By Mr. RAY: Resolution adopted by the Bethany Presbyterian congregation, of Bridgeville, Pa., favoring the passage of the bill to prohibit the opening of any exhibition or exposition on Sunday for which appropriations have been made by the United States—to the Select Committee on the Quadro-Centennial of the Discovery of America.

By Mr. REED, of Maine (by request): Petition of naval officers that equal pay be given for relative rank and service according to the law of precedence in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SCULL: Memorial of citizens of Saxton, Pa., favoring the enactment of House bill 12209, known as the immigration bill—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SKINNER: Petition of John T. Daniel, for the estate of John Westcott, deceased, late of Dare County, North Carolina, praying that his war claim be referred to the Court of Claims under the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: Petition of Benjamin Yeager, of Union County, Kentucky, asking that his claim be referred to the Court of Claims for a finding of facts; also, of Malissa W. Hawkins, of Madison County, Kentucky, for the same relief; also, of estate of C. B. Bunn, of Clinton County, Kentucky; also, of estate of William Emmert, of Washington, D. C., for the same relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of citizens of Kuttawa, Ky., praying passage of bill to prohibit the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday; also, of citizens of Eddyville, Ky., for the same purpose—to the Select Committee on the Quadro-Centennial of the Discovery of America.

By Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR: Petition of 2,000 colored citizens of the United States, in favor of House bill 3315—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILLMAN (by request): Petition of J. H. W. Platts, for the estate of Elizabeth Platts, deceased, late of Barnwell County, South Carolina, praying that her war claim be referred to the Court of Claims under the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania: Petition of Scrubgrass Presbyterian Church, Crawford County, Pennsylvania, against the Chicago World's Fair being open on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Quadro-Centennial of the Discovery of America.

By Mr. WICKHAM: Petition of 16 citizens of Huron County, Ohio, for passage of House bill 5553, defining options and futures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Memorial of Grange No. 790, Patrons of Husbandry, Wayne County; also, of Grange No. 820, of the same organization, in same county, Pennsylvania, in favor of a greater volume of currency—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *February* 26, 1891.

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

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

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

CORRECTION OF ERROR IN ENROLLMENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives; which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be directed, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 12782) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes, to omit the following words, namely: "to cause to be erected," in line 8 of Senate amendment numbered 7, page 14 of the printed bill.

RETURN OF DIRECT TAXES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 172) to credit and pay to the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia all moneys collected under the direct tax levied by act of Congress approved August 5, 1861.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the House of Representatives will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 20, after the words "District of Columbia," insert:

"But no money shall be paid to any State or Territory until the Legislature thereof shall have accepted by resolution the sum herein appropriated and the trusts imposed, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States on account of the levy and collection of said tax, and shall have authorized the governor to receive said money for the use and purpose aforesaid."

Resolved, That the House request a conference with the Senate on said bill and amendment.

Mr. MORRILL. I move that the bill and amendment be printed and lie on the table for the present.

Mr. GORMAN. I should like to ask what the bill is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the direct-tax bill. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Vermont that the bill and amendment lie on the table for the present.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 13th instant, a letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in regard to the Carlisle Indian training school; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting an estimate for an additional appropriation of $10,000 for the Mission Indian Commission; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 19th instant, a letter from the Fourth Auditor of the Treasury in regard to the appropriation for payment of claims of naval officers for difference between shore and sea pay for service on receiving ships; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in compliance with the requirements of section 194 of the Revised Statutes, a list of the clerks and other employés of that Department for the year ending December 31, 1891, showing the time each was actually employed and the sums paid to each; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. MCPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5067) for the relief of Archibald Hunley.

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

A bill (H. R. 13552) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892; and

A bill (H. R. 13586) to amend the various acts relative to immigration and the importation of aliens under contract or agreement to perform labor.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Legislature of the State of Montana, praying for such action as will preserve all the discovered and undiscovered mines and mineral lands bearing the precious metals to the people forever; which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also presented a petition of the Legislature of Montana, praying Congress to inquire by what authority the Commissioner of the Land Office requires evidence to determine the mineral character of land before claimants can file applications for patents for placer or lode claims, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of residents of Northwestern and other States, praying for the adoption of legislation looking to increased trade relations with Canada; which was referred to the Select Committee on Relations with Canada.

Mr. SPOONER presented a petition of members of the Congregational Church of Hammond, Wis., praying for the passage of Senate bill 4695, to prohibit the opening of any exhibition or exposition on Sunday where appropriations of the United States are expended; which was referred to the Select Committee on the Quadro-Centennial.

Mr. SHERMAN presented the following petitions, praying for the speedy passage of the Conger lard bill; which were ordered to lie on the table:

Petition of D. O. Smith and 31 other citizens of Centre Point Alliance, of Jackson County, Ohio;

Petition of Owen Swadiner and 35 other citizens of Old Town, Greene County, Ohio; and

Petition of Suballiance (No. 278) of Old Town, Greene County, Ohio.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of Council No. 73, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of New Lisbon, Ohio, praying for the passage of the bill to restrict immigration; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Rehoboth, Ohio, praying for the passage of the bill to prohibit the opening of any exhibition on Sunday where appropriations of the United States are expended; which was referred to the Select Committee on the Quadro-Centennial.

He also presented the petition of W. J. McManigal, of Orbiston, Ohio; a petition of the Furniture Manufacturers' Association of Columbus, Ohio, and a petition of 15 citizens of Dayton, Ohio, praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MANDERSON presented a petition of citizens of Omaha, Nebr., praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of certain citizens, members of the Farmers' Alliances of Polk, York, Webster, and Dakota Counties, in the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

State of Nebraska, praying for the passage of the Conger lard bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MANDERSON. I present sundry petitions signed by 258 citizens of Northwestern Nebraska, reciting the neglect of the Government to disarm the hostile Sioux, and praying for protection against depredations likely to be committed by them. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEWART presented a petition of the Legislature of Nevada, praying that a sufficient annual appropriation be made for the survey of the public lands in that State; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. STEWART. I present the petition of John Schuster, of Mineral Hill, Nev., praying for the enactment of the Torrey bankruptcy bill. I observe that the petition is in the usual printed form. I move that it lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TURPIE presented the petition of Trenkley & Scheyinger, of Fort Wayne, Ind., praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WALTHALL presented the petition of W. K. Collins and W. F. Wovelzine, of White Apple, Miss., praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. REAGAN presented the petition of Julius Runge, president of the Cotton Exchange; Ball, Hutchings & Co.; Adone & Lobit; M. Lasker, and W. S. Moody, leading business men and merchants of Galveston, Tex., and the petition of Wallis, Landes & Co., and 32 other citizens of Galveston, Tex., praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the memorial of Robert Gileson and 21 other citizens of Dallas, Tex., remonstrating against the passage of the Conger lard bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the officers and members of the National League for the protection of American institutions, remonstrating against sectarian appropriations for Indian schools, and especially against the increase of such appropriations; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of officers and members of the Farmers and Laborers' Union No. 251, of Callaway County, Missouri, praying for the passage of the Paddock pure-food bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of J. M. Monroe, of Joplin, Mo., and sundry other citizens of Missouri, praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of business firms and citizens of New Bedford, Mass., praying for the enactment of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of ex-soldiers, sailors, and marines of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of the bill to secure preference in appointment, etc., to veterans of the late war; which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. CAMERON (for Mr. QUAY) presented a petition of the Scranton (Pa.) Board of Trade, praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also (for Mr. QUAY) presented the petition of John S. Francks and other ex-soldiers, sailors, and marines, of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of a bill to insure preference in appointment, employment, and retention therein in the public service of the United States to veterans of the late war; which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also (for Mr. QUAY) presented a memorial of the Producers' Protective Association, of Bradford, Pa., remonstrating against the passage by Congress of any amendments to the interstate-commerce act which shall in any way change, abridge, or affect section 5 of that act, in regard to the pooling of freights; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also (for Mr. QUAY) presented a petition of the Fleming United Presbyterian Church, of Emsworth, Pa.; the petition of the congregation of Rev. J. R. Wallace, of Jamestown, Pa.; the petition of the congregation of the East Unity United Presbyterian Church, of Butler County, Pennsylvania, and the petition of the officers of the American Sabbath Union's Freeport Committee, of Freeport, Pa., praying for the passage of the bill to prohibit the opening of any exhibition or exposition on Sunday where appropriations of the United States are expended; which were referred to the Select Committee on the Quadro-Centennial.

He also (for Mr. QUAY) presented the following petitions, praying for the passage of the bill to restrict immigration; which were ordered to lie on the table:

Petition of Gas City Council, No. 273, Junior Order United American Mechanics;

Petition of Damascus Council, No. 536, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Damascus, Pa.;

Petition of Worthington Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Worthington, Pa.;

Petition of Council No. 260, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pittsburgh, Pa.;

Petition of Emporium Council, No. 532, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Emporium, Pa.;

Petition of G. W. Childs Commandery, No. 17, Local Lodge of Order United American Mechanics, of Pittsburgh, Pa.;

Petition of Grant Council, No. 352, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pottstown, Pa.;

Petition of Prospect Council, No. 229, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Prospect, Pa.;

Petition of Col. Sam Black Council No. 279, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pennsylvania;

Petition of Clover Council, No. 99, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Archbald, Pa.;

Petition of Delmont Council, No. 58, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Delmont, Pa.;

Petition of General J. K. Moorehead Council, No. 198, of Port Berry, Pa.;

Petition of Peter's Defiance Council, No. 298, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Best, Pa.;

Petition of Hillsville Council, No. 403, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Hillsville, Pa.;

Petition of Limestone Council, No. 373, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pennsylvania;

Petition of Fredonia Council, No. 52, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia, Pa.;

Petition of Valley View Council, No. 363, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Valley View, Pa.; and

Petition of Council No. 516, Junior Order American Mechanics, of Muncy, Pa.

Mr. CAMERON (for Mr. QUAY) presented the following petitions, praying for the free coinage of silver and the increase of the currency of the United States to $40 per capita; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Petition of Sanatoga Grange, No. 25, Patrons of Husbandry, of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania;

Petition of Wysauking Grange, No. 58, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bedford County, Pennsylvania;

Petition of Randolph Grange, No. 198, Patrons of Husbandry, of Crawford County, Pennsylvania;

Petition of Rising Sun Grange, No. 417, Patrons of Husbandry, of Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania;

Petition of Alert Grange, No. 905 Patrons of Husbandry, of Tioga County, Pennsylvania;

Petition of Grange, No. 141, Patrons of Husbandry, of Indiana County, Pennsylvania;

Petition of Valley Grange, No. 876, Patrons of Husbandry, of Tioga County, Pennsylvania;

Petition of Colley Grange, No. 365, Patrons of Husbandry, of Sullivan County, Pennsylvania;

Petition of Rundell's Grange, No. 871, Patrons of Husbandry, of Crawford County, Pennsylvania;

Petition of Brandywine Grange, No. 60, Patrons of Husbandry, of Chester County, Pennsylvania;

Petition of French Creek Valley Grange, No. 988, Patrons of Husbandry, of Crawford County, Pennsylvania;

Petition of Fair Valley Grange, No. 817, Patrons of Husbandry, of Tioga County, Pennsylvania;

Petition of Utility Grange, No. 874, Patrons of Husbandry, of Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania;

Petition of Charlesworth Valley Grange, No. 54, Patrons of Husbandry, of Tioga County, Pennsylvania;

Petition of Washington Grange, No. 890, Patrons of Husbandry, of Clarion County, Pennsylvania;

Petition of Jefferson Grange, No. 314, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington County, Pennsylvania;

Petition of Waterloo Grange, No. 448, Patrons of Husbandry, of Venango County, Pennsylvania;

Petition of Union Grange, No. 152, Patrons of Husbandry, of Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania; and

Petition of Steuben Grange, No. 858, Patrons of Husbandry, of Crawford County, Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILSON presented the following petitions, praying for the passage of the Conger lard bill; which were ordered to lie on the table:

Petition of the Knox Alliance and Industrial Union, of Fremont County, Iowa;

Petition of 16 citizens of Butler County, Iowa; and

Petition of 22 citizens of Fremont County, Iowa.

Mr. WILSON presented a petition of 30 business firms of Dubuque, Iowa, praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DOLPH presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce, of Portland, Oregon, praying that a Territorial form of government be given the people of Alaska; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. DOLPH. I present a petition purporting to be signed by many business men and firms of Portland, Oregon, and on the Pacific coast, praying for favorable consideration of the House resolution in regard

to reciprocity. The signatures are printed, but it is accompanied by a letter signed by Mr. Erastus Wiman, which I think brings it within the rule.

I take occasion to say that I am not at present committed to the action desired by the petitioners. I move that the petition be referred to the Select Committee on Relations with Canada.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DOLPH presented the petition of Peter Gleason, of Kelton, Ringgold County, Iowa, praying for the amendment of the Senate bill providing for the payment of Indian depredation claims so as to give the circuit courts of the United States jurisdiction, or that he be paid the value of his mules and horses stolen by Snake Indians; which was referred to the Select Committee on Indian Depredations.

Mr. HAWLEY presented a petition of the Norwich (Conn.) Board of Trade, praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PIERCE presented a memorial of the Legislature of North Dakota; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A JOINT MEMORIAL.

To the honorable the Congress of the United States:

The people of the State of North Dakota, in Legislative Assembly convened, respectfully represent:

That the military reservation known as the Fort Totten reservation, which has been abandoned as a military post by order of the War Department, is situate nearly in the center of the State, north and south, and that it is essential to the peace and prosperity of the entire State that it should be maintained and supported as a military reservation, and troops, sufficient to afford at least moral assistance and material aid when any emergency arises, should be stationed there. That, while there may exist no cause for alarm from Indians residing upon the reservation contiguous thereto, it should be borne in mind that across the boundary line, and not many miles distant, live the renegade Sissetons and their descendants, who participated in the massacre of the whites in 1862 in Minnesota. That these Indians have persistently refused to acknowledge allegiance to the United States and remain across the border as a standing menace to the peace and safety of all settlers living in the north and northwestern portions of our State. That in the judgment of your memorialists the maintenance of Fort Totten as a military post is essential to quiet the fears of the settlers in the sparsely settled northwest corner of the State and as a restraining power upon the renegade Indians who have fled from the United States and sought the protection of the Queen's Government.

Therefore, the people of the State of North Dakota, in Legislative Assembly convened, respectfully petition the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States, acting through the Secretary of War, to re-establish and maintain Fort Totten as a military post, with sufficient troops to assure the citizens of the State of North Dakota that they will be amply protected against any invasion from the Indians across the boundary line, as well as to assure them that the Indians now residing on the Fort Totten reservation will continue and be required to maintain peaceful relations with all the people living contiguous to said reservation. And the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized and petitioned to make a sufficient appropriation to maintain said post until such time as the people of the State of North Dakota become satisfied that their lives and property are not in danger by any invasion from foreign Indians, or by the Indians residing on such reservation, if such Indians should become turbulent and quarrelsome by reason of the absence of military power.

The present temper of the people of the State of North Dakota is such that they feel it to be absolutely necessary for their own welfare that this post should be maintained, and the troops that have been withdrawn therefrom should be sent back to the station, or such sufficient military force as will tend to allay existing fears.

That a copy of the foregoing memorial, signed by the president of the senate and speaker of the house of representatives, and attested by the secretary of the senate and chief clerk of the house of representatives, be sent to the honorable Senators GILBERT A. PIERCE and LYMAN R. CASEY and to the honorable Representative H. C. HANSBROUGH.

That the honorable gentlemen above mentioned, representing this State in the Congress of the United States, be, and are hereby, respectfully requested to present the memorial to their respective Houses, and to urge the passage of an act of Congress in accordance therewith.

ROGER ALLEN,
President of Senate.

Attest:

C. C. BOWSFIELD,
Secretary of Senate.

Mr. WASHBURN presented a petition of citizens of the State of Minnesota, praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Legislature of Minnesota, praying for the passage of House bill 582 relative to the construction within the State of New York of a ship canal around the Falls of Niagara; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Legislature of Minnesota, praying for the payment of a bounty to the First Regiment of Minnesota Mounted Rangers; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Legislature of Minnesota, praying for the passage of an act granting an invalid pension to John Fenske; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Minnesota, praying for the passage of a law giving the States authority to control the manufacture of oleomargarine, butterine, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against the passage of the free coinage bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PADDOCK presented the petition of R. F. Hodgin and other business men of Omaha, Nebr., praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. EVARTS presented a petition of 16 citizens of the State of New York, praying for the passage of the bankruptcy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PLUMB presented the petition of J. H. Jones and 23 other citizens of Reno County, Kansas, praying for the passage of the Conger lard bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the following memorials, remonstrating against the passage of the Conger lard bill, and praying for the passage of the Paddock pure-food bill; which were ordered to lie on the table:

Memorial of members of the Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union No. 2013, of Jewell County, Kansas;

Memorial of the Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union No. 2102, of Rooks County, Kansas; and

Memorial of the Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union No. 2282, of Norton County, Kansas.

Mr. PLUMB presented a petition of the Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union No. 589, of Stafford County, Kansas, and a petition of the Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union, of Kansas, praying for the passage of the Paddock pure-food bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the following petitions, praying for the passage of House bill 13291 providing for the division of the State of Kansas into an eastern and a western judicial district; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Petition of 4 attorneys, citizens of St. Francis, Kans.;

Petition of 8 members of the bar of Sherman County, Kansas;

Petition of 9 members of the bar of Russell County, Kansas; and

Petition of 24 attorneys and citizens of the State of Kansas.

Mr. PETTIGREW presented the petition of R. H. Garland and 17 other citizens of Columbia, Brown County, South Dakota, praying for the speedy passage of the Conger lard bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the following petitions, praying for the speedy passage of the Conger lard bill; which were ordered to lie on the table:

Petition of Hawkeye Alliance, No. 496, of South Dakota; and

Petition of Henry G. McNett and 15 other citizens of Hand County, South Dakota.

Mr. VEST presented the petition of Messrs. Allee & Atkin and other citizens of Olean, Miller County, Missouri, praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Walnut Grove Union, of Napier, Mo., praying legislation by Congress for the construction of three transcontinental lines of railroad, and paying for the same with an issue of legal-tender currency, and also declaring null and void all watered stocks and bonds of all railroads and other corporations; which was referred to the Committee on Railroads.

Mr. ALLISON presented the following petitions, praying for the passage of the Conger lard bill; which were ordered to lie on the table:

Petition of Alliance No. 1939, Osceola, Iowa;

Petition of Alliance No. 1962, Greenfield, Iowa;

Petition of Alliance No. 1996, Ashton, Iowa;

Petition of Alliance of Riverside, Montgomery County, Iowa;

Petition of W. F. Wilson and 18 other citizens of Calhoun County, Iowa;

Petition of Frank H. Brokaw and 46 other citizens of Seward County, Nebraska;

Petition of J. M. Dries and 12 other citizens of Osceola County, Iowa;

Petition of B. A. St. Clair and 21 other citizens of Montgomery County, Iowa;

Petition of Farmers' Alliance of Albion Township, Butler County, Iowa;

Petition of Mehaska Centre Farmers' Alliance, No. 1919, Iowa;

Petition of Coon Valley Alliance, Iowa;

Petition of Farmers' Alliance No. 1957, Iowa;

Petition of Spring Hill Alliance, No. 1958, Iowa;

Petition of Farmers' Alliance No. 1952, of Frankville, Iowa;

Petition of Joseph Weaver and 12 other citizens of Muscatine County, Iowa;

Petition of C. G. Starlin and 18 other citizens of Nebraska County, Iowa;

Petition of C. T. Vanderhalf and 20 other citizens of Buena Vista County, Iowa;

Petition of J. H. McKibben and 29 other citizens of Marshall County, Iowa;

Petition of James L. McKern and 20 other citizens of Marion County, Iowa;

Petition of George J. Cooper and 8 other citizens of Winneshiek County, Iowa; and

Petition of B. F. Yates and 20 other citizens of Calhoun County, Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON presented the following petitions, praying for the passage of a law to prohibit the opening of the World's Exposition on Sunday; which were referred to the Select Committee on the Quadro-Centennial.

Petition of trustees of Baptist Church of Danville, Iowa;

Petition of members of the Congregational Church of Danville, Iowa;

Petition of members of the Baptist Church of Waverly, Iowa;

Petition of members of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Waverly, Iowa; and

Petition of members of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Danville, Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON presented the petition of C. W. Derby and 10 other citizens of Muscatine County, Iowa, praying for the passage of the Butterworth option bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Algona (Iowa) Grange, No. 1684, praying for a law giving to the States the same control over the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine and other butter substitutes as is now accorded to them in the control of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. INGALLS presented the following petitions, praying for the passage of the bill for the relief of widows and minor heirs of pensioners; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions:

Petition of Johanna W. Turner, department president of the Potomac Woman's Relief Corps; and

Petition of Sarah C. Nichols, of Auburn, N. Y., department president of the New York Woman's Relief Corps.

Mr. MCCONNELL presented a petition of citizens of Chesterfield, Idaho, praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the following petitions, praying for the speedy passage of the Conger lard bill; which were ordered to lie on the table:

Petition of R. T. Rush and 67 other citizens of Oneida County, Idaho; and

Resolutions of Idaho Farmers' Alliance, No. 1, of Idaho.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. TURPIE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 6407) to restore to the pension roll the name of Ruth S. Byron;

A bill (H. R. 5458) granting a pension to Frances Jane McCloud;

A bill (H. R. 8933) granting a pension to Mrs. Sue Ditto;

A bill (H. R. 8302) granting a pension to Mary E. Graham;

A bill (H. R. 8303) granting a pension to Malinda Lemmon;

A bill (H. R. 4236) pensioning John George;

A bill (H. R. 7928) granting a pension to Jesse G. Hamilton;

A bill (H. R. 3080) granting a pension to George S. Howard;

A bill (H. R. 10890) granting a pension to Thomas F. Baker;

A bill (H. R. 12234) to increase the pension of George Garfield, late second lieutenant Company D, Third Ohio Volunteer Cavalry;

A bill (H. R. 1143) for the relief of Jacob Berg;

A bill (H. R. 12321) granting a pension to Harlan E. King;

A bill (H. R. 13206) restoring the name of Emily J. Welker to the pension roll;

A bill (H. R. 13318) granting a pension to Agnes C. Junot;

A bill (H. R. 12642) granting a pension to Elnora A. Dixon;

A bill (H. R. 12564) granting a pension to Mrs. Martha A. Brooks; and

A bill (H. R. 13223) granting a pension to Susan A. Malone.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8570) for the relief of Maj. John M. Laing, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4276) for the relief of Maj. John M. Laing, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4745) directing the Secretary of War to issue an honorable discharge to John Reilly, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5025) granting the right to erect and maintain dams across the Kansas River, within Shawnee County, in the State of Kansas, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. FRYE. I report from the Committee on Commerce the bill (H. R. 8239) to amend section 4488, Title LII, of the Revised Statutes as amended by chapter 418 of the acts passed at the second session of the Fiftieth Congress, with an amendment. I ask that this bill may take the place of Order of Business 2321, Senate joint resolution 146, and that that order may be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The title of the joint resolution will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. R. 146) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to suspend for a period of one year from March 29, 1891, the enforcement of the provisions of an act approved March 2, 1889, entitled "An act to amend sections 4488 and 4489 of the Revised Statutes, requiring life-saving appliances on steamers."

Mr. FRYE. I desire that to be postponed indefinitely and the bill I have just reported to take its place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

Mr. FRYE. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 159) authorizing Brig. Gen. Thomas L. Casey, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, to accept from the President of the French Republic a diploma conferring the decoration of officer of the National Order of the Legion of Honor to report it favorably without amendment. As it will take but half a minute, I ask that the joint resolution may be passed now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be read for information.

Mr. ALLISON. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the joint resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. SPOONER, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom was referred an amendment, on the 24th instant, intended to be proposed to the general deficiency appropriation bill, reported it favorably and moved its reference to the Committee on Appropriations, and that it be printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5537) for the relief of Warren Stamp, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10805) for the relief of Spencer D. Hunt, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11567) for the relief of telegraph operators during the war of the rebellion, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12643) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Michael Mahar, reported it with amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, submitted a report accompanied by a bill (S. 5118) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the President to confer brevet rank on officers of the United States Army for gallant services in Indian campaigns;" which was read twice by its title.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5112) correcting the muster roll of N. B. Gahagan, late of Company F, Second Tennessee Infantry Volunteers, reported without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6584) for the relief of certain enlisted men of the Ordnance Corps, United States Army, in the matter of claims for bounties, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred an amendment submitted by Mr. WARREN on the 23d instant, intended to be proposed to the general deficiency appropriation bill, reported it favorably, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 13528) granting a pension to Harriet N. Read;

A bill (H. R. 8604) granting a pension to Maria Brooks;

A bill (H. R. 5213) granting a pension to Frederick Hart;

A bill (H. R. 1863) granting a pension to John Yost;

A bill (H. R. 10465) granting a pension to Margaret Durand, hospital nurse;

A bill (H. R. 9111) granting a pension to Bridget Foley;

A bill (H. R. 9019) granting a pension to Emma Fulton;

A bill (H. R. 3070) granting a pension to Clara Fowler;

A bill (H. R. 7910) granting a pension to John T. Ballard;

A bill (H. R. 11064) granting a pension to Amanda E. Parkis; and

A bill (S. 4630) granting a pension to Michael Mulhare.

Mr. MCPHERSON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2099) for the relief of John G. Rose, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an amendment intended to be proposed to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 9545) granting a pension to Washington Grigsby;

A bill (H. R. 8388) granting a pension to Mrs. M. P. Felch;

A bill (H. R. 2297) granting a pension to Augustus W. Eaton;

A bill (H. R. 6048) granting a pension to Mary Robinson;

A bill (H. R. 6809) granting a pension to Nancy M. Gross;

A bill (H. R. 3766) granting a pension to Joseph Dascomb;

A bill (H. R. 6217) granting a pension to Abbie A. Colson;

A bill (H. R. 13042) granting a pension to Manuel Tibbs;

A bill (H. R. 10771) granting a pension to Robert A. Ware;

A bill (H. R. 13344) to increase the pension of William A. Peck;

A bill (H. R. 7477) granting a pension to Mrs. Hannah M. Foss;

A bill (H. R. 11857) granting a pension to Collin McClelland;

A bill (H. R. 12679) to increase the pension of Francis A. Gaskill, Company K, Sixth New Jersey Volunteer Infantry;

A bill (H. R. 10485) for the relief of Cynthia H. Quackenbush;

A bill (H. R. 13643) granting a pension to George W. Gray;

A bill (H. R. 10953) granting a pension to Lettie E. Covell-Buckley, late a nurse in the war of the rebellion; and

A bill (H. R. 13652) granting a pension to Johanna Carroll.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 13577) granting a pension to Kate and Ethel B. Cook;

A bill (H. R. 12051) for the relief of Margaret Hitt, of Lincoln County, Missouri;

A bill (H. R. 13688) to pension John B. Angell, father of James C. Angell, alias John McShier, late of Company G, Fifth Pennsylvania Cavalry; and

A bill (H. R. 4047) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca P. Nields.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5109) granting a pension to Georgie Anu Porter, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DAVIS (for Mr. BLODGETT), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 1186) granting a pension to John O. Mathis;

A bill (H. R. 13587) granting increase of pension to Ellis P. Phipps; and

A bill (H. R. 13108) granting a pension to Carrie F. Ogden and Susan Ogden.

Mr. FARWELL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported an amendment intended to be proposed to the deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Agriculture and Foresty, to whom was referred an amendment submitted by Mr. WARREN, intended to be proposed to the agricultural appropriation bill, reported it favorably, and moved its reference to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 949) to amend section 4787 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PLUMB. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5107) for the relief of R. A. Lancaster, to report it with amendments. I ask that the bill may be now considered, if there is no objection.

Mr. ALLISON. I object.

Mr. PLUMB. Then I withdraw the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. PLUMB. From the Committee on Public Lands I report a measure which really might take the form of an ordinary resolution, although it is a joint resolution. It is a matter of very great importance to certain settlers in North and South Dakota, who have been dispossessed by reason of a recent decision of the Supreme Court, and the joint resolution simply devolves the duty on the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the matter. I therefore report back favorably the joint resolution (S. R. 165) directing the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway Company with a view to securing its consent to select other public lands in lieu of certain lands to which it may be entitled under a decision of the Supreme Court, rendered on the 22d day of December, 1890, and I ask for its present consideration.

Mr. ALLISON. I must object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the joint resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3087) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mrs. A. Shirley, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 143) for the relief of Mrs. Eliza A. Brownlow, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, submitted a report, accompanied by a bill (S. 5119) to authorize the investigation by the Attorney-General of certain claims alleged to be due the late proprietors of the Knoxville Whig for advertising, and authorizing the payment therefor by the Secretary of the Treasury of any amounts found by the Attorney-General to be legally or equitably due; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. ALLISON. From the Committee on Appropriations I report with amendments the bill (H. R. 13049) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes. I ask that the bill as proposed to be amended be printed and placed on the Calendar; and I give notice that as soon as the sundry civil appropriation bill is disposed of I shall ask for its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Meanwhile the bill will be printed and placed on the Calendar.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was recommitted the bill (H. R. 11120) providing for the adjustment of accounts of laborers, workmen, and mechanics arising under the eight-hour law, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reported an amendment intended to be proposed to the agricultural appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported an amendment intended to be proposed to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

COMPENSATION OF SENATORS FROM NEW STATES.

Mr. HOAR. I am directed by the Committee on Privileges and Elections to report the following resolution; which I ask may be adopted at this time:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be directed to inquire and report at the next session of Congress at what time the compensation of Senators from newly admitted States ought to begin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ALLISON. I object.

Mr. HOAR. It is a mere order of inquiry.

Mr. ALLISON. It can be adopted to-morrow as well as to-day.

Mr. HOAR. It has been read, and——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa object.

Mr. ALLISON. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made, and the resolution will go over.

INVESTIGATION INTO CONDITION OF INDIANS.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada. I am instructed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON] December 19, 1890, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof appointed by its chairman, is hereby instructed to inquire into the condition of the Indian tribes in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and elsewhere, the causes leading to the occupation of Indian reservations by United States troops, whether the treaties with said Indians have been fulfilled; to investigate fully the facts concerning the arms and munitions of war in the possession of said Indians, and what steps, legislative and executive, are needed to disarm them and prevent supply of such armament hereafter; also to inquire whether the care and control of Indians living in the tribal relation should be transferred to any other department of the Government, and to report to the Senate by bill or otherwise. Said committee shall have power to send for persons and papers, examine witnesses under oath, employ a stenographer and interpreter, and sit during the session or the recess of the Senate at such times and places as the committee may determine, and the actual and necessary expenses of said investigation to be paid out of the contingent expenses of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ALLISON. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the resolution will go over.

ADDITIONAL CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON ENROLLED BILLS.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada. I also report from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Enrolled Bills be, and are hereby, authorized to employ an additional clerk during the remainder of the present session, at a compensation of $6 per diem, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of said committee.

I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. ALLISON. Let it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the resolution will go over.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada. I call the attention of the Senator to the necessity of having the resolution passed now.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well; I withdraw my objection.

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

SENATE ELECTION CASES.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada. I am instructed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], December 24, 1890, to report it favorably, and I ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be directed to cause to be prepared a new edition of the work on Senate Election Cases, and to add thereto an account of the precedents of the Senate regarding the com-

pensation of Senators, and of such other orders and resolutions connected with the privileges of the Senate and the duties of Senators as the committee shall think desirable; and be authorized to report the same at the next session of the Senate, and to sit, either collectively or by a subcommittee, during the recess, and to employ a clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ALLISON. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made, and the resolution will go over.

NAVAL COMMITTEE HEARING.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada. I am instructed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] January 16, 1891, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the stenographer employed to report the hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs on the bill (S. 2779) providing for the reorganization of the Engineer Corps of the Navy be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ALLISON. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the resolution will go over.

HEARING BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada. I am instructed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON] January 31, 1891, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of reporting the hearings given by the Committee on Printing of the Senate, under resolution relating to selection of a site for the Government Printing Office, be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution. There certainly can be no objection to it. It is simply to pay the stenographer who has taken testimony in connection with the Printing-Office site.

Mr. ALLISON. I will not object to that.

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

PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION OF DOCUMENTS.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada. I am instructed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON] February 9, 1891, to report it favorably, without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Committee on Public Printing, with three members of the present Congress who are re-elected to the next Congress, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or any subcommittee of said special joint committee, are hereby instructed to examine into the numbers printed of the various documents, reports, bills, and other papers published by order of Congress, or of either House thereof, and of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to report a bill in December next, making such reductions in the numbers and cost of printing and such changes and reduction in the distribution of said publications as they may deem expedient, with a report giving their reasons therefor; and that the said committee is also instructed to investigate the printing and binding for the Executive Departments, executed at the Government Printing Office and at the branch printing offices and binderies in the various Departments, and report a bill in December next making such reductions in expenses and imposing such checks as they may deem expedient, with a report giving their reasons therefor; and said committee is further instructed to make any other investigation calculated in their opinion to reduce the cost of the public printing, and report the result thereof; and the said committee is hereby authorized to employ a stenographer, to summon and to examine experts and witnesses, and to call upon the heads of Executive Departments and the Public Printer for such information regarding the preceding matters as they may desire; and any expenses necessarily incurred in making the investigations aforesaid shall be defrayed from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ALLISON. I object.

Mr. MANDERSON. I hope there will be no objection to its present consideration, for this reason: The committee that it is proposed to raise is a joint committee of the two Houses, and it is necessary for the other House to act. I hope the Senator will not insist upon his objection.

Mr. ALLISON. I must object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the resolution will go over.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. PIERCE. Inasmuch as my term of service expires with the present Congress, I ask to be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Territories, as it may be desirable to fill the vacancy at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will be excused, if there be no objection, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SHOUP] as a member of the Committee on Territories in his place.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to inquire whether there should not be an order of the Senate authorizing the Chair to make a special appointment in a particular case or is there a general order to that effect?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would be glad to receive information. The appointment was suggested to him.

Mr. HOAR. I merely made the suggestion. I suppose by unanimous consent it would be done as a matter of course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is it the pleasure of the Senate that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SHOUP] shall serve upon the Committee on Territories? It will be considered as agreed to, if there is no objection. The Chair hears none.

SITE OF GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

Mr. MANDERSON. From the Committee on Printing I report back a resolution of the Senate directing the commission appointed to select a site for the Government Printing Office to report to the Senate their doings. The commission have reported very fully their action; and on certain matters relating thereto the Committee on Printing have taken testimony and prepared a report. I submit the report and ask that it be printed, and that the resolution, it having accomplished its purpose, be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection.

Mr. GORMAN. In regard to this report, which comes from the majority of the Committee on Printing, I desire to say that I was so much engaged in the performance of other duties that I was not able to be present during the whole time when the testimony was taken, and I am unable to concur with the majority of the committee in the views which they present. Therefore I ask that the matter may be laid on the table or placed on the Calendar, so that if necessary I may have an opportunity to file a minority report before the close of the session. But it is probable that the question involved will come up in another form for the consideration of the Senate, upon the sundry civil appropriation bill, and a statement I shall then make will probably obviate the necessity of a minority report. However, I ask that the matter may be laid on the table.

Mr. MANDERSON. I have no objection to that action being taken with reference to the resolution, but I desire that the report may be printed at once.

Mr. GORMAN. Oh, certainly.

Mr. MANDERSON. I appreciate very fully the fact that on account of the circumstances alluded to the Senator from Maryland has had no opportunity to examine the matter.

Mr. COCKRELL. And the testimony ought to be printed.

Mr. MANDERSON. I think on examination the Senator from Maryland will probably unite with his brethren of the committee.

Mr. GORMAN. I have no objection to having the report printed, and the testimony as well.

Mr. MANDERSON. That will be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order to print the report and the accompanying testimony will be made, and the resolution will lie on the table for the present.

Mr. MANDERSON. I have a few further reports from the Committee on Printing, but I presume following the unpleasant precedent the Senator from Iowa has presented to us this morning their consideration will be objected to. Am I right in that?

Mr. ALLISON. I will state to the Senator that it is absolutely essential that the appropriation bills should be considered now. There will be intervals for other business. If any of these printing matters are matters of special importance, of course I do not object, as I did not in one or two instances; but I hope the reports will be deferred.

Mr. MANDERSON. I merely want to say that I shall not make the reports now, but later during the day, because I desire to ask their consideration when I do present them.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PLUMB introduced a bill (S. 5120) granting an increase of pension to Rhoda A. Reynolds; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 5121) for the relief of Luster P. Chester and Freeland Chester, and Luster P. Chester and Freeland Chester, executors of Thomas R. Chester; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 5122) granting a pension to William Sidney Myton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. FRYE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the post-office appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7616) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies taken and used by the United States Army as re-

ported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1883, known as the Bowman act; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MANDERSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the agricultural appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

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

Mr. MITCHELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the post-office appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, without printing.

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

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. MANDERSON to-day to the agricultural appropriation bill, reported it favorably and moved its reference to the Committee on Appropriations, and that it be printed; which was agreed to.

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

CLAIMS ALLOWED AND UNPAID.

Mr. ALLISON. I offer a resolution which I ask may be printed and lie over until to-morrow, although it ought to pass to-day.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to transmit to the Senate a list of all claims allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, since the allowance of those already transmitted to Congress during the present session, and also a list of judgments of the court of claims requiring an appropriation at the present session not already transmitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be printed and go over.

HON. ALEXANDER M'DONALD.

Mr. PLUMB submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committe to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Hon. Alexander McDonald, late a Senator from Arkansas, the amount due him as Senator in the Fortieth Congress from the 4th of March, 1867, till he was paid, said payment to be made from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate.

COLUMBIA RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. DOLPH. I offer a resolution which simply calls for information and which is important to the people of my section. I should like to have it passed this morning.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be directed to furnish to the Senate such information as he may possess concerning the progress and condition of the work of the construction of a canal and locks at the Cascades of the Columbia River, in the State of Oregon, the estimated cost of the completion of the same, and the time which will be required for such completion, together with copies of all reports of the engineer in charge of the work since his annual report concerning the same.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ALLISON. Let it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the resolution will go over.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 13552) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The bill (H. R. 13586) to amend the various acts relative to immigration and the importation of aliens under contract or agreement to perform labor was read twice by it title.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that that bill be placed on the Calendar in place of Senate bill 5035, which is exactly like it, and that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 21st instant approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 4397) to provide for the selection of a site for a military post at San Diego, Cal.; and

An act (S. 2639) for the relief of Mrs. Selina Bestor, Orson H. Bestor, and E. Francis Riggs.

The message also announced that the President had on the 23d instant approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 2276) for the relief of Rodman M. Price;

An act (S. 337) granting a pension to Levi Danley;

An act (S. 1035) granting a pension to Betsey Johnson;

An act (S. 2529) granting a pension to Sarah J. Powers;

An act (S. 2586) granting a pension to Andrew J. Elliott;

An act (S. 3258) granting a pension to Adaline L. Miller;

An act (S. 3552) granting a pension to Mrs. Jane Hinsdale;

An act (S. 3680) granting a pension to Peter Zimmerman;

An act (S. 3995) granting a pension to Myra E. Lakin;

An act (S. 4016) granting a pension to Frank C. Myrick;

An act (S. 4045) granting a pension to John Farrell;

An act (S. 4299) granting a pension to Nathan C. Moore;

An act (S. 4697) to pension Charles W. Geddes for services in the war with Mexico;

An act (S. 4474) to increase the pension of Edward H. Leib; and

An act (S. 3251) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Fosnot.

The message further announced that the President had on the 24th instant approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 4484) for the relief of D. H. Mitchell;

An act (S. 5000) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota;

An act (S. 874) for the erection of a public building in the city of Roanoke, Roanoke County, Virginia;

An act (S. 4746) for the relief of settlers upon certain lands in the State of Iowa;

An act (S. 2675) to authorize the Kansas and Arkansas Valley Railway to construct and operate additional lines of railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes;

An act (S. 4126) for the relief of Elizabeth Jones, widow of John Jones, deceased;

An act (S. 4376) for the relief of William G. Tidwell;

An act (S. 5012) granting an increase of pension to General W. H. Powell;

An act (S. 5077) granting a pension to Daniel Ullman; and

An act (S. 174) fixing the salaries of the several judges of the United States district courts at $5,000 per annum.

BILL BECOME A LAW.

The message also announced that the bill (S. 4671) authorizing the President to restore Tenedor Ten Eyck to the Army and place him on the retired list, having been presented to the President of the United States on the 12th of February, 1891, for his approval, and not having been returned by him to the House of Congress in which it originated within the time prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, had become a law without his approval.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. MCPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9798) to establish a United States land court and to provide for a judicial investigation and settlement of private land claims in the Territories of Utah and New Mexico and the States of Colorado, Nevada, and Wyoming, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CASWELL, Mr. WICKHAM, and Mr. MONTGOMERY managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 395) for the relief of Sarah K. McLean, widow of the late Lieut. Col. Nathaniel H. McLean;

A bill (S. 421) for the relief of the legal representatives of David Walter Jones;

A bill (S. 707) for the allowance of the claim of George Brown for stores and supplies taken and used by the United States Army, as reported by the Court of Claims, under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887;

A bill (S. 1160) for the relief of George W. Quintard and George E. Weed, assignees of John Roach, deceased;

A bill (S. 4724) for the relief of John P. Downing, first paying teller in the subtreasury at Boston, Mass.; and

A bill (S. 5037) to authorize the building of a railroad bridge at Little Rock, Ark.

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

A bill (H. R. 2259) for the relief of Willis Cornwell;

A bill (H. R. 3568) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to revoke the order dismissing Second Lieut. Edwin F. Nixon;

A bill (H. R. 4212) for the relief of Henry Ayres;

A bill (H. R. 5838) for the relief of Andrew J. Boss;

A bill (H. R. 6021) for the relief of Dr. James Madison;

A bill (H. R. 6186) authorizing the refunding of the duties paid on a painted glass window imported by the rector of St. Mary's Church, county of Harford, State of Maryland;

A bill (H. R. 7490) for the relief of Bvt. Lieut. Col. J. Madison Cutts;

A bill (H. R. 9599) for the relief of R. F. Balke, as Mellwood Distillery;

A bill (H. R. 11003) to detach the county of Logan, in the State of Ohio, from the northern and attach it to the southern judicial district of said State;

A bill (H. R. 11663) to relieve Orville B. Merrill, late captain Company I, Thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteers, of the charge of dishonorable dismissal; and

A bill (H. R. 12152) for the relief of Henry L. Morey.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, that order is closed and the Calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13462) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reading will be continued on page 65.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire now to ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of the bill debate on amendments thereto shall be limited to five minutes for each Senator on the pending question, and that no Senator shall speak more than once on the same amendment. I think there will be no difficulty in having as full debate as will be necessary on the remainder of the bill under the five-minute rule. I will state that I make this request in the interest of the promotion of the public business. I may have appeared somewhat ungracious this morning in objecting to what may be considered routine or detail business, but it is absolutely essential that these appropriation bills, involving many items, and many items of disagreement, shall go to the other House in order that they may be considered. Otherwise an extra session will be absolutely inevitable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. MORRILL and others. No objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered. The reading of the bill will be resumed on page 65.

The Chief Clerk resumed the reading of the bill at line 20, on page 65. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the items for surveying public lands, on page 66, line 3, after the word "lines," to insert:

And said rates, in contracts hereafter made, shall apply to the unexpended balances assigned to said States of the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

Mr. STEWART. In regard to the five-minute rule, I am in favor of it as a general proposition, but there is one matter in connection with the bill that may require a longer time than that if the committee offer opposition to it. It is an appropriation of $20,000 to gather information in regard to irrigation. I want to except the rule on that item because Senators from the West feel a great interest in the matter. We can get along with it under the five-minute rule unless opposition is shown, when we shall want more time to explain it. I desire to reserve that item from the operation of the five-minute rule if necessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. The Chair did not hear the remark made by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HALE. I understood that the proposition to apply the five-minute rule was unanimously agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That was the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. STEWART. I do not want to be regarded as having given unanimous consent to that rule in regard to the amendment which will be offered providing for collecting information in regard to irrigation, because a good many of us feel a deep interest in it. Probably there will be no objection made to the amendment. If there is not we can get along, but, if there is opposition to it, we shall not consent to the five-minute rule being applied on that amendment.

Mr. PADDOCK. I also have an amendment to offer of like import upon which I may desire to have a little more time.

Mr. HALE. It evidently is no use for the Senate in the expedition of public business to make agreements that are assented to apparently by every Senator if afterwards different Senators who have amendments of their own, in which they are undoubtedly interested, come in protesting and declaring that they will not abide by the agreement.

Mr. PADDOCK. I do not object to the rule.

Mr. HALE. The Committee on Appropriations is nothing but the organ of the body in trying to do business, and it is at the mercy of the body. After having faithfully attempted to relieve the Senate from the great pressure which is unprecedented now, the number of the appropriation bills, all of them important, not yet considered, being much greater than ever before at this period of a short session, if after an agreement had been made and entered into and recorded that upon one bill the five-minute rule shall obtain, Senators come in one after another and declare that they will not abide by that agreement, then we may as well understand that the time of the Senate is to be given to talk and not to doing business, and the Committee on Appropriations is powerless. There are appropriation bills that have not yet been before the Senate at all involving millions upon millions of dollars, that will have to be discussed here under some rule, and the five-minute rule is the only rule under which it is possible to give them any intelligent discussion. Otherwise one or two Senators will occupy the entire time upon those appropriation bills.

The five-minute rule is intended not to suppress discussion, but for the illumination of the subject-matter, and it is the only way by which the Senate will pass all these appropriation bills, and that can only be done by constant day and night and Sunday sessions. The only way they can be passed is under the five-minute rule, and if we do not adopt that rule and stick to it, it is as true as tides or sunrise that when the 4th of March comes we shall be confronted with the fact that we have failed to pass the bills and there must be an extra session. Senators ought to understand that.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I have not occupied a moment of time or said a word on any appropriation bill thus far, and I shall do all I can to facilitate the business by keeping still on ordinary occasions. But we are in an unfortunate position. At the end of every session all the appropriation bills come in here at once and we are compelled to pass measures here under the pressure of avoiding an extra session, so that we can not give that attention to the public business which ought to be given to it. It is a great calamity that the appropriation bills do not arrive here earlier.

MARITIME CANAL COMPANY OF NICARAGUA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 12 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 4827) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua," approved February 20, 1889.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be laid aside informally, if there be no objection.

Mr. STEWART. I object to laying aside the unfinished business informally.

Mr. PADDOCK. I desire again to repeat the notice I gave the other day, that so soon as the pending appropriation bill is determined I shall move to take up the pure-food bill, Senate bill 3991, in place of the order just laid aside.

Mr. STEWART. I object to laying it aside informally.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13462) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Iowa that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations, to insert certain words, beginning in line 3, on page 66.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 66, line 16, after the words "United States," to add:

And out of the sum herein appropriated for surveying the public lands, the Commissioner of the General Land Office, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, may assign a sum sufficient to complete the survey of the Public Land Strip—otherwise known as No Man's Land—and the boundary line between said Public Land Strip and New Mexico, and the prolongation of the same southward between Texas and New Mexico, established under act of June 15, 1858, is hereby confirmed.

Mr. ALLISON. I move to amend the amendment in line 22, by striking out "New Mexico" and inserting "Texas," and in the same line, by striking out the words "the prolongation of the same southward," and in line 24, after the word "June," by inserting "fifth" instead of "fifteenth."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 66, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "New Mexico;" in the same line, to strike out the words "the prolongation of the same southward;" and in line 24 to strike out "fifteenth" and insert "fifth;" so as to make the amendment read:

And out of the sum herein appropriated for surveying the public lands the Commissioner of the General Land Office, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, may assign a sum sufficient to complete the survey of the Public Land Strip—otherwise known as No Man's Land—and the boundary line between said Public Land Strip and Texas, and between Texas and New Mexico, established under act of June 5, 1858, is hereby confirmed.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 67, after line 6, to insert:

Improvement of Hot Springs reservation: For construction of roads in said reservation, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 17, before the word "thousand," to strike out "three hundred and twenty-five" and insert "two hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

For topographic surveys in various portions of the United States, $200,000, one-half of which sum shall be expended west of the one hundredth meridian.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 4, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifty" and insert "ten;" so as to make the clause read:

For the preparation of the report on the mineral resources of the United States, $10,000.

Mr. WILSON. I hope the amendment recommended by the committee in that paragraph will not be adopted. If it is intended to have the work provided for in that clause of the bill thoroughly done, then the sum contained in the bill as it came from the other House should be appropriated. The appropriation of $50,000 was recommended by the Secretary of the Interior in his letter to the Secretary of the Treasury of January 15, 1891, in which he says:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, *Washington, January 15, 1891.*

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith, with my approval, a supplemental estimate of $50,000, submitted by the Director of the United States Geological Survey, "for the preparation of the report on the mineral resources of the United States," and recommend the same to the favorable consideration of Congress.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. NOBLE, *Secretary.*

The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Embraced in the document I hold in my hand I find there is a detailed statement of all of the contemplated expenditures embraced within the estimated appropriation of $50,000, and I must say that, for minute statement, going into the smallest details, it is seldom that the Senate is placed in possession of a document that is more complete than this. Every purpose to which that money is to be applied and all the methods to be used in its expenditure are given in the minutest manner. It seems to me that, if this work is to be entered upon at all, it should be with a sum sufficient to enable the bureau to make a complete report.

From the annual report of the bureau on the subject of mineral resources of the United States for 1888, I am led to conclude that the appropriation which is now asked for will give a report so comprehensive in every respect that the Government can well afford to pay $50,000 for it. It is seldom that we have more intelligent and comprehensive work done than we find in this volume. The statement of the reasons given for asking for more money supports, in my judgment, the recommendation made by the Secretary of the Interior. The gentleman who has charge of this work, Professor Day, gives evidence in everything he does of thorough comprehension of the duties imposed on him and the purposes which he is expected to attain; and I think we may very well follow the suggestions made by him, especially under the light given by the statement in detail in respect of the expenses, to which I have called the attention of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to state in a few words the reasons which actuated the committee in proposing the reduction of this appropriation to $10,000.

Ten thousand dollars is the sum which has been appropriated for this purpose for many years. My colleague has said very truly that a valuable report has been published every year in pursuance of this $10,000 appropriation. Professor Day, of the Geological Survey, who has had charge of this matter for a good many years, is a very efficient officer, and under the Superintendent of the Census, during this year he is making a most elaborate report on this subject, and a considerable expenditure has been made, I think aggregating nearly $150,000, for the purpose of making a thorough and comprehensive report under the census of 1890. Of course a considerable clerical force has had to be employed in this work.

The object of the $50,000 appropriation is to continue this machinery for the collection of these mineral statistics from year to year. To begin now under this appropriation another collection, before even the report of this year under the census is printed and published, did not seem to the committee a wise expenditure of money. Under the provisions of the census law every fifth year the States take a census and the United States Government pays one-half the cost. Under these circumstances it seems to me we ought not now to enter upon the establishment of a new bureau which looks to the collection of the statistics of our mineral resources every year.

I will say to my colleague that in my judgment there is infinitely more necessity for providing for the collection of agricultural statistics each year, and if we are to enter upon this examination every year in detail, involving a large expenditure, I shall feel compelled for one to insist that it shall go beyond this, and that we shall have agricultural statistics and manufacturing statistics from year to year, as is now proposed respecting mineral statistics.

Mr. WILSON. My colleague will allow me to suggest to him that this does not propose to establish a new bureau. This is part of the organization of the Geological Bureau.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand that; but my colleague will bear in mind that the work of gathering the statistics of the mineral resources of our country has just been completed under the census at a cost of $150,000, and the report has not yet been printed. Now, it is proposed by this appropriation and those who have this subject in charge to undertake this work for next year and perhaps to keep this clerical force and this establishment going on from year to year. I say it is an injustice to the other great industries of this country to engage in this sort of work and for the bureau of mineral resources alone to have this power.

Mr. WILSON. I suggest to my colleague that the way to correct that injustice is not to do injustice to another interest, but by making provision for the industries to which he has referred. Then we may have them both complete.

Mr. STEWART. I had considerable connection with the inauguration of the collection of mineral statistics. It was started and brought around on my motion by Major Raymond and others, and the work has been of considerable value.

I was inclined at the last session to think that the bureau had gone far enough and there was no further necessity for it, because I feared that such reports might be used improperly, and if they should give particular descriptions of mines investors might be misled; but in justice to Professor Day I wish to say that my attention has been called to the work performed under his direction. I have spent some hours looking over the reports he has made, and I must say that they are very intelligent, very conservative, and useful. I wish to say that much in regard to his work.

How much money ought to be appropriated I leave to others who have investigated the subject. I merely want to bear my testimony to the value of the work which he has done. He is doing his duty very thoroughly. I want to do justice to all these men, and I generally take the trouble to find out what they are doing before I give my testimony in their behalf. Professor Day is certainly doing good work and his reports are valuable.

Mr. TELLER. I only wish to say a word. I think the appropriation as it came from the other House of $50,000 is little enough to do the work which is being done. I understand this work is done by officers who are employed otherwise than for the special purpose of doing this work. The money has been paid simply to pay traveling expenses and a slight salary, in some instances $200, and in one instance, I believe, $400, but the salary is nominal. This appropriation is really to defray expenses, and I am assured by those who know that it will greatly cripple the work to reduce the appropriation to $10,000.

Mr. SPOONER. I should like to inquire of the Senator who has the bill in charge what has been the ordinary annual appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. ALLISON. Ten thousand dollars, and with that appropriation they have been able to publish a valuable report each year respecting the subject.

Mr. SPOONER. On what intelligent theory, if the work has been properly done heretofore, can it be claimed that it would be very much crippled if the appropriation be made now what it always has been?

Mr. TELLER. There has never been made an entirely reliable statement of the mineral product. There never has been a thorough examination of the output of the precious metals from the mines at least. There never has been, in my judgment, a thorough examination of the output of gold until recently. Every mine-owner who produces gold should be interrogated as to his product, and every place where silver is produced should be thoroughly examined in order to determine the output. It is easier to find the output of silver than it is that of gold. We ought to know accurately the output, and $50,000 or thereabouts is not a large sum of money for this purpose. I am assured by the people who have been engaged in making this examination that they frequently have to make inquiries by letter, and when they do not get a response then they inquire of somebody what he thinks the output of a particular mine is. An officer of the Government should go upon the ground, go to the mine-owner, and ascertain the amount of his output.

Mr. SPOONER. Has not the matter been very thoroughly gone into under the auspices of the Census Office?

Mr. TELLER. So far as the work which has been done under the census is concerned, they have not been limited to $10,000. That is for this year. Every other year after the census ceases it will be as important to know what the output is as it is to know what is the output this year.

Mr. HALE. The census is not limited to this year. The statement prepared is an exhaustive and complete statement to put the public in possession of everything the Senator from Colorado wants, and it has cost between $150,000 and $200,000. Now, to start in upon the heels of that and make a new bureau with $50,000 a year is certainly not a fair appropriation of the public funds.

Mr. TELLER. No new bureau is made.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, the gentleman in charge of this particular branch, Dr. Day, is very solicitous to have this $50,000 appropriated and has urged it upon me, as he probably has upon all Senators whom he could reach. His statement, which I hold in my hand, is that he

was and has been for some years in charge of this branch of the Geological Survey, and that with the appropriation of $10,000 heretofore he has been enabled to make the report by securing, through correspondence and otherwise, the information which is contained in that volume. He was assigned to the head of the division of the Census Bureau having this special subject in charge, and has spent $200,000 within a year, according to his own statement, to make the most complete report which has ever been made upon this subject. Having this large bureau in the Census Office, and their work terminating with the year, except the finishing up of the report and presenting it to Congress, he is anxious to go on with a permanent and large bureau in the Geological Survey.

The Committee on Appropriations, seeing that this work has already been done at a cost of some $200,000 within the year, thought we ought to get along next year with $10,000. After the report has been submitted to Congress and the value of it can be ascertained, if further provision is necessary hereafter, Congress can make it. It is impossible to do it now without a waste of the public money.

Mr. PLUMB. The kind of information which the Senator from Colorado speaks of, it seems to me, is not necessary to be had, except in a very limited way. All the gold and all the silver go through certain well-ascertained channels. If a person who was not exceedingly careful went to every mine-owner and asked what his product was and then went to the smelting and reduction works, the assay offices, and all that, he might find himself duplicating the amount of the output. Every bit of gold practically in the country goes through an assay office or a smelter, as every bit of silver does. If there are leaks anywhere, they are inconsiderable and need not be taken into account.

This information is, of course, desirable to be had; but it is a well-trodden field. Whoever goes into it has no need of using instrumentalities which have not heretofore been used. There is no need at all of exalting this thing at this late date, especially after the exhaustive investigation of last year by the Census Office, adopting new instrumentalities and going into it with a large force as if it was a thing never before done. I believe $10,000 is ample for the purpose, and I hope we shall not now adopt the plan of enlarging the functions of this executive bureau, already pretty widely extended, and there are too many of them, I think, traveling in the track of others.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I do not know whether or not the amount of money asked for this purpose is too great. I do, however, think that it is a very clear proposition that the mineral resources of the United States are of the greatest importance to the national prosperity and that they are as yet undeveloped and unknown comparatively. That there should be constant attention and scientific inquiries and practical results obtained, seems to me to be a matter of no kind of doubt. Take the State of Florida, which has recently developed a vast mine of wealth in the phosphates which have been discovered there. They are not yet known. They are the subject now of careful examination and are constantly developing in still greater and greater quantities under the further scientific investigations that are being made by the Geological Survey. This is a fact that does not rest in the opinion of any one individual. The aggregate mineral resources, the metal resources, and some yet undiscovered, of this country, are of the very first importance. How are these resources to be ascertained? That is the practical question.

I understand that representatives of the mining industries of this country since this amendment has been proposed have written great numbers of letters to the Geological Survey, insisting upon the value of these very investigations and of the compilation which has been made. If that be true, this small amount of money is a matter of no consequence compared with the practical investigation and communication to the people of this country of the extent of its mineral resources and its mining industries. It seems to me that it is a question of the very first importance. If it be true, as I understand it to be, and as seems to be admitted upon all sides here, that this work has been done accurately, that the information has been compiled in a form that will be useful to the whole country and if it be true, as it is stated, that it is not yet completed, and that it is desired to continue this investigation upon a larger and wider field, it seems to me that the amount named by the other House can be used with great advantage to the economic administration of the Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations. The amendment will be regarded as agreed to, if there be no objection.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. There has been considerable objection to this amendment and I think there certainly should be a vote on it by the Senate. There have been two or three speeches made against the proposed amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will put the question on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 69, line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "five thousand" and insert "two thousand five hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

For the purchase of necessary books for the library and the payment for the transmission of public documents through the Smithsonian exchange, $2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 10, before the word "thousand," to strike out "seventy" and insert "fifty;" so as to make the clause read:

For engraving the geological maps of the United States, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, after line 10, to strike out the following:

For rent of office rooms in Washington, D. C., $3,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 12, to change the footing of the appropriations "for general expenses of Geological Survey" from "$723,900" to "$533,900."

Mr. ALLISON. There is a slight error in the footing there. I move to strike out "$533,900" and insert "$533,200." It is a mere change of footing.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the clause making appropriation for "Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb," on page 71, line 8, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifty-two" and insert "forty-seven;" so as to make the clause read:

Current expenses of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb: For support of the institution, including salaries and incidental expenses, for books and illustrative apparatus, and for general repairs and improvements, $47,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of the clause on page 71, line 10, "for maintenance of the Howard University."

Mr. ALLISON. The Committee on Appropriations authorized me to move an amendment in line 14, after the word "twenty," to insert "eight;" so as to make the amount $28,300.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 71, line 14, after the word "twenty," it is proposed to insert "eight;" so as to make the clause read:

For maintenance of the Howard University, to be used in part payment of the salaries of the officers, professors, teachers, and other regular employés of the university, the balance of which will be paid from donations and other sources, $28,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANCE. I offer the following amendment, to come in immediately after the amendment which has just been agreed to:

And the proper officers of said university shall report annually to the Secretary of the Treasury how all these appropriations have been expended.

Mr. ALLISON. Under the agreement the committee amendments are to be first considered. I say to my friend that I shall probably offer no objection to the amendment he proposes, but I ask him to withhold it for the present.

Mr. VANCE. We have no means of ascertaining how these appropriations made by Congress are expended. There is no kind of report made, as I understand, to any official of the Government. The amendment simply requires that a report shall be made.

Mr. ALLISON. Later on I shall probably agree to the amendment, but I think it should read "The Secretary of the Interior" instead of "the Secretary of the Treasury." The Howard University is under the Department of the Interior, and the report of what is done should be made to that Department.

Mr. VANCE. Very well; I will insert "Secretary of the Interior."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be in order when the committee amendments are concluded.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment was, on page 72, line 4, to increase the appropriation "for subsistence" for the "Freedmen's Hospital and Asylum" from "$22,000" to "$23,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to the clause ending on line 8, page 72.

Mr. ALLISON. On page 72, line 6, the word "three" occurs twice in succession. It should be stricken out in one place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That verbal correction will be made, in the absence of objection.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 72, line 16, to increase the total amount of the appropriations for "Freedmen's Hospital and Asylum" from "$51,525" to "$52,525."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Under the War Department," in the appropriations for "Armories and arsenals," on page 73, line 2, to increase from "$10,0000" to "$15,000" the apropriation "for general care, preservation, and improvements; for care and preservation of the water power; for painting and care and preservation of permanent buildings, bridges, and shores of the island; for building fences and sewers, grading grounds.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 23, after the word "arsenal," to strike out "including new tools and appliances;" so as to make the clause read:

Testing machine, Watertown arsenal: For labor and material in caring for,

preserving, and operating the United States testing machine at Watertown arsenal $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out the clauses from line 25, on page 74, to line 9, on page 75, inclusive, as follows:

Watervliet arsenal, West Troy, New York: For making macadam roads in arsenal grounds in continuation of such road-making already done, and to complete the same, $5,125:

For paving roads in arsenal grounds with granite blocks, $5,000.

For 3,000 cubic yards of filling obtained from future excavations at the arsenal and from gravel obtained from river dredging, filling, and grading low lying grounds within the arsenal inclosure, $900.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I move to strike out line 10, on page 75. That is the total of the appropriations preceding which have been stricken out, and the total should be stricken out with them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out line 10, on page 75, as follows:

In all, $11,025.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 75, line 11, before the word "meet," to strike out "To" and insert "For the repair of smaller arsenals and to;" so as to make the clause read:

Repairs of arsenals: For the repair of smaller arsenals and to meet such unforeseen expenditures at arsenals as accidents or other contingencies during the year may render necessary, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "buildings and grounds in and around Washington," on page 76, after line 2, to insert:

For granite curbing about Lafayette and Franklin squares, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, after line 11, to insert:

For laying asphalt walks in various reservations, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, after line 14, to insert:

For replacing the old flagging pavement of the sidewalk on Pennsylvania avenue in front of the Executive Mansion by a granolithic pavement, $7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the first proviso to the clause making appropriations for "lighting the Executive Mansion and public grounds," on page 78, line 18, after the word "than," to strike out "$21.50" and insert "$20;" so as to read:

Provided, That for each 6-foot burner not connected with a meter in the lamps on the public grounds no more than $20 shall be paid per lamp for gas, including lighting, cleaning, and keeping in repair the lamps, under any expenditure provided for in this act; and said lamps shall burn not less than three thousand hours per annum; and authority is hereby given to substitute other illuminating material for the same or less price, and to use so much of the sum hereby appropriated as may be necessary for that purpose.

Mr. ALLISON. On further examination the committee ask that that amendment may be disagreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the appropriations for "Engineer Department," on page 80, after the word "dollars," at the end of line 19, to insert:

Provided, That the plan for the improvement may be modified by changing the line limiting the excavation on Petty's Island to such position as the Secretary of War may consider desirable: *Provided further*, That the title to any additional lands acquired for this purpose shall be vested in the United States without charge to the latter.

So as to make the clause read:

For improving harbor at Philadelphia, Pa.: Continuing improvement; removal of Smith's Island and Windmill Island, Pennsylvania, and Petty's Island, New Jersey, and adjacent shoals, $300,000: *Provided*, That the plan for the improvement may be modified by changing the line limiting the excavation on Petty's Island to such position as the Secretary of War may consider desirable: *Provided further*, That the title to any additional lands acquired for this purpose shall be vested in the United States without charge to the latter.

Mr. HALE. I offer an amendment, to come in on page 80, line 24, after the word "desirable," in the amendment of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations, on page 80, line 24, after the word "desirable," it is proposed to insert:

And the material to be moved from said islands and shoals, under this appropriation and appropriations heretofore made and hereafter to be made, shall be deposited and spread on League Island, and to the extent of the cost of such deposit and spreading the said appropriations are hereby made available.

Mr. PLUMB. I suggest that that had better be done at somebody's discretion. That might prove to be much more expensive than some other method of raising League Island.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senator if there is not another appropriation authorized for that purpose. Is this with a view to enlarging that?

Mr. HALE. The amount can be fixed in conference. I am seeking to do what the Senator in charge of the bill, I know, would do, and that is, that the material which is dredged from this place, instead of being either dumped into the river or the bay, where it may be in the way and will have to be removed at some other time, may be put upon League Island, which we have to fill up. It is only utilizing this work. The amount that should be appropriated for this purpose I can not tell exactly, but the whole matter is left so that it can be adjusted in conference.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the amendment be again reported.

The Chief Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I suggest to the Senator that he strike out the words "hereafter to be made."

Mr. HALE. I will modify my amendment by striking out the words "hereafter to be made." That can be attended to hereafter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be so modified. The question is on the amendment to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of the following clause on page 81, line 5:

For improving harbor at Baltimore, Md.: Completing improvement, $151,200.

Mr. GORMAN. There is a misprint there, and I ask that it may be corrected. It should be "continuing improvement" instead of "completing improvement." I have a letter from the Chief of Engineers to that effect.

Mr. ALLISON. That is true. It should be "continuing" and not "completing."

Mr. GORMAN. I move to strike out the word "completing" and insert "continuing."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the appropriation for "military posts," on page 81, line 18, after the word "necessary," to strike out "six hundred and ninety" and insert "eight hundred;" so as to read:

For the construction of buildings at and the enlargement of such military posts as in the judgment of the Secretary of War may be necessary, $800,000: *Provided*, That the total cost of Fort Bliss shall not exceed $300,000, and that of Fort Brady $250,000, and that of Fort Omaha $500,000; and the name of the latter post is hereby changed to Fort Crook.

Mr. WARREN. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the committee, which I think will be acceptable to the Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senator to allow that amendment to be passed over until we get through with the committee amendments.

Mr. WARREN. I have no objection to that, if it can be done without prejudice.

Mr. ALLISON. It can be done without prejudice. I understand the purpose of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. WARREN. The object, I think, will meet the approval of the committee.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senator to withhold the amendment for the present.

Mr. WARREN. I withhold the amendment with the understanding that it is without prejudice and that I may offer it at some other time.

Mr. GORMAN. I do not want to delay action on this bill, but I wish simply to say that I think the sum of $800,000 is an extravagant amount for these military posts and that it is out of all proportion to the size of the Army. I think there is great extravagance in the matter and that it ought to be curbed. I do not want it understood that this increase from $690,000 to $800,000 goes through unanimously.

Mr. MANDERSON. I simply desire to say in response to the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland that I do not think the basis that he suggests as the proper basis for a sum to be expended for military posts is the correct one. There certainly can be no comparison between the size of the Army and the money that is necessarily expended for these posts. I suggest—and I think anyone familiar with the military posts of this Government will agree with me—that the amount proposed by the committee is too small rather than too large. The amount should be a million dollars or a million and a half for expenditures during the coming fiscal year in the interests of a true economy. The policy of the War Department is the abandoument of these small posts and the establishment of a few large garrisons. There is no question that that should be the course pursued by the War Department, and I hope there will be no effort made to reduce this amount. I think there really ought to be an increase of the amount proposed by the committee.

Mr. HAWLEY. Just a word in addition to what my colleague on the Committee on Military Affairs has said. It is unquestionably in the direction of economy, however much it may appear to be in the other direction. The Army is passing through a change; its purposes and necessities are changing. We used to speak of the "frontier." We have no frontier now within ourselves, and we are turning our attention more to what I might call our "external frontier." We shall be surrendering many military reservations and abandoning many military posts and concentrating the Army in larger numbers, and in that

there will be greater economy of support in all respects; but, in the mean time, it involves additional barracks at some places.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the appropriations for "national cemeteries," at the beginning of page 84, to insert:

National cemetery near Mound City, Ill.: For constructing and completing a gravel road and the necessary bridges from the national cemetery near Mound City, Ill., to Mounds Junction, on the Illinois Central Railroad, in Pulaski County, Illinois, $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary for such purpose, said sum to be expended and the work performed under the direction of the Secretary of War, but no part of this sum shall be expended until a contract for the completion of the work within this appropriation shall be made by the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, after line 11, to insert:

National cemetery, Presidio of San Francisco, Cal.: For continuing the work of construction and repair of the roads and walks leading to the United States national cemetery on the reservation of the Presidio of San Francisco, planting trees and shrubs, and for the protection and fencing of said roads and reservations in which the cemetery is situated, and also for the preservation of the same and its springs of water used for irrigating the post and cemetery from drifting sands, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "miscellaneous objects," on page 86, line 20, after the word "contract," to strike out "to be made with the city of Washington, under a contract;" so as to make the clause read:

Support and medical treatment of destitute patients: For the support and medical treatment of ninety-five medical and surgical patients who are destitute in the city of Washington, under a contract to be made with the Providence Hospital by the Surgeon General of the Army, $19,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 6, on page 88.

