I was still on the subject of the river and harbor bill itself. By and by, in the course of my remarks, if I do not get too tired, I shall refer to some other topics that have been very properly drawn into this discussion, as to the general state of the country, the taxation, expenditures, &c.; but for the present time, I am on the topic introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERRY] of taking the House bill, or, if we cannot get that with its \$40,000 more for Michigan, as the songs used to go in the war times:

We are coming, Father Abraham,
With forty thousand more,

which I believe is the exact sum of dollars that my friend from Michigan wishes to have the Senate understand his State gets, or, if we cannot get that, then we are to take the bill as the Senate have perfected it—save the mark—not as the committee, but as the Senate have perfected it, by increasing \$40,000 more for Michigan to \$50,000 or so. But the particular point to which I wish to draw the attention of the Senate now in the remarks of my honorable friend the President of the Senate as the ground for pressing this bill through, hit or miss, without regard to the perniciousness of any of its items, but as a whole, is that in his remarks of the 15th of July, as the prime or cardinal reason for our swallowing the bill whole, he said:

We will have a bill that appropriates \$5,800,000, which the House of Representatives has passed, and this, remember, is the body of the people.

Whether the Senator meant by that that the House of Representatives is the body of the people as the *posse comitatus* in the counties is the body of the county that the sheriff may call upon in case of sudden distress and everybody rallies to the flag, or whether he meant, as I suppose he did, that the body called the House of Representatives is a body that comes from the people, I do not particularly know, but I suppose that is what he meant, and I take it in that sense. I infer from that remark that the Senator imagines and believes that this body does not come from the people, but comes from some extraneous foreign source or territory, and that it does not represent the just, conservative, steadfast, uniform judgment of the people of the various States; and, therefore, no matter what our individual opinions may be about this item or that item or the other, we are bound to take it because the House of Representatives, being "the body of the people," or, as in old times, six, or eight, or ten years ago, used to be called the tribunes of the people, have thought it was wise or expedient, and that the only discretion left to us was that very narrow one that belongs to the servants to register the edict of the other House, because it is "the body of the people."

Mr. President, with the greatest possible deference to my friend from Michigan, I must be excused if I differ with him. According to my understanding of the frame-work of this Government, the Senate

is just as much as the House of Representatives, and in just as large a degree the body of the people as the House is. Who are Senators? Are they not of the people? Are they not citizens of the United States and of their respective States just as the members of the House of Representatives are? Are they not presumably equally respectable and equally intelligent? Is it not to be presumed that within the sphere of their habitations, among the people, and of the people, they may understand, man for man, just as much of the interests, of the wishes, of the prejudices, of the emotions of the people as the members of the lower House? I think that question must be answered in the affirmative; and if my honorable friend from Michigan will only recall to his recollection the history of the formation of this Government, he will find that such was the concurrent sentiment of the people of the United States, without regard to State lines. That great body of patriotic and intelligent men who composed the nation at that time, ordained and established this body just as much, in just as large a degree, the representatives of the people as it did the House of Representatives; with this difference, that the House of Representatives, being elected three times as often as Senators, reflect more perfectly the temporary passion of the hour, if I may so call it, or emotion of the hour, or sentiment of the hour, than the Senate. The reason why they gave Senators a long term of office as distinguished from the short term of the members of the House of Representatives, was that they intended to provide against the possibility of any sudden popular clamor or emotion, or prejudice, or interest which it was supposed, according to the infirmities of human nature, might affect a member of the lower House who was watching for a re-election presently, when it might not affect a member of this House who would have the courage to believe that if he stood against the tide of clamor and emotion there would be time for passion to cool and for reflection to come in, and that he, before his time expired, would be justified by the unanimous sentiment and judgment of his countrymen.

I know of no theory of the Constitution—and I cannot help believing that my friend will agree with me, because these words of his, of course, were spoken in the heat and hurry of an interloctory debate—which removes this body any more from being "the body of the people" than it does the members of the other branch of the legislative department of this Government. The one is the sudden and responsive element in the Government that fills every breath and breeze of popular emotion, be it hasty and ill-judged, or be it patriotic and wise; while this body does not represent such emotions, because the duration of its term is too long, as human affairs go, to have any prejudice or interest, or fear, or favor applying to its members largely influence their judgments. And, I think I may say, Mr. President, as to both these branches, that the theory of the frame-work of the Government was, as it must be of every just government where it is not the government of a mob, that is for this thing to-day and for that thing to-morrow, that it is the responsible Government of selected representatives of the people who, when selected, are subjected in both Houses to the test of a solemn obligation in the presence of Almighty God that, not according to popular passion, or prejudice, or interest, or wish, but according to the solemn judgment of each man, he will vote according to what he believes, and nobody else may believe, to be the public interest. So I must ask to be excused from going for this bill on the ground that the House of Representatives is "the body of the people;" and I feel quite sure that my honorable friend from Michigan on reflection will agree with the general principles that I have stated.

Mr. FERRY. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. EDMUNDS. With pleasure.

Mr. FERRY. Mr. President, I do not know from what the Senator has said that I am disposed to take back what I stated, but I think I will reiterate it. The view in which I stated that the House of Representatives represented the body of the people was that the members of the House of Representatives are elected by the people by districts casting their votes directly for the members representing those districts and composing the body of the House of Representatives. It was in that light that I spoke of that body as more immediately representing the people. In the theory of our Government I understand that the Senate more directly represents the States inasmuch as the Senators are elected by the Legislatures of the States, which bodies are elected by the people of the respective States.

I do not differ with the Senator from Vermont when he states that the Senate of the United States also represents the body of the people; but according to the theory of our Government this body is farther removed from the people, and, as he said, the members of the House of Representatives represent the fluctuating sentiment of the people, because their election was more frequent and they are more often called to answer to the judgment of the people. So in that sense I wish my words to stand that the House of Representatives rather than the Senate represents the body of the people *en masse*, while the Senate represents them in their aggregated capacity in the form of States.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, my friend says that he wishes his words to stand in the sense that he now puts upon them, which is exactly the opposite from the natural sense that reading his words as he stated them would bear to any intelligent reader, for he was urging us, almost commanding us, to put this bill through, right or wrong as it might appear to our judgment, because the House of Representatives had passed it and it was the body of the people. The Senator

now says that he understands the true meaning of this language of his to be that all there is about it is that the House is the body of the people because it is elected oftener than we are, and the people elect them directly instead of selectively by other agents of theirs chosen to make a more careful examination. That is the theory. Whether they do make it, of course my friend and I would be a good deal inclined to doubt.

Mr. FERRY. I have no doubt in my case. I do not know how it is with the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. EDMUNDS. My honorable friend goes on to say:

I am willing to face the country on this approval rather than let the knife be plunged into the life of this bill.

I take it the Senator meant by that, either that the knife was the motion of the Senator from Ohio to recommit the bill with instructions to reduce the total, by eliminating works that could now be dispensed with, to \$4,000,000, or that he alluded to the amendment I had the honor to offer to reduce the sum-total to \$4,000,000, and leave, as we did in 1869, the application of it in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Corps of Engineers to the most necessary works. If those be the knives that are inserted into the life of this bill, then the life of the bill is the largest possible total, for that is the only life that these two propositions assail unless the proposition of the Senator from Ohio may be considered as implying the postponement of Frankfort, and of Pent Water, and of McCargoe's Cove, and Otter Creek, and Swanton, and so on. If the life of this bill depends upon the people of Frankfort or the people of Vergennes—and I take them both in order that my friend may not suppose that I am addressing personal observations at all; I am on the substance of the thing—if the life of this bill that my friend is so eager to save depends upon the fact that the public Treasury shall be drawn upon this year to provide for Frankfort, and McCargoe's Cove, and Otter Creek, then my friend is probably right, because the chances are altogether that if this bill be recommitted to the committee with instructions to limit the appropriation to \$4,000,000 by items, McCargoe will disappear from the scene, and Frankfort will go with its college and with its iron-furnace and with its agriculture without the aid of an appropriation; and Otter Creek will dream over its former glories as a naval establishment and wait for "the good time coming."

What then does the Senator mean by appealing to the friends of this bill to stand by it and to stick to it as the House passed it, or better still, stick to it as the Senate fixed it in spite of its committee so that Otter Creek and McCargoe and Frankfort, &c., shall be sure to come into the enjoyment of the luxury of the expenditure of public money in their localities?

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

Mr. EDMUNDS. With pleasure. It is always a greater pleasure to me to hear my friend than to speak myself.

Mr. FERRY. If that were the case, the Senator would have yielded to me to occupy the floor more than he usually does, for I think he first criticised me for leaving the chair and then criticised me for occupying the chair so much; but I would like the Senator now to classify his position; whether he is the friend of the Senate bill or not. I have stated that I was a friend to the bill, and I appealed to the friends of the bill, including all who are friendly to it. I ask the Senator where he stands on it; whether he is a friend or an enemy of the Senate bill?

Mr. EDMUNDS. I am not wise enough to know that there is any Senate bill. I thought it was a House bill.

Mr. FERRY. I ask that the Senator may understand me; he does not wish to avoid my question, I suppose, because we are trying to get at the facts, as he stated a while ago. I mean the bill reported from the Senate committee as modified by the Senate in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. EDMUNDS. No, Mr. President—I am willing to be catechized upon that subject—I am not in favor of the bill as modified by the Committee of the Whole, although it contains Otter Creek and Swanton, and although it should contain every trout brook and every spring in the State of Vermont and every valley. I am not in favor of it then, because I believe it transcends the true principles of the Constitution and is an utter waste of the public money; and if I cannot have any popularity at home (for we are enough of the people, notwithstanding my friend's opinion, to be rather fond of being popular) except at the expense of taking out of the Treasury of the United States money to improve the internal streams of the State of Vermont, then I do not wish to be popular. But candor compels me to say that the people of the State of Vermont, as I believe, have not got educated up to the high pitch of supposing that it is any part of my mission to tax the people of New York, or Maryland, or Louisiana, or Missouri to assume the control of the streams over which the State of Vermont has absolute and sovereign jurisdiction, to improve them and regulate their use for the benefit of the people of the other States or for the benefit of the people of our own State. I have not got to any such pitch of perfection as that yet. So I am quite able to say that I am not in favor of the Senate bill, as the Senator calls it; as it has been perfected, as he calls it. I think I should have voted for the bill of the House as it was proposed to be amended by the committee of the Senate, who, by a careful analysis and examination, endeavored to strike off what could be dispensed with and to preserve and increase, where necessary, what the public interests of the whole nation demanded, although I should have done it with

great reluctance, because I believe that in the present state of the Treasury we ought not to expend from it so large a sum as the committee of the Senate reported finally as the total; and as to the House bill, the Senator himself, in respect of some of the items in that section of the country where he resides, has been forced to admit—no, I will not say forced, because that would imply that there was some want of candor—has candidly admitted that there is no present public necessity for the expenditure of any such money.

Mr. FERRY. In what respect?

Mr. EDMUNDS. Well, for McCargoe, for instance.

Mr. FERRY. The Senator in a measure is correct so far as my course in that respect is concerned, and I think it justifies the position I have taken upon this bill. I appealed to the Senator from Iowa, who has charge of the bill, to know what had been reported in this case, as I had no personal knowledge of it. Adopting the plan that I had pursued, that upon the statement of any Senator, he verifying the necessity for any appropriation, I was disposed to vote for such appropriation, I appealed to the Senator from Iowa if he had any such information. He did not give it; and therefore as upon my own information I could not press it. I did not do so; but the appropriation was inserted in the House. I knew nothing about its merits personally, and because of that I was consistent in not pressing it upon the attention of the Senate.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, my friend is abdicating already, although he is not of "the body of the people." "The body of the people" has said that McCargoe was a matter of indispensable necessity, of course, because the House would not have passed a bill that contained anything that was not; but my friend abandons it all at once. That is not at all consistent with that respect, that obedience which from the Senator's remarks is due to the House of Representatives. But now let us see.

Mr. FERRY. Allow me a word just there.

Mr. EDMUNDS. O, certainly.

Mr. FERRY. On the same principle, following "the body of the people," when I did ask that the House bill should be taken in case the Senate bill could not be adopted, on the same principle precisely I stuck to Otter Creek, because the body of the people, the people whom the Senator so eminently represents, had insisted on it; but upon my own knowledge, such as I have of that, I should not have voted for it unless the Senator stated, as he has I believe stated, the necessity of it. Upon my own knowledge I should not have voted for that; but as the bill comes from the House as a whole necessarily perhaps it includes exceptional cases. While I might not vote for the exceptions singly, yet taking the House bill as a whole I was disposed to support it, and I am still.

Mr. EDMUNDS. What is the use of having a Senate if, when the House sends us a bill which has items in it that are both exceptional and exceptionable to our knowledge and belief, we are not authorized to say so and reject it? What is the object of this body? Is it to have an elegant parliamentarian, a first-rate presiding officer, and to meet at twelve and adjourn at four, and go home to dinner and come back again the next day? Or is it to do some serious work for the protection of the interests of the people against the improper expenditure of their money? If the latter is the object then I submit that when the Senate finds a McCargoe's Cove or an Otter Creek that it does not see any ground for, it ought to have the courage to say so. But the Senator says he was somewhat ignorant about this matter in the State of Michigan, and that was because, I suppose, of the fact that he was not one "of the people;" but I find that he states that he appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and made propositions, as I suppose, between two high contracting parties. He says:

I first proposed to the Committee on Appropriations in behalf of the delegation of Michigan that we would consent—

How gracious, Mr. President!—

to a modification of the House appropriations for that State, to the reduction of \$40,000, yes, \$41,000, as I am reminded by my colleague.

"Appropriations for that State!" Mr. President, I believe I have said—if I have not I say it now—that I do not know, on the theory of this bill or on the theory of any other bill of national concern, that we make any appropriations for a State. McCargoe's Cove would be just as important if it were in the State of Wisconsin or Ohio or New York, I suppose. The commerce of the country, the great national interests would be equally at stake with the business of McCargoe's Cove if it were out of the great and noble State of Michigan. So it appears to me that my friend is occupying a rather uncertain attitude, in respect of its correctness but not in respect of its definition, because that is perfectly plain, as he always is when he talks about appropriations of this character for any State. They are appropriations of the nation's money for national objects; and when they cease to be that, they cease to be not only constitutional but to be either reasonable or just. That is my opinion; but I may be wrong. If this is a bill of distributions, as of a dead man's estate among his heirs, then the Senator is right; but if it be a bill for the execution under the Constitution of great national instrumentalities of commerce among the several States, then the locality of the particular harbor or of the particular port is of no sort of consequence, and the harbor of New York (if the State of New York, as was proposed once during the rebellion, should have been divided, and the Island of Manhattan should have been set up as an independent State) would

have been just as national, just as important to the whole interest of the country as it is now, forming the harbor of the Empire State of the Republic. It is not correct therefore, I submit with great deference to my honorable and learned friend, to speak of this bill or to look at it, so far as its merits are concerned, with any reference to how much or how little money is to be expended within the territorial limits of any particular State. When it descends to that, it descends to the region of the lobby, to the region of combinations and of log-rolling, as it is sometimes called, and ceases to be a national appropriation for national objects and comes to be a combined grab at the money of the people, to be spent among the people of particular localities. Any such bill, I am sure, my friend would not be any more in favor of than I am, if he understood it as I understand it, because we cannot disagree upon any such principle, I am quite sure.

Now, Mr. President, where do we find ourselves? We find ourselves, as the fact is, and as has been stated everywhere where an audience could be obtained, in a state of general stagnation of trade and of the active industries of the country, excepting those of agriculture and those other industries, if they can be called such, of the consumption of necessary articles of life; and therefore it has been said, as it ought to be said, that the greatest possible economy should be exercised at this present time, and that every expenditure that can be dispensed with ought to be dispensed with. Can there be any dispute about that? I have heard no dispute about it. No man, no party, no newspaper, no public meeting, no anybody has undertaken to controvert that proposition.

Where are we then? The State of Michigan—and I only speak of it now as a section of the country because on my view States have nothing to do with it except in the attitude I have named, that when we have left the Constitution and have left the public welfare, and have descended to scooping, as they say out West, money out of the Treasury—the State of Michigan, spoken of merely as a locality for the shortness of the name, has prospered and grown rich and grown wise in a degree that we all admire and most of us would emulate, without having yet had any appropriation for this year for Frankfort, or McCargo's Cove, or Pent Water, or any other of the numerous bays and inlets and streams that flow from that beautiful peninsula into the great lakes; and if the people of Michigan were able to prosper within this last year with these harbors as they are, in a time of great public distress and hardness, can they not wait for another year and prosper just as well? Has the prosperity of Michigan for the last year depended in any essential degree upon the circumstance that a half million dollars of the money of the United States has been expended within her borders for improving harbors of refuge and rivers and navigable streams? I think not. My friend will not contend that. Of course, the expenditure of money is an advantage to the people who receive it, but it is no advantage to the tax-payer who owns the farm close by a particular pier or a breakwater or a river where obstructions are to be removed. He does not get any of it. It does not help the general body of the community particularly. Then am I not safe in saying that Michigan—and when I speak of Michigan, as I have just now said, I repeat I only speak of it as merely one term as representing one of the various localities in this broad land of ours—or I will take Vermont—am I not safe in saying that Vermont would not have been any less prosperous in any essential degree if in the last year the breakwater at Burlington, Vermont, had not been extended one hundred feet, although at that port there is poured into the Treasury year after year nearly a million dollars of actual collected customs dues? It would have made no difference to us. It is possible, it is true, that a vessel that got shelter there might have gone ashore, and the insurance companies would have had to foot the bill; and it is certainly true, as it is with most of the places in Michigan, that national interests require in the proper way and at the proper time, when we are able to do it, that some reasonable facilities for the transaction of commerce with foreign nations and among the several States should be granted and provided for. And yet I venture to say that in this last year of the stagnation of trade and of commerce the people of the State of Vermont and of the State of New York on the opposite side of the lake, for which the ports on both sides are common of course, would never have known that they were not just as well off if last year's appropriation of \$25,000 for Burlington, \$50,000 for Plattsburgh, and so many for Whitehall, whatever it may have been, had never been made at all. Is it not one of those cases where we should act as a prudent farmer would do with a mortgage on his farm—as the national debt is a mortgage on all our income and all our property, if we have any honor, as I take it we have—when he has one year and another year and another of bad crops and disasters and low markets, so that he has no margin? Then he gets on with the old barn instead of building a new one; or, if he has not any barn at all, he stands by the ancient stack. Although my friend from Texas over the way [Mr. MAXEY] contended that every man ought to have a new thrashing-machine and a new mowing-machine every year without any regard to what his resources were, and he could not stand by the flail and the scythe any more, I think that is a little overdrawn. We all know that every prudent man who has sense enough to be kept out of an idiot asylum, when hard times come, stops improvement in the sense that we are now speaking of it. He gets on with the old barn and the old house and the old wagon and the old horse and the old flail and the old shoes and the old coat and the old everything;

and yet, when he puts in his crop, nature yields him the same increase it would have done had his barn been new, with a cupola and covered with a roof of gold, if you please. So I say, in respect to these internal improvements, as they are properly called; the time to pause in internal improvements is when there is a lack of money, a lack of prosperity, and no essential injury is done to the Republic if we wait, much less indeed than if we go on, because the money is much more needed for other purposes that cannot wait; for every dollar of money that gets into the Treasury and is appropriated for these purposes comes out of the pocket of somebody. The man who drank his cup of coffee, or not many years ago ate his ounce of salt, had to pay a tax upon it which went to swell the funds in the Treasury. So, now, this money in the Treasury, this six or seven millions that it is proposed to appropriate for these objects, in some way or other, in a large degree, comes out of the pockets of all our people, not absolutely in the case of customs, I admit, because the foreign producer bears a certain indefinite proportion of those expenses undoubtedly; but, in the general sense, every man, woman, and child in this country who has money enough, as he must have, to buy anything, be it even the product of the soil, contributes something to this sum of money that is to be expended in this way; and if the times be as they are stated to be, are we justified in doing things which if omitted we shall find ourselves substantially as well off next year as we are now when there is this universal stagnation, when there are these numerous failures of business enterprises, of manufacturing and of commerce particularly, rather than to wait until the forces of commercial nature, if I may use such a phrase, are again recuperated and the people go on in prosperity?

I am not making these remarks, sir, for the purpose of showing that we ought not to pass any bill at all. I am only endeavoring to press upon the minds of Senators the necessity of the highest degree of economy compatible with the protection of the works of internal improvement that have been commenced and of such completions and extensions as the great wants of national commerce in the broadest sense will lead us to believe we are justified in providing for at this time. That is my proposition, and in making it I appeal with some degree of confidence to my honorable friend from Michigan, I appeal with some degree of confidence to my honorable friends from Missouri and from Texas and to every Senator, however much their pride in developing the capacities of their particular localities without regard to State lines as I have said before may be, there is still, or there ought to be, that conservative economy that should compel us now to save every penny that is in the Treasury that the urgent and pressing demands of a broad national interest do not require us to expend. We found in 1869, when a bill of this character coming over from "the body of the people," as it is called, was so improved upon and amended in the Senate that it got into exactly the condition that this bill is now, that I believe almost by common consent, although the country was not then in the condition of depression that it is now, we dropped it as a thing unwise and extravagant and out of proportion, and provided the modest sum then I believe of two millions or two millions and a half of dollars. I propose \$4,000,000 now, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, and so of course through the careful examination of that Bureau in his Department called the Corps of Engineers, who look after these things for the most necessary and important purposes. We found when the year rolled around that the public weal had been promoted rather than injured; and it is not altogether certain that that two millions or two and a half millions, or three millions, whatever it was, had not done as much real good to the national interests of our whole people—not of States, not of localities, but of all as a nation—as the whole sum of five or six millions of dollars, mentioned in detail in the bill that we dropped and rejected would have done had it been expended. Can we not, then, in this time of our trouble and distress resort to a similar method with a similar well-grounded confidence that the public interests will be promoted and will not suffer?

I was talking just now about taxation, and I said what perhaps the Senator from New York [Mr. CONKLING] stated or referred to the other day, that this money which we are expending is the fruit of taxation; and so it is. Yet, on the other hand, the tax that the nation imposes, as we all know, although we seem very careful to keep it out of sight, is not a taxation that hampers anybody's industry. It is not a taxation that bears upon the manufacture of carriages or shoes or cloths. It is not a taxation like that provided in the Constitution upon the States according to their representation in the lower House of Congress. But it is in substance and effect, with a few minor exceptions, a taxation upon imports and a taxation upon whisky and patent medicines and tobacco. Whisky is considered to be in most communities a luxury that in hard times can be dispensed with, although the people of Michigan and of Vermont might feel that the harder the times the more whisky they would want to drown their sorrows. [Laughter.] I cannot say how that would be. I do not know that my friend and I would feel that way, or perhaps one of us.

Mr. FERRY. The Senator speaks for himself.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Yes, I will speak for myself. Perhaps I should need whisky, as the water of Vermont is not very good, as we are a mountainous country, and should drink that, while my friend from Michigan would drink of the waters of McCargo's Cove and would be at once inspired. Seriously speaking, and leaving off this badi-

nage which my friend and I are so fond of, the tax on whisky, which is the large share of our resource from internal revenue, is not a tax which embarrasses the productive industries of the country. The tax is not paid by the man who sells the corn that makes the whisky; it is neither paid nor borne by him. The tax is not borne by the man who makes the whisky and sells it to somebody else, in any large degree. Undoubtedly, theoretically, a share of it falls upon him and diminishes his profit, but the great bulk of the tax raised out of whisky is paid by the man who walks to the bar and pays his ten cents, or whatever the price is—what is the price? [laughter,]—and swallows his glass of whisky. That is where the tax is paid; so that it is useless to say that the people are now ground down by taxation imposed by the National Government. That is a delusion among honest men, and it is a fraud whenever it is represented by anybody else; because there is not a particle of truth in it. It is a tax upon luxury; it is a tax upon indulgence; it is a tax upon vice, that my friend will agree, to a certain extent.

Therefore it will not do to say that the present condition of this country, its paralyzed industries, its diminished income, and its general stagnation of business, so far as there is that stagnation as there is in manufacturing operations, arises at all out of any tax imposed by the National Government. If the States have heavy taxes it is an affair with which we have nothing to do. We are not to blame for it, so far as I know. Then we come to the other branch of taxation, that derived from customs. My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALLACE] has very well illustrated that, although I am not quite sure that he meant to do it, when he said that taxation was grinding the people of Pennsylvania; that the forges were closed, that the furnaces were shut up, and that the rolling-mills were closed, and all the great iron industries of that magnificent State were in a condition of enforced repose. Taxes are too high. How are you to help that? Does he mean to reduce the duties upon iron? Is that what the people of Pennsylvania are after? Would that revive the furnaces of Pennsylvania? When iron is now so low in the markets that they cannot afford to produce it, do you mean to take the tax off the importers of iron in order that the furnaces of Pennsylvania shall start with a still larger influx of the foreign commodity to compete with them? Is that the kind of democracy that my friend from Pennsylvania, who I am sorry is not here, is preaching? That is the effect of what he says, that the people of Pennsylvania are ground down by taxation. I suppose he meant, if he was talking to the purpose at all, taxation imposed by the National Government. I have disposed of the tax on tobacco and on whisky and on patent medicines, taxation by customs, taxation upon articles that so far as they affect the industries of the State of Pennsylvania, every per cent of it, cent by cent, is a protection and encouragement to those industries.

If the Senator wishes to tell the people of Pennsylvania that their true redress is to diminish imposts upon the articles that they produce, chiefly iron, then I think it will take him a good while to convince the people of Pennsylvania that that is the right way to do it. It is quite the reverse. Speaking from a Pennsylvania point of view, I think it might be safely said that the furnaces of Pennsylvania, and its rolling-mills, and its forges would begin work again when the tariff upon iron should be so increased that the foreign producer could not compete in the American market with the home producer, and not otherwise. Why can he compete now? He can compete now because the men in foreign countries who do the work do not get the pay that the men who work in Pennsylvania do. Not getting the pay, they do not live in the comfort that the laboring-men of Pennsylvania live in. Where the Pennsylvanian gets fresh beef twice a week, at least, perhaps six times a week, the worker in the mines and in the iron-mills of Great Britain or of Belgium, or wherever it may be, does not see it once in six months. Where the Pennsylvanian lives in a cottage of two stories with glass windows and with a carpet in its best room, possibly with a melodeon or some instrument of music for the amusement and education of his family, and where his children go clean and well-dressed to school, his collaborer on the other side of the Atlantic never heard of such a thing. He lives in a hovel with a clay floor; he sees neither beef, nor butter, nor white bread; his children never go clean or otherwise to school; and he is in misery. That man, be he democrat or republican, or other, who feels it to be a part of his duty to provide first for the poor and starving and unfortunate of some other country than his own, is not the democrat or the republican for me.

Some of our friends over the way have said that one part of our misfortunes has been in the terrible extravagance of the republican administrations, that, as they say, have cursed the country from 1861 down to this day; that appropriations and Government expenses have constantly increased, while the prosperity and the welfare of the people have constantly diminished. That is a very serious charge; and if it were true in the just sense the republican party ought to be turned out of power, and some better party, if there could be one, ought to go in. It is true that the republican party after 1860 increased the expenditures of the Government from forty, or fifty, or sixty, or seventy millions a year under Buchanan, and they ran up in a year or two to billions. There is no doubt about the fact; but what made them run up? Was it the fault of the republican party that it had the temerity, without the consent of the body of the people, as my friend from Michigan would say, or the body of the democratic party, to vote for their candidate for President instead of

the other one? Is that the cause of it? Not quite. Opposing civilizations, to quote an ancient phrase, had at last come to a critical climax, and under whatever name or under whatever pretext, it was essential in the due order of things that at last one of those opposing civilizations should yield to the other.

So there was the rebellion, if by the use of that phrase I offend no Senator here, and I am sure I do not. There was the rebellion; and in order to conquer the rebellion it was necessary to raise vast armies of men, to withdraw them from the peaceful pursuits of industry at home and to turn them into the terrible conflicts of the battle, and the terrible privations of the camp and of the prison. In order to do that, it was necessary that taxation should be vastly increased; that public expenditures should swell a hundred or a thousand fold; and they did. Yet our distinguished friends on the otherside of this Chamber have imputed that to the republican party as one of its crimes, and as one of the crimes for which the republican party is to be dismissed from the confidence of the people and from the administration of the Government, and that the men who forced the republican party to that dire necessity shall be put in power. Who are the men who forced the republican party to that dire extremity? Of course the representatives of the Southern States who went into the rebellion, so far as their power and their skill could go, confessedly did it; but that was not all the democratic party. I say as far as the democratic party of the North was concerned as a body, organized, with its captains of Tweeds and other men, it was just as responsible in the moral sense for this enormous increase of taxation, this enormous expenditure of treasure, this frightful destruction of human life and frightful increase of misery in this land, as the men who took up arms for the rebellion. In my opinion this rebellion would never have reared itself into the proportions it did, had not its leaders and the body of its supporters sincerely believed, as they had good ground to do, that the democratic party of the North would not permit a State to be coerced and kept in the Union in spite of its will. They believed that, and they had a very good right to believe it. In those northern States during the war where the power of what is now called the republican party was most potent, like the one which I have the honor to represent in part, all the patriotic members of the democratic party for the time being disbanded and joined the Union republican party, ran no candidates for office, and put their brave shoulders to the wheel to preserve the unity of the republican government of the Republic. Wherever, as in other States, the members of that party either from want of power or want of courage did not do that, by just so much in those States was the cause of the Union imperiled and retarded. There was the great State of New York. In the midst of rebellion, with a democratic executive and a democratic party behind him, thousands upon thousands of the soldiers of the Army of the United States, including one brigade from my State, had to leave the theater of war and encamp in the squares of the city of New York in order to preserve that State from aiding the rebellion by overturning everything that was used to support the Republic. That is a part of the expense that this republican party is responsible for.

So, Mr. President, I think it is not precisely just for Senators on the other side of the Chamber to appeal to the people of the United States at this day and hour against the republican party upon the ground that after 1861, when it came into power, the expenses of the Government were enormously increased, and therefore the Government ought to be turned over to the people whose crimes or whose misfortunes or whose misunderstanding of their rights compelled such great expenditures of life and of money.

Let us see how this was. My honorable friend from North Carolina, [Mr. MERRIMON,] who found it to be his special mission to assail the republican party for its terrible extravagance, submitted as documentary and conclusive proof of his assertions some tables that he said at first, as I understood him, were official, or at least prepared from official sources. The first one is a—

Summary or comparative statement of expenditures or appropriations—

"Or appropriations." Mark the word; as if one word were taken when that would answer best and the other when that would answer best, for there is no such head in any Treasury accounts, I beg to assure my friend—

in the several branches of the public service named, in the fiscal years from 1868 to 1875, respectively.

The first one is the Post-Office, in 1868, \$22,000,000; I leave off the hundreds of thousands and so on, in order to condense what I have to say as much as possible; in 1875, \$33,000,000; these he gives as the net ordinary expenses. I pass by what has been said so well by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] about the utter falsehood of these tables, taking them separately, as compared with the official documents before every Senator, in many instances showing that they are not compiled honestly from any official source. I pass all that by for the time being and take the thing as it stands in the table. My friend has complained, if there is any point in his speech at all—as of course there is, for he always speaks to the point—of the extravagance of republican administration about the Post-Office. That is the first item. What is that extravagance? He complains that its expenditures have run up from 1868 to 1875 by the sum of \$12,000,000. What made it run up? If it was the extravagance of the republican party, it ought to be condemned. If it was not, it ought not to be condemned. What was the state of the post-offices in this

country at the beginning of the fiscal year 1867? These are fiscal years, the statement ending on the 30th of June in each one of these years, beginning with 1868. What was the state of the Post-Office in this country in the year from 1867 to 1868? We did have a postal system that extended all over the United States. We had post-offices, and postmasters, and mail-carriers, and mail-contractors, and all the machinery that distributed to all the people of the several States intelligence according to the Constitution. What became of those post-offices in eleven or twelve States of the Union some years before? A body of men who undertook to separate from the United States destroyed all the system that the United States had. They seized the post-offices that the money of the people had built. They confiscated the postage-stamps and the postal moneys that the people of the United States had provided for, and the mail-bags, as my friend [Mr. HAMLIN] says, and the locks—everything; I believe, even the horses and the carriages of any mail-contractor who still had any faith in what was called the old flag.

Then when the year 1867-'68 came, and there was peace in the land again—if it can be called peace—peace enough to re-instate the postal system, we were obliged, and it was not only a duty but a pleasure, to resupply all this service in all these various States. In order to do that and be honest we were obliged to re-employ postmasters and post-boys, and mail-carriers, and mail-bags, and advertisements for routes; everything that makes up the multifarious expenditures of the postal system for the benefit of the people. It took millions of dollars to do it. Yet the Senator stands up in his place and assails that as one of the items in the aggregate wherefrom he brings a grand footing of crime, of extravagance, of wickedness on the part of the republican party! In addition to that, and apart from the topic I have now spoken of, the postal system is being, as it ought to be, prudently and economically, constantly extended into new States and new Territories, in order that the chief life of the Republic, the dissemination of intelligence, the coherence of parts, the unity of the people, may be constantly promoted; and that requires the expenditure of money. That is assailed as the extravagance or the crime of a republican administration. I should like to have the Senator go to some Western State or Territory whose hardy pioneers have built up their cabins, and are producing their crops, and educating their children, and accuse a republican administration of giving them the means of communicating by letter with their friends elsewhere, and of receiving every Saturday night their weekly newspaper, be it religious or otherwise. I do not think he would convict us upon an indictment of that kind. I think he would be dismissed out of court for want of jurisdiction quicker than any cause has been dismissed before us for want of jurisdiction a good deal.

Then the next item is the "Indians;" in 1867-'68, \$3,900,000; in 1875, \$8,384,000. That is a crime, it is said. Has the Senator pointed out or attempted to point out any one respect in regard to which this increase has been wrong or wicked? Not at all; but because there is an increase, therefore there is an extravagance, or therefore there is a crime! To many minds there might be a slight want of logic and sequence in a proposition of that kind. If the Senator will only go to the items that make up this increase, (and for this purpose I say I take his table to be true, just for the fun of it, not because it is true,) upon his own case he will find that a system of justice, of care, of economy, as diminishing military expenditures, has been inaugurated by the President of the United States, a system that, whatever may so far be its defects and however short it may so far have come of accomplishing the full beneficence of its purpose, was one that commended itself to the conscientious judgment of the religious denominations in the whole United States—denominations composed in equal degree of men of all parties, all creeds, all conditions of life; because what otherwise would have necessarily been expenditure under other heads, for Indian wars and for a thousand things, is now consolidated into this item of "Indians." Therefore, says the Senator, a republican administration has been guilty of wasteful extravagance or of criminal neglect.