Mr. MANDERSON. I call the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill to the word "book," in line 6, on page 88. I think it should be pluralized. It is evidently an error in the print.

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, the word "book," where it occurs the second time, should be "books."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 88, line 6, after the word "maps," it is proposed to strike out "book" and insert "books;" so as to read:

Infantry and cavalry school, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.: For text-books, maps, books of reference, instruments, and materials for use in theoretical and practical instruction, $1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to the end of line 8, on page 88.

Mr. MANDERSON. I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to that point in the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. I offer, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, an amendment to come in on page 88, after line 8.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 88, after line 8, it is proposed to insert:

For the construction, under the direction of the Secretary of War, of suitable buildings for a military storehouse and offices at the military depot at Omaha, Nebr., $60,000, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 88, after line 17, to insert:

Pedestals and statues of Generals Philip H. Sheridan, John A. Logan, and Winfield S. Hancock: For the completion of the pedestals and statues thereon in honor of the late General Philip H. Sheridan and the late General John A. Logan and the late General Winfield Scott Hancock, $10,000 for each commemorative statue, $30,000, in addition to the sums appropriated to these objects by the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890," to be expended under the direction as provided for in regard to the appropriations made by said act. And such part of the appropriations made by said act for the preparation of sites and pedestals in each case as may not be needed for that separate purpose, may be used and expended in the completion of the statues, respectively, to be placed on said pedestals in addition to the sums hereby appropriated thereto.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 100, line 24, before the word "hundred," to strike out "for" and insert "four;" so as to make the total of the appropriation for the National Soldiers' Home read "$2,447,093.95."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 101, after the word "cents," in line 25, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the accounts relating to the expenditure of said sums, as also all receipts by said homes from whatever source, shall, in addition to the supervision now provided for, be reported to and supervised by the Secretary of War.

Mr. ALLISON. The word "homes" in the amendment of the committee should be "home."

The VICE PRESIDENT. That modification will be made. The question is on the amendment of the committee as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY. Before proceeding to the State homes I wish to say to the chairman of the committee that I intend to move certain amendments relating to the National Soldiers' Home for a few additional buildings absolutely required according to the reports of the managers and the estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury, but I will wait, as I suppose is proper, until the consideration of the committee amendments shall have been concluded.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, that after the committee amendments are through with I think I shall not materially object to the sundry amendments suggested by him from that committee.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 102, line 11, after the word "and," to strike out "sewerage" and insert "plumbing;" so as to make the clause read:

For the remodeling and repair of the apparatus for the heating, ventilation, and plumbing of the United States courthouse in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, $1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 106, after line 17, to insert:

To enable the Attorney-General to employ special counsel to assist in the argument before the Supreme Court of the United States of the suit, United States versus the Des Moines Navigation Railroad Company $2,500, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, line 5, after the word "prosecutions," to insert "under the internal-revenue laws;" in line 9, after the words "complaint by," to strike out "some Government officer" and insert "a collector or deputy collector of internal revenue, or revenue agent;" in line 12, after the word "information," to insert "and belief;" and after the word "such," at the end of the same line, to strike out "prosecution is instituted by" and insert "arrest by a circuit or district judge or;" so as to read:

And no part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used to pay any fees to United States commissioners, marshals, or clerks for any warrant issued or arrest made, or other fees in prosecutions under the internal-revenue laws, unless the prosecution has been commenced upon a sworn complaint setting forth the facts constituting the offense and alleging them to be within the personal knowledge of the affiant, or upon sworn complaint by a collector or deputy collector of internal-revenue or revenue agent, setting forth the facts upon information and belief, and approved either before or after such arrest by a circuit or district judge or the attorney of the United States in the district where the offense is alleged to have been committed or the indictment is found.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, line 16, after the word "found," to strike out:

And whenever, in the opinion of the First Comptroller, any such prosecutions have been instituted and carried on solely for the purpose of making fees for the commissioners, clerks, marshals, or other officers of the United States, or for witnesses engaged therein, and not with a bona fide intention of punishing violators of the law, he may, with the approval of the Attorney-General, disallow entirely the accounts of such officers for fees and costs therein charged, and no recovery shall ever be had against the United States on accounts disallowed by virtue of the foregoing provisions, in any courts of the United States; and whenever, in the opinion of the First Comptroller, prosecutions begun in good faith shall be so conducted as to make unnecessary fees and costs, either by the selection of a commissioner not convenient of access for the witnesses to to be supœnaed, or by supœnaing too many witnesses, or by unnecessary length of the complaint or depositions, or by any other means, the First Comptroller may, with the approval of the Attorney-General, disallow in the accounts of every commissioner, clerk, and marshal such fees and costs as would not have been incurred had the prosecution been conducted with proper economy to the United States; and no recovery shall be had by any such clerk, commissioner, or marshal against the United States of such fees and costs as are disallowed under the foregoing provision in any court of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 109, after line 19, to insert:

UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Agricultural building: For the purpose of enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to erect on public reservation No. 2, in the city of Washington, D. C., a fireproof building for the scientific purposes of the Department of Agriculture, the same to be expended on plans to be made by the Supervising Architect of the Treasury and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, $250,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 110, after line 5, to insert:

Irrigation investigation: The time for the final completion of the report of the extent and availability for irrigation of the underflow and artesian waters within the region between the ninety-seventh degree of longitude and the eastern foothills of the Rocky Mountains, and the collection and publication of information as to the best methods of cultivating the soil by irrigation, limited to the 1st of July, 1891, by the act of September 30, 1890, is hereby extended to the 1st day of December, 1891.

Mr. STEWART. I suggest to the chairman of the committee to insert the word "thirty" before the word "first," in line 15; so as to read:

Is hereby extended to the 31st day of December, 1891.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not object to that.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment was, on page 111, after line 2, to insert:

Index to Congressional documents: To pay for the work done in preparing and completing the document index of the Fiftieth Congress by Alonzo W. Church, $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 111, line 14, before the word "thousand," to strike out "three" and insert "six;" so as to make the clause read:

Botanic Garden: For reconstructing propagating houses, extension and repairs to heating apparatus, and general repairs to buildings and walks, under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, $6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 111, after line 14, to insert:

Purchase of portrait of John Paul Jones: For the purchase by the Joint Committee on the Library of the portrait of John Paul Jones, $750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 111, after line 17, to insert:

Purchase of portrait of General Winfield Scott: For the purchase by the Joint Committee on the Library of the equestrian portrait of General Winfield Scott, painted by E. Troye, $3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 112, line 8, after the word "million," to insert "five hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

PUBLIC PRINTING AND BINDING.

For the public printing, for the public binding, and for paper for the public printing, including the cost of printing the debates and proceedings of Congress in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and for lithographing, mapping, and engraving for both Houses of Congress, the Supreme Court of the United States, the supreme court of the District of Columbia, the Court of Claims, the Library of Congress, the Executive Office, and the Departments, including salaries or compensation of all necessary clerks and employés, for labor (by the day, piece, or contract), and for all the necessary materials which may be needed in the prosecution of the work, $2,515,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 112, line 15, before the word "thousand," to strike out "eight hundred and eight" and insert "one million two hundred and ninety-nine;" so as to make the clause read:

And from the said sum hereby appropriated printing and binding shall be done by the Public Printer to the amounts following, respectively, namely:

For printing and binding for Congress, including the proceedings and debates, $1,299,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 114, line 1, before the word "thousand," to strike out "ten" and insert "fifteen;" so as to make the clause read:

For the Smithsonian Institution, for printing labels and blanks and for the "Bulletins" and annual volumes of the "Proceedings" of the National Museum, $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 114, line 15, before the word "thousand," to strike out "four" and insert "eight;" so as to increase the appropriation for printing and binding for the Department of Labor from $4,000 to $8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. PLUMB. I ask attention to the paragraph on page 104, lines 6, 7, and 8, which I move to strike out. I ask the Chief Clerk to read the paragraph.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Industrial Home, Utah Territory: For aid to the Industrial Christian Home Association, in Utah Territory, $4,000.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. President, the Government has spent about $75,000 for that institution up to date. The Senate knows, as the country knows, the theory upon which the appropriation was made. It was thought by reason of our very vigorous efforts to break up polygamy a considerable number of women who had been in polygamous relations with men would be thrown out of a home, or at all events would be anxious to permanently disassociate themselves from being connected with the religion of Joseph Smith and Brigham Young.

I have never believed that this institution would do any good. I have regarded it as an effort in the wrong direction. I have in my hand the report of the matron of the home, showing just how utterly ineffective the expenditure for last year was and how utterly inapplicable to the purpose for which the institution was created it has been. This report is directed to the secretary of the Utah Commission, who is also the secretary of the Territory of Utah, and it is as follows:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, *October* 27, 1890.

Mr. ELIJAH SELLS,
Secretary Utah Commission:

DEAR SIR: Yours of 25th received to-day. You will find inclosed a report of Industrial Home for the month of October, 1890. The reports for every preceding month since I took charge of the home are now in the hands of the president, Mrs. Ferry. She will doubtless return them to me next week when she comes to the city. There have been sixteen inmates in the home the greater part of the year.

That is about $275 per capita, supposing they remained there the entire year.

One woman refused to obey the rules of the home, and the board directed me to say to her that she must do so if she remained here. In reply she said, "I will go then," and did so September 8, taking her four children with her.

It will be noted in this connection that they took in women and children as well as women.

Her son, sixteen years old, had a few weeks before gone to live with an uncle for whom he was working. Her mother had gone two months before to take care of a sick daughter. There are but two persons employed in the home, Miss Lee, as cook, at a salary of $35 per month; A. L. Ryors, matron—

Who is the writer of this letter—

at a salary of $50 per month. There are two boys here now, aged fifteen years, who are not inmates of the home. They are the sons of Mrs. Dikes, the lady who is traveling in the Territory in the interest of the home.

It seems that they have an agent, a sort of commercial drummer, as it were, for the purpose of working up inmates for this home; I suppose selling goods at the usual rate of discount.

I was authorized to take care of them here by Mr. H. W. Lawrence, president of the board of directors of the home—

It seems that if anybody is looking for a place where he can lay his head he can go to this home for the unfortunate women of Utah—

during their mother's absence from the city. The ladies' literary society of the city have a room here which they occupy one afternoon every week. A committee from this society called upon me in September, stating that the room they had occupied for seven years had been rented to other parties when most of the officers of said society were away on their summer vacation, and they were unable to find a suitable room, and wanted to rent one here.

In other words, the Government has a room to rent in this building, and is carrying on a sort of apartment building or establishment, and so on, there.

I referred them to Mr. H. W. Lawrence as the proper person to see about this matter in the absence of the Utah Commission. At their request I called upon Mr. Lawrence and talked about it in the presence of the president of this society, who was also a member of the board of directors for this home, and we thought that no objections would be made to their occupying a room here until the Utah Commission came or could be heard from concerning it. It is not a permanent arrangement—

They are a sort of day boarders, as it were—

but only granted as a favor until they can secure a room in the center of the city. They hope to do this as soon as some of the business houses are completed. They agreed to pay me $22.50 per month for this room and paid this sum one month in advance. I took it at once to Mr. Lawrence, but he asked me to take charge of it until it was decided what use would be made of it. It is in the bank in my name, subject to your order to me.

The blanks I have for monthly reports are almost exhausted. Will be glad to have you mail me some before the close of November.

Respectfully,

A. L. RYORS,
Matron Industrial Home.

Appended to that is this report:

TERRITORY OF UTAH, SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Salt Lake City, Utah, October 28, 1890.

Report of Industrial Home for the month of October.

Inmates:	
Over eighteen years	3
Between five and twelve years	4
Under five years	2
Females	4

Mr. President, I hesitate to read the other line—

Males	5

Mr. President, see how completely that reverses the ordinary conception we have of Utah as a place where there are more females than males! Here is a Government institution carried on, as may be supposed, upon that entire basis of partiality which always results in the expenditure of Government money, and the balance invariably and inevitably comes in favor of males, where they are actually in a majority, in the institution created for the benefit of females.

Admitted October, none.
Discharged October, none.
The above report, for the information of the board of control, is respectfully submitted.

A. L. RYORS, *Matron.*

Mr. President, the result is that in an institution which we have created, endowed, supported, given the sanction of national legislation to, for the purpose of taking up and taking care of the women who are supposed to have been thrown out of relations with the men whom we have been prosecuting under Federal law for the violation of law, they have not chosen to go to the home at all; that the parties have been obliged to institute a practice of solicitation in order to get people into it; and that after all the drumming that has been done and after all the invitation of free board and free shelter and free clothing which has been offered in that Territory, the net result is four women and five men.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COCKRELL in the chair). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. PLUMB. My motion is to strike out the paragraph.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment moved by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, it perhaps can not be expected that in Utah the day of Pentecost, when three thousand and more shall have been brought under Christian influences, has yet come. This industrial home was established under the authority of Congress and supported chiefly by it in the aid, I may say without exaggeration, of the whole body of the Gentile women, whom I shall call Christian women, of that Territory, and of their husbands and brothers, and so on, to do what they could to make a place of safety and immediate support and provision for the future for plural wives of Mormon husbands and the children of those wives.

Now, my friend from Kansas has an objection to this for one reason,

that it appears that in that establishment there are five males to four females. The law does not provide and has never provided for any grown-up man or boy being taken in there, but for the plural wives who have renounced polygamy and their children. The objection is that these plural wives have had the misfortune to have more boy babies than girl babies, and therefore it happens that in the month of October, 1890, there are five boy children to four young infant girls. That is the proportion as I believe it was stated.

Mr. President, I think a mere statement of that is enough to make an answer to that argument. The fundamental proposition is that, as small as it may be in the earnest effort to destroy in a lawful and in a Christian way the polygamous hierarchy of that Territory, we have provided a means of shelter for the women who renounce polygamy and their children. It happens that in the month of October there are only fourteen or fifteen, or eighteen or twenty, or whatever the number may be, taking them all together, of these women and their children; and it happens that there are more male children than there are females.

I do not think that proves that the appropriation ought to be stricken out. These unfortunate women and these unfortunate children are not to blame for the particular sex.

Mr. HARRIS. How long is it since that home was established?

Mr. EDMUNDS. Three or four years. It was only got agoing about two years ago; and I think last year the complaint was that almost nobody was in it.

Mr. TELLER. My recollection is that last year there was only one inmate. However, I may be mistaken.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I say the number was very small last year. It has just got started and in operation. It is missionary work for Christianity, if Christianity consists in part, as I think it does, in the relation that all civilized countries regard as the proper one in respect of carrying on society as to marriage and so on.

If we are wrong about that, then we ought to strike it out, and we ought to let Utah run loose and make a polygamous State of it and be done with it. If we are right in the notions that Congress has hitherto entertained, then this is an aid and an auxiliary that every Gentile of whatever political party there (and there are two political parties, but the two always work together for this good all around) wishes to help in every way he can to take care of these unfortunate people, who give up their relations to one husband for three, four, or a dozen, or twenty wives, with their offspring, and bring them in here and take care of them.

Now, my friend says that it is a kind of drumming operation; that they send out agents. Why should they not send out agents as missionaries and find in every part of this vast geographical territory where is the case which will warrant taking up an unfortunate woman who has found the evil and the misfortune of her relations and bringing her into this place? Is my time up? I have said enough.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is up. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, this industrial home was established, after full debate in this branch, by the act of August 4, 1886; and in that year and subsequent years we appropriated $40,000, the language being as follows:

> To aid in the establishment of an industrial home in the Territory of Utah, to provide employment and means of self-support for the dependent women who renounce polygamy, and the children of such women, of tender age, in said Territory, with a view to aid in the suppression of polygamy therein.

After fully discussing and understanding this matter Congress has appropriated, and there has been paid out and spent, nearly $100,000 to establish this institution. As the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] has said, it has just fairly started. Last year the appropriation was opposed and sought to be striken out. It was said at that time that there were only one or two inmates. This year the number has increased.

Mr. President, they are doing a good work. The institution stands there constantly, as the promise of the Government to the women of Utah who abandon and renounce polygamy that for the time being neither they nor their children shall suffer because of that renunciation; and that invitation is extended every day in every year to everybody who will take advantage of it. The institution has not been filled up yet, Mr. President, but it stands there and the women and children of Utah who renounce polygamy have constantly an asylum there.

The little money that is provided for in this bill is not squandered. The very statement of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] shows that for the care of the small number of inmates there but two persons are employed. The whole management is carefully guarded. There is a board of trustees; all the accounts are scrutinized; everything is done openly and above board; every item is sent to the Secretary of the Treasury; and this appropriation here proposed to be made is in accordance with estimates duly made.

Mr. President, from the time this institution was first started it has met with the bitter hostility of the Mormon Church. It has met with bitter hostility upon this floor. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] has assailed it early and late. He does not believe in it. He can not see any benefit to come from it, and therefore he seeks to strike it out. What shall be done with this institution that we have endowed and equipped if we strike out this appropriation and refuse the small sum of $4,000 to maintain it?

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

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. PLUMB. I want the appropriation stricken out in order that the building shall be used for the benefit of dependent members of the Grand Army of the Republic, old soldiers of the Union. I have no doubt the Government can use it profitably for that purpose.

Mr. HALE. There has never been any call in that direction, and I venture to say now that the suggestion has not occurred to the mind of the Senator from Kansas until this moment, when I asked what should be done with it. Congress did not appropriate it for that purpose, but simply for the distinctive and single purpose which is incorporated in the original act; and all that is sought now is that this institution be given a fair trial.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. PLUMB. I hope the Senator from Maine will yield to me to allow me to say that, so far from what he has just said about the idea not having occurred to me until this moment being warranted by the fact, I hold in my hand a letter from an official in Utah in which that suggestion is made.

Mr. EDMUNDS. What is the name of the person?

Mr. PLUMB. Does the Senator want to know so as to put a detective on his track?

Mr. EDMUNDS. No; I want the name.

Mr. PLUMB. I do not feel warranted in giving the name to the Senator of any person proposing it in Utah, for fear the Senator would have him punished under the statute.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. PADDOCK. I simply desire to ask the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] the date of the letter he refers to.

Mr. PLUMB. It was written within the last twelve or fifteen days.

Mr. HALE. From that it is plain that it is an attempt to strike down this benevolent institution, started with the sanction of Congress, with the good wishes and prayers of benevolent men and women all over the United States, who are looking with interest to its operations. Mr. President, the clause will not go out of the bill without a yea-and-nay vote being taken upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB]. [Putting the question.] By the sound the ayes appear to have it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Then let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. PLUMB. Let us have a division.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us have the yeas and nays. I should like very much to have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HALE. Before the roll is called I ask that the clause be again read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas moves to strike out the clause which will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 104 it is proposed to strike out lines 6, 7, and 8, as follows:

> Industrial Home, Utah Territory: For aid to the Industrial Christian Home Association in Utah Territory, $4,000.

Mr. HALE. The amendment strikes out the appropriation.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. President, some years ago, when I was a member of the Utah Commission, the understanding on the part of all who were interested in breaking down the institution of polygamy was that polygamous wives could not be prevailed upon to leave their polygamous relations because they had no place to go; that if they abandoned the families of which they were members they would have no possible means of support. It was in that idea that this institution originated. It was believed by all who at that time were there, who were interested in breaking down this vile institution, that if an asylum could be furnished for polygamous wives many of them would sooner or later be induced to leave that relation who could not otherwise be prevailed upon to do so.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] smiles, but that is the fact. The institution had its origin in that theory, in that idea. Immediately when the plan had assumed practical form, and an appropriation was asked for, and when it appeared that it was to be a success, that the asylum was to be created, at once the batteries of the Mormon Church were directed against the idea and to prevent the success of the effort to establish the institution; and from the time that the matter was first presented in the Senate until this moment there has been no time that they have not assailed it in the most violent manner. They have used the influence and the power of the Mormon Church in the creation of a public sentiment by their supreme control in that country which few of those unfortunate women have had the courage to stand up against. The effect of that has been such as to deter these poor women from entering this asylum. Nevertheless there has been

an increase of the number of those who from time to time have braved this fearful influence and availed themselves of this beneficence.

I believe that the number will gradually increase as time goes on; and it seems to me that to do away with the institution now, when it has had only a couple of years' trial under these very hard circumstances, in the face of the formidable and terrible raids made against it by the most powerful organization that exists anywhere on this continent to-day, is not quite fair to those who have given their time and their money in their effort to establish this institution for these polygamous wives. I think it is due to them, to these good Christian men and women, who have devoted the last few years to originating this plan and carrying it out to accomplishment, so far as it has been accomplished, that another year or two at least should be allowed for a further test of its usefulness.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. President, I will modify my amendment by striking out all after the word "Territory" in line 6 and inserting what I send to the desk.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the amendment can not be modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment can not be modified now, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I object to any modification.

Mr. PLUMB. Then I ask to have the proposed modification read.

The CHIEF CLERK. Strike out all after the word "Territory" in line 6, and insert:

The building now under control of the Industrial Home in Utah Territory shall be turned over to the War Department to be used as a home for disabled volunteer Union soldiers.

Mr. HALE. That would be subject to a point of order, anyway.

Mr. PLUMB. The technicalities that the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Maine, of course, can exercise are one thing; but I want it understood that my purpose in moving to strike out and insert is to have an institution there which will accomplish some good, rather than to meet the sentiments which have been expressed, and which, so far, have had no response from the people of Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB].

Mr. PLUMB. I will withdraw, if I can, my original amendment to strike out, and then move another.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. Is there objection to giving unanimous consent to the Senator from Kansas to withdraw his amendment? Consent is given.

Mr. PLUMB. Now, having withdrawn my first amendment, I move to strike out all after the word "Territory," in line 6, and insert what has been read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment now offered will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 104, line 6, it is proposed to strike out the words "for aid to the Industrial Christian Home in Utah Territory, $4,000," and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The building now under control of the Industrial Home in Utah Territory shall be turned over to the War Department to be used as a home for disabled volunteer Union soldiers.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I make the point of order on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Maine be kind enough to state his point of order?

Mr. HALE. The point I make is that, by the statute to which I have referred, the act of 1886, and other acts, this building was erected for a specific and distinct purpose, to be used by the Industrial Home Association of Utah for the purpose of furnishing a refuge to the Mormon women who renounce polygamy, and their children; and that to now turn it to another purpose is to change existing law. I will not discuss it, because everyone will appreciate the point of order without discussing it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the decision of the Chair heretofore in such cases, the Chair will hold that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. PLUMB. Then I renew my motion to strike out, and I give notice that if that is agreed to I shall move to insert what has been read at the desk.

Mr. EDMUNDS. On the motion to strike out I demand the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas moves to strike out the clause on page 104, lines 6, 7, and 8, and upon that the Senator from Vermont demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

The roll was called.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. McMILLAN] is unavoidably absent from the Chamber and is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE].

Mr. CASEY. I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO]. As I do not know how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. BATE. I wish to announce the pair of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY]. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CASEY] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO].

Mr. VANCE (after having voted in the negative). I am paired generally with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN], and I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. CARLISLE] has been compelled to leave the Chamber on account of sickness.

Mr. PIERCE. I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CARLISLE].

Mr. DOLPH. I am paired with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. PAYNE (after having voted in the affirmative). I had not observed the absence of my colleague [Mr. SHERMAN] when I voted. I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HAMPTON. I am paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. DIXON].

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 31; as follows:

YEAS—20.

Berry,	Daniel,	McPherson,	Pugh,
Butler,	Eustis,	Morgan,	Reagan,
Cameron,	George,	Pettigrew,	Teller,
Cockrell,	Harris,	Plumb,	Turpie,
Coke,	Jones of Arkansas,	Power,	Vest.

NAYS—31.

Aldrich,	Edmunds,	Hoar,	Sanders,
Allen,	Evarts,	Kenna,	Sawyer,
Allison,	Frye,	Manderson,	Spooner,
Barbour,	Gorman,	Mitchell,	Squire,
Bate,	Hale,	Morrill,	Stewart,
Blackburn,	Hawley,	Paddock,	Stockbridge,
Blair,	Higgins,	Platt,	Walthall.
Call,	Hiscock,	Ransom,	

ABSENT—36.

Blodgett,	Dawes,	Ingalls,	Sherman,
Brown,	Dixon,	Jones of Nevada,	Shoup,
Carey,	Dolph,	McConnell,	Stanford,
Carlisle,	Farwell,	McMillan,	Vance,
Casey,	Faulkner,	Moody,	Voorhees,
Chandler,	Gibson,	Pasco,	Warren,
Colquitt,	Gray,	Payne,	Washburn,
Cullom,	Hampton,	Pierce,	Wilson,
Davis,	Hearst,	Quay,	Wolcott.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment from the Committee on Appropriations, to come in at the end of the bill, line 13, page 115.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. After line 13, on page 115, add the following proviso:

Provided, That the appropriation made in the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 13, 1890, to provide accommodations for the Government Printing Office and the authority for the expenditure of the same therein conferred, be, and the same are hereby, suspended.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER. On page 96, between lines 10 and 11, I move to insert the following words:

For the extension of the hospital, $20,000.

It is under the head of the Soldiers' Home, Northwestern Branch, at Milwaukee, Wis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The way the bill is paged now, that comes right after the Central Branch.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, on page 96, between lines 10 and 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be reported.

The SECRETARY. On page 96, after line 10, insert the following paragraph:

For the extension of the hospital, $20,000.

Mr. SPOONER. I will say that that is estimated for and the necessity for it is beyond any possible question.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I make no criticism; of course, the committee has acted as wisely as possible; but the local superintendents and the local visiting managers of the soldiers' homes made various recommendations concerning improvements in buildings and a number of recommendations for additional buildings, a boilerhouse here and there, a barrack here and there, and various things.

I have selected from those recommendations such as were approved by the Treasury Department, and then have selected from the list submitted by the Treasury Department a few that seem to be indispensable. Where it was for changes in headquarters buildings or something of that kind, I thought that it was a matter that might perhaps wait until next year. But where a hospital is crowded and men are put into quarters unfitted for hospital purposes I thought it right that I should see that an amendment was moved. Following the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], the next amendment I shall move will be on page 98, after line 11, to insert:

For the construction of a brick barrack, $31,000.

This for two or three years at least has been estimated for, but postponed. This winter there have been forty or fifty soldiers in tents. The report early in this month shows that there are forty-five who are not provided for in the buildings, and those, I suppose, are in the tents, of which, however, they do not make special complaint, because, being soldiers, they are rather comfortable in tents where they sleep, and some of them have actually petitioned for the privilege of going into the tents in preference to going into some of the crowded barracks.

But it is not quite decent to keep these men permanently in tents. They are willing to do so for the time being, because their sleeping quarters are otherwise crowded. But every single report from the home is to the effect that every place decently fitted for sleeping purposes is occupied, save the dining-room and two or three other rooms. I have all the figures here. This is the Central Branch.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to ask what is the aggregate of those figures.

Mr. REAGAN. We can not hear.

Mr. HAWLEY. The Senator from Iowa inquires about the aggregate. I have not added them up myself, because I went upon the merits of each individual case. I say, on the authority of the manager at Hampton and on the authority of General Franklin, speaking from his personal inspection and knowledge, that every room there in which a soldier could be put to sleep is already occupied. I know also, aside from that, that one of the buildings occupied as a barracks is scarcely fit for the purpose. Therefore I move, as I said, to insert on page 96, after line 10:

For the construction of a brick barrack, $31,000.

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. President, I shall not consume the time of the Senate. It would be useless to do so, at any rate. But I rose simply to call attention to the fact that this bill contains provisions for these homes amounting to about $3,000,000 for the next fiscal year; and in connection with that fact it is probable, and at least since the passage of the last pension bill, that every one of these men is drawing a liberal pension from the Government. Yet $3,000,000 is provided for homes for them in addition to their allowance for pensions. I know it is idle to waste time to call attention to these things, and yet it is right that it should be noted as we pass along.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment moved by the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY. In regard to the Western Branch, at Leavenworth, Kans., omitting other things they ask for in the way of storehouses, bakehouses, etc., I move to insert on page 99, after line 11:

For the construction of a brick barrack, $19,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY. Now, in regard to the Central Branch, at Dayton, Ohio, the estimates have quite a list of buildings and alterations, such as boiler room and coal shed, smokestack, and kitchen, boilers, tunnels, headquarter buildings, extension of hospital, water heater, extension of water supply, extension of electric lights, etc. I omit them all, and move on page 95, after line 10, to insert:

For the construction of one brick barrack, $15,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER. On page 2, line 19, I move to strike out the word "seventy" and insert the words "ninety five;" so as to read:

For post office at Burlington, Iowa: For completion of building under present limit, $95,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER. On page 7, line 15, I move to strike out the word "ninety" and insert in lieu thereof the words "one hundred;" so as to read:

For post office at Mankato, Minn.: For purchase of site and construction of building, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER. One more amendment, Mr. President. At the end of page 11, I move to insert the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, after line 25, at the foot of the page, add the following:

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to cause to be sold at public or private sale the buildings situate upon block 23 in the city of Milwaukee, Wis., acquired by the United States under the provisions of chapter 91 of the laws of the United States approved January 21, 1889, for a site of a public building in said city, and to apply the proceeds of said sale, together with the proceeds of the sale of the present public building and of the site thereof in said city to the erection of a building to be erected on said block 23, in addition to the limit of cost heretofore fixed for said site and building; and the Secretary may sell the present building and the site in said city at public or private sale, subject to the right of the United States Government to occupy the same at a reasonable rental, not exceeding 6 per cent. upon the sum for which the same is sold, at the completion of said new building.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I desire to offer an amendment; on page 26, at the end of line 14, I move to insert:

For the purchase of a site for the Long Branch life-saving station, $10,000, or so much thereof as may be required.

I hold in my hand a letter which I will send to the desk, being the recommendation of the Treasury Department, and also of the Life-Saving Department, with respect to this amendment, which, if desired, may be read; otherwise not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire to have read the communications referred to?

Mr. MCPHERSON. I do not ask to have it read unless some Senator wishes it.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator from New Jersey will not insist upon that amendment. I have no doubt it would be a good thing to make that purchase, but there is a station there now. The committee considered the question and thought it a matter that could lie over until next year.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Let the recommendation of the Department be read, as also that of the Life-Saving Service accompanying it.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not think that $10,000 is required for this purpose.

Mr. MCPHERSON. The necessity is very great, as is indicated in these reports.

Mr. ALLISON. I have read everything the Senator has presented, so far as that is concerned, but I have no objection to the letters being put in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letters will be printed in the RECORD. The letters referred to are as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1891.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of January 28, 1891, referring to me a copy of an "amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BLODGETT to the sundry civil appropriation bill providing $10,000 for the purchase of a site for life-saving station No. 5, at Long Branch, N. J.," and requesting suggestions touching the merits of the same.

In reply, I would respectfully state that the matter was referred to the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service for his consideration, and I transmit herewith his report with my concurrence.

Respectfully, yours,

A. B. NETTLETON,
Acting Secretary.

Hon. WILLIAM P. FRYE,
Chairman Committee on Commerce, United States Senate.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, UNITED STATES LIFE-SAVING SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1891.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge your reference of the letter of the Senate Committee on Commerce, transmitting a copy of an "amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BLODGETT to the sundry civil appropriation bill," and requesting suggestions touching the merits of the same.

The amendment proposes the appropriation of the sum of $10,000 "for the purchase of a site for life-saving station No. 5, at Long Branch, N. J." I would remark that the life-saving stations are not now and for some years have not been designated by numbers. The one referred to is known as the "Long Branch" station. The building is small, having been erected in the earlier years of the service when the requirements of the present time could not be anticipated, and the lot is insufficient in size, being but little larger than the station itself. In fact, it is impossible to get in and out of the station with the apparatus and appliances without passing over adjoining property.

This condition of things, which not only cramps the operations of the service, but renders the quarters of the surfmen uncomfortable, is unsatisfactory and embarrassing, but relief has not heretofore been considered possible. The inspecting officer of the district states that the only available land in the vicinity of which he has knowledge is a valuable lot adjacent to the present site, held at $20,000, and as he knew that this outlay could not be incurred by the service, he has not recommended it. He states that if a portion of this lot, or if any other suitable lot can be obtained in the immediate vicinity, he would strongly recommend its purchase, believing it to be for the best interests of the service and Government.

I concur in this opinion. A lot of 100 by 150 feet at least in dimensions and in the immediate vicinity of the present location of the station is needed. I think the proposed amendment ought to pass after being amended to read as follows: "For the purchase of a site for the Long Branch life-saving station, $10,000, or so much thereof as may be required."

Respectfully, yours,

S. I. KIMBALL,
General Superintendent.

The Hon. SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I have one other amendment which is recommended by the Committee on the Library.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 89, at the end of line 9, insert the following paragraph:

Thirty thousand dollars to be expended on the Trenton Battle Monument, Trenton, N. J., under the direction of the Secretary of War, when he is satisfied that a similar amount has been provided by the State of New Jersey and the Trenton Battle Monument Association.

Mr. MCPHERSON. That similar amount has been provided by the Battle Monument Association raising $15,000, and the State of New Jersey having contributed out of its funds $15,000 some two or three years ago, I hope the Senate will allow this item to be put in the bill. It has been passed three different times by the Senate. I think it no more than right that the appropriation should be made now.

Mr. ALLISON. I make the point of order upon the amendment that it is not estimated for, and there is no law for it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to come in after the word "dollars," in line 14, page 69.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 69, after line 14, insert:

Provided, That a sum not exceeding $25,000 of the foregoing sums may be transferred, by the order of the President, to the Department of Agriculture, to be expended in practical experimentation through the sinking of artesian wells, not to exceed six in number, on the public lands in the regions between the ninety-seventh degree of longitude and the eastern foothills of the Rocky Mountains, under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, for the promotion of agriculture by irrigation.

Mr. DOLPH. I offer an amendment to the amendment. I move to insert, after the words "Rocky Mountains," "and in the arid regions west of the Rocky Mountains and north of the forty-second degree of north latitude;" so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That a sum not exceeding $25,000 of the foregoing sum may be transferred, by the order of the President, to the Department of Agriculture, to be expended in practical experimentation through the sinking of artesian wells, not to exceed six in number, on the public lands in the region between the ninety-seventh degree of longitude and the eastern foothills of the Rocky Mountains, and in the arid regions west of the Rocky Mountains and north of the forty-second degree of north latitude, under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, for the promotion of agriculture by irrigation.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I make the point of order on the amendment that it has not been estimated for.

Mr. PADDOCK. I should like to hear the point of order stated.

Mr. ALLISON. That it has not been estimated for.

Mr. DOLPH. If the Senator from Iowa will allow me to prefer a request, I desire to have printed a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture and memorandum accompanying it.

Mr. ALLISON. I have no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That leave will be granted if there be no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 19, 1891.

SIR: In reply to your letter of the 6th instant, the office of irrigation inquiry, to which reference was made, returns the following statement as to the probable cost of sinking an artesian well, either by making a contract for the same or by the purchase of a plant and the direct use of it by persons temporarily employed for the purpose.

An engineering and geological reconnoissance will probably be necessary to determine the proper location for experimental well or wells. Oversight of the work will also be required. For this from $5,000 to $7,000 may be necessary.

The value of the reconnoissance needed will extend beyond the special wells proposed. Artesian wells for town purposes have been sunk at Baker City and Pendleton, Eastern Oregon, also at Pullman, Wash., and at Boisé City, Idaho. In the counties of Klamath, Lake, and Harney, Oregon, there should be found an abundant supply of artesian and overflow waters at very moderate depths. The entire foothills section and the basin of the Columbia River should also supply such waters. If desired, a brief will be made for your use of any data in possession of the Department.

I am, very respectfully,

EDWIN WILLITS, *Acting Secretary.*

Hon. J. N. DOLPH, *United States Senate.*

MEMORANDUM.

By contract the cost of the sinking of an artesian well in region north of 42 degrees and west of the Rockies will be $1.80 per foot, contractor guarantying water within or at 1,000 feet. Over that depth and for additional 500 feet it will be $2 per foot. This according to our best information.

The cost then will be: For 1,000 feet, $1,800; for 1,500 feet (600 additional), $2,400.

To purchase and man plant outright, the cost of first well boring will be from $4,500 to $5,000.

MEMORANDUM.

The eastern part of Oregon is largely arid in character. Nearly the whole of it requires the application of water artificially in order to produce crops. Klamath, Crook, Wasco, Lake, Harney, Grant, and Malheur are without question wholly within the arid region. Crook, Grant, and Baker are mainly a high, dry table-land, covered with natural grasses and well adapted to pastoral purposes. The eastern flanks of the Cascade Range from the Columbia south to the boundary of the State will unquestionably be found admirably adapted to storage of water, while in the valleys of Deschutes, Day, and Crooked Rivers there must necessarily exist in the gravel and erosion stratum below the alluvium a large supply of drainage water fed continuously by the precipitation on the Cascade Range. This is the more accessible, though not so copious, underground supply.

Artesian water proper, which has already been reached at Baker City further to the east, will, there is reason to believe, be found at comparatively moderate depths below the high table-land region. The seepage or soakage of the Columbia River as well at that of the Cascade Range, must be so great as to clearly indicate the probability of finding such a supply. In the south and southwestern section there will without doubt be found a considerable supply of what this office terms "negative" artesian water; that is, water held in storage in porous stratum with impervious beds beneath, accessible at moderate depths by boring, which rises in the bore, but does not flow to the top.

It is evident also by the number of shallow lakes, swamps, and lagoons found in Klamath, Lake, and Harney Counties, that the drainage "dip" or trend of the stratum and of the land generally tends in that direction. Even a superficial study of that area will satisfy a competent observer that phreatic or earth waters in sufficient quantity for small area irrigation can be obtained at moderate depth and cost. In the northern part of this portion of the State, embracing parts of Wasco, the whole of Sherman, Gilliam, Umatilla, and Morrow Counties, the returns made to the circulars sent out by this office, give evidence of the existence at very moderate depths of a considerable supply of earth waters, largely the drainage and seepage of the Columbia Basin, from both surface and river channel.

Irrigation works in Eastern Oregon are mainly found in Klamath, Baker, Union, and Umatilla Counties. Some very large projects, designed to cover several millions of acres of land, are now under way for reclamation purposes upon the table-lands of the Columbia Basin. The reclaimable area is estimated very moderately in Eastern Oregon at 3,000,000 acres. The projectors referred to propose to reclaim 1,250,000 acres.

In the Powder River Valley, Baker County, there are now in operation ten artesian wells ranging in depth from 75 to 155 feet. The total capacity of these wells is about 1,000,000 gallons daily. They are used for supplying Baker City. One other artesian well at Pendleton, having a flow of 1,000,000 gallons, is now in successful operation. It is used for town purposes. Along the Columbia River Basin the small dug and bored wells are mainly used for domestic purposes and orchard irrigation. They are so numerous as to indicate beyond question the possibility of their use for all fruit-farm purposes, and they also indicate the probable existence at a greater depth of a flow above the surface.

The western counties, beginning on the north with Wallowa, and going southward embracing Union, the eastern half of Baker, and the whole of Malheur, gives evidence of a water supply of value, with a strong pressure, beneath and near the surface soil. The Snake and Owyhee Rivers both carry large volumes of water, and drain a considerable hydrographic basin with broken and precipitous topography on either side. There is every reason to believe that a thorough reconnoissance will prove the possibility of considerable storage facilities, of a large supply to be obtained from the drainage seepage held in storage near to and beneath the surface, and as well also from the volume of higher precipitation which has found its way to deeper strata, and which will when tapped form an artesian supply.

In the judgment of the office of irrigation inquiry, Eastern Oregon will probably furnish a good supply for many artesian wells. More than that, it will give in the supplies nearer the surface, of the character known in our inquiries as underflow waters, a great number of separate wells and other small works sufficient to irrigate considerable though separate bodies of land, thus facilitating the cultivation of the soil, until the larger works shall present irrigation on a larger scale.

The average temperature in Eastern Oregon is 52°, and the range is from 90° in summer to 10° above zero in winter. As to rainfall, the average precipitation in the northern counties will be about 21 inches, that is as far as the Columbia basin is concerned. Umatilla has an average of about 10 inches. Union County to the southeast and Wallowa have a rainfall of about 24 inches. The central region covered by Crook and Grant Counties and the northern portions of Harney, Lake, and Klamath will show an annual precipitation of about 14 inches. The southern portion of Eastern Oregon, from Malheur to Klamath will range from 16 to 19 inches per annum.

Washington.—The eastern tier of counties in Washington are wholly within the subhumid or semiarid influences. This embraces Stevens County, east of the Columbia River, and Lincoln, Spokane, Adams, Whitman, Asotin, Garfield, Columbia, Walla Walla, and Franklin. The rainfall in this section will range from Colville, on the north, to Dayton, on the south, from 16.50 to 26.72 inches per annum, making an average of 21.61 inches for the whole section. On the north side of the Columbia basin the average is about 12 inches. In Yakima and Kittitass Counties the average will fall as low as 10 inches. North and west of the Columbia the precipitation will probably be about 12 inches, though no systematic records have been kept. It has been shown by the records in the eastern part of the State that the rainfall increases at an average rate of 3 inches for each 1,000 feet of altitude.

The whole of Eastern Washington lying south of British Columbia and east of the Columbia River is undoubtedly endowed with large volumes of phreatic or earth waters. In all the counties first named many hundreds of bored and dug wells are to be found, ranging in depth from 40 to 100 feet. The water when reached rises in the bore very near to the surface. The existence of a large amount of underflow water is shown everywhere along the Cœur d'Alene and the Blue Range. Artesian wells have been bored for town purposes at Pullman, where there are eight inside the corporate limits, having a depth of 75 to 95 feet, with a 5-inch bore, and discharging each from 700 to 1,000 gallons per minute. All efforts outside of the town proper to reach such water have been failures. A large well is in operation at Sprague, in Lincoln County, flowing 720,000 gallons per day, the water of which is pumped for part of the bore. The characteristics spoken of in regard to Oregon can all be found in Eastern Washington.

Idaho.—Some remarkable artesian developments have occurred within the past year in the vicinity of Boisé City, which is now supplied by water from artesian wells, twelve in number. These were sunk on a plateau 180 feet above the town and at an altitude of 2,280 feet above the sea level. Four of these wells are about 100 feet deep and give a daily flow of about 750,000 gallons. The pressure is strong and the water rises several feet above the surface. The remaining eight are rather shallow, averaging 45 feet in depth, water being struck at 40 feet. No use has been made of the water of these wells in irrigation except so far as to serve fruit and vegetable gardens within the city limits. A remarkable phenomenon is the finding of hot water, highly mineralized and under great pressure, on the same plateau at a distance of 480 feet below the surface.

At Moscow, Idaho, the town wells are three in number, 90 feet in depth, with a bore of 2½ inches, flowing for three wells 56,000 gallons per hour. The daily flow is over 1,300,000 gallons. There is no reason to doubt that considerable artesian and underflow water can be obtained throughout Western and Southwestern Idaho; also in Bingham and Logan Counties, in the southeast portion of the new State. A proper reconnoissance and some experimentation is likely to show favorable results in the prairie region between the Salmon and Snake Rivers. But in any event there will be found an ample water supply at moderate depths below the surface through Western Idaho for fruit, garden, stock, and domestic purposes.

Montana.—Very little is known in the direction of this memorandum with regard to Montana west of the Rocky Mountains. It can only be suggested that the topography of the country indicates with great positiveness the strong probability, in connection with known geological conditions, of finding an abundant supply of both artesian and surface drainage or underflow waters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Iowa restate his point of order against the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ALLISON. My point of order is that it is not estimated for, nor reported from any standing committee of this body.

Mr. PADDOCK. It is only in the nature of a limitation; it is a direction for the use of the money, and in the line of the appropriation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of opinion that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. CAMERON. I offer an amendment, to come in on page 14, after the word "dollars," in line 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, after line 3, insert:

In order to give the necessary full and free ingress and egress to the wagons carrying the United States mails, into and out from the Philadelphia post office, the Secretary of the Treasury, acting for and in behalf of the Government of the United States, is hereby authorized to acquire, by purchase or condemnation, certain lots or pieces of ground in the city of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania,

adjoining or adjacent to the Philadelphia post-office building, on the west, and more particularly described as follows, to wit:

All that certain lot or piece of ground late of John J. Ridgeway, deceased, situate on the south side of Market street, in the Ninth ward of the said city of Philadelphia, beginning at a point on the line of said Market street where the same intersects the west side of Post-Office street, containing in front on Market street 16 feet 8 inches, and extending in length or depth of that width southwardly between parallel lines at right angles with said Market street 231½ feet, to the north side of Chant street.

Also, all those three certain lots or pieces of ground, late of James Magee, deceased, situate on the north side of said Chant street, beginning at a point in the northern line of said Chant street 16 feet 8 inches westward from the west side of Post-Office street, containing in front on said Chant street 47 feet 2½ inches, more or less, and extending in length or depth northwardly between parallel lines at right angles with said Chant street 56 feet, more or less, to land now or late of Caroline A. Magee.

Also, all that certain lot or piece of ground now or late of Caroline A. Magee immediately adjoining the said last-described lot of ground on the north, beginning at a point on the westward line of the said first above-described lot or piece of ground at the distance of 56 feet northward from the north side of Chant street, extending thence northward along the westerly side of said first above-described lot of ground, 15 feet 6 inches; thence westwardly 47 feet 2½ inches to a point at the head of a certain alley; thence southward partly along the head of said alley and partly along the line of a certain lot or piece of ground the property of St. Stephen's Protestant Episcopal Church, 15 feet 6 inches to a point; thence eastwardly 47 feet 2½ inches, along the northward line of said second above-described piece of ground, to the place of beginning; and a sum sufficient for the purpose, not to exceed $135,000, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania whether that amendment has been reported from any committee?

Mr. CAMERON. It has been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. ALLISON. And referred to the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. CAMERON. It was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. It has gone through all the necessary forms.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON], reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I desire to offer on page 26, after line 14, an amendment which has been reported from the Committee on Commerce by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH] to establish a light station at or near Page's Rock, York River, Virginia, $25,000.

I desire to say that this is recommended by the Lighthouse Board. There was a wreck there recently. It is a very important point, and there is a largely increased commerce on the York River. I hope it will be the pleasure of the Senate to adopt it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, after line 14, insert the following:

To establish a light station at or near Page's Rock in York River, Virginia, $25,000.

Mr. ALLISON. I am told by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, that this amendment was reported from that committee. I want to say in reference to these lights that the Committee on Appropriations examined all the items with great care, and they called before them the naval secretary of the Lighthouse Board, and he gave us all the information as to what he regarded as important and pressing, or indispensable, and they were put in the bill. Of course I have no power to make a point of order upon the amendment, as it came from a proper committee.

Mr. BARBOUR. If the Senator will allow me, I will read from the annual report of the Lighthouse Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889——

Mr. ALLISON. I do not wish to disturb the Senator, but I am quite sure the Lighthouse Board has recommended it. I have no doubt on that point.

Mr. BARBOUR. I am quite certain that it is the most important appropriation for this purpose that can be made in the Virginia waters anywhere.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BARBOUR].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to come in on page 110, after line 15. I move to insert the following:

The sum of $20,000 is hereby appropriated to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish information as to the best methods of cultivating the soil by irrigation.

I wish to say, Mr. President, with regard to this amendment, that it has nothing to do with the sinking of artesian wells, or spending money for the inauguration of any new scheme. Its purpose is to enable the Department of Agriculture to collect information, and publish it, as to the modes of cultivating the soil by means of irrigation. There is a vast region of country that can only be cultivated in that way. Two-fifths of the entire area of the United States is in that condition.

It is exceedingly important that people coming to that part of the country shall not be deceived; that they shall know the facts in regard to the manner in which agriculture is to be pursued there, because hundreds of thousands of people have gone in there without information as to the conditions existing there. They have been in a starving condition after they have got there, and have had to be removed by charity, coming from various portions of the country. If we can have understood the modes of agriculture that must necessarily be adopted in order to enable people to live in that country it will be of great advantage. It is no more than we do for other departments, where the information is already more general, as, for instance, in regard to epidemic diseases and the modes of cultivating the various products of agriculture. We have an Agricultural Department for that purpose.

Here is a new subject, and our people know nothing about irrigation. Our ancestors came from a country that did not require irrigation. We have lived in a region of country where no irrigation is required, and now the public lands of the United States are sought where a new style of agriculture has to be pursued.

The object of this amendment is to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to collect information as to the mode of pursuing agriculture in that part of the country, and to publish it for the information of the people. It seems to me that it is a duty and a necessity, and I hope this amendment will not only be adopted, but that the committee will retain it in the bill. It is the unanimous desire of the delegation from that section, and I have asked nothing more than what is asked for other branches of agriculture. Let us get the information for the benefit of the country. This provision is the unanimous desire of the people there and I hope the amendment will be adopted. I will say no more.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, if all those who are interested in this question are content with this amendment, on both sides, with all its difficulties and relations, I shall not personally object to it. But if we are to have this amendment, and another amendment, and so on, from time to time, I shall make the point of order, so far as I can, upon each and every one of them. That is the reason why I made the point of order upon the amendment of my friend from Nebraska [Mr. PADDOCK], and I shall make the point of order upon this amendment if I have the power to do it. But so far as I am concerned, I am willing, if all parties agree, that something of this kind may be done.

Mr. DOLPH. Let the amendment be reported again.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, after line 15, insert the following:

The sum of $20,000 is hereby appropriated to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish information as to the best methods of cultivating the soil by irrigation.

Mr. REAGAN. In response to the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa, I wish to say for one that my impression is that the information sought to be collected is of very great importance to that part of the country, and that it would be wise to allow the amendment to be adopted.

Mr. DOLPH. I understand that the expenditure is not limited to any section.

Mr. STEWART. It is limited to no section; it covers the general subject.

Mr. ALLISON. I reserve the point of order, unless this is to be a final settlement of the whole question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. PADDOCK. I understand the observation made by the Senator from Iowa to be a demand upon me and all others that no amendment on this subject shall be proposed.

Mr. ALLISON. No.

Mr. PADDOCK. That of course is entirely unnecessary, because the amendment I proposed was ruled out by the Chair, and no other amendment of like import, for a like reason, should be received or considered. Therefore we are bound by the judgment of the committee and by the judgment of the Presiding Officer not to make any further amendments on this line.

If it were a matter connected with the ornamental business of the Geological Survey, no excuse or apology would be necessary. That is a branch of industry which has been more thoroughly cultivated than any other, official or other, in this country, but which has not produced, so far as I know, any particular practical result for these people, in this region of country, where these surveys have been mostly made and who are directly interested. These brave pioneers absolutely made the soil west of the ninety-third meridian of longitude to this eastern limit which is now fixed for the so-called subhumid region by the natural process of fertilization which they themselves set in motion by their settlement, by their agriculture.

These brave men and women have done more than any other people on the continent, almost, in the way of the progress and the development of the interior of this country. They made the overland mail stage a possibility. They made the pony express a possibility; and afterwards the construction and maintenance of the Pacific telegraph line; and still later they made it possible to construct the Pacific Railroad. They established a cordon of settlements between the Missouri River and the Pacific Ocean, through that almost limitless wilderness. They endured greater hardships and vicissitudes than almost any people on the face of the earth ever experienced. They made possible the creation of these great States which have been recently admitted into the Union. Mr. President, these hardy pioneers are now suffering, languishing in almost hopeless poverty, because that region has been stricken with a drought unparalleled almost in the history of the United States.

Encouraged by the success of agriculture farther East they advanced

too rapidly and too far up the greater altitudes of the semiarid region where irrigation is necessary to agriculture. They fully realize now that they can not maintain the advanced line of development which they hold at the present time without a system of irrigation, and for that they are now struggling. They need the aid of the Government in this behalf, and they have believed that they should and could get such aid from it. With such encouragement they would be able to go forward in this effort to inaugurate a system of irrigation which would save that country, and save themselves from ruin. It must be remembered that the Government owns two-thirds of the land in that region, which would receive a very large proportion of the benefit to result from the inauguration of such a system. And it has been demonstrated to be absolutely practicable in every respect to irrigate a large part of that section through a system of artesian wells and storage basins. I desire simply to say this much in explanation of my efforts for this amendment. I hope the amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be adopted, and I promise the Senate that we shall be heard from on this subject hereafter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REAGAN. I suggest that that amendment being adopted requires a modification of the amendment suggested by the committee on page 110, as to the repeal of the previous law of September 13, 1890, requiring the final reports to be made.

Mr. STEWART. Oh, no; this is another subject altogether.

Mr. ALLISON. It is a different thing entirely.

Mr. REAGAN. Then I will ask the chairman, if he will agree, that the word "thirty" shall be inserted before the word "first" in line 15.

Mr. ALLISON. That has already been done.

Mr. STEWART. That was done.

Mr. ALLISON. There were two or three committee amendments passed over, and I ask the Senate to consider them at this time. One is on page 14, line 13.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, after line 12, the Committee on Appropriations report to insert:

For the purchase, by the Secretary of the Treasury, of the land and buildings known as the Richards property, in the city of Washington, D. C., now occupied by the Coast and Geodetic Survey for use of said survey, $155,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations which was passed over will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. After line 18, on page 14, insert:

Purchase of the Maltby House: For the purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, for the use of Congress and the Executive Departments, of the premises known as the Maltby House, situated on the corner of New Jersey avenue and B street northwest, in the city of Washington, D. C., $125,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary; and for the purchase of the vacant lots on the west side thereof, $12,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary; in all, $137,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. MORRILL. I move to amend the amendment in line 21 by inserting:

Under the control of the Committee on Rules of the Senate.

Otherwise we turn this building over entirely to the Treasury Department. We ought to have some control over it.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not object to that amendment to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont is accepted by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Chair understands.

Mr. ALLISON. I think it is a proper amendment to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee as modified.

Mr. SHERMAN. The amount inserted in the amendment, in line 1, page 15, is $12,000. It should be $13,000. At the time it was under consideration that was the amount, and I think there was a mistake somewhere.

Mr. ALLISON. There was no mistake, but we were——

Mr. SHERMAN. I think that was the agreed price at the time; at least, I so understood it.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Ohio think that is the understanding that amount may be inserted.

Mr. MORRILL. That was the sum agreed upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. Page 15, line 1, strike out "twelve" and insert "thirteen;" so as to read:

Thirteen thousand dollars, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. REAGAN. I want to inquire what is the effect of placing this building under the control of the Committee on Rules. Is it to take that building from the control of the Departments and put it under the control of the Senate?

Mr. ALLISON. No, that is not the effect of it. The amendment provided that this building should be under the control of Congress and the Executive Departments; but, of course, "under the control of Congress" is a general term. It must be under the control of some branch of Congress or some part of it; and therefore the Senator from Vermont has moved to add to the words, "under the control of the Committee on Rules" instead of Congress, leaving the Executive Departments to stand, as I understand.

Mr. MORRILL. Exactly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio substituting $13,000 for $12,000 in line 1, page 15, will be agreed to, if there be no objection.

Mr. ALLISON. And $138,000 instead of $137,000 for the total appropriation, in line 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That will be considered as agreed to. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. On page 27, after line 11, I move to insert:

For two steam launches for use in Puget Sound, at a cost not exceeding $5,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I offer the following, to be inserted in page 10, after line 16:

In addition to the sum now authorized by law, for the purchase of a site for a building, courthouse, and other offices by the United States Government in San Francisco, Cal., $450,000, and any part of said amount which may remain after such purchase shall be used for commencing the construction of the building.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. On page 56, in lines 4 and 5, I move to strike out the words "and bringing to trial and punishment" and to insert the words "arresting and delivering to the United States marshal;" so as to read:

For the expenses of detecting, arresting, and delivering to the United States marshal dealers and pretended dealers in counterfeit money, etc.

Mr. GORMAN. I thought we had determined not to agree to that amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. We had determined not to agree to the subsequent amendments relating to the limitation, but I understood the committee had agreed to that amendment. I will say the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] handed me the amendment and stated that the committee had agreed to insert that. Of course if the Senator's recollection is otherwise and he objects to it I shall not press it.

Mr. GORMAN. Is the chairman himself clear that it ought to be done?

Mr. ALLISON. I think it ought to be done.

Mr. GORMAN. I think that is going too far. That is simply——

Mr. ALLISON. I withdraw the amendment; if the Senator will excuse me, I am not going to quarrel with gentlemen now about amendments very much.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. ALLISON. I am rather acting in behalf of the Senator from Kansas respecting these amendments. The committee had under consideration the question of an elevator in the public building at Leavenworth, Kans., and rejected it at first on the ground that it is a three-story building and was not entitled to an elevator. Afterwards the Senator from Kansas stated that it is a four-story building and the upper portion of it I think is used for court purposes. I offer that amendment subject to any objection that anybody may desire to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Where is the amendment to come in?

Mr. ALLISON. On page 6, after line 20.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, after line 20, insert:

For the purpose of constructing an elevator in the public building at Leavenworth, Kans., $8,000.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I desire to ask the chairman whether this proposition was not rejected by the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. ALLISON. I stated that it was, on the theory that it is a three-story building, but it turns out to be a four-story building.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Then I want to ask the chairman further, whether it is not true that the Committee on Appropriations rejected all the propositions to put elevators in these public buildings?

Mr. ALLISON. Where they were three stories. The Senator from Kansas stated afterwards that it is a four-story building. If the Senator objects to it, I withdraw it, of course.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Very well.

Mr. ALLISON. I withdraw the amendment, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. VANCE. Mr. President, the amendment I propose to offer may not possibly be in order, as it does not appropriate any money but only asks for an account as to how money already appropriated has been expended. On page 71, at the conclusion of line 14, I propose to amend by adding the following words:

And the proper officers of said university shall report annually to the Secretary of the Interior how this appropriation is expended.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is perfectly legitimate and proper.

Mr. GORMAN. That is right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 71, after line 14, add:

And the proper officers of said university shall report annually to the Secretary of the Interior how this appropriation is expended.

So as to read:

For maintenance of the Howard University, to be used in payment of part of the salaries of the officers, professors, teachers, and other regular employés of the university, the balance of which will be paid from donations and other sources, $20,300, and the proper officers of said university shall report annually to the Secretary of the Interior how this appropriation is expended.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope that amendment will be adopted. I think it is a very good amendment. I am obliged to the Senator from North Carolina for suggesting it.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. There is still another amendment which was passed over which the Secretary calls my attention to, resulting from an amendment already agreed to on page 39.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 39, strike out lines 1, 2, and 3, in the following words:

For rent of office buildings: For rent of buildings for offices, workrooms, and workshops in Washington, $10,500.

Mr. ALLISON. Having agreed to purchase the building, that provision for rent of course will be stricken out.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, there is one other amendment that I notice was passed over. It is on page 42.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42, line 13, before the word "thousand," strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" and after the word "dollars," in line 14, add "of which sum not more than $10,000 shall be expended in the payment of salaries and for services rendered in the city of Washington;" so as to make the clause read:

North American ethnology: For continuing ethnological researches among the American Indians, under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution, including salaries or compensation of all necessary employés, $30,000, of which sum not more than $10,000 shall be expended in the payment of salaries and for services rendered in the city of Washington.

Mr. PLATT. I should like to have an explanation by the chairman of the committee of the reasons why it is proposed to reduce the amount from $50,000 to $30,000, and I should like to have him state what the usual appropriation has been?

Mr. ALLISON. The usual appropriation has been $40,000. It has been running for a good many years and a great deal of valuable work, I have no doubt, has been done; but it seems to be a work that at some time ought to be either diminished in its cost or completed. The committee of course felt that it is a work of general interest and ought to be provided for. In making an examination we found that nearly $28,000 of the previous appropriation of $50,000 was spent for salaries in this city, and the committee thought it was wise to expend this money rather in researches than in paying so large a sum to people in this city, however competent they may be. That is the reason why the committee propose to strike it down.

Mr. PLATT. I hope the committee will allow this matter to stand at least at the sum which has heretofore been appropriated for this purpose. I do not know anything about the details as to how the appropriation has been used, but my own judgment about it is that the Government does not make any appropriation for any of the Departments which is subserving a better result than this appropriation. I trust the committee will allow it to stand at $40,000, as that has been the usual amount.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say just one word in addition, and that is that there are nine or ten volumes of this work not yet printed. The last printed volume was in 1885, and the work can go along at a little slower pace without any injury to the public service. So it seemed to the committee, and so I believe.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator from Connecticut will listen for a moment he will see that this appropriation, in terms, describes what was its original purpose:

For continuing ethnological researches among the American Indians, under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution, including salaries or compensation of all necessary employés.

Originally this work, a most interesting one, was prosecuted in accordance with the terms of the appropriation.

Researches were made throughout the country into the ethnology of the race, and all of the interesting facts connected with them, the circumstances surrounding the different tribes, the classification of languages, etc., among the Indians. Gradually it has departed from that, and the committee, to its surprise, its attention being called to the subject, investigated and found that of this $40,000, $28,000 is expended in salaries here, running from $3,000 in some cases down to a large retinue of laborers, messengers, and employés, establishing in fact a bureau and swamping the appropriation.

Now, the committee did not think that Congress intended that that should be done. Some of this money might be expended in that way, but it certainly was considered, in view of what the chairman of the committee has stated, that there are eight volumes in advance not published, that this appropriation could be cut down and that a limitation should be put upon the force employed here. The legitimate work, the interesting work, you may call it scientific, which should be pursued outside, ought to go on; but it ought not, after the fashion that is likely to take place in any of these things, to be simply run into a Washington bureau and used up in salaries.

The attempt of the committee is to remedy that. It seems to me that it ought to appeal to the Senate. It seems to me that nobody ought to object to it. The person in charge of the work ought not to object to it. Let the volumes be printed and come before the public, and then when the work goes on let it go on in a moderate way and in the right way, with the researches made outside, and a small sum for salaries here.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I have heard no evidence which sustains the statements made in regard to this appropriation in the bill or its being wasted and absorbed for purposes which are not legitimate to the object in view. The Senator from Maine can not produce any testimony to show that to be the case, and none such was offered before the committee. Nothing exists to sustain the statements which he has made here. It is an important branch of knowledge to mankind, and it is surprising that in this age of ours there should be any ignorance upon that subject.

The classification of language in order that it may be made upon some common basis, that some means of communication may exist which are common to the whole race of man, and tracing it up to its original sources in the most ancient and primitive times, apart from its mere historical knowledge as a matter of antiquarian research, has its practical ends and is to-day an object of solicitude with all intelligent and learned people. There is no evidence that any part of this appropriation has been expended for salaries not legitimate and necessary to that end.

Why should not the investigation into these facts be conducted here in Washington as well as elsewhere? What possible reason is there that this place should be selected for exclusion from this kind of research? Why should not the learned men who are engaged in it be assembled here, under the eye of the learned man at the head of the bureau, who I think is the most scientific practical learned man upon these subjects in the world, Major Powell, to whom all the institutions of learning and all the scientific men of the world have given a very high place, who is an honor to American science and American learning?

I have a statement here which shows how unwise it is to strike down appropriations or to make them without some fact upon which to justify it, and upon mere guessing. I will now read the statement, which is correct, and from a very high authority.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, BUREAU OF ETHNOLOGY,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1891.

SIR: On the forty-second page of the sundry civil bill (Calendar No. 2732), beginning with the tenth line, there is a paragraph headed "North American Ethnology." In this is contained the appropriation for continuing ethnological researches for the ensuing year. To the paragraph an amendment is reported by the Senate Committee reducing the amount adopted by the House of Representatives of $50,000 to $30,000, and a further amendment in the following language: "Of which sum not more than $10,000 shall be expended in the payment of salaries and for services rendered in the city of Washington."

The effect of these amendments if finally enacted into law will be greatly to embarrass the investigations for which the appropriation is designed, and I earnestly beg of you to consider the following statement:

The investigations for which this is intended, and for which similar appropriations have been made for a number of years, may be briefly set forth in the following manner:

1. The aboriginal inhabitants of the United States belong to fifty-eight distinct stocks, or families; that is, fifty-eight stocks of languages, entirely distinct, were spoken, and the Bureau of Ethnology has undertaken to record the vocabularies and briefly explain the grammatical structure of each of these fifty-eight stocks. This in itself is a work of great magnitude.

Only a small portion of the work is done by employés of the bureau. In it are engaged missionaries, teachers, and various linguistic scholars scattered throughout the country, and the work of all is correlated and systematized by the bureau. This linguistic work is the basis of all other work, as the other subjects of investigation can not be properly understood and the facts reported without a knowledge of the languages themselves.

2. These fifty-eight linguistic stocks of peoples were divided into about three thousand tribes, each tribe having a distinct form of government, executive functions inhering in chiefs, and legislative and judicial functions inhering in councils. No two tribes are organized on the same plan, different methods of selecting chiefs, different methods of organizing councils, and different customary laws recognized by chiefs and councils appearing in each case. The three thousand tribes present illustrations of multifarious tribal governments on a grand scale. With the appropriations made it is not possible to investigate them all, but a few typical examples have been taken, such as will serve to illustrate the more important characteristics of each great linguistic stock. These forms of tribal government can not be understood without at the same time understanding the language, for, not having written constitutions and written laws, their constitutions and laws are crystallized in forms of oral speech, which are handed down with great exactness by oral tradition from generation to generation.

3. With each great linguistic stock a distinct form of mythology and religion is discovered, the principles, forms, ceremonies, and precepts of which are formulated in bodies of oral tradition and handed down from one generation to another. Not all of these systems of mythology and religion are being investigated, but some of the more important ones, which will illustrate the general principles, have been and are still the subject of investigation.

4. With all of these tribes there are great bodies of habits and customs, of profound interest to all those engaged in the study of mankind, and, to the greatest extent possible with the means at command, these habits and customs are being investigated.

5. The tribes of North America were when discovered engaged in a great variety of arts of peace and war. Some tribes built houses of stone, known as pueblos; some of wood, some of thatched reeds, others of earth embankments, etc. They made pottery; they made baskets; they made clothing, in part of the skins of animals and in part of textile fabrics. They used stone implements and in some cases copper implements, and implements of bone, horn,

wood, etc. The arts of these people are being investigated and the products of their arts are being collected. For this purpose mounds, caves, and ruins are examined, and collections of their arts brought from all portions of the country to the National Museum.

It will thus be seen that the research is one of great magnitude, and the field of investigation is of equal magnitude, embracing an area equal to more than three-fourths of all Europe; that is, all the area of the United States. The investigations must be made now or never. Rapidly the people are losing their languages; some are already lost. Rapidly the people are losing their forms of tribal government; some of them are already lost. Rapidly the people are losing their mythologies and religions; some of them are already lost. Rapidly the people are losing their habits and customs; civilized habits and customs have usually been adopted by them. Rapidly the people are losing their arts; they are almost wholly lost, and can be studied only through the relics of them left in the archæologic remains of the country. But the purpose and significance of these arts can yet be discovered from a few tribes who still have well-defined traditions of the old arts.

To cut down the appropriation as recommended is to cut off this investigation to that extent in all of its features. And it should be understood that this is not to postpone the investigation, for what is not now gathered never can be gathered hereafter. In the last few decades all the civilized people of the globe have become interested in the antiquities of the countries which they inhabit, and they are all engaged in similar researches. The materials being gathered by the bureau are already of inestimable value, and will increase in value and interest as the years go by.

The clause in the paragraph which limits the expenditure for salaries to $10,000 is peculiarly unfortunate, for the investigations can not be carried on except by the employment of skilled specialists. The most important work in which the bureau is engaged will almost be limited to the expenditure of that $10,000, for we must have linguistic scholars and philologists for the work. The endeavor has always been made to expend these appropriations in the most economical manner, and we have found it highly advantageous and a great saving of expense to utilize the services of Indians coming to Washington, especially in the linguistic branch of the investigation.

Much of the remaining $20,000, if used at all, would have to be expended chiefly for the purchase of archæologic collections made by amateurs throughout the country who are engaged in making such collections largely for the purpose of selling them to foreign museums, and who do not collect with critical skill. All the assistants of the bureau above the grade of copyist and messenger are in the field a portion of the year and come to Washington to work only when it is necessary to prepare reports, that the results of their researches may be given to the public; and these results are now used in all of the universities, colleges, and higher schools of learning in the United States.

The preparation of the reports on these investigations has kept up with the work, and valuable and substantial results have already accrued. Six quarto volumes have been issued; three more have been printed, and are now in the Government Printing Office being bound. Ten octavo bulletins have been published; three more are now in the Printer's hands, and one is ready to be transmitted to the Printer. Of the annual reports, which are large imperial octavos, six have been published, the seventh is in the Printer's hands, and the eighth and ninth are completed, ready for the Printer, and are only awaiting the time when he can take them up. From the year 1885 to the year 1889, inclusive, there was much delay in the publication of the reports of the bureau, as well as of the reports of the Geological Survey, and there had accumulated more than thirty volumes of prepared but unpublished reports of the survey, and eight volumes of prepared but unpublished reports of the Bureau of Ethnology.