Next is the war expenditure; in 1868, \$123,000,000; in 1875, \$51,000,000. There is a diminution there, but not so great a diminution as there ought to have been in one sense of the term. I add to the Senator's observation, for, as will be seen, a large proportion of the expenditures of the War establishment is directly due as an inevitable consequence of the rebellion, and as we indulged in the luxury of compelling the Southern States to be a part of the Union we must bear the necessary consequences of that in those increased expenses of the Army that still come down to us from that great source.

The next is the Navy, \$16,000,000, if I correctly read the figures, in 1868; \$20,000,000 in 1875. There is an increase. How is it accounted for? My honorable friend says by extravagance, by fraud, by peculation, by corruption; and yet if he will only take the trouble (for he is quite competent to do it) to go to the Treasury accounts, item by item, of Navy expenditures, I feel safe in prophesying that he will not find in all that increase even \$15,000, even \$10,000, that he will say is in and of itself either extravagant or wrong. The end of the war found us with a vast amount of crazy and broken-down material in the Navy, old hulks and ships of every description that were worn out and good for nothing, built in haste of green timber and put together not with great skill, for the time would not allow of perfection; and so from year to year those in charge of the Navy Department, and within the appropriations made by Congress, have

endeavored, and I am happy to say with some degree of success, to rectify this state of things, to bring a consolidated order, if I may so express it, out of the chaos of material and of organization that existed at the close of the rebellion. Instead, therefore, of there having been extravagance or wickedness or crime, you will find, if you will only look at the items, which Senators do not seem to be particularly anxious to do, that instead of extravagance there has been economy, and that to-day, instead of having no Navy or a crazy and illy-regulated one, you have a Navy that makes the just influence of the people of the United States respected on every sea and on every shore. But that, the Senator says, is a crime. Perhaps he would agree to have the Navy what it was on the 1st of April, 1861, so that—I will not say "so that," for the Senator does not wish it so—but in such a condition that if some new insurrection should arise or some new tumult, some new war, to which all nations are exposed and will be until the millennium comes, the United States would find itself where it was when the rebellion broke out, absolutely paralyzed in respect of its naval power and of its naval capacity. The people of the United States are appealed to, with an air of confidence, to condemn a republican Administration for preserving and economizing this force upon the sea in order that the interests of the people may be protected.

There is the Coast Survey which has gone up from four hundred and odd thousand dollars to seven hundred and odd thousand dollars. What has run up the Coast Survey? Where are the light-houses and the beacons and the buoys that before 1861 the money of all the people of the United States had provided over more than a thousand miles of the southern coasts of the United States? What became of them? They "went away," as was said about the Americans at the battle of Bladensburg. They disappeared; and in their places were obstructions and decoys, instead of buoys marking the channels of commerce, and torpedoes and false lights to decoy vessels ashore. The wicked beneficence of the United States has restored them. My friend complains of it. At the mouth of Cape Fear River, in the noble State of North Carolina, the great light-house destroyed by the rebels once more spreads its beams over the sea. That, I suppose, is a crime. That is the reason why the Coast Survey expenses have run up from the end of the war until this time. Restoration, oblivion, good-will, fraternity has taken from the pockets of the people of the United States money to rebuild the light-houses of the southern coast, to restore the buoys in the channels of commerce, and to have peace and intercommunication once more; and that is charged to us as a crime.

Then there are the judiciary expenses, running from seven hundred and odd thousand dollars in 1868 to three million and odd thousand dollars in 1875. Where is the justification for that crime? There were eleven or twelve States of the Union from which all the judicial organization of the United States had been swept. War had taken the place of law. The courts of the United States, and the court-houses, the records, all the machinery of justice had been buried in the bottomless sea of rebellion. When at last order was restored, by the exercise of power, there was the natural consequence of irritation, of discontent, of prejudice, of violence, of mobs, of assassinations, of organizations to persecute men for political purposes, to drive "the cursed republicans" from the land, and to reduce the negro practically to his old condition. There were the Ku Klux and the White Lines, and whatever other organizations may have been. They could not consist with the reign of law. They could not consist with that reign of peaceful order out of which unity and prosperity only can grow. In order to establish courts and through the courts in order to enforce peaceful justice against turbulence and crime, the people of the United States have poured out of their Treasury large sums of money. That is another crime and extravagance of the republican party. Why not leave the Ku-Klux alone to work out their own salvation? Why not let the White Line carry its red banner wherever it pleases? Why not send home to every northern State, as there came home to my own more than once, the dead body of some white republican whose only crime had been that he asserted the independent right of a citizen of the United States to have an opinion? Wherefore spend money for the objects of the administration of justice, for the peaceful supremacy of law? That is our crime.

Then, we have the subtreasury. "The trail of the serpent," as the poet says, "is over them all." Every one of these items flows out of that vast fountain of blood and trouble. Even the subtreasury, as far removed as that may be supposed to be from these causes and these consequences, comes in for a share. The subtreasury expenses have run up from \$260,000 to \$460,000. What has increased the expenses of the subtreasury? Exactly the same cause: the collection of the customs entirely overthrown and disordered, the disbursements of the public moneys accumulated an hundred fold, all flowing out of this same fountain of wickedness and blood; and yet we are told that to restore administration and to regulate public accounts and to make these enormous disbursements—and this rebellion has caused it—that it is a crime in a republican administration to have spent any money to accomplish it.

Then, next and last, for I am sorry to weary the patience of the Senate, comes the miscellaneous items of expenditures, increasing from \$53,000,000 in 1868 to \$71,000,000 in 1875. Let us see how that happens. I have in my hand the report of the Secretary of the Treas-

ury, Forty-fourth Congress, first session, Executive Document No. 2, not a speech by somebody "elsewhere," as the saying is, but the official document wherein on the fourth page of tables attached to the report is shown what makes up this total of the miscellaneous expenses of the United States, and where the plain mind of the way-faring man can see how and why it is that they have increased. First in respect of a certain part of the Light-House Department, to which I have already referred, and the Coast Survey, which also is a part of the same general system, and the building and repairs of light-houses. This is only the last year, and not for all this period of seven years from 1868 to 1875. One single item is "return of proceeds of captured and abandoned property," \$880,000. That is one of our extravagances that has run this thing up. Another item is "re-payment for lands erroneously sold," that is, lands sold for the direct taxes in the Southern States, which, I believe, had something to do with the rebellion, \$35,000. Another is "payments under relief acts," ninety one-hundredths of which, if not a larger proportion, are relief cases growing directly out of the rebellion, \$157,000, without giving the odd numbers. The next one in this long list of items that the mind of my friend from North Carolina is too great to descend to, as he only looks at totals, is "refunding proceeds of cotton seized," \$36,000. The next is "southern claims commission," \$51,000, the table making millions in respect of items that grow directly, and by name, out of the consequences of the deplorable state of things that existed from 1861 to 1865. When you take every one of the other items, marine hospitals, refunding duties, and all the ten thousand items that go into the miscellaneous expenses of the Government, there are more than half of them that have increased necessarily in a stream that flows directly, and without any river and harbor improvement to get rid of obstructions, from this same great cause.

The Senator has labored under what I think is the misapprehension of supposing that when the rebels laid down their arms in the spring of 1865 there was not only oblivion as to the crime of the rebellion, but there was oblivion as to all public obligations and all claims and duties arising out of the then condition of things, that everything was to be stricken out and that we had no right to know and no right to bear any of the enormous expenditures which follow, as the night follows the day, or the morning the evening, from such a state of things as existed.

When you come to the employés you will find exactly the same thing wherever in the rare instances the employés have increased from 1868. Of course they have been enormously increased since 1859, because you cannot keep a million of men in the field and have billions upon billions of public money collected and expended and allowances made without an enormous increase of all the civil establishment of the Government to carry it on. Since that time, since 1868, wherever in the very rare instances there has been any increase at all, it has been directly attributable to the necessity of settling claims and adjusting accounts growing out of the rebellion. But when you come to take it on the whole, as the Senator can inform himself without borrowing from any member in another place or anybody else, but going himself to the sources of information, instead of there having been an increase in the persons employed by the United States since 1868 there has been decrease. The Senator foots up his totals in the Blue Book upon the idea that that represents the actual increase of the civil establishment, when in point of truth, as he can satisfy himself, if he will, (and I know he wishes to do it if he has the time,) what he calls the increase of the Blue Book is only the circumstance that by a new method of reporting in the Blue Book the names of persons employed who had not been inserted before, but who have always been employed of the same kind and the same degree year by year as the public service required it are inserted. It is just as if the census-taker were to come to my friend and to me and say, "What does your family consist of?" and I say, "Well, my family consists of four: my wife and my two children;" and my friend says, "My family consists of six: my wife and my four children;" and the next year the census taker comes around and puts the same question and we give the same answer; but then he asks, "Have you not somebody employed; have you not hired somebody this year?" "O, yes." "Well, whom have you hired?" "Tom, Dick, Harry, Joe, Smith, Jones," &c., and so down they go. Now, some enemy of ours desirous to write a book puts this down, and it is published; and then it is said, "The Senator from Vermont and the Senator from North Carolina must be very corrupt men; they must be getting rich at Washington; their establishments have increased four-fold since the last census. At the last census their establishments only consisted of four for one and six for the other, and now there are ten for one and twenty for the other. There must be something rotten in the state of Denmark." Yet the simple truth is that my friend and I have told the census-taker that we had employed this servant the last month and the other servant the month before, and we had this mechanic to mend our horse-shoes and that other one to mend our own shoes, and so on; and it all goes down into the book.

Mr. President, I cannot doubt that my honorable friend from North Carolina has had a sincere desire to correct what he supposed to be an evil; but I beg to suggest to him if he mounts his horse and takes his lance in hand to correct evils, it would be perhaps just as well as wise to first inquire with some care and not on anybody's say-so, but from the records themselves, whether the truth warrants the undertaking.

Mr. KERNAN. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the Senator from Vermont to what trouble he referred when he said the United States were required to camp its troops in New York during the rebellion?

Mr. EDMUNDS. I referred to an occasion in the year 1863, I think it was.

Mr. KERNAN. The Senator means the occasion of the riot in New York.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I will send for the book and get it for the Senator, as he does not seem to be familiar with the visit of the Vermont troops to New York on that occasion.

Mr. KERNAN. I will get at the matter without any controversy with the Senator.

Mr. EDMUNDS. He certainly cannot get into any controversy with me; I yield in advance.

Mr. KERNAN. There was a riot in New York. It was a riot that arose out of a state of things that existed there in reference to the draft. Excitement grew up; there was a breach of the law; there were grievous wrongs done from excitement and prejudice among a class; but it did not require any of the United States troops to restore order, I believe. My word might not go very far; but on an occasion in the constitutional convention of 1866-'67, of which Mr. Opdyke, a republican, who was mayor of New York when that riot occurred, was a member. There was some such allusion made to the riot and the then governor of New York as has been made here, and I can state in substance what he said. He said that he felt called upon, as he was the mayor of New York when that outbreak occurred, to state that he was there when the democratic governor came to the city, and he desired to bear his testimony in justice to that gentleman that he in every way discharged his duty as a good, patriotic, and an efficient governor, in aiding him at once in restoring order there.

That the Senator from Vermont may see that I do not state it erroneously, though I state from memory what Mr. Opdyke said, it will be found in the debates of that convention of 1866-'67. This was a sudden outbreak. There was no previous warning. The governor immediately went to the city. He used such means as were in his power to suppress the outbreak. He confronted and addressed the excited crowd, urging them to abide by the law, conferring with the republican mayor of the city, and acting with him in restoring order.

Mr. President, speaking only from memory, I want to say a word in reference to the State of New York and its people without regard to the political parties into which they were divided; and I say, and I am sure the record will confirm it, that when the call was made for volunteers in 1861 the governor of the State, who was not a democrat, appointed committees in the counties to raise troops without reference to party; and I know who acted on the committees in my own county, and I know they raised and sent out from that county during 1861 and 1862, without any coercion by the draft, without any inducement by large bounties, five full thousand-men regiments. They volunteered. They went out, democrat and republican, side by side, and they were officered by democrats and republicans, sometimes a democratic colonel and sometimes a republican. They served out their time, they fought side by side, and there was mourning in our State as often in democratic families as in republican families. So long as the volunteer system was adhered to New York furnished her full quota of soldiers. The governor of New York subsequently, and in 1863 or 1864, remonstrated that we had furnished more than our quota, and a commission on that subject was appointed and met at Washington. The matter was looked into, and it was ascertained that the State had furnished more than its quota. It was not an idle complaint.

Therefore, in justice to the people of New York, I say that they as a mass acted without reference to party unitedly in raising troops to sustain the Constitution and the Union. The regiment that marched out of Utica immediately after the Massachusetts regiment had been fired upon in the streets of Baltimore was a regiment made up of democrats and republicans, equally intent upon doing their duty to their country, in upholding the Constitution, and suppressing all armed resistance to it and the laws made in pursuance of it. It is not just, therefore, to the mass of the democratic party to say that they encouraged the rebellion, that they failed to do their duty in aiding to uphold the Constitution and laws by suppressing the rebellion, or that they as a party, or any large number of them, in any way gave it encouragement.

I say for the mass of the democratic party in the State of New York, and I say it that it may go home to the people who know in every neighborhood whether I speak truly or not, that while they differed from their political opponents with reference to the policy of the Administration, while they believed many of the measures adopted unwise, yet on every occasion they sent out volunteers to their full share to uphold the Constitution and maintain the Union. In 1863, when there was a sudden incursion of the confederate troops into Pennsylvania, the democratic governor of New York received the public thanks of the President and the Secretary of War for the promptness with which at their call he ordered out and sent our militia regiments into Pennsylvania to aid in repelling that incursion.

I do not want to claim anything beyond what is just; but I do wish to say in presence of all the people of the State of New York, that the man who attempts at this day, or at any other time, to get up a pretense that there was any body of men in that State or that the

democratic party as a body sympathized with the rebellion and were not disposed to do their full duty in suppressing it, does them a very great wrong.

The Senator from Vermont talks about the democratic party having control of the State of New York. It had a governor during 1863 and 1864, but during neither of those years had it the Legislature. The governor acted in entire accord with those who were aiding the Federal Government to troops and doing their duty to that Government in reference to suppressing the rebellion.

One or two other suggestions. I have been in favor of reducing the amount appropriated by the bill under consideration in the interest of economy. I am also opposed to some of the items in the bill because they are outside of what I believe to be the sphere of the action of the Federal Government. I understood the Senator from Vermont to be of the same opinion; and yet he has made an argument here that there is no need of economy, if I understood him correctly. He says in substance that there has been, if I understand him, all the economy exercised which could be exercised in the administration of the Government during the last five or six years.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That does not prove that there is not need to continue it, does it?

Mr. KERNAN. No; I was simply going to say that I do not think there has been all the economy in the administration of the Federal Government during the last five or six years which could be exercised or which ought to be exercised by those administering it. I am not one who has thought that any good came here from saying by way of taunt "you have done this" or "you have done that;" but when the Senator from Vermont, replying to gentlemen who on this floor respectfully urge and argue that there must be more economy now and in the future than there has been, argues to the contrary, I think he is at issue with the great mass of the press and of the intelligent people of this country.

Mr. EDMUNDS. But I have not argued to the contrary. I have argued that there should be the utmost possible economy all the time.

Mr. KERNAN. Well, my friend has said that this needed expenditure came from the rebellion. Does he think that when he gets up on this floor and attempts to stir up feeling by saying, "Why all this expenditure was caused by the war," he is making a fair argument in favor of economy?

Mr. EDMUNDS. I do.

Mr. KERNAN. The gentleman knows that men of his own party, leading men of high character, as long ago as 1872, before the election, by addresses to the people, by speeches in this Chamber and the other, by addresses on the platform, told the people of this country that there was maladministration, that there was need of great reform in the civil service; and some of them, leading men and long prominent members of the republican party of high distinction, said that they left that party because they believed they could not work out the reforms in the civil service which were necessary within that party. This is not my testimony. I appeal to Sumner, and Schurz, and Trumbull, and a number of others who put forth those views.

Mr. EDMUNDS. What do they say now?

Mr. KERNAN. Mr. Sumner has gone where he does not speak. I have not heard of any one of those living, whatever they may say now, who commends the civil service which they and Curtis said needed reform, and which they and Curtis have said down to this time has never been reformed.

Now take a portion of the press and a respectable and large portion of that supporting the nominees of the Cincinnati convention; they are full of articles stating that the party must unload, that the party must satisfy the people that there will be reform and greater economy and more retrenchment. While I am not here with book and table of amounts, and have not looked into the figures, yet when the gentleman supposes that those who speak as though there was need of retrenchment can be silenced by saying, "Why, this debt and expenditure were caused by the rebellion, and you men of the South were in it and the democracy of New York favored it," I tell him that I do not think he is saying anything that is beneficial to the country or beneficial to any party in whose behalf it may be said.

There is a feeling, wide-spread, among our intelligent people, that there is need of great retrenchment, of great reforms in the administration of public affairs. I assume that both parties come before the people promising that if they come into power they will make them; but, as I understood, the argument of the Senator was, "it has all been in the purest line of patriotism and expenditures have been only what were caused by the war;" and if that be so there can be no need of reform.

No, Mr. President, in my judgment the real friends of this country will welcome to their ranks the men who are in favor of scrutinizing appropriations of the public money, cutting them down where it can be done, admitting that there can be great reforms in the civil service, admitting as they fairly may that where a party is long in power evils will grow up and should be corrected when discovered. On a bill like this we should examine and see how much must be appropriated and how little properly may be. There will come no good to the country by the exhibition here of partisan feeling, none by taunting one another justly or unjustly in reference to the action of our respective political parties in the past. I think we should settle down to the business before us and endeavor to do our duty to this people

now eleven years after the war by economizing all we can, reducing taxation as we shall be able to do if we do economize, and then we shall have done something to perpetuate the Union better than attempting to make anybody believe that a large portion of the people of the North really were traitors to their country, to their Constitution, and to their duty.

All I meant to say in opening was that the people of the State of New York, without reference to party, were, as a whole, all through the war loyal to the Constitution, ready and willing to sacrifice their men and their means to maintain the Union under it, and anxious that when the war should be over we should bear the burdens it brought upon us North and South, taking care while doing so to cut off needless or extravagant expenditures and to bring back simplicity and purity and economy to the administration of public affairs under whichever party that administration may be conducted.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I accept with due humility the rebuke of my honorable friend from New York for introducing these disagreeable subjects, evidently disagreeable to him, into this debate; but I only did it in self-defense, and I believe self-defense is recognized by the Senator from New York as one of the fundamental laws of human existence. It was not any republican member of the Senate that on this river and harbor bill launched out into the cognate question of where the money was to come from and what had increased the expenses of the Government and made it, as the Senator says and as the Senators over the way have said, extravagant and wrong. It was his own party, his own associates, who under cover of this bill—I do not say illogically, for every bill that appropriates money naturally raises all questions of taxation, of revenue, of cause, the consequence of public-debt extravagance, everything—but they brought it into this debate—

Mr. MERRIMON. Will the Senator allow me one word?

Mr. EDMUNDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MERRIMON. With all due respect to the Senator, I deny that I brought this matter first into this debate. I deny that any Senator on this side did it, for I heard every speech that was made. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. MORTON] on Monday made a furious assault upon the democratic party. His speech is in the RECORD now, and it will appear that that gave rise to this discussion. He denounced it for corruption, denounced it for treason, and for everything else that could scandalize and demean a party and render it unfit to enjoy the confidence of any people.

Mr. EDMUNDS. So he did, Mr. President, and he did it because my friend and his associates, or my friend or his associates, I do not remember which, gave him a just and necessary and imperative occasion for it.

Mr. MERRIMON. In what respect?

Mr. EDMUNDS. If the Senator will only be good enough to look at the RECORD, as he seems to be opposed to looking at official figures, perhaps he will be willing to look at the RECORD, he will see. I am not going to waste the little strength I have in educating the Senator upon that topic.

Now, Mr. President, I will come back to my distinguished friend from the Empire State. I repeat that I have not said the little that I have said, by way of making any assault upon anybody; but when I see the administration that I have labored to the best of my ability to elect and support, in whatever respects I believe it to be worthy of support, (and those are in almost every, but not every, respect,) assailed as being profligate, corrupt, extravagant, wicked, I do not intend, so far as my small voice can go, whether it is on this bill or any other, to let falsehood and misrepresentation put on the garments of truth and go out to the world in that sort of guise. I have not introduced anything that has not been referred to before; I have only analyzed the causes and the particulars out of which the honorable Senator from North Carolina and the others draw their aggregate of infamy that they file upon the republican party; and if the honorable Senator from New York can point out a single instance in which I have misstated, or understated, or overstated any one of those facts I have referred to, I shall be very much obliged to him.

Mr. KERNAN. The gentleman, of course, does not mean to have it go forth that I put forth those facts?

Mr. EDMUNDS. By no means.

Mr. KERNAN. When my friend and the Senator from North Carolina get into a controversy about figures, is it entirely fair to bring New York in and display temper about it? Because he has done something in the Senator's view, is New York to be kicked?

Mr. EDMUNDS. We shall see. I am now bringing New York in because New York has assailed me. I am not bringing it in any hot temper, as the Senator suggests, but I am rather in earnest. I am bringing the Senator from New York in because he has accused me apparently, if there is any point in his remarks at all, and there always is, of fanning up old sorrows and old discontents and old troubles that ought to be buried in oblivion. That is the crime that I have committed according to the Senator from New York, if I rightly interpret the scope of his remarks. Now, have I? When his associates who are engaged in the same political enterprise that he is, undertake to assail me and my votes (because I have voted mostly to appropriate the money that these administrations have spent) for extravagance, and corruption, and blindness to public interest and insensibility to public demands, I imagine that I have the right to put the plain truth before this body, in order that it, or if not it the people, may know

who is responsible and who is not. If I am wrong in that, I beg my honorable friend's pardon. Of course I am not.

The Senator says that the people, the liberals who joined the democracy in 1872, were crying out for reform. So they were. Many of the leaders of them were crying out for office, and one of them got a nomination for it from a party whose wickedness he had done more to expose than any other man in the United States; and if I am wrong in that, as I am alluding to a distinguished citizen of the State of New York, I will yield to my friend to correct me. The great body of what are called the liberals ought not to be left with the remark I have just made. It does not apply to them. The great body of the men who had before acted with the republican party who voted for Mr. Greeley in 1872 were undoubtedly men of sincere convictions and honest purposes; but, like many other good men in times gone by, always excepting those in the State of New York who never make mistakes, they were laboring under a delusion that they have happily discovered. They have found from the bitter experience of careful observation and the bearing of heavy burdens how delusive are the promises of the democratic party, and how utterly hopeless (as much as the republican administrations may need further reforms and further economies) it is for honest and intelligent men to expect anything, so much as a crumb or a thimbleful, from the party of which my honorable friend is a distinguished member. They have seen the spectacle in the last seven months of one democratic organization, elected on the cry of reform, civil service reform, the discarding of political ideas in the selection of public servants, come into power, and with pitchfork and bludgeon pitch out the one-armed soldiers of the Union from little places of trust and small emolument and put in their own creatures. They have seen a body, elected on the cry of reform, pass bills as extravagant and reckless and wicked as the one that we now have under consideration, to say the least. They have seen claims that upon the principles of law and public policy ought never to find a place in a legislative body, go easily through. They have seen a great political convention manufactured into a preponderance for a particular candidate, as it is stated—I do not know it to be true, and I have not access to the accounts as my friend over the way has to the Treasury accounts—by paid for advertisements in newspapers before hand, puffing the particular fellow who was expected to run up. They have seen prize-fighters and gamblers leading the cohorts of the reform democracy to select a reform candidate for the benefit of the people of the United States. And so, Mr. President, speaking of those honest and intelligent men who having no lust for office and no taste for politics, feeling hurt and troubled at the slowness with which republican reform as they thought was going on voted for Mr. Greeley, they have come back again to the true church and to the true path, with whatever imperfections, as it has imperfections, it may still continue to bear, in the hope that the republican party in the future, as it has done in the past, with a unanimous fidelity to the great principles of constitutional liberty and the reign of law in this country, will continue, as it has begun to do year after year since the war closed, to diminish expenses, diminish taxation, diminish officials, and gradually and steadily build up and perfect the public service of the country.

So much for the liberal part of my friend's argument. Now, the worst thing that I have done, after all, if I have done it untruthfully, is what I have said about the democracy of the State of New York and other States during the war. My honorable friend misunderstood me if he understood me to say that the men who composed a part of the democratic party in that State and almost every other of the Northern States were as individuals opposed to maintaining the supremacy of the Union, and that the brave and patriotic democrat from the farms of Oneida County did not volunteer just as cheerfully as the brave and patriotic democrat on the hills of Vermont did. I did not say or intimate any such thing. The reverse is true; the patriotic sentiment ran through the people of all parties in the North, but there was the corporation still with its Tweeds and its Deans and its Pendletons at its head, and that corporation, in the State of New York particularly where politics are reduced to an organization with drill and obedience and discipline, I repeat in my belief, and history will approve it, threw its heavy weight all the time against the cause of the Union and for the cause of the rebellion; and I repeat that I believe had not our southern friends, misguided as they were in that belief, supposed that that corporate authority would control the masses of the North, they would never have undertaken the desperate deed they did, of breaking up the Union.

Ah, Mr. President, the idea that that organized clique of men who out of Tammany Hall and other similar places have ruled the democracy for the last thirty years were in favor of prosecuting with vigor and fervor the war against the rebellion is one that cannot be proved. The reverse can be proved, in my opinion. There was no act of Congress, there was no movement of troops, there was no call by the Executive either for money or for men, that that corporate organization did not put itself in some way, either by force or by casuistry or by doubt or by trouble about the Constitution or something, heavily against, and it culminated in an open public and official declaration at Chicago in the summer of 1864, when the scales of battle were trembling in the balance and when if our friends at the South, as we now call them, and as I now feel them to be, felt that if they could only hold out a little longer the North would be

discouraged, its money depreciating, its homes depopulated, its taxes burdensome, they would achieve the independence that they had sought for and fought for so bravely—what did the democratic party in its most solemn form do then? It met at Chicago and in the face of all the people and of all the country North and South, by its committee of which a distinguished member from the State of New York, now a candidate I believe for a high position, was a member, reported to the convention and the convention adopted and put forth to the people of the world the solemn declaration that this war for the Union was a failure. That is what my friend from New York calls helping it, I suppose, and at a time when but for the providence of God, who did not intend that a republic should exist on this continent whose cornerstone was slavery, it would have turned the scale; but it fell upon the people of the North, among democrats as well as republicans, as the blatant and wicked declaration of a treasonable clique; but it was the organized democratic party as far as that party could be said to have any life at all in the Northern States.

I do not want to be told, therefore, unless my friend has got some counter-evidence, that the organization—not every man of the rank and file, not half the men of the rank and file, perhaps not a quarter of the men of the rank and file, but the great leaders whose characteristics prominent and public I have already referred to—did not do this thing. And if they intended the natural consequences of their own acts, as every man must be wise to do, they did it in order that the rebellion might succeed, that the Union forces should be withdrawn, and that peace, honorable and victorious to the rebellion but dishonorable and infamous to the Union, should be concluded.

But I am supposed to have done injustice to the State of New York in respect of the incident, which is only a mere circumstance to which I referred as one item in this long catalogue of trouble, going to show that the democratic party as a party, and its chief and responsible and official leaders in the State, as such, did not exert themselves as they might to maintain the Union, and I said as a consequence of that the troops of the armies of the United States were withdrawn from the theater of war and its brigades, one of those from my own State among the number, had to sit down in martial array in the chief city of the Union in order to preserve the consistency and the existence of the Republic. The Senator has not denied that for some cause the armies of the United States to the extent of thousands upon thousands, and brigades upon brigades, were withdrawn from the front and were encamped within the streets and squares of the great city of New York. What was the need that these men, drilled veterans, in the very stress and crisis of the rebellion, should be carried a thousand miles from the theater of war and located in this peaceful and patriotic State? What led to it? Where was the chief executive of that State? Where were the loyal democrats of that State controlling its organization and commanding its militia? If they were swift to put down some little disturbance and riot in the city of New York, why did they not hasten to the scene? The telegraph was everywhere. President Lincoln and Secretary Stanton were undoubtedly in telegraphic communication with the chief authorities of the city of New York and of the State of New York, and I think it safe to say that if the militia of the State of New York could have been obtained to respond to the interests of peace and order in that city in the enforcement of the draft, the soldiers from the front would not have traced their weary way from the Potomac and the Rappahannock to the banks of the Hudson.

There is evidently something about it that needs explanation. The explanation that the world received at the time was that the governor of the State of New York either would not or could not produce force enough, he being the commander-in-chief of its military forces, to put down this so-called riot, really a rebellion in the greatest city of the Union. Could he have done so and had he done so, this thing would not have been done. But my friend says that he did everything that he could and that he received the thanks of the President of the United States, not because he failed to put down the rebellion in the city of New York and failed to call on his militia to restore peace there, but because he graciously condescended to allow the militia of the State of New York to go down into the State of Pennsylvania to repel General Lee at Gettysburg on the 4th of July. Perhaps the governor of the State of New York was entitled to thanks. I doubt if he did more than his duty. I do not, any more than I do about this bill regulating commerce, know any State lines when one State is assailed by a foreign or rebellious foe which would prevent the militia of one State from going into another State to help their brethren maintain order and restore peace, although to the shame of the State of Vermont be it spoken that we once had a governor who took that view of constitutional law in the war of 1812. When the militia of the State of Vermont, just before the battle of Plattsburgh, were gathered at Burlington in order to go across the lake and help to repel the British, the then governor of the State of Vermont thought the constitution did not allow him to permit our militia to leave the borders of the State. The consequence was, what might have been expected, that the militia left the borders of the State of Vermont in spite of its constitution, in spite of its governor, and fought at the battle of Plattsburgh and helped my friend's constituents to repel Sir George Prevost and all his host—I believe that is the way the song used to go—back again into Canada. That is the only instance known to me where the governor of any State has felt

any particular scruple or has been entitled to any particular thanks because the forces of one State marched into another to assist in repelling the common enemy.

But whatever Governor Seymour did about that let him be thanked for. I have not assailed him about that, and it was rather a military flank movement, I suppose, that transferred the scene of war in the mind of my friend from the city of New York to Gettysburgh. I was speaking of the city of New York; Mr. Seymour was the governor; and here is the record of what took place. The riots, as my friend has stated, arose out of the draft. That was the ostensible cause. The compiler of the work before me, once a famous democratic candidate for the Presidency, Horace Greeley, and therefore I suppose good authority, proceeds to state:

Governor Seymour, who addressed a large gathering in the New York Academy of Music, in language carefully weighed beforehand and tempered by the obvious requirements of his official position, was far more measured and cautious in his assaults and imputations than were the great majority of his compatriots.

Who as I infer spoke on the same occasion, and here are the speeches of his compatriots that refer in very pleasant terms to General Lee and other people rather prominent at that time, but I will not take the time to read them.

Yet he opened with this allusion to the nation's imminent perils and the disappointed hopes, the blighted expectations of those who, whether in council or on the field, were charged with the high responsibility of upholding its authority and enforcing its laws:

"When I accepted the invitation to speak, with others, at this meeting, we were promised the downfall of Vicksburgh."

This meeting was held on the very 4th day of July, at the very time, although Governor Seymour did not know it, that that wickedest of men and most corrupt of administration operators, General Grant, in the view of our friends over the way, was making rather a disturbance in that peaceful town of Vicksburgh.

"When I accepted the invitation to speak, with others, at this meeting, we were promised the downfall of Vicksburgh, the opening of the Mississippi, the probable capture of the confederate capital, and the exhaustion of the rebellion. By common consent all parties had fixed upon this day when the results of the campaign should be known to mark out that line of policy which they felt that our country should pursue. But in the moment of expected victory there came the midnight cry for help from Pennsylvania to save its despoiled fields from the invading foe; and almost within sight of this great commercial metropolis, the ships of your merchants were burned to the water's edge."

That was to encourage the draft, I suppose, to help the authorities of the United States to stimulate democratic patriotism to respond to the roll-call that used to be repeated in the North, I believe, in some very effective lines:

Now, now, while your brethren are fighting and falling,
Fill up the ranks that are open for you.

That was the way he would fill up the ranks. Mr. Greeley's history proceeds:

Having completed his portrayal of the national calamities and perils, he proceeded:

"A few years ago we stood before this community to warn them of the dangers of sectional strife—

That is patriotic—

but our fears were laughed at. At a later day, when the clouds of war overhung our country, we implored those in authority to compromise that difficulty."

O! compromise, how many crimes have been committed in thy name!

"We implored those in authority to compromise that difficulty, for we had been told by that great orator and statesman, Burke—

You will notice that a great orator always quotes Burke; it is an infallible test—

that there never yet was a revolution that might not have been prevented by a compromise opportunely and graciously made." [Great applause.]

And I suppose that compromise would have been to have said that Lincoln had better resign and allow the other fellow, whoever he was, to sit at the chief seat in the capital. That would have done it for the time being. The orator proceeds:

"Our prayers were unheeded. Again, when the contest was opened, we invoked those who had the conduct of affairs not to underrate the power of the adversary, not to underrate the courage and resources and endurance of our own sister States. This warning was treated as sympathy with treason."

And so it was.

"You have the results of these unheeded warnings and unheeded prayers. They have stained our soil with blood; they have carried mourning into thousands of homes; and to-day they have brought our country to the very verge of destruction. Once more I come before you to offer again an earnest prayer and beg you to listen to a warning."

What was that warning? To fill up the ranks or to test the constitutionality of the draft? We shall see:

"Our country is not only at this time torn by one of the bloodiest wars that has ever ravaged the face of the earth; but, if we turn our faces to our own loyal States how is it there? You find the community divided into political parties, strongly arrayed, and using with regard to each other terms of reproach and defiance.

What were those terms of reproach and defiance? The republican party I believe has generally been credited with a good deal of persistence and sincerity for prosecuting the war, and the only terms of reproach and defiance that the democratic party could have showered upon it were because it was prosecuting the war at all, raising taxes, borrowing money, issuing paper, opening slaughter-pens, making a draft upon the free and enlightened democracy of the State of New York. That was what it was reproached for. I suppose there were

only two sides to the question, so I add to what I said a little while ago this august authority, the chief magistrate of the State of New York, for the fact that the democratic organization was reproaching and defying the republican party in respect of the matters that the republican party was trying to accomplish.

"It is said by those who support more particularly the Administration that we who differ honestly, patriotically, sincerely, from them with regard to the line of duty, are men of treasonable purposes and enemies to our country.

"Hear, hear!" was the cry. Then, I take it, we have the statement of this witness that he and those who acted with him officially and otherwise did differ with the administration in respect of its policy, to use the very words of the governor, and that policy I believe we all agree was the most vigorous prosecution of the war.

"On the other hand, the democratic organization—

I hit the very word, my friend will see, when I spoke of the organization as distinguished from the men in it—

"The democratic organization look upon this administration as hostile to their rights and liberties.

There is patriotism for you! The securities and liberties of the democratic organization that the administration had anything to do with or attempted to have anything to do with were that, in common with all the other people of the United States, its able-bodied men should fight for the cause and that its rich men should pay taxes for the cause.

"They look upon their opponents as men who would do them wrong in regard to their most sacred franchises. I need not call your attention to the tone of the press or to the tone of public feeling, to show you how at this moment parties are thus exasperated, and stand in defiant attitudes to each other. A few years ago we were told that sectional strife, waged in words like these, would do no harm to our country; but you have seen the sad and bloody results. Let us be admonished now in time, and take care that this irritation, this feeling which is growing up in our midst, shall not also ripen into civil troubles that shall carry the evils of war into our own homes.

"Upon one point, all are agreed, and that is this: Until we have a united North, we can have no successful war.

I take it, therefore, he thought on the 4th of July, 1863, that the North was not united on the subject of the war. I put his testimony against that of my distinguished friend. They are both of them reputable witnesses. This witness spoke at the time with the fact before him. My honorable friend speaks now after a distance of thirteen years, over which, according to the mission of his party, a good deal of oblivion has spread its wings.

"Until we have a united, harmonious North we can have no beneficent peace. How shall we gain harmony? How shall the unity of all be obtained? Is it to be coerced?

There comes the draft, you see; coercion.

"I appeal to you, my republican friends, when you say to us that the nation's life and existence hang upon harmony and concord here, if you yourselves, in your serious moments, believe that this is to be produced by seizing our persons—

That is, conscripting citizens of the State of New York—

by infringing upon our rights, by insulting our homes, and by depriving us of those cherished principles for which our fathers fought, and to which we have always sworn allegiance. [Great applause.]

Was that encouragement to the administration of the Government of the United States? Was language like that calculated to cheer able-bodied men who heard those words from the greatest statesman of the State of New York and from the chief executive, through whose power alone, as the able-bodied man supposed, he could be compelled to serve the country in the time of its peril? Or was it calculated—mark the word; I do not say designed—was it calculated to stimulate, as it did stimulate, as the consequence showed, to the utmost resistance, breaking out in riot and rebellion, calling for portions of the regular and volunteer Army to turn their faces northward again in order that the ranks of the Army at the front might not be filled up by the able-bodied democrats of the city of New York. I will not read any more of this speech. There is a good deal of it which is equally suggestive reading; it is all in the same strain. There is no inconsistency in the remarks of the executive. The writer proceeds:

These orations are mild and cautious compared with the great mass of democratic harangues on this occasion. The allusions to Mr. Vallandigham's arrest as a lawless outrage and to the States as guardians of the rights of their citizens (with direct reference to the impending draft, which Governor Seymour with the great mass of his party was known to regard as unconstitutional) and all kindred indications of a purpose to resist the Federal Executive even unto blood, in case his "usurpations" and "outrages" should be repeated and persisted in, were everywhere received with frenzied shouts of concurrence and approbation, and a proposition to organize at once to march on Washington and hurl from power the tyrant enthroned in the White House would have elicited even more frantic manifestations of delight and approval.

So says the last democratic candidate of the democratic party for the office of President of the United States. I commend it to all his followers and supporters. He proceeds:

The first draft in the city of New York for conscripts under the enrollment act was advertised to commence at the several enrollment offices soon afterward; and, as a preparation therefore, the several democratic journals of that city seemed to vie with each other—especially in their issues of the eventful morning—in efforts to inflame the passions of those who at best detested the idea of braving peril, privation, suffering, and death in the prosecution of an "abolition war." That the enrollment here was excessive and the quota required of the city was too high were vehemently asserted, that there would be unfairness in the drawing of names from the wheel was broadly insinuated, but that the draft itself—any draft—

And the emphasis is that of Mr. Greeley, not my own—any draft—was unconstitutional, needless, and an outrage on individual liberty and State rights, was more emphatically insisted on.

And then he quotes from the Journal of Commerce, and from the New York World, and from the Daily News, and speaks of handbills. Then he speaks of the state of the mob and of the condition of the organized militia:

The organized militia of the city were generally absent in the interior of Pennsylvania; the Government had no military force within call but a handful on Governor's Island and in the forts commanding the seaward approaches; while the police, though well organized and efficient, was not competent to deal with a virtual insurrection which had the great body of the foreign-born laborers of our city at its back, with nearly every one of the ten thousand grog-shops for its block-houses and recruiting stations.

It must have been a charming democracy there, Mr. President.

The outbreak had manifestly been premeditated and pre-arranged; and the tidings of its initial success, being instantly diffused throughout the city, incited an outpouring into the streets of all who dreaded the draft, hated the war, or detested abolitionists and negroes as the culpable causes of both.

Then he goes on to speak how the riot accumulated as unrepressed riots generally do, and the things they did. They began on Monday. They were kept up through the three following days. He then proceeds to say:

But a riot stoutly confronted and checked has reached its enminating point; and this one—which would almost certainly have broken out on the fourth, but for the news of Lee's defeat at Gettysburg—was now prosecuted under the heavy discouragement of the full tidings of Grant's triumph at Vicksburg; while the first news of Banks's capture of Port Hudson, of Holmes's bloody repulse at Helena, and of Gillmore's initial success at Morris Island, now pouring in from day to day, proved a quick succession of wet blankets for the spirits of the rioters.

Now I come to Governor Seymour:

Governor Seymour had been in the city on the Saturday previous, but left that afternoon for New Jersey, and did not return till Tuesday forenoon, when he was at once escorted to the City Hall, and thence addressed the crowd who flocked thither—many, if not most of them, from the mob just before menacing the Tribune office—as follows:

My friends, I have come down here from the quiet of the country to see what was the difficulty; to learn what all this trouble was concerning the draft. Let me assure you that I am your friend. [Uproarious cheering.] You have been my friends. [Cries of "Yes," "Yes," "That's so." "We are and will be again."] and now I assure you, my fellow-citizens, that I am here to show you a test of my friendship. [Cheers.] I wish to inform you that I have sent my adjutant-general to Washington to confer with the authorities there.

What for? To show them that volunteers from all parts of the State are flocking in and that there is no use to resort to this invidious operation of drafting? Not exactly. I am afraid I am wrong in making that free recitation; let me give his exact words again:

I wish to inform you that I have sent my adjutant-general to Washington to confer with the authorities there, and to have this draft suspended and stopped.

That is my friendship for you; that is my loyalty to my country and my Government; that is what will dispense with turning thousands of the Army back again toward their northern homes to keep us in order. All will be peace in the State of New York, for she is not called upon to help fight the battles of the country!

[Vociferous cheers.]

He probably struck the key-note then.

I now ask you, as good citizens, to wait for his return; and I assure you that I will do all that I can to see that there is no inequality and no wrong done any one. I wish you to take care of all property as good citizens and see that every person is safe. The safe-keeping of property and persons rests with you; and I charge you to disturb neither. It is your duty to maintain the good order of the city; and I know you will do it. I wish you now to separate as good citizens, and you can assemble again whenever you wish to do so. I ask you to leave all to me now, and I will see to your rights. Wait until my adjutant returns from Washington, and you shall be satisfied. Listen to me, and see that no harm is done to either persons or property, but retire peaceably.

So he promises them that, if they will only wait, the object they have in view by these riots shall be accomplished without any further destruction of the property of their fellow-citizens and the lives of their fellow-citizens in the city of New York.

Mr. President, I think I have gone far enough with this particular incidental topic, which was only one drop in this great bucket of proof, to show that I did not do any injustice to the distinguished governor of the State of New York when I said that the organization of the democratic party and the action of the executive of that party at that time in the State of New York were adverse to the cause of the Union, and that all that doubt and difficulty and riot and hanging back could do to give aid to the rebellion and to break down the cause of the Union was done. I do not mean by that to say that Governor Seymour intended and desired that the rebellion should succeed; but he was stuffed so full of the dignity of the State of New York and was so crazy on the subject that any draft under national authority must be unconstitutional that he resorted to the same method of eloquence that demagogues—not that he was one—do to a mob to keep the peace and get what they desire without violence if they can; if they cannot, what then? Where was the militia of the State of New York, with its four million people? They were not all at Gettysburg; they were not all at the front. New York, like Vermont and every other northern State, although they all poured out their quotas for the war, still had men enough, able-bodied men enough in reserve to have fought a great many battles and enforced order in a great many cities larger than the city of New York. But that governor who alone had the constitutional power in and as

the head of that State to bring the force of the State to bear against this insurrection, as Mr. Greeley calls it, did not do it, and the forces of the nation were recalled from posts of infinite importance and at a most critical period in the history of the war to enforce that peace in the loyal State of New York which we were trying to enforce by arms over the seceded States.

Now, Mr. President, I am done, I believe, with that topic, and I only want to say one word more. I have not come into this debate—and it is not half exhausted; I am quite ready to begin again whenever I am obliged to do so, much as the people of New York submitted to the draft apparently—I have not come into this debate with any desire to stir up unhappy remembrances; but when what my honorable friends on the other side of this Chamber say in respect of the conduct of republican administrations necessarily leads to the root of this tree then I shall dig to the root, be satisfied or dissatisfied who may.

Mr. KERNAN. Now, Mr. President, I submit that the charge of the Senator from Vermont so elaborately made not to reduce this appropriation bill, but for other purposes, is an unjust charge. The riot in New York of which he has spoken was not fomented and there was no wish to excite hostilities or disturbance in New York with a view to aid the rebellion. What were the facts? I hope every American citizen will always remember the history of raising troops to put down the rebellion, if we ever have war again. The calls made for troops by the President were filled, and more were sent than were wanted up to the ordering of the three-hundred-dollar draft, as it was called. That draft never got the Government men. Prior to this draft there was never a call for troops when they were not raised by volunteering; and you will remember that prior to the order of this draft—I may not get the date accurately—there was an order issued from the War Department that they would not take any more men. There was no call on the States or the people for men and a refusal to furnish them prior to the ordering of this draft. I allude to it only to state what I think was the cause of the great dissatisfaction with the draft and of the riot in New York. There came an order for a draft, and every man drafted who could pay \$300 could stay at home by doing so. It did create excitement and feeling among poor men in every neighborhood. Before that in my own county, and I take it as a fair sample, we had raised without difficulty the needed troops from the men who were willing to volunteer; but when the order came that there should be a draft and that the drafted men who would pay \$300 each need not serve, the men without means who must go, although it was difficult for them to leave their families, became dissatisfied. Whether this was right or wrong I shall not discuss here. There was a feeling that this was an effort to make the poor men go as soldiers while others could get rid of going by paying \$300. That is what made the dissatisfaction, and that is what made it necessary for men in every neighborhood to appeal to that class to keep them from becoming very much excited in reference to what they thought an unfair discrimination. The result of it was that it did not give us men. Democrats and republicans alike throughout our State where there were cases of hardship raised the money and paid the Government the \$300, for it only asked the one or the other. This made excitement. Women with children, whose husbands could not raise the money, were alarmed and excited. A few months before we could call meetings and raise men by the regiment as volunteers from the class who had not wife or children depending on their daily labor to keep them in bread; but when this order for the draft came there arose dissatisfaction and excitement, not from bad men exciting disquiet, but because the class of laborers who had families and no means believed this mode of getting soldiers was unfair and unjust toward them. There was a very large body of this class of men in the city of New York; and let me say to the Senator from Vermont that those who were republicans and acted with the republican party of this class were excited just as much as democrats. They all thought it was an effort to make those go to the field without the credit of volunteering who could not raise \$300. That was what made the excitement which led to the riot in New York.

Did Governor Seymour incite it? Does the Senator from Vermont pretend to say that when he spoke in his address on the 4th of July, 1863, about differences between parties he meant they were stirring up hostile dissension and violence between parties? There were differences then; there were irritations arising out of arbitrary acts of the Federal Government; there were things in reference to the draft that created excitement; and when he appealed to the Government at Washington to let the State of New York raise her quota and not enforce this draft upon men who could not raise the \$300 and let all those who could stay at home, he did, in my judgment, what was wise and patriotic toward the Federal Government, and did not do it from any desire to prevent the Army from being filled with efficient soldiers. Everybody knows that sort of a draft was an utter failure. It did not furnish men; it degraded the whole thing down to selling a man for \$300.

But the riot broke out; and it probably grew to greater proportions than it otherwise would owing to the absence of our militia regiments from New York and its vicinity in Pennsylvania, to which I referred before. Our governor did not try to stop them going out of the State, as did the patriotic governor of Vermont in the war of 1812, as mentioned by the Senator. They went to Pennsylvania on the order of our governor, as commander-in-chief of the militia of the

State. Everybody remembers how promptly it was done. They were sent from the eastern part of the State because thence they could be transferred promptly to the relief of the Federal Government in Pennsylvania.

But the troops of the United States did not have to go to stop the riot. The riot was all stopped before the troops came. There were men ordered from the interior, but they did not get to New York until the riot had ended. But these excited and deluded men, who thought there was to be a system, not of volunteering, but of making those who were poor go to the war, were stopped by the efforts of Governor Seymour and the local authorities, and the speech made by Governor Seymour and referred to by the Senator, which has been so much abused, aided to stay violence and restore order. Governor Seymour is denounced because he addressed them as "my friends."

Remember, as I said before, it was that particular thing that called out Mayor Opdyke. He was with him. He thought he acted most firmly and wisely and prudently. It was a similar reference to that made by the Senator from Vermont here that was made in the convention that led Mr. Opdyke to make the speech to which I have alluded. The city was under a republican mayor at the time of this riot. Governor Seymour had spent Sunday out of the State, at a place where he had relatives, in New Jersey, and he hastened back to the city on the first intimation of the riot. The mayor and he together went to the scene of threatened violence, and he addressed the excited multitude as men. It was his duty to stay and disperse them without bloodshed if possible. They were men excited, not with a purpose of marching down South to help the rebellion, but they were men who had been excited by the idea that they, laborers, with families and without property, were to be dragged to the Army, while everybody who could pay \$300 would escape. He appealed to them as friends. A man who is a coward or who sympathizes with a mob will run away from it; but when a brave man or officer finds that his neighbor's life or property or the public peace is threatened by an excited mob, he does just what Governor Seymour did in this case. He, brave, patriotic, and honest, steps out before the mob and talks to them in the language of kindness, while it is also the language of firmness. He did address them in that way. The riot went down. He said that he had sent his adjutant-general to Washington. It was to make an arrangement that the State of New York might, in accordance with what had been the previous and wiser mode, be allowed to promptly furnish her quota of soldiers by volunteers and be relieved from this draft, which was peculiarly odious, because it permitted all who could pay \$300 to remain at home and required the laborer, who had not means, to leave his family in want and go to the war for years.

I submit to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, speaking as he does here in the absence of one whose life has been before the people of this country, speaking of one as to whom I would appeal to his political opponents in my own State for his purity, for his patriotism, for his sincere desire to do his full duty as a public and private citizen, whether he really can stand on the ground he has assumed here to-day in reference to Governor Seymour. I think he has done injustice to that distinguished citizen in carrying the idea that, first, he was a traitor to the Constitution of his country when he was governor; second, that he sought to incite men to resist the Government, and, thirdly, that when he addressed that mob he was not doing what was his duty, endeavoring to quell it, but telling them that he would endeavor to arrange so that the quota of New York might be raised in the future as it had ever been in the past, full and up and over of able, active young men who were willing to go to the Army as volunteers, but who did not wish to go as conscripts.

I leave it, as the Senator says, to history. I am not here to question the accuracy of Mr. Greeley's History of the War. He has gone to his grave. If I should read some of the things that he said in excited moments of large masses of republicans they would have to say that he did them injustice, and I should admit it. Does the gentleman say that a history written under the excitement of the war by a man of his character is to be taken always as true as to what he suggests as to motives of men from whom he differed politically? We nominated Mr. Greeley, as the Senator states, and he was not elected.

I have nothing to say so far as the Senator has read from that history what Governor Seymour said. All I ask is a fair interpretation of it. On the 4th of July, 1863, he was speaking on the great important point of the people of the North being united. United how? United on a policy as to the war which would suppress it speedily, which would uphold the Constitution, and which, the moment the men who resisted the Constitution laid down their arms, would insure them protection and republican government. That was the policy of many men in the State of New York throughout this entire war. They spoke against the wisdom and justice of arbitrary arrests in our own and other States where there was no war, and which excited bad feeling; they spoke in favor of our people standing together, in favor of putting down the rebellion by armed force, in favor of sending our share of men, in favor of raising our share of money, and making it a war solely for the Union, and with no other or ulterior or sinister motive of any kind. And now to read in this debate the remarks made by Governor Seymour on the 4th of July, 1863, which the Senator from Vermont has read, and to insinuate or charge that by those remarks Governor Seymour meant or intended to encourage or favor those in rebellion against the Constitution of the United States which he had sworn on the 1st of January, 1863,

to uphold, is doing him great injustice. I submit that the Senator from Vermont is entirely unjust.

I am willing to leave the history of the State of New York, of its democratic governor, of the party that acted with him in that State, to the judgment of fair men; and I would leave it to Governor Morgan, who was governor in 1861 and 1862 himself. He knows whom he put on as committeemen and chairmen of committees in the counties where men were to be raised in 1861 and 1862; he knows how the response was from the day of the first fire to the end of his administration; and I think that any one looking at it will find that the Federal Government was as fully sustained through the administration of his successor, Governor Seymour, as it was by the governor of any of our sister-States, and I believe as a rule they acted patriotically and they acted well.

Mr. MERRIMON. Mr. President, much as I regret to protract this debate I cannot allow the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] to assign me by inadvertence or on purpose a false position, or, if I can help it, to evade the force of the points I endeavored to make against the republican party the other day. He says in substance that I provoked this debate so far as it is partisan in its character. That I absolutely deny, as I have done repeatedly before. The Senate will bear me witness and the RECORD will bear me witness that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. MORTON] made a furious and what I regarded as an unjust assault upon the democratic party. He arraigned its leading men and denounced its principles and its policy and its practice. I thought that I had a right to say what I might deem proper in vindication of the policy of the democratic party at this time, and that I had a right in reply in some measure to arraign the republican party; and ventured on Tuesday last to do it. Out of what I submitted on that occasion has sprung, as the Senator from Vermont alleges, this warm debate. He would have the Senate and the country understand also that I dragged the war into the debate, and that all the declamation that has been indulged in in reference to the war was provoked by some argument or some statement made by myself. That imputation is equally as groundless. I expressly excluded the war from what I submitted to the Senate. I did not base any estimate that I made or any argument I made upon any expenditures or alleged maladministration during the late war. On the contrary, I said that the war was the occasion of increased expense; that during the time it prevailed the civil service was necessarily increased. There were many considerations that tended to increase the expenses of the Government during that time, and I avoided entering into a discussion of the war, or its causes or its consequences. Nor did I advert to the increase of the public debt or any of the practices that were carried on for which the republican party were responsible during that time. I put that on purpose entirely out of the case. Nor did I take into consideration the public debt for the purpose of seeing whether it was created on account of the war or on account of other causes. I put that entirely out of the calculation. I said in substance that, conceding for argument's sake, which I denied as a fact, that I was responsible for the war, that the southern people were responsible for the war, that the democratic party was responsible for the war, that all the crimes and outrages which were perpetrated during that time were chargeable to the democratic party, and that the republican party was virtuous and patriotic and did in all things what it ought to have done, could all that concession make any apology for the ruinous extravagance, the unheard-of frauds and fraudulent practices tolerated by, and in many instances connived at, by the republican party of the nation? That is the ground I based my remarks upon, and the Senator cannot by his ingenuity now draw me into a controversy about the war. It is in no just or proper sense a legitimate subject of discussion before the Senate at this time.

I shall not undertake to vindicate the course of the South or the course of the democratic party of the North, or anything that was done by any person who sympathized with the South during that tragic period; now is not the time or the place to do so; but I do undertake to say, and I have a right to say it, that, whatever the republican party may have done that was virtuous and good during the war or since the war, this can be no excuse or apology for any crimes and maladministration and frauds and corruptions which it may have tolerated since that time. If since that time it has proved faithless and unfit to be charged longer with power, the country ought to know the fact. And another material fact to be taken into this account is that, whatever might have been the position of the South during the war and however responsible it may have been for the war—I will not discuss that question now—since that time the people of that section of the Union have had to contribute their part of the public revenue, and they have paid it and are paying it to-day. They are responsible for their part of the public debt. They are responsible for and have paid and must continue to pay their share of the current expenses of the Government, and being so they surely have a right to be heard here in reference to the way and manner in which they are taxed, the revenues are collected, and public expenditures are made, and for what causes, and whether the authorities of the United States have administered the Government purely and honestly and for the best interests of the people.

It was in that view, and in that view alone, that I ventured on Tuesday last to engage in the debate, and exercise my right on this floor as a Senator representing in part one of the States of the Union. Is there anything wrong in that? Am I to be complained at for that?

Why make this *ad hominem* argument, that I am responsible for the war? What does it prove? Suppose that my hands to-day were red with traitorous blood, is that any argument in favor of the ruinous policy and practices of the republican party? Suppose that the whole South have committed savage crimes, as the Senator would intimate, and which I deny, is that any apology for the misrule and general distress brought on the country since the war by the republican party? I think not; and I apprehend that an intelligent people will not allow such an argument, however ingeniously put, and which goes off on immaterial points, to have the weight of a feather, when they come to pass upon the merits of the republican party and its conduct since the war.

The points I endeavored to make in what I said the other day were, first, that the republican party had utterly failed to administer the internal-revenue laws of the country in the matter of collecting taxes upon distilled spirits faithfully. I went on to show, and by data which no one denied, and which I undertake to say no one can deny, that in the neighborhood of a billion and a half of dollars ought to have been collected and should have gone into the Treasury of the Union from that single source of revenue, when less than one-half, not more than one-third of that amount was collected and accounted for. I went on further to show that, while a large part of the revenue due from this source was not collected, large sums were collected and not accounted for, and the republican party, having complete control of the Government, was responsible to the people for not having it collected and accounted for.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understand the Senator to say that is not denied. I denied it. I deny it now. I say there is no ground whatever for an assertion of that kind. I am surprised to hear the Senator from North Carolina say that two-thirds of the revenue that ought to have been derived from spirituous liquors has been lost by the republican party.

Mr. MERRIMON. That is not what I said.

Mr. SHERMAN. Or that we have failed to collect the tax, and only collected one-third of what we ought to have collected.

Mr. MERRIMON. What I said the other day and what anyone can see by turning to the RECORD was this—

Mr. SHERMAN. I am turning to it now.

Mr. MERRIMON. A civil-service commission was raised under a statute by the republican party at a time when the better class of that party—and good men in it have been protesting against manifest frauds all the time—were crying out against the frauds and corruption of those men who had got the control of it, and that civil-service commission put down in their report, from which I read, that one-fourth of the revenues were not collected; and that was not denied nor can it be denied. They not only asserted it but they said that estimates had been made by persons who were well qualified to speak on that subject and who had passed upon it.

Mr. SHERMAN. I desire—

Mr. MERRIMON. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not interrupt the gentlemen on the other side and I do not want to be interrupted now. I want to consume as little time as possible in setting myself in a fair, just light. The Senator will have sufficient time after I am through to say what he thinks proper.

Then I said, furthermore, that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fessenden, in 1864, set down in his report that the annual product of distilled spirits in this country at that time was 100,000,000 of gallons, I believe he said.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator yield to me right there?

Mr. MERRIMON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to say that Mr. Fessenden did say in 1864 that the consumption of whisky in 1860 was about 100,000,000 gallons; but afterward a most careful commission was created by the two Houses of Congress, of which David A. Wells was the chairman, consisting of three men, and they went into the whole question of whisky production, not only in the year 1860 but for a long series of years, and they concluded that less than 40,000,000 gallons was the average annual production of whisky.

Mr. MERRIMON. The statistics of the country show that the number of gallons of distilled spirits is more than that; that it is more than double that amount.

Mr. SHERMAN. Upon that point the Senator ought to allow me to make a statement.

Mr. MERRIMON. I think Senators ought not to be interrupting me in this way. They may correct me after I get through if I am in error. I cannot hear or yield to half a dozen at once.

Mr. LOGAN. We want to state the facts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina decline to yield?

Mr. MERRIMON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERMAN. Very well.

Mr. MERRIMON. I do not want to be interrupted further. Upon that statement made by a republican Secretary of the Treasury, and which I never heard contradicted until the other day by the honorable Senator from Ohio, [Mr. SHERMAN,] I made a calculation—an estimate—the accuracy of which cannot be denied, whereby it will appear that during Andrew Johnson's administration more than \$650,000,000 were lost. I said a great part of that was not collected at all, and because it was not collected the republican party was responsible. It was stolen by faithless officers and misapplied by others

whom the republican party kept in office when they ought to have punished them for it. That is what I said, and I repeat it, that it was right and proper that the American people should hold the republican party responsible for it. That is one point I made. In all the arguments made here I have not heard that satisfactorily answered, and I do not believe it can be. The estimate may be extravagant, but I know and the country knows that it has been a standing ground of complaint by the better class of men in the republican party and by the country generally that the Internal Revenue Department has lost millions since the close of the war through faithless officers and frauds of the most appalling character.

Another point that I made was that the republican party was not an economical party; that growing out of the way of administering the Government during the war, growing out of its extravagant notions of policy and principles, or some cause, it did not administer the Government economically; and I cited figures to show that fact. I undertook to show that the material figures that I cited are substantially correct, and no Senator has shown them materially incorrect. One or two of the tables which I have cited have been assailed to some extent, but they have not been assailed successfully in a material point of view. I showed that although in the first table showing the increase of the civil service there might have been some irregularity and inaccuracies about the details of the compilation and in the several items from which the table was made up, yet in the aggregate, taking the basis of estimate adopted by a distinguished republican, it was not far out of the way. The Blue Book, containing the names of officers, employes, and agents, contained over twelve hundred pages; and estimating seventy names to a page, as was done by the gentleman referred to, the number would be something over 84,000 officers and agents and employes in the service of the Government. Then it was not denied that the names of employes at the navy-yards and at many other places where persons were employed at one service or another were not contained in the Blue Book nor taken into the calculation at all; and if they had been the number in the table which I cited was not sufficiently great. As to the other table, about the current expenses, I could not see that there was any very great difference between the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] and myself. I had not verified the table to which he adverted last, as I told him and the Senate; but to-day, on looking at the report of the Secretary of the Treasury and comparing some items there with corresponding items in this table, I find that they harmonize exactly.

There is another fact in connection with that table to which the Senator from Massachusetts did not advert. If he had looked at the margin on the right-hand side of the table he would have found certain items put down as items of expenditure and other items as items of appropriation. He did not make that distinction which was material in determining its accuracy. So learning that there were errors in that table, I cited another table of which there could be no question, which I vouched for when produced, and it was the only one for which I did vouch. That table shows, as I insisted yesterday and on Tuesday, not only an extraordinary, but an unnatural, increase of the expenditures of the Government. I insisted that the republican party were responsible for that unnatural increase, and I so insist to-day. Senators in undertaking to answer these points may go off and declaim about the war and denounce the democratic party for sympathy with the rebellion and all that, but I take it sensible men will not allow that argument to weigh much with them when they come to consider the two points I have thus made. The people are interested in knowing whether these charges are true in whole or in part. There are the figures and the data; let every one calculate for himself. Those are the matters we are at issue about—not about the war and its crimes and calamities.

I have not time now to enter into an elaborate reply to the long, labored, and studied speech of the Senator from Vermont; but I am going to cite some striking statistics from the record, which I happen to have before me, in order that any man who has the capacity to calculate figures and reason at all may see in a general view the force and truth of the points which I made and have just restated. If Senators can show that this general view is not true, I respectfully challenge them to do it.

In the year 1850 the population of this country was 21,191,876. The net annual expenditures for administering the Government that year were \$37,165,990.09. Mark the proportion now of the increase as I pass along. In 1860 the population of this country was 31,443,321. In that year the net ordinary expenses of the Government were \$60,056,754.71. In 1870 the population of the country was 38,558,371. See now how the expenses go up, out of all reasonable proportion. In 1875 the net ordinary expenses of administering this Government were \$171,529,848.27, nearly three times what it was in 1860.

Mr. EATON. Exclusive of the pension-list.

Mr. MERRIMON. I think neither the appropriation for pensioners nor the interest on the public debt is included in that statement of the Government expenses. I know the interest on the public debt is not included. This is only the ordinary expenses of administering the Government for the last year. The increase for administering the Government is nearly three to one. The increase in population is not more, I believe, than ten millions in that time. Now, I put it to any one who can reason at all whether, taking the growth and development and the circumstances of the country, it is necessary in the year 1875 in carrying on the ordinary operations of the Govern-

ment, to increase it to three times what it was in 1860? If it is not necessary, then I ask my republican friends where has from forty to fifty million dollars in one year gone to? Answer that. Forty or fifty millions of dollars is an immense sum according to my notion of expenditures.

Then I call attention to another fact tending to show the extravagance I allege. The House of Representatives is fresh from the people, elected on the ground of reform and retrenchment. They came here to look after the people's interest, and they have done it as far as they could with lights before them and the circumstances surrounding them. They say that they have made appropriations sufficient to carry on the Government and to carry it on efficiently. And they have cut down the appropriations from last year \$38,000,000 in round numbers. Now I ask, if this is true, if the public expenditures the current year may be reduced \$38,000,000, why might not that sum have been saved last year and for several years past? Let him who can answer. Yet if the republican party, who have administered the Government since the war, have collected the revenues, have allowed no frauds, have administered the Government fairly and honestly in all respects, how is it possible that the democratic House have ascertained that the Government can be sufficiently supported during the year 1876-'77 and reduce the amount of revenue to be applied to that purpose \$38,000,000? That is something I cannot understand, and that is what I leave my republican friends to explain. My friend says it is not the fact, but has he risen here to say these figures can be denied? I cite the record here as to the fact. I cite the report of the Secretary of the Treasury as to the amount expended for administering the Government in the several periods I have mentioned. Can they deny that? Can they point out why the expenses in administering this Government in 1875 shall be three times as much as it was in 1860, leaving out the War Department and the war expenses? I leave them to answer that question. I put these striking facts and figures to the people, and I call upon them to call upon this party to explain how this is; and if they cannot explain it to their satisfaction, to condemn them at the ballot-box.

The Senator from Vermont, instead of meeting these figures, facts, and arguments, and showing they are false or substantially so, goes off in declamation, and the main part of his speech is devoted to the war, its crimes and horrors. He seems to want to divert attention from this subject by a stirring reference to the war. I do not go into that subject at all. I can see no good to come of doing so, and it is not material to do so. Then, too, he abuses the democratic party for what they did during the war. It is not my province to defend the democratic party or anything they did during the war. There are others who can do that more properly and who know more about it; but what transpired since the war I have a right to talk about, and I have talked about it.

The other day the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] almost alarmed me about the character of the speech I had made. He said I had denounced the republican party in a most wholesale manner; that I had said they were common thieves, robbers, dogs, scoundrels, and all that sort of thing. I wonder that he could so express himself. I never indulge in such language as that here or elsewhere. I was glad the next morning in looking over the RECORD to find that anybody looking at what I said could not truly say there was a coarse word of anybody in it. Nor did I deny that there were honest men in the republican party. On the contrary, I expressly said, I believe in reply to a question put by the Senator from Illinois, [Mr. LOGAN,] that there were good men and thousands of them in the republican party just as there are in all parties; but I did insist that bad, selfish, and corrupt men had gotten into that party in such numbers, they had got such control upon its vitality, that the party was not able to purge itself; and if the American people expected to rid themselves of this incubus they would be obliged to change the administration of the Government. That is what I said. I did not use any disrespectful word to any respectable republican on this floor or anywhere else. I did not charge the party as the Senator said I did, and I cannot see any reasonable motive for insisting that I charged the party in that way. That is the position that I occupied and now occupy, and so I wish to be understood.

This, Mr. President, is about all I care to say now. I do not want to protract this debate. I am anxious that we should come to a vote on this bill as soon as possible, but this much was due to myself.

Mr. LOGAN. Will the Senator allow me to make a suggestion to him?

Mr. MERRIMON. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOGAN. The Senator was speaking about the extraordinary expenditures of the Government and comparing them with the expenses of 1860. I should like to suggest one or two little items which will probably refresh his recollection. We estimate the Army to cost about \$1,000,000 to a regiment yearly. When the war broke out we had ten regiments. If the Senator will look into the condition of the Army now he will see a difference of about \$20,000,000 in that respect. If the Senator will examine the amount of claims that have been allowed every year since the war by the Quartermaster's Department and by the Commissary Department for horses lost in the service, for provision, for fuel, for destruction of property, and things of that kind growing out of the war, he will find another addition perhaps.

Mr. MERRIMON. I would remind my friend that expenses of that character are not embraced in the net ordinary expenses of the Gov-

ernment. In 1875 the gross expenditures in administering the Government were \$682,000,885.32.

Mr. LOGAN. That is paying interest—and everything else—every claim possible.

Mr. MERRIMON. Certainly; and paying these very expenditures which we are talking about.

Mr. LOGAN. For what year is that?

Mr. MERRIMON. Eighteen hundred and seventy-five; and here is the record if the Senator wishes to see it.

Mr. WINDOM. In 1875?

Mr. LOGAN. What does the Senator mean?

Mr. MERRIMON. The gross expenditures in 1875.