This resulted from the fact that in the judgment of the Public Printer other reports of the Government should have precedence, and the appropriation was insufficient for them all. Under the present Printer, however, most of these back reports have been issued, and in less than a year all printing will be up to date if the work proceeds as it has done for the past two years. The Director has in no sense been responsible for the delay in the publication of the reports. They have all been prepared in good time.

There is on hand at present manuscript sufficient for at least eight quarto volumes, the materials having been collected in the field. But all this manuscript requires editing and revising by the men engaged in the work, who have accumulated the materials. If the restricting clause should become law it would become necessary to discharge most of these men, and much of this work would be practically lost.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CALL. I will ask for the printing of these papers. I only desire that there may be some authentic information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Florida that the papers he presents shall be printed in the RECORD? The Chair hears none.

The letters referred to are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,
DIVISION OF MINING STATISTICS AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, December 29, 1890.

SIR: In reply to your letter for a statement of the work to be conducted in the division of mining statistics in the fiscal year 1892 and its probable cost, I have the honor to state that the condition of the subject under my charge is peculiar and critical.

This subject is the condition of the mineral resources of the United States, upon which I have reported to you by the annual publication, "Mineral Resources of the United States." The volume has contained much general information, and particularly an estimate of the product of each mineral used in the United States and its market value. This statistical feature has proved of particular interest, and in lack of more trustworthy information has come to be regarded as the standard and official statement of the United States. This is due naturally to the fact that no efforts have been spared within the means at command to make these estimates (which is the polite word for an expert's guess) as intelligent as possible.

The most eminent authorities on each subject have been selected to aid, and they have given most useful and earnest support to the object of furnishing the country with as trustworthy information as their personal opinions could lend. Among them have been the late Dr. Charles A. Ashburner, formerly geologist in charge of the Second Geological Survey of Pennsylvania; Mr. Joseph D. Weeks, editor of the American Manufacturer and Iron World; Mr. C Kirchhoff, editor of the Iron Age; Mr. John Birkinbine, secretary of the Charcoal Iron Workers' Association; Mr. James M. Swank, secretary of the American Iron and Steel Association; Mr. R. P. Rothwell, editor of the Engineering and Mining Journal; and Mr. Charles G. Yale, editor of the Mining and Scientific Press.

Besides the popularity of the survey's report, these efforts were further ratified by the selection of this band of workers for the collection of exact mineral statistics for the Eleventh Census, with the writer as special agent in charge. This work is about successfully completed. Its cost was estimated at $225,000, and I have kept considerably below that estimate.

Now, after such a drill in collecting exact statistics as this census work has furnished, no one of these experts is willing to go back to the method of estimating, and it is hoped that the organization of these workers and the co-operation of the producers which this work has brought about, may be kept up.

This simply means sufficient money to pay for the clerical work of corresponding with producers of minerals; it involves the sending out of letters and the expenses of such visits to mines as seem necessary, in doubtful cases, to render it useless for producers to send in exaggerated returns. The total, including all salaries, can be reduced from $200,000 to $50,000, the reason for the great reduction being that our directories are practically good and the producers willing to stand by the work actively and cheerfully.

PLAN.

Scope.—This should continue to be very limited. Perhaps five statistical questions should be answered by every producer in the United States. This is the item of expense. In addition, a careful study must be made of all the national and State geological work in its bearing upon the conditions of occurrence of mineral deposit and their mutual relationships, constant observation of the chemists, the mineralogist's and also the petrographer's work as to the characteristics of these minerals, and also a watch upon the changing needs of the arts for these natural stores.

These latter items are more apparent than really complicated, and (since they follow the spasmodic work of others) are not subjected to the systematic study which is the necessary and costly feature of the more exact work, *i. e.*, determining quantitatively a mineral product already increasing beyond $600,000,000 each year, and contributed to by more than sixty industries.

The scheme by which this result is to be accomplished, for the sum which many statisticians would regard as impracticably small, can best be shown by a table.

In spite of personal eagerness to continue work (which has certainly proved more gratifying than even my own opinion of it ever led me to expect), I must venture the recommendation that it will be good policy to discontinue the publication of this work if it is thought best to deny the financial support necessary for exact statistics, for the following reasons:

The expenditure of a proper amount of money will be presumed by the readers and corresponding results will be expected. This expectation of a different kind of work from what we can furnish will of course meet with the disappointment and disapproval which must follow an attempt for greater exactness than the instruments can furnish.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

———— ————,
Geologist in charge of Division of Mining Statistics and Technology.

Hon. J. W. POWELL,
Director United States Geological Survey.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *January* 17, 1891.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith, for the consideration of Congress, copy of letter of the 15th instant from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of $50,000 for the preparation of the report on the mineral resources of the United States.

Respectfully, yours,

WILLIAM WINDOM, *Secretary.*

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1891.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith, with my approval, a supplemental estimate of $50,000, submitted by the Director of the United States Geological Survey, "for the preparation of the report on the mineral resources of the United States," and recommend the same to the favorable consideration of Congress.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. NOBLE, *Secretary.*

The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,
Washington, D. C., January 14, 1891.

SIR: For a number of years the Geological Survey, in compliance with the statute regulating its operations, has prepared an annual volume on the mineral resources of the United States. The amount appropriated for this work is $10,000 for each year. For the current year, by direction of the honorable the Secretary of the Interior, the division in charge of this work has been consolidated with the division of mining statistics for the Eleventh Census, and the chief of the division, Mr. Day, of the Geological Survey, has had charge of the entire work.

This course was taken in order that there might be no duplication of expenditures. The small amount appropriated by Congress has enabled the Geological Survey to prepare a volume which has been very useful to the mining industries of this country, which now aggregate more than $600,000,000 yearly. The method of collecting these statistics was in small part by canvass, through correspondence of the more important mining districts, and in part by the study of market reports, and by further basing estimates upon the facts thus collected.

The experience of the current year shows that the work can be greatly improved by a more thorough method of canvassing the mines, and the demand for this more thorough work is very great from all parts of the country, coming especially from mine owners and from manufactories that use the product of the mines. Such requests come to the Director by personal representation from various people throughout the country and by letter, and especially in the journals which represent the interests of the miners and manufacturers of the country.

In obedience to this widespread demand the Director has prepared a very careful estimate of the cost of producing such an annual volume in the more thorough and elaborate manner demanded. The subjoined schedule will set forth the details of such plan.

In view of the considerations expressed above, I have the honor to request that the following estimate be transmitted to Congress:

For the preparation of the report on the mineral resources of the United States, $50,000.

I am, with respect, your obedient servant,

J. W. POWELL, *Director.*

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Supplemental estimate of appropriations required for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, by the United States Geological Survey.

Mineral resources of the United States:

For the preparation of the report on the mineral resources of the United States (appropriated, R. S. 26, page 391, section 1)	$50,000
Amount appropriated for the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, and estimated for 1892.....	10,000

Subjects, number of correspondents, method of collecting the statistics, clerical force, etc.

Subjects.	Number of correspondents.	Method of collecting the statistics.	Clerical force.		Traveling expenses.	Expert assistants.	Furniture and miscellaneous office supplies.	Miscellaneous.	Total cost.
			No.	Total pay.					
Coal:									
Anthracite	700	Correspondence chiefly, with co-operation of mine inspectors.	2	$1,800	$300	$300	.....	$200	$2,600
Bituminous	14,000	Correspondence and work of special agents in Western States.	2	1,900	1,800	600	$25	125	4,500
Petroleum	9,000	Correspondence entirely, except visits to Western fields.	2	2,500	1,200	250	100	300	4,350
Natural gas	4,000	do	1	1,450	575	300	25	150	2,500
Asphaltum	50	One trip by an agent and correspondence	.....	325	125	10	.....	110	570
Peat, etc	200	do	.....	50	175	50	.....	.....	275
Iron ore	4,000	Principally correspondence	2	1,500	400	400	15	300	2,615
Copper, lead, and zinc	3,000	do	2	2,800	300	500	50	250	3,900
Stone	8,000	Correspondence and some visits. An agent must visit Southwest Missouri.	2	2,800	800	500	100	250	4,450
Clay and brick	10,000	Correspondence and some visits	2	2,500	600	200	25	150	3,475
Cement	200	Correspondence and some inspection	1	1,100	125	100	.....	175	1,500
Quicksilver	150	Each work must be visited	1	100	50	100	50	150	450
Nickel and cobalt	25	Mine La Motte will be visited and also Sudbury, Canada.	.....	15	150	10	.....	5	180
Chromium	40		.....	25	115	25	.....	10	175
Manganese	250		1	100	25	100	.....	25	250
Aluminum	20		.....	10	.....	75	.....	10	95
Platinum	200		.....	15	100	25	.....	10	150
Tin	300		.....	50	100	.....	.....	140	290
Arsenic, antimony, and bismuth	20		.....	10	10	25	.....	10	55
Glass materials	300		1	300	100	200	25	175	800
Molybdenum, uranium, vanadium, tellurium	25		.....	10	.....	50	.....	20	80
Buhrstones	50		.....	25	130	50	.....	20	225
Corundum, emery	20		.....	10	20	50	.....	10	90
Garnet	30		.....	15	.....	.....	.....	10	25
Whetstones	20		.....	10	.....	50	.....	10	70
Ollstones	20		.....	110	.....	25	.....	25	160
Flint, etc	60		.....	15	.....	75	.....	.....	90
Precious stones	800	All the remainder will fit into the plan of general correspondence from the central office, and then the working up of the subject by some one who has been working up the correlative information.	1	1,000	.....	100	100	25	1,225
Phosphate rock	150		.....	100	100	100	10	150	460
Marl	200		.....	50	125	25	.....	10	210
Gypsum	100		.....	50	.....	.....	.....	10	60
Barytes	200		.....	25	175	.....	.....	.....	200
Salt	2,000		2	2,000	100	100	.....	150	2,350
Sodium and kalium salts (natural)	100		.....	50	260	25	.....	10	345
Borax	50		.....	125	10	25	.....	50	210
Pyrites	50		.....	125	25	50	.....	50	250
Sulphur	10		.....	5	30	10	.....	25	70
Mineral paints	80		.....	25	25	25	.....	10	85
Mica	150		1	100	25	100	.....	125	350
Feldspar	20		.....	10	.....	25	.....	5	40
Talc	75		.....	150	30	50	.....	125	350
Infusorial earth	10		.....	15	20	.....	.....	.....	35
Fluorspar	5		.....	10	25	.....	.....	.....	35
Asbestus	20		.....	10	25	10	.....	.....	45
Lithographic stone	10		.....	5	50	25	.....	.....	80
Graphite	20		.....	10	10	.....	.....	50	70
Mineral waters	1,000		2	1,600	100	200	20	30	1,950
									42,345
General salaries	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7,800
Total	59,730	.....	.....	25,010	8,335	4,940	545	3,515	50,145

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee. The amendment will be regarded as agreed to, if there be no objection.

Mr. PLATT. Let us have a vote, Mr. President.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. Mr. President, the latter part of the amendment, providing that not more than $10,000 of the $30,000 provided for in the appropriation shall be expended in Washington, seems to me to be particularly unjust, because nine-tenths of this work outside of the field explorations that are made by people who are in the field must be written up in Washington. It is true the agents who do the work in the field may go to St. Louis or New York to do it instead of coming to Washington City; but those who make these investigations must go somewhere where they can have the facilities for preparing their work at hand; and Washington City, it seems to me, is the most proper place to have that done.

That part of the amendment, it seems to me, above all others, ought not to be adopted. If the committee choose to cut the appropriation down from $50,000 to $30,000, which I consider very unwise, this limitation that only $10,000 out of the $30,000 shall be spent in Washington, it appears to me ought not to be considered for a moment. I hope no part of the amendment will be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to—ayes 28, noes not counted.

Mr. WARREN. On page 81, line 19, after the word "dollars," I move to insert:

Fifty thousand dollars of which shall be immediately available, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, for repairs and rebuilding of Fort McKinney, Wyoming;

So as to read:

For the construction of buildings at and the enlargement of such military post as, in the judgment of the Secretary of War may be necessary, $800,000, $50,000 of which shall be immediately available, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, for repairs and rebuilding of Fort McKinney, Wyoming.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STANFORD. On page 10, after line 18, I move to insert:

That the sum appropriated for the erection of a public building at Los Angeles, Cal., by the act of January 29, 1887, is hereby extended to $300,000 for the building, which sum is hereby appropriated, and which the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to expend under the provisions of said act; and that the Secretary may, at his discretion, reduce the fire limit on each side of said building from 40 feet to 20 feet.

Mr. BUTLER. May I inquire what is the original amount of the appropriation for that building?

Mr. STANFORD. This is to increase the appropriation for a building for a post office, court rooms, land office, and internal-revenue offices at Los Angeles. I have here the report, and I will read a brief communication from it.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not ask the Senator to read the report.

Mr. STANFORD. It is absolutely needed to go on.

Mr. BUTLER. That possibly may be.

Mr. SPOONER. It is raised from $150,000 to $500,000, an addition of $350,000.

Mr. BUTLER. I merely wanted to inquire what is the amount of the proposed increase?

Mr. STANFORD. The present appropriation is so insufficient that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Windom, ordered a suspension of the work, and he states that $350,000 is required. My amendment provides for but $300,000.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I dislike very much to object to any amendment offered by any Senator, particularly by the Senator from California, but the Committee on Appropriations have adopted a rule of making provisions here for public buildings that have been provided for by law and not to enter into the manner of legislation. I know that there are any number of buildings in this country provided for by bills that have passed the Senate. They have failed to receive action elsewhere and the attempt is made in numerous cases to have those items placed on the appropriation bill, but the committee have been compelled to object to nearly every amendment that has been offered. If we are to go on and authorize in the case of new buildings an increased appropriation of three or four hundred thousand dollars, this bill will be swollen beyond all proportions.

Now, take the case of my own city, the city of Baltimore, with the need of a customhouse greater probably than any other seaport on the Atlantic coast. We have passed a bill making provision for its extension and proper improvement, but as a matter of course, represented as we are, it can not get consideration elsewhere. I have in the committee in considering this bill refused to entertain a proposition, although urged by every commercial body in the city of Baltimore, to put on a provision for that customhouse, and I think we must all recognize that in the interest of the Government it is equally as important as post-office buildings in interior towns. One moment ago we increased the limit for the post-office building at San Francisco to $400,000.

That case is, like the one in Baltimore, of pressing need. Everybody understands the necessity of that appropriation, and it was passed through to gratify the Senator from California, and I was very glad to do it, making that discrimination as against other places of greater importance.

But I submit to the chairman of the committee that if the bill is now to be opened to all the post-office buildings in the country and we are to legislate for them on this bill, I shall ask the privilege that the whole matter shall be opened, that we may all have an opportunity to insert our public-building bills in the pending bill. As I said before, I have refrained from asking the committee of which I am a member to do it; but if the chairman intends to open this bill to such appropriations we ought to have a distinct understanding, it seems to me.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator from California will withdraw the amendment. I appreciate strongly what has been said by the Senator from Maryland. The Committee on Appropriations have a difficult task. We did reject all those amendments because they were so great in number. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds have offered only a few. By the general consent and understanding of that committee a few pressing cases have been put upon the bill.

I agree with the Senator from Maryland that if we are to open up this bill to the entire range of public buildings, the effect will be that not one of them will pass. The House of Representatives has put on a great number of these items, running up to two, three, or four million dollars; we have put on probably a million more, and it seems to me that we have done enough in this direction. That is my opinion about it. Of course I know this amendment is in order, except the last clause, which I shall move to strike out, if the Senator presses it; but I hope the Senator from California will allow the amendment to be withdrawn.

Mr. STANFORD. Mr. President, this is an extraordinary case. The city of Los Angeles has made most rapid growth in the last few years, and requires a much larger building than was supposed at the time when the first appropriation was made. It is now proposed to accommodate not merely the post office, but also the United States circuit and district courts, the land office, and the internal-revenue office. The construction of the building was stopped by the order of the Secretary of the Treasury because the appropriation was not sufficient to erect such a building as would afford sufficient accommodation. Mr. Windom said:

> The limit of cost of this building should be increased from $150,000 to $500,000. The object of this increase is to purchase additional land, extend the present building, and add an additional story, and make the building fireproof. It is deemed essential that this extension and additional story should be constructed in order to afford the proper accommodations for the public service.
>
> The building at present designed and contracted for is not sufficient to accommodate the needs of the public service even at this time, and affords much less space for the Post-Office Department than it has in the rented building now occupied by the Government.

I do not want to press upon the Senate anything that does not seem to meet the general approval, but I submit whether this is not an exceptional case. The need of the appropriation is very apparent.

Mr. BUTLER. May I inquire of the Senator from California whether there is a public building at Los Angeles?

Mr. STANFORD. There is not, except the one which I speak of, which has been commenced.

Mr. BUTLER. The building has been commenced, the Senator says?

Mr. STANFORD. Yes, sir; it was commenced, but work upon it was stopped because it would not be large enough to accommodate the needs of the Government at that place.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand $150,000 has been appropriated for the construction of this building, and it would seem to me that that sum ought to be sufficient for all present purposes, but if hereafter it should be found necessary we may extend the appropriations. I submit to the Senator from California, in view of the statement made by the chairman of the committee and by the Senator from Maryland, that it is scarcely reasonable to expect a discrimination to be made in favor of one particular place, and if, as has been stated by the Senator from Maryland, the door is to be opened in this way we all ought to come in. I think it will be found that every State and every Senator, perhaps, has some appropriation for a public building that it is desired shall be increased. I have no wish whatever to interfere with any reasonable request of the Senator from California.

Mr. STANFORD. Does the Senator understand that the work has been suspended for the want of means?

Mr. BUTLER. I understand that $150,000 has been appropriated. I do not understand that that amount has been exhausted.

Mr. STANFORD. The Secretary of the Treasury said it was suspended because the appropriation was insufficient.

Mr. BUTLER. Do I understand that the appropriation of $150,000 has been exhausted?

Mr. STANFORD. I know money has been expended, for, as I myself saw, a portion of the building was constructed, but how much I can not say.

Mr. BUTLER. They are going ahead on that building, and I submit the exigency is not of such urgency as to ask at this time that that be done.

Mr. DOLPH. I should like to make an inquiry before the vote is taken. Has the limit of cost of the public building at Los Angeles been increased since the first appropriation was made?

Mr. ALLISON. I think not. I agree with the Senator from California that the appropriation made for the public building at Los Angeles is not large enough, but we have only put the extremely pressing cases in this bill. Now, as to the case of the public building at San Francisco——

Mr. DOLPH. Will the Senator let me say a single word?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. DOLPH. The Senator himself saw last June a year ago, as I did, the foundation of the public building at Los Angeles, a splendid city of 75,000 inhabitants or more, with a splendid city hall, with a splendid building for county courts and county officers, and the foundation of a Government building entirely inadequate, starting under the appropriation made for a post-office building at Los Angeles, entirely inadequate for the business of the city, and entirely out of proportion to all the other public building in the city.

The Senate took up, I think, early in the last session and passed a bill increasing the amount of the appropriation for that building. We have just adopted an amendment increasing the amount of the appropriation for the public building at San Francisco, and I think some others, and I understand that it is held by the Committee on Appropriations that those amendments are in order; that it is only appropriations to commence a building that has not been authorized by law that have been rejected.

I want to say to the Senate that I do not believe there is another place in the United States where the importance of increasing the amount of the appropriation for a public building is so great as it is at this point. The construction of the building was suspended because the amount of the appropriation was entirely inadequate. It was started when the city did not have one-third the population it has today, and I am not sure but that it was before the southern judicial district of California was created and before there was a necessity for courts there.

The building that was occupied at the time the chairman of the committee and myself and other Senators were there (when we were driven through the city and saw the foundation of this building) rented for the purposes of a post office was far more commodious and appropriate for the use of the post office than the contemplated building. I do not believe there is another such place in the United States where there is such pressing need of a public building and to have the amount increased as there is at Los Angeles.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. STANFORD].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COCKRELL. Page 15, after line 4, I move to insert:

> That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to purchase all of lot 10 lying north of the portion of lot 11 recently purchased by the United States, together with a strip of the same lot 20 feet wide running to Delaware avenue, in square 683, situated in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, as laid out and recorded in the original plat of the city and District aforesaid, lying on the west side of Delaware avenue, between C and D streets northwest, and adjoining lot 11 in same square, now the property of the United States, and containing 8,675 square feet, at a price not exceeding $1 per square foot; and the sum of $8,675, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated for said purpose, upon proof of a perfect title, and the execution to the United States of a deed good and sufficient in law, and in form approved by the Attorney-General; said ground to be used for the erection of a suitable building for general storage purposes connected with the United States Capitol.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TELLER. I desire to offer an amendment, to come in on page 59, at the end of line 9. I move to insert:

For the purchase, importation, and care of reindeer for the use of the natives of Alaska, $15,000, to be expended at the discretion and under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. ALLISON. I make the point of order on that amendment.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator makes the point of order on the amendment I withdraw it, because I suppose it is subject to the point of order. But I desire now to offer another amendment that will not be subject to the point of order. On page 61, after the word "dollars," in line 7, I move to insert:

Provided, That $15,000 of this amount may be used by the Secretary of the Interior in the importation, care, and preservation of reindeer for the use of the natives of Alaska.

That does not increase the appropriation, and it is desired.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. I offer an amendment to come in at the end of the bill, and I should like before any point of order is made to make a statement in regard to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 115, after the amendment already agreed to, add the following:

To enable the Secretary of the Navy to provide a ship for the nautical training school at Boston, $50,000.

Mr. HOAR. I ask leave to have inserted in the RECORD a communication from a joint special committee of the city council of the city of Boston in regard to this matter. It is not necessary to read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be printed in the RECORD if there be no objection.

The communication is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF COMMITTEES, CITY OF BOSTON,
City Hall, February 24, 1891.

To the honorable the Members of Congress from the State of Massachusetts:

GENTLEMEN: The undersigned, a joint special committee of the city council of Boston, appointed to consider a plan for the establishment of a nautical training school for Boston, respectfully ask you to second such efforts as may be made by Congressman O'NEIL for the passage at this session of Congress of a special bill appropriating $50,000 to be used in the equipment of a vessel to be loaned by the Navy Department to the State of Massachusetts for the purposes of a nautical training school; said appropriation to become available when said State of Massachusetts shall establish such school. The committee have requested Mr. O'NEIL to prepare and introduce the bill above referred to on account of his being the representative of the part of Boston having the largest water front.

JOHN H. SULLIVAN, *Chairman.*
THOMAS F. KEENAN.
GEORGE L. VON L. MEYER.
WILLIAM B. MCCLELLAN.
BOWDOIN S. PARKER.
CHARLES H. DIRKSMEYER.
ABRAHAM C. RALSHESKY.
JOHN F. MULESALL.

Mr. HOAR. I should like, with the leave of my honorable friend from Iowa, to say that I received a communication on this subject from Governor Russell, the governor of Massachusetts, about a week ago, asking that a provision might be made for a school ship. I immediately replied that it was impracticable to get the Committee on Naval Affairs to act upon the matter at this late day, some of the members of that committee being employed all the time in the Committee on Appropriations.

I addressed, however, to the Secretary of the Navy a communication and have received an informal reply from the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Soley, in which he says that there are no ships at the command of the Department which could now be used for that purpose, and that it would require to fit up the only ship which they could use at this moment about $100,000; that it would almost require a rebuilding of the entire ship. So I am bound to say that the Navy Department feels that it is impracticable to accomplish this object at the present moment, but I thought I ought in deference to the wishes of his excellency the governor to move the amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to make the point of order on the amendment, but before doing so, imitating the Senator from Massachusetts, I desire to say a few words.

There is no estimate for this appropriation; and therefore, of course, it is not in order; but for a year or two we have had on the naval appropriation bill a suggestion (and it has been made frequently on this floor and elsewhere) that if we would make a small appropriation for the naval militia in order that the naval militia might secure a few accouterments, arms, etc., it would be a great advantage. We inserted at this session a small appropriation for that naval militia, and his excellency, the governor of Massachusetts, to be followed I suppose by others, now proposes that in addition we shall furnish ships.

Mr. HOAR. Will my honorable friend allow me one moment before he makes his point of order?

Mr. ALLISON. I have made it, but I will not press it now.

Mr. HOAR. This amendment has nothing to do with the naval militia question. They have a similar school ship at Philadelphia; they have a similar school ship at New York, and they have had them for many years. This is entirely independent of the naval militia question, and does not grow out of it and is not connected with it in the least. That was a small appropriation of $25,000 for training the volunteers for which the State pays all the cost. This has no connection with that whatever. But I agree that the Senator's point of order is well taken.

Mr. ALLISON. I am glad to know it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. MORRILL. I offer an amendment to come in on page 13, after line 23. I move to insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the governor of the State of Vermont the sum of $14,000, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be by him transferred to the Bennington Battle Monument Association, to be expended by them in the erection of a suitable iron stairway, for the removal of buildings, and grading and improving the grounds surrounding the monument erected to commemorate the Revolutionary battle of Bennington.

This amendment is introduced on a report from the Committee on Military Affairs. I have taken the liberty to reduce the amount reported from $22,000 to $14,000. It is for the purpose of putting up an iron stairway to a monument that is now completed, with this exception, three hundred feet high. The monument was put up at the expense of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts, with the additional support of the General Government of $40,000. There is to be a centennial celebration at Bennington on the 16th of August next. It is therefore important that this appropriation should be made at the present time.

I wish to say that while many Senators here have had their three or four public buildings provided for, in all of my service I have never asked for the State of Vermont more than two, although some three or four were asked this year for that State which I did not present. I hope the Committee on Appropriations will consider my forbearance in relation to some very much larger amendments that I desired to get them to assent to, but which they did not do, and therefore will consent to this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I desire to ask my friend from Vermont whether the Government has not already made an appropriation for this purpose?

Mr. MORRILL. It did several years ago, at the initiation of it.

Mr. BLACKBURN. An appropriation of $40,000?

Mr. MORRILL. Forty thousand dollars.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I may be in error—if so, I trust the Senator will correct me—but I understand the Government made an appropriation of $40,000 in the shape of a donation to the Bennington Monument Association; that the Government, having no control, assuming no authority, and denying all future responsibility, made a gratuity in the shape of a $40,000 appropriation to this private association, upon the express condition that the Government was no further to be responsible in any wise and was not to contribute any more money. Now, if that be the case, it seems to me that they should be required to comply with the contract upon which the Government made the donation of $40,000, and that was that they were to finish and complete this monument.

Mr. MORRILL. The Senator from Kentucky is entirely mistaken. There was no such contract made, but there was a provision originally that the same should be satisfactory to the Government, and Government officers inspected the proposals for the contract and it was found to be satisfactory. I wish to state that Vermont subsequently appropriated $10,000, and there will be $8,000 more that will have to be raised by the people of the State of Vermont, and the citizens of Vermont have contributed handsomely to it. This monument is not for Vermont alone; it is as much for New York and for all the rest of the country as for Vermont. It was there that the pivotal battle was fought that turned the contest in our favor.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Will the Senator inform the Senate as to what the total cost of the monument is, or what it is to be if indeed it shall ever be completed?

Mr. MORRILL. It is already completed.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Then what is the cost?

Mr. MORRILL. I do not know precisely; but it is somewhere between $80,000 and $100,000.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Then it appears that as a gratuity the Government has already contributed one-half in round numbers and protected itself from future responsibility. I think the Senate should be careful about adopting such an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Vermont. [Putting the question.] The ayes appear to have it.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORRILL. I wish to say in addition, before the yeas and nays are taken, that at the last session a bill was passed by the Senate, introduced here by my colleague [Mr. EDMUNDS], proposing to appropriate $22,000 for this same purpose and for the additional purpose of improving the grounds.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I should like to make an inquiry before the

roll is called. I wish to ask whether the Government has contributed or appropriated any money heretofore for the building of the monument?

Mr. FRYE. The monument is finished.

Mr. BLACKBURN. It is an additional appropriation for a stairway.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO].

Mr. FARWELL (when Mr. CULLOM'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. CULLOM] is detained from the Senate by sickness.

Mr. PIERCE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CARLISLE].

Mr. VANCE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCMILLAN]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. My colleague [Mr. MCMILLAN] is necessarily absent from the Senate, and is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE].

Mr. CALL. I wish to announce the pair of my colleague [Mr. PASCO] with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CASEY]. My colleague is absent on business of the Senate.

Mr. BLAIR. I am paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. BLACKBURN. My colleague [Mr. CARLISLE] is detained from the Senate to-day by sickness. I was requested to announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KENNA] has been called from the Chamber by sickness in his family. If those two Senators were present, they would vote "nay."

Mr. BATE. I will state that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY]. Also, that the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. DOLPH (after having voted in the affirmative). I withdraw my vote, and announce my pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. PADDOCK. I inquire if the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS] is recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He is not recorded.

Mr. PADDOCK. I am paired with that Senator.

Mr. BLAIR. I should like to inquire if a quorum has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum has voted.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 18; as follows:

YEAS—30.

Aldrich,	Farwell,	Mitchell,	Spooner,
Allen,	Frye,	Morrill,	Stewart,
Cameron,	Hawley,	Pettigrew,	Stockbridge,
Carey,	Higgins,	Platt,	Teller,
Chandler,	Hiscock,	Power,	Washburn,
Daniel,	Hoar,	Ransom,	Wilson.
Edmunds,	Jones of Nevada,	Sawyer,	
Evarts,	Manderson,	Shoup,	

NAYS—18.

Allison,	Butler,	Harris,	Reagan,
Barbour,	Call,	Jones of Arkansas,	Vest,
Bate,	Cockrell,	McPherson,	Walthall.
Berry,	Coke,	Morgan,	
Blackburn,	Gorman,	Plumb,	

ABSENT—39.

Blair,	Dolph,	Kenna.	Sanders,
Blodgett,	Eustis,	McConnell,	Sherman,
Brown,	Faulkner,	McMillan,	Squire,
Carlisle,	George,	Moody,	Stanford,
Casey,	Gibson,	Paddock,	Turpie,
Colquitt,	Gray,	Pasco,	Vance,
Cullom,	Hale,	Payne,	Voorhees,
Davis,	Hampton,	Pierce,	Warren,
Dawes,	Hearst,	Pugh,	Wolcott.
Dixon,	Ingalls,	Quay,	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REAGAN. I offer an amendment to come in on page 81, at the end of line 23, after the word "Crook." I move to insert:

To enable the Secretary of War to purchase a site for a military post at Eagle Pass, Tex., $20,000.

Mr. President, I desire to state that during the last session the Senate passed a bill appropriating $60,000, on the recommendation of the military authorities, for the purchase of a site and erecting buildings at that place. The bill went to the House of Representatives and was there amended by direction of the committee so as to provide $20,000 for purchasing the site but omitting $40,000 for the building. I offer the amendment now simply to enable the Secretary of War to purchase a site, and I beg leave to give two or three paragraphs from the report of General Schofield on the subject. It has been recommended by the military authorities.

WAR DEPARTMENT, *Washington, March 7, 1890.*

SIR: In reply to your reference of the letter of Mr. Thomas J. Devine, dated San Antonio, February 12, 1890, inclosing the resolutions passed by the Board of Trade of Eagle Pass, Tex., for the establishment of a permanent military post at that place, I have the honor to invite your attention to the inclosed report of the major general commanding the Army, of the 3d instant, on the subject, and to page 2 of the accompanying copy of his annual report for 1889, on which will be found his recommendation for the re-establishment of a military post at Eagle Pass.

In this connection I would add that copies of the above-mentioned reports have been sent to Hon. W. H. CRAIN, of the House of Representatives, in response to his request of the 3d instant for information on H. R. 6954, "to provide for the purchase of a military site at Eagle Pass, Tex."

Very respectfully,

REDFIELD PROCTOR,
Secretary of War.

Hon. J. H. REAGAN,
United States Senate.

HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY, *Washington, D. C., March 3, 1890.*

SIR: Referring to the inclosed petition to Congress from the Board of Trade of the city of Eagle Pass, Tex., received through Hon. J. H. REAGAN, United States Senator, wherein reasons are recited why adequate military protection should be afforded, and requesting an appropriation to purchase a suitable site for a military post at Eagle Pass, Tex., I have the honor to submit as follows:

The post of Fort Duncan, at Eagle Pass, was first occupied in 1849, and the occupancy, except during the rebellion, continued to August 31, 1883, when the post was abandoned, for the reason that an offer to sell it did not prove satisfactory to the United States, and the railroad company had found that its title to certain land, contemplated as a new site, was defective, and therefore the company could not offer it as had been intended. Moreover, it was believed that the necessary protection could be supplied from Fort Clark, 45 miles distant.

Upon a letter dated December, 1883, from Messrs. S. P. Simpson and other citizens of Eagle Pass, wherein the abandonment of the post was referred to and a re-establishment requested, Lieutenant General Sheridan, in considering that letter, in connection with a report from department headquarters, said January 26, 1884: * * * "Notwithstanding my former opinion and recommendation regarding Fort Duncan, I disapprove this application. Since that opinion (dated April 6, 1883) was given we have acquired Fort Clark by purchase, and I consider that post near enough to cover all the conditions that formerly governed in regard to Fort Duncan."

Subsequent experience established that the necessary protection could not be furnished from Fort Clark, and authority, dated April 3, 1886, and June 21, 1887, from the headquarters of the Army, Lieutenant General Sheridan then commanding, was granted to lease the old Fort Duncan military reservation in order to accommodate a troop of cavalry; and that occupation has been continued to the present time.

In considering the application of Messrs. Simpson and others of December, 1883, I, under date of January 22, 1884, while commanding the Division of the Missouri, and at the same time exercising the immediate command of the Department of Texas, favored the purchase of suitable ground for a military post at Eagle Pass; and in my last annual report I approved the earnest recommendation of General Stanley, commanding the Department of Texas, that "an appropriation for the purchase of the old reservation of Fort Duncan and the restoration of that post" be made. The interests of citizens of the United States at Eagle Pass and in the vicinity of that city will appear from the inclosed statement by the Board of Trade; and I need not add that they have greatly increased in value since 1883.

As to the importance of the location, I refer to the following extracts from official communications:

General Sherman, July 11, 1882; January 16, and April, 1883:

"Fort Duncan, the present site, is the true military point" * * * "The site of Fort Duncan is, in my judgment, after personal inspection, essential to the defense of the Rio Grande frontier." * * * "It is the best site at or near Duncan, being directly abreast the railroad bridge and opposite the town of Piedras Negras."

Lieutenant General Sheridan, April 6, 1883:

* * * "This point, Fort Duncan, commonly known as Eagle Pass, has been for many years a commercial crossing of the Rio Grande, of much importance, now very much increased by the new railroad." * * *

Brigadier General Augur, June 4, and September 5, 1883:

* * * "It is the important point on the frontier." * * * "The completion and active operation of this road can not fail, I think, to make Eagle Pass one of the most important military points on the Rio Grande." * * *

The site, embracing 62.94 acres can now be had for $20,000; and its purchase and the restoration of the post will give security to the city, to the costly bridges across the river, and to the railroad property. A further appropriation of $40,000, for buildings, will make it a valuable post for a small body of troops, sufficient for the object in view.

I am, sir, very respectfully,

J. M. SCHOFIELD,
Major General Commanding.

The SECRETARY OF WAR.

At a meeting of the board of trade of the city of Eagle Pass, held February 1, 1890, the following was unanimously adopted:

Whereas the city of Eagle Pass, on the east bank of the Rio Grande, in the county of Maverick, State of Texas, is without adequate military protection; and

Whereas the geographical situation and commercial importance of Eagle Pass are such that military protection should be afforded, and in order that this may be fully understood, the following statement is made:

Eagle Pass is situated 166 miles west of San Antonio, 600 miles south of El Paso, and 120 miles north of Laredo. Eagle Pass is an incorporated city of 3,500 inhabitants, has a taxable wealth of $1,000,000, and is constantly growing in commercial importance, and bids fair to become the largest city on the river. Is on the line of a standard-gauge railroad, leading, with its connections, to nearly all the important centers of population in the Republic of Mexico, and other lines are in process of construction to cross the river at this place for points in Mexico. One of the most substantial railroad bridges in the world spans the river at this place; this bridge is owned entirely by citizens of the United States.

A magnificent foot and wagon bridge, to connect Eagle Pass with the city of Piedras Negras, Mexico, costing many thousands of dollars, and owned largely by citizens of the United States, is in process of construction and rapidly nearing completion. A citizen of this city has a concession to supply the neighboring city of Piedras Negras, Mexico, with a system of water works, operated from this side and from this city, and the plant is now nearly completed. An electric-light plant is being established in this city by citizens of the United States to supply light to the Mexican city of Piedras Negras, as well as to the inhabitants of this city. A telephone line is operated by citizens of the United States across the Rio Grande into the city of Piedras Negras.

Immense coal deposits in this immediate vicinity are awaiting development, and one mine of considerable output is now in successful operation. A well is now being sunk for oil and natural gas. A United States customhouse is situated here, headquarters of the district of Saluria. Its receipts for 1889 were next

to the largest in the State, Galveston only collecting more revenue. Vast sums of money have been invested by citizens of the United States in cattle and sheep ranches, in mining, landed, and other properties, in the neighboring Mexican State of Coahuila, and American capital is daily being invested in different parts of the Republic of Mexico.

At least one-half of the mercantile business of Piedras Negras is done by United States citizens engaged in business there. The headquarters, general offices, and machine shops of the Mexican International Railroad are located in Piedras Negras, and the vast army of its employés are principally citizens of the United States. This railroad is standard gauge; extends from Eagle Pass to Torreon, Mexico, a distance of 384 miles, where it connects with the Mexican Central Railway, which extends from El Paso, Tex., to the City of Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. ALLISON. It has been estimated for and the bill has passed the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRYE. On page 27, after line 17, I move to insert:

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase, or build and equip, a steam vessel to be used for the purpose of boarding vessels at the port of Philadelphia, Pa., the sum of $32,000.

I desire to say that a bill providing for this vessel has passed the Senate, was reported favorably in the other House by the Committee on Commerce, and this amendment has been reported from the Committee on Commerce of the Senate. The tug now in use there is altogether too small; it is worn out, waterlogged, and there is not any manner of doubt about the propriety of having Philadelphia provided with this tug or boarding boat.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRYE. I desire to offer one other amendment from the Committee on Commerce. On page 20, after line 21, I move to add:

For the establishment of a first-order lighthouse on North Head, Cape Disappointment, in the State of Washington, and near the mouth of the Columbia River, $50,000; and when the light herein provided for shall have been established the light now at Cape Disappointment shall be discontinued and a light of the fourth order substituted therefor.

The safety of vessels and of human life absolutely demands the erection of this lighthouse. The present one is entirely inadequate; so found by the Treasury Department; so found by all mariners who are on that coast; it is misleading, and invisible in certain directions.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANIEL. At the time when this bill was reported, the bill which has passed both Houses of Congress for a post-office building at Roanoke, Va., had not become a law. I have been advised that the President has now signed the bill authorizing the appropriation of $75,000 for the purchase of a site and the construction of that building, and I offer an amendment to carry out the now existing law.

Mr. ALLISON. This amendment is in pursuance of the rule that the committee has established of putting on appropriations for all the small buildings where both Houses have authorized the erection of the building.

Mr. DOLPH. Did I understand the Senator from Virginia to say that the bill had passed appropriating money for this purpose? I presume he meant to say that a bill had been passed authorizing the construction, but not carrying an appropriation.

Mr. DANIEL. That is what I stated, that at the time the pending appropriation bill was reported the bill for the erection of this public building was in the hands of the President. I have been informed that the President has now signed the bill, so that it has become existing law. This is taking the usual course.

Mr. DOLPH. But I understood the Senator to say that the bill has passed appropriating money for the erection of the building. Some of the bills carry appropriations and others do not.

Mr. ALLISON. It merely authorized it.

Mr. DANIEL. The bill does not carry an appropriation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. After line 13, page 11, add:

For post office at Roanoke, Va.: For purchase of site and construction of building, $75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent that the vote of the Senate be reconsidered, by which an amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] was adopted during my unavoidable absence from the Chamber. I presume there will be no objection to a reconsideration of the vote.

Mr. GORMAN. None in the world. I trust it will be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask that the proposed amendment be reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be reported.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill, on page 115, add:

Provided, That the appropriation made in the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 30, 1890, to provide accommodations for the Government Printing Office, and the authority for the expenditure of the same therein conferred, be, and the same are hereby, suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment moved by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. MANDERSON. Mr. President, this appropriation was made on the sundry civil appropriation act of last year. It was an amendment made to the bill as it came from the House of Representatives on the motion of the Committee on Appropriations, their action having been instigated, I may say, by the act of the Committee on Printing. The Senator from Maryland was largely instrumental in obtaining that legislation. It was in the nature, I submit, of general legislation upon that appropriation act, for it not only provided for the appropriation——

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, it is utterly impossible to hear what the Senator says. I sit as near to him as almost any Senator, and I am not able to hear what he says. The confusion in the Chamber is so great that no business can be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Business will be suspended until order is restored. Will Senators resume their seats and cease audible conversation on the floor? [A pause.] The Senator from Nebraska will proceed.

Mr. MANDERSON. Mr. President, the action of the Senate last year upon the sundry civil appropriation act was, I submit, in the nature of general legislation. It proposed the purchase of a site for a new Government Printing Office. Not only that, but it proposed the erection upon that site of certain warehouses for storage purposes and other uses, for the distribution of documents, inaugurating to that extent at least a new principle in the matter of printing and the distribution of the public documents of the country.

Not only that, but the commission which was created for the performance of this specific duty was authorized to negotiate for the purchase of the site and also had power to institute and proceed with condemnation proceedings for the purpose of obtaining a site. I think there can be no question but that this was in the nature of general legislation, and that anything which proposes to repeal that provision is also in the nature of general legislation. Did this proposition come from the Committee on Appropriations, from which committee emanated the original proposition, I would not feel like raising any point of order upon it.

Mr. GORMAN. It does come from the committee.

Mr. MANDERSON. I do not understand that it comes from the committee.

Mr. GORMAN. Oh, yes; I offered it by instruction of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANDERSON. I have not so understood it.

Mr. ALLISON. I suppose I ought to say that this matter was a subject of general discussion in the committee, and a majority of the committee authorized the Senator from Maryland to offer the provision. Therefore it comes with the authority of the committee, whatever that may be.

Mr. MANDERSON. Then I must state that I could very easily be deceived by the action with reference to this amendment. It does not emanate, as all the committee amendments did, from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. It was not placed upon the bill while the committee amendments were being considered, but after they were disposed of it was moved as a personal amendment by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Maryland may not have stated it at the time, but this amendment was voted in by a majority of the committee, and the Senator from Maryland was authorized to offer it as a member of the committee. There can be no discussion on that question.

Mr. MANDERSON. Nevertheless, Mr. President, under those circumstances I rise to the point of order that it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill, and this amendment can not be considered.

Mr. GORMAN. I trust the Senator will withdraw his point of order for a moment.

Mr. MANDERSON. Certainly. Before doing so, however (I shall renew the point of order), I desire to make an appeal to the Senator from Maryland, and, if necessary, to the Committee on Appropriations.

This is a matter with which we are all more or less familiar. The preliminary steps taken toward a procuring of this site I have narrated. At this session of Congress there came a matter for inquiry by the Committee on Printing, spending a great deal of time in the investigation and putting in a great amount of labor taking the testimony of some thirty witnesses, many of them expert builders and expert architects. That committee considered the question, having been authorized by a resolution introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania upon my right [Mr. CAMERON]. Only this morning was that committee able to make a report, and that report has not been seen by the members of the Senate. In the very nature of things it has not yet been printed, and the Senate is without the information. The Committee on Appropriations is without information, and the Senator from Maryland himself is without such information, it seems to me, as will permit wise and proper legislation upon this subject.

There certainly can be no haste in this matter. There might just as well be a repealing clause in the nature of legislation upon an appropriation bill passed upon any other of the appropriation bills that are to be considered within the next few days. I certainly hope that the committee or the Senator will withdraw this amendment, in common courtesy at least, until the report made this morning by a majority of the Committee on Printing, and as I think the Senator from Maryland

himself will say not yet read by him, shall receive consideration. I think it is no more than fair that that should be done.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, it is due after the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska, the chairman of the Committee on Printing, that I should state precisely what occurred in the Committee on Appropriations about this amendment.

In the act of 1890, provision was made for acquiring the site. The commission was named. The history of the case is as the Senator from Nebraska states. The question came here at the beginning of this session on a resolution offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON], and I think another by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER], one requiring the Committee on Printing to investigate the proceedings of the commission, and the other requesting the Attorney-General to suspend any proceedings toward the condemnation of this site.

The Committee on Printing, owing to the early sessions of the Senate, beginning at 10 o'clock in the morning and remaining in session until 6 o'clock in the evening, were unable to inquire fully and completely into the transaction from its inception until now. It is true that I was able to attend one or two meetings of the committee in which we endeavored to ascertain the fact as to whether the ground was of a character upon which a large, permanent building could be placed; but no investigation covering the whole question, under the circumstances, could be made fully and completely, although the majority of the committee are satisfied that the ground itself is susceptible of bearing an appropriate building of the dimensions required.

Now, Mr. President, while that matter was pending before the Committee on Printing, the Senator from Nebraska, the chairman of the committee, knows that I would not take any action in any other committee that assumed to take the jurisdiction from him. So when it was brought up in the Committee on Appropriations I was instructed by a majority of that committee to confer with him in regard to the question, and I had quite a lengthy interview with that Senator, and part of the time with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] in the room of the Committee on Printing.

The report of that committee upon this transaction, it is true, I have not been able to read, but the investigation so far as it has gone has convinced me that, in the interest of the Printing Office itself as to its proper location, and the economies, and everything else that relates to a transaction of that sort, the matter ought to be suspended until the Committee on Printing has an opportunity to make a more thorough investigation and until Congress can have the time and opportunity, as it can not have at this session, to determine what we ought to do.

I have no desire to reflect upon any of the gentlemen connected with this commission, and I shall not do so. I do not believe that any suggestion even as to the fair dealing of a public official should be made, or of those who are engaged in disposing of their property to the Government, without the most conclusive proof that the transaction was not all that it should be. Therefore, sir, I studiously avoid in this case reflecting upon the parties who offered the property or upon the combination, if there was one, to run the price up, or upon the commission who had the right to select the property; but I do say this, Mr. President, that the commission were misled, and the result of their action in the beginning and the transaction was, in my judgment, an error of judgment, which makes it incumbent upon us at this time to suspend all proceedings until we can look into this matter further.

Now, after the passage of the act of 1890——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I shall try to say in five minutes what ought to be said in twenty.

The Government in common decency and humanity requires a new Printing Office. It is an old, patched-up, insufficient building. The ventilation is horrible; the people are badly crowded. We can save tens of thousands of dollars a year in transportation by having this building near a railway track, where a switch can run into the yard, unload the many tons of paper and tons upon tons of books that go out through the mails. All the work can be done on that little 3 acres of ground that now is done in various parts all over the city by the employment of a large number of wagons.

In view of this very obvious necessity and great economy Congress directed a commission of three, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Public Printer, and the Chief Architect of this Capitol, to select the ground and take steps, if necessary, for its condemnation for the erection of a new Public Printing Office.

The Senator from Maryland says it is not proper now, under the circumstances, to make any reflection upon the motives of anybody, etc.; either upon the man who owns the land, upon the selling price, or upon the conduct of the commission, whereby he has insinuated in the minds of the Senate a suspicion that there are charges.

There are none, Mr. President. No man has a shadow of foundation for making any charges against anybody connected with it. The dead Secretary stood above the possibility of charges even. So does the Public Printer, and so does the old Architect of this Capitol. They advertised. They advertised within certain limits, it is true, and one of the objections made is because they did not spread over the city. We wanted it within certain limits.

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

Mr. HAWLEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Was there a single piece of unimproved property embraced within the limits covered by that advertisement that came up to the dimensions demanded by the Government except this one?

Mr. HAWLEY. It did not matter whether it was unimproved or not. There were plenty of squares there upon which there was no very valuable building. The man who expects to find a 3-acre lot anywhere within a half mile of this Capitol without a building upon it is liable to be disappointed. It is true there was just this one, the base-ball ground, that happened to be unimproved.

Now, the next question raised, after intimating that these men were not fair in giving us a ground, was as to the insufficiency of foundation, it being alleged that by reason of its vicinity to old Tiber Creek there was bad ground beneath it. There stands an enormous building, a large planing mill with a great deal of machinery. A building on that ground has been used for storage, containing an almost immeasurable weight of paper, and public documents, and stuff of that sort belonging to the Government already.

Pits have been sunk in that ground and men have gone down into those pits who knew all about the ground anyhow, some of them having lived there and who fished and shot over that ground when they were boys. The architects and experts have been down there and examined that ground. The superintendent of buildings; General Clark, the architect; Mr. McComb, the superintendent of sewers, who knows all about the big sewers made there; General Meigs, the venerable Quartermaster of the Army, one of the best engineers of this country, and the architect of the Library Building, have all been down in those pits and examined that ground, and they say you can put any building you choose there.

I affirm here that there is no ground of suspicion or charge of complaint concerning that selection which will stand for one minute, and there is my evidence in support of it. Witness after witness was summoned day after day. The Senator and myself would not be there all the time, but the chairman of the committee is an able lawyer and competent to conduct the cross-examination. There is the evidence; and somebody for some reason—now I will deal in insinuation likewise—there is somebody who is not satisfied with our purchase.

This site is within a few rods of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. Then it can very well run a side track to save us all this great amount expended for freight. I do not know a reason in the world for stopping the work. The reasons for going on with it are the absolute indispensability of a good roomy building with plenty of space, within a few rods of a railroad, that will stand any weight you choose to put upon it.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I think it but fair on this proposition, involving an appropriation of a quarter of a million of money, there should be afforded an opportunity on each side for a ten-minute statement. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], who was speaking by authority of the Committee on Appropriations, was interrupted by the operation of the rule when he had hardly begun. I will ask now that I may be permitted to yield my time to him and let him have a chance to complete the statement upon the amendment which the Committee on Appropriations directed him to report.

Mr. HALE. Let me suggest to the Senator not to introduce the practice of yielding time, but let him ask unanimous consent.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maryland may be permitted to finish his statement, instead of having it given in piecemeal, part by myself and part by him.

Mr. HALE. I think there will be no objection to that, and then let the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] be permitted to reply. The same privilege should be extended to them.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Very well. They have had ten minutes and there have only been five minutes taken on this side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection to the suggestion. The Senator from Maryland will proceed.

Mr. GORMAN. The Senator from Connecticut did me a great injustice in intimating that I had made charges against the commission. I said that I intended to avoid going into that branch of the subject at all. I have not made and I would not make a statement without sufficient evidence; but the commission on the 2d day of September, 1890, having been authorized to select a site, and their power was very broad, inserted the following in the newspapers of this city:

> Sealed proposals will be received until 12 o'clock m. of Wednesday, September 17, 1890, by the undersigned, for the purchase of a site for a new building for the Government Printing Office, said site to contain about 150,000 square feet, and to be within the bounds of H street north—

That is the street on which the present structure is located—

> First street east, B street north, and Ninth street west, in the city of Washington.

That is, a strip of ground from the point where the present Government Printing Office now is and from this point to the Patent Office. That was the limit within which they were to receive proposals. Within that limit there was not a single square of ground containing

the number of square feet desired, except the baseball lot. The complaint has been general that that was unfair and that the commission might just as well have gone on without any public notice and bought the square.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am sure the Senator does not mean that which his words import. There were other squares containing that number of square feet. What the Senator means is that there was no other whole square unimproved.

Mr. GORMAN. As a matter of course, I mean a square unimproved. That was a mistake on their part, and I do not characterize it by any other name; but it was, in my judgment, such a mistake, eliminating everything else from it, as ought to compel us to say that for the present we have not the time to go into the whole proposition and we will suspend action on this matter.

Mr. President, it is true that the commission—and it is due to them to say it—unquestionably had in mind and were somewhat controlled by the debates in the Senate at the time, and the expressions coming from members of the two Houses of Congress, the baseball square being named in the debate. If that be so, the commission ought not to have inserted this advertisement and asked for proposals. We said—I speak for myself, and I believe that was controlling on the floor of the Senate in the debate—the object was that we might obtain a site immediately adjoining the railroad, so as to run the cars into the Government Printing Office and save this immense cost of transportation, but it turns out now, upon investigation, that the square they have selected is distant from the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad tracks by at least a half square, if not more, and we shall have no right of entry from the railroad to this square, except by the use of a public street.

That can be just as well had on the present location where the Government Printing Office is now established. Therefore, there is absolutely nothing gained, except in the distance of laying the track for a square, as between the two sites.

I should much prefer that this discussion should stop there and rest upon that one proposition alone. I think it is controlling. I think, in justice to everybody, that this matter should be inquired into and the whole transaction should be begun *de novo*. There can not be anything done until the next Congress meets in providing for a public building to go on that square. The Government would simply pay for the property and it would lie there until the next Congress took up the whole question.

Then the question as to the insufficiency of the foundation will necessarly come up. You would have a square of ground on your hands, and the question of foundation would be determined afterwards.

The majority of the Committee on Printing and the chairman may be right in insisting that the ground there will sustain the building. The chairman has had a better opportunity to examine that question than I, and he has taken all the testimony; but, Mr. President, the public interests can not suffer by permitting the subject to go over until we meet in December next, when it can be fully inquired into.

The price which has been agreed to be paid for the property is another question which has not been very thoroughly examined into. The price may be a proper one. It may be that the commission have not paid too much for it, but having contracted for it at $1.40 a foot, or whatever the price is, amounting in all to some $240,000 or $245,000, they have failed to get a title to the property, and the Attorney-General, as I understand, informs them that the parties who claim to own the land can not convey a good title to the United States. Then the property must be condemned, and the proceedings for condemnation have not yet been had.

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

Mr. GORMAN. Certainly.

Mr. VANCE. I should like to be informed if the Committee on Printing did not investigate this whole matter and take testimony; and, if so, if that testimony has ever been published for the information of the Senate.

Mr. GORMAN. The committee have taken testimony, as stated by the chairman.

Mr. MANDERSON. We can not hear the Senator.

Mr. GORMAN. I say the Committee on Printing have taken a large volume of testimony, a copy of which I hold in my hand, as to the site and whether a building of this character can be erected thereon.

Mr. VANCE. I did not know that the report had ever been published.

Mr. GORMAN. It has not been published so as to be accessible to all the Senators.

Mr. MANDERSON. The report was only presented to the Senate this morning.

Mr. GORMAN. It has been printed for the use of the committee.

Mr. BUTLER. May I ask the Senator from Maryland whether, in that testimony, there is not a very decided conflict of opinion between experts, between men who are competent to pass an intelligent opinion upon such a question?

Mr. MANDERSON. Does the Senator ask that question of me or of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. BUTLER. I am asking the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. MANDERSON. I beg pardon; I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. BUTLER. But I should be very glad to have the Senator from Nebraska answer it. I ask if there is not a very decided conflict of opinion between gentlemen who are competent to pass an intelligent judgment upon that matter, as to the sufficiency of a foundation which may be made for such building on the baseball ground; in other words, are there not some very intelligent engineers and men of experience who say that a suitable foundation can not be secured upon that ground except at a very great cost? I so understand.

Mr. GORMAN. As I stated a moment since, it was impossible for me during the sessions of the Senate to be present at the entire hearing before the committee. I only heard about a third of the testimony, as I should suppose from glancing at the volume which I now have in my hand. A large part of it was taken, I think, when the Senate was in session, by permission of the Senate, when it was impossible for me, however, to leave the body. The testimony was mostly taken by the chairman individually.

I think it due to frankness to say, on the point referred to by the Senator from South Carolina, that the testimony of a very large number of people gathered together for the purpose, property-owners and others, was taken. The weight of the testimony probably is that the building can be placed on that square, but there are statements from old residents, such volunteers as would come before the committee, and some experts, in which they give the most positive testimony that it will be impossible at a reasonable cost to place the building there. There is dispute about that fact.

It is said by the condemnation of this property the Government will secure it at a fair price. We all know that after the commission have agreed to pay $245,000 for it there is not a jury, when the condemnation proceedings are had, that will be likely to award a less amount. As to its value, I have no personal knowledge; but I do know that one of the owners of the property, in his testimony before the committee, said that he owned a one-fourth interest in this property, and that in 1886 he had secured an option on it at 50 cents a foot, and it is to be sold to the Government at $1.45 or $1.50 a square foot, or whatever the price is.

I do not want to read the testimony, because it was not completed. He first declined to state what his interest was. It is a mixed transaction so far as the owners of the land are concerned, and I am bound to say that it does seem to me that before the Government completes this transaction it ought to be inquired into further than it has been.

Then the other question comes up, which is a more important one than this, and that is, as we have the present Government Printing Office costing, I do not know how many hundreds of thousands of dollars, with all its machinery, on the square where it is now located, whether it is not a matter of economy and proper administration to simply enlarge that building, and whether we can afford to go on and build an entirely new structure on another square. All of these are matters which, in my judgment, ought to be looked into before this $250,000 is expended. I do not wish to say more now, and I do not know that I am justified in saying more.

I repeat I have not been able to go to the bottom of this case in any one of its phases. I had hoped that we might all agree that the matter should simply remain suspended until we meet here in December. In the mean time the Committee on Printing can take up the subject. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON] always gives to matters which come before the committee a fair and impartial hearing, and we can examine into the question under the resolution which is now pending directing the Committee on Printing to make certain investigations during the recess of Congress. The committee can, if necessary, spend half the summer here in the investigation of the various questions referred to it, and can also examine this subject fully and settle it fairly.

I say again to the Senator from Connecticut that I did not intend to reflect upon any of the gentlemen who were on the commission. As to the late Secretary of the Treasury, I know and everybody knows that he had no more to do with the transaction and had no more knowledge of it than I had. He was on the commission, but it was impossible for him to act. He had probably to deputize somebody to do it, and even his deputy may never have inquired into the details. The commission may have been, and I think they were, misled by the discussion of this question in the Senate and elsewhere, and they assumed in the beginning that we would take this identical square and no other. I think it was a mistake which occurred in the haste and hurry of affairs, and I do not attribute any other motive to these gentlemen.

I know the Public Printer well. I believe he is one of the best men who have ever occupied that position. I believe him to be a thoroughly honest and upright man. So everybody believes is Mr. Clark, the Architect of the Capitol. It is not a question of attacking their integrity or intelligence, but with the new lights which have come since they acted it seems perfectly clear to my mind that we ought to halt, and we can do it without any reflection upon them. In my judgment, if we do this we shall save thousands if not hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Government.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Is any question pending before the Senate, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I supposed the Senator from Nebraska [Mr.

MANDERSON] desired to move a reconsideration of the vote by which it was adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote has been reconsidered.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent to reply for a few moments only to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not think that any of us who were in the Chamber at the last session of Congress when the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] made his eloquent appeal in behalf of the occupants of the Government Printing Office will ever forget the picture he drew. It was of such a character that it alarmed the Senate and showed the character of the present building, that the life of every man, woman, and child doing duty for the Government in it was in jeopardy. For years the Senator from Maryland had shown that picture to Congress, but never with such vigor and force as he did in the argument which preceded the adoption of the amendment to the appropriation bill to which he refers.

I do not need to supplement what he then said by any further note of alarm. It is a fact notorious that that building in its present situation is a threatening danger to the life and limb of every person in it. Not only that, but it is the most expensive, the most uneconomical plant that the Government has in this city for the performance of its work.

We all agreed that there was a crying necessity a year ago for obtaining a site and the speedy erection of a new building, and we all agreed that another necessity was, in the interest of economy, that this new site should be so located that a railroad track might enter it, so that cars could carry in the crude material and take out and distribute the finished material. Now, it is proposed by the Senator from Maryland to waste more months of time, to come here again next year, to wait until another appropriation bill shall come to the Senate, perhaps next March or April, before even steps are taken toward the acquisition of a site on which to erect this structure.

Why, Mr. President, if this matter had not been explored to the very bottom, if there had not been the action of the three reputable gentlemen who formed the commission, if there had not been the careful reviewing action of the Committee on Printing, I should have nothing to say and would not oppose further time being given. But, Mr. President, the opportunity now offered for the acquisition of this property is one that probably can not be had a year hence. I care not where you may locate this Public Printing Office, whether it be near the present site or remote from it, the chance is that you will pay far more for a less desirable property a year or a year and a half hence than you would pay to-day.

The question is raised by the Senator from Maryland that there is trouble over this title. I am very glad there is trouble over the title, for it compels the parties who represent the interest of the Government to go into court and by condemnation proceedings obtain a good title. What is it to us whether one man or a dozen men lay claim legally or equitably to this land? Their rights will be litigated as between themselves when they come to quarrel over the proceeds that may be paid into court for their benefit, and we have nothing what ever to do with it.

It is suggested that the Government has agreed to pay too much for this property. The testimony is the other way. The testimony of witnesses produced before the Committee on Printing and the testimony that appears in the report made by the commission show that the price contracted to be paid for this property is really below the market value of land in that vicinity; but be that as it may, Mr. President, the question of price is to be decided under the law of 1890 by commissioners appointed by the supreme court of the District of Columbia to take testimony, to investigate, and as the result of their investigation, to fix the price that the Government shall pay. So that, it seems to me, is the end of any cavil or objection as to either the question of title or the question of price.

There can be no word of condemnation of the action of this board. In every step they have taken they have strictly complied with the law and have most carefully performed their duty, and never until another property-owner thought there was a chance for him to sell a lot was there a word of criticism from any source as to the action of Mr. Windom, Mr. Palmer, or Mr. Clark, who composed that commission. All of the smoke which is raised here is simply because of the fact that other parties own property and seek to sell it for Public Printing Office purposes. That is all there is of it.

Mr. President, under the resolution introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON] the investigation was most thorough and complete, and I answer now the question asked by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] by saying that no reputable expert, no disinterested builder or contractor, has said that the ground selected will not afford good and sufficient foundations for such a building as that proposed to be erected.

Mr. BUTLER. That is not the question. The question I put to the Senator from Maryland was whether there was not an opinion among certain experts or engineers or men of experience that the cost of a foundation for a building there would be very expensive.

Mr. MANDERSON. No.

Mr. BUTLER. If the Senator will permit me, I will say that you can make a foundation anywhere if you pay enough money for it.

Mr. MANDERSON. Of course you can, but nobody has said that. If the Senator from South Carolina will examine the testimony that is in print, I think he will be satisfied on that point. It is true the testimony was only submitted to the Senate this morning with the report of the committee. I think I am right in assuming, at least I will assume in common courtesy to the Committee on Printing, that no expert has said that it will take extraordinary or exceptional methods to get a good foundation.

On the contrary, Mr. Entwisle, the superintendent of the erection of buildings in this District, an expert, and an architect and a builder for a great many years, has examined the property and the different pits, nearly a dozen in number, which have been sunk through the filling upon this lot, through the original surface soil down to the gravel bed, each of them of such size that a man could enter and make an examination, and he reports that it is just as good for foundation purposes as any place in this District.

If the Senators will examine his testimony they will see how emphatic he is. Mr. Clark, the Architect of the Capitol, and General Meigs, that great architect under whose superintendence the wings of this Capitol were erected, and who superintended the erection of the Washington Monument, have examined this lot and are perfectly familiar with the locality, and say most emphatically that it will afford a good foundation, without any extraordinary processes, without piling, and without going to any exceptional expense.

Mr. McComb, the superintendent of sewers, who was referred to, and the superintendent of the Congressional Library, Mr. Green, made a personal examination, and if Senators will turn to Mr. Green's testimony they will see how emphatic he is. He even goes to the extent of stating that the gravel bed found under the surface soil, as shown by these pits, furnishes just as good a foundation as the place selected for erecting the new Library Building, and he is the superintendent of construction, the supervising engineer of that building.

Mark it, General Meigs and Mr. Clark, the architects, were requested to be brought before the committee by those who were adverse to the selection of the site and the attorneys who represented the other lots, which are sought to be sold to the Government at, I submit, a very much enhanced price over what we shall have to pay under these proceedings. These gentlemen said on the last day of the examination, "Send for General Meigs and Mr. Clark, put them under oath, and let them testify, and we will be content with what they say on the subject-matter of the foundation."

We sent for both of them. They were placed under oath and their testimony is here, most emphatic and pronounced, that that soil will afford just as good a foundation for a building as was afforded by that upon which this Senate wing now rests. There is no question about that. Then why this delay? I am at a loss to conceive. Why this change of sentiment? Why this change of mind by the Senator from Maryland? I can not account for it.

Mr. GORMAN. What does the Senator mean by "change of mind by the Senator from Maryland?"

Mr. MANDERSON. Change of mind from what he said a year ago, and we all remember the emphatic language of the Senator from Maryland that here was a crying necessity for immediate action.

Mr. GORMAN. I repeat that statement now as to the old part of the building on H street. It is a disgrace and an outrage that it is permitted to remain. There can not be any controversy about that.

The Senator and I know of that fact from personal examination. The building is propped up. But this action does not help it for the time being, and will not until an appropriation is made hereafter. Delay on this question now does not delay that. I consider it a great outrage that the Government has permitted it to remain in that condition; but it remains and will remain whether this matter is decided upon now or not.

Mr. MANDERSON. And there it will remain forever if we are to try here in the Senate of the United States the question whether we shall purchase land from this, that, or the other interested party. I say we should go on in the performance of our duty without reference to the ownership of any man in the city of Washington. If this proposition is not for the purpose of delay, I am at a loss to see what it is for. If we are to wait until an appropriation in another bill comes up next year, it means the delay of another year in acquiring this site.

Mr. President, I will not take further time. Unless the Senator desires to be heard in the discussion of the proposition I will renew the point of order I have made on the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have a very few remarks to make in connection with this subject.

Like the Senator from Maryland, I am not prepared to make any charges of fraud against anybody. It is not my habit to do so unless I have conclusive and absolute proof that there has been fraud. But I undertake to say—and I think I can say it without fear of contradiction—that there are some badges of fraud about this transaction which the Congress of the United States owes it to itself to have explained before it will pay two hundred and forty-odd thousand dollars for this piece of ground.

The first point to which I desire to call the attention of the Senate is that the commission, in advertising for bids in pursuance of the act of Congress, circumscribed the limits in such a way that they could procure no other land but the baseball lot.

Mr. MANDERSON. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him a moment?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANDERSON. Is it not true that under the law of 1890 the commission was not required to advertise at all?

Mr. BUTLER. That may be, and, if it is so, so much the worse.

Mr. MANDERSON. Further is it not true that they could by private negotiation with this party, if they could agree upon the price, have bought the property without reference to any other in the city of Washington?

Mr. BUTLER. So much the worse if that be true, and I have no doubt it is true.

Mr. MANDERSON. That is the law.

Mr. BUTLER. They were not bound to advertise, but they did advertise, and they advertised for ground within certain limits, and in those limits there was no possible chance to procure an unoccupied lot, except the base-ball lot.

Mr. SPOONER. Were they not charged by the law not only with the duty but with the power of selecting a site?

Mr. BUTLER. I suppose they were.

Mr. SPOONER. Was it a badge of fraud that they decided to exclude sites a certain distance from the Capitol?

Mr. BUTLER. I say they had authority under the act of Congress to make selections without advertisement, but they did advertise. It was their duty, however, as representatives of the Government, to have made that advertisement general, instead of confining it to particular limits.

Mr. SPOONER. Could they not have taken land within two miles of the Capitol?

Mr. BUTLER. That was a matter for the commission to determine for themselves.

Mr. SPOONER. They did determine it.

Mr. BUTLER. They did determine it, and they did advertise in the manner I have indicated. I repeat that the fact that they put the limits at H street, north, First street, east, B street, south, and Ninth street, west, absolutely excluded the possibility of procuring any other property except the base-ball lot, certainly any property which was unoccupied. I have the agreement here in my hand between the commission and a Mr. Snow, that he would execute a good and sufficient title within a certain time; but when the time came for the execution of the title it was disclosed that he had none, that he was a mere figurehead that had been set up; that he bought an option from somebody and somebody had bought an option from him and somebody else had bought an option from somebody else, and it went around in a ring. When the property came to the Government it was found it had gone up in price to $243,000, and it was questionable whether a good foundation could be made. The fact that the committee proceeded to inquire if a good foundation could be had there shows that there was doubt about it.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the Senator permit me a moment?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. HAWLEY. The committee went to work and inquired because of the complaints which were made. It was not that the committee had any doubt whatever on the subject, but in order to put complaint beyond reach.

Mr. BUTLER. Then I ask the Senator from Connecticut if that lot is not made ground, or, at least, a part of it.

Mr. HAWLEY. It is part made. There is earth right on top of earth there.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask if a large part of it has not been made by dumping earth upon it and if a part of it is not over the old Tiber Creek.

Mr. HAWLEY. The earth was there before the other earth was put on top of it.

Mr. BUTLER. Precisely.