Mr. WEST. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him one moment? The Senator gives correctly the gross expenditures, but there is a very great difference between the amount of money expended and what it costs to carry on the Government.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. WEST. One moment.

Mr. MERRIMON. I do not think I have ever seen a time—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. MERRIMON. If I can find out which gentleman to yield to. I do not want to be in any way discourteous to any one; but to which Senator shall I yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator now makes a statement that the expenses of the Government during the last year were \$682,000,000, and with an air of triumph he says he has got it here in a report right before him. Surely a Senator of the United States ought to be very careful about making a statement which every boy in the whole land will wonder at at once. Everybody knows that is not so. The very next figure to it, within half an inch of the statement of that large expenditure of \$682,000,000, which was the gross expenditure, shows there was paid in refunding the public debt \$407,377,492.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It is a mere change of the accounts.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is the very next figure [pointing on the report] only so far from that statement. That amount was expended in refunding the public debt, changing one bond to another.

Mr. MERRIMON. That included the sinking fund and other things, did it not?

Mr. LOGAN. And that sum of \$400,000,000 applies to the statement the Senator referred to as gross expenditures, and is to be deducted therefrom.

Mr. MERRIMON. Certainly, the gross expenditures. There are the figures, and Senators are denying the fact right in their faces.

Mr. LOGAN. The amount of money paid on the public debt is a part of the expenses of the Government, the Senator says, and when it was paid on a debt incurred by himself and others, a debt that the war produced.

Mr. MERRIMON. Here I will advert to one matter mentioned by the Senator from Vermont. He talked a great deal about the amounts that had been paid out to claims against the Treasury for cotton, &c. The Senator ought to have been candid enough to say that in paying out that money it was paid out because it had been covered into the Treasury when the cotton that produced it was seized and sold, and it was paid out to those who were entitled to it under the decisions of the courts of the country.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Undoubtedly; but the Senator's point was that the total expenditures of the Government had gone on increasing and increasing so as to show by the mere total that they were very extravagant. One item I say is paying that money down South for their confederate cotton. Is that extravagant? That was my question.

Mr. MERRIMON. No, sir; I did not pretend to say that it was extravagant.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Then what did the Senator say this was the total of extravagance for?

Mr. MERRIMON. That money was not gotten from the people by taxation, nor was that taken into the account which I have read, which shows the net ordinary expenses of administering the Government every year from 1865. If any Senator can answer the point I made, let him answer it. The figures and facts cited cannot be answered by going off on the war.

Mr. WEST. Some of your figures have been answered.

Mr. MERRIMON. I do not know when it was done.

Mr. WEST. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] answered your figures.

Mr. MERRIMON. No, sir; I read exactly what was in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Certainly.

Mr. MERRIMON. It included other matters, and I intended to state what the gross expenditures were.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The Senator read it just as the man read the Bible: "If Satan entice thee to sin, consent thou;" and there he stopped, leaving off the "not."

Mr. MERRIMON. That is a very poor way to meet a fact and an argument.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I submit to the Senator that it is.

Mr. MERRIMON. Making laughable suggestions here, there, and elsewhere does not meet the point. Can any Senator, will any disinterested man in this country, contend that the internal-revenue

system has been properly, judiciously, wisely, and faithfully administered since the close of the war; and that the amount of money has gone into the Treasury that ought to have gone there? The amount of money was not collected that ought to have been collected, the officers have not accounted for all the money that they ought to have accounted for, and they having failed to do it the republican party, having absolute control of the Government, are responsible for it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask the Senator—

Mr. MERRIMON. Then here these figures—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MERRIMON. No, sir. Here are these figures which show this unnatural, this abnormally extravagant increase of the expenses from year to year since the war. Has any Senator accounted for that to the satisfaction of any disinterested mind?

Mr. WEST. Which figures do you speak of?

Mr. MERRIMON. I trust the Senator will not interrupt me again. If I allow one to do it half a dozen will do it, and I must be courteous alike to all.

Mr. WINDOM. The Senator was asking somebody to account for it. We thought perhaps he would like to have it done.

Mr. MERRIMON. In the proper way and at the proper time.

Mr. EDMUNDS. "In some other way," as Agrippa said unto Paul.

Mr. MERRIMON. Instead of coming down to these points and showing how money ought to have been collected and how much was collected and accounted for, the Senator has gone off into the war to rekindle the fires of hate and discord. I shall not join in that work.

I adverted to the fact that extravagance was made manifest in that the democratic party in the House of Representatives have reduced taxation \$38,000,000.

Mr. WINDOM. By what bill?

Mr. MERRIMON. I mean appropriations. I explained that the other day. That is another subterfuge. That is the way you undertake to answer a point.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MERRIMON. I will not yield; I do not want to be discourteous, but if I yield to one, I will have to yield to half a dozen others, so that I cannot go on with the remarks I intended to make before taking my seat. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. MORTON] the other day, with an air of triumph asked the Senator from Ohio [Mr. THURMAN] or some other Senator, has the House sent in a bill here that proposes to reduce taxation one dollar? He thought that argument was a complete answer to the argument being made by the Senator on this side of the Chamber. It is appropriate to allude to it now in answer to the suggestion the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WINDOM] makes.

The answer to it is twofold and very plain. The republican party have administered this Government since 1860. Passing by the war, they have had absolute control of the Government since 1865, and what is the condition of the country to-day? Prostration of industries and business everywhere, and we witness distress on every hand. We hear of failures every day amounting in the aggregate to millions of dollars. Thousands of laborers are in want of bread and cannot find employment. Who is responsible for this disordered state of the country if the republican party are not? Is it not plainly attributable to their extravagance and misrule? The maladministration in the collection of the revenues is sufficient to produce widespread disaster. This alone, in my judgment, has contributed much to the present public distress and discontent.

How is it that all this evil has come upon the country while this party are and have been in power, while they are ruling? The Bible says, "When the wicked rule the people mourn," and the people mourn to-day. We hear of commercial failures; we hear of industrial failures; we hear of failures in every respect in every walk of life. On which side soever we turn our eyes we see distress and hear loud complaints. Who is responsible for it? All this is brought about by misrule. It has not come without a cause; and in such a country as this, with such a people, with such resources, want and distress cannot come if they are properly and faithfully governed. The revenues of the country are drawn from the same source they were drawn from last year, and they will fall short many millions of dollars; and we get that fact from the Treasury Department of the Government. The public distresses have impaired alarmingly the sources of revenue. Hence the taxes may not be reduced, unless in the contingency I will now mention. The House has reduced the appropriations \$38,000,000. If this republican Senate will concur in that reduction then we may expect a bill before we adjourn reducing the taxes of the people of the country \$20,000,000. Concur in the appropriation bills as the House passes them, and let us see if we do not get a reduction of taxation to that amount. The House, of course, cannot send a bill here reducing the taxes until they see what a republican Senate will do with the appropriation bills.

Mr. WINDOM. Would the Senator like to have me give a specimen of those reductions?

Mr. OGLESBY. I want to see a statement of those reductions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. MERRIMON. Two gentlemen want to put questions. I do not know to which Senator I am to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator yield to the Senator from Minnesota, [Mr. WINDOM?]

Mr. MERRIMON. I am obliged to yield.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is not fair. I asked the Senator to yield to me first.

Mr. MERRIMON. If anybody is going to misconstrue my motives, I will not consent to yield to anybody.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Go on; there will be time enough by and by.

Mr. MERRIMON. My purpose in rising was not to go into a general discussion. I am not prepared to do it now.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is evident.

Mr. MERRIMON. If I should take time and belabor the subject and study it as the Senator from Vermont has done, I would make many points that he would fail to meet, as he has failed to do to-day, the points I made the other day; he would make another speech based on the war! I have simply endeavored in the course of a hasty running debate to correct some misrepresentations and to restate two points, which seem to have given Senators on the other side so much trouble ever since. I believe every day since I spoke first in this debate Senators have been endeavoring in one way or another to get rid of two rather troublesome points made against their party. If I have the opportunity I can make the argument tenfold stronger, and the time will come before the November election when I will do it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I want to ask the Senator for a piece of information.

Mr. MERRIMON. I do not think I can yield to my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. All I want to know is this: My friend told the country and told me that the expenditures of the Government for 1875 were \$682,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. MERRIMON. No, sir; I did not say that at all.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. You certainly said so.

Mr. MERRIMON. No, sir; I did not say so, nor anything like it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. And that the report of the Secretary of the Treasury proved it.

Mr. MERRIMON. I said that the net expenditures of the Government were \$171,529,848.27; and I said that that was nearly three times as much as the administration of the Government cost in 1860, when the population has increased less than ten million; and I called upon the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Louisiana and all the republican Senators to explain to the American people how that happened. Let them do so, if they can, here or elsewhere.

Mr. WEST. As the Senator has alluded to the Senator from Louisiana, will he allow me to say a word to him, being what I wished to say to him a few moments ago?

Mr. MERRIMON. When I get through I will yield. There seems to be a persistent purpose on the part of a number of Senators, if possible, to divert me from the line of discussion I am pursuing and interject speeches of all sorts and character into my remarks. I am sure I did not interrupt any Senator in that way.

I was going to say that I did not expect or care to engage further in this debate and I rose this evening, after what the Senator from Vermont had said to-day, simply to restate the points I had made and to cite some figures from the record which happened to be convenient, which add weight to what I said on the former occasion. Whatever they may say about these two tables excepted to, no Senator upon that side has yet shown that they are substantially wrong. I repeat, no Senator has shown that either of those two tables is substantially wrong. Outside of and apart from those tables I desire to cite these figures from the record in order to show that the data upon which I rely for the points I made the other day are true as taken from the records, and I beg Senators, when they come to comment upon the positions I took the other day, to come up to the point and to meet the facts. When they shall do so successfully the country will be better satisfied than they will be with fiery declamation about the war and its horrors. The war is over; the people now want peace and faithful, honest, wholesome, government.

Mr. WEST. I want here to interpose and call the attention of the Senator and the Senate to some of the facts in connection with these tables. Whether the Senator from North Carolina said so or not, certainly the Senator from New Jersey so understood him, and certainly I so understood him, that the gross expenditures of this Government in the year 1875 were \$682,000,000.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The Senator said so.

Mr. WEST. That point was immediately answered by the Senator from Ohio, [Mr. SHERMAN,] who called the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to the fact that in the very next column of figures \$407,000,000 of that amount was accounted for in the changes in the public debt. I want to call the Senator's attention also to this column of net ordinary expenditures, as they are called and rendered in the Treasury book-keeping. They are no criterion whatever of the expenses of the Government. They are the disbursements out of the Treasury of the United States for any and all purposes and are obliged by law to be stated as expenditures. If the Senator will recur to the foot-note under that table, he will see one very prominent and marked instance, and that is the case where the money invested by the United States for the benefit of the Alabama claims claimants to the extent of \$15,500,000 is charged as an expenditure of the Government. This

sum of \$682,000,000 is the disbursement out of the Treasury of the United States. It has nothing to do with the expenditures whatever or the cost of the Government.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from North Carolina made a statement so extravagant and so wild upon this floor that when he made it it excited my surprise and perhaps rather an undue heat in reply to it; but here the figures are before me in black and white. I wish to point out to the sober sense of candid men in regard to this whisky tax, for that is all I shall refer to, the ample and full explanation given by official documents of the discrepancy between what it is alleged we ought to have collected and what was really collected. The Senator commenced by assuming an entirely erroneous estimate of facts; I do not care how it is called.

Mr. MERRIMON. I gave the estimate made by Mr. Fessenden.

Mr. SHERMAN. It was made casually by Mr. Fessenden. If you will show me the language of Mr. Fessenden I can explain it. I cannot find it. Here is his annual report as Secretary of the Treasury, and it is not in it. I will read from the speech of the Senator from North Carolina:

According to a statement which I have before me giving the amount of internal revenue raised from distilled spirits from the year 1863 to the year 1875, the aggregate number of gallons upon which the Government received revenue was 616,890,390. The number of gallons that ought to have been accounted for in that time is 13,000,000,000, according to the estimate made by the late Mr. Fessenden (then Secretary of the Treasury) in 1864.

Mr. Secretary Fessenden never made such an estimate. He died long before the expiration of the time that this estimate covers.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is probably their reason for supposing he made the estimate!

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from North Carolina commenced by saying that Mr. Fessenden stated we should have collected taxes on this large amount:

The number of gallons that ought to have been accounted for in that time is 13,000,000,000, according to the estimate made by the late Mr. Fessenden (then Secretary of the Treasury) in 1864.

That is, that Mr. Fessenden made an estimate that there was manufactured in this country from 1863 to 1875 13,000,000,000 gallons. Mr. Fessenden, unfortunately for the country, died in 1870.

Mr. MERRIMON. What I meant—

Mr. SHERMAN. I know what the Senator meant. I take what he stated as his data. In the first place, the whole basis for this computation alleged to have been made by Mr. Fessenden was a remark made by him either in debate here on the floor or in his report as Secretary of the Treasury. It was not made in his report as Secretary of the Treasury, because I have looked over that report. He would not have made it there, but in some speech he said that in 1860 we manufactured in this country 100,000,000 gallons, as shown by the census. This was a casual statement, such as we often make; just as my friend said the gross expenses of the Government for 1875 were \$682,000,000. But Mr. Fessenden was mistaken, because when you look at the census returns it is different. I have here the census returns of 1860, and they show that the entire amount, the highest amount that was ever estimated to be made in this country—not what was actually manufactured, but what was estimated to be made in this country—was 90,412,581 gallons, which it is said was made in 1860. Here is a falling off of 10,000,000 gallons to commence with; but that was not all. When this number of gallons was made, whisky was worth in Missouri and Illinois about fifteen or sixteen cents a gallon. It was largely consumed. Nearly one-third of the whole whisky was consumed for what was called burning-fluid, and the rest was made into alcohol at a very cheap rate and exported. This is shown by the official document that I have before me, and which is no less a document than Mr. Wells's report made to Congress, a gentleman who is an acknowledged authority upon this question.

Mr. LOGAN. A recent democratic candidate for Congress.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not know that he was a democratic candidate for Congress in Connecticut a short time ago. At all events he is a gentleman of character. Mr. Wells gives a statement of the former production of whisky and shows how rapidly it has fallen off, and then he says:

Since 1860, when the foregoing returns of the Census Office were made, a very large reduction in the distillation and consumption of distilled spirits in the United States has taken place. The first, and undoubtedly the largest, element in such reduction has been the disuse of alcohol for the preparation of burning-fluid, which is commercially prepared by mixing one gallon of rectified spirits of turpentine (camphene) with from four to five gallons of alcohol. Each gallon of alcohol thus used requires 1.88 gallons of proof spirits, by which is to be understood a mixture of about 50 per cent. alcohol and 50 per cent. water.

For some time previous to the year 1861 the use of burning-fluid in the United States as an illuminating agent, in places where coal gas was not available, was almost universal. Its price from 1856 to 1861 ranged from forty-five to sixty-five cents per gallon.

It would appear, by the investigations made into this subject by the commission, that the amount of alcohol converted into burning-fluid by mixing with rectified spirits of turpentine, (camphene,) and consumed during the year 1860, could not have been less than 12,000,000 gallons, which must have necessitated the use of upward of 19,000,000 gallons of proof spirits. At the South and West, however, large quantities of burning-fluid were prepared by mixing the alcohol directly with the crude or commercial spirits of turpentine, without subjecting the latter constituent to rectification; which amount being allowed for would probably increase the figures above given by one-third, and make the total consumption of alcohol, for the preparation of burning fluid in the country, during 1860, 16,000,000 gallons, requiring over 25,000,000 gallons of proof spirits.

Here are 25,000,000 gallons gone, because in 1861 petroleum became the substitute for burning-fluid. Thus 25,000,000 gallons disappeared at once from the consumption of the country and the amount was reduced from 90,000,000 to 65,000,000 gallons, instead of 100,000,000 gallons, as the Senator assumes.

Mr. MERRIMON. Allow me to ask the Senator one question.

Mr. SHERMAN. No; I want to get through with this explanation because I am now reading from documents.

Since 1862 the production and consumption of burning fluid in the United States have almost entirely ceased, and its price on the 1st of September, 1865, was reported to the commission as about \$4 per gallon. This result may be attributed mainly to the discovery of petroleum, and the use of its cheaper and less dangerous derivatives for illuminating purposes, and partially to the high price of spirits of turpentine in consequence of the rebellion, this article having advanced from forty-seven cents per gallon in 1860 to \$2.15 per gallon at the close of 1864. With a return of spirits of turpentine to its former price and a reduction of the tax on distilled spirits, it is the opinion of dealers most conversant with the trade that a partial revival of business of manufacturing burning fluid may be expected.

But the truth is that by reason of the great cheapness of petroleum, all this burning fluid, even from turpentine, is now superseded by the petroleum. This reduces the enormous estimate of the Senator down to 65,000,000 gallons. But I have here also the statement made by the same distinguished source, together with his associates of the revenue commission, showing that in 1866 by this and other causes stated in the report the production of whisky in this country had been reduced to 40,000,000 gallons on account of the tax being put upon it, and for this reason among other causes these commissioners recommend the reduction of the tax on whisky.

Let us go back again for a moment to the statement of the Senator from North Carolina and see if such an exaggeration would not excite surprise in a person who wished to get at the facts. I will read again what the Senator said:

In that year he said in his report, in making his estimates on the subject of the internal revenues, that the number of gallons distilled was equal to about one hundred millions per annum—

I should like him to furnish me the authority. I cannot find it in Mr. Fessenden's report certainly. I have the report, and I have given it to the Senator, and I should like him to find the authority—

and if that amount of spirits was distilled in 1864 it is reasonable to estimate that after peace returned, and when the industries of the country had been in some measure renewed, the number of gallons produced annually would increase; but for the sake of certainty and fairness I take it that the annual production of spirits in this country since 1864, and anterior to that time as far back as 1863, was equal to 100,000,000 gallons per annum.

In the first place, I show that the whole basis has dropped out of this estimate; first, that in 1860 only 90,000,000 gallons were produced; next, that in 1861 the amount fell off to 65,000,000 gallons by the authentic report of your commission, and that the following year by the same statement and report the amount fell down to 40,000,000 gallons.

Mr. MERRIMON. Will the Senator say that there is a less quantity of spirits distilled in this country now than in 1860?

Mr. SHERMAN. I am not saying a word about that now; I am coming to that. The Senator confuses dates. I say that in 1834 the official report of these commissioners certifies and shows that the amount produced in this country was not over forty millions of gallons, and they thought that was an overestimate, and that in 1863 and 1862 it could not have exceeded sixty-five millions, and the reasons were given for this estimate. Now take up the Senator's figures made up on this false assumption, first upon a statement that I do not find in Mr. Secretary Fessenden's report:

Mr. MERRIMON. But you admit he did say it.

Mr. SHERMAN. I admit he said in some speech that the amount produced in 1860 was one hundred millions, but that was not correct. But the Senator, instead of taking official data and looking at the census report himself, takes an *ad captandum* remark made by a Senator as the authentic basis for a remark that would sink the whole republican party into infamy if it were true. Upon this false basis he goes on and makes this arraignment of the republican party which I say would cover them with infamy if it were true:

If that is correct, I repeat the number of gallons that ought to have been made from 1863 to 1874 was 13,000,000,000 of gallons. In the years 1865, 1866, 1867, and 1868 the tax on spirits was \$2 a gallon. This ought to have yielded \$26,000,000,000 in those years. Now hear the fact, and a material one, that only \$104,000,000 were realized; so the loss to the Government pending that time was \$25,996,000,000! I ask the Senator from Indiana and I ask the Senator from Ohio, who propounded their questions with such an air of triumph a while ago, where did that money go to; into whose pockets did that go? It went into the pockets of those who collected the revenue and those who controlled the revenue; it went into ten thousand avenues to corrupt and demoralize and impoverish the country and prostrate the industries of the country, and to bring about the present state of general public distress and suffering.

Thus the Senator upon the basis of a single error of his own, upon, first, a false quotation, and next a false estimate, and next a false computation, makes a charge against a political party that it had squandered, put in its pockets and scattered among its leaders as an agency of corruption \$25,996,000,000. The Senator may think that that is a good stump argument; it is not a senatorial argument, for nobody believes that this money was ever collected; it has never gone into the hands of anybody or ever corrupted anybody, except so far as distillers and others engaged in the manufacture of whisky may have been able to steal and rob, and perhaps a few store-keepers and other officers may have been able to evade the law in collusion with them.

But let us go further. Take the Senator's own figures now. He quotes from a table which I suppose is correct; I have not stopped to verify it. He shows that in 1863 the number of gallons of whisky on which the tax was paid was 16,149,954. That was when the tax was twenty cents a gallon, and I have no doubt that probably represents all that was made during that year, because Senators must remember, those who were here at the time will remember very well, that when it was first proposed to put a tax upon whisky every distiller in this land went to work to make as much as he could continuously; the distilleries were run to the very utmost extent of their capacity in order to bring into the market unpaid whisky as they had a right to do. It was a part of their business. The result was that at the time our tax law took effect there was supposed to be on hand one or two years' supply. Whether that be so or not, it is difficult to tell; but at any rate for nearly a year after the tax of twenty cents took effect there was very little whisky manufactured in this country. The amount on hand filled the channels of consumption. I, among others, endeavored to put a tax upon the spirits on hand, but we found ourselves opposed by a large majority of both Houses of Congress and could not do it, on the ground that it was difficult to trace this whisky. The fact was that before the tax took effect probably 100,000,000 gallons had been manufactured and put on the market. Afterward, and most unwisely, there was an effort in the country—and it was voted for by a majority of both Houses of Congress against my earnest remonstrance—to raise the tax from twenty cents to \$2 a gallon. I believed then that it was a most suicidal attempt, but the very moment that proposition was made in either House of Congress, the distillers again went to work with full fury, every distillery was run to its utmost capacity, and in a single year they ran up the manufacture of whisky in this country at a tax of twenty cents a gallon to 85,295,393 gallons in 1864. They pushed it to the utmost extremity, and they had nearly a year at their utmost capacity to run up this whisky, and it was said the distilleries were running day and night; distilleries were built merely for the purpose of availing themselves of the opportunity. My friend from Missouri [Mr. BOGGS] I have no doubt is familiar with the history of the western country. Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois started in this business with great fervor and fury in order to evade the two-dollar tax. They ran into market in less than a single year 85,000,000 gallons and paid the tax of twenty cents a gallon on it, and what was the result? The channels were filled. The uses of whisky had been somewhat varied; the consumption had fallen off largely. The tax was so high at \$2 a gallon that it made the price \$2.50 a gallon. Its uses fell off and from and after the taking effect of that tax of \$2 a gallon there was very little whisky, comparatively, manufactured in this country. These commissioners estimate the amount at thirty to forty million gallons manufactured after that time; but unhappily this was accomplished in 1865 when the \$2 a gallon tax took effect just about contemporaneous with the coming in of Andrew Johnson, and the controversies which arose between the then President and the Senate, the republican party and the democratic party, as to who was responsible for Mr. Johnson.

The tax itself was unwise, and attempting to levy a two-dollar tax the republicans ought to take their full share of the responsibility, but I believe that every democrat in either House voted for it. It was not a party matter. It was an effort on the part of the temperance people of both political parties to gain the highest possible revenue out of whisky; but it was a piece of bad political economy. We defeated ourselves. I am glad to say that I voted against it, and I always have opposed these sudden and outrageous changes of our revenue laws. The result was to force the product of whisky before the two-dollar tax took effect to so great an extent that the channels of consumption were full, and for two or three years after that we raised scarcely anything. We did the same thing last year with partially the same effects, though I tried to defeat it. In 1865 the number of gallons of distilled spirits under the dollar tax had fallen to 16,958,845; in 1866 to 14,847,943; in 1867 to 14,588,739; in 1868, the last year of Johnson's administration, to 7,224,808 gallons. Thus, first by the operation of a bad law, and next by the operation of the political controversies that led to bad men being employed for the collection of the revenue, the whisky tax fell down until there was one year only \$14,000,000 received from it.

Mr. President, the idea that anyone should come in now and insist or claim as a political argument to be used on the stump, not here, that during those four years when Andrew Johnson could only collect a tax on seven million gallons there were one hundred million gallons of whisky made each year and that the republican party collected the tax on one hundred million gallons and used all except the \$14,000,000 collected as a corruption fund, is so strange, so extravagant, so wrong, that in a deliberative body like this it seems to me such a suggestion ought not to be made. Sir, it does seem to me that when one knows the facts as they are, to use such an argument before the people so as to mislead them into a gross and erroneous idea of a state of corruption that does not exist except in the imagination, is wrong.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Will the Senator allow me one question?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I understand the Senator from Ohio to say that during the administration of Mr. Johnson in one year there were only

about seven million gallons produced. I think the Senator means to say that is the amount on which revenue was paid.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I want to know whether in that year and subsequent years there was not a vast amount of illicit whisky distilled upon which there was no revenue collected?

Mr. SHERMAN. Undoubtedly; and here is this report of the Revenue Commissioner made in 1867 calling attention to it, and it became so gross and glaring that it led Congress to repeal that act and to retrace its steps. There were wholesale frauds committed in Mr. Johnson's administration.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I want to ask the Senator this question, to be honestly answered, whether if the revenue officers during that period had performed their duty and those charged with the administration of the Government had discharged their duty, could that illicit whisky have been manufactured and put upon the market?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not believe in a broad country like ours, with every opportunity to evade the laws, with mountains and streams and sparsely populated all over, it is in the power of man to collect a tax of \$2 a gallon on whisky. The cost of manufacturing whisky is only sixteen cents. I appeal to my friend from Delaware now to answer me in honesty when I ask him whether, if there is any responsibility for the failure to collect the revenue in those memorable years, it is not shared by both political parties, because Johnson sent us only men who belonged to his political faith, and we only confirmed the best that we could get from him?

Mr. SAULSBURY. I will answer honestly the inquiry. In the first place, I disclaim what has been attempted to be made here in argument the impression on the country, that the administration of Andrew Johnson was a democratic administration; but even if it had been a democratic administration the history of the country shows that the republican Congress changed the law and would not permit Mr. Johnson to turn out at his pleasure the revenue officers and other officers that he had the appointment of, and that he could only make appointments by the consent of the republican Senate. If there was any failure to have proper revenue officers it was not the fault of Mr. Johnson, but the fault of those who controlled his action by their legislation.

Mr. SHERMAN. I can divide with my friend even on his own argument. The tenure-of-office act, which he thinks transferred the responsibility from Andrew Johnson to the republicans, was not passed till nearly two years after Johnson was President.

Mr. STEVENSON. Johnson was a republican those two years, any how.

Mr. SHERMAN. Is it not ridiculous in the Senate of the United States to have this matter discussed as a question of responsibility for the loss of this whisky revenue when no human power could collect? It was a wrong law, sustained by both political parties, endeavored to be enforced at a time when from the nature of things and the political controversies that existed it was impossible to collect it. Therefore I know, without asking the answer of my honorable friend, that he would not make this broad, sweeping charge against the republican party for the corrupt use of \$696,000,000.

Let us go further, Mr. President. The result was that in 1868-'69 at the last session of Congress during Mr. Johnson's administration Congress undertook to correct this evil and reduce the tax to fifty cents, and from that time until the last two or three years the tax on whisky has been collected as closely as any tax levied by the Government of the United States. That is the judgment of the officers.

Mr. MERRIMON. Why, look at the prosecutions all over the country!

Mr. SHERMAN. I say that until the last three years the tax has been collected regularly, and the tax has been collected on more gallons of whisky, with a gradual increase of the number of gallons, than was estimated by the revenue commission which sat in 1869. The very table produced by the Senator from North Carolina will show that since the time General Grant became President of the United States, from 7,000,000 gallons which paid the tax the preceding year under Johnson's administration, it sprang up in 1869, the first year after we put in effect the new fifty-cent law, to 62,926,416 gallons; the next year after that to 78,490,198 gallons, and that year was the year that we changed and tampered with to some extent the fifty-cent law, by putting on the complicated barrel-tax and some other taxes. Under this new complication, or change, or enlargement of the tax, the number of gallons which paid tax was reduced. The next year it fell to 62,214,000; the next year after that, 1872, to 66,285,000; the next year after that to 65,603,000; the next year after that, 1874, there was a falling off to 62,000,000. From the commencement of Grant's administration until 1873 the whisky tax, I repeat, and I can fortify it by official testimony of the highest character, was collected as closely and regularly as any tax imposed by the Government of the United States; and the only evasion of that tax was in those sparsely populated Southern and Northern States where whisky could be made in the mountains and on the streams beyond the reach of the ordinary revenue officers, and where it was necessary to carry the military in order to enforce the collection of the revenue.

Then unwisely, as I again repeat, we tampered with this whisky tax, and raised it, and the result was that we threw into the pockets

of men who held whisky large sums of money and we lost revenue. And the result of this increase of the tax, and of every increase of the tax beyond a reasonable limit, or beyond that limit which experience shows to be the one best adapted for revenue, is wrong, and reduces the revenue instead of increasing it. Therefore, since 1873 the amount has not been so large, and this is probably due also to a falling off in consumption caused somewhat by hard times, because although that circumstance affects whisky less probably than anything else, for people will have their grog anyway, yet it does affect it to some extent by taking away from them the ability to buy their grog; but last year the tax-paid whisky had risen again somewhat, to 64,425,912 gallons. What it is this year I do not know.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the Senator let me ask him a question?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEVENSON. I should like to know how much the Government lost by these late robberies by these rings in various cities, Saint Louis, Milwaukee, and so on?

Mr. SHERMAN. I cannot tell.

Mr. STEVENSON. What is the estimate of the Treasury Department as to the loss of the Government arising from these robberies?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not know. I do not know that there is any basis for an estimate; and I here desire to say that, so far as they are concerned, all these whisky thieves, the men who endeavor to evade taxes, I am very glad to see them punished and glad to see them pushed to the extreme.

Mr. STEVENSON. Does not my friend know that some of those appointments were protested against as unworthy and incompetent to the President himself when they were made?

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from Kentucky, with more discretion than the Senator from North Carolina, wants to change the issue as to whether sometimes bad appointments were not made; but the Senator from North Carolina charged us with \$696,000,000 wasted and squandered, and put in the pockets of politicians in four years and scattered around as a corruption fund.

Mr. MERRIMON. No, Mr. President, I do not think that is fair.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is the statement.

Mr. MERRIMON. I laid down certain premises and deduced an argument from them.

Mr. DAWES. The Senator from Ohio is commenting on the falling off of the whisky tax for 1874 and 1875, but he does not take into consideration one element that had considerable to do with it. The question of the change of the whisky tax was pending here some six months, and every distillery was run night and day for six months in anticipation of that change of the tax. The necessary consequence was that the statistics that year would be greatly swollen and the next year greatly fall off.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is true, and that operated just as it did at the time when the tax was raised to \$2. It appears that one year, in 1864, the number of gallons run up to 85,000,000 on the twenty-cent tax in anticipation of the two-dollar tax.

But I desire to say in conclusion that the statements made by the Senator from North Carolina, exaggerated as they are shown to be, entirely untenable, blown up, calculated to mislead and deceive the people and convince them of a state of corruption that does not exist, are answered by the simple facts I have presented taken from his own speech in great degree. There is no desire, I am sure, on the part of the republican party, there can be no motive on the part of the republican party to see a falling off of the revenue or to see corruption and abuses in the collection of the whisky tax. Why, sir, the only men who have been punished have been punished by republican administration. General Grant himself has never deviated one hair's breadth from the declaration he made "let no guilty man escape." But whether he did or not, I do not want to be drawn into a mere political issue as to whether bad appointments are sometimes made and good appointments are always made. That is one question; but as for the charge made by the Senator from North Carolina, it seems to me when explained it will only excite derision, and every fair man will see that, while there may have been here and there a loss of the whisky tax, here and there frauds and corruption in the collection of this as of other taxes, the charge as made is a gross exaggeration, tends to mislead and deceive the people, and does not do justice to them or give them an opportunity to judge fairly of the facts that are submitted to them.

Mr. MERRIMON. Now, Mr. President, I wish simply to point out how unfair, in my judgment, the Senator from Ohio is. I made arguments. I took certain data; I pointed out to the Senate where I got those data, explained it fully, and then made certain deductions from them. Every man who reads my speech will see that I got at the data just in that way; and notwithstanding what the Senator says this evening, and we have for the most part his simple opinion about it, I think that he is very greatly mistaken about the amount of spirits distilled in this country.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have read the report.

Mr. MERRIMON. Here are the returns of the Internal-Revenue Office one year eighty-five million gallons.

Mr. SHERMAN. I explained that.

Mr. MERRIMON. Yes, you explained that in one part of your speech, and you go on covering it up in another.

Mr. SHERMAN. I say that during that year, tempted by the near approach of the two-dollar tax they ran their distilleries night and day.

Mr. MERRIMON. I believe that there are all of a hundred million gallons of spirit distilled in this country annually, and even more than that. Of course what I stated was a mere estimate, but I gave the data on which that estimate was made so that nobody could be misled by it. The figures are enormous; they are startling; they are alarming, and taking half of it to be so, it is still appalling.

Mr. SAULSBURY. (At five o'clock and fifty minutes p. m.) I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope that will not be done. Let us finish the bill.

Mr. CRAGIN. I appeal to the Senator to withdraw his motion to allow me to introduce a resolution. [No! no!]

Mr. SAULSBURY. It is near six o'clock.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to adjourn. I want to see—

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is debate.

Mr. ALLISON. I merely want to say that an adjournment on this bill now—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is not debatable. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the motion to adjourn.

The yeas and nays being taken; resulted—yeas 8, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Bayard, Bogy, Booth, Hitchcock, Oglesby, Saulsbury, Sherman, and Stevenson—8.

NAYS—Messrs. Allison, Anthony, Barnum, Boutwell, Cameron of Wisconsin, Christianity, Cockrell, Cragin, Davis, Dawes, Dennis, Frelinghuysen, Harvey, Howe, Ingalls, Kelly, Kernan, Key, Logan, McMillan, Maxey, Merrimon, Mitchell, Morrill, Norwood, Paddock, Ransom, Spencer, Wadleigh, Withers, and Wright—32.

ABSENT—Messrs. Alcorn, Bruce, Burnside, Cameron of Pennsylvania, Caperton, Clayton, Conkling, Conover, Cooper, Dorsey, Eaton, Edmunds, Ferry, Goldthwaite, Gordon, Hamilton, Hamlin, Johnston, Jones of Florida, Jones of Nevada, McCreery, McDonald, Morton, Patterson, Robertson, Sargent, Sharon, Thurman, Wallace, West, Whyte, and Windom—32.