Mr. HAWLEY. And in the mean time they dug down through that into the original gravel, and nobody who examined it has a doubt as to its sufficiency for a good foundation.

Mr. BUTLER. It is made ground, and it is made in a place that is no more accessible for a railroad than twenty other lots, because, as I understand, in order to get a railroad track into this lot the property of somebody else must be crossed and the Government must pay for that.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am sure the Senator does not want to make a mistake.

Mr. BUTLER. Not at all. I shall be glad to be corrected if I am wrong.

Mr. MANDERSON. By running the track either up F street or G street from Delaware avenue, less than half a block in length, the railroad tracks would enter this lot.

Mr. BUTLER. Can not the same thing be done at the present Printing Office?

Mr. MANDERSON. Not without crossing North Capitol street, which is a block or a block and a half away.

Mr. BUTLER. But a railroad track could go down a public street to the present building without condemning land.

Mr. MANDERSON. Very true; but the Senator must realize from what has frequently transpired here, that there is a very strong indisposition to cross North Capitol street, which is the main avenue leading to the north from the Capitol and will undoubtedly receive most substantial improvement. It has been already improved in part, and no railroad will ever be permitted to cross North Capitol street by the action of Congress.

Mr. BUTLER. That is a matter of sentiment. I do not know about that. I appreciate what the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] have said about the importance of having a better building for a Government Printing Office. I have no doubt about that. I think that Congress made a mistake in not taking steps years ago in order to get a better building.

I do submit in the face of the testimony, which I have not had time to read, in the face of all the facts connected with this transaction, that it will be almost scandalous for the Congress of the United States to make an appropriation of $243,000 in view of the doubt which exists, at least, in view of all the circumstances attending this purchase.

I have been informed that there is a Mr. Smith, whose testimony I have before me, who owns the adjacent property. He is interested in this selection, and has a sash, door, and blind factory, I believe, or a lumber yard which he owns on the adjoining property. I have been told by those who ought to know that the mere fact of the contiguity and proximity of that building is of itself a sufficient argument why the Government of the United States should not put this proposed building at that point on account of the combustibility of the materials about that factory.

I do trust, Mr. President, that the Senate will hesitate before it makes an appropriation for the payment of the purchase money of this lot under proceedings of condemnation, or otherwise, until, as the Senator from Maryland has said, we can have time to investigate it and make the appropriation for the purchase of the lot simultaneously with the appropriation to erect the building.

We can not make any progress by buying this lot now. There is nothing to be gained by it in time, and a very great loss may result to the Government if we go on now in pursuance of this, as it seems to me, unreasonable demand of the owners of this property and others interested, who come and insist upon this appropriation in the face of the controversy which has arisen out of it.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, as the agreement has been somewhat disregarded in relation to this matter, I hope there will be a few minutes longer allowed to me.

Knowing this matter from A to Z, I am astonished at the speech of the Senator from South Carolina—simply astonished. He says it will be almost scandalous. I say frankly to him that the scandal is on the other side, and that this transaction is spotless from beginning to end. I do not care anything about the owner of this land. He is X, an unknown quantity. He is nobody to me; he is minus; worse than zero. We go to the court and condemn the land. The money is laid down for whomsoever it may concern to come and take it if the court shall say their titles justify them in demanding it.

The Senator asked, in the first place, whether there was any doubt as to the suitability of this land for a foundation. There is not a shadow of a doubt disclosed there in that body of testimony. Nor have these men who own that land been here urging us to put this thing through. We care nothing about them. Very likely they do not want to sell the land, and possibly they may get more if they hold it for speculation. We do not care whether they ask for it or not. We are going to take it and pay them what it is worth according to the judgment of their fellow-citizens. If they are dissatisfied with the award, we can not help it. If they are found not to have a good title, I can not imagine that any possible harm can result to us, as was said by my colleague on the committee.

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

Mr. HAWLEY. I am delighted to hear any question.

Mr. BUTLER. What is the necessity for this great haste? What progress is to be made by this appropriation?

Mr. HAWLEY. I am glad to hear the Senator's question. The necessity for haste has existed for many years.

Mr. BUTLER. Precisely.

Mr. HAWLEY. By universal consent and to the delight of the Committee on Printing, last year Congress did heartily vote that there ought to be and should be a new building for the Government Printing Office. It is necessary as a matter of common sense and in just and kind treatment to our employés that we should erect a new building. It is a matter of very great economy, too, that we should put it up, and all the people who live about there and own lots are nothing to us.

Mr. BUTLER. Is there any appropriation for the erection of a building on this ground before next December?

Mr. HAWLEY. There ought to be and probably will be before we get through with this session.

Mr. BUTLER. Is there an appropriation now or can there be one made before the next Congress meets?

Mr. HAWLEY. We, of course, had to know something about the site. It was necessary to have the report of the commission heretofore ordered by Congress, and then came the investigation, which we were perfectly willing to grant, in order that we might wipe out the complaints of the people who have outside lots and want to sell them to the Government, but never will be able to sell them for the purposes of the Government Printing Office, because they are not suitable.

The Senator from South Carolina speaks as if we could get a railroad to any building lot by going through the highways. So we could, and we could even go through Pennsylvania avenue, but this body would hardly listen to a proposition of that kind. The property over which a branch track would go is just by the side of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad tracks; and the streets there are not large and important streets, and the ground is occupied very largely between North Capitol street and the railroad by the lot which we propose to take. It is just about 200 or 300 feet from our proposed building, and by using this track nobody would be damaged. There could not be a place found, unless we bought one literally adjoining the railroad track, that would be more convenient.

Mr. MANDERSON. I make the point of order on the proposed amendment that it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment on which the point of order is raised by the Senator from Nebraska was reported by the Committee on Appropriations. It is merely to suspend an appropriation heretofore made, and does not, in the opinion of the Chair, come under the head of general legislation. Therefore, the opinion of the Chair is that the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. MANDERSON. Then, Mr. President, I presume it will be necessary to demand the yeas and nays upon this question.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I want to say a single word on this subject. I, for one, do not like the ground upon which the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] in part bases his suggestion that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] ought to be inserted in this bill and maintained in it. While not making charges of actual, affirmative fraud upon the commissioners, the Senator says their transaction affords certainly evidence of fraud or that there are certain badges of fraud in connection with it. I might be disposed to agree with the Senator that there should be delay; it may be that the site chosen, on a very careful examination, might not be the best in all respects that could be found in the city, regard being had to the make of the ground and the facility for constructing the foundations.

Perhaps other sites might be chosen which would be better adapted to subserve the public interests. That, however, is all a question of opinion which men may differ about without any dishonesty on the part of any who consider the subject.

The suggestion of the Senator from South Carolina, as to badges of fraud in connection with the action of this board, is a suggestion the full weight of which I think the Senator did not apprehend.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator, of course, is too good a lawyer not to know that there may be many badges of fraud or evidences of fraud without any moral turpitude. I do not charge the commission with any deliberate purpose to defraud anybody. I do not charge them with moral turpitude; but I say, to a disinterested person, simply looking at the record, without regard to any knowledge as to the character of the individuals, there are badges of fraud which ought at least to induce the Senate to hesitate before proceeding.

Mr. SPOONER. That is a restatement of the Senator's position, not that in the public interests, apart from considerations of fraud or badges of fraud, this delay ought to occur, but that the members of this Senate ought to vote to delay all these proceedings, because, forsooth, in connection with the transactions of this board there are badges of fraud. The man who perpetrates a fraud is guilty of moral turpitude or else of great stupidity, one or the other.

Mr. BUTLER. A great many persons are imposed upon.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not think there is any evidence that the commission was imposed upon.

Mr. BUTLER. A great many people are imposed upon and commit fraud without knowing it.

Mr. SPOONER. Here is a board made up in this wise: William Windom, Secretary of the Treasury, who was made chairman when the board organized——

Mr. BUTLER. He did not act.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not know whether he acted or not.

Mr. BUTLER. I know.

Mr. SPOONER. He signed his name to the paper which is printed in this record, and the whole world has passed judgment upon him, basing their judgment upon a long life of public service in this Chamber and out of it, that he was a man of great ability, of great conservatism, of great care, and of the utmost probity. So that the Senator, or any Senator, or any man here or elsewhere ought to be very confident of his ground when he suggests either that this officer signed this paper as a mere matter of routine, devolving upon others entirely the personal trust or the discharge of the duty which had been reposed in him by act of Congress, or that he had exercised his function in such a way as to be amenable to the suggestion in connection with it made by the Senator as to fraud.

The next member of this commission is Frank W. Palmer, the present able Public Printer, not so distinguished a man as Secretary Windom, but an old member of Congress, an old soldier, and a man whom I believe to be as honest, as careful, and as conservative a man as ever entered the service of the people in any capacity whatever.

The other member of the commission is Edward Clark, the Architect of the Capitol, whom everyone knows about these precincts, and no man would suspect him of being other than as honest as we all know him to be capable.

What did this commission do? Although I am not called upon to justify their selection, I stand here upon the act of Congress and upon the record to aver that they did precisely what they had a right to do and what they ought not to be criticised for doing, at any rate in the manner adopted by the Senator from South Carolina. They were required by this law to select a site—were they not?—for a Public Printing Office, which, in their opinion, would best subserve the public interests. They were to take into account, as Senators would take into account, its proximity to the Capitol, because the Capitol is to stand where it has been builded for all the years to come, and there is to be constant transit, and it should be rapid, between the Capitol and Public Printing Office.

In the exercise of the power conferred upon them by the statute, they chose a site, or at any rate, they decided that it must be within certain boundaries. They said they would not consent that it should be located outside of certain limits. That question they settled, whether wisely or not; I am inclined to think wisely. They felt the nearer they could get to the Capitol the better, and under no circumstances would they go beyond certain limits.

Mr. President, they were not obliged to advertise for proposals. If the suggestion, or rather the implication, of the Senator from South Carolina were true, that within the limits indicated by the commission there could be chosen but one site, so that it was simply an advertisement for bids on the one site *ex necessitate rei*, there would be something strange about the course of the commission, but that was not, as I understand, the fact.

They fixed limits within which somewhere this public building ought, in their opinion, to be, and I am told by the chairman of the Committee on Printing, who is thoroughly familiar with this subject, that, within the limits embraced in this proposal for bids, five different locations, each with adequate area, could have been chosen by the commission. The owners of the property within that area, the line being drawn by the commission beyond which they would not go, were invited to submit their bids.

Mr. BUTLER. Was there sufficient ground in the other localities to which the Senator refers?

Mr. MANDERSON. Not in all of the five, but I can give the number of square feet in each.

Mr. SPOONER. Leaving out the baseball park, as it is called, how many sites were contained within the limits fixed by the commission of sufficient area?

Mr. BUTLER. With sufficient dimensions to erect this building.

Mr. MANDERSON. I will answer in a moment. The advertisement was for about 150,000 square feet. Bid No. 13 was for 133,678 square feet; bid No. 17 was for 213,772 square feet. Mr. Snow's bid, which is the one selected, was for 150,000 square feet or thereabouts, and 170,000 in another bid, and Carusi, Evans, and Carusi's bid was for 114,637 square feet. So that, while some of the lots exceeded 150,000 square feet, others were less than the 150,000.

Mr. BUTLER. May I inquire of the Senator if all the lots to which he has referred had not buildings and improvements on them, except the baseball ground?

Mr. MANDERSON. Yes; but the bids included the buildings. They were all within the $250,000 limit.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand; but did they not all have improvements upon them except the baseball ground?

Mr. MANDERSON. Yes, but what difference does that make when they were all within the limits of the expenditure?

Mr. SPOONER. My proposition is correct that within the geographical limits fixed by the commission and covering the area from the section in which they invited bids there might have been chosen five or six different sites, well located with reference to the Capitol and containing an adequate area of land. It makes no difference who were the owners and it makes no difference if there were buildings on the lots.

We all know what the character of the buildings in that part of the city is, and that would make very little difference with the transaction. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON] that it is no detriment at all that the Government is called upon to go into court and condemn the title, because that gives an absolute title to the Government beyond any possibility of question, and without any reliance upon real estate title insurance companies, leaving parties

who have liens for mortgages and otherwise, and equities and conflicting claims, to fight out their claims over the fund, in a court constituted for the purpose of settling such questions.

I am not prepared to say that there is not strength in the position taken by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] which would lead the Senate to delay. I have not examined that question. But what I rose to say was that no Senator here can find in these proceedings any ground apparently of fraud upon the part of this commission upon which the request for delay should be based; and it ought to be based on other grounds than the assumption that this commission has done anything except what the law clearly authorized them to do, and except what prudent men, endeavoring to perform their public duty, ought to do.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. President——

Mr. BUTLER. One moment. I am not going to occupy much time. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] enters into a touching eulogy, a panegyric, on gentlemen who have not been assailed, and I think he is indebted to me for the opportunity. He has delivered a very handsome eulogy on the late Secretary of the Treasury, on Mr. Palmer, and on Mr. Clark, who, so far as I know, have never been attacked. I disclaim any intention of attacking those gentlemen.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. I will ask the Senator whether, if anybody should suggest that there was a badge of fraud about any official action of the Senator, would he not take it as an insult?

Mr. BUTLER. That depends on circumstances.

Mr. SPOONER. I should; and I should defend the Senator against it anywhere.

Mr. BUTLER. That depends largely upon circumstances, and if I had gone to work in pursuance of a duty imposed upon me by Congress or anybody else and I had unfortunately got mixed up in a transaction such as that which is disclosed here in relation to Mr. Snow and other persons who have had dealings about this matter, however innocent I might think I was, if I had gone on and done that, there would be a ground at least of suspicion.

These gentlemen are of high character no doubt, but they are not infallible. The Senator argues on the assumption that these gentlemen are infallible and that they could not possibly be guilty of anything wrong.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will allow me, I stated distinctly that we might differ with them in opinion, that their judgment might not have been wise, and the place they selected may not have been the best one, but that they were not on that account open to suspicion. That is an ugly word. The Senator is unfortunate in his choice of epithets in this connection.

Mr. BUTLER. I see the Senator can not be satisfied, and therefore I will repeat what I stated.

Mr. SPOONER. I am satisfied.

Mr. BUTLER. I stated the fact that this advertisement had been made in the manner stated, and that the transactions which followed in pursuance of it were liable to the charge of having about them the badge of fraud. I repeat it. The Senator says they were not bound to advertise, that they had the right, or option, to go on under the authority of Congress and make this selection without consulting anybody. That may be true. If the commission had gone on and said: "We will take this baseball lot because we think it is the best," then I think I should have been silent, as should everybody else.

But having gone to the trouble of advertising, and circumscribing the limits within which bids could be made, within such narrow limits as—although the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON] states that there was other property offered—I must insist, imply that this was perhaps the only available property. I may be mistaken in that. If I am mistaken, of course my charge does not hold good, but I say that taking the record as it is it looks, Mr. President, if the Senator would prefer that, a little fishy. That is not so classic perhaps, but still it is quite graphic.

Mr. SPOONER. I think it will fall within the scope of the legal maxim, *Noscitur a sociis*.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, I hope the Senator will be satisfied after awhile. I repeat that there is nothing within this matter that demands or requires that we should make this appropriation now, but every sense of prudence, caution, and conservatism demands that we should suspend it until the first Monday in December, and at that time make the appropriation, but by this law or some other, and simultaneously with it, make the appropriation to erect the building.

I will go as far and as fast as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON], or the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], and do all that in my power lies to correct what I think is a public scandal—that is, the condition of the Printing Office of the United States Government. But we have nothing to gain by passing this now; we gain no time by it. We do nothing to relieve the inmates of that building and may make a very grievous mistake.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. President, it seems to me that this whole matter can be adjusted without the necessity of seeming to reflect upon anybody. There is bound to be a difference of opinion as to where this office ought to be located. I do not believe in the site that has been chosen, and when occasion offers I am willing to vote accordingly; and I shall vote to postpone this matter, because I think the commission was incautiously led to making an unfortunate call for bids.

It is true, as stated by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], that they were not bound to advertise at all; but they did advertise, and, having done so, they were bound, as I think, to disclose their entire purpose. That I do not think they did. They were misled; and instead of giving a large area along the railroad, or a narrow area along the railroad, as the case may be, they included a tract of land in the center of the city, northwest from the railroad, thereby giving to people who were interested in the subject the idea that they were going up as far as the Patent Office, perhaps, for a location. These things are always, more or less, done for the purpose of giving an impulse to the bidding, and so on; and that, no doubt, was the idea in the case of this advertisement.

I am not at all satisfied, myself, that the building can be properly erected, without enormous cost, on the site selected. I have not read with any degree of care the testimony in the case. I know that people have testified there that it can be so erected—among them the building inspector of the city. On the other hand, it is said to me by old residents of this city—persons who, I am quite sure, are disinterested in the matter—that a foundation can not be had. I am not satisfied, and shall not be until an examination has been made sufficiently thorough to properly determine, that we can erect a building on that site without a very expensive process of piling or underpinning before we come to the erection of the foundation proper.

For myself, I was in favor of a location on the block of ground adjoining the present Printing Office, on the score of convenience, and believing that we could close up the Government alley on the south side of the present building, and thus add very largely to the area available for the purpose of the building. An objection was made to that at the time, either privately or publicly, or perhaps both, that at times the water which comes down what was formerly the channel of the Tiber, a little stream that meandered through the center of the city, rose to a height in the present Government Printing Office which made it, if not dangerous, at all events inconvenient or unhealthful for occupation.

If that is true as to the present location, it must be doubly true as to the proposed or selected site. Enough has been heard in the controversy here, and before the committee and outside, to satisfy me that the wise thing to do before the erection of a large structure, and one especially which requires so secure a foundation, is to put it over for awhile. I do not think that that is an injustice to anyone. We do not always carry out the recommendations of executive officers. We do not always carry out the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury, or of the Interior, or of other Departments; and not to do so is not showing any disrespect to them. We are exercising our functions, which, I think I may say, are superior to theirs, and I have no doubt that no one would more readily have accepted such conclusion than the late Secretary of the Treasury.

It is true, as stated by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] that that Secretary did not participate in the proceeding. He signed his name to the document as he would sign other documents, because it was the action of his subordinates. Had he, however, given it the emphasis of his own personal selection I should still think it my duty in my capacity as a legislator to say that I thought he had made a mistake, and I would vote to put the thing over to another opportunity, deeming it best that before the site should be taken it should be subjected to a new inspection, so that we might be absolutely certain, or as nearly so as human judgment can be certain, that what we were doing was the best thing possible to do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MANDERSON. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CALL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. CASEY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO].

Mr. DOLPH (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. I withhold my vote until I see whether there is a quorum present.

Mr. KENNA (when Mr. FAULKNER'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. FAULKNER] is paired on all questions with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY].

Mr. CALL (when Mr. PASCO'S name was called). My colleague is absent from the Senate on committee duty.

Mr. SHERMAN (when his name was called). I am paired with my colleague [Mr. PAYNE]. If he were here, he would vote "yea" and I should vote "nay."

Mr. VANCE when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCMILLAN]. I do not know how he would vote. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARRIS. I will inquire whether the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] is recorded as voting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He is not.

Mr. HARRIS. Then I withhold my vote.

Mr. HAMPTON. I am paired with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. BARBOUR. I am paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. MORGAN. Has the vote of the Senator from New York [Mr. EVARTS] been recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He is not recorded.

Mr. MORGAN. Then I withhold my vote.

Mr. DOLPH. I would say to the Senator from Alabama that our votes are necessary to make a quorum, and I suggest that we transfer our pairs and let the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] be paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. EVARTS].

Mr. MORGAN. Very well. I vote "yea."

Mr. DOLPH. I vote "nay."

Mr. BLAIR. I should like to have the attention for a moment of the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WALTHALL]. Has the Senator voted?

Mr. WALTHALL. I have voted "yea."

Mr. BLAIR. Then I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 16; as follows:

YEAS—32.

Bate,	Daniel,	McConnell,	Reagan,
Berry,	Davis,	McPherson,	Shoup,
Blackburn,	Farwell,	Mitchell,	Stewart,
Blair,	Gorman,	Moody,	Stockbridge,
Butler,	Hoar,	Morgan,	Teller,
Call,	Jones of Arkansas,	Pettigrew,	Vest,
Cockrell,	Jones of Nevada,	Plumb,	Walthall,
Coke,	Kenna,	Power,	Wolcott.

NAYS—16.

Aldrich,	Chandler,	Hawley,	Sanders,
Allen,	Dolph,	Higgins,	Sawyer,
Allison,	Edmunds,	Hiscock,	Spooner,
Carey,	Frye,	Manderson,	Washburn.

ABSENT—39.

Barbour,	Eustis,	Ingalls,	Ransom,
Blodgett,	Evarts,	McMillan,	Sherman,
Brown,	Faulkner,	Morrill,	Squire,
Cameron,	George,	Paddock,	Stanford,
Carlisle,	Gibson,	Pasco,	Turpie,
Casey,	Gray,	Payne,	Vance,
Colquitt,	Hale,	Pierce,	Voorhees,
Cullom,	Hampton,	Platt,	Warren,
Dawes,	Harris,	Pugh,	Wilson.
Dixon,	Hearst,	Quay,	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALL. I offer the following amendment, to come in on page 20, after line 19.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, after line 17, it is proposed to insert the following:

For the construction of a first-class revolving lighthouse and light on Mount Cornelia, at Fort George, at the mouth of the St. John's River, Florida, $175,000.

Mr. CALL. This appropriation has been recommended at three different Congresses by the Secretary of the Treasury, and I ask that the report be read. It is a very short report.

Mr. ALLISON. I make the point of order on the amendment that it has not been recommended by any committee.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, it is contained in the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury, estimated for and recommended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of opinion that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. CALL. I appeal from that decision. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] is mistaken. It is contained in the Book of Estimates and in the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury and recommended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the appropriation recommended in the Book of Estimates?

Mr. CALL. Yes; it is in the Book of Estimates.

Mr. ALLISON. But my point is that it is not recommended by any standing committee of this body. The lighthouses put into this bill have either been recommended as indispensable by the Committee on Appropriations, or else they have come from the Committee on Commerce. Now I submit——

Mr. CALL. But the Senator from Iowa knows that that is not the rule of the Senate. He knows that the recommendation by a head of a Department and inclusion in the estimates is all that is required by the rules.

Mr. ALLISON. I know perfectly well that they have estimated for this. They have recommended a new light for an old one at the mouth of St. John's River. There is a large appropriation in this bill already for lights; but they have all been recommended either by the Committee on Appropriations or by the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CALL. The Senator will not say that that is the requirement or the rule of the Senate. The rule of the Senate is that it must be recommended by a head of a Department and estimated for. The Senator should not embarrass the case by this objection.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to accommodate my friend from Florida, but I feel obliged to raise the point of order.

Mr. CALL. But the Senator from Iowa knows that he has no right to raise his point of order. His point of order is not within the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not understand that the appropriation was estimated for. He thinks that it is in order.

Mr. CALL. Now, I simply desire to say that this light has been stated in this report, for two years, to be absolutely necessary to the safety of all the commerce that is conducted along the coast of Florida. I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. HOAR. Has the estimate been read to the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Extract from the annual estimates of the Lighthouse Board for 1892.

Mount Cornelia light station, Florida: Establishment of a first order light station on or near Mount Cornelia, north side of the St. John's River, Florida, $175,000.

NOTE.—The light now maintained at the mouth of the St. John's River is of the third order. For years there have been complaints of its inefficiency as a seacoast light. A first order light on Mount Cornelia would answer the requirements of commerce.

Extract from the Annual Report of the Lighthouse Board, 1890, page 113.

Mr. HOAR. My question was whether the estimate came from the head of a Department. What the Secretary has been reading is the report of the Lighthouse Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary is reading the paper sent to him by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL].

Mr. CALL. The Senator knows that the Lighthouse Board reports are made to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. HOAR. What I want to see is what the Secretary says.

Mr. CALL. The Senator has the book and can readily find it.

Mr. HOAR. There are regular estimates, as I understand it, made every year, of appropriations for the different Departments. Those estimates are made in each case by the head of the Department. Those are the estimates referred to in the rule. For example, the Bureau of Education and all other bureaus make estimates of the expenses of their bureaus, and those are found in their reports. But those are not the estimates of the head of a Department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will call the attention of the Senator from Florida to the fact that this estimate seems to be an annual estimate made in 1890.

Mr. CALL. It is repeated this year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is by the Lighthouse Board.

Mr. CALL. But it is repeated this year.

Mr. HOAR. Let us have the thing that the honorable Senator from Florida depends on, with the recommendation from the head of the Department.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, it is due to the truth that I should say that this is in the estimate. I have just been examining it. Here is the Book of Estimates.

Mr. HOAR. Let it be read to the Senate.

Mr. ALLISON. The item reads:

Mount Cornelia light-station, Florida:

Establishment of a first-order light-station on or near Mount Cornelia, north side of the mouth of the St. John's River, Florida. Submitted, $175,000.

Note.—The light now maintained at the mouth of the St. John's River is of the third order, etc.

Mr. CALL. Why, Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] ought to know that these reports come from the Secretary of the Treasury and are contained in the estimates.

Mr. HOAR. What the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] has just read is the estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury and makes this thing in order. What the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] sent to the Chair is the report of the Lighthouse Board of 1890, which did not make the thing in order. I have no fault to find with the Senator's proposition, but my insistence was that there should go into the RECORD the official communication that now has appeared on which the Chair bases his ruling.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to offer an amendment to come in at page 9, after line 13. This is in order, having been reported from a committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

The limit of cost of site and of erection of a public building thereon at Pueblo, Colo., fixed by act approved February 7, 1891, is hereby raised to and fixed at the sum of $300,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. I desire to insert on page 26, after line 14, the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, after line 14, it is proposed to insert as follows:

Also one at or near the mouth of Rogue River and one at or near Port Orford on the coast of Oregon.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is recommended by the Committee on Commerce and is in substance the bill passed by the Senate on May 3, 1890, at the last session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask the consent of the Senator in charge of the bill that the vote by which the amendment on page 20, line 16, was adopted may be considered as reconsidered, in order that I may offer an amendment to it that is in accordance with the recommendation of the Department.

Mr. ALLISON. I agree to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be considered as reconsidered, if there be no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. I offer now an amendment to the amendment reported by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, line 16, it is proposed to strike out the words "including repairs of wharf" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

And for the purchase of a site at the latter place and the construction thereon of a suitable wharf for the use of the Lighthouse Department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask that a letter in reference to the matter may be inserted in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE LIGHTHOUSE BOARD,
Washington, February 24, 1891.

DEAR SIR: The item relating to a buoy depot and wharf at Astoria, Oregon, in the estimates for the next fiscal year, and that now in the sundry civil bill would be of no effect unless it provided for the purchase of the necessary land.

Mr. MITCHELL's bill of December 4, 1889, a duplicate of which has passed the Senate the first session of the present Congress, provides for the purchase of a site and the construction of a wharf in Astoria, Oregon, for the use of the lighthouse establishment.

The item in the sundry civil bill now pending, in order to accomplish the end desired, should provide for an appropriation of the sum of $15,000, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be used under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury in the purchase of a site and the construction of a suitable wharf at Astoria, Oregon, for the use of the lighthouse establishment.

Respectfully, yours,

GEO. W. COFFIN,
Commander United States Navy, Naval Secretary.

Hon. JOHN H. MITCHELL,
United States Senate.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Mr. President, I desire to offer again an amendment that I offered this afternoon, which was objected to on a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 89, at the end of line 9, it is proposed to insert as follows:

Thirty thousand dollars to be expended on the Trenton battle monument, Trenton, N. J., under the direction of the Secretary of War when he is satisfied that a similar amount has been provided by the State of New Jersey and the Trenton Battle Monument Association.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. After the action of the Senate a few minutes ago respecting the monument in Vermont, I shall make no further objection to that amendment.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I am much obliged to the Senator and very glad that he makes no objection. I should like to say a word with regard to the amendment.

Several SENATORS. Oh, no.

Mr. HARRIS. I shall ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment and all similar amendments, because I want to record myself against them.

Mr. SPOONER. Will not the Senator withhold his demand until it comes into the Senate?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, the seat of government of the State of Maryland is the only seat of government in the United States without a public building. I move to amend the bill, on page 2, after line 10, by inserting the provision which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 10, it is proposed to insert the following:

For a site and building for post office at Annapolis, Md., $50,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. I move an amendment at the end of the bill——

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator will pause one moment I should like to make a suggestion to the Senate. This is an inclement night and we shall all be obliged to be here for an evening session. I suggest that unanimous consent be given that the Senate continue in session, rather than take a recess at 6 o'clock.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I did not hear the suggestion of the Senator.

Mr. ALLISON. My suggestion is that the Senate continue in session without taking the usual recess after 6 o'clock. I am told it is very inclement outside, so that very few Senators would probably go home if we took a recess at 6 o'clock.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator is correctly informed as to the state of the weather.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate continue in session without taking a recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa that the Senate continue in session without taking a recess will be considered as receiving unanimous consent. No objection is heard, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOAR. I now move my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following:

For the purchase of five manuscript volumes, being the letter books of William Vans Murray, formerly minister of the United States at The Hague and at Paris, $2,500.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. I move to add at the end of the bill the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add the following:

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to defray the actual and necessary traveling expenses of transportation of the several judges of the circuit courts of the United States, when traveling in the discharge of their duties beyond the limits of the district where they reside, $5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That no judge of such court shall accept or make use of any free pass from any public carrier of passengers.

Mr. ALLISON. I think the law forbids what is proposed to be forbidden in the proviso of that amendment.

Mr. HOAR. I understand the law applies to other courts and does not apply to this. My information is based on the statement of the Senator from Mississippi. I have no objection to striking it out, if the Senator is satisfied that the law already provides for it.

Mr. ALLISON. The interstate commerce law clearly provides for it.

Mr. HOAR. Then let it be stricken out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clause which is desired to be struck out will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike from the amendment the proviso, as follows:

Provided, That no judge of such court shall accept or make use of any free pass from any public carrier of passengers.

Mr. HARRIS. Let the amendment as modified be reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be reported.

The Chief Clerk read the amendment as modified, as follows:

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to defray the actual and necessary traveling expenses of transportation of the several judges of the circuit courts of the United States, when traveling in the discharge of their duties beyond the limits of the district where they reside, $5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. HARRIS. Let me inquire what the salaries of those judges are.

Mr. HOAR. Six thousand dollars a year. They are obliged now in these enormous new circuits to travel, some of them, I think, 1,500 miles. It is already the law as to district judges. This merely provides for the occasions when they go outside their respective districts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PLUMB. I move to add to the bill, on page 11, after line 10, what I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, after line 10, it is proposed to insert as follows:

For the construction of an elevator in the public building at Leavenworth, Kans., $8,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President, I arise as the friend of the friendless, as the volunteer representative of people who have no power to legislate and no power to tax themselves, no public Treasury, no representation in either branch of Congress, people who are entirely dependent on the liberality of Congress for their legislation and for all public improvements,

for a district 2,200 miles by 1,500 miles, that has no lighthouse or other aid to navigation. I move an amendment which is asked for in the interest of commerce and navigation, recommended strongly by the Secretary of the Treasury, and recommended also by the Committee on Commerce. Inasmuch as all the other places have been appropriated for in this bill I move that this amendment be inserted, to come in at the foot of page 20.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the foot of page 30 it is proposed to insert the following:

For the construction of a light and steam fog signal at St. Mary's station in the Territory of Alaska, $80,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I offer the following amendment to come in at page 65, line 11, after the word "undergrowth."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 65, line 11, after the word "undergrowth," it is proposed to insert:

Or rough and hilly lands, or lands devoid of water.

So that the clause may read:

And other surveys shall be confined to lands adapted to agriculture and lines of reservations, except that the Commissioner of the General Land Office may allow, for the survey of lands heavily timbered, mountainous, or covered with dense undergrowth, or rough and hilly lands, or lands devoid of water, rates not exceeding $13 per linear mile for standard and meander lines, etc.

Mr. ALLISON. I make the point of order on that that it is a change of existing law and not recommended by the head of a Department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of opinion that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. PLUMB. I move to amend on page 56, at line 4, by striking out the words "and bringing to trial and punishment" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "arresting and delivering to the United States marshal."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 56, at line 4, after the word "detecting," it is proposed to strike out the words "and bringing to trial and punishment" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "arresting and delivering to the United States marshal, dealers," etc.

Mr. GORMAN. I must raise the point of order on that.

Mr. PLUMB. I have no doubt it is subject to a point of order, but I hope the Senator will withdraw it for a moment.

Mr. GORMAN. Certainly.

Mr. PLUMB. A decision of a former Attorney-General seems to make it necessary, and it is recommended by the present Attorney-General. I think that at least the matter should be investigated, because the correspondence shows some embarrassment in the administration of justice owing to present conditions.

Mr. GORMAN. One of the gentlemen connected with the Department was before us, and his explanation was not satisfactory. During the absence of the Senator from Kansas this amendment was offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], and was either withdrawn or went out on a point of order.

Mr. PLUMB. I was aware that the Senator made the point, but I thought it was withdrawn. However, I have no objection, if the Senator raises the point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the amendment withdrawn?

Mr. PLUMB. I do not withdraw the amendment, but if the Senator insists on the point of order I have to submit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken.

Mr. MITCHELL. I move to amend, on page 20, after the amendments already agreed to, following line 17, by inserting what I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, after line 17, it is proposed to add:

For the purchase of a site and the establishment of a proper light and fog signal at the mouth of Coquille River, on the Pacific Ocean, the same to be constructed under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, $50,000.

Mr. MITCHELL. This has been recommended at this session by the Committee on Commerce, so that it is within the rule.

Mr. ALLISON. Though I should like this light appropriated for, I regret that the Senator from Oregon has seen proper to press it, but I suppose it is in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, I hope the amendments will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. HAWLEY. I have another amendment to offer.

Mr. CHANDLER. I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 46, after line 2, it is proposed to insert as follows:

And the foregoing sums for the Fish Commission, amounting to $361,293.10, shall be expended under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ALLISON. While I should be glad to have that done, I make the point of order that it would change existing law, and I hope the Senator will not press it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I had not thought that the Senator would make this point of order, even if it was good. Clearly it seems to me to be not well taken. I suppose that nothing is more common than that limitation should be put upon appropriations for the expenditure of public money. This does not change the supervision from one Department to another.

Mr. ALLISON. The Fish Commission now is a separate and distinct organization and the Senator by his amendment proposes to place it under an entirely different Department, which of course is new legislation.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will allow me——

Mr. HARRIS. The question of order is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of opinion that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. HAWLEY. I desire to offer an amendment and beg leave to make two or three words of explanation that will enable Senators to understand my object. The Senate has passed a bill—I think it came unanimously from the Committee on Military Affairs—and I am presenting it as an amendment to this bill. It has passed the Senate and is in the House and has been favorably reported upon there.

I move to insert, on page 84, after line 20, what I send to the desk. I have changed the amount from $125,000 to $60,000, because that will be enough to begin one year's work perhaps.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 84, after line 20, it is proposed to insert as follows:

For the purpose of ascertaining and defining the lines of battle at Gettysburgh and marking with enduring tablets, with inscriptions thereon, the positions occupied by the several organizations of the Army of Northern Virginia on that field on the three days of the battle, and for the condemnation and purchase of the lands necessary and convenient therefor, with proper avenues of access thereto, and for other lands important to be reserved, $60,000, to be immediately available.

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to do all such acts and make such expenditures as are advisable and necessary for the foregoing purposes. In the execution of this act the Secretary of War may appoint a commission of three persons to aid him in so doing, two of whom shall have been participants in said battle, one from each of the contending forces, and the third shall be some person having competent knowledge of the facts and positions to be established and marked, and he shall pay each of them a reasonable compensation for their several services rendered in that behalf.

Mr. HAWLEY. May I give a word of explanation, that it may be understood elsewhere as well as here? This provision passed the Committee on Military Affairs unanimously, passed the Senate unanimously, and is acceptable to both sides of the forces that contended at Gettysburgh. As matters stand now, while many hundreds of thousands of dollars have been expended by the United States Government and the governments of the several States in marking one side of the battlefield, it would appear from the markings that there was nobody to oppose them. That is not sensible. The proper marking of that field will make a splendid lesson for military students in all the future.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HISCOCK. I desire to move an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York move to reconsider the vote by which that amendment was adopted?

Mr. HISCOCK. I wish to make it read as follows.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Then you must move to have it reconsidered.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator may wish it to be regarded as a separate amendment, perhaps.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add the following:

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to defray the actual and necessary expenses of the several judges of the circuit courts of the United States when in the discharge of their duties beyond the limits of the district where they reside, $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. ALLISON. I object to that.

Mr. HISCOCK. I imagine that that is germane to the amendment already offered.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That would not help it at all.

Mr. ALLISON. It is not reported from any committee.

Mr. HISCOCK. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that, having once adopted an amendment, an amendment that is germane to that amendment is in order, either here or elsewhere.

Mr. HOAR. I wish to express my dissent to the proposition of the Senator from New York [Mr. HISCOCK], although I do not wish to antagonize his proposition. When a rule of the Senate says that any amendment, constituting substantially a separate amendment, is not in order except under certain circumstances, you can not make it in order by offering it as an amendment to another amendment.

Mr. HISCOCK. I understand that, but——

Mr. HOAR. Let me finish my point. It is not a question of being germane, but a question of being a substantially separate item.

Mr. HISCOCK. It does not make it a separate item. If it is not in order now, it certainly will be later.

Mr. ALLISON. I make the point of order on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair holds that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Now let the bill be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BERRY. There was an amendment reserved on page 41, in regard to the daughters of the late Joseph Henry.

Mr. ALLISON. Have all the other amendments been concurred in?

The VICE PRESIDENT. They have not. The question is on concurring in the amendments, with the exception of the one referred to by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to reserve for a separate vote the amendments of the committee on pages 42, 43, 44, 45, and 46, being all committee amendments under the head of "Fish Commission."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question will be, then, on concurring in all the amendments except those referred to by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], and that referred to by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY]. With those exceptions, all the other amendments will be considered as concurred in, if there be no objection. The Chair hears no objection, and they are concurred in.

The first reserved amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 41, after line 2, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, inserted the following paragraph:

For payment to the daughters of the late Joseph Henry, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, for valuable public services rendered by him, $10,000.

Mr. BERRY. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO].

Mr. EDMUNDS (when Mr. CULLOM'S name was called). As I do not see in the Chamber the colleague of the Senator from Illinois whose name has been called [Mr. CULLOM], I wish to say that that Senator has been detained at his home by illness.

Mr. HOAR (when the name of Mr. DAWES was called). My colleague is detained at his room, I would not say by illness, but he worked far into the night last night, and is somewhat fatigued, and unable to be present.

Mr. DOLPH (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], and shall withhold my vote until I see whether it is necessary in order to make a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The occupant of the chair will state that he would vote "nay" but for the fact that he is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. MCPHERSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HIGGINS], but I am sure he would vote "yea" on this question; therefore I will vote.

The call was concluded.

Mr. CASEY. I am released from my pair for this vote and vote "yea."

Mr. BATE. I will state that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY].

Mr. DOLPH. I would inquire of the Chair whether a quorum has voted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. DOLPH. The pair of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] with myself is transferred to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], so that the present occupant of the chair and myself may vote.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am paired with the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], who is necessarily absent for awhile this evening, but in order to make a quorum I will vote.

Mr. PIERCE. I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CARLISLE], but I will vote in order to make a quorum.

Mr. PADDOCK. I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS]; I believe his name is not recorded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. His name is not recorded.

Mr. PADDOCK. I will vote in order to make a quorum.

The result of the vote was announced—yeas 33, nays 12; as follows:

YEAS—33.

Allen,	Davis,	Ingalls,	Sanders,
Allison,	Dolph,	McPherson,	Sawyer,
Blackburn,	Edmunds,	Manderson,	Shoup,
Blair,	Evarts,	Mitchell,	Spooner,
Butler,	Farwell,	Morgan,	Stewart,
Call,	Gorman,	Paddock,	Stockbridge.
Cameron,	Hawley,	Pierce,	
Casey,	Hiscock,	Power,	
Chandler,	Hoar,	Pugh,	

NAYS—12.

Bate,	Daniel,	Moody,	Reagan,
Berry,	Harris,	Pettigrew,	Turpie,
Cockrell,	Jones of Arkansas,	Plumb,	Walthall.

ABSENT—42.

Aldrich,	Eustis,	Kenna,	Stanford,
Barbour,	Faulkner,	McConnell,	Teller,
Blodgett,	Frye,	McMillan,	Vance,
Brown,	George,	Morrill,	Vest,
Carey,	Gibson,	Pasco,	Voorhees,
Carlisle,	Gray,	Payne,	Warren,
Coke,	Hale,	Platt,	Washburn,
Colquitt,	Hampton,	Quay,	Wilson,
Cullom,	Hearst,	Ransom,	Wolcott.
Dawes,	Higgins,	Sherman,	
Dixon,	Jones of Nevada,	Squire,	

So the amendment was concurred in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next reserved amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 43, line 3, before the word "thousand," it is proposed to strike out "fifty" and insert "sixty;" so as to read:

Propagation of food fishes: For the introduction by the United States Fish Commission into and the increase in the waters of the United States of food fishes and other useful products of the waters, including lobsters, oysters, and other shellfish, and for such general and miscellaneous expenditures as the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries may find necessary to the prosecution of his work, including salaries or compensation of all necessary employés, $160,000.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish to call the attention of the Senate once more to the large and rapidly growing expenses of the Fish Commission. I know the fishing stations are so widely distributed throughout the country and the effects which are supposed to be derived from those stations have been so diffused that it does little good to call attention to these continually increasing expenditures. There had been expended for the Fish Commission down to 1887 $2,476,351.21. The appropriations for 1888 were $222,880.60; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, $257,580; and the appropriations for the current fiscal year were about $329,900. The appropriations which the committee have placed in the present bill amount to $361,293, a continually increasing rate of expenditure.

Mr. President, I wish to make no attack upon the Fish Commission. There have been charges made against it and they have been investigated at great length by the Committee on Fisheries. A large volume of testimony has been taken and the committee have made a report, which, as I understand, exonerates the Fish Commission from blame. I make no charges against them, but I recur to the necessity of having expenditures for this commission put under the supervision of some Executive Department.

We have now eight large Executive Departments of the Government, and we have the Fish Commission, the Public Printer, and the commissioners of the District of Columbia, that are not under any official supervision. Every branch of the executive work of this Government is supervised by a Cabinet minister except these three branches. I have tried to get the Fish Commission put under the Navy Department, but bills for that purpose meet with no favor. Then, changing my judgment and my effort, I sought to have the Fish Commission placed under the Department of Agriculture. The subject was considered and very full investigation made by the Committee on Agriculture. I will ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to state to the Senate what the result of the investigation of that committee was.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. President, after a very careful and full investigation of that subject it was considered wise to report to the Senate the bill, which was formulated and presented to the committee for its consideration, looking to the transfer of the commission to the Department of Agriculture.

I should state further that, as a matter of courtesy on the part of the Committee on Agriculture to the committee having charge of the subject of the Fish Commission, it was thought proper that the bill, after having been reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with a strong recommendation, almost a unanimous recommendation, I think, to the Senate, should be referred on the motion of the mouthpiece of that committee here to the Committee on Fisheries for their consideration. Nothing has yet been heard from that committee in reference to the bill. Whether they have given it consideration or not I do not know, but they have made no report of the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. We can not hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend until conversation ceases. [A pause.] The Senator from Nebraska will proceed.

Mr. PADDOCK. I was stating that the bill to which I refer, for the transfer of the Fish Commission to the Agricultural Department, was reported from the Committee on Agriculture with the recommendation that it be passed. As a matter of courtesy to the Committee on Fisheries, however, it was thought to be the duty of the Committee on Agriculture to refer the bill with their recommendation to the Committee on Fisheries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. PADDOCK] is speaking in the time of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], and the time of the Senator from New Hampshire under the order agreed upon has expired.

Mr. PADDOCK. I will speak a word or two in my own time, then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. PADDOCK. That bill was referred, as I have stated, to the Committee on Fisheries, and it was hoped and expected that action would be taken by that committee. I suppose, however, they have not been able to give it such attention as the importance of the subject demanded, and so it has not come back here from that committee for the consideration and action of the Senate. I very much regret that, because it seemed to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to be a very important matter.

The disbursements being so very heavy, the responsibilities being so very great, it seemed to us that the commission ought to be placed under the head of some executive branch of the Government, that some executive officer who was in close touch with the President of the United States, with whom the President could advise and on whom he could rely, should be at the head of that institution, or should be, at all events, in a situation to have a check upon it. There was no unfriendliness on the part of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to the commission. There was no attempt to investigate in respect to the charges which have been made, because that did not come within the purview of that committee, but the commission was treated with the utmost kindness and courtesy in that investigation, and the investigation only went so far——

Mr. BATE. We can not hear a word on this side and some of us desire to hear what is said on this subject.

Mr. PADDOCK. I was saying that the investigation in reference to that bill which was reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] is a member, went no further than to consider the question of the propriety, if there was to be a transfer, of transferring the commission to the Department of Agriculture, which that committee represented. That is all there was of it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask unanimous consent to proceed until I occupy so much of my time as was taken by the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. COCKRELL. In the absence of the chairman of the committee, I am willing to extend the Senator's time five minutes, but not beyond that.

Mr. EDMUNDS. We ought not to do that sort of thing at this stage of the session.

Mr. CHANDLER. There are half a dozen amendments here, and five minutes on each amendment would be ample.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But one amendment has been reported to the Senate, and that is the amendment under consideration.

Mr. CHANDLER. Instead of reducing the expenditures, the Senate committee have increased them. Here is an increase of $10,000, a second increase of $10,000. There is a fish hatchery in Maine, provided for at $15,393.10; a fish hatchery in Vermont, at $5,000; a fish hatchery in New York, at $5,000; and the purchase of a "shad battery," at $15,000. The total expenditures for the commission for the coming year have piled up to about $361,000 as against $230,000 for the last year.

Mr. President, the Fish Commission ought to be put under some Department of the Government. It was conceded by the Commissioner, in the investigation made by the Committee on Agriculture, that the commission ought to be put under some Department, and the Committee on Agriculture reported a bill to place it under the Department of Agriculture. That bill went to the Committee on Fisheries, and that committee has not yet made its report. Of course it is too late for the committee to report a bill for action at this session, but I desire to give notice that I shall follow this matter up until this extravagantly managed department shall be placed under that efficient supervision which it ought to receive at the hands of some Cabinet minister of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate concur in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I may be excused, perhaps, for saying a word on this subject, as the fact has been alluded to that a bill providing for the transfer of the Fish Commission to the Agricultural Department was referred to the committee of which I have the honor of being the chairman and has not been reported to the Senate.

I would simply say, sir, that shortly after that bill was referred to the committee charges against the Fish Commissioner and the management of his bureau were made in the public press and given so much publicity that the Commissioner demanded an examination, and that examination was made by a subcommittee. It was quite lengthy, and, owing to the absence of some of the members of the committee, the report has been delayed. It has just been published. It is quite voluminous.

The Committee on Fisheries thought it was wise to defer the consideration of the bill providing for the transfer of that department until they had completed their examination into its management. Their report upon that subject has been laid upon the desks of the Senators. Fearing that in the hurry of business it may not have been generally read, I desire to say that the subcommittee made a very thorough examination into the affairs of that department. There were all sorts of charges; that it was run as a Democratic political machine; that there were all sorts of abuses, waste of money, favoritism, nepotism, and all that sort of thing.

I desire to say very briefly that we found that there was not a shadow of foundation for any of those charges. We also found that the management of that Department was most admirable, that the greatest economy was used, that while the expenses of the Department have increased from year to year the work of the commission has also increased very largely. I will simply say that in 1877 we had twelve fish-hatching stations, while now we have twenty-one. In my opinion no money expended by the Government is expended to better advantage and for a more worthy purpose than the money spent in the propagation of fish and the stocking of our streams. It has been said, and I believe truly, that an acre of water, if properly cultivated, if I may use the term, is worth more than any acre of land.

Various new hatcheries have been established. One was established in Colorado the last year. One is provided for in this bill in Vermont, for stocking the streams of that State with trout, for which they are admirably adapted. Another one is provided on the St. Lawrence, with the view of co-operating with the Canadian authorities for the protection of fish and stocking Lake Ontario. No money is better expended than this money. The appropriations have been carefully scrutinized by the committee, and I trust they will not be reduced.

Mr. PLUMB. I wish to say just one word, Mr. President. I understand there is no proposition involved which is in any sense a reflection upon the present Fish Commissioner in the line of the charges which the Senator spoke of; but I do not think there is any one who watches the course of these appropriations and who is familiar with the operations of the executive department but will agree that the Fish Commission ought to be under some one of the Departments of the Government, and it ought not to be lying around loose.

All experience shows that those persons who are best qualified to look after and give effect to scientific investigation are the least qualified, as a rule, to transact the actual every-day business of paying out money, of employing help, and of generally managing what might be called the financial affairs of a bureau or a Department.

The existence of the Fish Commission as a separate entity, without departmental control, as an independent bureau, is without a parallel in this Government. I do not intend to minimize the work which this bureau is doing. It is like most of the other things carried on by the Government which we do not hear anything about in our country. The country will get big enough after awhile and the wind will blow from the proper quarter, and we shall probably come within the purview of appropriations generally and I hope will be considered when these things come to be passed around.

It is not fair that the issue in this case should be obscured by the constant laudation of the work of the commission, nor of the work of the propagation of fish. To hear the Senator from Michigan speak of the value of this good work makes me think of what the Irishman said to the man who told him if he had a good stove he would save half his wood, and the Irishman said he would buy two stoves, then, and save it all. [Laughter.]

An acre of water is worth so much more than an acre of land that, at the present rate we are going on, we shall not cultivate the land at all, but simply abandon the land for water, and I am under the impression that all of us will take to the water after awhile on the question of the transfer of the Fish Commission to some Department of the Government, which one makes no difference to me; it is of no consequence.

The only purely scientific Department in this Government is that of Agriculture. It is so and has been so from the beginning to a very large extent, except in that minor way which comes under the easy condemnation of the press and the sneers of the unwise in regard to the scattering of seeds, but it is a work which has been always scientific and is growing more so. I believe the Fish Commission ought to go to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It ought to go there if it goes anywhere.

Mr. PLUMB. As the Senator from Vermont says, it ought to go there if it goes anywhere, and in the very nature of things it must go somewhere in due time, unless its finances are to be mismanaged. I do not speak in any manner as reflecting upon anybody, past, present, or to come, but in the very nature of things there must be business management connected with the disbursement of large sums of money. All our experience shows that we do not get that in the highest degree from a purely scientific person.

In addition to that, whoever represents the expenditure of money in large sums in the transaction of the public business or in the conservation of the public interests ought to be represented at some time by a seat around the table of the President as a Cabinet Minister, and the President in turn, who is responsible for this, ought to have somebody there to whom he can address personal inquiry in regard to the transactions of all the great functions of Government.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is on the principle that we made the Commissioner of Agriculture a Cabinet officer.

Mr. PLUMB. As the Senator from Vermont says, and very well says, that is the principle on which the Department of Agriculture, which was originally only a bureau, while nominally a Department, was made a full-fledged Department, in order that the person who transacted its affairs might be one of the advisers of the President, and in turn might himself be directed by the President to do the things which were pertinent to the transaction of public business committed to him by law.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has spoken once.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from Michigan does not speak very often, although he speaks very well. I hope he will have consent to speak again.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I hope so, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the Senator from Michigan will proceed.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I assent to the general proposition laid down by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB], that scientific men are generally deficient in their practical ideas and their business methods. I desire to say, lest some one may misunderstand the subject, that, from my quite intimate knowledge of the affairs of the Fish Commission, gained particularly by the recent examination, I doubt whether there is any Department of this Government where expenditures are made with more judgment and with more checks upon them than in that department.

On another point I attempted to explain why the committee had not reported upon the bill which was referred to them after having come from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I desire to say that I have some very distinct and well-defined ideas in regard to this matter, and I think that this bureau and some other outlying bureaus of the Government can very properly be brought, possibly, into the Department of Agriculture, giving to that Department a larger sphere of usefulness and a greater dignity. As the Secretary is a Cabinet officer, we may as well group under him several bureaus of the Government which exist by themselves now, and it is my purpose during the recess of Congress to prepare a bill providing for that very thing. I will say nothing more on that point.

As to the appropriations in this bill, Mr. President, I hope they will not be interfered with. The money is all needed and will be expended for a useful purpose, and the appropriation should not, in my judgment, be reduced.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire, having spoken once upon the amendment——

Mr. COCKRELL. Twice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is not in order under the rule.

Mr. CHANDLER. In order to obviate the discussion on each of these amendments, I ask unanimous consent that the discussion may proceed upon this one. I do not think it will take a long time.

Mr. ALLISON. Allow me to suggest to the Senator that the vote be taken on all these amendments in gross.

Mr. CHANDLER. There is no objection to that. I do not intend to call for a division on any of the amendments.

Mr. ALLISON. Take the amendments in gross and that will give the Senator an apportunity of speaking five minutes.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have no objection to the Senator having five minutes longer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The other reserved amendments will be reported; but one has been reported.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

Mr. CHANDLER. There is no objection to that.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 43, line 14, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, struck out "forty-three" and inserted "fifty-three;" so as to make the clause read:

Maintenance of vessels: For the maintenance of the vessels and steam launches of the United States Fish Commission, and for boats, apparatus, machinery, and other facilities required for use with the same, including salaries or compensation of all necessary civilian employés, $53,900.

After the paragraph just read, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, inserted:

For repairs to the vessels Albatross, Fish Hawk, and Grampus, $10,000.

On page 44, after line 17, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, inserted:

Fish hatchery, Craig's Brook and Green Lake, Maine: For completion of construction and equipment at Green Lake, Maine, including all buildings, ponds, flumes, dams, pipes, wharf and boats, roads, grading, engineering, and repairs, $15,333.19, of which the sum of $10,000 shall be immediately available.

Fish hatchery in Vermont: For purchase of site and establishing a fish hatchery at a suitable place in the State of Vermont, $5,000.

Fish hatchery in New York: For purchase of site and establishing a fish hatchery at a suitable place in the State of New York, on or near the St. Lawrence River, $5,000.

Fish hatchery, Neosho, Mo.: For the completion and equipment of building, for the construction of outbuildings, roads, and inclosures to grounds, $1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Fish hatchery in the Rocky Mountain region: For investigation respecting the advisability of establishing a fish hatching station in the Rocky Mountain region in the State of Montana or Wyoming, $1,000.

For the purchase of the lands on "Shad Battery," or Edmonson's Island, in the Chesapeake Bay, Maryland, not now owned by the United States, together with all buildings, wharves, and improvements thereon, and fishing rights appurtenant thereto, $15,000: *Provided*, That the payment of said sum shall be in complete satisfaction and extinguishment of all claims of the owner of said island for rent, or use and occupation thereof, and mesne profits and damages in respect thereof, and that a perfect title in the premises, and deed sufficient in law, conveying the same to the United States, both to be approved by the Attorney-General, be given by the owner thereof.

Mr. CHANDLER. There is an appropriation here—

For repairs to the vessels Albatross, Fish Hawk, and Grampus, $10,000.

I now wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that, in addition to the $361,000 of expenditure provided by this bill, the Fish Commission engrosses the service of a large number of officers and men of the Navy, and the expenditures for the officers and men of the Navy engaged in conducting these vessels are paid for from the appropriations for the pay of the Navy. It is also to be noticed that in this expenditure of $361,000 there is only one salary fixed, and I especially call the attention of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] to the fact.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am listening.

Mr. CHANDLER. There is only one salary fixed here, of $5,000. The provision for salaries and compensation of necessary employés under the head of "Propagation of food fishes" and under the head of "Maintenance of vessels" includes the salaries of a large number of civilian employés, and there is upon the roll of this commission a large number of salaried clerks. The power exists under this appropriation in the Commission of Fisheries to fix every one of these salaries of clerks and employés. Large sums and small sums can all be fixed according to the will of the Fish Commissioner, and only his own salary is fixed by law.

There is very grave doubt, I think, whether the Fish Commissioner, who is not the head of a Department, can appoint clerks, as clerks are appointed by him in pursuance of this general appropriation. Therefore, I submit to the Senate that the sooner these salaries are specifically fixed by law, as other salaries are fixed in the appropriation bills, the better it will be for the management of the commission. I ask the Senator from Nebraska whether it did not appear from the investigation that there was a large roll of clerks employed by the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries.

Mr. PADDOCK. That is true.

Mr. CHANDLER. And I ask whether the committee did not think that it was contrary to law to have these appointments made by any other person than the head of a Department.

Mr. PADDOCK. That was the judgment of the committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. I call the attention of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. STOCKBRIDGE] to the fact that this is going on year after year, and we are giving this man a salary of $5,000 and then giving him $361,000 to expend among all his employés, with unlimited power to fix their salaries at just such sums as he chooses to name. That is an absolute anomaly in the Government which can not be found in any other Department of the public service.

I am glad to learn that the Senator from Michigan proposes to give this subject his attention during the coming summer. I hope he will visit all these places, including the three or four in Michigan, the new ones to be established in Massachusetts and Vermont, and report a scheme for conducting this commission under the charge of some Cabinet minister of the Government. Seeing the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH] rising, I hope he will go to Oregon and see the three or four stations which are there and give us some supervision in this business.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I wish to say, as the Senator has referred to Oregon, although the Senator from Oregon is on his feet, that the Fish Commission has done a great work in Oregon. The supply of salmon in the Columbia River was nearly exhausted, and under the operations of the work of the Fish Commission they have been restored. The shad of the Potomac would have been exhausted but for the work of the commission.

As to the compensation of the clerks, of course every body understands this work can not be carried on without clerks, There is nobody to appoint clerks under the present management but the Commissioner, and I say, from my own personal investigation, that the salaries of those clerks are lower than the same grade of clerks in other Departments. There has been no extravagance in that respect.

Mr. DOLPH. I was not going to say anything upon this subject. I was out of the Chamber and did not hear all the criticisms of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] upon the Fish Commission, but I think that the criticisms which he has made upon this bureau may well be made upon several other bureaus of the Government. I think he will find that the money which is expended to maintain the fish hatcheries, the fish stations, is economically and well expended. There are not two or three fish-hatching stations in Oregon. There is but one in all the Northwest country, and that is upon a tributary of the Willamette River, which is a branch of the Columbia River. The expense is very small.

The fishermen and cannery men on the river some years ago contributed the amount necessary to purchase a site and establish a salmon hatchery. This, I believe, they turned over to the General Government substantially free of cost. The original amount which was used for establishing a hatchery I think was only $10,000. Certainly the ex-

pense of maintaining it from year to year is not great, while many million small salmon are hatched at the station and put into the waters of the Columbia to replenish the salmon of that river.

I think wherever the committee will go they will find that the money which is actually expended for maintaining the hatcheries is economically expended and is producing good results; but I think they will find that all the bureaus or many of the bureaus which are maintained here are like this one and like the Bureau of Ethnology, and that the money is too largely expended here in this city, and too largely expended in the manner indicated by the Senator from New Hampshire. They will probably find some establishments in this bureau, possibly that at Wood's Holl, where the expenditure is large and where the actual and beneficial results to the Government are much less.

Mr. COCKRELL. The increased appropriations from year to year have arisen not from the action of the commission, but from the legislation of Congress. When the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] say that the accounts of the Fish Commission are under no supervision, they certainly do not understand the effect of their language. I say the accounts, including every item of expenditure, under the Fish Commission undergo precisely the same process in the Treasury Department that any bureau of the War Department does.

Every account goes to an Auditor, is passed upon by the Auditor, and goes to a Comptroller and is passed by the Comptroller, just as do the accounts of all the other bureaus. There is just the same kind of supervision to-day that there is over any other bureau, except simply that the accounts are not transmitted to the Treasury Department by a mere figurehead, called a Secretary or a head of a Department.

Mr. PLUMB. Does the Senator mean to say that the Comptroller of the Treasury exercises the same supervision over the expenditure of money by the Fish Commissioner that the Secretary of the Interior does over the expenditure of money under him, or the Secretary of War does under him, and so on? I admit, of course, that the Comptroller ascertains whether these items have been spent or not.

Mr. COCKRELL. In accordance with law.

Mr. PLUMB. Precisely.

Mr. COCKRELL. Just precisely as any other accounts.

Mr. PLUMB. Very likely. Then, of course, according to the Senator's theory, any one, a paymaster, a quartermaster, a land officer, or any one else, does not need supervision, but should simply have his clerks send his accounts to the Treasury Department.

Mr. COCKRELL. The impression has been made that the Fish Commissioner adjusts all his own accounts, spends the money as he pleases, and that there is no supervision.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. COCKRELL. If it does not come out of my time. The Senator has had eighteen or twenty minutes. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will not take much of the Senator's time.

I have not said nor have I undertaken to create the impression that the accounts of this officer are not properly audited by the Auditors and Comptrollers of the Treasury. What I have undertaken to say was that nobody supervised the work which he does and expenditures which he makes. The Senator knows what I intended.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am glad the Senator has made the statement, or the impression would have gone out that the Fish Commission was an independent department, whose accounts were audited and settled by itself and nobody knew how it was spending its money, and that it was spending it extravagantly. I challenge the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from New Hampshire, and the Senator from Nebraska to show any bureau of this Government more honestly and economically administered than the Fish Commission under the present Commissioner. They can not do it.

It is honestly, it is economically, it is faithfully, it is justly, it is intelligently and efficiently administered. Here is the report made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Fisheries, who has addressed the Senate, and there the vile charges which were brought before the Senate and hurled against the head of the commission were, every one of them, proved to be utterly and absurdly false and ridiculous. There was not a particle of foundation for them, in fact or in imagination.

I hope that the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations will be concurred in just as they were agreed to in Committee of the Whole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate concur in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole which have been read?

The amendments were concurred in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still in the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. HAWLEY. At the request of my colleague, who was too ill to remain in the Chamber for the remainder of the evening, I propose an amendment on page 22. At the end of line 25, after the words "Connecticut River," I move to insert "Thames River, between Norwich and New London," and at the end of that paragraph, that is to say, on page 23, in line 15, after the words "three hundred," to insert "and three."

The object of the amendment is to turn over to the Government certain river lights in the Thames River, which have for years been supported by the merchants and shippers along that river.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, line 25, after the words "Connecticut River," it is proposed to insert:

Thames River, between Norwich and New London.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has presented two amendments.

Mr. HAWLEY. I read two. They are distinct amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment just reported.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 23, line 13, after the word "hundred," it is proposed to insert "and three;" so as to increase the total amount of the appropriations for "lighting of rivers" from "$300,000" to "$303,000."

Mr. HAWLEY. That changes the total of the appropriation in accordance with the other amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALL. There was adopted while I was out of the Senate an amendment reducing the appropriation made by the House of Representatives for protecting the public lands, on page 70, line 12, from $120,000 to $100,000. I desire that a vote may be taken upon that amendment, and I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to have inserted in the RECORD a letter of the Secretary of the Interior, which he has addressed to me on that subject and some statements in connection with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would say to the Senator from Florida that the amendment he refers to has already been concurred in in the Senate.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope there will be no objection to the Senator printing the letters in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was concurred in?

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator will not do that.

Mr. CALL. I do not ask that. I will only ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the letter of the Secretary of the Interior showing the necessity of the appropriation and some statements in relation to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the papers referred to by the Senator from Florida will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CALL. I submit the papers, as follows:

The extracts are from a paper published in Boston, and from a very recent work, showing the necessity of the appropriation for securing the public lands to the people, as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior:

The American Economist asserted, in 1889, that in twenty-five years the number of people in the United States who owned their own homes had fallen from five-eighths to three-eighths. A paper called The Progress, of Boston, in 1889, gave the following significant and prophetic figures:

The eloquent Patrick Henry said: "We can only judge the future by the past."

Look at the past:

When Egypt went down 2 per cent. of her population owned 97 per cent. of her wealth. The people were starved to death.

When Babylon went down 2 per cent. of her population owned all the wealth. The people were starved to death.

When Persia went down 1 per cent. of her population owned the land.

When Rome went down 1,800 persons owned all the known world.

There are about 40,000,000 people in England, Ireland, and Wales, and 100,000 people own all the land in the United Kingdom.

For the past twenty years the United States has rapidly followed in the steps of these old nations. Here are the figures:

In 1850 capitalists owned 37½ per cent. of the nation's wealth.

In 1870 they owned 63 per cent.

In 1889, out of 1,500,000 people living in New York City, 1,100,000 dwelt in tenement houses.

At the same time farm lands east and west had fallen in twenty-five years to one-third or one-half their cost. State Assessor Wood, of New York, declared in 1889 that, in his opinion, "in a few decades there will be none but tenant farmers in this State."

In 1889 the farm mortgages in the Western States amounted to $3,422,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., December 22, 1890.

SIR: On December 14, 1889, deficiency estimates were submitted for "depredations on public timber" and for "protecting public lands" for the fiscal year 1890 for $17,962.15 and $19,500, respectively, which Congress appropriated.

In the regular estimates for the fiscal year (1891) the Appropriation Committees of the House and Senate were urged to increase the appropriations for the fiscal year 1891 to $100,000 and $140,000, respectively, to enable this office to retain the force employed during the entire year to clear up the work. But the amounts appropriated were $100,000 and $120,000.

Our estimates were on an economical basis, and if the amount asked had been appropriated we would have been enabled to carry the force throughout the entire year without a deficiency and to have brought up much of the old work.

On the 8th instant a deficiency estimate of $20,000 for "protecting public lands" was submitted with the statement that unless the amount asked for was appropriated a reduction of the force would be necessary, which would greatly impair the service. Owing to the great number of entries awaiting examination as to the character of the same, and to enable the Department to keep employed a force sufficiently large to do this work in a reasonable time, the amount asked for should be appropriated.

Very respectfully,

LEWIS A. GROFF, *Commissioner.*

To the honorable SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

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.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. CAMERON. I ask the Senate at this time to consider Calendar No. 2740, being Senate bill 5110.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title of the bill will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 5110) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire of course, as soon as I can get the floor, to take up the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. CAMERON. I would say, in reply to the Senator from Iowa, that I do not think it will take ten minutes to pass this bill. It is an important bill, and should be passed now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to consider the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLISON. I object for the moment. Later in the evening the Senator may have an opportunity to secure the consideration of his bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized by the Chair.

Mr. CAMERON. Is it in order for me to ask that the Senate take up the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that it is.

Mr. SPOONER. I hope the Senator from Iowa will withdraw his objection and allow the bill to be considered and passed.

Mr. CAMERON. If the Senator will give me a few minutes I think the bill can be passed.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to say that I am appealed to on every side of the Chamber to yield for the passage of bills that it is said will take but a moment. If it can be understood among Senators that this is the last bill to be called up in this way I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. CAMERON. I have no right to speak for other Senators.

Mr. ALLISON. I know the Senator has not, but I have a right to object, and I shall object unless I can have some understanding respecting the progress of the business of this night especially.

Mr. CAMERON. This is just as important as any bill the Senator may have in charge. I hope he will yield and give me five minutes. If there is any discussion about the bill I will withdraw it.

Mr. ALLISON. I shall object unless I can have it understood also, by unanimous consent, that when this matter is disposed of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill shall be considered.

Mr. CAMERON. To that I agree.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I hope that will be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] that the consideration of the bill requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania shall proceed, with the understanding that the legislative, etc., appropriation bill be taken up next? ["No objection."]

There being no objection, the bill (S. 5110) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PLUMB. I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question.

Mr. CAMERON. Certainly.

Mr. PLUMB. That is as to the propriety of spending this money at Philadelphia, where, I understand, the sentiment is unanimous that there never shall be another silver dollar coined.

Mr. CAMERON. The Senator is mistaken about the sentiment. I voice the sentiment of the people of Pennsylvania.

Mr. PLUMB. All I know about it is what I see in the newspapers, and they are all opposed to the coinage of silver; and, if that be so, I do not see the necessity of having any building for the coinage of silver in that city.

Mr. CAMERON. The Senator had better take my vote as the indication of the sentiment of the people of Pennsylvania.

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

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON. I now move, in accordance with the unanimous understanding, to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18049) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, this is a bill comprising a great many pages, but it is largely a bill of detail, providing for the ordinary legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government.

I think there are a few points of difference in this bill, or questions that will lead to debate, and I hope the Senate will indulge me in the effort I desire to make to have this bill completed to-night.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

Mr. ALLISON. Before the reading of the bill is proceeded with, I desire to ask the usual order, that the amendments of the committee may be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, such will be the order of proceeding. The reading will proceed.