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I am not going to make a speech; but I am going to ask my honorable friend from North Carolina, who stated that my statements respecting what made up what he calls the net ordinary expenses of the Government did not include the items to which I referred directly referable to the rebellion, to turn to pages 16 and 17 of the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for this present session. There he will find the items for the War Department for the years 1865, 1866, 1867, 1868, 1869, 1870, 1871, 1872, 1873, 1874, and 1875, and for the Navy Department for the same years, for the Indians for the same years, for pensions, to which I did not allude, amounting to \$30,000,000 each year in round numbers.

Mr. MERRIMON. The Senator misunderstood me; I did not say that.

Mr. EDMUNDS. If the Senator will be good enough now, as he told me, to wait until I can make some consecutive statement of figures that possibly if he will look at he will understand, he will oblige me. And then there are the miscellaneous expenditures. These five heads are there given, and then comes a table of the ordinary net expenditures, not his table, but a table which the Senator will find on page 16 and page 17 of Executive Document No. 2 of the Forty-fourth Congress, first session, now here. Instead of my being mistaken in respect of what items went to swell these aggregates, if the Senator will only be good enough to look at it himself and not take any member of any other body in any other place for his authority, he will see that I was perfectly correct in every particular. The only want of correctness that my observations had in respect of these expenditures was that I only stated the leading items, for I would not weary the patience of the Senate by going through them. This shows, if there is any value at all in statements of expenditures made officially to Congress, and not in speeches, the book being here, that wherever there has been an increase of expense, it has been directly referable to the unhappy causes to which I alluded, and the charge of the Senator was that that was extravagance in the republican party.

Mr. MERRIMON. I do not care to continue the controversy this evening. There may be an opportunity on another occasion. I am anxious for a vote.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I hope there will be another occasion, for I have a good deal more to say.

Mr. NORWOOD. I move to lay on the table the motion to recommend the bill.

Mr. MORRILL. Would not that carry the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That motion would carry the bill.

Mr. STEVENSON. I hope the Senator will withdraw the motion.

Mr. NORWOOD. Does the Chair rule that the effect of my motion would carry the bill to the table if it should prevail?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks that would be the effect.

Mr. MERRIMON. A motion to lay on the table in case of an appropriation bill does not take the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. Why not vote directly on the question?

Mr. NORWOOD. I withdraw the motion.

Mr. STEVENSON. I shall vote for the recommittal of this bill as proposed by the Senator from Ohio, [Mr. THURMAN.]

I shall do so for two reasons: First, because the bill contains large appropriations to objects purely local, exclusively within the cognizance of the States, and forbidden in my judgment by the Constitution of the United States; second, in this hour of monetary depres-

sion, when the Treasury is depleted, and the people are threatened with increased taxation, I deem it impolitic to appropriate one dollar more to works of internal improvement already commenced, than is absolutely demanded; and, as to works not commenced, I think their construction should be postponed to a more convenient season. I understood the Senator who has this bill in charge, [Mr. ALLISON] unequivocally to say, that the House bill contains many large appropriations to works already commenced, which the engineers having them in charge report can be reduced without detriment to the public service. If this be true, expediency and economy alike demand that such reductions should be at once made. I do not intend to be drawn into any discussion of the political issues of the presidential campaign upon which we have just entered. Such a debate belongs more appropriately to the hustings than to the Senate Chamber. But I must be pardoned for saying, that the country will demand, and has a right to expect, retrenchment and reform from all parties, and especially an economical reduction of the annual expenditures of the Government. That is the surest way to reduce taxation. Economize by lessening appropriations, and what remains of the annual revenue received each year from taxation will go to a reduction of the public debt. With its diminution come lower taxes.

I will not say, after the reprimand the other day of the Senator from Indiana, [Mr. MORTON,] that "the wolf is at the door, and that the Government is threatened with bankruptcy," words charged by him to have been improperly used in some late impromptu speech by the democratic candidate for President, Mr. Tilden, and which seemed somewhat to stir up the ire of that Senator. But really, as it seems to me, there was no occasion for it. The words, if used at all, were used figuratively, to denote the disordered and depressed condition of our public affairs and the oppression of the people under onerous Federal taxation. It was a very pardonable and usual license of clear, strong illustration; one which Mr. Clay in former times often indulged in, when arraigning his political opponents for mistakes and maladministration of our public affairs. He would often declare: "We are in the midst of a revolution, bloodless as yet." The people are groaning under political misrule greater than "war, pestilence, or famine." Mr. Tilden, doubtless, never supposed that in resorting to similar figurative illustration, he would subject himself to so sharp and personal a criticism as that indulged in by the Senator from Indiana upon him for an innocent play upon words.

No one can deny, Mr. President, that, whatever republican speakers may say about the material wealth of our country, and the inexhaustible character of its resources, it is self-evident that the present monetary and industrial condition of the whole country is deplorable. Its business energies paralyzed; its currency disordered; the national credit abroad depressed; the future uncertain; and the people groaning under the burdens of an oppressive, frightful, and ruinous taxation. This is what Mr. Tilden intended to portray; nor is the picture overdrawn. I am informed that the business failures of 1875 amounted to seventy-seven hundred and forty, and during the first three months of this year exceeded twenty-eight hundred, with aggregate liabilities in that period exceeding \$264,674,000. Public confidence is shaken, business is disturbed, and bankruptcies overwhelm the land.

No matter, then, to what source these evils are to be traced, whether to the maladministration and mistakes of the party in power; or to any other cause, no one doubts the fact of their existence. Consequently, all legislation having for its object reduced expenditures and lower taxation, became an imperative obligation upon all political parties. Government is a trust, and all intrusted with its administration are trustees for the benefit of the people within the limitations and the exactions of the Constitution. If the pending bill, therefore, contains a solitary appropriation not clearly authorized by the Constitution, let it be stricken out. So, too, if appropriations to objects clearly constitutional are greater in amount than competent engineers in charge of them say, present necessities demand, let them all be reduced.

Like my friend from Maryland, [Mr. WHYTE,] I have been reared, Mr. President, in a political school of strict constructionists whose founders and followers have never believed that the Federal Government possessed the constitutional authority to enter upon a general system of internal improvements. I know it is a school which some democrats deride and would now discredit; still there are some of us who are not ashamed of its faith and still cherish its doctrines. We still think, that, as in the past so in the future, it may turn out that a rigid adherence to the Constitution, strictly construed, with a simple Government, honestly and economically administered, may prove the best mode of preserving free institutions.

Our fathers believed that a recurrence to fundamental principles would often prove a safeguard against dangerous political evils. My belief is, that it is because certain great principles of the Constitution have been departed from, that the Government has of late been so often in peril. We have proved our ability to preserve the unity of Government from all armed and direct assaults from without or from within. But the problem of our capacity to resist internal perils is yet to be solved. The dead empires of the past have found their graves in extravagance, luxury, idleness, and corruption. Our safety and our success, as a free constitutional Republic in the past, has been based upon the ready adherence and obedience of the people to the restraints and limitations of the Constitution imposed by them on their own power. Their willing observance of the law, and their

unwillingness to overleap its barriers, under any temptation and in any emergency, has been hitherto our shining excellence.

When river and harbor bills, or other similar enactments containing immense appropriations from the Treasury of the United States to objects in every section of the country, in which the people of every State where the proposed improvement is located, are so deeply interested, are under consideration, I know how difficult it is for the representative so to read the Constitution, uninfluenced by local self-interest, as to find among its provisions a negation of power to make an appropriation to objects in his own State. This difficulty has been signally illustrated in the great conflict of opinion which has existed in the past, among the most eminent and distinguished statesmen upon the extent of constitutional power in the Federal Government to make these improvements. All agreed, in the main, that the constitutional power extended to objects national, as contradistinguished from local; to improvements of a general character, in which the whole country were interested, rather to such as were wholly within a State, local in their character and within the exclusive cognizance of State jurisdiction. But the great difficulty was, what was national and what was local? That was the precise point of conflict which has existed, and still exists.

While vetoes of river and harbor bills have often marked democratic administrations, yet it would not be difficult to find in many of the bills that have received the sanction of democratic Presidents some objects of questionable constitutional power. I know, too, and I trust I deeply appreciate, the present condition of the South, and the imperious call for necessary appropriations to improvement of their rivers and harbors, most of which are clearly within the sphere of the Constitution. Nor do I undervalue the deep interest of Southern Representatives for the passage of this bill. It makes large appropriations for improvements in the South. Here comes the test. The conflict of self-interest, with the barriers imposed by the Constitution against such a forbidden appropriation. I shall not be guilty of the ungracious task of criticising, or attempting to point out the various items of appropriations in this bill which are wholly and purely local.

No such bill as this was ever presented to a democratic President, and none such, if presented, could have received his assent. No Senator can deny, that the bill does contain appropriations to objects clearly local, and not sanctioned by the Constitution. The test of the truth of this statement which I propose is this: Let each separate object for which this bill makes an appropriation be put into a separate bill, and how many of them would pass muster either in the House or in the Senate? I put it to Senators upon this side of the Chamber to tell me, is it not a dangerous precedent for us, in an hour when we have been decrying against the usurpations and unlicensed assaults of centralized power on the constitutional rights of the States, to allow a combination of local interests in the States to blind our eyes to any open violation of the Constitution for any purpose? Why, Mr. President, there can be no cavil about the fact, that a large number of the appropriations in the House or in the Senate bill, are made to objects for which Congress has no power to appropriate the public money. And how unequal and unjust is this unauthorized distribution? The House bill contained appropriations to an amount exceeding \$5,000,000, and yet I am informed that two States—neither of them very large in extent or in population—neither of them bordering on the seaboard—one an inland State—have received one-fifth of the whole sum appropriated by that bill. This is certainly a significant fact, and does not indicate the safest plane for enlightened or wise legislation. The Senate Committee on Appropriations struck out eight or nine hundred thousand dollars, I believe, of the appropriations contained in the House bill; but yet that committee substituted other objects to which they appropriated amounts greater than those contained in the House bill, increasing the sum appropriated by the House some \$30,000. If I err in this statement I hope some Senator will correct me.

My honored friend the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WITHERS] is amazed that Senators who claim that the House bill was objectionable, because it contained many appropriations clearly local, and therefore unconstitutional, should have voted to non-concur with the Senate committee in striking out these objectionable items. My friend tells us, that if he should ever require a political Mentor, he would take care never to seek him from among his brother-Senators who have been guilty of such political inconsistency. Mr. President, I happen, like the Senator from Ohio, [Mr. THURMAN,] to be one of the Senators who find themselves in this unfortunate category of the Senator's exclusion. Now I have no ambition whatever to be the political Mentor of any Senator, or of anybody else. I have neither the acquirement nor experience to fit me for so exalted a position; but, if I did aspire to such a distinction, I utterly deny that the fact stated by my friend from Virginia, would be any argument or proof of my disqualification to teach even him, political orthodoxy and consistency as a democrat of the old school.

There would have been great force in the suggestion of the Senator, of an alleged inconsistency on the part of these Senators who voted to non-concur in the amendments of the Senate committee—if that committee had stricken out all the appropriations to local and unconstitutional objects in the House bill, and retained only those clearly within the sphere of constitutional power. But unfortunately for my friend's logic, the Senate committee did no such thing. They

struck out local appropriations from the House bill, it is true; but they put in their stead other objects even more local and more objectionable. The Senate committee increased the entire appropriation over that made by the House some \$30,000. The House bill, although it contained many objects clearly unconstitutional, was preferable to the bill brought in by the Senate committee. The latter contained as many local objects, but in addition, increased the gross amount of money appropriated. I voted therefore to non-concur in all the amendments of the Senate. I did so to kill both bills if possible, and if I failed in that, I preferred the House bill as containing the smaller appropriation and consequently the lesser of two evils. The Senate committee struck out a small appropriation to Rock Castle River of \$2,000, and to Cumberland River, above Nashville, which had been put into the House bill. But while these appropriations were stricken out, the Senate committee put into the bill, as amended by them, a large appropriation to Elk River, in West Virginia, and another to the Little Kanawha, in the same State. If the first were local, the last were. If there was to be a general distribution of money to local objects in the States, instead of appropriating to rivers and harbors authorized by the Constitution, I desired justice should be done to Kentucky, which is among the largest tax-paying States. If local objects were stricken out in Kentucky, I desired them stricken out elsewhere, so as to have an equal and exact justice in the distribution among the States. But neither the restoration or exclusion would have secured my vote to either bill.

Mr. WITHERS. A general distribution, then, would control your ideas as to constitutional obligation?

Mr. STEVENSON. By no manner of means. I have just said that I would vote against both Senate and House bills, and the fact that they contained appropriations to local objects in Kentucky four times greater than the insignificant sums contained in the House bill would never change that vote. The fact that an appropriation is to a local object in Kentucky will never, I trust, affect the standard of my judgment upon the question of constitutional power. No appropriation to an object deemed by me outside of the Constitution, whether large or small, in Kentucky or out of Kentucky, will ever receive my sanction.

Mr. WITHERS. Then you ought not to vote for the House bill.

Mr. STEVENSON. I will never vote for it. I said I never could be induced to vote for either bill in their present shape. I am only surprised that a Senator coming from Virginia, trained in and familiar with the construction of the Constitution which made that noble old Commonwealth illustrious, from the foundation of the Government to 1860, doctrines illustrated by Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, could have so far forgotten his early political teachings as to be willing to vote for such a bill as this, because it contains appropriations to local creeks within the confines of Virginia. I was also raised in that same Virginia school, and I may say, I cling to its doctrines of close construction and rigid adherence to all the limitations of the Constitution upon congressional or executive power with greater tenacity now than ever, as the palladium of political safety. If local combinations in bills like this shall override the constitutional barrier and inhibitions upon Congress to appropriate money except to national objects, the end will soon come.

Mr. WITHERS. I will say, with the permission of my friend, as he has expressed surprise at my position, that I received my ideas on the subject of the powers of the Government in this line from a distinguished Kentuckian, who, although he was born in Virginia, made his reputation as a statesman of Kentucky. At his feet I was brought up in my political faith. He had no such scruples of conscience about appropriations for improvements.

Mr. STEVENSON. No one respects more than I do the fame of that distinguished Virginian who has rendered illustrious the Commonwealth which I in part represent in this Chamber. I never agreed with him in political opinion.

Mr. WITHERS. I did.

Mr. STEVENSON. I looked, as I said, to Jefferson, to Madison, and Jackson as my mentors, and believed with them in a closer construction of the Constitution than Henry Clay did; but my friend, the Senator from Virginia, can never find shelter under Mr. Clay for the support of any such bill as this. Never, sir; never! I went over his record upon that subject this morning, and I defy the Senator to show that Mr. Clay ever advocated a bill with appropriations like those which we are called upon on this occasion to sanction by our votes.

The distinguished statesman to whom my friend has referred was a liberal constructionist. He believed in appropriations to our harbors, on salt water or fresh, on the lakes or on the oceans. He favored liberal aid to the Mississippi and all its tributaries, the Ohio, the Arkansas, the Missouri, the Red, and the White, indeed to all objects of a general and national character. I have no doubt he would have supported the Pacific railways, as he did the Cumberland road, but nowhere can his vote be found for objects such as are contained in this bill. At least such is my opinion, and I think I would vouch the record in support of my statement.

I hope this bill will be recommitted and that the committee will reduce the appropriations to objects that are clearly national. While I am a Kentucky Senator, charged with the protection of her interest and honor, I do not forget that I am also a Senator of the United States. I shall vote liberal sums to our harbors North and South, to our lakes and to our great highways and national thoroughfares. I

include those made for our rivers like Cape Fear, which empties into the ocean and which is a harbor of incalculable value. So of many others of like character. As was said by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. EATON] the other day about the removal of obstructions at Hell Gate, near New York, which when accomplished would shorten the voyage from New York to Liverpool three hundred miles, what State in the confederacy is not interested in and would not be benefited by that improvement?

But in all these appropriations I must look to the limitations of the Constitution. I have no other guide. In the faithful observance of its sanction is our safety. Let not appropriations in the several States beguile representatives into the support of appropriations not warranted by the organic law. Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Polk, and Pierce all vetoed measures like this, but containing no such objectionable objects as the pending bill. All these vetoes rested upon the invasion of the sovereignty of the States, which appropriations by the Federal Government to objects clearly local, and wholly within the domain and cognizance of the State, would invariably inaugurate. If this measure pass, it is the opening-wedge to unlimited appropriations under this head as our country expands and the applications for appropriations to local objects increase. Such legislation, if continued, must ultimately beggar the people. It is six millions to-day, it may be twelve next year, and twenty a few years hereafter. There is no limit. If States are to be seduced into the support of bills like this because objects within their territorial limits receive large appropriations, then States may combine and disregard all limitations of the Constitution.

If objects contained in this bill be constitutional, I am unable to perceive any limit to which the power of appropriations may not be carried. Increased taxation, higher protective tariffs, and corrupt legislation must be the legitimate fruits of such a policy. The States will become mere stipendiaries of the Federal Government, mere playthings of its unlimited appropriations. It was but a few years since, that Congress was asked to charter an Ohio company to construct a railroad across the domain of Kentucky, against the consent of the State, from Cincinnati to Chattanooga, in Tennessee, with no guards, or only such as Congress might be pleased to put into the act of incorporation. The proposed legislation was resisted and failed to become a law. Kentucky, through her Legislature, has since granted a charter, under proper guards and restrictions, and the road is being rapidly constructed.

So, too, a similar effort was made to obtain from Congress a charter to build a railroad from Washington to New York without the consent of the States to be traversed; but Maryland, Delaware, and, I believe, New Jersey opposed it, and it failed. Let us leave local improvements to the States. What is to become of their sovereignty if the Federal Government possesses the power to appropriate money to any and to all local objects wholly within State cognizance? The Federal Government acquires exclusive jurisdiction whenever it constructs improvements and appropriates the public money! Where will the Federal power end? What State will be exempt from its influence, if improvements are to be carried on without stint on the scale contemplated by this bill? I have been surprised to hear during this debate certain powers claimed, and certain doctrines announced by Senators on the other side of the Chamber. The power to make these appropriations is asserted to exist under the common-defense-and-general-welfare clause of the Constitution; and we have heard the statement, that, if the Government were to-day to appropriate twenty millions to these improvements, it would have a good influence in stimulating industry and production, and in giving employment to labor. This is not and never can be the doctrine of reformers!

It would be retrenchment, economy, and reform with a vengeance! If Senators on this side of the Chamber mean to aid in the correction of existing abuses; if they intend to reduce extravagant expenditures of the public money; if they are in earnest in one common effort to take away incentives to public profligacy, I entreat them to recommit this bill.

The country is in no condition now, to enter into such a general scheme of improvements of rivers and harbors as is here proposed. Whatever Senators may say, and whatever peans they may sing, as to the inexhaustible resources of this country, the masses of the people, irrespective of party, crushed beneath the load of oppressive taxation, have felt personally the pressure, and are determined upon a simpler, more honest, and more economical administration of public affairs.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, I rather enjoy this wrangle between the representatives of the democracy of Kentucky and Virginia; but I do not rise to participate particularly in the points discussed by the Senator from Kentucky, except some portions of the foremost part of his address this evening. He has referred to the extreme distress that pervades all parts of the Union in relation to all branches of industry, and also to the numerous bankruptcies that have occurred the past year. I want to repel the idea that this country has been brought to the extreme of bankruptcy or is in any position where we cannot make such appropriations as are just and proper for the support of the Government.

As I understand it from the latest estimates of the Treasury Department we shall have revenue sufficient to defray all the ordinary expenses of the Government, all the interest of the public debt, and yet have a sinking fund sufficient to pay 1 per cent. upon the public

debt, which amounts to something over \$30,000,000 a year; and by the bills, as presented here by the Senate Appropriation Committee, the appropriations will be upward of \$20,000,000 less than the estimates; showing conclusively that we shall have at least \$50,000,000 to devote to the payment of the public debt the present year unless the House has already sent or shall send here extraordinary appropriation bills that we shall be forced to agree with, which shall increase the expenditures of the Government.

Now, let me say a word in relation to the general prosperity of the country. Take the agricultural interest. I assert, without fear of contradiction, that never for a quarter of a century has the agricultural interest, taking the whole country together, been in as prosperous a condition as at the present moment. Not in a single State will you find any staple crop that is cut off, but in almost all there is an average or an excess.

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

Mr. MORRILL. I only propose to speak for a few moments, and do not desire to be interrupted.

There is no grasshopper plague; there is no drought or anything that has brought general distress on the agricultural community in any portion of our country. The only distress that exists is in the mercantile, manufacturing, and the mining interests; and what is the cause of that? Simply overproduction. It is not greater here to-day than it is in Great Britain; and why? We see there that the amount of cotton and wool and flax that have been manufactured has very largely increased within the last ten years, but the increase has been greater on the continent; so has it been here; and, in addition to our usual competition, the South has awakened to the idea of establishing manufactures in the South, and this year we find that, instead of the entire amount of cotton manufactures being confined to the North, perhaps the only really prosperous manufactures of cotton are located in the South, where they make regular and fat dividends, while in the North they are unable to do that in consequence of being so far away from the raw material and in consequence of not being able to employ as cheap labor. In Great Britain the same result has taken place from the fact of a 5 per cent. protective tariff upon cotton goods in India, and they have, therefore, there very largely increased their manufacture in India. So that it is competition that has caused distress among the manufacturers, both here and abroad; and I may say the same thing has taken place in relation to the iron manufacture. The surest and cheapest way of securing cheap fabrics, cheap products, is to encourage their production broadcast all over the country. To-day we find printing cotton sold for three and three-fourths cents a yard, and calicoes already printed, in some cases, for five cents a yard. Never was the time before when these fabrics were sold at so low a rate.

Now I want to deny, for one, that the country is suffering in the extremes of bankruptcy at this present moment. To be sure, with the manufacturing interests, with the mercantile interests, in the fall of prices, the great diminution in the prices of goods, a large amount of business is stopped and must stop until people begin to purchase again; but, while these facts exist, men will wear their old hats for three or four months longer and women will buy fewer silk dresses than they otherwise would.

But, Mr. President, in relation to bankruptcies, let me ask why did not the Senator from Kentucky state the whole facts in that connection? In the first quarter of this year it is very true there was a large amount of bankruptcies, but they have been steadily decreasing all the time since; so that the last three months present no discouraging feature; and I may say in relation to this that the bankruptcies across our borders in Canada are much larger than they are here. If they were to be only equal to our bankruptcies they should have been one-fifteenth part, while in point of fact they are one-sixth part of all the bankruptcies that have taken place in this country.

Then let me call attention to another and most healthful aspect in our commercial affairs. I find that the imports for the eleven months ending May 31, 1876, were \$490,535,488, while for the eleven months ending May 31, 1875, they were but \$426,495,382, making sixty-four millions in our favor for this year of exports. Then look at the exports for 1876. The exports for eleven months ending May 31, 1876, were \$544,724,585, and in 1875 \$517,417,767, leaving about \$27,000,000 in excess of last year. So that whether we look at our exports we find them increasing, whether we look at our imports we find them diminishing—ninety-one millions in our favor—and when we diminish imports we not only save the amount of duties that would be paid to the Government, but we save the amount of the entire cost of the goods abroad which amounts to from sixty to seventy millions this year. Therefore, I say that the Treasury of the United States and the country is in a healthy condition and it is not to be impeached by these general tirades as to our poverty, as to our bankruptcy, or anything of the sort. I agree to economy and perhaps, so far as I am concerned, as I generally do, shall vote for the smallest sum that may be proposed. I shall, therefore, vote for any amendment that may be proposed on this appropriation bill which will reduce the amount.

Mr. BOUTWELL. Mr. President, I agree with much that has been said by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] in regard to the condition of the country, and I disagree entirely to the theory that if the condition of affairs for the moment were as unfavorable as represented by gentlemen on the other side, therefore necessary ex-

penditures on public works should be omitted. Whatever may be the condition of affairs to-day, nothing can be more certain than that the country has in the future a career of prosperity. We have credit; we have resources; and above all we have great capacity for labor. Now, so far as public works have been undertaken, the undertaking of which was wise, it is more wise to prosecute them and prosecute them with vigor under the circumstances that exist, and if the circumstances were more unfavorable so with stronger reason ought we to prosecute these works.

The reasons are two: first, they can be now prosecuted to completion at less cost than they can be when the affairs of the country are in a more favorable condition, and, second, although I would not undertake public works, and especially those not necessary, for the purpose of giving employment to the people, yet, when public works are undertaken and when those works are necessary, there can be no higher duty resting upon a Government which has both resources in property and resources in credit than to prosecute those works to successful completion.

A government should be above the reach of panics, which necessarily affect individuals, and under unfavorable circumstances we should exhibit courage, not only because the exhibition of courage is favorable in a pecuniary point of view to the Government itself, but we set an example to people who otherwise would be lacking in courage, and they will take advantage of opportunities which in a less degree are equally favorable to their own fortunes. Now, if our friends on the other side will excuse me for the statement of a fact which occurred during the war, I will venture to make it. In the darkest days, when our enemies were pressing us at every point along the line and when from the steps of this Capitol you could hear the reverberation of the cannon across the Potomac, we voted an appropriation for the completion of this Capitol. It was notice, whether taken or not, it was notice, and it was so given to our then enemies, that we did not intend to abandon this Capitol.

Now, there are in this bill appropriations that I think are unnecessary, and to me they are very disagreeable, and I am at this moment quite in doubt whether I shall vote for the bill or vote against it; but the time is coming, if it has not now arrived, when the representatives of the people, without distinction of party, will resist appropriations for works which, whether constitutional or not, have no such national importance that they ought to be undertaken and executed at the public expense; and unquestionably there are in this bill such appropriations and similar appropriations have been made in years past. But we are all concerned in putting an end to such drains upon the Treasury which profit nothing in a large sense probably. By the States and by the people where these works are the attempt would never be made for their execution. We ought to unite and abandon this system of making appropriations in one State because men in another State want other appropriations and stand as representatives of States upon the fact. If the representatives of a State can satisfy their associates here that the works for which they ask appropriations are national works and the country is in a condition to undertake those works, let the work be undertaken. But in this bill there are appropriations for improvements which are not national, which if anything are local, and which ought never to find countenance in the Congress of the United States. What I shall do about this bill in the end I cannot say, but I am at present in favor of recommitting it in the hope that the committee will strike out all these appropriations that are not national, whether the works have been undertaken or whether they are new ones, and let us for once, if we can, pass a bill which, whether it appropriates \$3,000,000 or \$6,000,000, we can stand upon and say to our constituents and to the country, "These appropriations are made for important public national works that will yield a return in the facilities that will be afforded to the commerce and business of the country."

Now, Mr. President, I depart from the particular subject before the Senate for the purpose of introducing a document which I have had in my desk for many months waiting for just this occasion, a statement prepared at the Treasury with great care, showing the net expenses of the Government in the years 1800, 1810, 1820, 1830, 1840, 1850, 1860, 1870, and 1875. There is a minute and analytical comparison of the expenses of the Government in 1860 and 1875, excluding in the latter year all those expenditures which arose from the war, and there are tables containing items of the expenditures which are thus excluded, so that, if the whole shall be printed, any person who chooses to examine will have an opportunity to see whether those items classed as belonging to the war are properly so classed. This table was prepared under the direction of and by Mr. Charles F. Conant, who is now Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. His letter to me is dated at the Treasury Department, Washington, September 16, 1875. He says:

I inclose herewith tables showing the comparative expenses of the Government for the years 1875 and 1860, excluding war charges.

Mr. Conant is the responsible person for this document and upon my request made it. The total expenditures for the fiscal year 1875 were \$274,623,392.84; the total expenditures for the year 1860 were \$63,025,788.98. After deducting the expenditures for the year 1875 on account of the war—and there are appended to this, which I will have printed, analytical tables showing what these deductions are—the net result is that the expenditures for the year 1875 were \$84,773,762.49 in currency, but the expenditures in 1860 were in gold.

Mr. Conant has deducted 12 $\frac{75}{100}$ per cent. as the premium on gold for the year 1875, leaving a net expenditure in gold for that year of \$74,028,688.09. Then there are deductions made both from the expenditures of the year 1860 and of the year 1875 growing out of the method of keeping the books of the Department. Upon that point there is an analytical statement of the deductions and also a note showing the reason for them. He says:

The following items which are included in the aggregate as expenditures both for the year 1860 and 1875 are deducted from each for the reason that they are not expenditure in the true meaning of the word, as they involve no outlay of money by the Treasury and are no burden upon the tax-payers, they being merely entries on both the debit and credit side of the books (made necessary by the system of book-keeping in the Department) of moneys received from persons and subsequently returned to them or expended in their behalf, namely:

And then he gives the items in each year. After deducting the amounts thus placed to the debit and credit side of the books for the years 1860 and 1875, respectively, the result is that the expenditures for the year 1875, excluding the war expenditures, deducting the premium on gold, excluding the amounts placed to the debit and credit side of the books in the Department, were \$69,856,117.77. The expenditures upon the same basis for the year 1860 were \$61,402,408.64.

Mr. BOGY. By whom is the table furnished?

Mr. BOUTWELL. By Mr. Conant, the present Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BOGY. It is not official, is it? because it states facts that cannot be official. They are absurd. The premium on gold certainly can play no part in the expenses. In 1860 gold was the only coin used, and it cannot properly be added or deducted. It plays no part. This is an individual table.

Mr. BOUTWELL. Senators will deal with the processes as they think justice requires; but Mr. Conant—and in that I concur—had deducted from the currency expenses of the year 1875 the premium on gold, so that the expenses are represented ultimately in this table as gold expenses in 1860 and gold expenses in 1875.

Mr. BOGY. The premium on gold can correctly play no part in a table of that kind. It is not correct at all. It can be neither added nor deducted; it cannot be treated as an item at all.

Mr. BOUTWELL. I desire now to call the attention of the Senate to the tables showing the expenses *per capita* in each of the years which I will mention.

The expenses *per capita*, including slaves who paid no part of the expenses of the Government directly, were in—

1800.....	\$2.038
1810.....	1.171
1820.....	1.597
1830.....	1.176
1840.....	1.424
1850.....	1.766
1860.....	1.952
1870.....	1.781

In 1875, estimating the population at 40,000,000, which was the estimate of the Treasury Department, the expenses *per capita* were \$1.746.

But, estimating the population in 1875 at 43,000,000, which is my own opinion upon the best information I can obtain, the expenses were \$1.60 for each inhabitant, including those who had formerly been slaves. This table I will hand to the reporter with a request that the whole of it may be printed.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Does it contain any items which the Senator has not read?

Mr. BOUTWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I believe the rule was applied to this side of the Chamber that it must be read, or otherwise it ought not to go into the RECORD.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Very well, let it be read. We cannot dispense with it.

Mr. HAMLIN. It is done every day.

Mr. BOUTWELL. I hope the Senator from Delaware will not object to these tables being printed. The tables show the items of deductions made on account of the war expenses, and are very necessary to a proper understanding of the tables themselves and also furnish the evidence by which the correctness of the estimates here made will be ascertained, either established or refuted. I should not like to withdraw them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to allowing the tables to be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. BOUTWELL. It will take a couple of hours to read them, I dare say.

Mr. BOGY. The table is the work of a gentleman who may be holding office, but it is not an official paper at all, and does not pretend to be an official paper. But taking the figures stated by the Senator from Massachusetts they would show that the expenses of the Government are now, or were in 1875, about \$150,000,000. The total amount of expenses mentioned in that document, unofficial as it is, is \$274,000,000, from which should be deducted fairly about \$100,000,000 for the interest on the public debt; it is a little less than \$100,000,000, but call it \$100,000,000 in round numbers; and \$30,000,000 for the pension list.

Mr. EDMUNDS. How about southern claims?

Mr. BOGY. Taking these two main items from \$274,000,000, there

will remain about \$144,000,000, or say \$150,000,000 in round numbers as the expenses of the Government other than expenses created for the Army or the Navy, or what the gentleman from Vermont has so often stated have grown out of the late unfortunate war. Nevertheless the fact remains that the expenses are about \$144,000,000 or \$150,000,000 besides the amount paid for interest and the amount paid for the pension-list. I have no objection to the statement being published; I have no objection to the facts going before the country, no matter where they come from; but this is not an official document; it is the mere production of a gentleman who may be holding office, but it has no evidence of official character even, and some of his items are, in my estimation, very absurd and should not be in a statement of this character.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I move that the Senate adjourn. I think there is not a quorum present.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President—

Mr. BOUTWELL. I believe I have the floor, and I wish this paper to be read as part of my speech if there is objection to its going in the RECORD without being read.

Mr. HOWE. Is there objection?

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should like much to hear it, as its accuracy is assailed.

Mr. HAMLIN. I rise, Mr. President, to a question of order, that no objection prevents a Senator from incorporating such a paper in his remarks. It is done almost every day.

Mr. EDMUNDS. He can have it read by a majority vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that there is no rule of the Senate on the subject. A majority of the Senate can determine the matter in the judgment of the Chair. The Chair will submit the question, if it is the desire of the Senator, whether this statement shall be incorporated in the RECORD without being read. Senators, those in favor of this permission will say ay; of a contrary opinion will say no.

Mr. STEVENSON. I ask for the yeas and nays on that question of order. It is an important question of order.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SAULSBURY. On account of the appeals made to me by my friends on this side of the House, I will withdraw, if it is not too late, the objection, while my own judgment is that it has been the rule of the Senate not to permit statements to be incorporated in the RECORD which are not read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being withdrawn, the point of order falls, and the statement will be incorporated in the RECORD. The tables produced by Mr. BOUTWELL are as follows:

Table showing expenditures per capita.

Year.	Population.	Expenditures.	Per capita.
1800.....	5,305,925	\$10,813,971 01	2.038
1810.....	7,239,814	8,474,753 37	1.171
1820.....	9,638,131	18,285,534 89	1.897
1830.....	12,866,020	15,142,108 26	1.176
1840.....	17,069,453	24,314,518 19	1.424
1850.....	23,191,876	40,948,383 12	1.766
1860.....	31,443,321	61,402,408 64	1.952
1870.....	38,555,983	68,684,613 92	1.781
1875, (estimated).....	40,000,000	69,856,117 77	1.746

Note.—For explanations of deductions see accompanying statements marked A to K, inclusive.

STATEMENT A.—Congress.

Reporting debates in Congress.....	\$45,625 00
Printing for Congress, including debates.....	259,527 38
Printing for Treasury Department.....	136,000 00
Printing for War Department.....	43,284 00
Printing for Interior Department.....	102,000 00
Printing for Department of Justice.....	5,100 00
	591,536 38

STATEMENT B.—Executive.

	Expenses in 1860.	Expenses in 1875.	Increase.
Salaries in Treasury Department:			
Office of Secretary.....	\$47,931 00	\$476,698 97	\$65,600 00
First Auditor.....	35,470 00	72,908 81	37,438 81
Second Auditor.....	35,470 00	266,583 22	231,113 22
Third Auditor.....	132,905 70	246,801 97	113,896 27
Fourth Auditor.....	27,737 80	77,697 46	49,959 66
Fifth Auditor.....	17,621 43	51,304 83	33,683 40
First Comptroller.....	28,340 00	72,454 75	44,114 75
Second Comptroller.....	26,840 00	110,936 97	84,096 97
Treasurer.....	26,751 15	414,361 44	387,610 29
Register.....	51,707 11	243,337 50	191,630 39
Comptroller of the Treasury.....		134,764 01	134,764 01
War Department and its Bureaus.....	145,584 02	972,535 17	826,951 15
Navy Department and its Bureaus.....	107,300 00	121,735 20	14,435 20
Interior Department, Pension Office.....	126,206 46	464,821 21	338,614 75
Internal Revenue Office.....			335,166 80
			2,889,065 67

STATEMENT C.—Judiciary.

The expenses of courts incurred on account of internal revenue suits are estimated by the First Comptroller at one-third of the total expenditures, or.....

\$1,395,876 07

STATEMENT D.—Foreign Intercourse.

Salaries and expenses of United States and British claims commission..... \$2,093 25
Awards to British claimants..... 1,929,819 00
Salaries and expenses, court of commissioners of Alabama claims..... 84,374 70

2,016,296 95

STATEMENT E.—Miscellaneous.

Payment of judgments, Court of Claims..... \$516,531 35
Salaries and expenses southern claims commission..... 51,800 00
Examination of national banks and bank-note plates..... 705 75
Expenses of engraving and printing..... 1,581,669 41
Expenses of national currency..... 330,978 27
Expenses of national loan..... 2,444 47
Refunding national debt..... 150,255 51
Refunding proceeds of cotton seized..... 51,229 47
Payment for lands sold for direct taxes..... 23,920 00
Return of proceeds and expenses of collection of captured property..... 881,249 84
Refunding taxes illegally collected..... 893 00
Re-issuing national currency..... 64,244 76
Support of free schools in South Carolina..... 3,900 00
Refunding excess of duty to national banks..... 258 40
Defending suits and claims for seizure of captured property..... 26,124 00
Compensation of persons employed in insurrectionary States..... 4,068 65
Expenses of assessing and collecting internal revenue..... 5,188,513 31
Support of Freedmen's Hospital and Asylum..... 50,000 00
National Association for Relief of Colored Women and Children..... 10,000 00
Compensation in lieu of moiety..... 67,134 18
Postage in lieu of franking privilege..... 1,022,165 13

Extraordinary expenses incurred for the District of Columbia:

Payment of indebtedness..... \$1,300,000 00
Payment of interest on 3.65 loan..... 154,554 64

1,454,554 64

Public buildings and improving rivers and harbors in 1875..... 15,365,012 30
Expended for same purposes in 1860..... 2,913,371 48

12,451,640 82

Expenses of collecting revenue from customs, including revenue-cutter service, in 1875..... 8,006,678 10
Cost for same service in 1860..... 3,324,430 53

4,682,247 57

28,616,528 53

STATEMENT F.—Pensions.

The entire amount on account of pensions is deducted, as it is not reasonable to suppose that many persons who would be entitled to the benefits of the old pension laws are now living..... \$29,456,216 22

STATEMENT G.—Military establishment.

Bounty under act of July 28, 1866..... \$227,111 44
Traveling expenses of California volunteers and Michigan cavalry..... 12,185 15
Bureau of Refugees and Freedmen..... 34,716 20

Horses and other property lost in military service..... \$83,720 68
Reimbursing States' expenses in suppressing rebellion..... 186,667 93
Claims of loyal citizens for supplies furnished during the rebellion..... 1,265,170 40
Publication of official records of the war of rebellion..... 20,000 00
Commutation of rations to prisoners of war..... 4,000 00
Stoppages or fines due National Home for Disabled Volunteers..... 911,505 12
Expenses under reconstruction acts..... 240 04
Bounty and prize money to colored soldiers and sailors..... 80,000 00
Keeping, transporting, and supplying prisoners of war..... 2,195 35
National cemeteries..... 168,889 59
Head-stones for graves in national cemeteries..... 134,989 17
Medical and Surgical History of the War..... 40,000 00

Total of claims actually paid..... 3,171,371 07

Increased expenditures of the Army in consequence of the war:

	1860.	1875.
Pay of the Army.....	\$3,828,924 55	\$10,870,760 39
Commissary Department.....	2,745,162 67	2,851,334 74
Quartermaster's Department.....	6,470,472 58	12,950,263 22

13,044,559 80 26,672,358 35 13,627,798 55

STATEMENT H.—Naval establishment.

Prize-money to captors..... \$842,582 22
Bounty for destruction of enemy's vessels..... 50,419 32
Payment to officers and crew of United States steamer Kearsarge..... 2,040 87
Navy pensions..... 96,363 93
Extraordinary expenditures on account of construction of four new vessels..... 4,000,000 00

4,991,406 34

STATEMENT I.—Public debt.

Interest on the public debt..... \$103,093,544 57

STATEMENT K.

The following items, which are included in the aggregate as expenditures both for the years 1860 and 1875, are deducted from each, for the reason that they are not expenditures in the true meaning of the word, as they involve no outlay of money by the Treasury and are no burden upon the tax-payers, they being merely entries on both the debit and credit side of the books (made necessary by the system of book-keeping in practice) of moneys received from persons and subsequently returned to them or expended in their behalf, namely:

Items.	1860.	1875.
Refunding excess of amounts deposited by importers for unascertained duties.....	\$814,826 87	\$1,863,657 85
Debitures and drawbacks.....	585,158 39	1,626,562 17
Refunding duties erroneously or illegally collected.....	3,821 55	9,810 93
Patent fund.....	219,573 53	672,539 37
Total.....	1,623,380 34	4,172,570 32

Comparison of the expenditures of 1875 with those of 1860.

Objects of expenditure.	Expenditures for fiscal year 1875.	Deductions of expenditures arising in consequence of the rebellion, 1875.	Expenditures on peace basis, 1875.	Expenditures in 1860.
A. Congress.....	\$5,137,012 47	\$591,536 38		\$2,619,529 43
B. Executive.....	10,152,860 68	2,880,065 67		2,347,458 05
C. Judiciary.....	4,187,628 21	1,395,876 07		1,181,667 93
Territorial governments.....	290,416 77			
Total civil list.....	19,767,918 13	4,876,478 12	\$14,891,440 01	6,148,655 41
D. Foreign intercourse.....	3,231,087 13	2,016,296 95	1,214,800 18	1,163,207 15
E. Miscellaneous.....	48,071,697 72	23,616,528 53	19,455,169 19	20,658,007 92
Indians.....	8,384,656 82		8,384,656 82	3,955,686 59
F. Pensions.....	29,456,216 22	29,456,216 22		
G. Military establishment.....	41,120,645 98	16,799,169 62	24,321,476 36	16,409,767 10
H. Naval establishment.....	21,497,626 27	4,991,406 34	16,506,219 93	11,513,150 19
I. Interest on public debt.....	103,093,544 57	103,093,544 57		3,177,314 62
Total.....	274,623,392 84	189,849,630 35	84,773,762 49	63,025,788 96
Deduct 12.675 per cent., the average premium on gold during the year, the expenditures here given being in currency while those of 1860 were in gold.....			10,745,074 40	
K. Deduct items which are not in reality expenditures, but which appear so by reason of the system of book-keeping in practice in the Department.....			74,038,688 09	
			4,172,570 32	1,623,380 34
			69,856,117 77	61,402,408 64
Excess of expenditures of 1875 over 1860.....			8,453,709 13	

Mr. SAULSBURY. I move that the Senate adjourn.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts give way to the Senator from Delaware for that motion?
Mr. BOUTWELL. I understand that the tables are to be printed.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, sir.
Mr. EDMUNDS. By unanimous consent.
Mr. BOUTWELL. Then I will yield the floor.
Mr. STEVENSON. Will the Senator from Delaware withdraw his motion for a moment?
Mr. SAULSBURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEVENSON. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] takes issue with the statement made by me. He says that this country is not depressed, and that its financial and agricultural and commercial interests are in a good condition.
Mr. MORRILL. The Senator states it too broadly. I stated that it was not in that extreme condition of poverty and bankruptcy which had been alleged.
Mr. STEVENSON. I did not say anything about bankruptcy.
Mr. MORRILL. You mentioned the amount of bankruptcies that had taken place.

Mr. STEVENSON. I stand now by my statement, and I take issue with the Senator from Vermont. I say that the statistics in New York will show that over eight thousand and some hundred bankruptcies occurred in the year 1875, and in the first three months of this year more than two thousand occurred. I say further from information from republicans and democrats alike in the city of New York that rents are fearfully depressed, that business is in a very unsatisfactory state, and from every section of the country I hear clamors of great pecuniary distress and of increased taxation.

Mr. MORRILL. I merely stated that this extreme exaggeration about the condition of the country was entirely unfounded. I admitted that the manufacturing interests and the mercantile interests and the mining interests were depressed; but I claimed that the agricultural interest was never more prosperous, and that is the greatest interest of this country. Why, Mr. President, the amount of cotton that will be produced this year will be an average crop. The hay, which is the largest agricultural crop perhaps in the country, is good all over the country. There is not a single article of agriculture in any portion of the country that I am aware of the crop of which this year does not promise well.

Mr. STEVENSON. Let me ask the Senator what the price of cotton is now, and whether it is not at one-half the price it used to command?

Mr. MORRILL. It is one-half what it was during the war, but it is about two cents a pound more than it was prior to the war.

Mr. STEVENSON. Is it not one-half now what it was the year before the last—seven years since the war? Still I only wanted to correct the Senator's statement as to my position. All I said was that there was great popular distress in this country and that all species of its business were unsettled and depressed.

Mr. EDMUNDS. What are the causes of that condition of things?

Mr. STEVENSON. That is more than I can tell.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is the thing we ought to know, in order to correct them.

Mr. STEVENSON. I know that in the old times when the democratic party in the days of Mr. Van Buren were charged with the responsibility, the bad management of its rulers was then said to be the cause.

Mr. EDMUNDS. What does the Senator say now?

Mr. STEVENSON. I do not intend to go into any political discussion. What I say to the Senator from Vermont is that the people are competent to judge. They will render their verdict as to what the cause is in November, and by that verdict I am willing to stand.

Mr. MORRILL. Will the Senator answer me this?

Mr. STEVENSON. I will answer any question.

Mr. MORRILL. Is not the cotton crop not only prosperous in the South, but are they not producing vastly more of the cereal crops and more stock than prior to the war?

Mr. STEVENSON. I do not understand it to be so.

Mr. MORRILL. I do.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentlemen who raise cotton tell me it is not so, and certainly the price of cotton, if we were in good times, would be a great deal more than three and a half to four cents.

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. President, what has become of the motion to adjourn?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to adjourn was withdrawn.

Mr. OGLESBY, (at six o'clock and fifty-five minutes.) I renew the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is moved that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the Chair allow me an opportunity of making a request of the Senator? There is a very earnest necessity for an executive session, and I hope the Senator will allow me to submit that motion.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I will yield to that.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator yield to me? We have remained late. We have all lost our dinner, or are likely to, whether we adjourn now or an hour hence; and I do submit that the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Vermont can settle the question of the causes of the trouble, if we have any now in this country, on Monday just as well on some other bill as on this.

Mr. STEVENSON. I have no unsettled question. I have finished all I have to say.

Mr. ALLISON. Then, if it is all settled, I hope we shall go on and vote on the bill. We can get through with it and adjourn in fifteen minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware insist on his motion.

Mr. SAULSBURY. If the Senator from Maine wishes an executive session I will yield for that purpose. Otherwise I insist on my motion.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope not.

Mr. HAMLIN. I will not make the motion. I want an executive session, but I want to close this bill more than I want that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no motion before the Senate, the yeas and nays will be taken on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The question being put, a division was called for; and the yeas were 4, and the noes 32.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate refuses to adjourn, but there is not a quorum voting.

Mr. HOWE. I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SPENCER and others. Another division will do.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move that absent Senators be sent for.

Mr. MORRILL. The yeas and nays will ascertain the fact.

Mr. FERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion. That will test whether we have a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are called for. The Clerk will call the roll on the motion to adjourn.

Mr. CRAGIN. I suggest that there is a quorum evidently present. Another division will show it, without wasting time in calling the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate is out of order. The question is on the motion to adjourn. The yeas and nays will be called.

The question being taken by yeas and nays, resulted—yeas 5, nays 35; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Booth, Edmunds, Hamilton, Oglesby, and Saulsbury—5.

NAYS—Messrs. Allison, Anthony, Barnum, Bogey, Bontwell, Cameron of Wisconsin, Christiancy, Cockrell, Conover, Cooper, Cragin, Davis, Dawes, Dennis, Ferry, Frelinghuysen, Hamlin, Howe, Ingalls, Kelly, Kernan, Key, Logan, McMillan, Maxey, Merrimon, Mitchell, Morrill, Norwood, Paddock, Ransom, Spencer, Windom, Withers, and Wright—35.

ABSENT—Messrs. Alcorn, Bayard, Bruce, Burnside, Cameron of Pennsylvania, Caperton, Clayton, Conkling, Dorsey, Eaton, Goldthwaite, Gordon, Harvey, Hitchcock, Johnston, Jones of Florida, Jones of Nevada, McCreery, McDonald, Morton, Patterson, Randolph, Robertson, Sargent, Sharon, Sherman, Stevenson, Thurman, Wadleigh, Wallace, West, and Whyte—32.

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I do not rise at this late hour to discuss this question. I submitted some views upon it a few days ago, and do not propose to detain the Senate with any extended remarks in reference to this bill. But I find in the RECORD of to-day remarks of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] yesterday in which he alluded to my course of action on this bill, to which I desire to make some reference. The Senator said:

I desire to speak in reference to Delaware. The distinguished Senator from Delaware, [Mr. SAULSBURY] who is not now in the Senate Chamber, was spiritedly in favor of reform, and yet whenever his State was touched, whenever an amendment was proposed by the Senate committee striking out anything from Delaware, he was on his feet to protest against the amendment striking anything for Delaware.

Now, I wish to correct the statement made in that paragraph by the Senator from Missouri. In the first place, there was no amendment of the Senate committee striking out any appropriation whatever that had been made in the State of Delaware. Consequently, I had no occasion to protest against striking out appropriations for the State which I have the honor in part to represent. There was in reality but one appropriation for that State. There was an appropriation made for the pier at the town of Lewes, which is a national work, which is not designed for the interests or benefit of the people of the State, and upon which no citizen of the State puts his foot without the permission of the Federal authorities in charge of the work. That certainly is not an appropriation to the State of Delaware. So again of the ice harbor at New Castle. New Castle is situated just above the head of the Delaware Bay. The river at that point being not less than two miles wide, it frequently becomes necessary for vessels going up the bay to Philadelphia to take refuge in that harbor. It was not put there for the purpose of benefiting the people of Delaware in any respect. But there is an appropriation to Wilmington Harbor, which lies within the State, and in which the citizens of our State are particularly interested. Wilmington is a port of entry, a place where there is very great commerce, and where a large number of iron ships and other vessels are built, and where the Government vessels to-day are laying for the purpose of being repaired.

The Senator referred also in his remarks yesterday to streams which were incorporated in the section of the bill providing for surveys, and represented them as mere minnow streams. Why, sir, there is not one of those streams but what has very considerable commerce upon it and tide-water navigation. There is scarcely one of them upon which vessels are not built. Upon one of these streams, Misspillion Creek or River, within the last three years a vessel of nine hundred tons burden has been built; and so upon Jones River and Duck Creek; and every stream incorporated for a survey is a stream where there is tide-water and upon which there is a considerable commerce, and upon which vessels constantly ply.

I rose simply to correct that mistake, because I have not had incorporated into this bill any survey except a survey of a navigable stream, and where there is already a very considerable commerce. I have felt it due to myself to make this correction of a statement made perhaps inadvertently by my friend from Missouri.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I have just listened with pleasure to the constitutional doctrine applicable to this bill stated by the Senator from Kentucky, [Mr. STEVENSON], and yet I shall probably not vote with him. I cannot vote for the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, [Mr. EDMUNDS], which is to appropriate \$4,000,000 and leave it the administration of the Secretary of War. I do not think \$4,000,000 is a sufficient appropriation. I shall not vote to recommit the bill because the chairman of the committee or the Senator having the bill in charge has submitted to the Senate a substitute for the bill, which probably incorporates all the advantages we would derive from a recommitment, and I propose, when the opportunity comes, to vote for that substitute.

I confess that I feel more kindly toward this measure than some of those with whom I am in the habit of coinciding. If I believed that this country or nation was poor, I would move and vote to lay the bill on the table. I know that the country is not poor. The people are somewhat poor, and I am very sorry for it; and there need be no question as to what makes them so. If in a circle a hundred miles in diameter on our prairies you gather all the cereals produced in the land for five or six years and then drive in all the sheep and horses and oxen, and pile on all the fabrics and all the productions of a highly stimulated industry and then gather around it the best youth of the country, with their energy and muscle and capacity to produce, and let them put the torch to that vast funeral pile and then leap into it themselves, no one would wonder that as the smoke from that destruction went up to propitiate the Moloch of war that there should be poverty in the land. Or if you stimulate every energy of a country so that it is fevered and excited and every nerve so strained that it is ready to break, it is certain that there will be a reaction, an exhaustion, a prostration; and that is just what this country is now suffering.

The people are poor, but the country has vast hidden resources, and it seems to me that the way to make the people rich is by developing those resources; and I do not think that I am stating an extravagant proposition when I say that the only means of making the people rich is by developing those resources, for I do not know any other source from which we derive wealth and luxury but this rugged earth from whence we come and whither we go.

If I believed that this bill was to burden the people with taxes I would move and vote to lay it on the table, but I know it is not. The question whether we appropriate four million or five million is the question whether we shall next year pay one million more or less on the public debt, and that is all of it. I believe that by appropriating with reasonable liberality and developing the resources of the country we enable ourselves to pay five million five years hence much easier than we can pay one million next year.

Mr. President, it seems to me that we should learn something from the past. Look at the developments and at the increase of the wealth of the country in the last fifty years. I can remember when the good and patriotic men of the country feared that the nation was going to be ruined by its very increase and development; by the remoteness of its parts they feared that it would fall to pieces. Then it was that hidden in the earth was found the wealth of iron, which was followed by the introduction of railroads, binding the land together, and then by the invention of the telegraph, which has made the people of this vast continent one community, so that San Francisco is to-day for all practical purposes nearer, much nearer to the Atlantic seaboard than Cincinnati was then. Then I remember that reflecting men said we were to be ruined for the want of fuel, and then we found the illimitable fields of coal, supplying not only domestic purposes but the vastly greater demands of manufacturing and transportation. Then, as the New London whaler came in without any cargo, thoughtful men said we were to have an oil famine and that we would be straitened what to do in the numerous purposes to which it is applied; then some man in Pennsylvania drove a pipe down into the earth and developed a supply of oil, enough for the world. A great man has said of the world what is true of this country; he said that the world is God's hot-bed that He has planted deep and multifariously, and there are many things which have not yet come up. The Senator from Wisconsin, [Mr. HOWE,] in a speech of a few minutes the other day, hit the very point when he said that it was the duty of the Government to water our country's crops and make the seed sprout.

But, Mr. President, besides all that, this is the proper time to make the appropriation. We have hitherto decided that these improvements are fit to be made and valuable, and we now can make one dollar of expenditure produce two dollars in the results of work, and the people want the occupation and the money. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. THURMAN] says that is making this Government parental. Well, if developing the wealth of the country even if the people do thereby incidentally gain employment, if increasing the revenues of the nation is making the Government parental, let it be parental. There is much of wise political economy in the saying of Solomon: "There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty."

Neither do I think that these appropriations should be confined to salt water or to deep water. I do not differ from the Senator from Kentucky as to the constitutional rule relative to internal improvements. The question which determines the propriety of an appropriation for an internal improvement is whether it will be for the general welfare. In the language of the Constitution, do "we lay the taxes, duties, imposts, and excises in order to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States?" If we do, we are acting in harmony with the Constitution. It is the eighth section of article 1 that gives us the constitutional power to make these appropriations, and the question suggested is the test as to whether any particular improvement comes within the purview of that section of the Constitution.

It may be that a stream three feet wide may float lumber and grain and coal so as to promote the general welfare of the United States, and if it does its improvement is within the legitimate powers of the Constitution. If it be waters entirely within one State confined in its benefits to a mere locality, it is a perversion of the Constitution to

claim that the General Government is to spend money in its improvement. The provision of the Constitution relative to the regulation of commerce which has been so much discoursed upon has nothing to do with this question. Under that provision the Government can take control of all navigable waters, but under the general-welfare clause it can improve land or water without taking control of either.

Mr. President, one word more. Every dollar that we expend for these improvements probably stimulates twenty dollars from private capital and thus increases the wealth and the revenues of the nation. Besides, there are many other reasons why individual States cannot so well make these improvements as the General Government. It is a little extraordinary, I know, that one State deriving no direct advantage should be taxed for an improvement in another State; thus, for instance, the State of New Jersey has little or no beneficial interest in this bill; she does not receive a fourth as much as she will contribute to the amount expended; but then, sir, we are one people, one nation; we all have a common interest, and I rejoice in any legislation which brings practically and vividly to the people of different sections the beneficent influences of this one great nation. Mr. President, we are rich enough, our history is sufficiently glorious, the prospects of the future are bright enough; there is but one thing we want, and that is for every section and every party to determine that the great provision of the Constitution enacting that all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof shall be citizens thereof and of the State in which they reside, shall everywhere be enforced so that every citizen, white and black, at the North and South, shall fully and freely enjoy full American citizenship, with the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. If only that could be vouchsafed, this nation would this year enter upon a career most grand and glorious.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the motion made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. THURMAN] to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report a bill not exceeding in amount the total of \$4,000,000.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEY, (when his name was called.) On this question I am paired with the Senator from Nebraska who sits farthest from me, [Mr. HITCHCOCK.] If he were here he would vote "yea," and I should vote "nay."

Mr. STEVENSON, (when his name was called.) I am paired with the Senator from Georgia, [Mr. GORDON.] If he were here he would vote "nay," and I should vote "yea," on this motion.

Mr. RANSOM, (when Mr. THURMAN's name was called.) The Senator from Ohio [Mr. THURMAN] is paired on this question with the Senator from West Virginia, [Mr. CAPERTON.] The Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. DAVIS. They are both unwell.

Mr. RANSOM. They are very sick.

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. STEVENSON. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. MCCREERY] is still detained at home by the dangerous illness of a member of his family.

The result was announced—yeas 9, nays 23; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Booth, Boutwell, Dawes, Hamlin, Ingalls, Kernan, Logan, Oglesby, and Saulsbury—9.

NAYS—Messrs. Allison, Anthony, Barnum, Bogy, Cameron of Wisconsin, Christianity, Cockrell, Conover, Cooper, Davis, Dennis, Ferry, Frelinghuysen, Hamilton, Howe, Kelly, McMillan, Maxey, Merrimon, Mitchell, Morrill, Norwood, Paddock, Ransom, Spencer, Windom, Withers, and Wright—23.

ABSENT—Messrs. Alcorn, Bayard, Bruce, Burnside, Cameron of Pennsylvania, Caperton, Clayton, Conkling, Cragin, Dorsey, Eaton, Edmunds, Goldthwaite, Gordon, Harvey, Hitchcock, Johnston, Jones of Florida, Jones of Nevada, Key, McCreery, McDonald, Morton, Patterson, Randolph, Robertson, Sargent, Sharon, Sherman, Stevenson, Thurman, Wadleigh, Wallace, West, and Whyte—35.

So the motion was not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the substitute offered by the Senator from Vermont, [Mr. EDMUNDS.]

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should like to hear it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill and insert:

That the sum of \$4,000,000 is hereby appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1877, to be expended for the repair, extension, preservation, and completion of works for the improvement of rivers and harbors under the direction of the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to cause such expenditures to be made so as best to subserve the interests of commerce; and he is required to report to Congress, at the opening of its December session, all expenditures made under the provisions of this act up to that time in detail.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, now after much wandering, as the children of Israel had, we have got back to this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will remind the Senator that the five-minute rule is in operation.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I do not know that there is any special need for the Chair taking a minute out of my time to tell me so in advance. I have got time, I think I have, and like the rest of the American freemen that the poets have talked about, I know my rights, and "knowing, dare maintain."

If we have got back to this bill in serious interest out of the discursive region where we have been wandering, I have this to say: In the year 1869, when the revenues of the Government in a comparative sense were overflowing, both Houses of Congress agreed that the

true and wise plan, having before them a bill that was filled up with items many of which could not stand constitutional or practical tests, was to put a gross sum in charge of the War Department, which means the Corps of Engineers, subject to the provision and veto of the Secretary of War, to be applied to the most necessary objects of public improvement already in the course of existence and progress. That bill only provided, if I remember, two millions or two millions and a half. I propose now, in this state of public exigency, of diminished revenues, and therefore of an increased necessity for small appropriations, to double the sum of 1869 and to require the Secretary of War to take \$4,000,000 only of public money and appropriate it to the most necessary objects of national improvement already provided for by law. That is the proposition, and I appeal to Senators on all sides and from all States and all localities whether this is not in the present condition of the country the wise and the right thing to do.

I have not risen, Mr. President, to take up time, to make speeches, but only to state the precise point on which my amendment rests.

Mr. HOWE. I move to amend the substitute by striking out "four" and inserting "six," so that the appropriation shall be \$6,000,000 instead of \$4,000,000. So far as the works in the State of Wisconsin are concerned I do not object for one moment for allowing the disbursements to be made under the direction of the Engineer Corps. I do not want a dollar expended in that State that is not recommended upon the judgment and the responsibility of those officers; but I insist upon it that \$4,000,000 is not a fair and business-like appropriation to make for these purposes. On that subject I only wish to refer the Senate to the very excellent speeches made this afternoon by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BOUTWELL] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] who took his seat a few minutes ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered to the substitute by the Senator from Wisconsin to strike out "four" and insert "six;" so as to make the total \$6,000,000.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOWE. I move to insert "five" in place of "four;" so as to make it \$5,000,000.

Mr. COOPER. I move to lay on the table both the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin and the substitute of the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That motion carries the bill with it.

Mr. COOPER. No, it does not, I understand.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It does. This is not a general appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is not a general appropriation within the meaning of the rule. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the substitute.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the substitute offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. EDMUNDS. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to offer an amendment to the substitute, if it is in order. I am not quite certain that it is.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It is in order. There is no doubt about its being in order, I think.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment to the substitute is in order.

Mr. ALLISON. I propose what I send to the Clerk's desk as an amendment to the substitute, striking out all after the first word "that."

Several SENATORS. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be reported.

Mr. SPENCER. It has been printed and laid on our tables. Its reading can be dispensed with.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to say one word.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us have it read before it is debated, in order to see what it is. I do not understand it myself.

Mr. SPENCER. It is long, and has been printed.

Mr. LOGAN. Before it is read I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Iowa. Suppose his amendment should be adopted as an amendment to the substitute, then what effect would that have? The substitute provides for \$4,000,000. Would his amendment be a distribution of that sum?

Mr. ALLISON. My proposition strikes out everything after the first word of the substitute, and inserts what I send to the Clerk's desk instead of the substitute.

Mr. LOGAN. What is its effect upon the original bill?

Mr. ALLISON. It is an amendment to the substitute proposed by the Senator from Vermont. It strikes out all that the Senator from Vermont proposes to insert, and also all that is in the original bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment to the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the word "that" in the first line of the amendment and insert—

Mr. RANSOM. I hope the Senator from Iowa will withdraw his amendment, and let us vote upon the substitute of the Senator from Vermont. That seems to be the shortest way to get through this matter.

Mr. SPENCER. And then afterward the Senator from Iowa can offer his amendment to the bill.

Mr. HAMLIN, (to Mr. ALLISON.) Stick to your amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I should be very glad of course to save time; but if the amendment of the Senator from Vermont be voted down, as I am certain it will be, then I shall offer my substitute and have a vote upon it; and if it is to be read, it may as well be read now, and we may as well act upon it now as after the amendment of the Senator from Vermont is voted down. It is only a question of the order of proceeding.

Mr. OGLESBY. May I ask the Senator from Iowa a question?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. OGLESBY. The bill as reported from the Senate Committee on Appropriations is a distinct proposition in and of itself. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont is a distinct and different proposition. We ought to vote directly upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont in order to test the sense of this body on that independent proposition, for it is based on new reasons, a new theory, and new facts. If that amendment should be voted down, as the Senator from Iowa thinks it will be, then his amendment could be read and voted upon. That course would enable us to act upon the amendment of the Senator from Vermont as an independent proposition. If the amendment of the Senator from Iowa is offered now we shall have to vote both upon the bill of the House and the amendment of the Senator from Vermont in voting upon the substitute proposed by the Senator from Iowa. A better, and simpler, and plainer way would be to vote upon the amendment of the Senator from Vermont first, and then if the substitute of the Senator from Iowa is offered it can be read and voted upon and the question considered fairly and independently. There may be Senators here disposed to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Vermont who would also vote for the substitute proposed by the Senator from Iowa if the amendment of the Senator from Vermont should fail; but those Senators might not vote for the substitute of the Senator from Iowa if that substitute is to slaughter both the original bill and the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. HOWE. I want to suggest to the Senator from Illinois that I think he is mistaken. If the amendment moved by the Senator from Iowa be adopted, the question will then be on substituting his proposition for the bill now before the Senate, will it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. OGLESBY. I misunderstood the Senator from Iowa in his reply to the Senator from Illinois, then. I understood the Senator to say that his amendment was offered as a substitute both for the bill and the pending amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa offers his amendment as a substitute for the substitute offered by the Senator from Vermont. Does the Senator from Iowa insist on his amendment at this time?

Mr. EDMUNDS. It is being read.

Mr. MERRIMON. I ask as a question of order whether the first vote is not upon the substitute of the Senator from Vermont? We perfect the principal measure first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa is in order. The substitute of the Senator from Vermont is open to amendment.

Mr. FERRY. Let me understand to which proposition does the Senator from Iowa propose his substitute as an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As an amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont, as the Chair understands.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is it. He proposes to strike out all after the word "that" in my amendment and insert what the Clerk is about to read. He has a right to do that, and you cannot prevent it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Iowa insists on the amendment, the Clerk will proceed to read it.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the amendment, and having read to line 50 was interrupted by

Mr. SPENCER. I rise to a question of order. I should like to know whether this substitute is in order? It varies very little from the bill originally reported from the Committee on Appropriations. There is very little difference between the two.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. SPENCER. The Senate has voted "nay" on this same proposition repeatedly. I think there is a very large majority of the Senate opposed to this amendment.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Does that make it out of order? It is pretty strong evidence that it is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair feels compelled to call Senators to order. The reading of the amendment will proceed.

Mr. SPENCER. I should like to appeal to the Senator from Vermont to withdraw his call for the reading of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont insist on the reading?

Mr. EDMUNDS. I will hear the appeal. I want to hear the reasons for dispensing with the reading.

Mr. SPENCER. The amendment is familiar to the Senate. Every Senator has read this amendment and understands it. We have voted on it repeatedly.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. HOWE. What is the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama rose to

a point of order that the substitute of the Senator from Iowa was not in order. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. SPENCER. The Chair was in too great a hurry to overrule the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will resume the reading. The Chief Clerk resumed the reading of the amendment at line 51; and having read to line 143, he was interrupted by

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. May I interrupt the reading of the amendment for the purpose of suggesting to the Senator having the bill in charge whether an arrangement may not be made to commence voting on the bill and amendments on Monday morning at a quarter after eleven o'clock, and whether it would not be agreeable, as debate has stopped, that we take the vote then?

Mr. ALLISON. It would certainly be very agreeable to me, if we could go on either to-night or on Monday morning without debate.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If unanimous consent is given to such an arrangement, we might adjourn now.

Mr. ALLISON. I have no objection to that course, for my part.

Mr. FERRY and others. Let us go on.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If there is no objection to it, I make that proposition.

Mr. ALLISON. I have no objection to it, but Senators about me all say "go on."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading will proceed.