The Chief Clerk began the reading of the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Legislative" in the appropriations for "Senate," on page 1, line 10, after the word "for," to strike out "salaries" and insert "compensation;" so as to read:

For compensation of eighty-eight Senators, $440,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 1, to increase the amount of the appropriation "for compensation of the officers, clerks, messengers, and others in the service of the Senate" from "$396,766.70" to "$429,976.40."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 2, line 9, after the words "telegraph page," to strike out "seven hundred and twenty" and insert six hundred;" and in line 10, after the words "five thousand," to strike out "five hundred and eighty" and insert "four hundred and sixty;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of the Vice President: For secretary to the Vice President, $2,220; for messenger, $1,440; telegraph operator, $1,200; one telegraph page, $600; in all, $5,460.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "Office of the Secretary of the Senate," on page 2, line 20, after the word "dollars," to strike out "or so much thereof as may be necessary;" so as to read:

Hire of horse and wagon for the Secretary's office, $700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "clerks and messengers to committees," on page 5, line 6, before the word "Rules," to strike out "and," and after "Rules" insert "Patents, Coast defenses, and Engrossed Bills."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 10, to increase the total amount of the appropriations for "clerks and messengers to committees" from $77,500 to $84,160.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "office of Sergeant-at-Arms and Doorkeeper," on page 6, line 10, before the word "laborers," to strike out "fifteen" and insert "twenty-five;" so as to read:

Twenty-five laborers at $720 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 12, after the word "each," to strike out "twelve laborers during the session, at the rate of $720 each per annum, $5,047.80."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 15, after the word "Chamber," to strike out "including one telephone page," and after the word "session," at the end of line 16, to strike out "$8,520" and insert "$7,987.50;" so as to read:

Sixteen pages for the Senate Chamber, at the rate of $2.50 per day each during the session, $7,987.50.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after the word "cents," at the end of line 18, to insert "one telephone page, $600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 20, to increase the total amount of the appropriations for "office of Sergeant-at Arms and Doorkeeper" from $13,851.60 to $16,071.50.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, in the clause making appropriations for expenses "under Architect of the Capitol," in line 24, before the word "conductors," to strike out "two" and insert "three;" so as to read:

Three conductors of elevators, at $1,200 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 3, to increase the total amount of the appropriation in the clause "under the Architect of the Capitol," from $14,950 to $16,150.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 8, to strike out the clause from line 5 to line 7, inclusive, as follows:

For twenty-five clerks to committees, at $6 per day during the session, $31,950.

And insert:

For twenty-three clerks to committees, at $1,500 each, $34,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, to strike out the clause from line 11 to line 13, inclusive, as follows:

For thirty clerks to Senators who are not chairmen of committees, at $6 per day each during the session, $38,340.

And insert:

For thirty-nine clerks to Senators who are not chairmen of committees, at $1,500 each, $58,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations "for contingent expenses," on page 9, line 1, after the word "necessary," to strike out:

And hereafter the appropriations for expenses of maintaining and equipping horses and mail wagons for carrying the mails for the Senate shall be expended under the direction of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate under contracts to be let annually to the lowest responsible bidder therefor after due advertisement.

So as to make the clause read:

For expenses of maintaining and equipping horses and mail wagons for carrying the mails, $3,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 7, to increase the appropriation "for materials for folding" from $4,000 to $6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 9, to reduce the appropriation "for folding speeches and pamphlets, at a rate not exceeding $1 per thousand," from $4,000 to $3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 13, to increase the appropriation "for purchase of furniture" from $2,000 to $3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 15, to reduce the appropriation "for materials for furniture and repairs of same, exclusive of labor," from $2,000 to $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 16, after the word "cleaning," to insert "repairing;" so as to make the clause read:

For services in cleaning, repairing, and varnishing furniture, $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 19, to increase the total amount of the appropriation "for miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor," from $20,000 to $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 2, after the word "page," to strike out "fifteen" and insert "twenty-five;" so as to make the clause read:

For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, including compensation to stenographers to committees, at such rate as may be fixed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but not exceeding $1.25 per printed page, $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "office of Postmaster, House of Representatives," on page 16, line 17, after the word "necessary," to strike out:

And hereafter the appropriations for hire of horses and mail wagons for carrying the mails for the House of Representatives shall be expended under the direction of the Postmaster of the House, under contracts to be let annually to the lowest responsible bidder therefor after due advertisement.

So as to make the clause read:

For hire of horses and mail wagons for carrying the mails, $1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "Civil Service Commission," on page 20, line 24, after the word "secretary," to strike out "sixteen hundred" and insert "two thousand."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after the word "dollars," to strike out:

One stenographer, $1,600; one messenger; and for all other necessary expenditures to enable the Civil Service Commission to give effect to and execute the provisions of "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States," approved January 16, 1883, $36,400, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

And insert:

Five clerks of class 4; five clerks of class 3; seven clerks of class 2; three clerks of class 1; three clerks, at $1,000 each; two clerks, at $900 each; one messenger; and one laborer.

And in line 10, page 12, after the word "all," to strike out "fifty-three thousand seven" and insert "fifty-two thousand two;" so as to make the clause read:

Five clerks of class 4; five clerks of class 3; seven clerks of class 2; three clerks of class 1; three clerks, at $1,000 each; two clerks, at $900 each; one messenger; and one laborer; in all, $52,200.

Mr. GORMAN. I suggest that these amendments go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They will go over, if there be no objection. The reading will proceed. Does the Senator from Maryland desire the first amendment to go over?

Mr. GORMAN. I do not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That has been announced as agreed to, and it will remain as so announced, and the remainder will go over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the appropriations for "Department of State," on page 21, after the word "three," in line 24, to strike out "seven" and insert "eight;" so as to read:

Eight clerks of class 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same clause, on page 22, line 1, after the word "dollars," to strike out "fourteen" and insert "fifteen," so as to read:

Fifteen clerks of class 1.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 2, before the word "clerks," to strike out "four" and insert "five;" so as to read:

Five clerks, at $1,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same clause, on page 22, line 6, to increase the total amount of the appropriation for "compensation of the Secretary of State, assistant secretaries, and clerks and employés in the Department," from $117,670 to $121,270.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 13, to increase the appropriation "for stationery, furniture, fixtures, and repairs, and for the purchase of passport paper," from $6,000 to $7,500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to call the attention of the Senate to the language of the bill on page 24, lines 7 and 8: "Three firemen; five firemen, at $660 each."

Mr. COCKRELL. What point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Lines 7 and 8 on page 24.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is correct. It is a difference in salaries, that is all.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading will proceed.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Treasury Department," in the appropriations for office of "Supervising Architect," on page 29, line 7, after the word "appropriations," to insert "and the Secretary of the Treasury may make temporary appointments of architects, skilled draughtsmen, and civil engineers in the office of the Supervising Architect for the foregoing purpose, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe;" so as to make the clause read:

And the services of skilled draughtsmen, civil engineers, computers, accountants, assistants to the photographer, copyists, and such other services as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary and specially order, may be employed in the office of the Supervising Architect to carry into effect the various appropriations for public buildings, to be paid for from and equitably charged against such appropriations, and the Secretary of the Treasury may make temporary appointments of architects, skilled draughtsmen, and civil engineers in the office of the Supervising Architect for the foregoing purpose, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe: *Provided*, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, shall not exceed $200,000; and that the Secretary of the Treasury shall each year in the annual estimates report to Congress the number of persons so employed and the amount paid to each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 8, before the word "clerks," to strike out "three" and insert "four;" and after the word "all," at the end of line 10, to strike out "eighty-eight" and insert "eighty-nine;" so as to make the clause read:

First Auditor: For First Auditor of the Treasury, $3,600; deputy auditor, $2,250; four chiefs of division, at $2,000 each; seven clerks of class 4; ten clerks of class 3; eleven clerks of class 2; eighteen clerks of class 1; four clerks, at $1,000 each; four copyists and counters, at $900 each; two assistant messengers and two laborers; in all, $89,810.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 17, before the words "clerks of class 3," to strike out "forty-two" and insert "forty-three," and in line 21, after the words "two hundred and," to strike out "sixty-six thousand" and insert "sixty-seven thousand six hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

Second Auditor: For Second Auditor, $3,600; deputy auditor, $2,250; six chiefs of division, at $2,000 each; thirteen clerks of class 4; additional to one clerk of class 4 as disbursing clerk, $200; forty-three clerks of class 3; fifty-six clerks of class 2; forty-nine clerks of class 1; eleven clerks, at $1,000 each; one skilled laborer, $900; one messenger; three assistant messengers; eight laborers; in all, $267,630.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 16, before the words "clerks of class 2," to strike out "fifty-three" and insert "fifty-four;" and in line 20, after the words "one hundred and," to strike out "ninety-two thousand four" and insert "ninety-three thousand eight;" so as to make the clause read:

Third Auditor: For Third Auditor, $3,600; deputy auditor, $2,250; five chiefs of division, at $2,000 each; six clerks of class 4; twenty-one clerks of class 3; fifty-four clerks of class 2; twenty-nine clerks of class 1; ten clerks, at $1,000 each; six clerks, at $900 each; one assistant messenger, and ten laborers; and one female laborer, at $480; in all, $193,850.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 1, before the words "clerks of class two," to strike out "eight" and insert "nine;" in the same line, before the words "clerks of class one," to strike out "ten" and insert "eleven;" and in line 5, after the word "all," to strike

out "seventy-two thousand four hundred" and insert "seventy-five thousand;" so as to make the clause read:

Fourth Auditor: For Fourth Auditor, $3,600; deputy auditor, $2,250; three chiefs of division, at $2,000 each; two clerks of class 4; thirteen clerks of class 3; nine clerks of class 2; eleven clerks of class 1; four clerks, at $1,000 each; five clerks at $900 each; two clerks, at $800 each; one messenger; one assistant messenger; and two laborers; in all, $75,030.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "Bureau of Engraving and Printing," on page 39, line 21, after the word "three," to insert "who shall be disbursing clerk;" so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Engraving and Printing: For Chief of Bureau, $4,500; assistant chief, $2,250; accountant, $2,000; one stenographer, $1,600; one clerk of class 3, who shall be disbursing clerk; two clerks of class 1; one clerk, at $1,000; two assistant messengers; and one laborer; in all, $17,450.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for Bureau of Statistics, on page 40, after the word "statistical," at the end of line 2, to strike out "expert" and insert "clerk;" so as to read:

One special statistical clerk, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 2, after the word "dollars," to insert "one assistant messenger," and in line 3, after the word "all," to strike out "three thousand four hundred and seventy" and insert "four thousand one hundred and ninety;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of Construction of Standard Weights and Measures: For construction and verification of the standard weights and measures, including metric standards, for the customhouses, other offices of the United States, and for the several States, and mural standards of length in Washington, D. C.: One adjuster, at $1,500; one mechanician, at $1,250; one assistant messenger; and one watchman; in all, $4,190.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for the "Office of Supervising Surgeon General Marine-Hospital Service," on page 43, line 2, after the words "surgeons and," to strike out "one passed assistant surgeon" and insert "two passed assistant surgeons;" so as to make it read:

And hereafter the Supervising Surgeon General is hereby authorized to cause the detail of two surgeons and two passed assistant surgeons for duty in the bureau, who shall each receive the pay and allowances of their respective grades in the general service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Independent treasury," on page 47, line 17, before the words "clerks, at $1,200 each," to strike out "two" and insert "three;" and in line 21, after the word "all," to strike out "twenty-one thousand six" and insert "twenty-two thousand eight;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of assistant treasurer at Baltimore: For assistant treasurer, $4,500; cashier, $2,500; three clerks, at $1,800 each; two clerks, at $1,400 each; three clerks, at $1,200; one clerk, at $1,000; one messenger, $840; three vault watchmen, at $720 each; in all, $22,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 23, before the words "clerks, at $1,200 each," to strike out "five" and insert "seven;" and on page 49, line 1, after the word "all," to strike out "twenty-five thousand nine" and insert "twenty-eight thousand three;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of assistant treasurer at Chicago: For assistant treasurer, $4,500; cashier, $2,500; paying teller, $1,800; bookkeeper and receiving teller, at $1,500 each; three coin, coupon, and currency clerks, at $1,500 each; seven clerks, at $1,200 each; one messenger, $840; one janitor, at $600; and three watchmen, $720 each; in all, $28,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 19, after the word "dollars," to insert "paying teller, $2,200;" on page 52, line 6, before the words "female counters," to strike out "four" and insert "five;" and in line 8, after the word "all," to strike out "forty thousand one" and insert "forty-three thousand two;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of assistant treasurer at Philadelphia: For assistant treasurer, $4,500; for cashier and chief clerk, $2,500; bookkeeper, $2,500; paying teller, $2,200; chief interest clerk and chief registered-interest clerk, at $1,900 each; assistant bookkeeper, $1,800; coin teller, $1,700; redemption clerk and assistant coupon clerk, at $1,60 each; assistant registered-interest clerk, $1,500; assistant to cashier and assistant coin teller, at $1,400 each; receiving teller, $1,300; three clerks, at $1,200 each; assistant receiving teller, $1,200; superintendent, messenger, and chief watchman, $1,100; five female counters, at $900 each; seven watchmen, at $720 each; in all, $43,240.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 52, line 15, after the words "assistant bookkeeper," to strike out "and one clerk;" in the same line, after the words "coin teller," to insert "an additional assistant teller," and in line 19, after the word "all," to strike out "seventeen thousand eight hundred" and insert "nineteen thousand;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of assistant treasurer at St. Louis: For assistant treasurer, $4,500; chief clerk and teller, $2,500; assistant teller, $1,800; bookkeeper, $1,500; assistant bookkeeper, and teller, and additional assistant teller, at $1,200 each; coin clerk, assistant coin clerk, and messenger, at $1,000 each; three watchmen, at $720 each; in all $19,060

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 25, after the words "receiving teller," to insert "paying teller;" and on page 53, line 5, after the word "all," to strike out "twenty-seven" and insert "twenty-nine;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of assistant treasurer at San Francisco: For assistant treasurer, $4,500; cashier, $3,000; bookkeeper, $2,500; chief clerk, $2,400; assistant cashier, receiving teller, paying teller, and assistant bookkeeper, at $2,000 each; coin teller and one clerk, $1,800 each; one clerk, $1,400; one messenger, $840; and four watchmen, at $720 each; in all, $29,120.

The next amendment was, on page 57, under the head of "Assay office at Boisé City, Idaho," line 4, to increase the appropriation "for incidental and contingent expenses, including labor," from $7,500 to $9,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, under the head of "Assay office at Charlotte, N. C.," to increase the appropriation "for incidental and contingent expenses, including labor," from $2,000 to $2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, under the head of "Assay office at Helena, Mont.," line 17, to increase the appropriation "for wages of workmen" from $12,000 to $12,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, under the head of "Assay office at New York," line 12, to increase the appropriation "for wages of workmen" from $25,000 to $30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, under the head of "Territory of Utah," line 24, to increase the appropriation "for contingent expenses of the Territory, to be expended by the governor," from $500 to $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the same head, on page 61, after line 21, to insert:

To enable the governor, Territorial secretary, and the board of commissioners mentioned in section 9 of the act approved March 22, 1882, entitled "An act to amend section 5350 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in reference to bigamy, and for other purposes," in said Territory, as soon as practicable and upon the basis of the census of said Territory taken in the year 1890, to redistrict said Territory, and apportion representatives in the same in such manner as to provide, as nearly as the same may be, for an equal representation of the people, excepting Indians not taxed, according to numbers, in the Legislative Assembly, and to the number of members of the council and house of representatives thereof, respectively, as now established by law; and to cause a record of the establishment of such new districts, and the apportionment of representation thereto, to be made in the office of the secretary of said Territory; and such establishment and representation shall continue until Congress shall otherwise provide, $5,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. GORMAN. I suggest that this amendment be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the amendment will be passed over. The reading will proceed.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for the War Department, page 62, line 24, before the words "clerks of class three," to strike out "six" and insert "five;" in the same line, after "three," to strike out "including one for the retired General of the Army, to be selected by him;" and in line 7, page 63, to strike out "eight thousand one" and insert "six thousand five;" so as to make the clause read:

WAR DEPARTMENT.

For compensation of the Secretary War, $8,000; Assistant Secretary, $4,500; chief clerk, $2,750; disbursing clerk, $2,000; three chiefs of division, at $2,000 each; two stenographers, at $1,800 each; five clerks of class 4; five clerks of class 3; nine clerks of class 2; twenty-one clerks of class 1; seven clerks, at $1,000 each; four messengers; seven assistant messengers; eight laborers; carpenter, $1,000; foreman of laborers, $1,000; one hostler, $600; two hostlers, at $540 each; and one watchman, at $540; in all, $106,550.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Record and pension division," page 63, line 12, after the word "and," to strike out "sixty-four" and insert "sixty-five;" and in line 20, after the word "million," to strike out "eight thousand one," and insert "nine thousand three;" so as to make the clause read:

Record and pension division: Two chiefs of division, at $2,000 each; twenty clerks of class 4; forty-three clerks of class 3; ninety clerks of class two; four hundred and sixty-five clerks of class 1; one hundred and twenty-seven clerks, at $1,000 each; fifty copyists; one engineer, $1,460; one assistant engineer for night duty, $900; two firemen; one skilled mechanic, $1,000; five messengers; twenty-nine assistant messengers; one messenger boy, $360; five watchmen; one superintendent of building, $250, and sixteen laborers; in all, $1,009,390, and all employés provided for by this paragraph for the record and pension division of the War Department shall be exclusively engaged on the work of this division for the fiscal year 1892.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, under the head of "In the office of the Inspector General," line 10, after the word "two," to strike out "one clerk" and insert "two clerks;" in line 11, after the words "in all," to strike out "eight thousand one" and insert "nine thousand three;" so as to make the clause read:

In the office of the Inspector General: For one clerk of class 4; one clerk of class 3; two clerks of class 2; two clerks of class 1; one assistant messenger; in all, $9,320.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Signal Office," page 64, line 19, after the word "four," to strike out "two" and insert "three;" in line 20, after the word "and," to strike out "one laborer" and in-

sert "two laborers;" and in line 21, after the word "all," to strike out "five thousand seven hundred" and insert "seven thousand five hundred and sixty;" so as to make the clause read:

Signal Office: One clerk of class 4; three clerks of class 1; one messenger and two laborers; in all, $7,560.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "In the office of the Quartermaster General," page 65, line 12, to insert in the beginning of the line, "one experienced builder and mechanic, $2,500;" and in line 13, after the word "and," to strike out "fifty-six thousand four" and to insert "fifty-eight thousand nine;" so as to make the clause read:

In the office of the Quartermaster General: Chief clerk at $2,000; thirteen clerks of class 4; eleven clerks of class 3; twenty-four clerks of class 2; thirty-six clerks of class 1; ten clerks, at $1,000 each; six skilled typewriters, at $1,000 each; one female messenger, at $480; four messengers; nine assistant messengers; two laborers; one civil engineer, $1,800; one assistant civil engineer, $1,200; one draughtsman, $1,800; one assistant draughtsman, $1,600; one assistant draughtsman, $1,400; one assistant draughtsman, $1,200; one experienced builder and mechanic, $2,500; in all, $158,940.

Mr. GORMAN. Let that amendment go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over without objection. The reading will proceed.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for the Navy Department, page 71, line 11, to insert, after the word "Navy," the words "who shall hereafter perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy or required by law;" in line 19, after the word "dollars," to strike out "one clerk" and insert "two clerks;" in line 20, after the word "one," to strike out "one clerk at $1,000" and insert "two clerks at $1,000 each;" and on page 72, in line 2, after the words "in all," to strike out "forty-seven thousand seven" and insert "fifty thousand one;" so as to make the clause read:

NAVY DEPARTMENT.

For compensation of the Secretary of the Navy, $8,000; Assistant Secretary of the Navy, who shall hereafter perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy or required by law, $4,500; chief clerk, $2,500; clerk to the Secretary, $2,250; disbursing clerk, $2,250; two clerks of class 4; one clerk of class 4, in charge of files and records; two clerks of class 3; one stenographer, $1,600; two clerks of class 2; four clerks of class 1; two clerks at $1,000 each; telegraph operator, $1,000; one carpenter, $900; two messengers; three assistant messengers; two messenger boys, at $120 each; one messenger boy, $360; one laborer; one clerk of class 2; and one laborer (for Inspection Board); one clerk of class 1 (for Examining and Retiring Board); in all, $50,160.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, under the head of "Hydrographic Office," line 7, after the words "San Francisco," to insert "Port Townsend;" and in line 8, after the word "Chicago," to strike out "Illinois;" so as to make the clause read:

Contingent expenses of branch offices at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, Savannah, New Orleans, San Francisco, Port Townsend, Portland, Oregon, Portland, Me., and Chicago, including furniture, fuel, lights, rent and care of offices, car fare and ferriage in visiting merchant vessels, freight, express, telegrams and other necessary expenses incurred in collecting the latest information for the Pilot Chart, and for other purposes, for which the offices were established, $12,000; rent for office in New York, $1,000; in all, $13,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, under the head of "Bureau of Equipment," line 16, after the word "dollars," to insert "one clerk of class 3;" and in line 18, after the words "in all," to strike out "seven thousand five" and insert "nine thousand one;" so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Equipment: For chief clerk, $1,800; one clerk of class 3; one clerk of class 2; one clerk of class 1; two copyists; one assistant messenger; and one laborer; in all, $9,180.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, under the head "Bureau of Provisions and Clothing," line 9, after the word "three," to strike out "two" and insert "three;" and in line 13, after the words "in all," to strike out "thirty-six thousand four" and insert "thirty-seven thousand eight;" so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Provisions and Clothing: For chief clerk, $1,800; two clerks of class 4; four clerks of class 3; three clerks of class 2; two stenographers, at $1,400 each; eleven clerks of class 1; two clerks, $1,000 each; two copyists; one assistant messenger; and two laborers; in all, $37,840.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 78, line 9, after the word "and," to strike out "officers" and to insert "offices;" so as to make the clause read:

For stationery, furniture, newspapers, plans, drawings, drawing materials, horses and wagons to be used only for official purposes, freight, expressage, postage, and other absolutely necessary expenses of the Navy Department and its various bureaus and offices, $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for the Department of the Interior, under the head of "Office of Assistant Attorney-General," on page 80, line 5, after the word "dollars," to strike out "twelve" and insert "thirteen;" and in line 6, after the word "each," to strike out "two" and insert "three;" and in line 7, after the words "in all," to strike out "thirty-six thousand nine" and insert "forty thousand five;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of Assistant Attorney-General: For one law clerk, at $2,750; one law clerk, at $2,500; one law clerk, at $2,250; one reporter of land decisions, $2,250; thirteen law clerks, at $2,000 each; three clerks of class 3, one of whom shall act as stenographer; in all, $40,550.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Indian Office," on page 82, in line 9, after the words "Assistant Commissioner," to strike out "who shall also perform the duties of chief clerk;" in line 11, after the word "dollars," to insert "one chief clerk, $2,000;" in line 15, after the word "division," to strike out "nine" and insert "ten;" in line 17, after the word "dollars," to strike out "eleven" and insert "twelve;" in line 18, after the word "two," to strike out "nineteen" and insert "twenty;" in line 20, after the word "female," to strike out "messenger" and insert "laborer;" in line 21, after the word "laborer," to strike out "eight hundred and forty" and insert "six hundred and sixty;" and in line 23, after the word "and," to strike out "two thousand and twenty" and insert "eight thousand and forty," so as to make the clause read:

Indian Office: For the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, $4,000; Assistant Commissioner, $3,000; one chief clerk, $2,000; financial clerk, $2,000; chief of division, $2,000; principal bookkeeper, $1,800; five clerks of class 4, one of whom shall have charge of the educational division; ten clerks of class 3; one draughtsman, $1,600; one stenographer, $1,600; twelve clerks of class 2; twenty clerks of class 1; nine clerks at $1,000 each; twelve copyists; one messenger; two assistant messengers; one laborer; one female laborer, $660; one messenger boy, $360; and two charwomen; in all, $108,040.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the same head, page 82, after line 24, to insert the following paragraph:

To enable the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to transcribe and copy contracts, reports, and miscellaneous matters in his office, $2,500, for which purpose he may employ per diem clerks at not to exceed $2 per day each, and to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Pension Office," on page 83, line 22, to increase the number of clerks of class 2 from three hundred and seventy-four to three hundred and seventy-six; and on page 84, line 11, to increase the total appropriation for the Pension Office from $2,294,010 to $2,296,810.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the same head, on page 85, line 1, after the words "per annum," to strike out "but no such allowance for expenses for subsistence shall be made where the duties are performed in the District of Columbia;" so as to make the clause read:

For per diem, when absent from home and traveling on duty outside the District of Columbia, for special examiners or other persons employed in the Bureau of Pensions, detailed for the purpose of making special investigations pertaining to said bureau, in lieu of expenses for subsistence, not exceeding $3 per day, and for actual and necessary expenses for transportation and assistance, $215,000: *Provided*, That five special examiners, or clerks detailed and acting as supervising examiners, and special examiners or clerks detailed as such, not exceeding three in number, with headquarters in the District of Columbia, may be allowed, in addition to their salaries and in lieu of per diem and all expenses for subsistence, a sum not exceeding $900 each per annum: *Provided further*, That the salary and such allowance to each shall in no case exceed $2,400 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "United States Patent Office," on page 85, line 18, to reduce the salary of the chief clerk from $2,500 to $2,250; on page 86, line 23, to reduce the appropriation for forty-five laborers at $680 each to $480 each; and on page 87, to reduce the total appropriations for the Patent Office from $693,240 to $692,990.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Bureau of Education," on page 88, line 14, to increase the number of clerks of class 2 from four to five; in line 15, to increase the number of clerks at $1,000 each from two to three; and in line 21, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Education from $47,220 to $49,620.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of the "Office of the Director of the Geological Survey," on page 91, line 21, after the word "office," to strike out "five thousand five hundred" and insert "six thousand;" and in line 22, after the words "in all," to strike out "thirty-five thousand five hundred" and insert "thirty-six thousand;" so as to make the clause read:

For rent of buildings for the Department of the Interior, namely: For the Bureau of Education, $4,000; Geological Survey, $10,000; Indian Office, $6,000; General Land Office, $16,000; in all, $36,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head "surveyors general and their clerks," on page 93, line 4, after the word "office," to strike out "two" and insert "four;" and in line 5, after the word "all," to strike out "three" and insert "five;" so as to make the clause read:

For surveyor general of Minnesota, $1,800; and for the clerks in his office, $4,000; in all, $5,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the same head, on page 93, line 16, after the word "office," to strike out "two" and insert "four;" and in line 17, after the words "in all," to strike out "four" and insert "six;" so as to make the clause read:

For surveyor general of Idaho, $2,500; and for the clerks in his office, $4,000; in all, $6,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the same head, on page 96, line 7, after the word "office," to strike out "three" and insert "five," and in line 8, after the words "in all," to strike out "five" and insert "seven;" so as to make the clause read:

For surveyor general of Wyoming, $2,500; and for the clerks in his office, $5,000; in all, $7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for the "Post-Office Department," on page 97, line 2, after the words "class one," to insert "one assistant messenger;" and in line 3, after the words "in all," to strike out "eleven thousand five hundred" and insert "twelve thousand two hundred and twenty;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of Assistant Attorney-General for the Post-Office Department: Law clerk, $2,500; two clerks of class 4; one clerk of class 3; one clerk of class 2; two clerks of class 1; one assistant messenger; in all, $12,220.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 97, in appropriations for the "Office of First Assistant Postmaster-General," in line 15, before the word "clerks," to strike out "eight" and insert "nine;" in the same line, after the word "two," to strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twenty-six;" in line 16, after the word "one," to strike out "ten" and insert "eleven;" in line 17, before the word "clerks," to strike out "two" and insert "three;" and in line 19, after the word "and," to strike out "twenty-three thousand nine" and insert "twenty-nine thousand six;" so as to make the clause read:

Office First Assistant Postmaster-General: For First Assistant Postmaster-General, $4,000; chief clerk, $2,000; chief of salary and allowance division, $2,200; chief of appointment division, $2,000; chief of bond division, $2,000; superintendent division post-office supplies, $2,000; superintendent of free delivery, $3,000; four clerks of class 4; twenty-two clerks of class 3; one clerk of class 3 to act as stenographer and Department telegraph operator; nine clerks of class 2; twenty-six clerks of class 1; eleven clerks, at $1,000 each; three clerks, at $900 each; six assistant messengers; nine laborers; two pages, at $360 each; in all, $129,680.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Dead-Letter Office," on page 99, line 2, after the word "each," to strike out "fifty-five" and insert "sixty;" in line 4, after the word "messenger," to strike out "two" and insert "three;" and in line 6, after the word "and," to strike out "sixteen thousand eight hundred and eighty" and insert "twenty-three thousand and forty;" so as to make the clause read:

Dead-Letter Office: For superintendent of Dead-Letter Office, $2,500; one clerk of class 4, who shall be chief clerk; one clerk of class 4; three clerks of class 3; eleven clerks of class 2; twenty-four clerks of class 1, including eight female clerks; five clerks, at $1,000 each; sixty clerks, at $900 each; six female clerks, at $720 each; one assistant messenger; three laborers; four female laborers, at $480 each; in all, $123,040.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Office money-order system," on page 99, line 19, after the word "one," to strike out "six" and insert "seven;" in line 20, after the word "each," to strike out "five" and insert "six;" and on page 100, line 2, after the words "in all," to strike out "seventy-six thousand" and insert "seventy-seven thousand nine hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

Office money-order system: For superintendent of the money-order system, $3,500; chief clerk, $2,000; six clerks, of class 4; eight clerks of class 3; five clerks of class 2; twelve clerks of class 1; seven clerks, at $1,000 each; six clerks, at $900 each; one assistant messenger; one engineer, $1,000; one assistant engineer for additional building for money-order division, Sixth Auditor's Office, $1,000; one fireman; four watchmen; one conductor of elevator, $720; four charwomen; one female laborer, $480; and ten laborers; in all, $77,980.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 100, under the head of "Office of mail depredations," in line 6, after the word "thousand," to strike out "six" and insert "two;" in line 7, after the word "one," to strike out "three" and insert "four;" and in line 9, after the words "in all," to strike out "eighteen thousand four hundred" and insert "nineteen thousand;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of mail depredations: Chief clerk, $2,000; one clerk of class 3; one stenographer, $1,200; two clerks of class 2; five clerks of class 1; four clerks, at $1,000 each; two assistant messengers; in all, $19,040.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Office of disbursing clerk," in line 16, page 101, to insert "two firemen;" and in line 17, to increase the total appropriation for the office of disbursing clerk from $59,320 to $60,760.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "For contingent expenses of the Post-Office Department," to increase the appropriation, on page 102, "for stationery and blank books, including amount necessary for the purchase of free-penalty envelopes," from $12,000 to $13,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 12, page 102, after the word "purchase," to strike out the word "of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the same head, page 102, line 22, to strike out "the money-order division of;" in line 23, after the word "Department," to strike out "nine" and insert "eleven;" and in line 1, page 103, to strike out "twenty-two" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the clause read:

For rent of topographer's office, $1,500; for rent of a suitable building or buildings for the use of the money-order office of the Post-Office Department, $8,000; for rent of building for use of the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department, $11,000; for rent of a suitable building for the storage of post-office supplies, $4,000; in all, $24,500.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for the Department of Justice, under the head of "Office of the Attorney-General," on page 104, line 1, after the word "dollars," to insert "examiner of claims, to be designated hereafter as;" so as to make the clause read:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Office of the Attorney-General: For compensation of the Attorney-General, $8,000; Solicitor-General, $7,000; four Assistant Attorneys-General, at $5,000 each; one Assistant Attorney-General of the Post-Office Department, $4,000, Solicitor of Internal Revenue, $4,500; examiner of claims, to be designated hereafter as solicitor for the Department of State, $3,500; etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. In lines 16 and 17, I move to strike out the words "two hundred and thirty-two" and insert "three hundred and twenty."

Mr. COCKRELL. What is that?

Mr. ALLISON. On page 108.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 17, page 108, strike out the words "two hundred and thirty-two" and insert in lieu thereof the words "three hundred and twenty;" so it will read:

For salaries of the sixty-four district judges of the United States, $320,000.

The amendment was agreed so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading will proceed.

The next amendment was in the appropriation for judicial expenses, under the head of "United States courts," on page 108, in line 17, after the word "dollars," to insert "And hereafter the salaries appropriated for the United States judges in the districts of North Dakota, South Dakota, Washington, Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming may be paid monthly;" so as to make the clause read:

For salaries of the sixty-four district judges of the United States, $320,000. And hereafter the salaries appropriated for the United States judges in the districts of North Dakota, South Dakota, Washington, Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming may be paid monthly.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator from Kentucky will wait until we get through the bill.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I reserve the right to offer an amendment at the close of line 25, page 108, at the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, until the bill shall have been read through.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent the Senate is considering the committee amendments. The bill will be open to amendment after they shall have been disposed of. The Clerk will proceed.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Court of Claims," line 9, page 109, before the word "clerks," to strike out "two" and insert "three;" and in line 10, after the words "in all," to strike out "thirty-two thousand two" and insert "thirty-three thousand four;" so as to make the clause read:

Court of Claims: For salaries of five judges of the Court of Claims, at $4,500 each; chief clerk, $3,000; one assistant clerk, $2,000; bailiff, $1,500; three clerks, at $1,200 each; and one messenger; in all, $33,440.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 109, after line 21, to strike out the following paragraph:

For preparation and superintending the printing of a digest of the twenty-five existing volumes of the Court of Claims Reports, to be paid on the order of the court, $2,000, said sum to be paid to the reporter, notwithstanding section 1765 of the Revised Statutes, or section 3 of the act of June 20, 1874, chapter 328.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, on page 21 there is an amendment reserved that I ask may be considered now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment referred to by the Senator from Iowa.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, line 24, after the word "dollars," strike out all down to and including the word "necessary," in line 6, page 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Five clerks of class 4; five clerks of class 3; seven clerks of class 2; three clerks of class 1; three clerks at $1,000; two clerks at $900 each; one messenger; and one laborer.

Mr. CHANDLER. I supposed the arrangement was that these suggested amendments were to go over until we have a full Senate; or does the Senator from Iowa wish to go on to-night?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not desire to create any controversy in any way or to raise any question in regard to any amendment.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Without the raising of the question of a quorum let us go on and dispose of the amendments. I will agree not to call attention to the matter of a quorum, no matter what the result may be.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLISON. That is on page 21. I know the Senator from Maryland would rather have a vote in a full Senate upon the amendment reserved on page 21 in relation to the civil service. I will ask the Senator if he will not be able to accomplish what he desired by allowing this amendment to be formally agreed to, or otherwise, and then reserve the further consideration of it in the Senate, so as to allow the bill to be reported to the Senate to-night, and to-morrow take up that question in the Senate, so that the reserved amendment may be considered to-morrow morning in the Senate.

Mr. GORMAN. If the Senator from Iowa thinks that will facilitate the passage of the bill, I have no objection to it.

Mr. ALLISON. If it should transpire, however, that a quorum shall appear within half an hour or so, then we can go on with these amendments.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator from Iowa has something else, I do not care to interrupt him.

Mr. ALLISON. On pages 61 and 62 there is a reserved amendment relating to the reapportionment in Utah. I do not suppose there will be any objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What disposition does the Senator propose to make of the amendment on page 21?

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that that may be adopted *pro forma*, and then the whole question can come up later.

Mr. PLUMB. In connection with that amendment I want to offer an amendment which I submitted in the Senate on the 17th of the present month, and also proposed in committee, in regard to this same subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported from the committee.

Mr. PLUMB. I hope it will be read so that everybody can have notice of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment.

Mr. PLUMB. I do not care whether the amendment is read or not, so that we can have a vote on it.

Mr. ALLISON. Let it be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, after line 11, insert the following:

That stenographers, chiefs of divisions, clerks, copyists, and computers of the Census Office, who shall have passed the examination prescribed by the Census Office, or who, having passed the general examination of the Civil Service Commission, were eligible for appointment in said office, and were so appointed, or who, by reason of efficient services rendered in connection with the Tenth Census, were employed at the Eleventh Census without passing such examination, and who have served therein as stenographers, chiefs of divisions, clerks, copyists or computers for a period of not less than one year, and who shall have obtained a certificate of proficiency from the Superintendent of the Census, shall be eligible to appointment without examination in the classified departmental service of the Government; and whenever a vacancy shall occur in the clerical force of any of the Departments of the Government, any stenographer, chief of division, clerk, copyist, or computer in the Census Office holding such certificate shall be entitled to a transfer to fill such vacancy at the grade last held in the Census Office, or to a grade inferior thereto: *Provided*, That such transfer shall be subject to the provisions concerning appointments, contained in section 2 of an act entitled "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States," approved January 16, 1883.

Mr. ALLISON. In connection with this amendment, on page 68, lines 16 and 17, "for stationery for the War Department, its bureaus and offices, $25,000," I am instructed to move to strike out the words "twenty-five" and insert the word "forty," so that it will provide $40,000 for stationery for the War Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. Do I understand that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] desires to make the point of order on the amendment beginning in line 22, on page 61?

Mr. VEST. Yes; that is general legislation.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator wants to reserve that to be considered later?

Mr. VEST. I do not care about reserving it.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not think it is subject to the point of order, but I do not care to have it decided just now, unless the Senator wants to have it done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] to raise the question of order on the amendment?

Mr. ALLISON. The amendment on page 65, lines 12 and 13, is reserved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 65, line 11, after the word "dollars," insert "one experienced builder and mechanic, $2,500;" and in line 13, strike out the words "fifty-six thousand four" and insert the words "fifty-eight thousand nine;" so as to read:

One experienced builder and mechanic, $2,500; in all, $158,940.

Mr. MORGAN. Now, Mr. President, I have an amendment from a committee which I desire to offer.

Mr. STEWART. I suggest to the Senator from Iowa that in fifteen or twenty minutes there will undoubtedly be a quorum here.

Mr. ALLISON. I am just arranging for an amendment or two.

Mr. STEWART. All right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment just reported, which was reserved upon the first reading of the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I am authorized to offer an amendment, on page 71, line 19, after the word "dollars," where it first occurs, to provide for one stenographer at $1,400, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I will omit the words "to be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy."

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the amendment be reported in due time.

The CHIEF CLERK. Page 71, line 19, after the word "dollars," insert the following:

One stenographer, at $1,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN obtained the floor.

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator from Iowa now give way for an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has been recognized by the Chair.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to submit an amendment, in line 4, page 109, after the word "dollars."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 109, after line 4, insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the marshal, district attorney, and clerks of the circuit and district court in the district of Washington shall, for the services they may perform during the fiscal year herein provided for, receive the fees and compensation allowed by law to like officers performing similar duties in the districts of Oregon and Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment by inserting the words "districts of Washington and Montana."

Mr. EDMUNDS. Put in North Dakota.

Mr. SANDERS. I am also requested by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom this matter has been referred, to insert "North Dakota."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chief Clerk will report the amendment as suggested.

Mr. ALLEN. I am willing to accept the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Washington is modified accordingly, and will be reported as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the second line of the proposed amendment strike out the word "district" and insert the word "districts," and after the word "Washington" insert the words "Montana and North Dakota;" so as to read:

That the marshal, district attorney, and clerks of the circuit and district courts of the districts of Washington, Montana, and North Dakota shall, for the services they may perform, etc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington modifies his amendment according to the suggestion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. SANDERS]. The question is, Will the Senate agree to the same?

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. I move an amendment, on page 5, line 7, after the words "engrossed bills," to insert the words "privileges and elections."

Mr. GORMAN. Let the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 7, after the word "bills," insert "Privileges and Elections, at $2,220 each."

Mr. STEWART. I desire to amend by inserting "clerks of all Senate committees."

Mr. HOAR. If the Chair will pardon me one moment, I have reason to believe that the Committee on Appropriations came to the conclusion two years ago that this particular amendment should be inserted, but it was not inserted at that time. The reason why it was not inserted it is not necessary to state. If there is any question of order about the amendment I will withdraw it.

Mr. STEWART. I do not think there ought to be any question of order raised upon it.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator wishes to make a general movement let that be made by itself. I will withdraw my amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say that we have provided for all clerks of committees, and I hope in a way which will be satisfactory to the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. The committee have provided for all of them?

Mr. ALLISON. For all of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Massachusetts as withdrawing the amendment.

Mr. HOAR. I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. SAWYER. I offer an amendment to come in on page 98, after line 21. I move to insert:

For Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, $4,000.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. President, I very much hope that amendment will not be adopted. I do not claim to be quite as well informed in regard to the *personnel* and the machinery of the Post Office Department as my friend from Wisconsin, and I have great confidence in his judgment, but I can say from what I have seen of the operations of that Department in the last few months that this office would be absolutely superfluous.

I do not know of any Department of the Government in which, except at certain pleasant seasons of the year, the assistants to the head of the Department do as little work as they do in the Post-Office Department, and I think to add to the number of officials in that Department now would be a misuse of the public money. I know very well, of course, that the Senator from Wisconsin does not regard it in that way; but I have not been in that Department for months when I have not seen the assistants of the Postmaster-General, with a single exception, in the enjoyment of a leisure that I know I have not had, and when they have not been reading newspapers and generally disporting themselves like men who have no responsibility except the drawing of their salaries.

I believe, Mr. President, one other thing. I believe that the Post-Office Department under its present management is unnecessarily extravagant. I think, in the estimates that are furnished from time to time, there is a lack of that economy, of that close, careful management of public funds that ought to characterize all Departments of this Government. When I say that I do not mean to say that anyone, consciously, at all events, is asking for what he does not think to be right; but what I do say is that it has rather been in magnificent proportions which have not heretofore obtained, and which I think are to a large extent unnecessary, and which do not obtain in private business, and have not heretofore obtained in the management of that Department.

I shall regard this as an absolute giving to the Postmaster-General of assistance for which he has no use and which will enable him to apply all his time, as he probably would, to his private business.

Mr. SAWYER. I am very sorry that my friend from Kansas takes that view, because I am sure the business of the office has increased. The work of the First Assistant is enormous, and any man who had that amount of business would have an aid to whom he could go. The First Assistant can not do the business that is put upon him, and it ought to be divided up. It will not cost the Government. The Government will save money by it, and I know it.

When we inaugurated the office of Assistant Postmaster-General in 1836 there were only 11,000 offices and now there are about 70,000. The whole of the compensation paid postmasters then was $812,000 and now it is over $13,000,000. He has to adjust all the salaries of clerks, and attend to the appointment of clerks in all the departments of the postal service. The free-delivery system has made an immense amount of labor. The compensation paid for carrying the mails at that time was only $1,600,000. Now is is over $33,000,000. I know that it is economy for the Government, for I have studied the matter. I am sure that it is a thing that ought to be done, and I hope the Senate will allow this amendment to go into the bill.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I take it for granted that this amendment will be adopted, but I simply want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that when we shall have concluded the legislation at the end of this session there will be more new offices created and a greater increase in compensation all around than ever before in the history of the Government?

Mr. SAWYER. I wish to say to my friend that this was recommended under Mr. Cleveland's Administration.

Mr. GORMAN. No doubt of it; but the Department did not get it then.

Mr. SAWYER. They asked for a Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General in Mr. Cleveland's Administration, however.

Mr. GORMAN. The Post-Office Department and all the Departments recommend such an increase, but we did not give it at the last session nor allow this office to be created.

Mr. SAWYER. That is no reason why it should not be granted now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. PLUMB. On that I call for a division.

Mr. ALLISON. This bill will not be finished to-night, and I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will withdraw the amendment for the time being and present it to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin withdraw his amendment?

Mr. SAWYER. Very well; I will withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. MORGAN. I move, in line 9, page 7, after the words "one thousand," to strike out "two hundred" and insert "four hundred and forty;" so as to read:

One assistant in document room, $1,440.

I will state just what is my reason for moving this amendment. Mr. George H. Boyd has been chiefly raised in the Senate document room, and he is just as indispensable to it as Amzi Smith. In the absense of Mr. Smith, as Mr. Boyd understands all the intricacies of the document room and its papers, he takes his place, and he is a very faithful, competent, and efficient officer. It is pretty hard lines on him to have to remain there and work for $240 less than other men who have been put there on the influence of Senators, who do not know anything about the business. I move to insert this additional amount for the purpose of enabling George H. Boyd to have just compensation for labor that is useful to the Senate, and he deserves the pay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. EDMUNDS. There are some reserved amendments, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are some reserved amendments.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us go back to those.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the first reserved amendment.

The first reserved amendment was, on page 20, line 24, after the word "dollars," to strike out all down to and including the word "necessary," in line 6, on page 21, as follows:

One stenographer, $1,600; one messenger; and for all other necessary expenditures to enable the Civil Service Commission to give effect to and execute the provisions of "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States," approved January 16, 1883, $36,400, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Five clerks of class 4; five clerks of class 3; seven clerks of class 2; three clerks of class 1; three clerks, at $1,000 each; two clerks, at $900 each; one messenger; and one laborer.

Mr. ALLISON. That is a controverted question. I had an understanding with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] that that amendment should be agreed to *pro forma* in Committee of the Whole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the amendment will be informally passed on.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It is understood that to get on the amendment is agreed to for the time being, so as to get the bill out of committee.

Mr. ALLISON. And it is to be taken up in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be agreed to, if there be no objection, with that understanding.

Mr. ALLISON. I have agreed to yield to the Senator from Montana [Mr. SANDERS] to offer an amendment.

Mr. SANDERS. I have three amendments to offer. One is merely a formal amendment, however.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 57, line 12, strike out the words "two hundred and fifty" where they occur and insert "five hundred" in lieu thereof; so as to read:

Assay office at Helena, Mont.: For salary of assayer in charge, $2,500.

Mr. ALLISON. And melter the same.

Mr. SANDERS. That is a subsequent amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment submitted by the Senator from Montana will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 57, line 13, after the word "thousand," strike out "two hundred and fifty" and insert "five hundred;" so as to read:

Melter, $2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SANDERS. The balance of the amendment is a formal one touching the aggregate to which the two sums amount.

Mr. ALLISON. Add $500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The third amendment will be reported.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Just change the footing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment simply changes the footing to correspond with the two amendments agreed to. That change will be made, without objection.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I move to amend by striking out lines 23, 24, and 25, at the foot of page 108, and inserting in lieu thereof what I send to the desk.

Mr. EDMUNDS. There is one reserved amendment, on page 61, which has not been acted on. Will the Senator allow that to be disposed of in some way to follow through the bill?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will turn to page 61 and state the reserved amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 61, after line 21, insert:

To enable the governor, Territorial secretary, and the board of commissioners mentioned in section 9 of the act approved March 22, 1882, entitled "An act to amend section 5350 of the Revised Statutes of the United States in refer-

ence to bigamy, and for other purposes," in said Territory, as soon as practicable and upon the basis of the census of said Territory taken in the year 1890, to redistrict said Territory, and apportion representatives in the same in such manner as to provide, as nearly as the same may be, for an equal representation of the people, excepting Indians not taxed, according to numbers, in the Legislative Assembly, and to the number of members of the council and house of representatives thereof, respectively, as now established by law; and to cause a record of the establishment of such new districts, and the apportionment of representation thereto, to be made in the office of the secretary of said Territory; and such establishment and representation shall continue until Congress shall otherwise provide, $5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. VEST. I make the point of order on that amendment that it is general legislation.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It is not general legislation at all.

Mr. COCKRELL. I suggest to my colleague and the Senator from Iowa that that amendment be agreed to *pro forma*, just as the other, without any prejudice, reserving the point of order to be made in the Senate.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I wish to be heard for a moment on the point of order, which I know is to be decided without debate, if the Chair will allow me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the Chair will hear the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The law as applied to that particular Territory, and not by any general law of the United States, is that a certain apportionment shall stand until Congress shall otherwise provide. That is the effect of it. It does not read that way, but that is what it amounts to. It is proposed here to appropriate this sum of money to enable, as a special and particular thing (and it is not general law any more than a hundred other things in this bill), those people to have a fair representation on the new census in their Territory. Therefore, there is no general legislation about it under the rule.

It provides for a particular case that a particular piece of legislation provided for in a particular instance, as in the Navy appropriation bill, as I may suppose, there was a limitation one year that no more than $500,000 should be applied to the building of a particular ship. That is the law until Congress changes it, and then Congress says: "We will give another $100,000 for that purpose."

So, I submit with entire respect and with entire confidence that this provision is in order under the peculiar situation there, and which is desired by everybody, I think I may say, by the Mormons, though I am not so sure about that, but by all the Gentiles of every political party, and there are only two there, even in theory; but in respect of Democrats and Republicans there is no party at all there, they are all together. It simply provides that these people may be represented in their Legislative Assembly according to their numbers in this new census and provides this money for paying for it. There is no general law or general legislation which affects this topic any more than there is about a ship, as I said, in the illustration that I made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the point of order raised on the amendment proposed by the committee on page 61.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I understand the question is upon the point of order raised by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such was the statement of the Chair.

Mr. BLACKBURN. May I have the privilege of addressing the Chairman for a moment in answer to the Senator from Vermont?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair has indulged one or two other Senators without objection the Chair will hear the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I simply desire to say that I scarcely think the Senator from Vermont has reached the question of order which was raised by the Senator from Missouri. I did not raise the question, but it being presented I think the Chair can reach but one conclusion. The amendment supported by the Senator from Vermont evidently changes existing law. It is new legislation. It is not taken out of the operation of the rule by the action of any committee of the Senate so far as I am informed. Whatever the merit may be of the amendment which the Senator offers, it is still obnoxious to and amenable to criticism in the light of the rule under which the Senator from Missouri has protested against its consideration.

I do not know, Mr. President, that it would be well to have this enumeration made in order that the people of Utah Territory might have a fair count and representation under the census that has just been taken. The Senator from Vermont very properly disclaims any authority to speak for the Mormons of that Territory. We all admit that he has a right *par excellence* to speak for the Gentiles, but of all the men upon this earth I expect that he is the last who would be induced to claim any authority or right to speak for the great majority of that Territory.

Now, I do not think that the amendment of the Senator from Vermont is in order. I think that it is amenable to the criticism raised by the Senator from Missouri. I do not mean to dispute with the Senator from Vermont the fairness or even the necessity for the legislation that his amendment proposes, but I do mean to reiterate that it is not in order upon this appropriation bill for the reasons assigned.

Mr. HOAR. What is the amendment, the one in print?

Mr. EDMUNDS. The one in print, the amendment of the committee. I have proposed no amendment.

Now, Mr. President, I ask you to turn to page 149 of our rules, which contain Rule XVI of the Senate about amendments to appropriation bills, the third paragraph of which reads this way:

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

Then it comes to the relevancy, etc.

There was never any general legislation of the United States concerning the question of apportionment of representatives in the Territory of Utah.

There never was, but if there were this amendment provides simply for making a new apportionment for that special Territory, which relates to this alone and which provides for this alone, just as I said before about changing a former law in respect of its not continuing any longer, to change the adjustment of a ship that we build in the naval appropriation bill or an office of a clerk that exists merely in the ordinary run of legislation in one Department or another.

Therefore, I humbly submit that this thing that is proposed by the committee is not general legislation. It does not change any general law of the United States nor defeat it, there being a special law of the United States that the particular apportionment in Utah shall stand under that legislation until Congress decides otherwise. We now provide in this special instance, applied to that special ship of state, as it is, for good or for bad, that they may be represented according to their numbers as they appear. I submit that the very language does not change existing law. That is not what the rule says. It is "general legislation." In the House of Representatives I agree my friend's point would be good.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Do I understand the Senator from Vermont to deny that is general legislation?

Mr. EDMUNDS. I do deny it, most decidedly.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I admit it does not apply to the world. It does not apply to European governments. It does not apply to all the States of this Union. But if it is not general legislation when it takes in the territory of a whole Commonwealth, although it may be a territory bigger than half of the States of New England combined, we had better now, I think, get a definition as to what constitutes general legislation.

Mr. EDMUNDS. We have had it a thousand times already.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am asking for it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair has always believed, as he believes now, that legislation which changes policy and does not refer directly to the direction of a particular and necessary appropriation authorized, was that class of legislation which was intended to be forbidden by the rule and ought to appear in an independent bill. In the opinion of the Chair the point of order is well taken. It is legislation, and, as the Chair thinks, that class of legislation which the rule was intended to prohibit.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I must appeal from the decision of the Chair, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Upon this ruling the Senator from Vermont appeals; and the question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. EDMUNDS. The Senator from Iowa asks me that this question on the appeal may be suspended until to-morrow, when the Senate will be more full, and if the Chair is willing, let it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will go over if there be no objection.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to make an observation.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Now, I renew my amendment.

Mr. HOAR. I ask leave to make an observation before this question goes over that it may go over in connection with the ruling. Reverse this case and suppose we had a constitutional provision, as they have in some States, prohibiting special legislation. Would this be prohibited by such a rule as that? Very clearly not.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Now, Mr. President, I renew my amendment, which is to strike out lines 23, 24, and 25 at the bottom of page 108, and insert in lieu thereof the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 108, strike out lines 23, 24, and 25, in the following words:

For salaries of the chief justice of the supreme court of the District of Columbia and the five associate judges, $24,500.

And insert:

From and after the passage of this act the annual salaries of chief justice and associate justices of the supreme court of the District of Columbia, instead of the amount now paid by law, shall be as follows: For the chief justice, $5,500, and for each associate justice, $5,000.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I make the point of order that this is legislation ten thousand greater than what I stated and entirely different from it, not falling within it at all, for the salaries of the judges of the supreme court of the District of Columbia are provided for by general law, like the salaries of all the other judges.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Very well; if the Senator has contented himself with stating his point of order I will try to come not only within the limit of the rule technically construed but within his own con-

struction, and offer an amendment which I now send to the desk, which has been reported favorably by the Committee on the District of Columbia under order of the Senate, and reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky withdraws the amendment previously offered?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment now offered will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 108, strike out line 23 to line 25, inclusive, as follows:

For salaries of the chief justice of the supreme court of the District of Columbia and the five associate judges, $24,500.

And in lieu thereof insert:

From and after the passage of this act the annual salaries of the chief justice and the associate justices of the supreme court of the District of Columbia, instead of the amount now fixed by law shall be as follows: For the chief justice, $6,500, and for each associate justice, $6,000, payable out of the funds appropriated for the District of Columbia.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I wish to ask my friend from Kentucky if he thinks that amendment is in order after what he has just said?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I should like to be advised as to why it is obnoxious to the rule.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Does the Senator think it is within the rule?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I most certainly do. It has been passed upon by the committee of the Senate, and under order of the Senate has been referred to the Committee on Appropriations and comes back here.

Mr. EDMUNDS. So with the Utah amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does it not change the existing law and change the general policy?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Unquestionably; but I ask the Chair to rule as to whether this is general legislation——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the question of order. It is well taken. The amendment is not in order.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I have made no question of order.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Will the Chair hear me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Vermont as raising the question of order. The Senator says he did not?

Mr. EDMUNDS. No, I did not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is before the Senate.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I bow respectfully to the decision of the Chair, who has sustained a point of order that has never been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has stated to the Senator from Kentucky that he understood the Senator from Vermont as raising the question of order.

Mr. BLACKBURN. And the Chair——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont said that he raised no question of order, and therefore the Chair announced that the Senator's amendment is pending, and the question is upon agreeing to the same.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am entirely content to have the Senate pass upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator would do well to hear the statement of the Chair before he undertakes to criticise it.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am delighted that the Chair revised his hasty ruling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair undertook to rule upon a question that he supposed, and had a right to suppose, was raised, but the Senator from Vermont says he did not raise it.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I agree with the Chair. I am only happy that the question never was raised and the Chair has now discovered that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has discovered it upon the distinct announcement from the Senator from Vermont, whose every utterance meant that he did raise it, until he disclaimed it. The question is, Will the Senate agree to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. ALLISON. On that question I wish to say a word.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa will proceed.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope now, the Senator having renewed his amendment so as not to be objected to on a point of order, that he will modify it so as to make the salary of the chief justice $5,500 and the other salaries $5,000.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa and ask leave to offer as an amendment to the pending amendment the one first sent to the desk.

Mr. COCKRELL. No; strike out "$6,500," and insert "$5,500."

Mr. EDMUNDS. I reserve the question of order.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am proposing to do that now, to strike out "$6,500" and "$6,000" and all that portion of the amendment which makes the salaries chargeable to the District fund and simply make it read "the salary of the chief justice, $5,500, and the salary of five associate justices, $5,000 each," in order that that may conform to a law passed within the last four days by Congress which fixes the salary of all district judges at $5,000.

Mr. MANDERSON. Will the Senator from Kentucky permit me a suggestion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BLACKBURN. With pleasure.

Mr. MANDERSON. If he so amends his amendment it will leave no appropriation for the payment of these judges. It simply fixes their salary at $5,500 for the chief justice and $5,000 for the associate justices, but that is all it does. It carries with it no appropriation, and they would be without compensation for the ensuing year.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I crave the Senator's pardon, this bill carries the appropriation in its each and every item. The first clause makes the appropriation for all the salaries provided for in the bill. We are simply to enumerate the officers and fix the items.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, I think it a duty in the way the thing is going on to make the question of order on the amendment, because it is absolutely out of order.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I insist that the point of order comes too late now. The matter has been pending before the Senate and has been debated pro and con.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The Senator has just modified his amendment. I think I have the right to make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chief Clerk will report the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. Modify the amendment, so as to read:

That from and after the passage of this act the annual salaries of the chief justice and the associate justices of the supreme court of the District of Columbia, instead of the amount now fixed by law, shall be as follows: For the chief justice, $5,500, and for each associate justice, $5,000.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I make the point of order, Mr. President, that that is clearly general legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Upon the amendment the Senator from Vermont raises the point of order that it is general legislation, which question of order the Chair sustains.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Before the decision of the Chair is announced may I be permitted to make a suggestion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Questions of order are not debatable, but the Chair will hear the Senator from Kentucky if there be no objection.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I do not ask it unless it be the pleasure of the Chair to hear simply a suggestion. I offered an amendment to which no point of order was made and the Chair announced that it was pending before the Senate and for determination. I then offered, as I thought I had a right to do, both under the rule and practice, to amend that amendment or modify it as the Chair stated. That was discussed pro and con, and was ready to be voted on by the Senate, and I submit to the Chair now, with great deference, and I shall be entirely content with its decision, whether it is not too late to raise the question of order against it as it stands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks that a question of order may be raised upon an amendment at any stage while it is pending.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is the practice of the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. I want to make a suggestion in regard to this matter. I suggest to the Senator from Kentucky that without making it a law to operate in future, if he would modify his amendment so that it would be for the salary of the chief justice of the District of Columbia $5,500, and for the associate justices $5,000 each, making the appropriation for them this year without making it permanent, Congress would undoubtedly follow it hereafter.

It would then certainly not be subject to the objection.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I suggest to the Senator from Nevada that is all my amendment proposes to do. I do not propose to make it permanent.

Mr. STEWART. The amendment proposes that they shall hereafter have this amount, changing it as a permanent salary, but it has been recommended by a committee that there shall be that much appropriated at this time. Simply making the appropriation $5,500 for the chief justice and $5,000 for the associate justices, I think, would avoid the point of order.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The Senator is entirely mistaken, because no committee has reported any such amendment. If they had it would have been open to some consideration.

Mr. ALLISON. I beg leave to make a suggestion to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLISON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas to offer an amendment.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Will the Senator from Kansas allow me to rise to a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PLUMB. Certainly.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I confess that I have no very well-defined ideas as to what amendments are or are not in order, and I desire to ask whether an amendment would be in order, and if so I desire to offer it now, to strike out, in lines 24 and 25, on page 108, the words "twenty-

four thousand five hundred dollars" and insert "thirty thousand dollars."

Mr. EDMUNDS. No committee has reported any such amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an estimate for the appropriation of that amount of money from any Department?

Mr. BLACKBURN. There is a report of a committee here favoring the appropriation of a still larger amount of money for that purpose.

Mr. EDMUNDS. No committee has reported any such amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is this amendment reported by any committee, standing or select, of the Senate?

Mr. BLACKBURN. An amendment is reported by a standing committee of the Senate of which the present occupant of the Chair is, and for many years has been, an honored member, appropriating more money for this specific purpose than the amendment which I now submit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If any committee, standing or select, of the Senate has recommended the amendment the Senator proposes the Chair would hold it to be in order, making a simple appropriation of that amount of money.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Then permit me to say that I have been unable to maintain against points of order the amendments that have been reported by standing committees of the Senate or any amendment that even fell short of that; and I shall yield the point, but in the Senate I shall renew the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Kentucky that a standing or select committee reporting an amendment to increase an appropriation, or to make an appropriation not in the bill where it is simply a matter of appropriation, the Chair would hold to be in order; but no committee of the Senate can report general legislation and make it in order upon an appropriation bill by so reporting it. That is the principle upon which the Chair proceeds, and, as the present occupant of the chair conceives, the correct principle. The bill is still in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. PLUMB. On page 97, line 12, after the word "dollars," I move to insert the words:

Assistant superintendent of free delivery, $2,000.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, if there are no further——

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa was recognized by the Chair.

Mr. ALLISON. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. SANDERS. I offer an amendment, to come in on page 110. I move to add to section 2 the following:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized in his discretion, and from time to time during the year next succeeding the approval of this act, to purchase silver bullion not exceeding in the aggregate fifteen million ounces in addition to the amount authorized to be purchased by the provisions of section 1 of an act entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes," approved July 14, 1890, and to pay for the same in Treasury notes, such as are in said act provided, which said silver bullion when so purchased shall be subject to be treated as is other silver bullion purchased under said act.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I make the point of order on that amendment, Mr. President.

Mr. SANDERS. I trust the Senator will not make a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the question of order is well taken.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, I ask that the bill be reported to the Senate, and I ask only that the Senator from Missouri allow the matter he proposes respecting the amendment to be put in such shape that it can be considered in the Senate. Of course with the appeal of the Senator from Vermont now pending it is impossible to get the bill out of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let the appeal go into the Senate. That was reserved. We agreed all around that that was to be reserved.

Mr. ALLISON. If by unanimous consent the appeal can be reserved and go into the Senate, then I would ask that the bill may be reported to the Senate and the amendments that are not objected to be concurred in as a whole, and then I shall ask nothing further in respect to the bill to-night.

Mr. SPOONER. It will still be open to amendment in the Senate?

Mr. ALLISON. It will still be open to amendment in the Senate to-morrow.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the chairman of the committee allow me to make a remark or two for his consideration between now and to-morrow in regard to a certain matter in the bill?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL. I desire to make a suggestion for the consideration of the Committee on Appropriations and Senators generally in the hope that some remedy may be suggested to-morrow by some amendment or amendments to the bill. This bill carries appropriation simply for the fiscal year, which ends on the 30th day of June, 1892. Consequently no money appropriated under the provisions of the bill can be utilized for any purpose whatever before the 1st day of July next.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Except where there is a special provision that it shall be immediately available.

Mr. MITCHELL. Except where there are special provisions. Now there are certain annual clerks, as we all know, for a great number of the committees. They of course are provided for, because the appropriation in the bill of last year covers the ground from the 4th of March, when this Congress expires, until the 1st day of July next. I notice in the bill that three other committees have been added to the list of committees entitled to annual clerks at $2,220 each; that is to say, the Committee on Patents, the Committee on Coast Defenses, and the Committee on Engrossed Bills.

If this bill should become a law just as it stands, without any further provision, it is perfectly clear to my mind that neither the Committee on Patents, nor the Committee on Coast Defenses, nor the Committee on Engrossed Bills can avail anything between the 4th of March and the 1st of July so far as a clerk is concerned, because there is no money appropriated to meet the payment of clerks that those committees might appoint, provided always that they have the power to appoint after the 4th of March.

Then we come to page 8, where the Committee on Appropriations undertakes to change the rule as to the rest of the committee clerks by making them annual instead of paying them $6 per day during the sessions, as heretofore, and this provision was inserted on the recommendations of the committee:

For twenty-three clerks to committees, at $1,500 each, $34,500.

Another provision was also reported by the committee providing that each of the thirty-nine Senators who are not chairmen of committees shall be entitled to a clerk at the annual salary of $1,500. That is all very nice so far as it goes, but it is absolutely useless, as the chairman will see and as every Senator must see, for there is no money appropriated in the bill as it stands now to meet the salaries of these clerks, either as to the twenty-three committees or the thirty-nine Senators, for the time intervening between the 4th of March and the 1st day of July next.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I take it, the law will not go into effect until the beginning of the next fiscal year, on the 1st of July.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that the Committee on Appropriations have struggled and labored with this question thoroughly, and that it is their purpose to make provision in a bill that is yet to appear for the remainder of the fiscal year in accordance with the general policy that we have established.

Mr. MITCHELL. For these clerks?

Mr. ALLISON. For these clerks; and therefore there need be no anticipation that there will be trouble on account of it.

Mr. MITCHELL. The Senator agrees with me that I am right about the pending bill?

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly; but this being a bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, we could not very well provide for it here when it properly belongs to the fiscal year 1891, and an item will appear in the deficiency bill covering the point suggested by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is one other difficulty to which I wish to call the attention of the Senator. There are quite a number of us whose terms expire on the 4th of March next, and yet we have been re-elected. We are not Senators, however, after the 4th of March, and will not be until we are sworn in. Of course that does not affect my friend from Iowa, because his clerks are annual and run right along independent of committees and all that; but there are several, myself among the number, who are in the category that I describe.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not think there will be any trouble about the matter suggested by the Senator.

Mr. MITCHELL. I simply wished to call the attention of the committee to the point.

Mr. ALLISON. All these items are in committees and I hope will be cared for. Now I hope if there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole that the bill may be reported to the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move to strike out, on pages 70 and 71, the whole item under the head of "State, War and Navy Department Building."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 70, strike out from line 17 to line 25, inclusive, and, on page 71, strike out from line 1 to line 7, inclusive, the words proposed to be stricken out being as follows:

STATE, WAR, AND NAVY DEPARTMENT BUILDING.

Office of the superintendent: One clerk of class 1; one chief engineer, at $1,200; eight assistant engineers, at $1,000 each; one captain of the watch, $1,200; two lieutenants of the watch, $840 each; fifty-eight watchmen; one carpenter, $1,000; one machinist, $900; one plumber, $900; one painter, $900; four skilled laborers, at $720 each; twenty-four firemen; ten conductors of elevators, at $720 each; twenty laborers, and eighty charwomen; in all, $118,500.

For fuel, lights, miscellaneous items, and repairs, $42,500.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I make this motion for the purpose of calling the attention of the Senate to the extraordinarily large amount appropriated for the taking care of this building—$118,500 simply for taking care of the State, War, and Navy Department building and $42,500 for fuel, light, and miscellaneous items. I had occa-

sion this afternoon to call attention of the Senate to the fact that the Fish Commission has no supervision and I contended that its expenditures ought to be superintended by the head of some Department. Here is a Department which on the other hand is suffering from too much supervision.

The care of this building is intrusted to the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy. They have given to them a chief engineer of the Navy, whose salary is not included in this amount, and in addition persons who draw $118,500 of salaries.

This does not include any of the messengers of any kind, doorkeepers, or any of the numerous attendants in the State Department, the War Department, and the Navy Department, but it includes solely the salaries of the persons who are supposed to be engaged in taking care of that building.

It is a large building, it is a fine building, it is an expensive building, but, Mr. President, I do not believe it requires fifty-eight watchmen to take care of that building. I do not believe it requires twenty-four firemen to take care of that building.

I find, on page 108 of this bill, that the appropriation to pay the salaries of the Chief Justice and the eight associate justices of the Supreme Court of the United States amounts to only $90,500, and we pay more by some twenty-three or twenty-four thousand dollars to take care of this one building, for the salaries per diem of the men who are engaged in the work, than we pay for the annual salaries of the Chief Justice and associate justices of the Supreme Court of the United States. I also call the attention of the Appropriations Committee to the appropriations for taking care of the Treasury Department building, on pages 23, 24, and 25, $167,680, a most enormous sum simply for taking care of the building.

Mr. President, as I have been sitting here while this bill has been under consideration this evening, I certainly have not been disposed to object to small appropriations or to find fault with little items. However, I could not but be struck with these enormous expenditures. The Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN] has on various occasions called attention to the enormous expenditures for salaries and the pay of employés in the District of Columbia. I agree with him in many of the remarks which he has made on that subject.

I am convinced from my observation for many years and from an inspection of this bill that economy ought to begin somewhere in the expenditures that are made from year to year for the petty work that is conducted in this District of taking care of these buildings that in doing the work of the District; it is of no use to begin to find fault now with the fifty-eight watchmen in the State, War, and Navy building, or the fifty-eight watchmen who are employed in taking care of the Treasury Department building, but I think that in the next Congress some time, somewhere there ought to be a retrenchment in this connection.

Mr. GORMAN. There will be.

Mr. CHANDLER. I moved to strike out this clause for the purpose of calling the attention of the Senate and the attention of the Committee on Appropriations to the enormous expenses that are incurred here simply for taking care of a building—$24,000 more for taking care of one building than all the salaries of the Chief Justice and associate justices of the Supreme Court of the United States. I withdraw the amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn. The bill is still in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. On page 8, line 18, I desire to offer an amendment, and in doing so I wish to say one word in response to the Senator from New Hampshire. I hope he will exert himself in the direction indicated by him; but when he examines with care the question of the persons employed to take care of the State, War, and Navy Department building, he will find, if he consults this trio of Secretaries, that they all believe that the amount here appropriated and the persons employed are not sufficient to take care of that great building, which has within it more than 2,500 people. This matter has been gone over with the utmost care by the Committee on Appropriations of the House and by the committee of the Senate, and if the Senator can next year show that one man provided for here is not necessary I shall gladly aid him in leaving that employé out of the appropriation bill.