The Chief Clerk resumed the reading at line 144, and having read to the end of the first section, at line 361, he was interrupted by

Mr. ALLISON. I suggest to the Senator from Vermont that we waive the reading of section 2, as it is precisely the bill as reported from the Committee on Appropriations with some additions, which may be read. The additions can be read, but the reading of the original print can very well be dispensed with.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I think, and the Senate will bear me out in that, that I have never consented to pass upon any question in the Senate until it should be read. Therefore, for the honor of what I consider to be a most necessary rule of legislation, I want to hear the amendment read through.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont objects, and the reading will continue.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the amendment to the amendment, as follows:

The following sums of money be, and are hereby, appropriated, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended, under the direction of the Secretary of War, for the repair, preservation, construction, and completion of the following public works hereinafter named:

For the improvement of the harbor at Buffalo, New York, \$85,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Wilson, New York, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Oak Orchard, New York, \$2,000.
 For removing obstructions in the East River and Hell Gate, New York, \$300,000.
 For the improvement of the natural entrance to Superior Bay, Wisconsin, \$3,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Du Luth, Minnesota, \$15,000. Said appropriation is made upon the express condition that it shall be without prejudice to either party in the suit now pending between the State of Wisconsin, plaintiff, and the city of Du Luth and the Northern Pacific Railroad, defendants.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Ontonagon, Michigan, \$15,000.
 For the improvement of Eagle Harbor, Michigan, \$15,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Marquette, Michigan, \$2,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Manistee, Michigan, \$14,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Ludington, Michigan, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Muskegon, Michigan, \$15,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Grand Haven, Michigan, \$15,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Green Bay, Wisconsin, \$8,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Ahnapee, Wisconsin, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Two Rivers, Wisconsin, \$5,000.
 For the improvement of the Falls of Saint Anthony, Minnesota, \$125,000.
 For the improvement of Minnesota River, Minnesota, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Toledo, Ohio, \$75,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Sandusky City, Ohio, \$25,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Vermilion, Ohio, \$5,000.
 For a breakwater at Cleveland Harbor, Ohio, \$50,000.
 For repair of east pier at Cleveland, Ohio, \$8,000.
 For the improvement of Connecticut River below Hartford, Connecticut, \$30,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Fall River, Massachusetts, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at New Bedford, Massachusetts, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of Penobscot River, Maine, \$10,000; \$4,000 of which shall be expended at or near the "Narrows" in said river at Bucksport.
 For the improvement of Cochecho River, New Hampshire, \$14,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Burlington, Vermont, \$20,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Swanton, Vermont, \$2,000.
 For removing obstructions from, and the improvement of, the harbor at Wilmington, Delaware, \$16,000.
 For the construction of piers in Delaware Bay, near Lewes, Delaware, \$30,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Chicago, Illinois, \$5,000.
 For the improvement of the Des Moines Rapids, Mississippi River, \$250,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Baltimore, Maryland, \$75,000.
 For the improvement of the Rappahannock River, Virginia, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of James River, Virginia, \$60,000.
 For the improvement of Cape Fear River, North Carolina, \$125,000.
 For the improvement of the French Broad River between Brevard and the Buncombe County line, North Carolina, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of Cumberland River below the city of Nashville, Tennessee, \$35,000.
 For the improvement of the Great Kanawha River, West Virginia, including the purchase of sites for dams and locks, not exceeding \$15,000, \$250,000.
 For removal of Beaver and Naylor Bend rocks, and for cleaning out snags and fallen trees in the Little Kanawha, West Virginia, \$7,300.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Savannah, Georgia, \$62,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Brunswick, Georgia, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of the Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, Georgia, \$30,000.
 For the improvement at Sabine Pass, and for improvement of Blue Buck Bar and Sabine Bay, and for deepening the channel over the bar at the mouth of the Sabine River, and for deepening of the channel over the bar at the mouth of Neches River, where these rivers enter Sabine Bay, \$40,000.

For the improvement of Pass Cavallo inlet to Matagorda Bay, Texas, \$25,000.
 For the improvement of the Coosa River, from Rome, Georgia, to the bridge of the Selma, Rome and Dalton Railroad Company in Alabama, \$30,000.
 For the improvement of the Ouachita River, Arkansas and Louisiana, \$12,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Cedar Keys, Florida, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of the Lower Willamette and Columbia Rivers from Portland, Oregon, to the sea, \$25,000.
 For the improvement of the Upper Willamette River, Oregon, \$30,000.
 For the improvement of the Upper Columbia, including Snake River, \$15,000.
 For the improvement of Sacramento and Feather Rivers, California, \$15,000.
 For the improvement of Oakland Harbor, California, to be applied to finishing training-walls and dredging between them, \$75,000.
 For the improvement of San Joaquin River, California, \$15,000.
 For the improvement of the Delaware River below Petty's Island, \$50,000.
 For removing raft in Red River and closing Tome's Bayou, Louisiana, \$30,000.
 For the improvement of the Schuylkill River, Pennsylvania, \$25,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Southport, Connecticut, \$5,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Black Lake, Michigan, \$15,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Saint Joseph's, Michigan, \$12,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Manitowoc, Wisconsin, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Sheboygan, Wisconsin, \$8,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Port Washington, Wisconsin, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Oswego, New York, \$100,000.
 For the improvement of the Harlem River, New York, \$15,000; to be expended between Ward's Island and Hudson River.
 For the improvement of Hudson River, \$66,000.
 For the improvement of Elk River, West Virginia, \$15,000.
 For the improvement of the Appomattox River, Virginia, \$25,000.
 For the improvement of the South Branch of Elizabeth River, Virginia, \$5,000.
 For the improvement of Nansemond River, Virginia, \$5,000.
 For the improvement of the Yazoo River, Mississippi, \$15,000.
 For the improvement of White River at Buffalo Shoals, Arkansas, \$15,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Charleston, South Carolina, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of the Ocmulgee River, Georgia, between Macon and the seaboard, \$15,000.
 For the improvement of New River from the lead mines in Wythe County, Virginia, to the mouth of Greenbrier River, West Virginia, \$15,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Norfolk, Virginia, \$39,600.
 For the improvement of the Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, Alabama, above Demopolis, \$15,000.
 For continuing the improvement on the outer bar at Galveston, Texas, \$150,000.
 For the improvement of the Missouri River above the mouth of the Yellowstone, \$30,000.
 For the improvement of Chester River at Kent Island Narrows, Maryland, \$5,000.
 For removing bowlders and snags in Big Sandy River, Kentucky and West Virginia, including Louisa Fork, Virginia, \$15,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Michigan City, Indiana, \$40,000.
 For the improvement of the channel of the Mississippi River opposite the city of Saint Louis, Missouri, by the construction of a low dam across the channel east of Arsenal Island, known as Cabokia Chute, and in the revetment of said island, \$30,000.
 For the improvement of the Rush Chute and the harbor of Burlington, Iowa, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Fort Madison, Iowa, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at South Haven, Michigan, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of Saint Mary's River and Saint Mary's Falls Canal, Michigan, \$150,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Cheboygan, Michigan, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of the Saginaw River, Michigan, \$11,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, \$26,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Kenosha, Wisconsin, \$9,000.
 For the improvement of the Mississippi River above the Falls of Saint Anthony, \$20,000; no part of which shall be expended upon the Falls of Saint Anthony.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Charlevoix, Michigan, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Thunder Bay, Michigan, \$4,764.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Port Clinton, Ohio, \$5,000.
 For repair of piers at mouth of Black River, Ohio, \$6,000.
 For the improvement of the Fox and Wisconsin Rivers, \$300,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Erie, Pennsylvania, \$50,000.
 For the improvement of the breakwater at Block Island, Rhode Island, \$40,000.
 For the improvement of the Boston Harbor, Massachusetts, \$50,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Plymouth, Massachusetts, \$5,000.
 For the improvement of Little Narraganset Bay, Rhode Island and Connecticut, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of the Kennebec River, Maine, \$5,000.
 For the improvement of Belfast Harbor, Maine, \$8,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Rondout, New York, \$50,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Port Jefferson, Long Island, New York, \$6,000.
 For the improvement of the channel between Staten Island and New Jersey, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Provincetown, Massachusetts, \$4,000.
 For the construction of piers of Ice Harbor and removing obstructions at New Castle, Delaware, \$12,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor of refuge, Lake Huron, Michigan, including removal of the wreck of "The City of Buffalo," \$75,000.
 For the improvement of the Chippewa River, Wisconsin, \$15,000.
 For the improvement of the Wabash River, Indiana, \$70,000.
 For the improvement of the harbor at Calumet, Illinois, \$25,000.
 For the improvement of the Illinois River, Illinois, \$40,000.
 For the improvement of the Red River of the North, Minnesota, \$10,000.
 For the improvement of the Upper Mississippi River, \$30,000; and \$7,000 thereof may be applied in constructing the necessary machinery used in Captain Edward Bell's process for building wing-dams and applying said process in the improvement of said river.
 For the improvement of Rock Island Rapids, Mississippi River, \$30,000.
 For the improvement of the Mississippi, Missouri, and Arkansas Rivers, \$100,000: *Provided*, That \$40,000 of the above sum shall be expended on the Missouri River.
 For the improvement of the Mississippi River between the mouths of the Illinois and Ohio Rivers, (\$15,000 of which are to be expended between the mouths of the Illinois and Missouri Rivers, and \$30,000 of which are to be expended to prevent erosion and destruction of its banks between the foot of Dickey Island and the mouth of the Ohio River, and \$5,000 of which are to be expended to prevent erosion of its banks between islands No. 14 and No. 15, near the town of Kaskaskia, Illinois,) \$200,000.
 For removal of a bar in the Mississippi River opposite Dubuque, Iowa, \$15,000.
 For the improvement of the Ohio River, \$230,000.
 For the annual expense of gauging the waters of the Lower Mississippi and its tributaries, and for continuing observations of the rise and fall of the same, as required by joint resolution of February 21, 1871, \$5,000.
 For the improvement of the Tennessee River, \$300,000; \$15,000 of which are to be expended above Chattanooga, and the remaining \$285,000 are to be expended upon Muscle Shoals.
 To ascertain in current and next fiscal years, as required by act of March 3, 1875,

the depth of water and width of channel secured and maintained, from time to time, by James B. Eads, at South Pass of Mississippi River, and to enable the Secretary of War to report during the construction of the work the payments made from time to time and the probable times of other payments, and to report during the construction of the work all important facts relating to the progress of the same, materials used, and the character and permanency with which the said jetty and auxiliary works are being constructed, \$15,000.

For the construction of a canal around the cascades of the Columbia River in the State of Oregon, \$100,000; of which amount the Secretary of War is authorized to expend so much as in his judgment may be necessary and proper to secure title and right of way for canal and locks, not exceeding the sum of \$10,000; and when, in the prosecution of the said work, it shall have become necessary to obtain the right of way over any lands for the said canal and locks, the Secretary of War shall take possession of and use the said lands, after having purchased the same, or, in case the said lands cannot be purchased for a reasonable price, then after having paid for the same, or secured the value thereof, which value may be ascertained in the mode provided by the laws of Oregon for the condemnation of lands for public uses in that State. The Department of Justice shall represent the interests of the United States in any legal proceedings under this act to obtain the right of way for said canal.

For the improvement of the harbor at Racine, Wisconsin, \$9,000.

For the continuing of the work on the ship-channel in Galveston Bay, \$75,000.

For the improvement of the mouth of the Mississippi River, \$100,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall cease to be available when its necessity is superseded by any other work of improvement authorized by law.

It shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to apply the moneys herein appropriated as far as may be by contract, except when specific estimates cannot be made for the particular work, or where, in the judgment of said Secretary, the work cannot be contracted at prices advantageous to the Government, and except appropriations made for examinations and surveys; and such contracts shall be made after sufficient public advertisement for proposals, in such form and manner as the Secretary of War shall prescribe; and such contract shall be made with the lowest responsible bidders therefor, accompanied by such securities as the Secretary of War shall require.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to cause examinations or surveys, or both, to be made at the following points, namely:

Kentucky River, from the Three Forks of said river to Savannah, Georgia, via Cumberland Gap.

Cumberland River above Cumberland Falls, Kentucky.

Dan River, from Clarksville, Virginia, via Danville, Virginia, to Danbury, North Carolina; and Stanton River, from Roanoke, Virginia, to Brookneal, Virginia.

New River, from the lead mines in Wythe County, Virginia, to the mouth of Wilson in Grayson County, Virginia.

Tug Fork of Big Sandy River, Kentucky, and West Virginia.

Onancock Creek, Virginia.

Hunting Creek, Virginia.

Etowah River in Georgia, from Cooper's Iron-Works to Canton; and the south branch of said river, known as Little River, from its junction with the Etowah above Cooper's Iron-Works to the mouth of Cooper's Sandy Creek.

Tonawanda Harbor, New York, on the east branch of Niagara River, at the mouth of Tonawanda Creek, and extending north and south therefrom.

Sackett's Harbor, New York.

Harbor at Whitehall, at the south end of Lake Champlain, to procure twelve feet of water.

Bayou Bartholomew, Arkansas.

Saline River, Arkansas.

Upper Arkansas River, commencing at Kansas City, in the State of Kansas, to Fort Smith, in the State of Arkansas.

Holston River, Tennessee, commencing above the mouth of French Broad River, to Union, Tennessee.

Nolachucky River, Tennessee, from its mouth to Warrensburg.

Southflower River, Mississippi.

Paul River, Mississippi.

Big Black River, Mississippi.

Towne Creek, Monroe County, Mississippi.

Chattahoochee River, from Columbus, Georgia, to Thompson's Bridge.

Examination and survey of the harbor at Annapolis, Maryland, and an estimate of the cost of the removal of the bars at the entrance thereto.

Western branch of the Patapsco River, from Light Street Bridge to Elk Ridge Landing.

Pocomoke River, Maryland.

Great Choptank River, between Denton and Greensborough, Maryland.

Tread Haven Creek, at or near Easton Point, Talbot County, Maryland.

Slaughter Creek, near the mouth of Little Choptank River, Maryland.

Brown's Creek and Southeast Creek, Maryland.

Corsica Creek, Maryland.

Harbor at Leonardtown, Maryland.

Duck Creek, from its mouth to Smyrna Landing, Delaware.

Dover River, or Saint Jones's Creek, Delaware.

Murderkill Creek, Delaware.

Mispillion Creek, Delaware.

Brandywine River, Delaware.

Broad Creek, emptying in Nanticoke River, from its mouth to the town of Laurel in the State of Delaware.

Laurel Creek, Kentucky.

Harbor at San Luis Obispo.

Coos Bay, Oregon.

Coquille River, Oregon.

McKenzie River, Oregon, with a view of ascertaining the most practicable steamboat channel from the mouth of said river to the mouth of Mohawk River at Yarnels.

The channel in Black River between the Kennebec at Bath, Maine, and the Sheepscott River.

Songo River, and the channel leading from Long Lake to Sebago Lake, Maine.

Manistee River, from its mouth to Sherman, Wexford County, Michigan.

Survey and examination of the rocks in the channel of the Potomac River, between Georgetown, District of Columbia, and the new outlet-locks of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, and ascertaining cost of removing the same: *Provided*, The cost of such survey shall be paid by the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company.

From the Dalles of the Saint Croix River to Lake Superior in Minnesota, with a view to a water-route.

Port of Memphis, Tennessee, so as to ascertain what measures, if any, are necessary to protect the landings and wharf from further injury from the current of the Mississippi River, and the cost of the same.

Mouth of Dell River, Saint Clair County, Michigan.

Cohasset Harbor, Massachusetts.

Gloucester Harbor, Massachusetts.

Man-of-War Shoal at Boston, Massachusetts.

Breakwater at Fairweather Island, Connecticut.

Bayou Courtableau, from its mouth in the Atchafalaya River, to Washington, Louisiana, with estimates of the cost of removing obstructions in said bayou so as to give a sufficient depth of water to accommodate the steamboats traveling on the bayou.

A survey of that portion of the Monongahela and Alleghany Rivers lying within and along the boundaries of the city of Pittsburgh, which portion of said rivers is hereby placed under the direction of the engineer in charge of the Ohio River.

For continuing survey of Youghiogheny River, to continue the slack-water navigation up said river to the headwaters at the foot of the Alleghany Mountains, thence by canal to Cumberland, intersecting there the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal.

A survey to ascertain the practicability and cost of the construction of a seawall or breakwater for the protection of the city and harbor of Galveston, Texas, against storm floods from the Gulf of Mexico, to be paid for out of the appropriation for the survey of rivers and harbors.

A survey to ascertain the practicability and cost of the construction of a water-route for transportation from the mouth of Saint Mary's River on the borders of the States of Georgia and Florida through the Okefenokee Swamp, and through the State of Florida, to the most available and convenient point on the Gulf of Mexico; and that the sum of \$7,500 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated for that purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

A survey to ascertain the practicability and cost of a water-route from head of tide-water on the Patapsco River, Maryland, to head of tide-water on the eastern branch of the Potomac River, near the town of Bladensburg, Maryland.

To ascertain the practicability and cost of cutting a deep channel from the lower anchorage of the bay of Mobile to the city of Mobile, Alabama.

A survey to ascertain the cost and practicability of removing the obstructions in the Withlacoochee River, Florida.

An examination and survey to ascertain the cost and practicability of removing the obstructions at the entrance of the harbor of Pensacola, Florida, and of deepening the channel of Blackwater River between Pensacola and Milton, in said State.

A survey for a ship-channel through Galveston Bay, beginning at twelve feet water in the mouth of the San Jacinto River and running out of the mouth of said river east of Morgan's Point to the present channel, through Red Fish Bar; thence through the same, extending through Galveston Harbor, passing west of Half-Moon Shoals and Pelican Island, and to twelve feet water in Galveston Channel; and to cause an estimate of the cost of the same to be made, and of the comparative merits of the same, with the route to the head of Bolivar Channel; and of the effects of the completion of each of said channels on the Galveston Harbor as to shoaling or deepening the same, and report the same to Congress by the 1st day of December, 1876.

A resurvey and estimate of the cost of deepening the channel across the bar at the mouth of the Brazos River, Texas; and an estimate of the capacity of the harbor at the mouth of the Brazos, and its fitness for a harbor of refuge and naval station.

Harbors of Ashland and Bayfield in Wisconsin.

Chaumont Bay in Lake Ontario, New York.

The Missouri River, from the town of Saint Charles to the mouth of said Missouri River, with the view to protect the owners of land on the banks of said river, in Saint Charles County, Missouri, against the deflection and abrasion of the current of said river by reason of the erection of the Saint Charles bridge.

A survey and estimate of the damages, if any, done, or to be done, to riparian owners of lands, and improvements thereon, at or in front of the town of Venice, Illinois, near Saint Louis, Missouri, by reason of Government improvements made, or to be made, at or near said town of Venice.

Delaware River, near Cherry Island Flats.

Delaware River, near and between Petty's and Smith's Islands.

A survey, estimate, and report of the cost of a dike from the upper (north) end of the island known as Bloody Island, in the Mississippi River opposite the city of Saint Louis, Missouri, to the wing-dam opposite Brooklin, Illinois, and of the practicability and usefulness of such dike for improving said river and its harbors and for protecting the lands on the east bank of said river against overflow and the deflection and abrasion of the current of said river.

Survey of Red River above the raft to western boundary of the State of Arkansas.

Little River from its mouth to western boundary of Arkansas.

Survey of the Potomac River from Georgetown, District of Columbia, to the new outlet locks constructed on the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal.

Roanoke River, from Weldon, North Carolina, to Clarksville, Virginia.

Examination and survey of the Missouri River immediately above and at Nebraska City, Nebraska, with a view of determining what measures, if any, are necessary to be adopted to preserve the landing for steamboats and other vessels at said port.

And the sum of \$50,000 is hereby appropriated for such examinations and surveys and for incidental repairs of harbors for which there is no special appropriation provided by law: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War shall make an estimate of the total cost of the examinations and surveys herein provided for; and in case the sum herein appropriated should prove insufficient to complete said examinations and surveys, only such rivers and harbors shall be examined and surveyed as, in his judgment, are most important.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] to the substitute offered by the Senator from Vermont, [Mr. EDMUNDS.]

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should be glad to have the Senator from Iowa explain to us the general scope of this amendment, the amount of money that is appropriated by it, and how far it differs from the bill as amended by the Senate in Committee of the Whole; and, having done that, I should like to ask him some questions about some of the particular items that are contained in it.

Mr. ALLISON. I will endeavor briefly to comply with the request of the Senator from Vermont. The bill as it now stands in Committee of the Whole, striking out the amendments proposed by the Committee on Appropriations where those amendments reduced the amounts of the appropriation and inserting the recommendations of the committee where the amounts were increased, appropriates \$6,759,014.

Mr. HOWE. Does the Senator mean the bill or the substitute?

Mr. ALLISON. I mean the bill as it stands now, without the adoption of the substitute, the Senate in Committee of the Whole having rejected all the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations in one respect and accepted their recommendations in another respect. The substitute which I propose will appropriate \$5,271,664, or a reduction of the bill as it now stands of \$1,487,350.

Mr. MERRIMON. How does it compare with the House bill?

Mr. ALLISON. It is a reduction of the House bill of over \$600,000.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should like to ask the Senator, if I do not disturb him, as to one or two items in this substitute, because I have had no means of comparison with the time I have had. Taking the item on page 3, line 51, for the improvement of the harbor at San-

dusky City, Ohio, which I remember was a disputed item in the Senate, how does that stand as compared with the amendment made by the Senate as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. ALLISON. For the harbor at Sandusky City the Senate increased the amount recommended by the committee \$5,000, making it \$30,000. In my substitute I reduce the amount \$5,000.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Just as the committee reported it?

Mr. ALLISON. Just as the committee reported it. The same is true with respect to Cleveland, Ohio; I reduce the amount there \$25,000; that is, from \$75,000 to \$50,000. I do this on the faith of the engineer in charge, who says these sums will enable him to get on very well with these two harbors for the present year.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I made the inquiry for the sole purpose of information.

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly; I understand it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should like my honorable friend in charge of the bill to turn to page 5, line 97, &c.:

For the improvement of the Great Kanawha River, West Virginia, including the purchase of sites for dams and locks, not exceeding \$15,000, \$250,000.

How does that compare?

Mr. ALLISON. That is a reduction of \$50,000 from the amount appropriated by the House.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Then in the next paragraph:

For removal of Beaver and Nailor Bend rocks, and for cleaning out snags and fallen trees.

I think the word "fallen" ought to be stricken out so as to take the standing trees as well; but that I cannot move just now.

In the Little Kanawha, West Virginia, \$7,300.

How does that compare?

Mr. ALLISON. The Committee on Appropriations recommended that amendment.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Just that sum?

Mr. ALLISON. Just that sum; and the Senate adopted it. That is just the sum that the engineer reports is necessary to clean out the Little Kanawha River for a distance of forty-six miles and enable them to get coal, &c., down that river into the Big Kanawha. For further particulars I refer the Senator from Vermont to the Senator from West Virginia, [Mr. DAVIS.]

Mr. EDMUNDS. Just as they say at the shows, "for further particulars inquire within."

Mr. CHRISTIANCY. "See small bills."

Mr. EDMUNDS. "See small bills;" that is it. It would not be necessary to look at this bill in order to see one of that character. On page 8, line 182, there is this item:

For the improvement of New River from the lead mines in Wythe County, Virginia, to the mouth of the Greenbrier River, West Virginia, \$15,000.

How does that item now stand in the bill as agreed upon in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. ALLISON. I reduce it \$10,000. It stands in Committee of the Whole \$25,000.

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask the Senator, if I do not trespass too much upon his knowledge of geography, to tell me if this improvement of New River goes up from the lead mines to the mouth of the Greenbrier or down from the lead mines to the mouth of the Greenbrier?

Mr. ALLISON. I infer that it must run with the course of the river, down.

Mr. EDMUNDS. You think that the appropriation runs with the stream?

Mr. ALLISON. I think it must run from the lead mines down to the mouth of the Greenbrier, as I think New River flows into the Greenbrier; but I refer to my honorable friend from Virginia.

Mr. WITHERS. I will state that these lead mines are about two hundred and fifty or three hundred miles south of where the Greenbrier runs into New River.

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask the Senator from Virginia, while we are on that point, what is the present size of New River at the lead mines, in Wythe County?

Mr. WITHERS. About the size of the Potomac River at Georgetown.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It is a very good river, then. I suppose that no Senator will suppose I am wasting time; but I think as this involves some millions we all have a right to know what little we can about it. On page 9, lines 195 to 197 inclusive, I see this item:

For removing bowlders and snags in Big Sandy River, Kentucky and West Virginia, including Louisa Fork, Virginia, \$15,000.

Will the Senator give us what information he has on that subject as compared with the bill as it now stands in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. ALLISON. That is not changed. We had such a practical expression of opinion about the Big Sandy, particularly Louisa Fork, that I did not change it, for fear I might lose a vote for the amendment. The engineers report that that improvement will be very valuable in the Big Sandy River. It is really not a waste of money.

Mr. EDMUNDS. But how about Louisa Fork?

Mr. ALLISON. Louisa Fork is a small portion of the river. The appropriation will chiefly, of course, be expended on the Big Sandy.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Why so?

Mr. ALLISON. Because the engineers so desire, and so recommend, and I have no doubt will so do.

Mr. EDMUNDS. What is Louisa Fork? Will the Senator be good enough to tell us? Is it a part of the river or an affluent of it?

Mr. WITHERS. It is one of the forks of the Big Sandy River. Any information the Senator desires in regard to it I think I can furnish.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I wish the Senator would tell us.

Mr. WITHERS. The Tug Fork is one of the forks of the Big Sandy and the Louisa Fork is the other fork. I will also state to the Senator as a little curious piece of history that the Louisa Fork was originally *Le Visé* Fork, or the "survey" fork, of the Big Sandy River, and the name has been corrupted first into Eliza Fork and now into Louisa Fork.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That of course would justify the appropriation.

Mr. WITHERS. Just as much as the fitting up of a flotilla on Lake Champlain would justify an appropriation for Otter Creek.

Mr. ALLISON. I think I misled the Senator from Vermont. I think I reduced the Big Sandy \$10,000 from what it appears in the bill as it now stands.

Mr. EDMUNDS. If the Senator has reduced the appropriation and has not reduced the fork, I think the bill may be considered as safe; for the fork evidently would not bear much reduction. On page 9, lines 205 and 206, there is this item:

For the improvement of Rush Chute and the harbor of Burlington, Iowa, \$10,000.

How does that stand compared with the bill?

Mr. ALLISON. It stands just as it does in the bill.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Will the Senator kindly tell us what Rush Chute is?

Mr. ALLISON. With the greatest pleasure. Rush Chute is a narrow channel of the river on the west side of the Mississippi River, a mile or two above Burlington.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It is a part of the Mississippi River?

Mr. ALLISON. It is a part of the Mississippi River. The water flows in there and makes a bar by crossing over to the east shore at Burlington Harbor. The object is to close that chute and thus throw the water into a different direction.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Then on pages 11 and 12:

For the improvement of the harbor of refuge, Lake Huron, Michigan, including removal of the wreck of The City of Buffalo, \$75,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move to indefinitely postpone this bill. Will the Chair be good enough to state the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion made by the Senator from Vermont to indefinitely postpone the bill.

Mr. COOPER. I ask if that motion is in order?

Mr. EDMUNDS. I will take my seat when a question of order is made, until it is decided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair overrules the point of order. The Senator from Vermont will proceed.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I beg Senators to believe, and I think they will justify me in saying so, that as far as I have gone the inquiries I have made are fair and proper by way of explanation. If under the five-minute rule on a substitute of this kind, which covers the whole question, we are to be cut off with five minutes, then I for one feel perfectly justified in a lawful way in taking measures that will enable me to understand the proposition submitted. So much to my honorable friend from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was compelled to call the Senator's attention to the expiration of his time.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The Chair was perfectly correct. I beg the Chair not to suppose I was reflecting on him in the slightest degree. I was only addressing myself to my uneasy friend from Tennessee, who does not seem desirous that this substitute shall be inquired into.

Mr. COOPER. If the motion is in order, I have no remarks to make.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Exactly; but the Senator ought to have known; and he has found out.

Mr. COOPER. I have, and therefore I have yielded.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is right. Therefore we will begin again if we are all in order. On pages 11 and 12 I was inquiring of the Senator from Iowa to explain about this wreck of the City of Buffalo, for a question of this kind was once up on the subject of a wreck in the harbor of New York which has led my attention to this item.

Mr. ALLISON. In the first place, at this point I reduce the amount \$25,000. The amount as it stands now in the bill is \$100,000. This provision in relation to the wreck of The City of Buffalo is now in the bill, and it is there by the recommendation of the Bureau of Engineers, for the reason that, as they understand the law, a mere appropriation for the improvement of a harbor does not authorize them to remove the wreck of a vessel. This vessel was wrecked at this precise point and is very much in the way, and must be removed.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Yes; but what I wish to get at (and what drew my attention to the subject is an old case of this sort) is whether this wreck being removed and raised it is for the benefit of the owners of the vessel, or whether it is merely to be blotted out and destroyed as a thing that has been abandoned by the owners; whether like a snag or any other thing that obstructs commerce it is to be dis-

posed of, or whether some private party or corporation is to have the benefit of this appropriation. That is what I want to get at.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that inasmuch as this came to us from the Engineer Bureau it never occurred to me that there was a private job in it. It may be possible there is, but if so I know nothing about it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Of course I should know that.

Mr. ALLISON. I made no inquiry beyond the point that the Engineer Bureau stated that it was necessary to insert these words in order to enable them to use this money for this purpose, as otherwise perhaps the law would not authorize them to do it. I do not know what will be done with this wreck when it is raised. It may be in the interest of some private parties. If so, I trust that some Senator who knows it will state the fact.

Mr. FERRY. I should like, if the Senator from Vermont will allow me, to ask the Senator from Iowa if the sum of \$100,000 was not appropriated last year for this harbor of refuge aside from any wreck?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. FERRY. And does not the bill as it passed the House appropriate \$100,000 for this place of refuge?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That does not touch the point of my inquiry in respect of which the committee has no information. Here is a vessel that appears to be sunk at that harbor, or at its entrance, or somewhere, that is in the way and has to be removed.

Mr. CHRISTIANCY. The appropriation is both for raising it and removing it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. They are to remove it, and you cannot conveniently remove it until you raise it, ordinarily. Therefore, my inquiry was devoted to ascertaining (if it is not invidious to anybody to know the just grounds upon which it rests) if this wreck be still, as many wrecks are, not abandoned by the owners but by the underwriters as mere derelict and gone, like any other obstruction that belongs to nobody, or whether this sum of money, \$75,000, or so much as may be necessary, for there is no discretion as to the two items, may be appropriated under this wicked and corrupt Administration that so much has been said about, to raising a sunken vessel, a steamer I should infer from the name of it, for the benefit of the proprietors and furnish at public expense a great private advantage to them. I have no information about it, and therefore I merely ask for information.

Mr. ALLISON. I prefer to strike the clause out rather than to have any question about it. I only know what the engineer said. It did not occur to me for a single moment that there was any private interest in it. I prefer to modify my substitute by striking it out.

Mr. FERRY. I do not know anything about it, but it seems to me, if there is a wreck, it is very just and necessary to remove it in order to make that harbor available; that it is as necessary to remove it as any other obstacle. It is a wreck lying there valueless, so far as I know. I have no information particularly except that which comes in the way mentioned by the Senator from Iowa, from the engineers.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is one of the misfortunes that my friend bears in company with the rest of us, because he is not of "the body of the people." If he were, he would of course know all about this work. I, not being of "the body of the people," according to his constitutional theories, do not know anything about it myself, and it was in order to get information that I put the inquiry. It may be a perfectly proper work. I have no reason to doubt it or to believe it. All I want is information.

Mr. ALLISON. I have the information now, if the Senator will hear it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us have it.

Mr. ALLISON. I will either strike out the clause or leave it in, as the Senator prefers. I ask the Clerk to read the letters which I send to the desk.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1876.

SIR: On the 17th of November, 1875, Major Weitzel, Corps of Engineers, reported to this office that a vessel had been wrecked during a severe storm on September 10, 1875, in the harbor of refuge at Sand Beach, on Lake Huron.

The wreck lying in such a position as to seriously obstruct navigation, the question as to whether its removal could be required of the owners was submitted to the honorable the Attorney-General of the United States, who gave the opinion that the case was not of a character to warrant the institution of proceedings against the owners.

From the inclosed copy of a communication, dated 26th of April last, from Major Weitzel, it will be seen that he desires to be informed whether, in the event of an appropriation being made at the present session of Congress for continuing the work at the harbor of refuge, any portion of it could be applied to the removal of the wreck in question, which not only seriously obstructs the navigation of the harbor, but materially interferes with the economical prosecution of the work of improving it. In order to settle the question as to the propriety of applying any portion of the appropriation to the removal of the wreck, it is respectfully suggested that the matter be brought to the attention of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate of the United States, with a view to securing such an amendment to the item in the river and harbor act containing the appropriation for the harbor of refuge on Lake Huron as will authorize an expenditure of a sufficient amount for that purpose. A sketch of the harbor, showing the position of the wreck, is inclosed.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

A. A. HUMPHREYS,
Brigadier-General and Chief of Engineers.

Hon. ALPHONSO TAFT,
Secretary of War.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Now let us hear the report of the Attorney-General on the state of the case.

The CHIEF CLERK. There is nothing here from the Attorney-General; there is a letter from the Secretary of War:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington City, July 8, 1876.

SIR: I have the honor to invite the attention of your committee to the inclosed letter of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 3, 1876, in regard to the harbor of refuge at Sand Beach, on Lake Huron, and have respectfully to suggest that the item in the river and harbor act containing an appropriation for the harbor of refuge on Lake Huron be so amended as to authorize an expenditure of a sufficient amount for the purpose of removing the wreck of the City of Buffalo in that harbor, which the Chief of Engineers reports not only seriously obstructs the navigation of the harbor, but materially interferes with the economical prosecution of the work of improving it.

It was the intention to forward the inclosed letter on the day it was written. The delay is the result of an oversight, and has just been discovered.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. D. CAMERON,
Secretary of War.

Hon. ROSCOE CONKLING,
Chairman Committee on Commerce, United States Senate.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I greatly regret that we have not the opinion of the Attorney-General stating the facts about this thing to show whether this is still a valuable stranded vessel which when removed and lifted out of the sand is going to be taken possession of by its private owners or not, and the grounds upon which it proceeds. There is certainly nothing in the paper which leads to the inference that anything improper about it exists. At the same time there are so many cases of this character occurring over the United States that I thought it due to the Senate to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to it. It may be perfectly correct. If it were perfectly correct there would be some difficulty in proving that the improvement of the harbor did not cover the removal of this wreck, which had been abandoned by its owners and which has become like a snag, or a bowlder, or a sand-bar, a mere abandoned obstruction to commerce. The mere fact of putting this clause in would seem to imply that it was doubtful whether it was to be removed for the benefit of the private owners or whether it ought to be removed at their expense, on the other hand, as something that still had a material value when taken out of that place. I have no knowledge on the subject, and calling the attention of my friend to it I of course have no observations to submit upon it.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senator from Vermont whether it ought to be stricken out or remain in?

Mr. EDMUNDS. I do say, speaking as a Senator, that I do not think we ought to provide specifically for removing a thing that if it be an abandoned thing, and a mere general obstruction, would fall within the general bill, unless we know particularly the grounds upon which the Attorney-General proceeds.

Mr. ALLISON. Then I move that the clause be stricken out.

Mr. EDMUNDS. In justice to all the parties, I want to repeat that I know of no circumstance which gives any ground for probable belief that there is any job about it. It is just to everybody to say that. I only want to call attention to it.

Mr. CHRISTIANCY. If the Senator will allow me, he has all the information that any other Senator has in regard to it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I have not the least doubt about it. I hope neither of my honorable friends supposes for a moment that I thought they were withholding any information; far from it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa modifies the amendment to the amendment by striking out in lines 263 and 264 the words "including removal of the wreck of The City of Buffalo."

Mr. EDMUNDS. Now I ask the attention of the Senator from Iowa to page 14, line 322 to the end of the paragraph, about the locks, &c., at the cascades of the Columbia River in the State of Oregon, which so far as I know are a proper subject of public improvement. Of course I do not know that this particular sum can be wisely expended this year, but in that great river I have no reason to doubt that the improvement of those cascades is a proper object. What I wish to call the attention of the Senator in charge to is whether the phraseology that he has adopted in respect of condemning private property is one that will work in practice and stand the test of the courts of law?

Mr. ALLISON. I did not examine the subject with very great care. It is precisely the provision inserted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] in open session. I noticed the Senator from Vermont paid particular attention to the provision and made no special objection to it. I concluded, therefore, that it was a proper provision, and I copied it and inserted it here.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I have made no special objection to anything. I did not notice that it would do any particular good.

Mr. KELLY. Will the Senator from Vermont allow me to explain that provision?

Mr. EDMUNDS. Certainly.

Mr. KELLY. I can by turning to the last volume of the Statutes at Large produce a clause in relation to the condemnation of property for the Fox River improvement which is nearly identical, not altogether the same, but this is merely changed so as to suit the circumstances of the case where they differ from that.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I only call attention to it not because I propose any amendment or make any criticisms upon it, but as being one of

the people responsible with the vast mass of us here, when this bill comes to pass—and I suppose it will some day—for this sort of legislation. I should be sorry to have anybody suppose that I believed this particular provision as it stands would be in point of law adequate to the end that is in view. That is all.

All the rest of this bill is about surveys, and I do not wish to waste the time of the Senate in going through with them. Many of them, as was pointed out before, are for objects, on the most latitudinal construction of the Constitution and the powers of Congress, obviously outside of its constitutional authority; and if it were in order, so as to bring my friend's proposition down to its real merits upon these appropriations for improvements and continuing work, I would move to strike out the second section, so as to leave us to pass upon the first section upon the real merit or want of it that the first section and the principal part of the bill may provide.

Mr. ANTHONY. Can you not divide the amendment?

Mr. EDMUNDS. I do not know, as my friend from Rhode Island suggests, but that we may be authorized—I rather think we may be—to divide this question, as the amendment is in two distinct sections, although I am not particularly sure about that, it being an amendment to strike out and insert.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator will take note of the last clause of the second section in line 361. I think a few moments would so modify that last clause as to cover the point made by the Senator, because there the Secretary of War is required to make an estimate of all these rivers and harbors. I think myself it would be much better to have a fund placed in the hands of the Secretary of War to make such surveys of rivers and harbors as, in his judgment, ought to be surveyed.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is quite a different proposition from what is here contained.

Mr. ALLISON. I know it is.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Would not the Senator for the time being, to avoid the doubtful question of order about dividing one whole amendment, just withdraw the second section of his amendment; and when the first section is disposed of he can offer it again and we can get a vote on it in that way separately?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, sir; I will do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa is so modified.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I understand the Senator from Iowa withdraws the second section for the time being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. EDMUNDS called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. FERRY. Let us understand the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa in the first place offered the printed amendment as a whole, as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont. He has now modified it by withdrawing the section relating to surveys. He offers the residue of the amendment as an amendment to the substitute offered by the Senator from Vermont, and that is the pending question.

Mr. FERRY. The question is on that amendment as modified?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the question.

Mr. BOGY. On the first section. There are two sections.

Mr. FERRY. As I understand, Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa has modified his substitute by withdrawing that part of it which pertains to surveys.

Mr. ALLISON. Temporarily only, for the moment, in order to take the question separately.

Mr. FERRY. Is it the intention of the Senator from Iowa to propose the second section as part of the bill?

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. FERRY. Then why not try the whole now?

Mr. ALLISON. I wanted to accommodate my friend from Vermont, and I did not know but that I could in a few moments modify the second section so as to make it more acceptable.

Mr. FERRY. I desire to ask upon what basis or theory the Senator from Iowa has so modified his proposition as to take from Michigan some \$97,000? As I see by the bill, the reduction of his proposition is \$600,000, which would be 10 per cent. from the bill as reported by the committee. The amount taken from the State of Michigan is over 20 per cent., and from national works, so considered during the debate. I ask that question for information.

Mr. ALLISON. I would say in reply to the Senator that in making the deductions which I made in this substitute I looked upon a reduction of the appropriations for the Sault Ste. Marie Canal and the harbor of refuge as no detriment to the State of Michigan, the Senator from Michigan himself having stated on the floor that these were national improvements in their character and not local, and therefore should not be charged to Michigan. I regard them as national improvements in their character. The season is far spent; we are nearly up to the 1st of August. This harbor of refuge is situated in the northern portion of Michigan, and I think that \$75,000 perhaps is as much as they can properly expend, comparing that with the season of last year when they had the entire summer. I can assure the Senator from Michigan that there was not the slightest idea of dis-

turbing the harmonies of this bill with reference to the several States. I look upon these items as great national works in which the Senator from Michigan had as much interest as other Senators and no more.

Mr. FERRY. That is true, and I have so regarded them; but in the course of this debate there has been a persistent effort to attach to Michigan and place on Michigan all these amounts so as to swell the aggregate of the appropriations to that State. That has been the effect and the tendency of those who have advocated a reduction of this bill, and for that reason I felt it my duty, as it is my privilege, to ask the Senator, inasmuch as he has framed this substitute, on what basis it proceeds. As I understand the principle on which the committee's action was based it was cutting down local appropriations rather than national ones. Now I see that the only two national improvements in the broadest sense connected with the State of Michigan are cut down, one \$50,000, and the other \$75,000. It was for the purpose of gaining that information that I interrogated the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COOPER, (when Mr. STEVENSON's name was called.) The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STEVENSON] desired me to announce that he is paired with the Senator from Georgia, [Mr. GORDON.] The Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea" on this question, and the Senator from Georgia "nay."

Mr. DAVIS, (when Mr. CAPERTON's name was called.) My colleague [Mr. CAPERTON] is paired with the Senator from Ohio, [Mr. THURMAN.] If present my colleague would vote "nay," and I think the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea." They are both sick.

The roll-call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 17, nays 22; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Allison, Anthony, Booth, Boutwell, Cameron of Wisconsin, Cragin, Dawes, Frelinghuysen, Hamlin, Howe, Logan, McMillan, Morrill, Oglesby, Paddock, Windom, and Wright—17.

NAYS—Messrs. Barnum, Bogy, Christiancy, Cockrell, Conover, Cooper, Davis, Dennis, Ferry, Hamilton, Ingalls, Jones of Florida, Kelly, Kernan, Key, Maxey, Merrimon, Mitchell, Norwood, Ransom, Spencer, and Withers—22.

ABSENT—Messrs. Alcorn, Bayard, Bruce, Burnside, Cameron of Pennsylvania, Caperton, Clayton, Conkling, Dorsey, Eaton, Edmunds, Goldthwaite, Gordon, Harvey, Hitchcock, Johnston, Jones of Nevada, McCreery, McDonald, Morton, Patterson, Randolph, Robertson, Sargent, Saulsbury, Sharon, Sherman, Stevenson, Thurman, Wadleigh, Wallace, West, and Whyte—33.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair believes the Senator from Vermont withdrew the motion to indefinitely postpone.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the substitute offered by the Senator from Vermont, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. LOGAN. I was in hopes this bill could be so arranged that I could vote for it because there are some appropriations in it for my own State, and I believe that is the reason that most people vote for bills of this character; I do not know any other. But, without committing myself, I want to call the attention of the Senate to the proposition that the Senate has just refused to strike out. There are six pages, and supposing there to be ten items to a page there are sixty new surveys provided for in this bill of different harbors, sluices, creeks, spring branches, and duck puddles I could name—I dislike to do it, however—some of these rivers and creeks that I have crossed over myself; some of them I have jumped across, and if I did not I made my horse do it. The idea of providing for sixty or seventy surveys for the purpose of laying out a large margin for the next Congress to appropriate probably two or three million dollars, or a million at least, to be expended on these streams that will be surveyed during the year merely to get them started for the purpose of large expenditure of money, I do not think is proper legislation.

Mr. SPENCER. Will the Senator from Illinois allow me to interrupt him a moment? If he will read the latter part of the section he will notice that only \$50,000 is appropriated for surveys.

Mr. LOGAN. It would make no difference if it was only five cents, if that was sufficient to commence the surveys, the meaning of it would be to complete the work, which would cost millions of dollars; and there is hardly an item mentioned in these new surveys that is worth the attention of this country at all. The idea of surveying some of the little streams mentioned here in different parts of the country, that almost every one who knows anything about the country is conversant with—the idea of surveying them for navigable streams to float the commerce of this country upon, is absurd and ridiculous. It is only the entering-wedge to large appropriations. It is an outrage, and if it was not that nearly every Senator has got an appropriation in this bill for some creek or river in his own State, it could not get five votes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. President, I recognize the Senator from Iowa as the captain of this ship to-night, and I sail under his orders. I would suggest, as we are just upon the edge of a quorum and the bill is a very important one, whether we had not better adjourn until Monday. I make the suggestion to him and shall follow his wishes.

Mr. ALLISON. If we could vote on Monday without debate, as I think we all understand this bill pretty well, I should be very glad to do it.

Several SENATORS. Finish the bill now.

Mr. ANTHONY. You cannot pass it to-night.

Mr. ALLISON. Perhaps we can go on a little while longer.

Mr. WINDOM. What is the amount named in the amendment of the Senator from Vermont?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four million dollars.

Mr. WINDOM. I move to amend by making it \$5,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment has already been offered and rejected by the Senate.

Mr. WINDOM. I move, then, to make it \$5,200,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is in order. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont to make the amount \$5,200,000.

Mr. COCKRELL. What has become of the second section of this bill? Is that out of the way?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is out of the way.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It is not out of the way; it is in the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. It will be in the way again after a while.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from Illinois made objection to it. I suppose we had better vote on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WINDOM] to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$5,200,000."

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the substitute offered by the Senator from Vermont, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEY, (when his name was called.) On this question I am paired with the Senator from Nebraska, [Mr. HITCHCOCK.] If he were here he would vote "yea," and I should vote "nay."

Mr. NORWOOD, (when Mr. GORDON's name was called.) On this question my colleague [Mr. GORDON] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky, [Mr. STEVENSON.] If present my colleague would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kentucky "yea."

The roll-call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 12, nays 26; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Allison, Anthony, Booth, Cragin, Dawes, Edmunds, Hamlin, Logan, Morrill, Paddock, Wadleigh, and Wright—12.

NAYS—Messrs. Barnum, Bogy, Boutwell, Cameron of Wisconsin, Christiancy, Cockrell, Conover, Cooper, Davis, Dennis, Ferry, Hamilton, Howe, Ingalls, Jones of Florida, Kelly, Kernan, McMillan, Maxey, Merrimon, Mitchell, Norwood, Ransom, Spencer, Windom, and Withers—26.

ABSENT—Messrs. Alcorn, Bayard, Bruce, Burnside, Cameron of Pennsylvania, Caperton, Clayton, Conkling, Dorsey, Eaton, Frelinghuysen, Goldthwaite, Gordon, Harvey, Hitchcock, Johnston, Jones of Nevada, Key, McCreery, McDonald, Morton, Oglesby, Patterson, Randolph, Robertson, Sargent, Saulsbury, Sharon, Sherman, Stevenson, Thurman, Wallace, West, and Whyte—34.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I offer the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill and insert:

That the sum of \$5,500,000 is hereby appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1877, to be expended for the repair, extension, preservation, and completion of works for the improvement of rivers and harbors under the direction of the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to cause such expenditures to be made so as to best subserve the interests of commerce; and he is required to report to Congress, at the opening of its December session, all expenditures made under the provisions of this act up to that time in detail.

Mr. President, I have only to say that this amendment is the same as the Senate has just disagreed to, except that it increases the sum, in order to reach the evident wishes of those Senators who are strongest for reform and the diminution of expenses, by the amount of a million and a half of dollars, while it is still three or four hundred thousand dollars below the reformatory measure, as it may be called, that came from the House of Representatives. I hope that everybody will vote for it who has the real interest of economy and the best interest of the public service at heart, because I wish again, in all seriousness, to call the attention of Senators to the well-known fact that in the time of a republican administration—and I do not refer to it to provoke political discussion, but only to say that when both Houses were republican and things were going, as our friends on the other side would say, with a flowing hand, and there was no House of Representatives to criticise in the hostile sense, as there is now, an appropriation of two or three million dollars was made in precisely these terms when a difficulty like that now existing had arisen; and the event proved as everybody agrees—I never heard it questioned at all—that this responsible expenditure in the responsible discretion of the proper department for these public works much better subserved the public interest and in the end everybody in all the States was better satisfied than they were by this little arrangement by States, "You give me and I will give you," and all that sort of thing that these bills are made up on. Therefore I appeal to gentlemen of all parties to do this wise and proper thing, if we can go up to that sum, and it seems the Senate is determined that we shall.

Mr. WITHERS. Will the Senator please say why, if that system operated so beneficially, it was abandoned the very next year and the old system substituted for it?

Mr. EDMUNDS. I will state why, with my due share of mortification and humiliation and confession and shame, it is that according to human observation and human experience it was not quite so handy for people running for members of Congress not to have in

their own control in a bill a certain sum of money to be spent in their districts, and that refers as well to republicans as democrats, for human nature is just the same. Whenever, therefore, a bill that has a show of decency on its face is made up by items of congressional districts, it goes through; and when it gets so bad that nobody can stand it, then we do the other thing, and we get better public service and better satisfaction to everybody except the candidate for some office.

Mr. KERNAN. I cannot vote for this amendment of five and a half millions or four millions, because I do not think it wise or proper legislation to appropriate that amount of money to be expended according to the discretion of one man.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I have a word to say upon that, if the Senate will pardon me. The discretion of one man in respect of appropriations, if you call it one man, as it is not, has been practiced from the foundation of the Government; and for many years after the Government was founded the leading appropriations were made in bulk to be expended by the Secretaries and heads of the various Departments for foreign intercourse and for the administration of the Treasury, just as now for the administration of the Treasury there is a permanent appropriation for the collections of the customs revenues that runs up I do not know how high. My friend from Massachusetts can say, probably, but one or two or three millions every year, that Congress does not have anything to do with it at all; and it is no republican idea; it has been so always; and yet, in the main, everybody agrees it is the best way of providing, instead of saying that each custom-house for each district and port shall have so many men in it, and the money shall be expended in a certain way. So my friend from New York, I think, is not just in suggesting that this is an innovation on the custom, because practice has shown the reverse to be true.

Mr. HOWE. I wish to add one word to what the Senator from Vermont has remarked. We call every year on the very Department which is to have charge of these expenditures for estimates of the amount of money they want and the localities where that money is to be expended, and they tell us year after year. They call for more money than the representatives of the people think they can afford to expend in any year. Undoubtedly the capacity of the Engineer Corps is equal to expending more money than we can afford to appropriate in any one year. So this proposition is to limit the amount which we will apply to this work this year; and I want to say, for one, that I am perfectly willing to refer to the professional and the political responsibility of the officers at the head of the Engineer Corps for the expenditure of every dollar that is to be expended in the State of Wisconsin. I am willing to abide by their judgment. Therefore I shall vote for this amendment.

Mr. LOGAN. I have not taken up much of the time of the Senate on this bill, but I desire now to call the attention of the Senate again to this proposition. I see that it is a foregone conclusion, perhaps, what disposition is to be made of this bill. Where you find one side of the Chamber voting solid, with nearly each one perhaps having some particular favorite measure that induces him to do so, irrespective perhaps of that which would be generally beneficial to the country, and the other side dividing, it is perfectly natural to suppose that the bill will pass; but, before it does, I wish to give my reasons for voting for the proposition of the Senator from Vermont, which I shall do when my name is called.

I have counted in the brief time that I have been sitting here since I was last on the floor the new surveys that are proposed by the bill. I have figured along very rapidly and perhaps have not counted accurately; but about seventy will be found to be the number of the new surveys that are to be put in operation during the present year under this bill. Precisely one-fourth of the space of the bill is occupied with provisions for new surveys. An appropriation of \$50,000, which is a very small amount it is true, is in this bill for that purpose. It may be said, or is said by some, that that is a small amount; but that amount is to be expended for the purpose of ascertaining if these creeks, spring branches, and ponds can be made navigable by any expenditure of money. That is the meaning of it. I have voted for appropriation bills, but I have always deemed it proper to vote for appropriations for the repair of harbors or the improvement of rivers that were navigable, that were of such a character as would be naturally advantageous to the commerce of the country; but when we undertake to make rivers, to dig out small streams in order to make rivers, we are going beyond that which was ever contemplated by the Constitution, and certainly beyond that which is proper and good legislation.

In the State of Illinois we have not been very fortunate in having appropriations. There is an appropriation in this bill for the Mississippi River, that bounds one side of the State which I in part represent, and there is an appropriation in it for the Illinois River. Until very recently the Illinois River has been improved by appropriations of our own people, and is now being improved by appropriations by the Legislature of our State. I venture the assertion that the Illinois River bears more commerce upon its bosom than every item that is mentioned in these seventy surveys all put together; but still we never asked an appropriation from the General Government for it. There is a small amount here for the purpose of carrying out the estimates in reference to that river; because at the time the Senator from Vermont mentions, when the Secretary of War distributed the

gross appropriation, a small amount was given to the Illinois River because it was for the continuation of work that had been commenced. Work had commenced on the Illinois River a number of years ago under Joseph Johnston, well known in confederate circles, or at least on a report made by him, and on that ground a small amount of money was used for that purpose. The engineers have been doing some work on it, and a small appropriation is in this bill for that river now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LOGAN. I move to postpone the bill indefinitely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois moves to postpone the bill indefinitely.

Mr. LOGAN. I ask the privilege of the Senate to detain them a moment longer. If I had the time, if time was given, I would go over these several items, and call the attention of Senators to them, and I would ask Senators to state as Senators on this floor what the character of these streams is that are to be surveyed. Some of them I know myself and some of them I could name, but I do not wish to do so, that I do not believe you could float a flat-boat down, drawing only eighteen inches of water, in the highest water ever produced in them; some of them only have water in a heavy rain-storm, as I said the other day, to any great extent. Some of the streams in the South mentioned here I know something about. I have crossed them myself, and they are considerable streams; but the idea that they should be surveyed now for the purpose of getting appropriations at the next session for their improvement at the hands of the very men who are talking about economy and the reduction of taxation, is very strange to me. We ought not to appropriate one dollar in this bill except for such works as have already been surveyed.

The Engineer Department recommended to this Congress that we appropriate \$14,000,000—for what? Fourteen million dollars for the purpose of continuing the work on rivers and harbors already surveyed, not for new surveys. Now, we propose to give them, instead of \$14,000,000, \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000, merely to continue the work, and then to add some seventy-odd surveys more in order that their estimate may be a great deal larger next year. If that is economy, I do not understand it. If that is proper legislation, I do not understand it. I will vote to give into the hands of the Secretary of War this amount of money, and rely upon his judgment and the judgment of the Engineer Corps, upon whose recommendations this bill is based, that this money shall be distributed in the places where it is needed; and that where it is not needed not one dollar shall be spent. These are my reasons. I withdraw the motion to postpone indefinitely.

Mr. WINDOM. I do not know but that there is a misapprehension as to this provision for surveys. Certainly there is not so much in it as the Senator from Illinois seems to indicate.

Mr. LOGAN. There will be a good deal in it before you get through with it.

Mr. WINDOM. I have the floor. The appropriation is for \$50,000 for such examinations and surveys as the Secretary of War shall deem most important. With that proviso, it did not seem very material to the committee how many surveys were named, for only those that are most important in the estimation of the Secretary of War will be surveyed. I will read the whole provision:

And the sum of \$50,000 is hereby appropriated for such examinations and surveys, and for incidental repairs of harbors for which there is no special appropriation provided for by law.

So that the whole \$50,000 is not for surveys, but a portion for harbors:

Provided, That the Secretary of War shall make an estimate of the total cost of the examinations and surveys herein provided for; and in case the sum herein appropriated shall prove insufficient to complete said examinations and surveys, only such rivers and harbors shall be examined and surveyed as, in his judgment, are most important.

Now the honorable Senator from Illinois has great confidence in the Secretary of War. If he is willing to place the whole amount of five and a half millions in his discretion, certainly he ought to be willing to trust his discretion upon \$50,000 for surveys.

Mr. LOGAN. I make the same motion again for the purpose of making one remark. It is not an objection to the \$50,000 that I make; that is a small amount of money; but it is to the enumeration of certain rivers and creeks and streams that are to be surveyed. Although I have great confidence in the Secretary of War, does the Senator not well know that as to every one of the streams mentioned in this new survey section the members of Congress concerned and the Senator of the State will go to the Secretary of War and ask for the distribution of that \$50,000 so that each one shall have a survey? What does a survey mean? It is a mere examination of the stream. If they merely go along it and make a report on it that is the meaning of a survey under this bill. After these surveys are all made, if there was only \$10,000 appropriated instead of \$50,000 appropriated, it would mean \$50,000,000 in the next ten years. That is the objection I have to it, not that the \$50,000 is a large amount, but it is to the surveying of these streams for future appropriations.

Mr. WINDOM. I think the Senator is unnecessarily frightened. The Secretary of War is not likely to send a peregrinating company of engineers to the country to walk along the banks of these streams and make report on them. If he is, then I am certainly not in favor of placing five millions and upward in his hands to be used in his dis-

cretion. The bill provides that he shall take only those that are most important, and the Senator from Illinois knows, I think, as well as I do, that not one in ten of the streams named here can be surveyed under the appropriation made.

Mr. LOGAN. What is the use of naming them here if not one in ten can be surveyed? For the purpose of keeping them on the list of streams to be appropriated for.

Mr. WINDOM. Because the Secretary of War, informed by the Engineer Department, knows better than we do which of these streams is the more important.

Mr. LOGAN. I withdraw the motion to postpone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the substitute offered by the Senator from Vermont, [Mr. EDMUNDS.]

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. OGLESBY. I do not propose to detain the Senate but a very few moments, perhaps not the five minutes to which I am entitled.

I am about making up my mind to vote for this amendment. I am doing it with some reluctance. It is a great power to confer upon one Department of this Government, or upon one person executing the duties of that Department, to place a large amount of money at the disposal of the Corps of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of War. If river and harbor improvements are constitutional and right, it does seem to me that Congress should take the responsibility of naming the harbors and the rivers upon the information furnished to Congress by the Engineer Department. Congress should take the responsibility of naming which river and which harbor will best subserve the commerce of the country. It seems to me the responsibility is upon us for proper legislation, and therefore I shall vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont with some reluctance, doubting very considerably the propriety of the step. It is a departure from established custom; it is a departure from fixed law; it is a departure from the custom of the country, and I think, to some extent, it is a perilous adventure; but as we ventured to trust that Department once, I believe I will take the responsibility to-night (as I see the Senate is very anxious to vote on this bill and dispose of it) of voting for the amendment and making the trial.

But, Mr. President, are we to suppose that by transferring the expenditure of five millions and a half, if the amendment shall carry, the Secretary of War is to be liberated from the influences that control Congress in appropriating money for these purposes? Is the country to understand that the Secretary of War is not to be besieged; that the Engineer Department will not be besieged in detail for the expenditure of this fund to every object mentioned in this bill? I suppose appeals will be made there directly and forcibly and continuously for scattering this money over the country just as the Congress has been in the habit of scattering it, and the Engineer Corps in the War Department may very well say, "We can dribble this sum out in every direction, because we have heretofore surveyed these works; we have heretofore made recommendations upon them, and in the interest of commerce we can distribute this amount *pro rata*, according to the principle fixed in the bill in Congress which failed." I suppose that the Secretary of War will be besieged precisely as the committees of this body have been, and I doubt if we shall make any great progress in getting rid of that difficulty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. President, as I do not wish to delay one moment of time, I will not ask the liberty of making the usual motion for an indefinite postponement. I hope the Senate will come to a vote as speedily as possible.

The question being taken by yeas and nays, resulted—yeas 16, nays 23; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Allison, Anthony, Booth, Cameron of Wisconsin, Cragin, Dawes, Edmunds, Frelinghuysen, Hamlin, Howe, Logan, Morrill, Oglesby, Paddock, Wadleigh, and Windom—16.

NAYS—Messrs. Barnum, Bogy, Bruce, Christiancy, Cockrell, Conover, Cooper, Davis, Dennis, Ferry, Hamilton, Ingalls, Jones of Florida, Kelly, Kernan, Key, Maxey, Merrimon, Mitchell, Norwood, Ransom, Spencer, and Withers—23.

ABSENT—Messrs. Alcorn, Bayard, Boutwell, Burnside, Cameron of Pennsylvania, Caperton, Clayton, Conkling, Dorsey, Eator, Goldthwaite, Gordon, Harvey, Hitchcock, Johnston, Jones of Nevada, McCreery, McDonald, McMillan, Morton, Patterson, Randolph, Robertson, Sargent, Sanlisbury, Sharon, Sherman, Stevenson, Thurman, Wallace, West, Whyte, and Wright—33.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORRILL, (at nine o'clock and twenty minutes p. m.) I believe we had better think on this question until Monday. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was not agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I offer the following motion:

That the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to report the bill so amended as to provide for not exceeding \$5,500,000 in the whole, to be expended at points of the greatest importance to public interests in the preservation, repair, and completion of the public works to be named in the bill.

Upon this motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COOPER. I move to strike out "the committee" and insert "Senate." This is the Committee of the Whole. Let it be referred to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This bill will go to the Senate if this motion shall be voted down.

Mr. COOPER. I do not insist on the amendment.

The question being taken by yeas and nays, resulted—yeas 14, nays 25; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Allison, Anthony, Booth, Cragin, Dawes, Edmunds, Frelinghuysen, Hamlin, Howe, Logan, Morrill, Oglesby, Wadleigh, and Windom—14.

NAYS—Messrs. Barnum, Boggy, Bruce, Cameron of Wisconsin, Christianity, Cockrell, Conover, Cooper, Davis, Dennis, Ferry, Hamilton, Ingalls, Jones of Florida, Kelly, Kernan, Key, Maxey, Merrimon, Mitchell, Norwood, Paddock, Ransom, Spencer, and Withers—25.

ABSENT—Messrs. Alcorn, Bayard, Boutwell, Burnside, Cameron of Pennsylvania, Caperton, Clayton, Conkling, Dorsey, Eaton, Goldthwaite, Gordon, Harvey, Hitchcock, Johnston, Jones of Nevada, McCreery, McDonald, McMillan, Morton, Patterson, Randolph, Robertson, Sargent, Saulsbury, Sharon, Sherman, Stevenson, Thurman, Wallace, West, Whyte, and Wright—33.

So the motion was not agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Shall the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole be concurred in in gross?

Mr. EDMUNDS. Separately, one by one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the first amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. The first amendment made as in Committee of the Whole is in line 12 of section 1, to strike out "seventy-five" and insert "one hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

For the improvement of the harbor at Buffalo, New York, \$100,000.

Mr. EDMUNDS. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ALLISON. I want to know what has become of the amendment in lines 9 and 10.

Mr. EDMUNDS. All the strikings out are gone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The text of the bill was not changed there. The Senator from Vermont asks for the yeas and nays on concurring in this amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and being taken, resulted—yeas 17, nays 18; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Allison, Booth, Bruce, Cameron of Wisconsin, Davis, Dawes, Hamilton, Howe, Jones of Florida, Kernan, Key, Mitchell, Ransom, Spencer, Wadleigh, Windom, and Withers—17.

NAYS—Messrs. Barnum, Boggy, Christianity, Cockrell, Conover, Cooper, Cragin, Dennis, Ferry, Harvey, Ingalls, Kelly, Logan, Maxey, Merrimon, Norwood, Oglesby, and Paddock—18.

ABSENT—Messrs. Alcorn, Anthony, Bayard, Boutwell, Burnside, Cameron of Pennsylvania, Caperton, Clayton, Conkling, Dorsey, Eaton, Edmunds, Frelinghuysen, Goldthwaite, Gordon, Hamlin, Hitchcock, Johnston, Jones of Nevada, McCreery, McDonald, McMillan, Morrill, Morton, Patterson, Randolph, Robertson, Sargent, Saulsbury, Sharon, Sherman, Stevenson, Thurman, Wallace, West, Whyte, and Wright—37.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not a quorum voting.

Mr. HAMILTON, (at nine o'clock and thirty-five minutes p. m.) I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was not agreed to; there being on a division—ayes 18, nays 21.

Mr. MERRIMON. I move to direct the Sergeant-at-Arms to request the presence of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a quorum present on the last vote by the count.

Mr. MERRIMON. I withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. EDMUNDS. What is the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment which will be read.

Mr. ALLISON. The yeas and nays were taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But no quorum voted. That is the question now. The Clerk will call the roll again.

Mr. HOWE. Let the amendment be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 12, strike out "seventy-five" and insert "one hundred;" so as to read:

For the improvement of the harbor at Buffalo, New York, \$100,000.

The question being taken by yeas and nays, resulted—yeas 23, nays 11; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Allison, Anthony, Booth, Bruce, Cameron of Wisconsin, Cragin, Davis, Dennis, Ferry, Frelinghuysen, Hamlin, Jones of Florida, Kelly, Kernan, Key, McMillan, Mitchell, Morrill, Paddock, Ransom, Spencer, Windom, and Withers—23.

NAYS—Messrs. Barnum, Boggy, Christianity, Cockrell, Conover, Cooper, Harvey, Ingalls, Maxey, Merrimon, and Oglesby—11.

ABSENT—Messrs. Alcorn, Bayard, Boutwell, Burnside, Cameron of Pennsylvania, Caperton, Clayton, Conkling, Dawes, Dorsey, Eaton, Edmunds, Goldthwaite, Gordon, Hamilton, Hitchcock, Howe, Johnston, Jones of Nevada, Logan, McCreery, McDonald, Morton, Norwood, Patterson, Randolph, Robertson, Sargent, Saulsbury, Sharon, Sherman, Stevenson, Thurman, Wadleigh, Wallace, West, Whyte, and Wright—38.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not a quorum voting.

Mr. FERRY. I ask for a call of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan moves a call of the Senate. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and thirty-seven Senators answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a quorum present. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOOTH, (when his name was called.) On this question I am paired with the Senator from Texas, [Mr. HAMILTON.] If he were here he would vote "nay," and I should vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 10; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Allison, Anthony, Boutwell, Bruce, Cameron of Wisconsin, Conover, Cragin, Davis, Dennis, Ferry, Frelinghuysen, Hamlin, Howe, Jones of Florida, Kernan, Key, McMillan, Mitchell, Morrill, Norwood, Paddock, Ransom, Spencer, Windom, and Withers—25.

NAYS—Messrs. Boggy, Cockrell, Cooper, Harvey, Ingalls, Kelly, Maxey, Merrimon, Oglesby, and Wadleigh—10.

ABSENT—Messrs. Alcorn, Barnum, Bayard, Booth, Burnside, Cameron of Pennsylvania, Caperton, Christianity, Clayton, Conkling, Dawes, Dorsey, Eaton, Edmunds, Goldthwaite, Gordon, Hamilton, Hitchcock, Johnston, Jones of Nevada, Logan, McCreery, McDonald, Morton, Patterson, Randolph, Robertson, Sargent, Saulsbury, Sharon, Sherman, Stevenson, Thurman, Wallace, West, Whyte, and Wright—37.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not a quorum voting.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, (at nine o'clock and fifty minutes p. m.) Well, Mr. President, we have been here nearly eleven hours attending to this business, and I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was not agreed to; there being on a division—ayes 14, nays 20.

Mr. SPENCER. I move that the absent Senators be called.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I have been endeavoring to stand by this bill through all its adversities and misfortunes, and I trust the friends of the bill, as they are denominated, now will allow me to move an adjournment. We have no quorum here; I do not believe we shall have a quorum to-night unless we send for people.

Mr. WINDOM. The Senator from Iowa will allow me to make a suggestion, and I believe that we can pass a bill if he will follow it. Take an adjournment now and let the Senator from Iowa prepare an amendment to his substitute which shall make the whole sum not to exceed five and one-half millions, and I believe we can pass it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa moves that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at nine o'clock and fifty-two minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned.

IN SENATE.

MONDAY, July 24, 1876.

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

THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read.

Mr. MORRILL. Is there a quorum present?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will ascertain by count. [A pause.] There is not a quorum present by actual count. The roll will be called, if the Senator from Vermont insists upon it.

Mr. MORRILL. I think we had better have a quorum.

The Secretary called the roll of the Senate, and, after some delay, thirty-seven Senators having answered to their names,

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*, (at eleven o'clock and twenty minutes a. m.) There is a quorum present. The Journal will be approved.

CORRECTIONS OF RECORD.

Mr. MORRILL. I desire to make a correction in my remarks on Saturday evening. I think that I made a mistake in reading from the statistical tables and said "exports" when I should have said "imports" and "imports" when I should have said "exports." In one instance I reversed the figures "1875" to "1876," and at another time said "1876" when I should have said "1875." I presume that I made the mistake myself; I know I am entirely responsible for it, because I had an opportunity of correcting the manuscript of the reporter and did not do it.

Mr. HAMLIN. I wish to state that there is a matter which ought to be considered to-day by the Senate in executive session. We are to have the impeachment trial at twelve o'clock. If we do not have an executive session this morning, I fear we shall not have it to-day at all. There is a very decided necessity for it, and I must therefore ask the Senate to go into executive session.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I wish the Senator would let me say one word first.

Mr. HAMLIN. Very well.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Chair, by which, of course, I mean officially the Senate, and my honorable friend from North Carolina, [Mr. MERRIMON,] to what may be called a personal explanation. That is the only head that it can come in under that I know of. I see in the RECORD of Monday, July 24, a statement of the debate on the river and harbor bill.

Mr. DAWES. On what page?

Mr. EDMUNDS. Page 27, in the left-hand column. This running conversational debate occurs:

Mr. MERRIMON. That money was not gotten from the people by taxation, nor was that taken into the account which I have read, which shows the net ordinary expenses of administering the Government every year from 1865. If any Senator can answer the point I made, let him answer it. The figures and facts cited cannot be answered by going off on the war.

Mr. WEST. Some of your figures have been answered.

Mr. MERRIMON. I do not know when it was done.