In line 18, on page 8, I move to strike out the words "four thousand five hundred" and insert "five thousand;" so as to read:

For stationery and newspapers, including $5,000 for stationery for committees and offices of the Senate, etc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. Now I ask that the bill may be reported to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa asks that with the amendments the Chair ruled to be out of order, from which ruling the Senator from Vermont took an appeal, notwithstanding the pendency of that appeal and that ruling the bill may be reported to the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. EDMUNDS. It may be done even on objection.

Mr. GORMAN. Do I understand that the question comes up precisely the same as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. ALLISON. Precisely.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Of course that may be done in reporting the bill to the Senate, only reserving the question of order for further consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will not change the status at all. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Are there further amendments as in Committee of the Whole? If there be not, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has made sundry amendments thereto.

Mr. ALLISON. I reserve any amendments that have been suggested by the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Missouri, and I ask, unless some other Senator desires——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will specify precisely so that the clerks may take down the reserved amendments.

Mr. ALLISON. The first amendment is on page 21, relating to the civil service, covering all those amendments. There are several of them. The next amendment is on pages 61 and 62, covering the Utah question. I know of no others. If there are other amendments to be reserved, I do not know of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no other reserved amendments, the question is, Will the Senate concur in the amendments not reserved?

Mr. EDMUNDS. Of course it is understood that the Utah amendment, which was not acted upon as in Committee of the Whole, stands as a question to be considered by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Its status is precisely the same in the Senate as it was in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is understood; all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate concur in the amendments made in Committee of the Whole not reserved?

The amendments were concurred in.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, I will ask no further action respecting this bill to-night, but I shall ask the Senate as soon as we can, after the morning business to-morrow morning, to take it up and finally dispose of it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator yield to me to make a suggestion?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRELL. I desire to state that I believe it would be in the interest of all Senators and of the public business if in the morning, immediately after the conclusion of the routine business of the morning, we could take up by unanimous consent the Calendar of unobjected House cases favorably reported.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator means after the pending appropriation bill is disposed of?

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes; after it is disposed of.

Mr. EDMUNDS. We ought to take up Senate cases rather than House cases.

Mr. ALDRICH. Why not do that to-night?

Mr. ALLISON. I have nothing further to say respecting that matter, but I have a brief conference report on an appropriation bill to submit, which I hope will take but a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will receive the report.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12922) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

W. B. ALLISON,
C. B. FARWELL,
WILKINSON CALL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

H. J. SPOONER,
SAM'L P. SNIDER,
S. M. ROBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was concurred in.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES], who has charge of the Indian appropriation bill, is ill to-day and unable to be here. I desire at this time to report from the Committee on Appropriations the bill (H. R. 13388) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes, in order that it may be printed, and I hope he will be able to take charge of it to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be placed on the Calendar, and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF IMMIGRATION TESTIMONY.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 5,000 bound copies of the testimony taken by the Senate Committee on Immigration and the House Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, under concurrent resolution of March 12, 1890, and the various reports submitted in connection therewith, 1,500 copies to be for the use of the Senate and 3,500 copies to be for the use of the House of Representatives, the same to be printed under the direction of the chairman of the Senate committee.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 2259) for the relief of Willis Cornwell was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (H. R. 3568) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to revoke the order dismissing Second Lieut. Edwin F. Nixon;

A bill (H. R. 5838) for the relief of Andrew J. Boss;

A bill (H. R. 6021) for the relief of Dr. James Madison;

A bill (H. R. 7490) for the relief of Bvt. Lieut. Col. J. Madison Cutts; and

A bill (H. R. 11663) to relieve Orville B. Merrill, late captain Company I, Thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteers, of the charge of dishonorable dismissal.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Finance:

A bill (H. R. 4212) for the relief of Henry Ayres;

A bill (H. R. 6186) authorizing the refunding of the duties paid on a painted glass window imported by the rector of St. Mary's Church, county of Harford, State of Maryland; and

A bill (H. R. 9599) for the relief of R. F. Balke, as Mellwood Distillery.

The bill (H. R. 11003) to detach the county of Logan, in the State of Ohio, from the northern and attach it to the southern judicial district of said State was read twice by its title.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest that that bill be withdrawn for the moment and lie on the table until to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will lie on the table without reference.

Mr. HOAR. I presume the Senate will pass upon it without any reference.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask the Senate to take up Order of Business 2721.

Mr. COCKRELL. I must object.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is a House bill reported from the Committee on Military Affairs favorably.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have ten or fifteen cases, and it would be a discrimination in favor of this bill and against somebody else. I must insist when we go to House cases that we take them up in order, and let every Senator have a chance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island asks the consent of the Senate to consider at this time a bill, the title of which will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4376) for the relief of Washington L. Parvin and Henry A. Green.

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

Mr. EDMUNDS. I call for the regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the regular order?

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to inquire what is the regular order?

Mr. PADDOCK. I should like to make a statement of a word or two.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 4827) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua," approved February 20, 1889.

Mr. PADDOCK. I gave notice this morning that when the consideration of the appropriation bill should have been concluded I would move to take up Senate bill 3991, a bill to prevent adulteration and misbranding of food and drugs, and for other purposes. I now make that motion.

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

Mr. COCKRELL. I rise to a question of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asked the Secretary, not knowing, what was the unfinished business, and was informed by the Secretary that the bill laid before the Senate was the unfinished business.

Mr. PADDOCK. I think not. I think the bill which has been laid before the Senate was laid aside this morning by positive action on the part of the Senate at 12 o'clock to take up the appropriation bill.

Mr. BLACKBURN. If the Senator from Nebraska will allow me, I ask him whether he believes it is practicable to take up the Conger lard bill or the Paddock pure-food bill at this stage of the session and discuss it as elaborately as it must of necessity be discussed and wedge it in between appropriation bills that have not yet been considered by the Senate?

Mr. PADDOCK. I consider it entirely practicable to take up the pure-food bill and discuss it and reach a conclusion in respect to it.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I fear not. I have no desire to delay it.

Mr. PADDOCK. I do not care to-night to do more than have the bill laid before the Senate, but I insist, after months——

Mr. MORGAN. I rise to a question of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama will state his question of order.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to know whether a quorum is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll, and the Chair will be able to inform the Senator.

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

Aldrich,	Coke,	Ingalls,	Sawyer,
Allen,	Daniel,	Manderson,	Shoup,
Allison,	Dolph,	Mitchell,	Spooner,
Bate,	Edmunds,	Moody,	Stockbridge,
Blackburn,	Frye,	Morgan,	Vest,
Blair,	Gorman,	Paddock,	Warren,
Call,	Harris,	Pettigrew,	Washburn.
Casey,	Hawley,	Plumb,	
Chandler,	Hiscock,	Power,	
Cockrell,	Hoar,	Sanders,	

Mr. CALL. My colleague [Mr. PASCO] is absent upon business of the Senate.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. WILSON] is absent this evening on account of illness.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. CARLISLE] is detained from the Chamber on account of illness, and is not able to be here.

Mr. BATE. I wish to state that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] is absent on a committee appointed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-seven Senators have responded to their names. No quorum is present.

Mr. MORGAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 27, 1891, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *February* 26, 1891.

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m. Prayer by Rev. GEORGE ELLIOT, of Washington, D. C.

The Journal of last evening's session was read and approved.

JOHN P. DOWNING.

Mr. COGSWELL. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill No. 4724.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (S. 4724) for the relief of John P. Downing, first paying teller in the subtreasury at Boston, Mass.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to pay to John P. Downing, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,303.28, the said sum of money representing a loss incurred by him, without default or negligence on his part, in the payment of a check drawn by Maj. G. C. Goodloe, paymaster in the Marine Corps, payable to the order of Maj. J. P. Houston, commanding United States marines, Boston, Mass., with indorsements thereon forged by a trusted subordinate at the marine barracks at said Boston, said loss having been made good to the Treasury of the United States, through the assistant treasurer at Boston, by the said John P. Downing.

There being no objection, the Committee on Ways and Means was discharged from the further consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, House bill 10346, corresponding in its provisions with the Senate bill just passed, was laid on the table.

RAILROAD BRIDGE AT LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

Mr. DOCKERY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 5037) to authorize the building of a railroad bridge at Little Rock, Ark.

The Clerk was proceeding to read the bill, when

Mr. DOCKERY said: Mr. Speaker, this is a bridge bill in the usual form, and has been approved by the War Department. I call it up at the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS]. I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

There being no objection, the reading of the bill was dispensed with;

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

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

House bill 13663, corresponding in its provisions to the Senate bill just passed, was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

ANDREW J. BOSS.

Mr. COMSTOCK. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5838) for the relief of Andrew J. Boss.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $190 to Andrew J. Boss, late private of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment of Michigan Veteran Volunteers, the said sum being the unpaid installments of veteran bounty withheld from the pay of said soldier at his final discharge.

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

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I ask that some statement of this matter be made.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report, which is short.

The report (by Mr. THOMAS) was read, as follows:

The Committee on War Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5838) for relief of Andrew J. Boss, submit the following report:

Andrew J. Boss enlisted November 23, 1861, in Company K, Thirteenth Michigan Volunteer Infantry, mustered January 18, 1862. Re-enlisted January 18, 1864; was honorably discharged because of disability June 25, 1865; thirteen days thereafter his regiment was mustered out. If he had served the thirteen days he would have received the $190 veteran bounty withheld.

Your committee deem it but just that the bounty so withheld should be paid.

Your committee therefore report the bill back with a favorable recommendation.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

DR. JAMES MADISON.

Mr. FITHIAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6021) for the relief of Dr. James Madison.

Be it enacted, etc., That there be appropriated and directed to be paid Dr. James Madison the sum of $320, due him for services rendered by him as assistant surgeon of the Twenty-first Regiment of Illinois Volunteer Infantry from the 16th day of September to the 16th day of November, A. D. 1861, and for which he has never heretofore been compensated in any manner whatever.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

The amendment reported by the Committee on Claims to strike out "$320" and insert "$160" was read, and agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORVILLE B. MERRILL.

Mr. HOPKINS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill No. 11663.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11663) to relieve Orville B. Merrill, late captain Company I, Thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteers, of the charge of dishonorable discharge.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to remove from the rolls and records in the office of the Adjutant General of the United States Army the charge of dishonorable discharge now standing on the said rolls and records against Orville B. Merrill, late captain of Company I, Thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteers, and when so removed that the said Orville B. Merrill be restored to all rights lost or suspended by the said record.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

The amendments reported by the Committee on Military Affairs were read, as follows:

In line 4, strike out "the" and insert "his."

In line 5, strike out the words "of the Adjutant General of the United States Army."

In line 6, strike out "discharge" and insert "dismissal."

In line 9, strike out the words "when so removed that" and insert the word "grant."

At the end of the bill, strike out the words "be restored to all rights lost or suspended by the said record" and insert "an honorable discharge as of the date of said dismissal."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection the title of the bill just passed will be amended by striking out "discharge" and inserting "dismissal;" so as to correspond to the amendments made in the bill.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES OF DAVID WALTER JONES.

Mr. STONE, of Missouri. I desire unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 421) for the relief of the legal representatives of David Walter Jones.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to adjust and audit the claim of the legal representatives of David Walter Jones, deceased, late receiver of public moneys at the Mineral Point United States land office, in the State of Wisconsin, for two balances, one of $1,860 85, and the other of $235.58, aggregating the sum of $2,096.43, now appearing by the records of the Treasury Department to be due to said Jones, and to pay to such legal representatives of said Jones whatever sum of money, if any, may be found due and unpaid.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

SECOND LIEUT. EDWIN F. NIXON.

Mr. McCORMICK. I ask unanimous consent that House bill No. 3568, which I send to the desk, be taken up for consideration and passed.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3568) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to revoke the order dismissing Second Lieut. Edwin F. Nixon.

Be it enacted, etc., That the order heretofore made dishonorably dismissing from the military service of the United States Second Lieut. Edwin F. Nixon, of Company E, Seventh Pennsylvania Cavalry Volunteers, be, and the same is hereby, revoked, annulled, and set aside, and the Secretary of War is directed to grant an honorable discharge of said Nixon (now deceased) to his legal representatives, and to correct the records of his Department to show the removal of the said order of dismissal; and the legal representatives of said Nixon are restored to all rights and privileges lost or suspended by such order.

The amendment reported by the committee was read, as follows:

At the end of the bill strike out the words "and the legal representatives of said Nixon are restored to all rights and privileges lost or suspended by such order."

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

Mr. McMILLIN. Reserving the right to object, let us understand something in regard to the case.

Mr. McCORMICK. The report sets forth the facts more briefly than I could state them. I ask that it be read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the report, but was interrupted by

Mr. McMILLIN, who said: Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the gentleman having this bill in charge that it does not undertake to clear this man's record in any such way as to render possible a draft upon the Treasury; that the measure is simply a matter of sentiment with the family. I have therefore no objection to the passage of the bill. Otherwise I should desire to know more explicitly the facts.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

The amendment reported by the Committee on Military Affairs was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

EXAMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON COINAGE, WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES.

Mr. VAUX. I am authorized by the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, and also by the chairman of the Committee on Printing, to ask unanimous consent for the adoption of an order for the printing of 10,000 copies of the testimony taken before the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, together with the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the making of the order as requested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a request to the House. I ask unanimous consent that when the House concludes its session this afternoon it adjourn to meet at 8 o'clock this evening.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to taking a recess, but I do object to an adjournment.

Mr. McKINLEY. I am indifferent as to the form in which this arrangement is made. But it seemed to be the understanding last night that we should take up the deficiency bill to-night and conclude it after the special order arranged for to-day had expired, which terminates at 6 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The difference is that if the House fixes a time for a recess it must be specified in advance; while if the order is made in the other way the House can continue its session as long as necessary under the special order.

Mr. ROGERS. The time ought to be specified anyway. If we are to assemble here to-night we ought to have some fixed hour for adjournment during the day. We are human and have to eat and sleep and rest.

Mr. McKINLEY. But under the order fixed on yesterday the House will proceed until 6 o'clock with the special order, unless the general debate be closed before that time. Six o'clock is the hour fixed in the rule.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not see any objection to taking a recess from 6 o'clock until 8.

Mr. McKINLEY. Very well; let that be the order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that a recess be taken from 6 o'clock until 8 this evening. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE PHELAN.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Saturday evening at 4 o'clock be fixed for the eulogies in memory of the late Representative Phelan, from the State of Tennessee, instead of Friday, originally fixed for that purpose, but which has been assigned to the special order arranged on yesterday.

Mr. DINGLEY. I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he has consulted the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman will remember that objection was made on yesterday.

Mr. McMILLIN. I will state to the gentleman from Maine that there has been no consultation with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; but I speak no secret when I say that that was the understanding when the special order was fixed.

Mr. DINGLEY. I have no objection myself, but inasmuch as objection was made on yesterday I thought perhaps it might not be withdrawn.

Mr. McKINLEY. I would ask the gentleman from Tennessee to withhold that request until the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations comes in.

Mr. McMILLIN. I will do so, but my friend will bear me out that I violate no agreement in making the request.

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman from Tennessee is withheld for the present.

LARCENY, ETC., IN POST OFFICES.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the further consideration of the bill (S. 3942) to amend section 5478 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

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

The bill was read at length.

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

Mr. McMILLIN. I object.

Mr. ROGERS. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I do not desire to interfere with unanimous consents, but we have a very small House this morning, and it seems to me that if we are to dispose of any business at all in the absence of a full House, we ought to take up and dispose of the business on the Speaker's table which can be done *nem. con.*

The SPEAKER. The Chair has been recognizing gentlemen in matters which are of practically very small importance so far as the country is concerned, and has been endeavoring not to permit the calling up of any matters to which any serious objection might be made.

Mr. ROGERS. I have no serious objection to the matters called up, excepting this present bill, to which I shall object; but there are a number of matters on the Speaker's table, bridge bills and matters of that kind, in which the people of the Southwestern part of the country are interested, which I hope will be disposed of in due time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the present consideration of the bill which has been read?

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I object until——

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I have objected.

Mr. BINGHAM. I trust the objection will be withdrawn for a moment.

The SPEAKER. Several gentlemen have objected.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I objected simply because I wish to ask the question whether the matter has been considered by the Judiciary Committee? It seems to be a radical change in the law.

Mr. ROGERS. It has been considered by the committee, and the bill laid on the table, and therefore I object.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman withhold the objection for a moment?

Mr. ROGERS. I will not, in a case where the Committee on the Judiciary have laid the bill on the table by a unanimous vote.

HENRY AYRES.

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4212) for the relief of Henry Ayres, and put it upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed and required to pay to Henry Ayres, of Evansville, Ind., the sum of $3,282.68, or such part thereof as the said Ayres shall show to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue was erroneously or illegally assessed or collected, or was collected on deficiencies in the production of spirits which resulted from unavoidable accidents or from misunderstanding of the requirements of the law or regulations.

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

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

NAVIGATION OF THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a protest by the Legislature of Wisconsin against certain legislation pending here, supposed to interfere with the navigation of the Upper Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the memorial will be printed.

There was no objection.

The resolution referred to is as follows:

Joint resolution in relation to the navigation of the Upper Mississippi River.

Whereas the general commercial interests of this State and the other States and Territories of the Northwest require the unobstructed navigation of the Upper Mississippi River; and

Whereas the bill now pending before Congress (Fifty-first Congress, second session), section 4962, entitled "A bill to authorize the Minnesota Boom Company to construct and operate booms and other structures in certain sloughs of the Mississippi River, and to drive and sheer into such booms logs, timber, and lumber found in said river," will, if passed and carried into effect, convert the said Mississippi River between the mouth of the Chippewa River and the city of Winona, a distance of 45 miles, into a log-driving stream under the control of a private corporation, authorizing the building of obstructions therein without the previous sanction of the War Department, and legalizing the running of loose, unrafted logs therein, and in this manner render the navigation of said portion of the river by steamboats dangerous, uncertain, and practically impossible: Now, therefore,

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be earnestly requested to use their utmost endeavors to defeat the passage of said bill.

Resolved, That the governor be, and hereby is, requested to forward copies of these resolutions to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

STATE OF WISCONSIN, *ss:*

We, the speaker and chief clerk of the assembly, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Legislature of this State.

J. J. HOGAN,
Speaker of the Assembly.
G. W. PORTH,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

SARAH K. M'LEAN.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the bill (S. 395) and to put it upon its passage.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proper accounting officers be, and they are hereby, directed to settle and adjust to Sarah K. McLean, widow of the late Lieutenant Colonel Nathaniel H. McLean, all back pay and emoluments that would have been due and payable to the said Nathaniel H. McLean as a major from July 23, 1864, to the date of his reinstatement, March 3, 1875, and that the amount found due by said adjustment is hereby appropriated, to be paid out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

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

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I ask for the reading of the report.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I will state to my friend from Iowa that the report is quite long. Major McLean was on duty at Cincinnati in 1863. My friend may remember that in the administration of the Quartermaster's Department fraud and corruption were discovered. Major McLean was directed by General Burnside to go to the bottom of the thing and make an investigation, which he did, revealing the fact that it reached to high places and to nerve centers. As a result, while he was preparing his report, he was suddenly ordered to Vancouver, in the Northwest, which it took three months to reach. While there he found that assaults were being made upon his character as an officer, attempting to destroy it and to destroy his influence and the report that he had prepared. He had to resign to return to defend himself and his reputation.

The reports were so concealed that he was unable to get his hand on

them for a number of years, and not then until through the aid of General Boynton, who finally, through one of the officers, got hold of the copies of the report. Not until that time was Congress ever advised in regard to the great wrong done this officer. He had been accused of disloyalty and all that kind of thing, when a more loyal heart never beat within the Republic. Thereupon Congress unanimously directed that he be restored to rank and pay. To get that this bill had to be passed. It was favorably reported by the committee of the Senate and passed by that body, favorably reported by the Military Committee of the House and also by the House Committee on Claims. It simply restores him to his position in the Army at that time. He is now dead.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

Mr. BUTTERWORTH moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

WILLIS CORNWELL.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2259) for the relief of Willis Cornwell.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,900 to Willis Cornwell for property taken by the Army for its use during the late war.

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

Mr. CULBERSON, of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear the report read.

Mr. McMILLIN. The report is only a third of a page long, and I will ask that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on War Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2259) for the relief of Willis Cornwell, report as follows:

The claim is for horses, wheat, corn, etc., alleged to have been taken by the Army of the United States during the late war from the claimant in Clay County, Tennessee. Claim stated at $2,900.

The claim was filed in the office of the Quartermaster General, January 21, 1880, and was barred from consideration by the third section of the act of March 3, 1879, which sets forth that all claims not presented and filed under act of July 4, 1861, prior to January 1, 1880, "shall be forever barred."

The records of the Department showing the justice of the claim, and there being no obstacle to its payment except a technical defect in its time of presentation, your committee think that it should be paid. They therefore report back the bill and recommend its passage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause]. The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McMILLIN moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and also moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

GEORGE BROWN.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Mr. Speaker, I have a bill which is similar in character to the one just passed, which I ask to have considered at this time.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I thought we met this morning at 10 o'clock for the purpose of carrying out a special order.

The SPEAKER. That is very true, and the special order can only be interrupted in the way that it is now being interrupted by unanimous consent.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. When the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries fixed this special order I supposed they would be ready, as marines usually are, to go ahead.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and required to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George Brown, of the District of Columbia, the sum of $1,525, the same being in full for, and the receipt of the same to be taken and accepted as a full and final discharge of, the claim examined, investigated, and reported favorably by the Court of Claims of the United States under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

Mr. FARQUHAR moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and also moved to lay the motion to reconsider upon the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent the corresponding House bill (H. R. 2725) was ordered to lie upon the table.

J. MADISON CUTTS.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7490) for the relief of Bvt. Lieut. Col. J. Madison Cutts.

Be it enacted, etc., That in view of the long and faithful services of Bvt. Lieut. Col. J. Madison Cutts, late captain and brevet lieutenant colonel United States Army, and of very severe wounds received by him in battle, creating total disability, the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint him a captain in the Army of the United States, and thereupon to place him on the retired list of the Army as of that grade, the retired list being thereby increased in number to that extent; and all laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby suspended for this purpose only: *Provided*, That from and after the passage of this act no pension shall be paid to the said J. Madison Cutts, nor shall any compensation be paid him for any period prior to his appointment under this act, but this proviso shall be no bar to any claim for pension that his widow or children may have after his decease.

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

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I object for the present in order that I can ask for the reading of the report, subject to objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let the report be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7490) for the relief of Bvt. Lieut. Col. J. Madison Cutts, respectfully report as follows:

We find from the evidence, and a careful examination of his record as certified by the War Department, that this soldier, then a young lawyer, was one of the earliest of those who patriotically enlisted for the defense of the Union.

After serving as a private soldier in the First Rhode Island Volunteers (three-month service) he was commissioned by President Lincoln, at the request of Hon. Stephen A. Douglas, made shortly before his death, as captain of the Eleventh United States Infantry.

After organizing as mustering and disbursing officer Rhode Island troops, cavalry, artillery, and infantry, he was ordered to report for duty on the staff of Major General Burnside, and served on that general's staff as aid-de-camp, judge advocate, and in other staff capacities in his successive commands of the Department of North Carolina, the Ninth Army Corps, the right wing of the Army of the Potomac, the Army of the Potomac, and the Department of the Ohio. During that period he was present in the battles of South Mountain, Antietam, and Fredericksburgh, in which his services were of a very high order of distinction.

He thereafter served with his regiment in the Mine Run campaign of General Meade and in the many battles of General Grant's campaign of the Wilderness, and was acting field officer, and thereafter commanded his regiment at General Grant's headquarters City Point, Va., and at General Meade's headquarters and in the battle of Fort Steadman, Va. His final service was in Louisiana, as commander of the post of Shreveport, La., with subposts at Marshall and Jefferson, Tex.

His services as a soldier were very varied, arduous, unremitted, often extremely hazardous, and involving great responsibilities, and he was at all times noted for ability and fidelity to duty and for conspicuous and distinguished acts of gallantry on many battlefields until, after rallying his regiment, which had been broken by a decimating artillery fire in front of Petersburgh, Va., June 18, 1864, he himself fell, as was at the time supposed mortally wounded, while advancing in front of his regiment in the line of battle which he had reformed.

He then incurred a disability, in the performance of a specific act of great gallantry, sufficient to have entitled him to be at once retired as captain. A little more than two years afterwards he could have been retired under the act of Congress of July 26, 1866, with the rank of his command when wounded, that of a field officer.

Although often urged and advised to avail himself of the provisions of that act, he had no desire to become a charge upon the country he had helped to save, and remained in the service, although seriously disabled, hoping still to be of service to his country.

He resigned June 19, 1868, under circumstances of great personal distress and after having been tried by a court-martial on two sets of charges, which seem to have originated largely from personal difficulties with one of his officers.

At the time of his resignation Colonel Cutts believed that the court-martial had sentenced him to dismissal, but was entirely ignorant of the fact that the court had unanimously recommended, not mitigation or leniency, but the entire and absolute remission of the sentence, thus, while rendering a technical or *pro forma* judgment, themselves declaring that in view of all the circumstances the accused was not strictly amenable to their sentence.

This fact, by reason of his resignation, was not known to Colonel Cutts until May, 1890, and has only lately been officially certified by the Secretary of War to your committee.

His career since his resignation has been one of long-continued, useful, and honorable effort in civil and professional life. The committee believe it highly to his honor, and after marrying and having eleven children, seven of whom are now living, he has forborne to press his claim and appeal for relief, until no longer able, by reason of disability, the result of his wounds and exposures in the service, to bear the cares, anxieties, and wants of his large family.

In view of his long-continued and distinguished services, entitling him in a marked degree to the gratitude of his country, the committee recommend that he be honorably restored to the status he held when wounded, and accordingly report favorably the bill for his retirement in the Army with the rank of captain.

In justice to the soldier and in support of their action, your committee append the statements of the many distinguished soldiers, living and dead, who were his friends, immediate and associates, and comrades in arms.

APPENDIX.

Captain Cutts rendered efficient services as mustering and disbursing officer in organizing Rhode Island troops, for which he was personally thanked by the governor of that State.

Maj. Gen. William Sprague, late governor of Rhode Island, writes:

"COLONEL: Say from me that your early action, the earliest who stirred, becoming the forlorn hope, against the organized South, entitles you to great consideration. More than that, your more than interested relations South would have restrained you had you not been more than ordinarily imbued with patriotic ardor. Besides, were you not the brother-in-law of Stephen A. Douglas? Your services were of a high order here, and I unite fully with all who certify to your services, with equally praiseworthy ones under my official eye."

The statements of Maj. Gens. Samuel D. Sturgis, J. D. Cox, John F. Hartranft, Hugh Ewing, Henry J. Hunt, and William B. Franklin fully cover the period of his staff services.

Says General Sturgis:

"I was well acquainted with Colonel Cutts during the campaign in Maryland in 1862, and can not speak in terms too high of the valuable, arduous, and often

hazardous services which he rendered at the battles of South Mountain and Antietam. My personal acquaintance with Colonel Cutts included also his services at the battle of Fredericksburgh, Va., in the fall of 1862, where his services were well understood by the army corps (Ninth) to which we both belonged.

"I believe it may be safely said of Colonel Cutts that there are few officers of his rank and opportunities who have done so much and received so little in return."

Writes General J. D. Cox:

"I take pleasure in stating that during the years 1862 and 1863 I was well acquainted with the military standing of Col. (then Captain) J. Madison Cutts, who was then serving on the staff of Major General Burnside, commanding the right wing of the Army of the Potomac. This brought me in constant intercourse with the gentlemen of General Burnside's staff, and I know that Captain Cutts was among the most energetic, brave, and intelligent of the officers in that service. He sought active field service as acting aid, and was found wherever severe duty was to be done."

Says General Hunt:

"I knew and esteemed Colonel Cutts during the late war, whilst he was serving on the staff of General Burnside, commanding the Army of the Potomac, my own headquarters being with those of General Burnside.

"He bore the character of an active, intelligent, and efficient officer, not only during that time, but in the previous campaign in Maryland, when General McClellan commanded that army.

"After he joined his regiment I did not personally see so much of him, but his services were always well spoken of until he was disabled by a severe wound received in one of the assaults on Petersburgh in June, 1864."

Writes General Hartranft:

"I was well acquainted with Col. J. M. Cutts during his services with the Army of the Potomac and up to the time of his disabling wound in front of Petersburgh, June, 1864.

"He was distinguished for bravery and unswerving fidelity to duty, and I cheerfully testify to the very high regard in which he was held by his comrades and his superior officers. On the staff of Major General Burnside and with his regiment he fully met every requirement of a gallant soldier and true patriot."

Says General Hugh Ewing:

"The troops which I commanded were led to their position in line of battle at Antietam by Colonel Cutts, and the soldierly skill, coolness, and bright courage displayed by him that day won from me the highest admiration.

"He displayed on that field the noble qualities that go to make up the brilliant soldier, and I do not recall a single other officer during the entire course of the war that so quickly and profoundly impressed me.

"What more can I say? He was a bright light on the field of battle, cheering up the duller spirits, and by such service long continued as few rendered or could render, he secured the gratitude of the soldier and earned the lasting gratitude of the Republic."

Writes General Franklin:

"I well remember the fact that you were with me at the first battle of Fredericksburgh, December 13, 1862, as a member of the staff of General Burnside, the commanding general, I being at the time the commander of the left grand division. The service that you then rendered was brave, able, and efficient, and deserved honorable recognition by the authorities, although I have never heard that you received it. As our paths led in different directions after that time, I can not speak positively of your service afterwards; but I know that it was honorable and distinguished, and that you were severely wounded in action and were entitled to have been placed on the retired list had you applied to be so placed. I do not think that, under the circumstances, you ought to be considered as having lost your right to such a position now, and sincerely hope that you will be successful in your efforts to have your merits recognized by the action of Congress, for which you ask."

Says Maj. Gen. Rufus Ingalls, chief quartermaster of the armies operating against Richmond:

"This certifies that I have personally known Col. J. Madison Cutts, captain Eleventh Infantry, for years, running back before he entered the Army. I saw much of him while he served in the Army of the Potomac on General Burnside's staff and with his regiment. I saw him at City Point when dangerously wounded in battle on the 18th of June, 1864, and sent him to Washington for treatment. He is a man of fine education and had a robust constitution before his hard and dangerous service, but is now enfeebled from the effects of this service and wounds. As a soldier he stood high with all who served with him. No one questioned his ability, patriotism, and bravery. He served faithfully, and is deserving of his country now in his day of need."

In the early days of his recovery, while still confined to his bed, Captain Cutts was cheered and strengthened by a letter written by General Griffin, his division commander, to Mrs. Griffin, and by her brought to him to read.

Writes General Griffin:

"I asked General Ayres to-day how Captain Cutts was getting, and he replied he understood he was out of danger, and added he had made his mark as a gallant officer this campaign.

"I doubt whether any officer of the regulars has been so specially gallant and attentive to duty as Captain Cutts, and it was a subject of universal remark before he was wounded or thought he was going to die; still, it would not have surprised anyone who had known his father."

Writes General Ayres, his brigade commander:

"My knowledge of Colonel Cutts dates back to his army service. He joined my command in 1861, and was with it in that long series of battles commencing with the Wilderness, through that, Spottsylvania Courthouse, the North Anna, Cold Harbor, and the crossing of the James, to the front of Petersburgh, when, in the assault on that place, June 18, he was severely wounded and carried from the field.

"His good conduct was marked in all those battles, and in some of the severest his gallantry was conspicuous. He was a soldier who deserves well of his country."

And again, in a separate paper, General Ayres, writing from personal knowledge, as an eyewitness of the circumstances under which Colonel Cutts was wounded, says:

"I have the honor to state, from personal knowledge, that Bvt. Lieut. Col. J. Madison Cutts, late captain Eleventh Infantry, was second in command of his regiment (and acting field officer) on the 18th of June, 1864.

"In the engagement in front of Petersburgh, Va., on that day a spherical case shot burst in front of the regiment, killing seven men and wounding twenty-three others. Of course confusion in the regiment followed. Colonel Cutts stepped to the front and straightened out the line. While doing so he was severely wounded, and carried from the field. His conduct was, as on former occasions, conspicuous and gallant."

It now remains to refer to the statement of that most distinguished and skillful surgeon, Dr. Basil Norris, United States Army, who attended Colonel Cutts while wounded. He writes:

"Capt. J. M. Cutts, Eleventh United States Infantry, was wounded on the 18th of June, 1864, in front of Petersburgh, Va., while acting as field officer, and, as I have been informed, advancing in line of battle in front of his regiment.

"He was conveyed to Washington, where he arrived June 20, 1864, and placed under my treatment, and continued under my care until September following. His wound was a gunshot wound (rifle ball) of left side. The ball entered between the eighth and ninth ribs on a line below the axilla, fractured the ninth rib, penetrated the lung, and made its exit between the ninth and tenth ribs at a point about 1 inch from the spinal column.

"Captain Cutts was brevetted lieutenant colonel for gallant and distinguished services in that campaign of the Army of the Potomac, having previously rendered conspicuous services in the preceding campaigns of the same army.

"His wound created a permanent disability, which then, and ever since, would have entitled him, had he requested while in the service, to be placed on the retired list.

"He never made such application, but before his wounds were entirely healed rejoined his regiment and sought opportunities for further service and distinction.

"He resigned in 1868, and now, with a large family, after a long interval of honorable exertion, he finds himself no longer able to contend against his increasing disabilities incurred in the line of duty and in battle.

"Informed, as I am, that Colonel Cutts will apply to Congress to be placed on the retired list of the Army, I would respectfully say that such recognition of his services and sufferings would only be in accordance with the custom of service in the regular Army in like cases, and that I believe he abundantly merits such consideration."

Colonel Cutts was twice brevetted for gallant and distinguished services. He was recommended for the colonelcy of one of the regiments of General Hancock's veteran corps. Although strongly commended by his brigade, division, corps, and army commanders, Generals Ayres, Griffin, Warren, and Meade, and although his detail was requested by General Hancock in person, it was declined and refused by the Secretary of War, because he decided that the veteran corps was designed to bring back into the service those that were out of it, and he therefore would not order the detail of an officer already in the Army.

The indorsement of that distinguished soldier Maj. Gen. G. K. Warren, the commander of the Fifth Army Corps, with reference to Captain Cutts's promotion to the colonelcy of a veteran corps regiment, followed the recommendations of his brigade and division commanders, Generals Ayres and Griffin, and was as follows:

"HEADQUARTERS FIFTH ARMY CORPS, *August 24*, 1864.

"I could add nothing to the recommendations above, which I fully indorse. I hope such faithful service and suffering will not go unrewarded."

Writes Maj. Gen. Edward Ferrero:

"It affords me great pleasure to recommend Col. J. M. Cutts, having known him personally while connected with the Ninth Army Corps. A brave and accomplished officer, whose faithful services during the late war entitle him to the kind consideration of his fellow-men in general. I sincerely hope that his wishes to be retired will meet with the approval of the Senate and House."

Writes Maj. Gen. and Ex-President R. B. Hayes:

"During the Antietam campaign I served in the same corps with Colonel Cutts, and have sufficient information of his services throughout the war to be well assured that it was of decided merit.

"I am confident that he deserves the relief that Congress is asked to afford, and I trust sincerely that it will be granted."

Testifies Brig. Gen. David B. McKibben:

"It affords me great pleasure to add my testimony to your gallantry on the field of battle and to your high soldierly character when we served together in the Army of the Potomac. The records of the War Department show this. All your brother officers were witnesses of it. Such being the case, a generous country will not refuse its aid, only asked for when broken down by wounds and disease incurred battling for its existence.

"I sincerely wish you success, and I have not the slightest doubt you will achieve it. No one has a better claim and few as richly deserve of their country."

Writes Maj. Gen. Orlando B. Willcox, now governor Soldiers' Home:

"I have read the abstract of your service in the Army with great interest, and cheerfully add my testimony to the mass of evidence to your distinguished services during our acquaintance in the war of the rebellion.

"I remember your activity and great usefulness in the fights at South Mountain and Antietam, particularly where, as aid-de-camp to General Burnside, you contributed so much to success, and I may safely say that no staff officer habitually exposed himself to danger in carrying orders and gaining intelligence more than yourself.

"In my humble judgment you are richly deserving retirement, with the rank of captain at least."

Testifies Maj. Gen. George W. Getty:

"I fully concur in all that has been said in your behalf.

"During the Maryland campaign, which resulted in the battles of South Mountain and Antietam, I was the chief of artillery of the right wing of the Army of the Potomac. You rendered most efficient aid to me in selecting positions for the artillery, and subsequently in conducting the batteries to the positions selected.

"In the Virginia campaign, under Major General Burnside, your services were active and dangerous in carrying orders and gaining intelligence of the movements of General Lee's army. No staff officer on General Burnside's staff rendered more efficient and valuable services than yourself.

"Your services during the war were eminent and honorable, deserving the highest consideration.

"I do most sincerely hope that Congress, as a simple act of justice, will grant the relief you ask."

During the reading of the report,

Mr. KERR, of Iowa, said: Mr. Speaker, I will waive the reading and withhold the objection and let the House vote upon the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

LOGAN COUNTY, OHIO.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 11003) to detach the county of Logan, in the State of Ohio, from the northern and attach it to the southern judicial district of said State.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the county of Logan, in the State of Ohio, be detached from the northern and attached to the southern judicial district of the State of Ohio and assigned to the eastern subdivision therein.

SEC. 2. That all civil and criminal causes or proceedings now pending in the northern district of Ohio which originated in said county of Logan shall remain within the jurisdiction of the United States court for said northern judicial district for final disposition, and all offenses committed in said county

against the laws of the United States before the passage of this act shall also be cognizable in the United States court for the said northern district until final disposition of the same.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

AUDITOR OF RAILROAD ACCOUNTS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who desires to call up a public bill.

Mr. DALZELL. I ask for the present consideration of the bill (S. 590) to amend an act entitled "An act to create an auditor of railroad accounts, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1878.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress approved June 19,1878,entitled "An act to create an auditor of railroad accounts, and for other purposes," be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding to the same three sections, to be numbered 5, 6, and 7, respectively, and which new sections shall be in the words following:

"SEC. 5. That each and every railroad company aforesaid which has received from the United States any bonds of the said United States, issued by way of loan to aid in constructing or furnishing its road, shall hereafter transmit to the Commissioner of Railroads a duplicate of each and every bill for services in the transportation of passengers or freight, the carrying of mails, express, or for any service whatsoever rendered for or on behalf of the United States.

"SEC. 6. That it shall be the duty of the Commissioner of Railroads, upon receiving bills for transportation services named in the foregoing section of this act, to immediately cause the same to be entered of record in suitable books provided for that purpose, giving the name of the railroad company, date and nature of service, and amount claimed. After such bills shall have been so entered the commissioner shall at once forward the same to the proper accounting officers. It shall also be the duty of said commissioner, upon receiving from any accounting officer of the Government a report of the action taken by him on bills rendered against the United States for transportation services by any of the railroad companies referred to in section 5 of this act, to make entries of the action taken by said accounting officers in the books where the original bills are entered and opposite the original entries. When final action shall have been taken and reported as herein provided by the accounting officers upon any bill, whether it be disallowed or allowed in whole or in part, the said commissioner shall report to the railroad company presenting the bill the action that has been taken thereon.

"SEC. 7. That all accounting officers of the Government who are charged with the duty of examining, auditing, allowing, or paying the bills for transportation services rendered by any of the railroad companies referred to in section 5 of this act shall, when such bills are acted upon, promptly report the action taken thereon to the Commissioner of Railroads. Said accounting officers shall also, immediately upon the passage of this act, furnish to the Commissioner of Railroads a complete list of all bills and accounts of the aforesaid railroad companies which are in their hands and have not been audited, allowed, or paid.

"Sections numbered 5, 6, and 7 of the act to which this act is an amendment shall be numbered sections 8, 9, and 10, respectively."

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I reserve objection until I can hear an explanation of the bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope that we will have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, under the laws that now exist it is the duty of the Commissioner of Railroads to state the accounts between the Pacific bond-aided railroads and the Government. That law does not impose on the railroads the duty of furnishing such accounts to the Commissioner of Railroads, and he is, therefore, unable to state the accounts until he has gathered them by getting the bills from the various Departments. Now, the purposes of this bill are simply to compel the Pacific Railroad companies to send duplicate copies of their accounts to the Commissioner of Railroads, so that any citizen may at any time find in the hands of the commissioner an exact statement of the accounts of these railroads. The bill is called for by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will explain the benefit it is to the Government that these reports shall be made to the Commissioner of Railroads.

Mr. DALZELL. Because the Commissioner of Railroads is supposed under the law to have in his office at all times an exact statement of accounts between the railroad companies and the Government; but inasmuch as the railroad companies are not bound to send their accounts to the Commissioner of Railroads, he can only state such amounts after they have come to him in regular order, and after they have been audited and paid.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to call up something else while that conversation is going on?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it would not be strictly in order.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to know if the effect of this act would not be to give the accounts of the railroad corporations a special advantage over other accounts before the accounting officers?

Mr. DALZELL. Not at all.

Mr. HOLMAN. Because it requires the accounting officers to promptly settle these accounts.

Mr. DALZELL. The Commissioner of Railroads can not state the accounts of the railroads sometimes until a year or two after the accounts have been settled; and therefore the records of his office are incomplete.

Mr. HOLMAN. I see that; but the effect of this will be to secure early consideration of the accounts.

Mr. DALZELL. Not at all; the effect is simply to show both the debit and the credit side of the account while the account is pending.

Mr. HOLMAN. That would be valuable, perhaps, if it should go back to the beginning, but it will now be an imperfect record; and the office of Commissioner of Railroads is really of no value, and is rendering the country no service, I think.

Mr. DALZELL. If the gentleman will permit a letter to be read from the Secretary of the Interior I think he will be better satisfied with the bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. I would be glad to hear it.

Mr. CANNON. I agree with the gentleman from Indiana fully that the office of Commissioner of Railroads is not of any use now, but it seems that this would make it a little useful.

Mr. DALZELL. That is another question. I wish the gentleman from Indiana to listen to the reading of the letter, and I think it will remove his objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, February 7, 1891.

SIR: Referring to Senate bill 590, to amend an act entitled "An act to create an auditor of railroad accounts, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1878, I beg leave to call your attention to the importance of securing the passage of this measure at the present session of Congress. This bill makes it the duty of all railroad companies which are indebted to the United States for bonds and interest on the same, loaned to aid in the construction and furnishing of these roads, to transmit to the Commissioner of Railroads a duplicate of each and every bill for services in the transportation of passengers or freight, the carrying of mails, express, or for any service whatever rendered for or on behalf of the Government.

It is to the interest of the Government to know the exact condition of its accounts with the railroad companies it has aided and whose obligations it holds. As accounts are rendered at present it is vexatious and almost impossible to secure such information. Were duplicates of all accounts rendered as provided in the pending measure, which would incur little, if any, additional expense, then the records of the office of the Commissioner of Railroads would at all times give easy access to any information that might be desired by Congress or any of the Departments of the Government in regard to the amount of indebtedness of any of the bonded roads.

I can not imagine any possible objection that can be urged against the bill, and its early passage by the House of Representatives will most surely aid in the matter of a satisfactory and correct administration of the affairs of the Government in connection with its railroad services.

Very respectfully,

GEO. CHANDLER, *Acting Secretary.*

Hon. JOHN DALZELL,
Chairman Committee on Pacific Railroads,
House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BIGGS. Yes, sir, there is objection. I want to examine that bill. I have not yet had an opportunity to do so.

Subsequently,

Mr. DALZELL said: Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill just read.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California withdraw his objection?

Mr. BIGGS. I do not.

Subsequently,

Mr. BIGGS said: I withdraw my objection. I have seen the bill, and think it is a proper one; and therefore withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suspend the reading of the bill now being read and ask if there be further objection.

Mr. BYNUM. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

GEORGE W. QUINTARD AND GEORGE E. WEED.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1160) for the relief of George W. Quintard and George E. Weed, assignees of John Roach, deceased.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I think that if a bill requiring the Pacific railroads to state their accounts and transmit them to the Commissioner of Railroads can not be considered we had better have the regular order.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to pay to George W. Quintard and George E. Weed, assignees of John Roach, deceased, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sums and on the following accounts, that is to say, the sum of $38,840.40 for extra work done by order of the Navy Department requiring a change in the specifications and increase of the dimensions of the iron frame and hull of the monitor Puritan; and the further sum of $20,274.25 for the care, towage, pilotage, and wharfage of the monitor Roanoke from March 17, 1877, to September 9, 1883.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I would like to know how this bill is being read.

The SPEAKER. It is being read subject to objection.

The reading of the bill was resumed and concluded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope that there will be some explanation of the measure. I ask that the report be read.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the gentleman from Indiana, I will state that this bill, as favorably reported from the Committee on Claims, calls for the relief of George W. Quintard and

George E. Weed, assignees of John Roach, deceased. This claim, Mr. Speaker, has been pending for the period of sixteen years and is for work done for the Government as far back as that time.

The amount embraced in this bill comprises two claims—one for increasing the dimensions of the iron frame or hull of the Puritan, the other being for the care, towage, wharfage, etc., of the Roanoke. All the work done and for which compensation is claimed was performed by the late John Roach, and was not included in the original contract.

As reported from the Committee on Claims, there is nothing charged for in said account but the reasonable value of the work performed.

Many precedents might be cited as going to show that similar acts of relief were passed for such extra work performed, notably an act approved on the 10th of last June appropriating $33,384 to the Union Iron Works of San Francisco for work done on the cruiser Charleston. Also another, approved September 30, 1890, for the relief of the Columbian Iron Works and Dry Dock Company of Baltimore City; that amount was $56,450.

No person who thoroughly understands this bill will for a moment object to its passage; no man who desires to act honestly will refuse to support and vote for it.

The Committee on Claims, in a very lengthy report, recommends the passage of the bill, and believing, as I do, that it is a thoroughly honest, a thoroughly just measure, I hope there may be no objections to it, and that the bill will pass.

Mr. HOLMAN. The report is very short, and I ask that it be read.

The report (by Mr. RAY) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1160) for the relief of George W. Quintard and George E. Weed, assignees of John Roach, deceased, respectfully submit the following report:

The bill H. R. 4409, which is an exact copy of the Senate bill, has heretofore been considered by the committee and favorably reported. (Report No. 415.)

The committee recommend the substitution of the Senate bill for the House bill when the latter is reached on the Calendar, and that it be passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the bill H. R. 4409, of the same title, will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

REFUND OF DUTIES.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. STUMP], who is absent, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the desk, the bill (H. R. 6186) authorizing the refunding of the duties paid on a painted glass window imported by the rector of St. Mary's Church, county of Harford, State of Maryland.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to release and refund, and pay to William F. Brand, rector of St. Mary's Protestant Episcopal Church, in the county of Harford, State of Maryland, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $126.82, it being the amount of duty paid by him in April, 1875, on paintings on glass intended, and imported for, and used in, a window in said church.

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

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I ask for the reading of the report.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I will say to the gentleman that the bill is reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee. It simply provides for a refund, such as is usually made in these cases. But if the gentleman desires to have the report read it can be read. It is very short.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I would like to hear the report.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be no objection to this bill.

Mr. DINGLEY. Under the present law the glass would be admitted free of duty.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Maine, that under the present law this glass would come in free, I will not ask for the reading of the report.

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

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

HENRY L. MOREY.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 12152) for the relief of Henry L. Morey.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to amend the record of Capt. Henry L. Morey, Company G, Seventy-fifth Ohio Volunteers, to show him continuously in service as captain of said company from March 1, 1863, date of his muster in, until December 22, 1864, the date of his muster out.

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

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

R. F. BALKE.

Mr. CARUTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9599) for the relief of R. F. Balke.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to remit and abate the deficiency tax on 3,456 gallons of spirits assessed against R. F. Balke, as Mellwood Distillery Company, for the months of May and part of June, 1888, said deficiency having resulted from an erroneous survey of the said distillery, and not from any fraud or fault of said Balke.

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

Mr. DINGLEY. I would like to know if this is recommended by the Department.

Mr. CARUTH. It is recommended, and the payment is held up by the commissioner in order that this bill may be passed.

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

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SAWYER was recognized.

Mr. BYNUM. I demand the regular order.

LAND COURT BILL.

Mr. CASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the appointment of a committee of conference on the land court bill. It will take but a moment. The Senate has amended the bill, and has made a slight omission which is almost fatal to the object of the bill, and they ask for a conference. I make the motion *pro forma* that the House nonconcur and agree to a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CASWELL] asks unanimous consent that the House nonconcur in the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9798) to establish a United States land court and to provide a judicial investigation and settlement of private land claims in the Territories of Utah and New Mexico, and the States of Colorado, Nevada, and Wyoming, and agree to a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLMAN. Is this the bill that allows the parties to go to the Court of Claims?

Mr. CASWELL. No. This is a bill that was passed almost unanimously here, and the Senate have made an amendment and they ask for a conference.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope that we shall hear the amendment read.

Mr. CASWELL. It is very long. They propose an entirely new bill, but with no substantial change.

Mr. MCCREARY. What is the change?

Mr. CASWELL. Really, the only change is that the Senate omitted by accident a provision to provide for settlers on small parcels of land. They concede that the omission was an accident, but it is absolutely necessary that the provision shall go in. As the gentleman from New Mexico will tell you, the omission would be almost fatal to the interest of the small settlers.

Mr. JOSEPH. Yes. The bill is very acceptable with a few *pro forma* amendment which will protect the small holders of lands in my Territory, and which I have no doubt will be readily agreed upon in conference.

Mr. HOLMAN. Does this apply to Arizona?

Mr. CASWELL. Yes, they make it apply to Arizona.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope it will not be made to apply to Arizona until the gentleman representing that Territory can be heard.

Mr. FITHIAN. Let us have the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPRINGER. I hope the regular order will not be insisted upon until this matter is disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FITHIAN] demands the regular order.

Mr. FITHIAN. I withdraw the demand as to this matter, but I will insist upon it after this is disposed of.

There being no further objection, the motion of Mr. CASWELL was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. CASWELL, Mr. WICKHAM, and Mr. MONTGOMERY.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of the tonnage bill.

The SPEAKER. The order provides for that.

Mr. BELKNAP. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to withhold his motion for a moment, while I present a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BELKNAP] for the consideration of the conference report?

Mr. McMILLIN. The time has been encroached upon so much already that I do not think we ought to entertain anything else now.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the objection.

Mr. BELKNAP. This is a conference report on a pension bill. It is very brief.

Mr. McMILLIN. Well, I think the special order is so important that this matter ought to be held up until that is disposed of.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Saturday evening of this week be set apart for the consideration of bills presented by the Committee on the District of Columbia, the session to begin at 8 o'clock.

Mr. CANNON. I think the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] is a proper one, but it should be accompanied with the provision that the order shall not interfere with the consideration of appropriation bills, revenue bills, or conference reports.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Before any unanimous consent is given to the proposition of the gentleman from Vermont, I would like to request of the gentleman that he shall not present at that special evening ssesion any railroad bills for this District.

Mr. GROUT. Very well.

Mr. HEARD. Then I object. If the gentleman from Vermont proposes to let the gentleman from Kansas dictate the order of business for the committee, I propose to object to any such proceeding.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. We have given enough of our franchises to corporations already. I object.

The SPEAKER (while a colloquy was proceeding between Mr. GROUT and Mr. HEARD). The House will be in order. Objection has been made to the request of the gentleman from Vermont. Under the order already adopted the House now resolves itself into Committee of the Whole, and the Reporters will not take notes of the remarks of members who are engaging in discussion without the recognition of the Chair.

THE SHIPPING BILL.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole (Mr. BURROWS in the chair) and resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3738) to place the American merchant marine engaged in the foreign trade upon an equality with that of other nations.

The CHAIRMAN. In pursuance of the special order of the House, the session of to-day until 6 o'clock is assigned for general debate on this bill.

Mr. FARQUHAR. When this bill was last under consideration the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] had thirty minutes of his time remaining. Before he resumes I desire to suggest an understanding that the time to be occupied in debate by the friends of the bill shall be controlled by myself as chairman of the committee, and the time occupied by the opponents of the bill controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FITHIAN], a member of the committee.

Mr. HOLMAN. I would like to have some understanding as to the length of time to be consumed, especially on this side of the House.

Mr. DINGLEY. The opponents of the bill will have half of the time until 6 o'clock.

Mr. FITHIAN. The general debate, according to the special order, is to close at 6 o'clock this evening. The time meanwhile will be divided equally between the two sides of the House.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is, between those in favor of the bill and those opposed to it.

Mr. FITHIAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLMAN. I do not know that the order can be made in the Committee of the Whole, but if it could be I would like to request that there be a session from 8 till 10 o'clock to-night for the continuation of the general discussion on this bill.

Mr. FARQUHAR. By an order agreed upon this morning before the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] came into the House this evening was assigned for other business.

The CHAIRMAN. In the absence of objection, the time allowed for debate during the day on this bill will be equally divided between gentlemen on the two sides of the measure, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR] controlling the time occupied in favor of the measure and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FITHIAN] controlling that in opposition. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. FARQUHAR. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] is now entitled to the floor for thirty minutes.

Mr. DOCKERY. I ask the gentleman to yield to me for the announcement that the vote on the Pacific railroad item of the general deficiency bill will, according to agreement, be taken to-night at 10 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago, during the consideration of the general deficiency bill, some gentleman proposed an amendment allowing me $10,000 additional pay for extra services in the preservation of order during this session of Congress. That proposition was withdrawn upon the suggestion that the sum was not adequate. [Laughter.] Now, I do appeal to members that the last hours of the Fifty-first Congress shall not excel in disorder the first.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order, that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] may proceed with his remarks.

[Mr. GROSVENOR addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. FARQUHAR. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. FITHIAN. The understanding was that we were to have the next thirty minutes on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FITHIAN] claims the floor the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. FITHIAN. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I am at a great loss to account for the change which has come over the spirit of the dream of our friends on the other side of the House. Within the space of a few short revolving moons our Republican friends stood in this Hall and the other and before the American people, claiming that our home market ought to be protected against the introduction of the products of the labor of the people in all other parts of the world. The echoes of these patriotic speeches are almost resounding around the Hall yet.

Gentlemen went back and brought up the old doctrines of their philosophers, of Mr. Henry C. Carey, who contended that the Almighty had not made this world right in leaving it with oceans which could be crossed with the products of the labor of one people to be exchanged for the products of another; that these oceans ought to have been set on fire, so that no one could go from this country to any other country of the globe and no one could come from any other country to this; that the ocean should be like that dark river that divides the finally impenitent from the blessed, which poets tell us is tossed with fires and with no sounds heard upon its bosom but groans that are groaned and sighs that are sighed, and where tears ever weep and ever fall, but not in mercy's sight. [Applause.]

Mr. Carey boldly contended that if it were within human power we ought to invent something to set the oceans on fire. Professor Thompson, a late philosopher of that faith, contends that it would be better to hang every American sailor at the yardarm of his vessel than to permit him to be engaged in carrying the surplus products of the people of the United States to foreign countries, to be exchanged for the products of the labor of other people that are calculated to satisfy the wants of our people.

And but recently the third illustrious disciple of that faith has been writing in one of the magazines inculcating the same doctrine. He says that foreign trade is a contemptible braggart that ought to be overthrown; yet that very same gentleman, a distinguished manufacturer of steel rails, has been appointed by this Administration as one of the members of the Pan-American Congress to negotiate for a reciprocity that will let his steel rails into South America. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Why this great change? What does it mean? The earth rings in every direction with the acclamations of the same disciples of the same political party, the same zealous missionaries who want reciprocity and trade, reciprocity defined by lines of latitude. "We want reciprocity," they say, "for another bushel of wheat and another barrel of pork." If this is what they want, why do they not try to negotiate with England or with France or with Germany?

Why do they not try to negotiate a little with themselves? England has put down the bars and is ready to welcome the admission of every bushel of our wheat, every barrel of our pork. You feed from your Western farms the crowded populations that stand in her factories, and from the fields of the South we furnish the great staple that gives employment to her people to manufacture clothing for the population of the globe. She is willing to take more of our cotton, more of our wheat, more of our pork, more of our agricultural products if you will only take down the bars and extinguish the fire in the ocean, stop hanging your American sailors to the yardarms of your vessels.

You say you want foreign trade. But you have built up an intervening wall. Twelve months ago you said you did not want to come in contact with foreign paupers. Now you want to trade with them; and in order to get that trade you are proposing to pay out money wrung by exorbitant, wicked taxation from the laboring people of this country—money to build ships to go over the seas that you have set on fire—seas from which you have prohibited navigation by declaring that any vessel which sails the ocean displaying your flag must come back in ballast.

Why, sir, the distinguished leaders of the Republican party in the Senate made a report two years ago that we could not compete in the markets of the world with our wheat, that it was a melancholy fact confronting the American people that we must look to the home market alone for the consumption of our wheat, that we must cease speaking

about sending wheat to Europe and exchanging it for their calicoes, their woolens, their iron, their steel. What did those Republican Senators propose to do in order to relieve the situation? Why they gravely proposed to send to Europe and import her population to come here and eat up our wheat!

Now, Mr. Chairman, our production of wheat is about 500,000,000 bushels per annum. We consume annually less than 5 bushels per head. We may assume that our domestic consumption is 320,000,000 bushels, although it is less than that. This leaves 180,000,000 bushels which our friends tell us must not be exported. They say we must import a population here to consume it. When that foreign population comes here they will eat our wheat I suppose in just about the proportion that we do, though they do not do it at home.

I can prove by every Republican stump speaker in the Union that we are better fed, better housed, better clothed than any other people on the globe. But we will assume that these foreigners coming here will eat five bushels of wheat per head annually. Then it will require 36,000,000 of people to be imported the first year to consume the surplus 180,000,000 bushels of the wheat of the United States. That is what you are building your ships for—to send over to Europe to transport those people to the United States to consume our wheat.

They tell us, besides, that this must be a nonagricultural people to do this. They say that if these are agriculturists they will only make more wheat and add to the surplus. It must, therefore, be the people who are brought here, in pursuance of the protective policy, who will consume and not add to the surplus—people who will eat wheat and not make it.

Let me read their statement to you. It is startling:

The competition in wheat growing which has been developed in India, South America, Australia, and in the British possessions in North America is likely to make unprofitable the production of this cereal for exportation by our people, and to cause the wheat-grower of the Northwest to look to an enlargement of the certain and remunerative home market. This enlarged and profitable market can only be secured by increasing the number of people engaged in other than agricultural pursuits, and by furnishing to all increased employment without diminution of wages.

* * * * * * *

Wheat can now be laid down in Liverpool from the central provinces of India at as low a cost for transportation as from Chicago, and Indian wheat can be delivered in New York at less cost for transportation than from the wheat fields of Dakota.

This is a strange statement, and the strangest thing about it is that we are annually exporting wheat at a lower export price than any people in the world, and do it because we produce it cheaper than any people in the world.

It is a startling problem, Mr. Chairman, that we are to import as many people as are to-day in the whole Kingdom of Great Britain into the United States in one single year to consume the surplus wheat product, and that all of these are to be other than farmers. Think of it for a moment!

About one-third of all our people, as the census shows, are engaged in gainful occuptions. Then one-third of those who must come under this protective policy must come and engage in gainful occupations, and the other two-thirds, being the women and children, are to be supported by the labor of the one-third.

Twelve millions of people, being the one-third of 36,000,000, the total number of people required to consume the surplus are to be laborers engaged in the factories and other gainful occupations throughout the country. Well, 4,000,000 of our people, it is estimated, make the manufactured product of America, amounting to seven thousand millions annually. Three times four are twelve, and the 12,000,000 of persons employed in manufacturing products, being the addition to our population under this policy, would make twenty-one thousand millions of manufactured products in place of seven thousand millions; and where will we get the market for its sale?

Why, you can not consume your own products now, and you are hunting markets for your manufactures under the name of a "bushel of wheat and a barrel of pork." We can not consume them ourselves, and here you are proposing this policy to the people of the United States, to import 36,000,000 of people in one year to eat up the surplus wheat made by the labor of our country. We have not imported 36,000,000 people during the hundred years of our existence.

But, Mr. Chairman, this plan is still more startling when it is applied to the cotton product of the country. The same gentleman, who is one of the members of the Pan-American Congress, has thought proper to criticise me severely because I advocate the removal of the obstructions to our foreign trade. He says that I am a representative of the great cotton interests of the country, and as such ought to want the people of America—our manufacturers—to consume the whole product of the cotton fields of the South.

Let us see for a moment how this would be. What is our cotton product? Last year it amounted to 3,600,000,000 of pounds. We consume in the United States 1,100,000,000 of pounds. More than two-thirds, therefore, of the entire cotton product, with all of your high tariffs and protection, is still going out into the world to be manufactured. The McKinley bill have not arrested its departure, and the thirty years of protection have not changed it. Two-thirds of it still constantly goes to other factories in other countries. We consume about 18 pounds of raw cotton per head of our population.

If the people of Europe consumed one-half of it—and they do not, for it is estimated that Great Britain consumes about one-half and the continent of Europe less than half as much as we do per capita—but if all European countries consumed 9 pounds per capita it would take more than 250,000,000 of people to be brought from Europe to come here to consume the surplus of one year's cotton crop! What a magnificent development of statesmanship! [Applause on the Democratic side.] Instead of sending our surplus abroad, sending the things we do not want in exchange for the things we do want, to benefit ourselves and our fellow-men, they propose to break up all the habitations of all the people of the globe and bring them here to consume our surplus and hunt up employment here! [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You say you want ships. Why not build them? You have the protective policy. You say it develops American industries. You say it cheapens and brings down the cost of production. But there is one thing at least that the history of the last few months shows you have succeeded in cheapening, and may be you think that is "nasty" too; you have succeeded in cheapening American labor in all parts of the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Yes, Mr. Chairman, since the passage of the McKinley bill, if you will take up the papers of the country, you will see a string like long skeleton fingers pointing to factories which have curtailed—stricken down—the wages of their employés, and there is a reason for all of these things which I have not the time now to discuss.

Why is it, if you gentlemen do not like cheapness, that you will insist on cheapening the wages of the men you employ? If you want to compel people to pay manufacturers higher prices because they are American, why do they not, when there is no law to compel them to do it, do the same thing for the people they employ? Why do they not, out of the goodness of their hearts, practice the doctrines that they preach to others? I think they are somewhat like Dow, jr., who in preaching to his congregation said, "Don't do as I do, my hearers, but do as I tell you." [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is your doctrine.

Now you want to subsidize ships; you want to have ships built, and you think the way to do it is to destroy your commerce and then make ships to build it up again. Why do you not stand on one side of this fence and fight loyally on one set of principles all the time? Why are you now talking about extending your foreign commerce? These subsidies you are giving are not for your coastwise shipping. They are to encroach upon the dominion of that little braggart whom Mr. Andrew Carnegie says we ought to help dethrone. You are for building up foreign commerce. If you will tear down your wall, it will build itself up.

What is it that makes commerce? Did you ever stop to think about it? Why do people trade? Each man has something that he does not want, that he can not consume, that is valueless to him. The man who raises 100 bushels of wheat can only consume 5; 95 bushels of it are for somebody else; and upon the possibility of exchanging those 95 bushels of wheat for something that he does want, clothes, hats, boots, shoes, agricultural implements, and ten thousand things that he does want, depends his prosperity. He does not want that surplus wheat, and if you say he shall not exchange it, you deprive him of the value of that wheat. You lower the value of that man's capacity to employ and pay for labor, and then comes reduction in the wages of labor.

Now, if you will take off your duties and bring them down to a revenue standard, placing them upon articles where they will be the least possible burden upon the taxpayers, and permit your importations to come in overwhelmingly, what will be the result? I would welcome a double amount of importations, because it would mean a double amount of exportation. That increases the value of all farm products. That distributes wealth among 30,000,000 people, each dollar of which is behind a want. Each one demands employment of labor to satisfy that want. Each one of them sends joy and life into the heart of American industry and brings prosperity and peace, contentment and happiness, where now misery and want prevail.

But you say, "We do not want these pauper products of foreigners. We want our own products. Our policy is to send our surplus product to foreign countries and sell it for gold and silver and bring the gold and silver home, and then expend that gold and silver for the purchase of things made in this country by the labor of our own people."

Now, let us follow that absurdity a little. In the recent discussions before the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures it was shown that there are seven and a half billions of gold and silver in all the world. Of that amount we have one billion. There remains then among the other people of the world, the accumulated stock of four thousand years or more, six and a half billions of gold and silver. Well, suppose we send abroad a billion dollars' worth of products a year; we are sending abroad now about six hundred and thirty millions of agricultural products; we could easily make it a thousand millions of agricultural products alone—suppose we send a thousand millions of agricultural products and sell them for a thousand millions of gold and silver. That will leave five and a half billions. Remember that all the gold and silver we bring here must remain here. It can not go away, for it could only go away for commodities, and your protective policy will not let us import them. It can not go away to exchange for gold and silver, because there could be no profit in such an exchange and there could be no object in carrying on such a commerce.

Now, let us follow out this idea and see what will be the upshot, the final termination of this policy.

In six years, if it were possible to carry out that palpable absurdity, we would have in the United States the whole accumulated stock of gold and silver in the world. Then what would take place? Your trade would stop still. You could not export anything more. In six years the judgment day comes. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Six years and you go back to barbarism. No man can exchange his surplus. You then have a thousand million bushels of wheat, perhaps more than you can consume, but it ceases to be of any value. We have perhaps by that time seven or eight million bales of cotton more than we can consume. That vast amount is worthless. It can not be consumed in this country, it can not buy anything, it is as worthless as the water so far as commercial value is concerned, or as worthless as the wind. You can not buy it or sell it. All your products fall to the earth. And that period, when it comes, would be the final millennium of the great policy of American protection as foreshadowed and taught by the great American Republican party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This policy that you are teaching leads to making all the products of labor less valuable, leads to making everything that money measures and buys less valuable, leads to darker days, leads to more tears, more distress, leads to a more hopeless struggle by borrowing money to keep from sinking down into the depths of distress and woe, and at last the people must touch the last deep of distress and go through all the horrors of universal bankruptcy.

Mr. MCMILLIN. It means more mortgage.

Mr. MILLS. What we want, Mr. Chairman, is to conform our actions to the immutable and unchangeable laws of Him who created all the universe and made the law for the governing not only of the planets that revolve in their daily and yearly circuits, but made a law for the government of each individual upon each one of those planets if they are inhabited. Each one of them is subject to a law as unerring as it is good and wise.

The Creator hath made us dependent upon each other for the satisfying of many of our wants. By living in harmony with that law which binds with threads the human heart, and by conforming to that law of the Creator we will obtainthe greater satisfaction of our wants, the greatest distribution of comforts, and make the highest advance in civilization and the greatest growth in prosperity and happiness. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has five minutes remaining.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, before I take my seat I want to refer for a moment to what my friend the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MCKINLEY] said yesterday. For the second time he has called my attention to the fact that I have said that "majorities ought to rule." I have; and that is Democratic doctrine; and I will give the gentleman to drink from the fountain from which that pure stream emanates. I will take him back to the bible and creed of all Democrats, the inaugural address of Thomas Jefferson, the first Democratic President of the United States. He says in this short, terse sentence:

Absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority—the vital principle of republics, from which there is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

That is Democratic doctrine, and I will call the gentleman's attention to another paragraph in the same great paper.

All, too, will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail,that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights,which equal laws must protect, and to violate which would be oppression.

[Renewed applause on the Democratic side.]

There is where we stand. I say it over and over, and reaffirm every word that my friend referred to, which I uttered years ago. I re-emphasize, with all the force I can place upon it, that the will of the majority within the bounds assigned to it under the Constitution is the law to all, so far as man is concerned. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] But it must be reasonable. It must be rightful. It must be by equal laws to protect the equal rights of minorities. That is what we have contended for. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

There is one thing that I am afraid my friend has not learned in his political studies, and that is that there are sacred things that the ruthless hand of no majority can touch. Its profane hand can not touch the liberty of one's religion. It can not tell a man at what altar he shall kneel and what creed he shall confess. Mr. Chairman, as long as the Constitution remains the supreme law of the land, and the love of liberty resides in the hearts of our people, if all the people of this Union and all the power of this Government were to be exercised to command me to bow down and worship a stock or a stone, I could appeal to the courts of my country to vindicate my rights against persecution and protect me against the violation of my religious liberty. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The Government can not impose on the people of the United States any form of religion. You can not organize a court-martial to try a man in time of peace. You can not organize a military commission or a court-martial to try a citizen by the unanimous vote of both Houses. You can not do it by unanimous consent of the whole people but one. The citizen has the right of trial by jury. Under the common law of England it was said to be the bulwark of the Englishman's liberty. That right has been placed in the citadel of our Constitution and surrounded with rifled guns, that continually sweep every access and passage by which the liberty of the citizen can be invaded, and "the supreme law of the land" preserves that right to him to be transmitted from generation to generation to the remotest posterity. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BINGHAM having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, a message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had agreed to the following resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be directed, in the enrollment of the bill of the House (H. R. 12782) an act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes, to omit the following words, namely: "to cause to be erected," in line 8 of Senate amendment numbered 7, page 14 of the printed bill.

THE SHIPPING BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York yields thirty minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN.]

[Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey, addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. FITHIAN. I yield sixty minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS].

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to indicate my opposition to this bill by recording my vote against it without any remarks on the merits of the measure. But the evident intention of the gentlemen who have it in charge to make it a party measure and to use the party whip to bring to its support Republican Representatives who doubt the propriety as well as the expediency of such legislation has led me to change my original intention and to submit some remarks upon the merits of the bill. I take it there is no member of the House who does not wish a revival of our merchant marine and whose heart would not beat with patriotic pride to again see the Stars and Stripes floating over merchant vessels in the ports of every civilized nation in the world.

I am firmly convinced, however, that this measure will not accomplish the great object for which it is intended, and that it carries with it a principle of special legislation deterimental to the best interests of our common country and in violation of the spirit if not the letter of the Constitution. It selects a class of men engaged in a private calling and proposes to guaranty them against the hazards and losses incident to all business.

This system of direct subsidy is defended upon the ground that it is the only way in which we can accomplish the restoration of our merchant marine engaged in foreign commerce. This I deny. I am not willing to accept the issue presented by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] in his very able speech on this bill some days ago. He argued that we must favor this bill or favor the Democratic idea of free ships. That was a very ingenious way for the gentleman to put the question before the committee. He appreciated to its fullest extent that if he could make it a question between the support of this bill and that of free ships that he would solidify the Republican vote in favor of this measure.

As a Republican I am not willing to accept the issue he has presented. I maintain that there are other means of aiding our merchant marine without giving a direct bounty to each ship that floats the American flag. When the gentleman was speaking of the once proud position that we held in the carrying trade of the world, did he not know that that was accomplished without bounties or subsidies? Why can not we better abrogate our treaties of reciprocal liberty of commerce than plunder the Treasury for the benefit of those who have their capital invested in ships and shipyards.

The bill that proposes aid to our steamships in carrying our ocean mails has many features about it superior to the bill advocated by the majority of members on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I have prepared a bill which I propose at the proper time to offer as a substitute to the one now pending before the committee, which I will explain more fully later on. I desire now to deal more directly with the bill under consideration. I am opposed to it because it does not meet the exigences of the hour. The trade relations of the ocean have changed as radically as the trade relations upon the land, and you might with as much propriety ask Congress for a subsidy for maintaining the old stagecoach to put it in competition with the limited express and mail trains operated by the railroads of to-day as to ask for a bounty, as this bill does, for the wooden sailing ships of Maine.

It is temporizing with a great subject. From what has been said by the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], who so zealously and

ably supports the bounty bill, those of you who have not made a careful study of the navigation laws of our country would naturally suppose that the decline of our merchant marine engaged in foreign commerce was due, not from any changes or modifications of our navigation laws, but from the subsidies which England has paid her steamship companies, and that our tonnage engaged in the foreign carrying trade has declined in the inverse ratio to the increase in the subsidies to English lines.

This is not correct; but I shall not, Mr. Chairman, in this debate be led into a discussion as to whether England has in the past or does now resort to subsidies or subventions to increase her carrying trade upon the ocean. From my standpoint this should have but little weight in determining what is the wise and judicious course for Americans to adopt. England and Germany are countries that maintain large standing armies, but all agree it would not be wise for us to imitate their example.

The history of our merchant marine will disclose the fact that the period of its greatest prosperity was during the time when the principles of protection which exist to-day under our revenue laws for the benefit of the American citizens engaged in all the various vocations on land were extended to those who found their employment upon the sea.

The gentleman from Maine has appealed to the founders of the Republic as men who had the statesmanship and sagacity to see the importance of our having an extensive merchant marine. I, too, challenge the attention of the members, not only to the spirit which animated those great men in their efforts to build up our merchant marine, but to the methods adopted by them in that laudable effort.

The second act ever signed by Washington as President of the United States was one which gave protection to the American marine. It was not a bounty, as advocated by the friends of this bill, but consisted of an increase in the duties to be laid on all goods imported in foreign vessels. Without taking money from the Treasury of the United States to subsidize one ship or a hundred, it enacted such legislation as made it profitable for the foreign manufacturers and all importers to have their goods carried in American vessels. This legislation was at once felt not only in our carrying trade, but also in the stimulus that was given to the building of American ships. Sixteen days after this law was passed a further protection was given to the American marine by the way of imposing tonnage duties, as follows: "On all vessels American built owned by citizens or foreign built owned by citizens the 29th of May, 1789, and while owned by citizens, per ton, 6 cents. On all vessels hereafter built in the United States, partly or wholly owned by foreigners, per ton, 30 cents. On all other ships or vessels at the rate of per ton, 50 cents."

This clear discrimination in favor of American citizens engaged in the ocean carrying trade laid the foundation for that magnificent American merchant marine which found its way into the ports of every civilized country in the world and made the Stars and Stripes, the emblem of our nationality, alike familiar at home and on the sea. The fathers of the Republic did not stop here. In 1794, under a revision of the revenue laws, additional protection was given to American vessels engaged in foreign commerce. This was followed by the legislation of 1804, of a similarly friendly character.

It was under such legislation as this that our tonnage in the foreign trade increased, so that American vessels carried over 95 per cent. of all our imports and 89 per cent. of all our exports. Had the policy of our Government respecting this great interest remained unchanged, we never should have witnessed this remarkable decline in our merchant marine which has been so eloquently and feelingly portrayed by the gentleman from Maine. We would to-day be the mistress of the sea, and the American sailor and the Stars and Stripes be the two most familiar objects in the ports of every country where ships and seamen are found.

But unfortunately for this great interest and unfortunately, too, for our country, a class of statesmen gained control of our Government and dictated its domestic and foreign policy for many years who did not believe in the principle of protection either on land or sea. They were impressed with the idea, which has been so often repeated on this floor during the debates on the so-called McKinley bill, that American citizens could compete successfully with the cheap labor and the cheap capital of Europe under any and all conditions, and that the adoption of free trade would bring to us unnumbered blessings. Inspired by this feeling, such legislation was enacted as would give to this and all other countries what was termed reciprocal liberty of commerce.

The plain English of this phrase was and is that English merchantmen and merchant vessels of all other foreign countries could enter our ports under the same terms and conditions as our own. No longer was there any object, after the adoption of such trade relations, for foreign manufacturers to import their goods into this country in American vessels. Inspired by patriotic principles as well as selfish motives the English manufacturers and importers commenced systematically to employ English merchant vessels to transport their goods to this country. This example was followed by other foreign countries.

The transition from sail to steam vessels in 1854, followed by our late civil war, are causes which hastened the wonderful decline in our foreign carrying trade. The changed condition of the commercial countries of the world, and the steady discrimination against American vessels by the British Lloyds, have brought us to the condition that to-day but 12½ per cent. of our foreign commerce is carried in American vessels. This is the condition, then, that confronts us. It has been characterized as humiliating in the extreme. I join with others in the hope that we may regain, measurably at least, our position in the carrying trade of the world's commerce. This bill if enacted into a law will not, in my judgment, accomplish this much-desired object.

With the indulgence of the members of the House, I will give some of the reasons for this opinion which I have expressed. The bill proposes to pay to any vessel, sail or steam, registered pursuant to the laws of the United States, engaged in the foreign trade, plying between the ports of the United States and foreign ports, a bounty ranging from 20 cents per gross register ton for every thousand miles sailed on an outward or an inward bound voyage, to 30 cents per ton. All vessels of less speed than 16 knots per hour, not carrying the United States mails, will not be entitled to receive pay under this act unless they have freight on board at the time of sailing in ton weight of at least 25 per cent. of other net-cargo capacity. All other vessels are paid the bounty provided in the bill regardless of the freight carried.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Of certain classes.

Mr. HOPKINS. Of certain classes, of course. I have not nor shall I attempt to make a close analysis of the bill, and show its glaring inconsistencies. It is enough to state that it is planned on the French system of subsidies. It has proved a failure in France. Its adoption by the American Government will entail a heavy taxation upon the American people for the benefit of a special enterprise, and that, too, without any reasonable expectation of any corresponding or adequate benefits resulting either to our commerce or carrying trade. In support of this statement, I desire to call the attention of members to the evidence of Capt. Ambrose Snow, taken before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries while the original bill reported was under consideration by that committee.

Captain Snow is an ardent supporter of this bill. He is vice president of the American Shipping League, an organization which in season and out of season has worked for the enactment of such legislation. In response to a question asked by me Captain Snow said:

> We could reach the same position that the French have reached now nearly, and they are contemplating this. They say their course of subsidizing ships is a pretty heavy burden upon France, and France is a small country, you know. Now, they are asking to prorogue that bounty system for some few years longer so their treaties will expire, and they are now considering the question of differential duties in France in order to put it in the place of the bounty that is now being paid.

If France finds this system of subsidizing her merchant marine too heavy a burden to maintain, why should we adopt it here? If she proposes to adopt a system of differential duties in lieu of a bounty, why should we not profit by her experience?

I ask you gentlemen of this House, I ask you especially members on the Republican side of this House, my colleagues, if it is wise statesmanship or just legislation to adopt this bill in the face of such evidence as this?

I quote the following from Le Yacht of December 21, 1889, a paper which seems to be regarded as authority:

> By these statistics we ascertain that France alone among the great nations sees its merchant service decreasing in importance. The second place she occupied in 1888, owing to her steam navigation, she has just lost. Will she still continue to retrograde? We can not tell; but it seems to us that this lamentable situation is to be attributed to the approach of 1891, when the premiums granted to navigation are to be abolished.

This, mark you, was after an experience of nine years under the bounty system.

Mr. DINGLEY. What leading commercial paper does the gentleman read from? Is it the sportsman's paper, known as Le Yacht?

Mr. HOPKINS. It is possibly a sporting paper. I do not say that it is not, but it was regarded as of sufficient importance by the committee to embody it in the hearings before the committee to demonstrate, not only to the House, but to the country, the condition of the shipping of France under the bounty system.

But, sir, whatever its importance may be, I will fortify and sustain the statement of this paper, I care not how it may be characterized by the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HERBERT. Will the gentleman from Illinois allow me a suggestion just there?

Mr. HOPKINS. Certainly.

Mr. HERBERT. The gentleman from Maine knows that the statement from the Le Yacht was appended to the testimony of Mr. Crump. Mr. Crump quoted it as official authority——

Mr. FITHIAN. And it was translated by the State Department, and the translation ordered printed by the committee.

Mr. DINGLEY. It was put into the report of the committee.

Mr. HOPKINS. Very well, it is in the report. The gentleman from Maine himself never has sought, up to this moment, to discredit the statements of this paper.

Mr. DINGLEY. I am not discrediting it.

Mr. HOPKINS. If he has done so, it has escaped my observation.

Mr. DINGLEY. I have not discredited it; but simply call attention to the fact that it is not a leading commercial paper.

Mr. HOPKINS. Well, I quote it for what it is worth. If the gentleman does not discredit it, then I give its figures and statements as bearing directly upon the question under consideration, to show that the bounty system that the gentleman from Maine is desirous of fastening on this country in aid of the wooden ships of Maine has proven a disastrous failure in France.

But there is other evidence to which I desire to ask the attention of the committee to show that the bounty system is a failure. Let me call your attention also to what the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of the State Department said about the French bounty system in 1886:

One important fact is shown, that the bounties have been practically of no avail in stopping the continued decrease in sailing tonnage. While the sailing tonnage stood in 1880 at 641,539, in 1884 it was only 522,557 tons, a decrease of 118,782 tons, or more than 18 per cent., though the number of vessels was somewhat larger. And in the three years for which returns are given 105,464 tons were built under the bounty law, for which $222,012 was paid—an expenditure which has produced no effect that is shown in the aggregate.

* * * * * *

The bounties have succeeded in infusing life into neither shipbuilding nor ship navigation. France finds it cheaper to have her iron vessels built in Great Britain and a large share of her wooden ships in other countries. The lines of ships that were called into being through the liberal offers of the Government are represented as being in a state of bankruptcy, and existing lines that participate in the bounties are either paying no dividends or very small amounts. The exports of France, reflecting as they did the slight reaction which ensued in 1879, have since declined, and are still declining in value, and the decrease can not be explained by a fall in the price of commodities, but rather by an absolute decrease in the foreign commerce of the nation. In fact it may be asserted that the bounty policy of France, intended to bridge over a temporary depression, has aggravated the situation, and has proved itself to be a source of mischief and not of cure.

Mr. DINGLEY. Will the gentleman allow me simply to make a statement as to a matter of fact?

Mr. HOPKINS. I can not yield.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Ford is a free trader.

Mr. HOPKINS. The gentleman says this is the statement of a free trader. I do not care whether he is a free trader or a protectionist, a Republican or a Democrat. His statistics are what I wish to use here and they are not affected by his political convictions.

Mr. DINGLEY. But you said it was a Republican authority.

Mr. HOPKINS. He has given these figures and shown that in the short period of four years under this bounty system the tonnage of that country fell off 118,000 tons. These are facts.

Mr. FARQUHAR. You mean the sail tonnage.

Mr. HOPKINS. These are facts, regardless of the source from which they come.

The gentlemen who favor this bill, including the worthy chairman of our Merchant Marine Committee and the distinguished Representative from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], must admit on their honor that at best it is but a mere experiment. They have not attempted by any facts or figures presented in debate to demonstrate that it will restore our merchant marine to the position it held from 1830 to 1850 in the ocean carrying trade. Even our Commissioner of Navigation, who seems to have devoted a great deal of thought and study to this subject, in speaking of such a measure, on page 177 of his report, says:

To what extent the bounty bill, if passed, will increase the tonnage of our marine is not easy of prediction. It may well be regarded as a problem to be solved by trial. By the terms of the bill reducing the bounty after ten years there is no inducement to lay the foundation of great shipping houses or to establish permanent agencies in foreign ports. The aspect of transitoriness is not much calculated to inspirit shipbuilding, encourage shipowning, or induce investment in commercial enterprises to be carried on with the world abroad. The bill seems to ask too little from the Government.

Here are two admissions from the Commissioner of Navigation, to which I wish to call your attention: First, that the bill is an experiment, and secondly, that the chances are all in favor of its proving a failure, because it does not look to a permanent system of subsidy, and the amount asked for in the bill is too trifling to be considered in the development of our foreign carrying trade. Now, Mr. Chairman, is there any member of this House who is willing by his vote or his voice to aid in making and executing a mortgage upon the American people to provide funds for a permanent system of subsidizing American merchant ships? I believe there is no man here who would go to that extent in the aid of our merchant marine, and yet the experience of France demonstrates, and the opinion of our Commissioner of Navigation is to the same effect, that this bounty system, to be beneficial, must be permanent in its character.

This alone should not only make us hesitate as Republicans in support of this bill, but should cause us to abandon it and look for some other method, if need be, to aid this great industry.

Mr. ADAMS. How much does he recommend?

Mr. HOPKINS. I am just about to state.

Now, let us look for a moment to the question of the amount of money which this bill will take from the United States Treasury. The Commissioner of Navigation, as I have stated, says that the amount is too small, and yet the lowest estimate made by him of bounty payments to American shipping under the bill for a period of ten years is $47,186,000.

The bill contemplates the payment of bounties for a period of nineteen years, and under the system of estimates made by the Commissioner in arriving at the estimates I have given, for the first ten years the total amount carried by this bill is not less than $80,000,000.

The Philadelphia Record, under date of December 16, 1890, had this estimate of the Merchant Marine Committee carefully examined, and after an elaborate review of the subject estimated the total cost to the Government for the first ten years under the bill would aggregate the enormous sum of $200,475,000, and on that basis for the period of nineteen years, the time limited for the payment of bounties under the bill, the total amount taken from the Treasury of the United States for this purpose would not be less than $375,000,000. I will not vouch for the accuracy of either statement. The estimates of the Philadelphia Record are as carefully compiled as those of the Commissioner of Navigation.

Mr. DINGLEY. But does the gentleman think that the estimate he has quoted from the Philadelphia Record is a fair or even a decent estimate?

Mr. HOPKINS. I give the figures as they are given in the Record. Anybody can figure that out as well as I can.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I want to make one statement that I know the gentleman will allow me to make. That statement in the Philadelphia Record as to figures that I have furnished, and on which they base this opinion, is false from first to last. I never saw the figures, never knew of them until I saw them in that paper; so that the whole table is good for nothing. And more than that, I have a statement which is official that will show substantially what it will cost.

Mr. HOPKINS. I can not yield further.

Mr. Chairman, I said at the beginning that I would not vouch for the figures of the Commissioner of Navigation or of the Philadelphia Record.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I hope you do not.

Mr. HOPKINS. But I think that the basis for the figures of the one is just as reasonable as that of the other. The Commissioner of Navigation admits it, because in his statement to us he says it is purely experimental.

It is sufficient for us to know that the adoption of this bill by the House and the enactment of it into a law by this Congress will entail upon the Government an unwarranted and a prodigal expenditure of money. I can not understand how gentlemen who appreciate the condition of the United States Treasury can favor this bill. If we go on with expenditures as contemplated in this bill it means correspondingly heavier taxation upon the people. No people will submit to taxation unless those who impose it can demonstrate that it will result beneficially to those upon whom the burden is cast. For all great national measures patriotism as well as the feeling of self-interest dictate a willing acquiescence by the taxpayers.

This bill, however, I care not how strongly gentlemen may appeal to our feelings of national pride, can not be dignified into a measure of that kind. Stripped of the garb of sentiment and national pride with which its friends have sought to surround and clothe it, it means simply this: That if A B or any other person wishes to engage in the business of carrying ocean freights, if he will purchase an American-built ship and float the Stars and Stripes over it the Government of the United States will pay him out of her Treasury a bounty for so doing. He is not required to carry freights any cheaper than they are now carried from every port of the United States to all those countries with whom we have commercial relations. And in all the talk that has been indulged in by friends of the bill during this debate no one has intimated that freight and passenger rates between the United States and any of the foreign countries would be lessened.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, from the statement that was made by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] it can be easily demonstrated that paying the bounty under this bill will not only not lessen the freight and passenger rates in ocean carriage, but that it is not sufficient to enable American merchant vessels to compete successfully for trade with their foreign rivals. During the course of his very able speech in favor of the bill he stated that the bounty will only pay about 11 per cent. of the cost of the running expenses of any ship, and that that was just about the difference in expense between the running of an American merchant vessel and an English merchantman or other foreign merchant ship. And in this same connection he contended also that England is subsidizing her merchant marine, and that it is by reason of this subsidy that she controls all of the great lines of carrying trade on the ocean.

If his position is correct it requires no argument upon my part to show that the bounty paid by the American Government, if we propose to compete with England for the carrying trade of the world, must not only be sufficient to cover the difference in the extra expense incurred in sailing an American merchantman, but it must be sufficient to meet the bounty paid by the English Government. Any amount short of that fails of the very object for which the gentleman from Maine contends, and is a wasteful and extravagant, if not a criminal expenditure of the people's money.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is a vital point.

Mr. HOPKINS. So that from his own position the bill as reported by his committee should not become a law. Save to the Treasury the money that the bill carries, or else make it sufficient to accomplish the purposes sought in this kind of legislation.

But, Mr. Chairman, the trade conditions of the world are such that

the payment of any bounty, unless it be fabulous in its amount, will not restore to us the relative position that we once held in the carrying trade upon the ocean. For more than a quarter of a century there has been an overproduction of ships for mercantile purposes. The result of this is that ocean freight and passenger rates are now at a minimum figure. Capital can not be induced to invest in this enterprise while more remunerative returns can be guarantied upon investments on land, and in addition to all this the underwriters' discriminations in marine insurance against American vessels are sufficient to debar the American merchant marine from successful competition with its British rivals.

In speaking upon this subject the Commissioner of Navigation, in his report to the Secretary of the Treasury, on page 97 of the report, says:

Of the several forces which influence the choice of merchants in the employment of vessels, few have so much weight or potency as underwriters' rates. These are wholly arbitrary, often unfair, and never proportioned to risks. * * * The lack of science and the arbitrary nature of marine insurance have enabled the British Lloyds to institute and operate a protective policy for British shipping.

And on page 99 of his report, continuing his observations on the same subject, he said:

American vessels venturing to compete for the carriage of British cargoes even out of our own ports are especially turned aside, delayed, and as much as possible excluded from the trade. This is effected by a studied bias of inspection and disparagement of materials and workmanship of American ships. By underrating and refusal of just classification, premiums are overvalued and exaggerated and insurance often refused. This course results in the rejection of American ships and a preference for British by the owners of cargo in every port of the world. It prevents equal and fair competition for freights and completely nullifies the reciprocity supposed to exist between the British and foreign nations * * *

American cargoes outward being of our own products it ought to be thought our shipping should have held its own for their transportation; but such has been the will and power of the Lloyds it could not do so even if other obstacles did not exist as they did. The bonded-warehouse system established in 1846 in the course of time has thrown our import trade into the hands of foreign merchants, shipowners, and underwriters, and reduced the most of our merchants to shipping and commission business for foreign houses.

And again, on page 100 of his valuable report, he says:

It might seem to a superficial observer that our ships could secure loads at any time by competition by putting freight so low as to make certain of engagements. But this idea will not materialize. If it would, then the Lloyds policy would be overthrown. On the contrary it has been the aim of Lloyd's to vanquish foreign competition and put down its rule.

He then gives a detailed statement of the manner in which this discrimination is made against American merchant ships and shows clearly and conclusively that the amount of bounty proposed in the pending bill is not sufficient to affect the existing conditions under which the commerce of the United States is carried largely in foreign ships. He cites instances where offers had been made by the owners of American merchant ships to carry the cargoes of the shippers 40 per cent. cheaper than their English rivals and that they had been rejected by the merchants and shippers and their British rivals preferred.

How worse than folly, then, it is, Mr. Chairman, to adopt legislation that will tend to deplete the Treasury and impose heavier burdens upon the taxpayers of this country, when we know by the exercise of our reasoning powers and observation of the manner in which the world's commerce is carried on that the amount proposed in the pending measure is inadequate to accomplish the restoration of our merchant marine to the position it held half a century ago. Listen again to what the Commissioner of Navigation says respecting the subject. I quote from page 244 of his report to the Secretary of the Treasury:

Foreigners control our carrying because the operation of our commercial treaties has enabled them to grasp and hold our commerce and to share among themselves the navigation that is rightfully American. What we may think is American commerce and should yield employment to our ships in the foreign trade, belongs to merchants and owners of foreign nations and is preferably insured and protected by foreign underwriters and foreign flags. * * * If Congress needs to be convinced of the futility of competition for the employment of American ships in foreign trade, let it look into history. Take six months of the year 1885 at San Francisco in the grain trade. During the month of August twelve British, but not one American ship was chartered and for three months while twenty-seven British and one German ship sailed not a single American in the trade left the port. * * * Our ships were offering for charters at rates much below the British all the time. In the last week in October British iron ships were asking and receiving 20 per cent. and the British wooden ships 5 per cent. more than American vessels could obtain when they did secure engagements.

Had I the time I could show from the report of the Commissioner that, owing to the cumbersome and burdensome condition of our navigation laws and our treaty relations with foreign countries, especially the European countries, American ships can not compete successfully in the freight and passenger traffic with their British and other foreign rivals in the trade with those countries. We must adopt a different method than that proposed in the present bill if we would restore our foreign commerce to American ships. This bill holds out a delusive hope and disappointment, and disaster will surely follow any ventures upon the sea formed or prosecuted under its influences.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while I deplore as much as any gentleman upon this floor the loss of our prestige upon the sea, I do not regard it as any indication of inferiority to our British or other foreign rivals, or as a decadence of that hardy and adventurous spirit so prominent in the earlier days of the Republic, when American sailors and American merchantmen were familiar objects in the ports of all civilized countries and upon every sea. The marvelous development of the Middle, Western, and Northwestern States since 1850 has attracted the class of men who once "went down to the sea" for employment. Here, with less hazard, they have found more inviting fields for their enterprise and their genius. Language is inadequate to portray in fitting terms the wonderful results of their labor and their enterprise in this great section of our common country. Forests have been felled, cities built, and the prairies of the West transformed into cultivated fields, with their rich and abundant harvests.

The capital which, if continued in our foreign carrying trade would have given but meager return, invested in the various enterprises which have made such a transformation with the great central and western portion of our country, has brought to its owners not only untold wealth but has developed a domestic commerce greater than that of any other country in the world. When trade conditions change, as they will, and some of the burdensome features of our navigation laws are removed, it will not require a bounty paid out of the United States Treasury to induce capital to reinvest in ships for foreign trade or to hire American citizens to again resume their employment upon the sea. Mr. Chairman, I wish to challenge the attention of the members of the House to this, that the great decline in our carrying trade referred to so often by the gentleman from Maine does not mean a decline in our foreign commerce.

In the heat and excitement of debate members are apt to confound our foriegn commerce with the carrying trade. Do not make this mistake. They are distinct and independent. From 1855 to 1860 was a period when the American shipping interest attained its greatest prosperity, and yet we carried 25 per cent. less of the products of this country to foreign markets in American vessels than we did a quarter of a century before that time.

That this decrease in our carrying trade was not the result of a decrease in American tonnage, or American sailors to man our ships, is evidenced from the fact that every ton of the products from our farms and factories intended for foreign commerce, if carried in American bottoms would not have required over 50 per cent. of our then tonnage engaged in foreign commerce.

Statistics show that at this very time we had nearly 1,300,000 tons of American shipping in the employment of foreigners and engaged in trade in which the United States had no connection except as carriers. And now, when our foreign registered tonnage has decreased so that we to-day have less than a million tons engaged in that commerce, and instead of carrying 95 per cent. of that trade we now carry only 12½ per cent., our foreign commerce has not only steadily increased during all of these years, but that increase has been so rapid and so great as to amaze our commercial rivals. In the proud days spoken of by the gentleman from Maine in his speech, when more than 75 per cent. of our foreign commerce was carried in American bottoms and under the Stars and Stripes, the value of our imports and exports per capita aggregated less than $22—to be entirely accurate, our per capita imports and exports aggregated $21.85.

Now, when, as is claimed by the gentleman, American merchant vessels are no longer seen upon the ocean, instead of our imports and exports decreasing, as we would naturally infer from his argument, they have actually increased per capita; and with a carrying trade of only 12½ per cent. of our foreign commerce, the value of our imports and exports per capita aggregate $26.30. To fully appreciate these figures you should remember that we have added to our population since 1860 nearly thirty-three million people, and with this vast increase in our population our foreign commerce has not only kept pace but has increased nearly $5 per capita on the total population as given to us under the new census. No commercial country in the world has developed her foreign commerce with such rapidity.

The gentlemen who favor this bill claim that England is mistress of the seas and that her commerce goes to the uttermost parts of the earth; but, sir, with all of her boasted power and supremacy upon the sea she has not kept pace with this country in the development of her foreign commerce. I hold in my hand the annual report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics on the foreign commerce of the United States for the year ending June 30, 1890, and on page 14 I find a comparative statement of the total imports and exports of the United Kingdom and of the United States, by decades, from 1850 to 1889. I insert it here in my remarks.

Comparative statement of the total imports and exports of the United Kingdom and of the United States, by decades, from 1850 to 1889.

Years.	United Kingdom.	United States.
1850	$942,695,380	$317,885,252
1860	1,825,191,648	687,192,176
Increase	882,496,268	369,306,924
Per cent	93.61	116.21
1860	1,825,191,648	687,192,176
1870	2,663,620,718	917,794,421
Increase	838,429,070	230,602,245
Per cent	45.99	33.56

Comparative statement of the total imports and exports, etc.—Continued.

Years.	United Kingdom.	United States.
1870	$2,663,620,718	$917,794,421
1888	3,336,087,844	1,417,172,421
Increase	672,467,126	499,378,000
Per cent	25.25	54.41
1850	942,695,380	317,885,252
1889	3,616,930,121	1,597,628,312
Increase	2,674,234,748	1,279,743,060
Per cent	283.68	402.57

It shows that while England has increased her imports and exports during that period 283.68 per cent., the United States has increased her imports and exports 402.57 per cent., an increase over the percentage gained by England of 118.89 per cent. From these figures it is plain that it is not necessary to have American merchant ships to increase our foreign commerce. So long as capital and labor can find handsomer remuneration upon land they will not look to the sea for investment and employment. If it is cheaper to hire ships in foreign commerce than to own them, enterprising business men can not be induced to invest their capital in that way.

But gentlemen who favor this bill insist that business reasons should not alone control the policy of this Government in giving or refusing aid to our merchant marine. They contend that State reasons demand a subsidy as provided in this bill, and that a merchant marine can be used as an auxiliary to our Navy, and that these merchant ships can be used as schools to fit American sailors for service in the Navy in time of war. This is the sentimental and patriotic side of the question, and is one which is liable to influence members of the House who have not carefully investigated the subject. It is a style of argument that is always indulged in when reason and facts have been swept away.

The knave as well as the honest man can talk patriotism when it answers his purpose. Without wishing to arraign the character or the motives of the men who favor this bill, I desire to call the members' attention to the remarkable fact that this same argument was used by those who favored the Pacific Mail steamship subsidy many years ago in this House. Nine hundred thousand dollars was used by the promoters of that scheme to secure its passage through Congress. The scandals that were developed in the investigation which followed were a disgrace to our legislation. Sam Ward, the king of the lobby, frankly admitted that he had received many thousand dollars of this corrupt fund, but brazenly defended his course upon the ground that these measures were justified as a means of restoring our merchant marine to its old-time glory. We are developing our Navy quite as rapidly as is consistent with the true interests of our republican institutions.

We do not wish to rival England in her navy any more than it is important or desirable to rival Germany in a standing army. Our position is an isolated one as compared with any of the countries of Europe. The policy of our Government has ever been to cultivate the principles of peace with all nations. A large standing army or a great navy such as England maintains to-day would be a menace to the permanency of our republican institutions. It was the professional soldier that overthrew the Roman republic and established a monarchy in its place. The experience of all history teaches us that the fathers of the Republic were not only wise statesmen, but were patriotic men as well when they favored the disbandment of a large standing army and urged the transformation of war ships into merchant vessels.

Mr. Chairman, the American Navy has never been in better condition than it is to-day. Some of the finest war ships that float the seas have been constructed in our shipyards and are abundant proof of the skill and ability of Americans in this branch of industry. The Government of the United States has been liberal in its expenditures in this branch of its service. More than $265,000,000 have been taken from the Treasury of the United States since 1875 and expended on our Navy. It seems to me, sir, that our Navy is receiving quite as much attention as is consistent with the interests of the taxpayers from whom this money is taken. I am not saying that this vast sum has been injudiciously expended, but I do say that if it has not been, no friend of the American Navy should complain that our Government in this regard has not done and is not doing its full duty.

The gentleman from Maine during the course of his speech referred to the fact that the English Government had given many of its contracts for the construction of naval vessels to private shipbuilders. I will not say that he designed it, but the impression left upon my mind, and I doubt not upon the minds of other members of the House was, that this Government had pursued a different policy and that the private shipyards in this country are in a languishing condition. On investigation I find that this Government has been not unmindful of the interests of private shipbuilders and that many contracts have been entered into with private shipbuilders for the construction of some of our largest and best war vessels.

The Chicago, Boston, Atlanta, and Dolphin were all built in the shipyard at Chester, Pa.; for which the Government paid to the owners of that yard the snug little sum of $2,440,000. Mr. Cramp, of Philadelphia, is one of the gentlemen who are very desirous of the passage of this bill. He believes with Mr. FARQUHAR, of New York, and Mr. DINGLEY, of Maine, that we should subsidize American-built ships. On looking over the contracts that the Government has with his shipyard, I see that it has agreed to pay him for work already contracted for, the sum of $16,153,000. The Union Iron Works, at San Francisco, Cal., get $9,050,450. The shipyards at Bath, Me., at Boston, at Baltimore, at Bristol, R. I., and at Elizabethport, N. J., all have their contracts with the Government, the total amount of which to all these yards aggregates $33,151,514.

This sum of money, Mr. Chairman, of itself ought to keep these shipyards from being closed and their workmen sent into other industries for employment. This is only what the Government is doing for our private shipyards. All vessels in our foreign commerce and in our coastwise trade under existing law must be built in American shipyards. Our coastwise trade is larger than that of any other commercial country. Our total tonnage amounts to 4,424,497 tons. To maintain such a merchant marine as this, in addition to the work furnished to these shipyards by the Government, will insure to us skilled workmen in this branch of industry in sufficient numbers to enable our Government to meet any exigency that may arise in her foreign relations. We have in our lake and coastwise trade and foreign trade 23,467 vessels. If merchant vessels can serve as a nursery for the Navy, we have here a marine sufficient in number to answer that purpose.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is advocated by its friends, not so much for the benefit of our Navy as it is to enable a few enterprising and already wealthy gentlemen to prosecute their private business more successfully than they fear they can without Government aid. The men who have been here lobbying for it are all men who expect to reap pecuniary benefit if the bill is enacted into a law. Their patriotism seems to be limited to their private interests. The moment a man invests his capital or any portion of it in shipyards or shipbuilding interests he blossoms into a full-grown patriot, and insists upon having the Treasury of the United States opened for his benefit.

The Government has already done too much for special and private interests. It is high time to call a halt. In this country no man or class of men should have any special privileges granted them. The legislation of Congress should be for the entire people who own allegiance to the Government, and not for the favored few. It is claimed, however, that if we are to take advantage of the reciprocity clause in the late tariff act and enter into trade relations with foreign countries, we must have ships to transport the products of this country to those entering into such trade relations. It is remarkable with what eagerness the lobby have seized upon this to impress upon the members of the House the necessity of the passage of this bill.

I have already stated, Mr. Chairman, that there is an overabundance of ships in the world's trade. The lines of commerce or trade between here and all of the countries of Europe are already occupied, and freight rates and passenger rates are at a minimum figure. I care not what the bounty may be upon American ships plying between an American port and any of the ports of the European countries, no benefit will be derived therefrom to the American shipper. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the products of the farms and factories of the West can not reach the markets of Europe any cheaper than they can now unless the Government pays a sufficient bounty to navigate the ships, and in that manner you will take from them indirectly by taxation for the payment of this bounty what you grant to them in the way of lower freight and passenger rates.

There is a point in these charges for transporting goods across the ocean below which it is neither wise nor just to go. Trade conditions will regulate that. The artificial stimulus of a bounty will derange and injure it, and the shippers of all produce will gain nothing in the end. A still further objection to subsidizing any lines between here and Europe is that the products of all of those countries which are designed for the American market are adapted to the habits and character of our people, and our exports to those countries are such as are required by the consumers there.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, our mail facilities are so perfect and our trade relations so well understood by the merchants, shippers, and manufacturers of the respective countries that they can not be improved upon by any bounty that this Government may give to Americans engaged in the carrying trade. If Marshall, Field & Co., of Chicago, desire the silks manufactured in France for their trade, that firm has now all the knowledge and information relating to that industry in that country that it would have if a hundred millions of money were donated by this Government in the way of subsidies to our merchant marine engaged in foreign commerce. And what is true of this firm and this one industry is equally true of all other persons and corporations in the United States engaged in the import or export trade, and of all the articles that are produced or manufactured here and in Europe designed for the import and export trade between these countries.

Since the announcement by the President of the trade relations that have been entered into between this country and Brazil under the Aldrich amendment of the new tariff law, the promoters of this subsidy

scheme have redoubled their demands for the passage of this bill. As I view the subject, Mr. Chairman, this furnishes no argument favoring the bill. There are now thirty-one lines, with an aggregate of something like one hundred and thirty steamers, engaged in transportation between this country, Central and South America, and the West Indies. The carrying service between this and those southern countries is much better and more efficient than the trade demands, and yet the statistics show that with the increased facilities in the carrying trade our commerce with Mexico and Central and South America is less than it was in 1883.

This is another evidence, Mr. Chairman, that the development of our foreign commerce with any particular country depends much more upon trade conditions than as to whether the products are carried in American or foreign vessels. Why is it that our trade has fallen off with the Central and South American States? A recent editorial in the Panama Star and Herald, one of the leading papers of those Latin-American countries, tells the story in so graphic a manner that I will insert it in my remarks:

The chief cause is that American manufacturers will not alter their old, conservative methods to suit any foreign markets. Their overproduction they are willing enough to sell, but can not bring themselves to create special branches of manufacture for foreign markets. This happens to be just what England, Germany, and France have laid themselves out to do, and with the results which we see to-day. Take the Chilian markets for example. In 1863 Europe exported to that country $13,164,442 worth of merchandise against the United States' $1,635,958. "That was a heavy balance against Uncle Sam, truly; but look at what it had run up to in 1888, when the imports reached their maximum figure of $,601,492, against the European, which were then only a little over $40,500,000.

There is much food for reflection. It is a fatal error to imagine that a taste can be created in South America for North American products. Our civilization is complete in itself as is that of England or Germany or France or even the United States; our tastes are permanently formed and past educational endeavors, and producers who would find new markets in South America must cater to South American tastes. If for machetes they will persist in sending us bowie knives; if for plain cottons they will send us variegated prints; if for small packages they will persist in shipping us unwieldy bales that can not be carried from the coast, the American manufacturers must continue to find our Southern markets practically closed against them. These are solid truths, however distasteful, and the sooner they are realized and acted upon by the Americans the better it will be for them.

Gentlemen who favor the bill talk as though all we need now are ships to carry the products between the two countries. This article which I have just quoted shows that American merchant vessels are of a secondary consideration. The truth is that the manufacturers of this country have produced for the American market which has been built up under our protective tariff system. It is the surplus that they have attempted to dispose of abroad to a class of people living in a different climate, with different manners, tastes, and characteristics.

The goods which we have sent them have not been adapted to their wants and hence they have very properly turned their trade to England, Germany, and other European countries, whose manufacturers have appreciated this difference and adapted the manufacture of their goods to such changed conditions. I am told, Mr. Chairman, by those familiar with the South American trade, that the manner of packing the goods shipped to those Latin-American countries of itself is enough to open a market or close it against American goods. All goods intended for the interior of the country must be packed so as to be carried on mules, and are required to be made as small and compact as possible.

The expense incurred in taking the bulky form of the packages shipped from the United States and repacking them to suit the interior trade of the South American countries decreases by a very large per cent. the profits in handling the goods. Again, we should have direct banking facilities between New York and these South American countries. Under the trade conditions to-day all commercial transactions between those countries are settled in London, and every business man understands that the settlement of these differences in the trade of the respective countries through the banks in London places the American merchants who desire to extend their trade in the South American states at a very great disadvantage.

Another element that enters in the trade between the two countries that in my judgment has not been sufficiently dwelt upon in this debate is the acquaintance between buyer and seller necessary to successfully carry on commercial transactions. Our manufacturers and exporters have not paid sufficient attention to this in looking to our Southern trade. A large wholesale house in New York City may possess the finest line of goods that can be found in any market and the prices may range 20 per cent. less than those charged for like goods in Philadelphia, Baltimore, or Chicago, but unless it sends out its agents to form an acquaintance with those desiring its class of goods the enterprising merchants of Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Chicago will control the market.

Just so is it in our efforts to establish a market in Brazil and other Central and South American States. If the cotton manufacturers of New England wish to find a market in those countries for the product of their mills they must send their agent there, so that he may form the acquaintance of the people, study their habits and peculiarities, learn from actual contact with them the character of the cotton goods best adapted to their wants, and then, instead of manufacturing a product that will sell well in Wisconsin or Minnesota, produce a cotton cloth that is adapted to that civilization and that climate. The products of the West intended for the Brazilian market must be shipped under the trade conditions that I have here but faintly expressed, or we will find that our much-lauded reciprocity with that country is like "keeping the word of promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope."

As I have already shown, there are an abundance of ships now in the ocean carrying trade to transport our products there. The opening of the United States Treasury to subsidize these lines already existing and new lines which may be established between the countries will not meet the demands of the hour. Our trade relations with Brazil can not be built up in a moment. A prodigal expenditure of money from the Treasury for this purpose will impose a burden upon the taxpayer without his receiving any resultant benefits. My remedy, Mr. Chairman, is embodied in the substitute which I have offered for the pending bill. It in brief is this:

It authorizes the Postmaster-General to enter into contracts with American citizens to establish lines of swift-going steamships for the carrying of the mails between the ports of this country and of such foreign countries as have entered or may hereafter enter into trade relations with the United States under the reciprocity clause of the new tariff law. These steam vessels must be built under the supervision of the Secretary of the Navy, and so constructed that they can easily be transformed into naval vessels in case of war with any foreign country. They must be manned by American sailors, and are to be paid for the carrying of the mails at rates based on the speed made in the transporting of the mails from one country to another.

The compensation, under the contracts made with the Postmaster-General, is to be taken from the revenues the Post-Office Department receives from our foreign mails. This amount, as shown by the Postmaster-General's report to the present Congress, aggregates a little over $2,655,000. If the substitute is adopted by the House and becomes a law it will enable this Government, at a small expense, to establish close, direct, and rapid postal relations between the United States and Brazil, and all other countries entering into such trade relations. Our increased mail facilities will naturally and necessarily lead to a greater personal acquaintance between the merchants and shippers of the respective countries, and trade will necessarily adapt itself to the new order of things.

There are ships enough now to carry the goods. What we want are the conditions that will be brought about under the substitute to the pending bill which I have offered for the consideration of the House. No class of citizens can take exception to our Government using the revenue that it receives from its foreign mails to still further facilitate our postal relations with foreign countries. This will not deplete the Treasury of the United States and is not obnoxious to the one hundred and one objections that can be urged against the bill reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

It will act as an aid or auxiliary to the reciprocity clause of the new tariff legislation in this, that our Government can show, as an extra inducement to other Central and South American States to enter into trade relations with us, that this Government is authorized to aid in placing a line of steamers between the ports of the two countries and establish direct and increased mail facilities as soon as their trade relations are concluded.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, this substitute will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR] is recognized.

Mr. MORROW. The gentleman from New York, prior to his departure from the Hall a few moments ago, made an arrangement whereby I should control a portion of the time in the discussion at this point.

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was under discussion in the House before, and several times in the progress of debate upon other measures, it has been alleged that this proposition is supported by the presence of an active lobby around this Capitol.

I desire to say that I have not come in contact with any such advocates of the bill. I presume that the inference sought to be conveyed is that the measure is supported by some improper influence. I do not think that the charge is well founded or just. Like other members of the House I am advised, or I try to be advised, by the opinion of people who are conversant with subjects of legislation such as is now under consideration, and with reference to this pending matter I am free to say that there are business men in various parts of our country engaged in commercial enterprises who are more familiar with the practical side of this subject than I am. I can not avoid being influenced by their good judgment, to a certain extent at least, in determining the probable results which it is supposed will be accomplished by this measure.

The subject of American shipping interests is one that has been thoroughly considered on the Pacific coast. About two years ago the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, realizing that our interests on that coast were different in some particulars from what they are in the East, called a conference of the representatives of the commercial bodies of the Pacific coast in San Francisco. At this conference there assembled representatives from the Board of Trade of Portland, Oregon; the Chamber of Commerce of Tacoma, Wash.; Chamber of Commerce of Astoria, Oregon; Chamber of Commerce of Eureka, Cal.; the Board of Trade of Sacramento; the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles; the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego; the California State Board of Trade, San

Francisco; the Board of Trade of San Francisco; the San Francisco Produce Exchange; the Manufacturers' Association of California; the Board of State Viticultural Commissioners, and the Federated Trades of the Pacific coast.

Representatives of these bodies, as I have said, assembled in conference in San Francisco in 1889 and took into consideration the various commercial questions which were of importance and pressing interest to our section of the Union. Committees were appointed to confer with respect thereto, and among other subjects considered was the one relating to the permanent establishment of special mail steamship lines on the Pacific Ocean, to be encouraged by liberal compensation on the part of the Government for the carriage of the mails on such lines by steamers available for war or other purposes. I shall not have time to read the resolutions, but will submit them with my remarks, and invite the attention of members to a careful examination of the reasons given for the support they ask of the Representatives of that part of the country for this legislation.

At a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, held on the 23d day of July, 1889, Capt. William L. Merry presented the following resolutions, which, after due discussion, were unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That prior to the departure of our Pacific coast Senators and Representatives for the national Capital, this chamber of commerce shall convene in special session, inviting their attendance, and also the Manufacturers' Association, the State Board of Trade, the Board of Trade of San Francisco, the State Viticultural Society, the San Francisco Produce Exchange, the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego, the Chamber of Commerce of Eureka, Cal., the Portland (Oregon) Board of Trade, the Astoria (Oregon) Chamber of Commerce, Tacoma and Seattle Chambers of Commerce, and such other incorporated commercial organizations in California, Oregon, Washington, and Nevada as may be decided entitled to admission by the board of trustees of this chamber, to send representatives to a commercial convention called for the consideration of the following subjects:

"1. The permanent establishment of ocean mail steamship lines on Pacific Ocean routes, and the liberal compensation by the Government for the carriage of ocean mails on said lines, by steamships available for war and transport purposes.

"2. The application of the interstate-commerce law to the American carrying trade of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the abolition of the bonding system for railway carriage through foreign territory.

"3. The maritime defense of Pacific coast ports.

"4. An ocean telegraph cable to Australia via the Pacific Islands.

"5. The energetic construction of the Nicaragua Canal as a means of national defense and commercial development.

"6. The encouragement of maritime commerce and increased energy in the construction of a navy.

"*Resolved*, That the board of trustees of this Chamber of Commerce shall fix the date for said special session, issue the necessary official invitations, and appoint committees to report on the subjects above named.

"*Resolved*, That no other subjects shall be considered at said special session, except by unanimous consent."

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF SAN FRANCISCO.

Special session, August 29 and 30, 1889.

Report of commercial conference with the Board of Trade of Portland, Oregon; the Chamber of Commerce of Tacoma, Wash.; the Chamber of Commerce of Astoria, Oregon; the Chamber of Commerce of Eureka, Cal.; the Board of Trade of Sacramento, Cal.; the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal.; the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego, Cal.; the California State Board of Trade, San Francisco; the Board of Trade of San Francisco; the San Francisco Produce Exchange; the Manufacturers' Association of California, San Francisco; the Board of State Viticultural Commissioners, San Francisco; the Federated Trades of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco.

Committees appointed to report on subjects named.

On the permanent establishment of ocean mail steamship lines on Pacific Ocean routes, and the liberal compensation by the Government for the carriage of ocean mails on said lines, by steamships available for war and transport purposes:

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce committee: Capt. Charles Goodall, Capt. Oliver Eldridge, Capt. John H. Freeman, George H. Sanderson, and John L. Howard.

Conference committee: Capt. William L. Merry, J. W. Case, John Kastle, E. W. Jones, M. K. Snell, J. McCracken, F. A. Weck, John T. Doyle, E. J. Gregory, W. H. Mills, Levi M. Kellogg, C. B. Stone, and Irving M. Scott.

* * * * * * * *

Report on the permanent establishment of ocean mail steamship lines on Pacific Ocean routes, and the liberal compensation by the Government for the carriage of ocean mails on said lines, by steamships available for war and transport purposes, as adopted by the conference.

The following propositions were submitted by resolution to your committee for consideration:

"The permanent establishment of ocean mail steamship lines on Pacific Ocean routes, and the liberal compensation by the Government for the carriage of ocean mails on said lines, by steamships available for war and transportation purposes."

The foregoing reference embraces three propositions, which your committee for convenience will consider separately.

1. "The permanent establishment of ocean mail steamship lines on the Pacific Ocean routes."

The existing ocean steamship lines which naturally fall within the scope of your committee's investigation are:

JAPAN AND CHINA.

1. Pacific Mail Steamship Company, American; employing four steamships on the American register, alternating about every eleven days with the—

2. Occidental and Oriental Steamship Company's steamers, four in number; chartered from the White Star Line of Liverpool. These chartered British steamers alternate with the Pacific Mail Company's vessels.

3. Canadian Pacific line of chartered British steamships, three in number, which provide a four-weekly service between Japan and China and Vancouver, British Columbia.

The United States Post-Office Department pays no subsidy for postal or other purposes to the American line between San Francisco and China. The remuneration for carriage of the United States mail is ocean letter rates, which amounted to $13,229.34 in 1886–'87, and about $14,000 in round figures last fiscal year.

This amount is divided between the two American companies running American and chartered steamships to Japan and China from San Francisco in proportion to the size of the mail carried by each, respectively. The Pacific Mail Company's vessels, being on the American register, are paid ships' letter and inland postage rates; the chartered vessels of the Occidental and Oriental Company are paid ships' letter rates only.

The distance covered by the vessels is about 12,768 miles each round voyage. The mail service averages about thirty-three round trips each year. The United States Government pays an average of $427 per round trip for carrying its China mail. This payment can not be termed adequate remuneration for such postal services, and, as contrasted with payments for railroad mail transportation, the injustice done to American steamships engaged in the foreign trade is at once apparent. The Post-Office Department pays American railroads for carrying the United States domestic mail an average of 10.95 cents per mile. If the same rate of payment were made to American steamships in the foreign trade by the Post-Office Department it would be some encouragement to steamship owners, but this is not the case, and the practical effect of the post-office law at present is to discourage the employment of American steamships in foreign commerce.

The Canadian Pacific Company established a four-weekly line of steamers between Vancouver, British Columbia, and China and Japan, in 1887, and ran them in opposition to the two steamship lines trading out of San Francisco.

The Canadian line was established in the expectation of a substantial subsidy, which has since been realized.

A ten-years' contract has been entered into by the British and Canadian Governments with the Canadian Pacific Company by which the latter is to receive $400,000 a year for a four-weekly mail service with three steamships between Vancouver, Hong-Kong, and Shanghai. The sea distance is considerably less on each round trip than the distance covered by the Pacific Mail and Occidental and Oriental vessels.

It is only necessary to contrast the postal subsidy payable to the British Canadian line to China with the payment by the United States Government for carrying its mail by the American line from San Francisco to China, to realize the immense advantage British commercial interests enjoy over American commercial interests in the China trade. Thus, for the services of three steamships, making thirteen round trips each year, the owners are to receive for carrying the British mail in excess of $37,769 per round voyage. The United States Government enjoys the services of eight steamships sailing from San Francisco making an average eleven days' service, the steaming distance being considerably greater than on the British line, and it pays the owners and charterers for carrying the American mail $127 per round voyage, as already presented.

The statement of this fact is enough to condemn the parsimonious policy of our Government in respect to ocean commerce, and to excite admiration for the liberal and progressive policy of England and Canada. The intention is that the Pacific Ocean line from Vancouver to China shall connect, by the Canadian Pacific Railroad at Quebec and Halifax, in summer and winter, respectively, with a weekly line of fast steamships to run from those ports to Liverpool and for which England and Canada have contracted to pay an annual subsidy of $500,000.

The steamships for the Canada-Atlantic and the Canada-Pacific lines are to be built under the admiralty rules, and to be capable of being converted into unarmored cruisers without delay or modification of any kind. For this, the British admiralty pays a handsome bonus upon each vessel, and stipulates to make adequate compensation to the owners should the Imperial Government incorporate any of the ships in the navy of Great Britain. The amount of such payment can not be ascertained, but it is understood to be large.

The establishment of the Canadian Pacific Steamship line to China and Japan has had the effect of diverting a considerable amount of United States freight from the American railroads and steamship lines, making San Francisco their terminus. The Chief of the United States Bureau of Statistics reports an increase of 90 per cent. on the half year ended December 31, 1888, over the preceding half year, in the quantity of merchandise exported from the United States to China and Japan by the Canadian Pacific Railroad. The weight of the merchandise so transported for the six months in question is given at 2,175 tons, as against 5,488 tons for eighteen months ended December 31, 1888.

The principal export in the last six months of 1888 consisted of 2,391½ tons of New England cotton goods, which showed that American manufactures are being shipped from Eastern points to China by the British steamship line, and not from San Francisco by an American line. As a further illustration of this diversion of trade, Vice President Towne of the Southern Pacific Railroad stated before the Senate Interstate-Commerce Committee that whereas the imports of tea by the American lines had decreased nearly 2,822 tons in 1888 as compared with 1887, the imports by the Canadian Pacific have increased by 1,849 tons.

The aggregate trade of the Dominion proper with China and Japan on the basis of goods entered for consumption and exported was $2,261,155 in 1888.

The aggregate value of the Japan and China trade of the United States in 1888 was $44,109,139, or about twenty times greater than the trade of Canada with those countries, yet the United States Government pays only $14,000 a year for its important and frequent China mail service; while England and Canada have contracted to pay $400,000 a year for an unimportant four-weekly service. England is also to pay a heavy construction bonus for naval purposes on the vessels employed. With such special advantages the Canadian Pacific can afford to quote rates which must drive the American lines out of the China trade, and inflict an almost irreparable injury upon San Francisco.

NORTH PACIFIC LINE TO BRITISH COLUMBIA.

1. Pacific Coast Steamship Company, American; runs a line of steamships every five days to Victoria, British Columbia, thence to Puget Sound ports and Alaska.

The Canadian postal department pays $1,470 per month for mail service performed by the company, or $17,640 per annum. The United States Government paid this company for one year $219.28 for carrying the American mail to British Columbia in fifty voyages. Comment upon these figures is superfluous.

MEXICAN AND CENTRAL AMERICAN LINE.

1. Pacific Mail Steamship Company, American; runs five steamships on the main line from San Francisco and Panama, touching at Mexican and Central American way ports, and forms connection with the Atlantic line of the same company at Aspinwall, by the Panama Railroad. Carries the United States mail. During coffee season makes three trips per month; fortnightly service at other times.

Receives ships' letter rates and inland postage for carrying the United States mail to Mexican and Central American ports of the Pacific coast to Panama. The payment for this important and expensive service last year was an insignificant sum. The distance traversed each round trip is about 5,200 miles.

2. Pacific Mail Steamship Company, American; runs three coasting steamers from Central American ports to Panama.

3. Pacific Coast Steamship Company, American; runs one steamship monthly to Mexican ports from San Francisco. Is paid ship's letter rates and inland postages for the limited quantity of mail carried.

4. A small Mexican steamer runs to and from San Francisco in opposition to the American vessel, and enjoys special advantages. The Mexican Government pays the owners $2,700 per monthly trip; and they get an abatement of $650 monthly on port charges. This is equivalent to a subsidy of $40,200 yearly. In addition to this direct money payment to the Mexican steamship owners, American shippers have a rebate of 2 per cent. of customs duties who patronize

the line. To meet this the American vessel is compelled to accept very low rates for freight or withdraw from the Mexican trade.

On the other hand, the United States collect tonnage dues on this Mexican steamer of about $600 per trip, and on account of a similar discrimination occurring in New Orleans, and as a retaliatory measure, orders have been issued by the Secretary of the United States Treasury to exact 10 per cent. duty on all goods hereafter imported by vessels under the Mexican flag.

The Marquis de Campo established a Spanish line of steamers between San Francisco and Panama, about three years ago, but although subsidized by Spain and the Central American Government, it was not a success, and the vessels, four in number, were withdrawn after about a year's trial. This abortive attempt to drive the Pacific Mail Company off the Mexican and Central American trade suggests the possibility of more effective opposition in the interests of British shipping after the China and Australian trade has been captured from American steamship lines.

AUSTRALIAN, NEW ZEALAND, AND HAWAIIAN LINES.

1. Oceanic Steamship Company of California, American, employs four steamships to perform this important service, two of which are on the American and two on the Hawaiian register.

The Australian and New Zealand line provides a four-weekly service between San Francisco, Auckland, and Sydney, which covers all Australian colonies; and as the vessels of this line call each trip at Honolulu, alternating with a direct steamer to that port, the Hawaiian Islands enjoy a fortnightly mail service with this coast. For this service, the Hawaiian Government pays $24,000 a year subsidy to the Oceanic Company.

The Australian line is subsidized by the Governments of New Zealand and New South Wales. These colonies pay in subsidy and bonuses about $200,000 yearly under the present contract. Up to November, 1885, the United States simply paid the steamship companies carrying the American mail to Australia and Oceanica ship letter rates, ranging yearly from $4,000 upwards. It would be a liberal estimate to average the general payments for postages by the United States to the steamships on the Australian line since 1870 at $10,000 per annum.

When the contract with the Oceanic Company was being entered into, in 1885, the United States Postmaster-General was requested by the New Zealand Government to contribute an equitable share of the subsidy, and he consented to pay $20,000 a year for three years, which was intended by him to cover the transportation of the bulky United States mail to Honolulu, Samoa, New Zealand, Fiji, Australia, Tasmania, and other places in the South Pacific. This was not considered sufficient by the colonies and great dissatisfaction at the niggardly policy of the United States was expressed. So strong did this feeling become that in 1888 the New Zealand Legislature passed a resolution instructing the Government not to renew the contract after 1889, an extension for that year being agreed to. This extended contract expires November, 1889, so far as New Zealand is concerned.

The action of the New Zealand Parliament and the general dissatisfaction of the colonies having been strongly presented to the Postmaster-General, he consented to pay $50,000 per annum for the United States Australian mail. This decision was not arrived at, however, until after the order to discontinue the California mail route had been made by the New Zealand Legislature. It became operative for the present year, but inasmuch as one of the steamships owned by the company is not on the American register a reduction is made, the actual payment being $46,800. Of this amount the Oceanic Company receives $28,666 and the colonial Governments $17,332 towards reducing their payment on account of subsidy.

It thus appears that the United States, with a population of 60,000,000, pays less than one-fourth the amount now contributed to the Australian mail service by New Zealand and New South Wales which have jointly a population of 1,600,000. And it should be noted further that these British colonies pay this relatively large subsidy to an American steamship company for postal facilities of which the United States avails itself more than they do. The ratio of the United States mail carried by the Oceanic Company's steamers is that of five American pouches or bags to four British and colonial bags of mail.

The United States, while not contributing any substantial amount to the Australian mail service for many years, collected a large sum annually from the British post office for the transportation of the Australian mail by railroad from New York to San Francisco. This charge has averaged for a considerable period about $80,000 yearly, and its imposition forms a serious objection by the colonies to the continuance of the California mail route.

New South Wales has conditionally agreed to continue this service for another year, but as yet nothing has been definitely settled. The colonies are reported to be willing to pay half the subsidy for an efficient fortnightly mail service on the San Francisco route if the United States post office pays the remaining half. This is a very liberal offer and calls for reciprocal action by the United States.

Meanwhile the Canadian Pacific is in the field urging its claims for subsidy to a competing line from Vancouver to Australia. If the United States Postmaster-General could at once guaranty half the subsidy for a fortnightly Australian mail service, the colonial Parliaments being now in session, the question might be speedily settled in favor of the San Francisco route; but this can not be done, and every day's delay improves the chances of the Canadian Pacific and weakens that of the American line.

The Australian mail service was established by New Zealand and New South Wales in 1870, and has been maintained by them ever since, with the exception of one year's interval before the Pacific Mail Company got the contract, in November, 1875, and which it held till November, 1885, when it was taken up by the Oceanic Company. The Pacific Mail Company withdrew from the Australian trade because without substantial aid from the United States Government the line would not pay with the greatly reduced colonial subsidy then offered.

It has cost the two colonies named about $5,000,000 to maintain this distinctly American mail service. The United States payment for carrying its Australian mail has not averaged $10,000 per annum for the seventeen years of actual running, but taking it at that figure there is a total expenditure of $170,000.

In point of fact, however, the United States post office derived a large net revenue from the Australian postal line, established and maintained by colonial enterprise. The post office retained all postages on mail matter originating in the United States, which was far in excess of its payments to the steamship owners for postal services; and it collected a further sum for railroad transportation of the closed British mail, which may be estimated at not less than $60,000 per annum for the entire duration of the service.

In 1880-'81 Congress appropriated $20,000, which the colonies received as a refund for that year of what was considered to be an excessive charge. Deducting this sum and the average payments to the steamships, there is an apparent aggregate net revenue to the United States post office on the Australian mail of $830,000, plus postages in excess of ship's letter rates. On the other hand, New Zealand alone, with a population at the present time of about 600,000, has paid in direct subsidies and bonuses to this line $3,021,465 since its establishment. What wonder if New Zealand declined to continue this subsidy, when the United States, whose commerce was being extended and which derived the greater share of the postal and other advantages, not alone refused to pay an equitable amount for carrying its mail, but made it a source of revenue. Yet New Zealand is willing to bear a fair proportion of the cost of establishing a fortnightly service to San Francisco jointly with the United States.

Even the little Kingdom of Hawaii, with a population of 80,000 people, paid a much larger sum annually, for the past eight or ten years, for its mail between Honolulu and San Francisco, a steaming distance of about 4,000 miles each round trip, than the United States, with its fifty to sixty millions of people, paid for its Hawaiian, New Zealand, and Australian mail, the steaming distance being 14,400 miles the round voyage.

The Oceanic Steamship Company will receive from the United States post office during 1889, for thirteen complete voyages $28,666, or about $2,205 per round trip of 14,400 miles. During the three previous years it received $20,000 per annum, or $1,538.46 per round trip; and for ten years previously the Pacific Mail Company did not average more than half that amount for performing a similar service for the United States Government. The burden of maintaining the Australian mail service via San Francisco fell upon two small British communities, and American steamship lines earned nearly all the colonial subsidies. This is hardly creditable to the United States.

The Australian mail service has developed a very important and increasing trade from San Francisco to Hawaii, Samoa, New Zealand, and Australia. The value of the Australian trade with the United States last year was $16,196,458, of which $3,407,358 fell to the share of San Francisco. The bulk of Australian trade was with the East. The maintenance of this mail service is therefore of the utmost commercial importance to Eastern manufacturers and shippers. It is capable, however, of very great development. The foreign commerce of the Australian colonies in 1887 aggregated $539,029,745; last year, in round figures, it amounted to $600,000,000, with a population of about 4,000,000 in all the colonies.

England controls this trade, and pays large subsidies to the Peninsular and Oriental, and Orient Steamship lines for postal purposes to enable her to retain it. The Australian colonies also subsidize these lines, and the British India Steamship Navigation Company—a very powerful organization—is also subsidized by the Queensland Government. New Zealand also pays a subsidy of $100,000 a year for a direct steamer service to England in addition to its contribution to the San Francisco service. Yet the experience of most of the colonies in question is that the postages nearly recoup the subsidies, the payment of which develops commerce.

The Canadian Pacific is endeavoring to obtain a subsidy for a line of steamships from Vancouver to Sydney via Fiji, with a branch line from Fiji to Auckland. The Dominion Government has promised a subsidy, and a conference of representatives of the various Australian Governments has been arranged to meet a Canadian representative and discuss the terms upon which Australia will participate in the Canadian project. Should this conference come to a mutual understanding and agreement, it is intended by New South Wales to withdraw from the San Francisco mail service and take up the Canadian Pacific line to Vancouver. This would be very injurious to American commerce, and especially so to San Francisco, which benefits largely from Australian travel. The danger is imminent, and should be met by prompt defensive measures. The establishment of a fortnightly American steamship line to Auckland and Sydney from San Francisco suggests itself as the most direct and effective way to preserve the Australian trade.

STEAMSHIP COMPENSATION.

The second proposition in the reference to your committee is "the liberal compensation by the Government for the carriage of ocean mails on Pacific Ocean routes."

Having presented in the foregoing recital the policy of the United States Government in regard to ocean-mail payments, and its necessarily injurious effect upon the foreign commerce of the country, it is proper to consider the remedy that should be applied. And here your committee have the practice of other countries to guide them.

England has built up her vast shipping interests by liberal subsidies paid to steamship companies for postal services. France, Germany, and Italy are following England's example with marked success. An English Parliamentary commission recently elicited the information from Clyde shipbuilders that orders from the continent of Europe for ships were now rarely secured, the bounty system and subsidies having led to the establishment of great shipbuilding yards in France and Italy especially. These countries will soon be wholly independent of England for their ships, the adoption of the British policies having accomplished that for them.

England paid $5,950,000 in steamship subsidies in 1851. After our civil war the payment of subsidies was reduced to $1,000,000, but it was soon increased to $6,107,000, and thereby England succeeded in checking the attempt at competition by American steamship lines. The Brazil service, established by John Roach, was run off by a competing English line guarantied 8 per cent. on the capital stock by the British Government. The same policy is being applied to the Pacific Ocean trade. The China trade is already doomed; so also is the Australian and Central American trade, unless Congress adopts prompt and effective measures to preserve and extend our commercial influence in the Pacific.

Without going into details, it appears to your committee that the French system is best adapted to meet the exigencies of the case. The United States is practically without a merchant navy. England has in round figures an excess of 3,000 steamships in the foreign trade, with a carrying capacity of over 3,000,000 tons. The United States has 40 steamships in the foreign trade, of 75,000 tons. The total tonnage of England is about 6,000,000 tons; of the United States about 800,000 tons. American bottoms now barely carry 14 per cent. of American foreign trade; in 1855, 75½ per cent. of our foreign commerce was carried by American ships.

Steamships and sailing vessels must be built in America if we are to become a powerful maritime nation; and they must be built upon terms which would enable their owners to obtain them as cheaply as they could buy them abroad. There is a difference in builders' cost of 15 per cent. in favor of British iron or steel ships as against American ships. This difference should be made good by a bounty, but that would hardly suffice under actual conditions. The great demand for ships under such a policy would necessarily increase wages, hence add to the cost of construction. The bounty should cover that, and it should also be sufficient to induce capitalists to establish new shipbuilding yards and foundries to supply the wants of the American foreign trade.

The French bounty system would probably suffice, and should have a test of at least fifteen years. France pays $11.58 per ton bounty for iron or steel hulls; $7.72 per ton bounty for composite vessels; $3.86 per ton bounty for wooden vessels. A further sum of $3.52 bounty is paid for every 225 pounds of boilers and machinery placed on board; also a navigating bounty of 29 cents per ton for each thousand miles traversed, the payment being reduced 1 cent per ton for every year the vessel floats. In addition to this, iron or steel vessels built according to the marine department plans receive a further bonus of 15 per cent. France also pays heavy postal subsidies. The Messageries Maritimes Company, in the Australian and China trade, receives in all about $2,500,000 a year.

Italy pays a construction bounty of $5.70 per ton for iron and steel; also a considerable bounty on engines and boilers, a navigation bounty, and other specific advantages which need not be enumerated.

Germany aids liberally in construction and pays heavy postal subsidies, the North German Lloyds in the Australian and American trade receiving $1,100,000 a year.

Spain pays very liberal postal subsidies, and is extending its commerce; a new Spanish steamship line from Genoa to Colon having been announced recently. Spain pays to its postal routes to Mexico, the West Indies, and the

United States $1,022,640 per annum, and the line from Havana to the United States receives $20,687 per voyage.

The necessity for a navigation bounty to American steamships as well as a liberal construction bounty will be evident from the fact that the cost of sailing an American vessel is far greater than that of sailing an English or other foreign vessel of the same tonnage. According to the United States consular reports, English officers and men receive 38 per cent. lower wages than American crews, while the American crews demand 27 per cent. better fare than the English. This comparison is for the Atlantic voyage; if a Pacific voyage were selected the difference against the American owners would be more marked still, because on the Pacific trade the men insist upon higher wages and more expensive food supplies.

Congress therefore should protect American vessels engaged in the foreign trade as fully as the owners of vessels of any other nation are protected by their governments. If it does not do so it will be impossible for American ships to be built and compete with foreign vessels in ocean commerce. They are wholly unable to do so now. As an illustration of this your committee would cite the fact that of a total grain fleet last season at San Francisco numbering 289 vessels only 60 were American, while 199 were English, the remainder belonging to other nationalities. Estimating the freight at 30 shillings per ton, foreign shipowners must have received $5,165,301 freight from this State last season, while American shipowners only earned $929,838. Freight is always paid in gold, and it appears to your committee that it is the pressing duty of Congress to stop this immense drain of gold and enable Americans to build and sail steamships and other vessels to compete upon equal terms in the open market for a share of the world's commerce while handling their own.

FORMATION OF A NAVAL RESERVE.

This brings your committee to the last point, namely, that "the United States mail should be carried on American vessels available for war and for transport purposes."

National safety demands that this should be the case. England is girdling the world with swift, unarmored cruisers built as men-of-war, but sailed as passenger and mail boats in time of peace. The terms of the Canadian Pacific contract for the China service, and of Messrs. Anderson's contract for the connecting Atlantic line serve to disclose the policy of England upon this point, and should lead to the adoption by the United States of a similar policy.

France, Germany, Italy, Spain—indeed all maritime countries—have adopted the English method of creating a naval reserve while stimulating trade and commerce. England pays liberally for the privilege of supervising the construction of these ships, and this country can afford to outdo her in liberality. There is no time to be lost. American interests are spreading; American commerce is the largest factor in the world's trade; and America should not be at the mercy of any foreign power to destroy its commerce at pleasure. Our flag should be on every sea, and the National Government should have the means at its command to protect it.

CONCLUSIONS.

Your committee, from a consideration of the foregoing, would submit the following resolutions for adoption:

Whereas it is of the utmost national importance to maintain and improve the existing American steamship lines on the Pacific Ocean, and to establish new steamship routes for the extension of American commerce; and

Whereas an enlightened policy of national defense demands the formation of a strong naval reserve to co-operate with the national ships in time of war:

Be it resolved, That Congress be requested to adopt measures whereby the following results may be obtained, namely:

To enable the American-China line from San Francisco to compete successfully with the subsidized British-China line from Vancouver.

To establish and maintain at least one new and efficient steamship line between San Francisco and South American ports.

To establish and maintain a fortnightly mail and passenger service between San Francisco and Australia, touching at Honolulu, Samoa, and New Zealand.

To maintain the independent Hawaiian mail steamship service.

To develop American trade with Canada by paying an adequate amount for the conveyance of the United States mail to British Columbian ports.

To maintain and extend the existing American steamship service between San Francisco and Panama, calling at Mexican and Central American ports.

To encourage American steamships to engage in the Mexican trade by placing them in a position to compete successfully with subsidized vessels of any nationality.

And be it further resolved, That in order to encourage American shipbuilding and to create a strong naval reserve, as well as to establish and maintain the above-mentioned Pacific steamship routes, all of which are absolutely essential to the extension of American commerce, Congress be requested to adopt the French scale of construction, navigation, and naval bounties, for iron or steel, composite and wooden vessels: *Provided*, That no steamship intended for the American foreign trade shall be entitled to receive a bonus from the navy appropriation unless it shall have been built according to the rules of the Navy Department and enrolled in the naval reserve list.

That for the better development of American trade and commerce it is a primary condition of success that liberal payments should be made to American steamships carrying the United States mails, to enable them to compete with subsidized foreign vessels on the same routes.

That Congress be requested to enact the necessary laws to give effect to these resolutions and appropriate a sufficient sum for the above-mentioned purposes.

From the arguments here presented, Mr. Chairman, I have felt it to be my duty to support the bill under consideration, and during the short time I shall occupy the attention of the House I propose to give some further reasons why this bill will have my vote. I do not look upon this as a partisan measure.

If there is a bill before Congress that should be considered on its merits, without reference to party or sectional influences, it is this bill. The conditions it seeks to remedy are certainly of such an unfortunate and deplorable character as to invite the best judgment of patriotic men of all parties.

In the year 1860 the population of the United States was 31,443,321. In 1890 the population had increased to 62,622,250, an increase in population in thirty years of 31,178,929, or nearly 100 per cent.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1861, the imports into the United States were valued at $289,310,542 and the exports at $219,553,833. The total imports and exports amounted to $508,864,375. For the year ending June 30, 1890, the imports amounted to $789,310,409, the exports to $857,824,684, and the commodities that arrived and departed in transit to $111,398,852. The total value of our foreign commerce, including transit trade, was therefore $1,758,537,945—an increase in our foreign commerce in thirty years amounting to $1,249,673,570, or nearly 246 per cent.

In carrying our foreign commerce of 1861 there were employed American vessels of the registered tonnage of 2,494,894 tons. In 1890 there were employed American vessels of the registered tonnage of 928,062 tons, a decrease in thirty years of American vessels representing 1,566,832 tons, or a loss of nearly 63 per cent. in tonnage. This extraordinary contraction of American tonnage engaged in the foreign trade, when compared with the enormous expansion of our foreign commerce and increase in population, shows that there is something seriously wrong in the policy we have pursued of late toward this industry.

It is evident that we have arrived at a most critical as well as a most important period in our merchant-marine service—critical, because after nearly thirty years of constantly decreasing American tonnage in our foreign carrying trade we have reached a point of weakness where we must either abandon all pretense of national concern in that direction and allow our flag to practically disappear from the great ocean highways of commerce, or by a change of policy seek without further delay to regain our lost prestige as one of the leading maritime nations of the world.

Our present utter feebleness must end soon, either in complete destruction or resurrection. Which shall it be? It ought to be unquestionably a quick and positive resumption of former vigor. The present condition of affairs presents an opportunity for a speedy and profitable revival when we can take advantage of such high developments in steam power and naval architecture as to promise the most economical and permanent results.

When mechanical skill can extract from 1.3 pounds of coal a steam energy of one horse power for one hour, carrying a ton of freight 26 miles, we may safely assume that the limit of efficiency has nearly been reached, and we will not be called upon to waste much labor or material in useless or unprofitable experiments. Moreover, we have the skill and all the appliances for building modern ships of the most approved types. Our naval construction, although recent, has already demonstrated our ability to build steamships of the best class.

We are all agreed, furthermore, that we want American ships to carry American products to the markets of the world. The question is, how shall we obtain this result? Our Democratic friends insist that free trade and free ships will accomplish the purpose, but there is not a particle of evidence anywhere to support this claim. The methods that have been resorted to by the leading nations to develop and extend their merchant-marine service may be enumerated as follows:

1. Discriminating import and tonnage duties in favor of domestic vessels.
2. Drawback on imported shipbuilding materials.
3. Free shipbuilding materials.
4. Free ships.
5. Construction bounties.
6. Navigation bounties.
7. Postal subsidies.
8. Naval subventions.

THE POLICY OF PROTECTION.

The first method, that of imposing discriminating import duties against foreign vessels and in favor of domestic vessels, was the effective system of protection devised and adopted by the statesmen of the first Congress under the Constitution, and was a part of that famous protection act signed by Washington July 4, 1789. It provided a discrimination in favor of American vessels in the importation of teas from Europe and a still greater discrimination in favor of American vessels in the importation of teas direct from China and India, as follows:

Duties on different kinds of tea (per pound).

Manner of importation.	Bohea.	Souchong.	Hyson.	Other green.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
From China or India in American ships ...	6	10	10	12
From Europe in American vessels	8	13	26	16
In any other way than as above.....	15	22	45	27

The duties on East India goods other than teas, if brought by foreign vessels, were 12½ per cent. ad valorem, nearly double the rate by American vessels.

The act provided further:

SEC. 5. That a discount of 10 per cent. on all the duties imposed by this act shall be allowed on such goods, wares, and merchandise as shall be imported in vessels built in the United States, and which shall be wholly the property of a citizen or citizens thereof, or in vessels built in foreign countries and on the 16th day of May last wholly the property of a citizen or citizens of the United States, and so continuing until the time of importation.

This act was immediately followed by another act imposing duties on tonnage, which was approved July 20, 1789. It was the counterpart of the first-named act in extending specifically the principle of protection to the American vessel itself.

It provided as follows:

TONNAGE DUTIES.

	Cents.
On all vessels American-built, owned by citizens or foreign-built, owned by citizens the 29th of May, 1789, and while owned by citizens.....per ton..	6
On all vessels hereafter built in the United States, partly or wholly owned by foreigners.....per ton..	30
On all other ships or vessels, at the rate of.....do....	50

Here was a percentage of protection in favor of American vessels that would have furnished a text for our free-trade friends had they been there to assist in laying the foundations of the great Republic. Think of a tonnage duty that gives a protection of 500 per cent. to American vessels owned by American citizens as against American vessels owned partly by foreigners and partly by American citizens, and a protection of 833⅓ per cent. against all other vessels. If percentage always measures correctly the value of protection, as we were told in the last tariff debate, and the McKinley bill, giving an average protection of 44 per cent., has made the producers of protected articles "robber barons," pray what sort of sea pirates were these American sailors who, with this enormous percentage of protection, founded the American merchant-marine service, carried the flag to every part of the globe, and for more than fifty years dominated the seas?

But this tonnage act went still further and provided:

SEC. 2. That no ship or vessel built within the aforesaid States, and belonging to a citizen or citizens thereof, shall whilst employed in the coasting trade or in the fisheries pay tonnage more than once in a year.

SEC. 3. That every ship or vessel employed in the transportation of any of the produce or manufactures of the United States, coastwise within the said States, except such ship or vessel be built within the said States, and belong to a citizen or citizens thereof, shall, on each entry pay 50 cents per ton.

In plain language, this law required an American vessel engaged in coastwise trade to pay tonnage once a year, while a foreign vessel was required to pay the tax every time it entered an American port.

This was the commencement of the policy of protection which has saved to us our splendid coastwise trade, a policy which was made secure by being carried into a prohibition against foreign intrusion by section 4 of the act of March 1, 1817, providing—

That no goods, wares, or merchandise shall be imported, under penalty of forfeiture thereof, from one port of the United States to another port of the United States, in a vessel belonging wholly or in part to a subject of any foreign power, but this clause shall not be construed to prohibit the sailing of any foreign vessel from one to another port of the United States, provided no goods, wares, or merchandise, other than those imported in such vessel from some foreign port, and which shall not be unladen, shall be carried from one port or place to another in the United States.

In 1789 the tonnage of American vessels engaged in the coastwise trade was 68,607 tons, and under the policy of protection so wisely adopted and so vigorously maintained it has increased until now it has reached 3,409,435 tons. In this magnificent growth we find no free ship material nor free ships. It is all American industry and American enterprise, keeping pace with the development of the country.

The history of our foreign carrying trade presents a record equally satisfactory under this same policy of protection as long as it lasted, but unfortunately this policy was surrendered by degrees to secure what was termed in high-sounding phrase the "reciprocal liberty of commerce."

FREE TRADE IN FOREIGN SHIPPING.

The capitulation commenced in 1815, when Congress passed the act of March 3 of that year repealing the acts imposing discriminating duties on the tonnage of foreign ships and on goods, wares, and merchandise imported in foreign vessels, to take effect in favor of foreign nations wherever the President of the United States should be satisfied that the discriminating duties of such foreign nations, so far as they operated to the disadvantage of the United States, had been abolished. This act opened our ports to vessels of producing nations like Great Britain, engaged in direct trade, and was the first step in the direction of general free trade in the business of transportation between ports of the United States and foreign ports. The other concessions followed in due time. The act of March 1, 1817, to which reference has been made as providing protection to the coastwise trade, enlarged the freedom of our ports to vessels employed in the indirect foreign trade by providing that goods, wares, and merchandise might be imported into the United States in such foreign vessels as belonged to the citizens or subjects of that country from which such goods, wares, or merchandise could only be, or most usually were, first shipped for transportation, provided such vessel belonged to a nation which had adopted a similar regulation in favor of the United States.

It will not be necessary to refer to all the acts passed by Congress in favor of foreign ships between 1815 and 1850. They all appear to have had but one purpose, and that was the removal of the protection afforded by the act of July 4, 1789, which removal was finally consummated, so far as Congress was concerned, by the act of May 24, 1828. It provided:

That upon satisfactory evidence being given to the President of the United States by the Government of any foreign nation that no discriminating duties of tonnage or impost are imposed or levied in the ports of said nation upon vessels wholly belonging to citizens of the United States, or upon the produce, manufactures, or merchandise imported in the same from the United States, or from any foreign country, the President is hereby authorized to issue his proclamation declaring that the foreign discriminating duties of tonnage and impost within the United States are, and shall be suspended and discontinued so far as respects the vessels of the said foreign nation, and the produce, manufactures, and merchandise imported into the United States in the same from the said foreign nation or from any other foreign country; the said suspension to take effect from the time of such notification being given to the President of the United States, and to continue so long as the reciprocal exemption of vessels belonging to citizens of the United States and their cargoes, as aforesaid, shall be continued, and no longer.

It must be remembered that at this time Great Britain and all the leading nations of Europe were giving the greatest measure of protection to their ships and commodities. Great Britain in particular was laying with care the foundation of her future greatness as a maritime nation and was accepting reciprocity only when it gave her some new and decided advantage or privilege. The time had not then arrived when she could profitably withdraw the protection she was giving her merchant vessels. The general offer therefore contained in the act of 1828 was accordingly held in abeyance and we were left to surrender in detail, which we did without much hesitation, and Congress passed the act of May 29, 1830, opening our ports to British vessels engaged in the British West Indian trade on condition that Great Britain should open her ports in the West Indies to our vessels. There was no real reciprocity in this transaction, as was soon discovered, for imports from the United States into such colonial ports were made subject to heavy duties. We simply withdrew our protection from American vessels at the time and in the manner that would best subserve the shipping interests of Great Britain. But the time came when she was ready for free trade. At the opening of Parliament on February 2, 1849, the Queen, in her speech, said:

I again commend to your attention the restrictions imposed on commerce by the navigation laws. If you shall find that these laws are in whole or in part unnecessary for the maintenance of our maritime power, while they fetter trade and industry, you will no doubt deem it right to repeal or modify their provisions.

Parliament did find that the restrictions contained in the navigation laws were no longer necessary for the maintenance of British maritime power, and accordingly they were in the main repealed or modified by the act of June 26, 1849, bearing the significant title of "An act to amend the laws in force for the encouragement of British shipping and navigation." The act went into effect January 1, 1850. Our surrender now became complete, and the Government lost no time in accepting this offer of free trade in navigation, as appears by the following letter of the Secretary of the Treasury referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR] in his speech the other day:

[Circular instructions to collectors and other officers of the customs.]

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *October* 15, 1849.

In consequence of questions submitted by merchants and others, asking, in consideration of the recent limitations of the British navigation laws, on what footing the commercial relations between the United States and Great Britain will be placed on and after the 1st day of January next, the day on which the recent act of the British Parliament goes into operation, the Department deems it expedient at this time to issue the following general instructions for the information of officers of the customs and others interested:

First. In consequence of the limitation of the British navigation laws above referred to, British vessels from British and other foreign ports will, under our existing laws, after the 1st of January next, be allowed to enter in our ports with cargoes of the growth, manufacture, and production of any part of the world.

Second. Such vessels and their cargoes will be admitted on and after the date above mentioned on the same terms as to duties, imposts, and charges as vessels of the United States and their cargoes.

W. M. MERIDITH,
Secretary of the Treasury.

This act of our Government removed the last vestige of effective protection from American shipping and handed over our foreign commerce to our vigilant and scheming rivals. The "reciprocal liberty of commerce" contemplated by the act of March 1, 1817, and the act of May 24, 1828, was realized on the 1st day of January, 1850.

The American tonnage employed in foreign trade in 1789 was 123,893 tons. In 1850 it had increased under protection to 1,439,694 tons. The effect of the removal of this protection was not however immediately apparent. Several influences contributed to the advantage of our merchant-marine service from 1850 to 1855, chief among which were the discovery of gold in California and Australia and the immense and urgent demand for shipping in the Pacific trade. The Crimean war also sent commerce to our flag, while liberal subsidies to transatlantic, Cuba, Panama, and Pacific coast steamers had a decidedly beneficial influence in increasing American tonnage on the high seas. The result was that with the momentum of sixty years of protection and the influences I have mentioned our tonnage rose to 2,348,358 tons in 1855. It remained at about this magnitude until 1861, when it reached the highest point, at 2,494,894 tons. This closes the first chapter of our foreign carrying trade. We find in it no free ships, no free ship materials, and no drawback on ship materials. We find in it nothing but protection, somewhat weakened towards the last, but nevertheless protection. And now what was the effect of its removal?

DECLINE OF AMERICAN SHIPPING IN THE FOREIGN TRADE.

From 1861 to 1890 we have a record of decline, neglect, and abandonment of American shipping in the world's great and growing commerce. Our foreign-going ships have been nearly driven from the seas, and the tonnage of those remaining has dropped to 928,062 tons on the 30th day of June, 1890. I append a table taken from

the able and interesting report of the Commissioner of Navigation showing the rise and decline of our merchant-marine service engaged in the foreign trade. It is a valuable statement, showing as it does in detail the various changes that have taken place from year to year in this once important trade:

Growth, thrift, and premature decline of United States shipping in foreign trade.

[Favorable events in roman letters, highly favorable events in small roman capitals, adverse events in italics, strongly adverse events in boldface.]

Year.	Foreign trade.	Shipping per capita.	Commerce per capita.	Proportion of American carriage in foreign trade.		Events, changes, transactions, and influences favorable and adverse, accounting for the growth, thrift, and decline of American shipping in the foreign trade.
				Imports.	Exports.	
	Tons.	*Cu. ft.*		*P. ct.*	*P. ct.*	
1789..	123,893	2.64	$14.00	17.5	30.0	DISCRIMINATIVE TARIFF AND TONNAGE DUTIES—NAVIGATION ACT PASSED.
1790..	346,254	9.75	12.17	41.0	40.0	British and French at war; duties increased 2½ per cent.
1791..	363,110	9.81	13.03	58.0	52.0	Do.
1792..	411,438	10.55	13.39	67.0	61.0	*Algerine piracy begun.*
1793..	367,734	8.96	13.95	82.0	77.0	*Algerine war. Our first naval fights.*
1794..	438,863	10.32	15.91	91.0	86.0	Duties on goods increased, AND 10 PER CENT. EXTRA ON THOSE IN FOREIGN SHIPS.
1795..	529,471	12.03	26.76	92.0	88.0	British and French wars continue.
1796..	576,733	12.53	32.28	94.0	90.0	*The French begin spoliation of our commerce; war follows.*
1797..	597,777	12.45	27.54	92.0	88.0	*All the British banks fail. We have war with France.*
1798..	603,376	12.06	26.01	91.0	87.0	*War with France continued until 1799½.*
1799..	657,142	12.63	30.33	90.0	87.0	
1800..	657,107	12.33	30.04	91.0	87.0	Peace with France.
1801..	630,558	11.26	36.06	91.0	87.0	*Trouble with the Barbary States, followed by a two-year war.*
1802..	557,760	9.74	26.04	88.0	85.0	**War with Barbary States.** A navy called for and built.
1803..	585,910	9.84	20.33	86.0	83.0	Do.
1804..	660,514	10.82	26.67	91.0	86.0	Light-money dues of 50 cents a ton added to tonnage dues. Tariff raised 2½ per cent. *British impressment of our seamen begun.*
1805..	744,224	11.81	34.31	93.0	89.0	
1806..	798,507	12.28	35.53	93.0	89.0	*Both British and French capture and confiscate our vessels.*
1807..	810,163	12.54	36.84	94.0	90.0	*British and French confiscations continued. Embargo act passed.*
1808..	765,252	11.09	11.51	93.0	88.0	**Embargo act in force. Hurt ourselves most.**
1809..	906,855	12.77	15.71	88.0	84.0	**Non-intercourse act.** *This, too, was damaging to ourselves.*
1810..	981,019	13.43	20.84	93.0	90.0	French warfare ceased. *England determined to bring on a war.*
1811..	763,607	10.18	15.29	90.0	86.0	*Great decline in our tonnage—much of it laid up.*
1812..	758,036	9.78	14.91	85.0	80.0	**War with England.**
1813..	672,700	8.40	6.23	71.0	65.0	**Commerce much restricted.**
1814..	674,633	8.17	2.41	58.0	51.0	**Our harbors all blockaded. Very little commerce.** *Suspension specie payments.*
1815..	851,295	10.05	$19.47	77.0	71.0	Peace with England. **First act for free shipping passed.**
1816..	800,760	9.12	26.10	73.0	68.0	First packet line to Liverpool. *A flood of British importations.*
1817..	804,551	8.94	20.76	79.0	74.0	**Second act for free shipping,** *causing a*
1818..	589,951	6.39	23.31	85.0	80.0	*Great falling off in tonnage. Discriminating duties taken off goods from German ports.*
1819..	581,230	6.08	16.55	87.0	82.0	British banks resumed specie payments.
1820..	583,057	5.95	14.70	90.0	89.0	Our banks resumed specie payments.
1821..	593,825	5.88	12.63	92.7	84.9	Second packet line to Liverpool.
1822..	582,701	5.63	14.05	92.4	84.1	London and Havre packet line started.
1823..	600,003	5.63	14.03	92.1	87.4	*From 1819 to 1827 we made several free-shipping treaties.* West Indies opened.
1824..	636,807	5.79	14.23	93.4	88.7	**Third act for free shipping,** *suspending protective duties.* Tariff increased.
1825..	665,409	5.88	17.33	95.2	89.2	*British, North American, and West India ports closed again.*
1826..	696,221	6.00	14.01	95.0	89.6	Culmination of proportionate American carriage.
1827..	701,515	5.87	13.54	94.3	87.5	*Beginning to experience effect of free-shipping policy.*
1828..	757,998	6.18	13.12	91.4	84.5	**Final act for free shipping reciprocity. Protection stripped off.**
1829..	502,859	4.70	11.65	93.0	86.0	*Low freights and hard times for shipping.*
1830..	537,563	4.15	11.14	93.6	86.3	*British shipping gaining our trade. Tariff reduced.* West Indies opened again.
1831..	538,136	4.94	13.80	91.0	80.6	Railroad building. Money plentiful.

Growth, thrift, and premature decline of United States shipping in foreign trade—Continued.

Year.	Foreign trade.	Shipping per capita.	Commerce per capita.	Proportion of American carriage in foreign trade.		Events, changes, transactions, and influences favorable and adverse, accounting for the growth, thrift, and decline of American shipping in the foreign trade.
				Imports.	Exports.	
	Tons.	*Cu. ft.*		*P. ct.*	*P. ct.*	
1832..	614,121	4.48	13.74	89.4	75.8	Havre packets increased. *Tariff reduction.*
1833..	648,869	4.63	14.11	90.7	75.5	*Tariff reduced.* France, Spain, Portugal, and Algiers at war.
1834..	749,376	5.18	15.97	89.0	74.4	*British Lloyds Register Society organized.*
1835..	788,173	5.32	18.25	90.2	77.3	*Tariff reduction.*
1836..	753,091	4.95	20.94	90.3	75.4	All packet lines increased.
1837..	683,295	4.38	16.56	86.5	77.0	**Panic and suspension of banks.** *Tariff reduction.*
1838..	702,902	4.39	13.84	90.0	82.8	Banks resume, *but close again in 1839. First British steamers arrive.*
1839..	702,400	4.25	17.13	88.7	78.3	*Cunard Line subsidized,* $125,000. *Canadian rebellion. British war imminent.*
1840..	763,838	4.48	14.05	86.6	79.9	New England and New York banks pay specie. (They served a shipping people.)
1841..	788,398	4.48	$14.15	88.4	77.8	*General specie suspension. Tariff reduction.*
1842..	823,749	4.53	11.23	88.5	76.3	Specie resumption. TARIFF RAISED. Duties to be cash down.
1843..	856,930	4.36	11.50	77.1	77.0	First British war with China since 1840. American China clippers built.
1844..	909,471	4.66	11.38	86.7	70.5	Times improving. Shipbuilding increasing.
1845..	901,476	4.54	11.65	87.3	75.8	Annexation of Texas. War impending with Mexico.
1846..	943,307	4.60	11.48	87.1	76.2	Bremen packets put on. **Tariff reduction and bonded-warehouse acts.** Irish famine.
1847..	1,017,454	4.96	14.46	77.2	65.3	FIRST AMERICAN TRANSATLANTIC STEAMERS SUBSIDIZED AND BUILT.
1848..	1,168,707	5.38	14.24	82.9	71.1	California gold-mining and emigration. Revolutions in Europe.
1849..	1,258,758	5.62	13.10	81.4	68.9	British "free-ship" act. California clippers. Collins's steamers beginning to run.
1850..	1,439,694	6.23	14.28	77.8	65.5	The English chartering our ships. (The Lloyds prevented buying them.)
1851..	1,544,063	6.47	18.22	75.0	69.8	Sailing packet lines and ships increased in number.
1852..	1,705,650	6.93	17.18	74.5	66.5	*British steamers increased; their subsidy advanced.*
1853..	1,916,471	7.50	19.60	71.5	67.1	Crimean war to 1856. Australian gold-mining and clipper trade.
1854..	2,151,918	8.18	22.16	71.4	69.5	Reciprocity with Canada. *British Lloyds advance rating of iron ships to 12 years A1.*
1855..	2,348,358	8.63	19.72	77.3	73.8	Great increase of shipbuilding. *Bonded-warehouse time increased.*
1856..	2,302,190	8.19	22.83	78.1	70.9	*Bank contraction.* Second British war with China for three years.
1857..	2,268,190	7.83	24.33	71.8	60.2	*Tariff reduction and bank panic following.*
1858..	2,301,148	7.72	20.27	72.0	75.0	Rebellion in India. **Steamship subsidies withdrawn.** *Collins Line fails.*
1859..	2,321,674	7.58	22.73	63.7	69.9	*All our lines of transatlantic steamers dissolve and sell off.*
1860..	2,379,396	7.58	24.27	63.0	69.7	France and Austria, Great Britain and China at war.
1861..	2,494,894	7.76	18.19	60.0	72.1	**The great civil war for four years. Southern ports closed.**
1862..	2,173,537	6.62	13.28	44.8	51.5	*Specie payments suspended. Many vessels sold abroad. Insurance rates advanced.*
1863..	1,926,886	5.75	17.46	43.3	40.0	*Rating of British iron ships raised to 20 years at Liverpool.*
1864..	1,486,749	4.35	19.61	24.6	30.0	**Confederate cruisers destroying our ships at sea.**
1865..	1,518,350	4.36	$17.36	29.9	26.1	END OF THE CIVIL WAR. INSURANCE RISKS REDUCED. Efforts to regain our losses.
1866..	1,387,756	3.91	28.47	25.1	37.7	Prussia and Austria, France and Mexico at war.
1867..	1,515,648	4.18	24.28	28.0	39.1	Culmination of effort to revive our navigation.
1868..	1,491,389	4.06	23.02	33.0	36.6	*Continued specie suspension. British steamers increasing.*
1869..	1,496,220	3.97	23.25	31.3	34.9	*British Lloyds discriminated severely against wooden ships since the war.*
1870..	1,448,846	3.76	25.76	33.1	37.7	**British Lloyds degrade "foreign ships" in their register.** *Opening of Suez Canal.*
1871..	1,363,652	3.45	28.70	31.0	32.6	Bank expansion. France and Germany at war.
1872..	1,359,040	3.37	30.80	26.8	29.8	*Tea and coffee put on free list. British steamers bring the tea.*

Growth, thrift, and premature decline of United States shipping in foreign trade—Continued.

Year.	Foreign trade.	Shipping per capita.	Commerce per capita.	Proportion of American carriage in foreign trade.		Events, changes, transactions, and influences favorable and adverse, accounting for the growth, thrift, and decline of American shipping in the foreign trade.
				Imports.	Exports.	
	Tons.	*Cu. ft.*		*P. ct.*	*P. ct.*	
1873..	1,378,533	3.33	32.42	27.0	25.7	*Bank contraction followed by panic.* American steamers in foreign trade increased.
1874..	1,389,815	3.27	30.88	30.2	24.6	New steamers on the Pacific Ocean to China and Japan.
1875..	1,515,598	3.48	28.00	29.2	23.7	Development of Pacific Ocean trade.
1876..	1,553,705	3.46	25.51	30.8	25.4	Reciprocity treaty with Sandwich Islands. Russo-Turkish war.
1877..	1,570,600	3.41	25.95	31.5	23.7	Development of West Indian and Mexican trade by steam.
1878..	1,589,348	3.36	25.59	32.2	22.6	Bank and Government contraction in view of specie payments.
1879..	1,451,503	3.00	24.60	31.6	17.6	*Increase of foreign steam lines.*
1880..	1,314,402	2.62	32.21	20.0	13.7	Specie payments resumed.
1881..	1,297,035	2.51	32.52	19.9	13.3	Large employment of our ships in California grain trade.
1882..	1,259,492	2.38	29.59	19.2	12.8	*French bounty and subsidy protection to French marine.*
1883..	1,269,681	2.33	29.51	20.7	13.4	Large employment of our ships in California grain trade.
1884..	1,276,972	2.28	27.06	22.4	14.4	*"Free-ship" plank in St. Louis platform discouraging our ships.*
1885..	1,262,814	2.20	24.48	21.3	13.7	*German subsidy protection to marine.*
1886..	988,041	1.81	23.80	20.0	13.6	*British admiralty subvention. Italian bounty and subsidy.*
1887..	989,412	1.63	24.89	18.6	12.2	*Increase of foreign subsidized steam lines and ships.*
1888..	919,619	1.48	24.60	18.5	11.7	*Congress refusing to protect our shipping.* Protection plank for American shipping in Chicago platform.
1889..	999,610	1.57	22.37	17.0	11.6	
1890..	928,062	1.45	25.73	16.6	9.0	*Passage of bounty bill delayed. French bounties renewed. Italian subsidies renewed. Canadian subsidies begun.*

It will be observed from the foregoing table that the decline of our shipping in the foreign trade is not fully disclosed in the large decrease in tonnage. As previously stated, the actual percentage is much greater, if we take into consideration the volume of commerce in which we were entitled to share. The country has been growing, and our foreign commerce has been expanding in every direction. From the Bureau of Statistics we learn that in 1850 our foreign commerce amounted in value to $330,037,038, while for the year 1890 it reached the enormous sum of $1,758,537,945, including the transit trade.

Our foreign commerce, carried in home vessels, measured by its value, has declined from its highest point, 75 per cent. in 1856, to 12.47 per cent. during the last fiscal year, while 80.57 per cent. was carried in foreign vessels. Only 7.09 per cent. of our foreign trade was conducted in steamers bearing our national flag, while 72.09 per cent. of that trade, with all its profits from the employment of capital and labor, was conducted in alien steam vessels.

The principal causes that have operated to produce this result may be stated generally as having been:

First. The withdrawal of protection in 1850 from American vessels engaged in the carrying trade between this country and foreign nations, whereby foreign vessels were admitted to our ports on a basis of perfect equality with our own.

Second. The change of the material of construction of vessels from wood to iron, and latterly to steel, and the development and application of steam in the creation of a more effective tonnage for the ordinary traffic. In the use of wood and sail the United States had the advantage in the material used and in the skill required in the construction and navigation of vessels, but in the use of iron and steel in construction and steam power for the motor the advantage passed to Great Britain, but not necessarily to remain. In a free race, under other conditions, we can hold our own with any nation in steam and metal shipping.

Third. The next cause of decline was the destruction of American vessels during the war of the rebellion by Confederate cruisers and the sale and transfer during the same period of American vessels to foreign flags to avoid war risks and escape destruction, amounting altogether to nearly one thousand vessels and representing a capacity of about 1,000,000 tons.

Fourth. The discontinuance of mail subsidies and the limitation of compensation provided by the act of June 14, 1858, under which American vessels can only be paid the amount of the sea and inland postage for carrying our foreign mails. In 1855, when American vessels carried 75.6 per cent. of all our foreign commerce, we paid $1,936,715 to American vessels for carrying these mails, and not a cent was paid to foreign vessels for this service. In 1890, when our vessels carried only 12.4 per cent. of our foreign commerce, we paid only $120,170 to American vessels for carrying our mails and $420,507 to foreign vessels.

Fifth. The next cause of decline has been the inability of our vessels to compete with foreign vessels having the advantages of cheap labor and supplies and the substantial aid of liberal subsidies.

A restoration of the principle of protection as it prevailed prior to 1850 is of course impracticable.

The Geneva award has settled the losses sustained by the depredations of the Confederate cruisers, or such of them as could be traced to the responsibility of Great Britain in failing to observe her obligations as a neutral power. This leaves us to consider the existing disadvantages under which our merchant-marine service is struggling for an existence in the foreign trade.

AID TO AMERICAN SHIPPING.

Now, what has been done to arrest this rapid decline in a trade which we ought to own and develop for the benefit of all the people of the United States? It can be told in a single sentence. By the act of June 6, 1872, provision was made for the free importation of materials used in the construction and repair of our vessels. A privilege which has been somewhat enlarged by the acts of March 3, 1883; June 26, 1884, and October 1, 1890, but without adding, so far as I know, a single vessel to our registered tonnage, and yet our Democratic friends propose that we shall go a step further in the same direction and give the trade free ships. That is to say, that we shall leave our own skilled workmen and "buy where we can buy the cheapest;" which means, of course, that we shall purchase our vessels in the shipyards of Great Britain.

Let us waive for the present the question of policy and consider only the end to be reached. Is the cost of the ship the only thing that stands in our way, and would that method of procedure restore our merchant-marine service? No shipowning nation in the world to-day depends upon the cheapness of its ships for the value and extent of its marine service. Great Britain, the very source of all cheap things produced by the skill and industry of civilized man, has not in all its history depended for one moment on the supposed advantage of its cheap materials. It is the employment of a ship that determines its value. It is like a railroad car in this respect. Who ever heard that the construction of a line of railroad would depend upon the ability of the company to purchase cheap cars. It is the line of traffic that settles that question, and railroads are frequently built to open new sections of country for the purpose of creating traffic. It is the reaching out for trade at any cost that builds railroads, stimulates industry, develops producing sections, and makes markets.

The great cities of Chicago, St. Louis, Kansas City, Omaha, those two beautiful twin cities of Minnesota, St. Paul and Minneapolis, and others that might be mentioned, are conspicuous illustrations of the value of this modern enterprise that explores plains, valleys, and mountains for trade and commerce. These cities have become populous and wealthy because their business men have had the wisdom to look beyond the expenditure for a line of traffic to the productions that will be developed and the markets that will be sustained. And what these enterprising cities are to the great railroad lines of the West, London and Liverpool are to the great ocean highways of the world. Great Britain has increased her carrying trade and extended her commerce by means of liberal expenditures, having in view profitable returns in the value of her own markets as points of exchange for the whole world, and from the monopoly of her shipping supremacy in carrying commodities to and from such markets.

BRITISH SUBSIDIES.

Prior to 1850 the Government of Great Britain protected her merchant-marine service by the most stringent navigation laws, and in addition sent her ships to sea with well-paid employment in carrying her mails. From the year 1800 to and including the year 1850, she paid in subsidies for the transportation of mails to foreign countries $94,063,200, or nearly $2,000,000 a year. Is it any wonder that she was ready in 1849 to repeal the restrictions in her navigation laws and ask the world to give her ships free access to all its ports? She was ready to occupy all the lines of traffic and develop new ones. She had then 18,221 sail and steam vessels with a tonnage of 3,096,342 tons. But she was not disposed to leave even this splendid merchant-marine service without substantial assistance, and we find her increasing her mail subsidies in every direction where her steamships could possibly secure trade. From 1851 to 1890 she paid for this service $189,115,788, as follows:

From 1851 to 1860	$60,000,000
From 1861 to 1870	48,944,021
From 1871 to 1880	48,232,278
From 1881 to 1888	28,755,064
In the year 1889	3,184,425
Total	189,115,788

From this statement it appears that Great Britain has been paying her vessels since 1850 nearly an average of $5,000,000 per annum for carrying her ocean mails. It is true that the amount reported as having been paid for the year 1889 is $3,184,425. Whether this sum in-

cludes the whole of the $1,200,000 subsidy that is now being paid the Peninsular and Oriental Line to the East Indies is not clear from the reports to which I have had access. Then there is a subsidy of $500,000 for a steamship line from England to Halifax or Quebec, to which the Dominion of Canada adds an additional $500,000; another of $225,000, to which Canada adds $75,000, making $300,000, for a line of monthly steamers from Vancouver to China and Japan, or $500,000, if the service is made fortnightly, Great Britain to contribute $375,000 and Canada $125,000. Then the Dominion of Canada proposes to grant a subsidy of $125,000 for a line of steamers from Vancouver to New Zealand and Australia.

I shall have occasion to again refer to these subsidies for lines in the Pacific when I come to discuss the value of our commerce in that region, now in danger of being lost by reason of its diversion by these British subsidized lines.

In addition to the so-called postal subsidies granted by Great Britain, she pays a naval subvention of about $300,000 per annum for the privilege of taking possession of ten of the swiftest vessels in her merchant marine service, at the pleasure of the admiralty, for naval purposes. These are well known to the public as the "ocean greyhounds." They are the Majestic and Teutonic of the White Star Line, the City of Paris and the City of New York of the Inman Line, the Etruria, Umbria, and Aurania of the Cunard Line, and the Victoria, Britannia, and Oceanica of the Peninsular and Oriental Line to India.

To these British subsidized lines running vessels designed, and held under subvention, to destroy our commerce in the event of war with Great Britain, the Government of the United States paid last year the following sums as compensation for carrying about 40 per cent. of our open and closed European mails:

Cunard Company	$96,907.60
Inman and International Company	46,569.56
White Star Line	30,196.09
Total	$173,673.25

But we are told that Great Britain pays no subsidies, that her expenditures for sea service are only in the nature of compensation for actual services rendered. What are subsidies? Webster defines the word "subsidy" as meaning "Support; aid; co-operation; especially extraordinary aid in money rendered to a sovereign or to a friendly power."

Mr. Heaton, M. P., in a letter to the postmaster-general of Great Britain, in 1886, on the subject of the imperial ocean penny post, and referring to a deficiency of $1,200,000 for one year in the Indian postal service alone, says:

> It can not be insisted too strongly that the subsidies are not paid by way of making up a deficiency in the postal accounts, but in order to keep up the character of our merchant fleet, and to encourage the establishment of the fastest and most frequent means of intercommunication between the various ports of the empire. In short, the subsidies are paid as a matter of state policy, and the postal service should, therefore, not be saddled with them.

Mr. Heaton, in this letter, is urging the adoption of an ocean penny post. The objection has been made that there is already a large deficiency in the British postal service, and it would be unwise, therefore, to reduce the sea rate of postage. Mr. Heaton effectually disposes of this objection by showing that the postal subsidies are paid as a matter of state policy to secure fast and frequent means of communication between the various parts of the empire and to keep up the character of the British merchant fleet.

In the contract between Great Britain and the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company there is the following provision:

> Whenever the annual income of the [steamship] company, from all sources, does not admit of a dividend of 8 per cent. on the capital employed, the subsidy shall be increased by so much as is required to make up such dividend.

Here is the use of the word "subsidy," in a written contract and provision made in that contract, for substantial "support, aid, and co-operation." I can not imagine a more appropriate use of a word in a transaction, and I know of no people in the world who understand better than the English people do how to use it to advantage in business affairs.

But in order that the prosperity of British shipping shall not be invoked as an example in favor of the bill under consideration, it is asserted with much reiteration that government aid, by whatever name known, paid to merchant vessels only reaches 2 per cent. of the British tonnage. This is not correct. The Commissioner of Navigation has made an examination into this question, and finds that the British subsidized tonnage is 17.82 of the total metal steam tonnage holding class in Lloyd's Register. But the percentage is unimportant. If compensation to the shipowner were the only purpose in view we might admit that there is force in the statement that any part of the tonnage is unsubsidized; but this is not so. The point of the comparison is that the subsidized vessels of Great Britain, including at one time the entire steam tonnage, have opened markets and established channels of trade for her whole merchant-marine service. A means of communication between two sections, whether it be a bridge, a highway, a railroad, or a steamship line, is for the benefit of the people, who are thus brought into closer and more convenient business relations with each other, and when the connection extends beyond a mere local convenience it is of public concern in the interest of trade that the communication should be opened and maintained. The President in his last message states the proposition accurately and forcibly when he says:

> The steamship carrying the mails statedly and frequently, and offering to passengers a comfortable, safe, and speedy transit, is the first condition of foreign trade. It carries the order or the buyer, but not all that is ordered or bought. It gives to the sailing vessels such cargoes as are not urgent or perishable, and, indirectly at least, promotes that important adjunct of commerce.

This was the wisdom of the policy of Great Britain when, in 1837, for political and commercial purposes, she established a mail service between the United Kingdom and India by granting to the Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Company an annual subsidy of $145,000, which was increased in 1845 to $800,000. The same policy caused her, in 1839, to grant an annual subsidy of $1,200,000 to the Royal Mail Steamship Company for carrying the mails to the West Indies and Central America, and in the same year to enter into a contract with Mr. Samuel Cunard for the transportation of the mails to New York for $275,000, employing three vessels, which was increased almost immediately to $425,000 for the employment of four vessels on the same line. That this policy established the lines of the present immense shipping industry of Great Britain there can be no question. That it was justified has been demonstrated by its continuance and extension by the government in every direction. That it has been profitable in a commercial sense is evidenced by the enormous increase in the tonnage of vessels entered and cleared at ports of the United Kingdom, and particularly in the increase in the tonnage of British vessels to and from such ports.

In the year 1840 the tonnage of all vessels entered and cleared at ports of the United Kingdom was as follows:

Ships.	Tonnage.	Per cent.
British	6,490,485	68
Foreign	2,949,182	32
Total	9,439,667	100

The population of the kingdom, according to the census of 1841, was 27,057,923. The tonnage of vessels arriving and departing, as compared with population, was, therefore, nearly .35 of a ton of shipping per capita.

In the year 1889 the tonnage of all vessels entered and cleared at ports of the United Kingdom was as follows:

Ships.	Tonnage.	Per cent.
British	52,469,654	73
Foreign	19,420,241	27
Total	71,889,895	100

The population of the kingdom by the last census, that of 1881, was 35,246,562. Assuming that the population has not greatly increased, the tonnage of vessels arriving and departing as compared with population was therefore in 1889 about 2 tons of shipping per capita. Here is an increase of tonnage per capita of 571 per cent. since Great Britain commenced the payment of liberal mail subsidies to her regular lines of steamship companies, and if we take into consideration the change that has been made from sail to steam, and the consequent increase of efficiency in the present tonnage largely steam, as compared with that of 1840 largely sail, we will find an increase in active British tonnage of over 2,000 per cent. per capita.

It is to our shame that the United States has no such record to present to the world. The policy of extending trade and commerce by opening up channels of traffic with the postal service is at the bottom of the commercial enterprise of all the leading nations of Europe, who are paying subsidies in one way or another in aid of sail or steamship lines to distant countries.

FRENCH SUBSIDIES.

France, realizing the necessity for a merchant-marine service for this purpose, has been aiding its development in every possible manner. The Government commenced with free-ship materials and free ships, but as the result was not satisfactory the law of the 29th of January, 1881, was passed, abolishing the privilege of importing ship materials free of duty, and providing construction and navigation bounties in addition to postal subsidies. The construction bounties given to French shipbuilders are as follows (I quote from the report of Consul-General Rathbone, dated September 20, 1889):

> On wooden ships of less than 200 tons, 10 francs ($1.93) per ton, gross measurement; on wooden ships of 200 tons or more, 20 francs ($3.86) per ton, gross measurement; on composite ships (those built of wood outside, but having beams or ribs of iron or steel), per ton, gross measurement, 40 francs ($7.72); on iron or steel ships, 60 francs ($11.58) per ton, gross measurement; on the motory engines and auxiliary apparatus, 12 francs per 100 kilograms ($1.05 per 100 pounds); on changing boilers the shipowner is allowed a compensation of 8 francs per 100 kilograms (70 cents per 100 pounds) of new boilers, weighed without the pipes and of French make. Any modification or alteration of a ship whereby its tonnage is increased entitles to a bounty calculated as per above tariff on net increase of tonnage. The above allowances, after delivery of the register, are paid by the customs collector of the port nearest the place of construction.

The bounty has no limit as to time.

The navigation bounty is as follows:

Article 9 of the law provides a compensation for the burden laid upon the mercantile marine by the recruiting of sailors for the French navy by a premium on navigation allowed to French steam and sailing vessels for a period of ten years from the promulgation of the present law. This bounty applies only to long-voyage navigation, which includes all ports beyond those situated between Gibraltar and the north of Europe and in the Mediterranean and Black Seas. Ships employed in the great and small fisheries, subsidized lines, and pleasure boats in general are excepted from the bounty. The bounty is fixed at 1.50 francs (29 cents) per ton net register and per 1,000 miles run for ships of French build, or those made French before the promulgation of the law. The number of miles is calculated by the distance between the starting points and the points of arrival, measured by a direct maritime line.

The bounty decreases yearly at the rate of 0.075 francs ($0.014) per ton on wooden or composite ships and 0.05 francs (1 cent) per ton on iron ships. The bounty on ships built abroad is only one-half of that stated above. It could be increased 15 per cent. for steamers built on plans approved by the Navy Department. In case of war the merchant ships can be requisitioned by the Government.

This navigation bounty was for a period of ten years from the date of the law, namely, from January 29, 1881, and would therefore have expired this year, but it has been extended for another year and the bounty restricted to French-built vessels, as will be seen by the following amendment recently enacted:

ARTICLE 1. The regulations provided in articles 9 and 10 of the law of 29th January, 1881, relative to the bounties on navigation will continue to be in force until 29th January, 1892, subject to the modification notified in article 2 of the present law.

ART. 2. Until the 29th January, 1892, ships of foreign construction naturalized after the 29th January, 1891, will not have any rights to the bounty established by article 9 of the law of 29th January, 1881.

The total amounts expended under the provisions of the law for allowances and bounties to French shipbuilders from 1881 to 1887, inclusive, were as follows:

The total amounts expended under the provisions of the law for allowances and bounties to French shipbuilders from 1881 to 1887, inclusive, were as follows:

Years.	Amounts paid to ship builders.	Premiums on navigation.	Total.
1881	$183,522	$575,312	$758,834
1882	876,335	1,246,512	2,122,847
1883	609,937	1,633,704	2,233,651
1884	865,599	1,657,742	2,523,341
1885	217,927	1,460,435	1,078,362
1886	580,084	1,462,622	2,042,706
1887	281,294	1,586,203	1.867,497

The French construction bounty has resulted in placing on the ocean some of the best built and most efficient vessels in the world, notably the four splendid vessels of the Compagnie Générale Transatlantique between New York and Havre—La Gascogne, La Bretagne, La Bourgogne, and La Champagne. Mr. Charles H. Cramp, the Philadelphia shipbuilder, in his testimony before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, last January, paid a handsome tribute to the builders and navigators of these ships. He said:

Now, I will say here, if you will permit me, that one of the great results of the French bounty system was to put afloat these great ships named after the French provinces, the Gascogne, Bretagne, Bourgogne, Champagne, etc., and all these ships are superior to British ships in performance. What I mean to say is they go faster with a less consumption of coal. They give better accommodations on a less outlay of money. The whole combined performances of these ships are better than the British ships. Before the subsidy, up to ten years ago, the French built several ships, but they were all failures as far as workmanship was concerned. They were not good ships. I recollect that two French ships came to New York and had to go into the dry dock. Mr. Roach repaired them and had a bill of $50,000 for repairing one. It was in one of the dry docks we had rented there. But in this period of ten years they have gone so far and advanced so rapidly in the art of building and navigating ships, that these ships named after the provinces are better than the English ships. There is another thing to be mentioned here. People ten or fifteen years ago were timid about crossing the ocean with a French captain and crew, because they said they lacked experience, and they were said to be excitable and all that sort of thing. Now these French captains are just as good as any, and so are the French crews. They have not only built ships, but they have educated the men to navigate them.

The reading of such testimony as this ought to excite the patriotic sentiment of every true American, and make him wish that we had such vessels on the ocean carrying the American flag. Do you want them? Pass this bill and they will be built and placed on the highways of commerce to our credit. You will find Mr. Cramp, of Philadelphia, competing with improvements for speed and comfort on the vessels now afloat, and Mr. Scott, of San Francisco, and other shipbuilders competing with Mr. Cramp and the rest of the world in building vessels that will give employment to American officers and seamen; furnish a naval reserve, carry the American mails, receive the passage money of the restless "globe trotter," and the active commercial agent, and, carrying the flag that once was known and honored in every port, will notify the world that we are still a member of the family of nations.

The French mail lines, it must be remembered, do not receive the navigation bounties, but are paid liberally under contracts for the transportation of the mails. The Government of the United States paid the Government of France last year the sum of $25,442.94 for the services of the subsidized steamers of the Compagnie Générale Transatlantique in carrying the foreign mails between New York and Havre.

The amount reported as having been paid by the French Government for transportation of the mails for the year 1887 was $5,217,569.12. If we add to this sum the amount paid for construction and navigation bounties, $1,867,497, we have a total of $7,087,059.52 as the amount paid by France in aid of its merchant-marine service for the year 1887. The effect of this system has been to raise the French steam tonnage from 356,000 tons in 1880 to 744,000 tons in 1887. Whether the result has been satisfactory or not is answered by Consul-General Mason in his report to the Department of State dated September 29, 1889. He says:

Has the French system been successful? A glance at the shipyards along the Seine, the Garonne, and the bay of Toulon, as well as the ports of Havre, Bordeaux, and Marseilles, with their regular and busy steamship lines to South America, India, China, and Australia, bringing the raw materials of those remote countries to France and returning freighted with the products of French industry, would afford a ready and conclusive answer.

GERMAN SUBSIDIES.

The recent industrial and commercial development in Germany must not be overlooked in estimating the value of a policy of encouragement to shipping in the foreign trade wisely adjusted to the principle of protection to home industry. Germany is in favor of protection, but she permits foreign-built ships to obtain a German registry. This has not been sufficient for her commercial purposes. In 1885 the Reichstag granted a subsidy of 4,500,000 marks, equal to $1,047,619, per annum, on a contract with the North German Lloyd Steamship Company for a service during a period of fifteen years to Eastern Asiatic, Australian, and Mediterranean ports.

A subsidy has also recently been granted of $225,000 per annum for ten years for the establishment of a line of steamships from Hamburg to Delagoa Bay, on the eastern coast of Africa.

The vessels of the North German Lloyd, plying between Bremen and Hamburg (via Southampton) and the United States, received last year from the postal authorities of the United States $185,457.27 as compensation for carrying about 43 per cent. of our European open and closed mails.

The value of this subsidy policy has already been realized in the first-named enterprise. Our consul-general at Frankfort furnishes the Department of State with a copy of a report made by the British legation at Berlin to the home office on this subject, as follows:

How well founded was the expectation that a prosperous future awaited the new enterprise is manifested by the fact that the German mail steamers to East Asia have surpassed in speed the old-established French and English lines. The passenger and goods traffic is on the increase, as well as the conveyance of mails, which has been augmented by the growing use made of German mail steamships by foreign postal administrations.

By the establishment of great lines of its own the imperial postal administration finds itself in the satisfactory position of being able to offer, on terms of reciprocity, a reduction in the interchange of mails, and thus to improve the mail traffic—to the furtherance of German interests—with other important countries not touched by German lines.

In another report concerning the German subsidized steamship lines the consul general says:

Germany is to-day absorbed and controlled by an aggressive mercantile spirit which is almost American in its restless energy, and far more than American in its grasp of the essential conditions of a vigorous foreign trade and the courageous enterprise with which it provides the necessary facilities for developing and sustaining it.

Referring to Mr. von Engelbrechten, under whose energetic and intelligent lead German trade is being developed in the Levant, he says:

To a practical man like Mr. von Engelbrechten, whose successful establishment of a German steamship line between German North Sea ports and the mouth of the Danube entitles his opinion to respect, there seems to be no difficulty in grafting a prosperous foreign trade upon the sturdy stock of a protective home tariff, provided the offshoot can be sustained and rendered independent of foreign means of transport by regular and competent shipping facilities in German hands and under the imperial flag. There are some things which a progressive people can better afford to do for itself than to have done by others, and among these is prominently the transportation of mails, freight, and commercial travel to and from countries which produce raw materials in excess of their domestic needs and consume manufactured goods which they are unable to make at home.

The steam tonnage of Germany has increased from 604,000 tons in 1885, to 726,000 tons in 1888, or an increase of 20 per cent.

ITALIAN SUBSIDIES.

The example set by France in 1881, in granting construction and navigation bounties, was followed by Italy in 1885. As in France, the shipowners of Italy had then, and have now, the privilege of purchasing foreign ships and placing them under the Italian flag, but the privilege was without value in competition with the commercial energy of the other leading nations. The navigation bounty requires the transportation of the mails. For the year 1888 the Italian Government paid her steamship companies subsidies amounting to $1,761,069.82. The Italian steam tonnage increased from 195,000 tons in 1885 to 284,000 tons in 1888, or an increase of 46 per cent.

SPANISH SUBSIDIES.

The Spanish Government grants a bounty of $7.72 per ton on the tonnage of all vessels constructed in Spain. It also returns all tariff duties paid on imported materials for building or repairing vessels or their machinery, and, following the example of Great Britain, it pays liberal subsidies on a recent contract with the Spanish Transatlantic Company amounting, as estimated, to the sum of $1,689,044.45 per annum for the purpose of maintaining steamship service between Spanish ports and the principal ports in Europe,

Asia, Africa, North, South, and Central America and the West Indies. The duty of carrying the mails is undertaken by the company without any further compensation than the subsidies, which is to be paid monthly. The Spanish steam tonnage in 1885 was 361,000 tons. In 1888 it had increased to 399,000 tons, or an increase of 10 per cent.

The world's effective shipping tonnage is properly limited by estimate to vessels of 100 tons and upwards. I append a table of such tonnage as recorded in Lloyd's Register for comparison as to the interest of the several nations in this important industry.

Number, tonnage, and description of the steamers of 100 tons gross, and of sailing vessels of 100 tons net and upwards, belonging to each of the several countries of the world, as recorded in Lloyds' Register Book, together with the proportion of tonnage under each flag.

Flag.	Gross steam tonnage.	Net sail tonnage.	Total steam and sail tonnage.	Percentage of total tonnage.
British:				
United Kingdom	7,774,644	2,467,212	10,241,856	46.23
Colonies	461,210	894,040	1,355,250	6.11
Total	8,235,854	3,361,252	11,597,106	52.34
American	517,394	1,306,488	8,823,882	8.22
Argentine	21,245	21,897	43,142	.19
Austro-Hungarian	151,166	118,482	269,648	1.21
Belgian	106,467	4,104	110,571	.49
Bolivian		2,303	2,302	.01
Brazilian	67,707	81,359	149,066	.67
Chilian	30,934	71,457	102,391	.64
Chinese	44,558	1,282	45,840	.20
Colombian		444	444	
Costa Rican	528	288	816	
Danish	159,072	120,993	280,065	1.26
Dutch	217,022	161,762	378,784	1.79
French	809,598	235,504	1,045,102	4.71
German	928,911	640,400	1,569,311	7.07
Greek	83,839	223,801	307,640	1.38
Hawaiian	13,838	5,567	19,405	.08
Haytian	3,401	989	4,390	.01
Italian	300,625	515,942	816,567	3.68
Japanese	138,431	33,123	171,554	.77
Mexican	7,733	3,308	11,041	.04
Montenegrin		3,282	3,282	.01
Norwegian	246,669	1,337,686	1,584,355	7.17
Persian	838		838	
Portuguese	44,701	46,501	91,202	.41
Peruvian	2,188	8,860	11,048	.04
Roumanian	529	407	936	
Russian	156,070	271,265	427,335	1.92
Sarawak	2,269	347	2,616	.01
Siamese	644	3,519	4,163	.01
Spanish	414,817	119,994	534,811	2.41
Swedish	181,781	294,183	475,964	2.14
Turkish	71,607	158,170	229,777	1.03
Uruguayan	9,111	2,903	12,014	.05
Venezuelan	2,635	1,123	3,758	.01
Zanzibar	4,723		4,723	.02
Other countries	8,467	7,295	15,762	.07
Total	12,985,372	9,166,279	22,151,651	100.00

From this table it will be seen that the tonnage of vessels belonging to Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy, and Spain represent about 82 per cent. of steam and 70 per cent. of the entire shipping tonnage of the world. In considering the influences that have created this tonnage we have therefore gone sufficiently far in searching for the policy that dominates the carrying trade of the world to-day. It is clearly not free ships or free shipping materials that has caused the recent energy in the building of vessels. The merchant-marine service is manifestly treated as a matter of government concern in its mail service, foreign commerce, and possible naval strength in time of war. In this view the leading nations of Europe have become active and aggressive, and are reaching out for the control of lines of traffic and the establishment of possible naval power in directions that deeply concern the people of the United States.

SUBSIDIES PAID BY OTHER COUNTRIES.

From the latest consular and other reports it appears that nations other than those mentioned pay large sums annually as subsidies, bounties, or for the transportation of the mails, as follows:

Argentine Republic (estimated)*	$3,000,000
Brazil	†1,700,000
Netherlands	775,191
Mexico	‡758,000
Canada	730,090
Japan	500,000
Russia	454,306
Belgium	430,127
Austria-Hungary	363,000
Australian Colonies	280,000
Chili	225,000
Portugal	108,000
Trinidad	98,000
Barbadoes	90,000
Jamaica	72,000
Various West India Islands	72,000
New Zealand	$56,000
Norway and Sweden	41,055
Guatemala	34,000
The Island of Tobago	25,000
San Salvador	24,000
Bahama Islands	18,500
Nicaragua	16,000
Honduras	12,500
Costa Rica	12,000
British Honduras	7,500

* Including bounty on immigrants and exports of beef and mutton.
† Not including $5,500,000 bounty on immigrants.
‡ Not including bounty on immigrants.

A SUBSIDY OF SIXTY CENTS.

In contrast with these liberal subsidies, subventions, and bounties, amounting to millions of dollars, paid annually by the leading nations of Europe in aid of their merchant-shipping fleets, consider the liberality of our own Government in that direction. The Postmaster-General reports that he paid last year the sum of 60 cents to American vessels, being the sea and inland postage, for the transportation of American mails to Europe. This sum was paid to "The American Steamship Company," plying between Philadelphia and Queenstown and Liverpool. It appears that owing to the greater facilities offered by the fast foreign subsidized steamships sailing from New York to the same ports the only letters and papers dispatched by the vessels of the American Steamship Company were those specially addressed upon the covers to be forwarded by such vessels. It is probable, therefore, that a few Philadelphia merchants, doing business within the shadow of Independence Hall, were the correspondents who stood by the flag last year and requested the postmaster to send their letters and papers by an American vessel.

In order that our expenditure for the transatlantic mail service last year may be clearly understood, let me state it a little more fully.

We paid for services of—

Foreign subsidized vessels	$397,668.80
American vessels	.60
Total	397,669.40

In other words, we are contributing about $400,000 a year for the maintenance of swift foreign cruisers that may be turned against our own few vessels and our populous seacoast cities at any moment. These vessels that we are hiring to carry our mails constitute the most effective part of the naval reserve of the nations to which they belong. While we are building our own Navy we help also to build up foreign navies. If our enemy feels disposed to smite us on the right cheek, we will not only graciously turn the left to his convenient and ready blow, but we will furnish him with a club that his blow may be all the more destructive. This may be present economy, but it is not business prudence, and it is not statesmanship to pursue this policy longer, for if continued it will make us a nation of cowards in asserting our rights in any contention with foreign governments.

THE UNITED STATES.

Now, what is our position? We are on the line of the world's great commerce between Europe and Eastern Asia and the islands of the Pacific. We are also interested in the trade and commerce of all the nations to the south of us. To avail ourselves of the advantage of our position we must carry our mails across the sea and have a merchant-marine service employed in our foreign commerce. This is our weakness now. The table I have just presented showing the tonnage of vessels of 100 tons and upwards belonging to the several nations of the world credits the United States with a gross steam tonnage of 517,394 tons, and a total sail and steam tonnage of 1,823,882 tons. This is a good showing as it stands, but the amount stated includes the tonnage of our coastwise trade.

The steam tonnage employed in the foreign trade in the year 1890 is estimated at only 197,630 tons. From the Bureau of Navigation I have obtained the following statement of American steam vessels and their tonnage employed in regular lines, which is about the extent of our effective steam tonnage in foreign trade:

Lines.	No.	Tons.
WHOLLY IN FOREIGN TRADE.		
United States Mail Steamship Company	3	8,192
New York and Yucatan Steamship Company	1	1,919
New York Steamship Company	1	1,598
Atlantic and Caribbean Steam Navigation Company	5	9,452
J. E. Ward & Co. (New York and Cuba)	8	21,424
Oceanic Steamship Company	3	8,568
Pacific Mail Steamship Company	18	50,040
Oteri, S. J., Pioneer Line	2	2,052
Plant, H. B	2	2,495
Total	43	105,740
PARTIALLY IN FOREIGN TRADE.		
Pacific Coast Steamship Company	8	9,457
Clyde, W. P., & Co	14	19,054
Morgan's Louisiana and Texas Railroad and Steamship Line	7	15,627
Oregon Railway and Navigation Company	4	8,186
Total	33	52,324
Total of lines wholly and partially in foreign trade	76	158,064

Our lines of steam communication are few, and as a rule our vessels are not large or swift. Such as we have are engaged in a ruinous competition with the subsidized lines belonging to the nations I have mentioned. We are not, in a national sense, equipped for the trade we ought to control and develop for the benefit of our own producers and consumers.

THE COMMERCE OF THE PACIFIC.

The Pacific Ocean, touching the populous shores of Asia, and inclosing the continental islands of Australasia, and the thousands of lesser islands of Polynesia, will be the scene of the great commerce of the future.

The immense area of these islands of the Pacific would anywhere else in the world be traversed by railroads, but the trade and commerce of the people of these fruitful lands between themselves and with the continents must always be carried on in sea-going vessels. It is no great wonder therefore that such maritime nations as Great Britain, Germany, and France should undertake to parcel out these islands among themselves. In such acquisition of territory they would not only supply new fields for the relief of an increasing population at home, but would secure the very trade that was required to support a mercantile-marine service.

The Government of the United States, in accordance with its well-established policy, has refrained from asserting any territorial jurisdiction over any of these islands, although repeatedly urged to do so by the natives on some of them. This neutral policy should not however prevent us from claiming our share of the important and growing commerce of the Pacific. Its natural tendency is largely in our direction, and we have only to send for it to get it. Indeed, I might go further, and say that the people of the Pacific islands and Australia ask to come to us with their trade.

THE OCEANIC STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

About twenty years ago a line of steamships was established between San Francisco and Australia under a subsidy of $400,000 per annum paid by the Australian colonies. In 1885 the subsidy was reduced to $200,000 per annum, paid by the colonies of New South Wales and New Zealand, the former paying $62,500 and the latter $137,500. Prior to 1885 this line of steamers was operated by the Pacific Mail Steamship Company jointly with an English company. When the subsidy was reduced the Pacific Mail withdrew its steamers. Thereupon citizens of San Francisco established the Oceanic Steamship Company for this service and have maintained it ever since.

That this line has developed a profitable trade between the United States and the Australian colonies is shown by the fact that while our exports to the colonies for the year ending June 30, 1890, amounted in value to $11,266,484, our imports were $4,277,676, the balance in our favor being $7,988,808. From 1876 to 1890 our exports have been $129,762,569, while our imports were $48,394,501, the balance in our favor for the fifteen years being $81,368,068. I append a table of exports to and imports from British Australasia for the last fifteen years, furnished by the Bureau of Statistics:

Value of merchandise exported from, and imported into, the United States from 1876 to 1889, inclusive.

INTO AND FROM BRITISH POSSESSIONS IN AUSTRALASIA.

Year ending June 30—	Exports.		Total exports.	Imports.	Total imports and exports.
	Domestic.	Foreign.			
1876	$3,878,866	$77,089	$3,955,955	$1,455,649	$5,411,604
1877	5,780,278	105,189	5,885,467	1,476,238	7,361,705
1878	6,479,193	292,102	6,771,295	1,185,905	7,957,200
1879	7,042,875	128,940	7,171,815	785,773	7,957,588
1880	4,687,223	61,367	4,748,590	2,920,812	7,669,402
1881	6,636,130	92,375	6,728,505	2,088,302	8,816,807
1882	8,982,974	126,915	9,109,889	3,689,424	12,799,313
1883	9,638,997	156,659	9,795,656	4,021,395	13,817,051
1884	9,225,459	161,867	9,387,326	4,373,465	13,760,791
1885	10,534,138	114,054	10,648,192	2,823,393	13,471,585
1886	10,981,915	152,386	11,134,301	3,859,360	14,993,661
1887	9,543,474	124,961	9,668,435	4,411,119	14,079,554
1888	11,076,053	92,626	11,168,679	5,027,779	16,196,458
1889	12,252,147	69,833	12,321,980	5,998,211	18,320,191
1890	11,168,081	98,403	11,266,484	4,277,676	15,544,160
Total	127,907,803	1,854,766	129,762,569	48,394,501	178,157,070

In proportion to our total foreign commerce this trade has been by far the most profitable and satisfactory of any that we have had during that time. Now, what has the Government of the United States contributed to the support of a mail service to the colonies in competition with lines to Europe by way of the Isthmus of Suez. It has actually been making money out of the business. When the Oceanic Steamship Company was established in 1885 our Postmaster-General agreed to pay the company the munificent sum of $20,000 per annum for carrying the mails. This amount was paid until November 17, 1888, when the sum was increased to $50,000 (less $1,000 for each trip performed by a foreign steamer). This allowance has been recently further increased to $60,000 per annum for vessels of United States register, to date from the 1st of January, 1891, the same being the estimated amount of postage collected on such mails.

It is of course understood that the Postmaster-General is now paying the Oceanic Steamship Company all that he is now authorized to pay under the law, but it is not sufficient to maintain the service, and Canada now comes forward with a proposition to grant a subsidy of $125,000 per annum for the transportation of these mails from Vancouver to Australia. The establishment of such a line will of course cause the American line to be withdrawn and we will lose our mails and a large part of our trade with Australia. The President in his message calls the attention of Congress to this subject in the following language:

The present situation of our mail communication with Australia illustrates the importance of early action by Congress. The Oceanic Steamship Company maintains a line of steamers between San Francisco, Sydney, and Auckland, consisting of three vessels, two of which are of United States registry and one of foreign registry. For the service done by this line in carrying the mails we pay annually the sum of $46,000, being, as estimated, the full sea and United States inland postage, which is the limit fixed by law. The colonies of New South Wales and New Zealand have been paying annually to these lines £37,000 for carrying the mails from Sydney and Auckland to San Francisco. The contract under which this payment has been made is now about to expire, and those colonies have refused to renew the contract unless the United States shall pay a more equitable proportion of the whole sum necessary to maintain the service.

I am advised by the Postmaster-General that the United States receives for carrying the Australian mails, brought to San Francisco in these steamers, by rail to Vancouver an estimated annual income of $75,000, while, as I have stated, we are paying out for support of the steamship line that brings this mail to us only $46,000, leaving an annual surplus, resulting from this service, of $29,000. The trade of the United States with Australia, which is in a considerable part carried by these steamers, and the whole of which is practically dependent upon the mail communication which they maintain, is largely in our favor. Our total exports of merchandise to Australasian ports during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, were $11,266,484, while the total imports of merchandise from these ports were only $4,277,676. If we are not willing to see this important steamship line withdrawn or continued with Vancouver substituted for San Francisco as the American terminal, Congress should put it in the power of the Postmaster-General to make a liberal increase in the amount now paid for the transportation of this important mail.

PACIFIC MAIL STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

The Pacific Mail Steamship Company is also engaged in an unequal contest in an effort to maintain a line of traffic between the United States and Japan and China. Last year the Government paid this company $14,567.67 for carrying the mails across the Pacific. Great Britain and Canada grant subsidies which combined amount to $300,000 per annum for a monthly service or $500,000 for a fortnightly service between Vancouver and Japan and China. These British vessels are operated in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway and contribute enormously to the business of that corporation. Moreover, the traffic is drawn largely from the United States, and the transportation from the overland roads.

During the year ending June 30, 1890, commodities were exported from the United States through British Columbia via the Canadian Pacific Railway to China and Japan of the weight of 24,405,549 pounds. The principal commodities exported were cotton goods weighing 12,637,137 pounds and flour weighing 10,106,079 pounds. The imports into the United States for the same period from China and Japan, through British Columbia via the Canadian Pacific, amounted in weight to 11,060,037 pounds. The principal articles of import were tea, weighing 8,549,320 pounds, and raw silk, weighing 1,245,950 pounds.

In a statement recently made to a select committee of the Senate by Mr. Nimmo concerning our relations with Canada, he states the question suggested by these facts with such accuracy that I repeat it now as one of the most important questions we are called upon to answer in the pending legislation:

The precise question which confronts Congress and the country is: Shall a foreign railroad built by a foreign government and a subsidized British steamer line, established in connection with that railroad for commercial and political purposes inimical to the United States, be permitted to divert American commerce from American vessels, American seaports, and American transportation lines; and, if not, what measures shall be adopted for the protection of such American interests?

PACIFIC RAILROADS AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The policy we are pursuing in neglecting our own interests would bankrupt any nation in the world not possessed of the marvelous resources of the United States. Here we are demanding that the Central and Union Pacific railroads shall pay their debt to the United States at maturity, while we stand feebly by and permit the business of the roads to be diverted to a foreign and rival line. It must also be remembered that Great Britain is strengthening its naval power on the Pacific by having these Canadian Pacific Railway steamers built on naval models and brought under an admiralty subvention. The necessity for protecting the interests on the Pacific I have mentioned would justify the expenditure of every dollar that might be drawn from the Treasury under this bill.

The overland railroads, by the way, show the value of Government aid in opening up an important line of transportation, and the general public is probably not aware of the immense benefit these roads have been to the Government in the cheaper transportation it has secured. A commission, of which the Hon. Robert E. Pattison, the present governor of Pennsylvania, was chairman, was appointed by President Cleveland under the act of March 3, 1887, to investigate and report on the affairs of these roads, and, among other things, to ascertain and report the average cost per annum of Government transportation in the region now traversed by the Pacific railroads

between the year 1850 and the completion of the roads, and also the average cost per annum since such completion. The commission took a large amount of testimony on this subject, which is submitted with the report.

From the argument of Mr. Haymond, general solicitor of the Central Pacific road, made before a select committee of the Senate, I take the following statement, which I assume to be correct, as it appears to be based upon official reports: The Pacific roads were completed in 1869. The saving in cost in the transportation of the Government mails, troops, and freight to the Pacific coast from 1870 to 1885, as compared with the cost of such service prior to 1870, is estimated at the enormous sum of $139,347,741.25. This sum is about $25,000,000 more than the principal and unpaid interest of the bonds loaned to the companies by the United States to secure the construction of the roads. Now, in view of this statement of what these roads have done for the Government in the past and what they will be required to do in the future in providing for the payment of their indebtedness, would it not be the part of wisdom to give them and the business interests of the country the protection against foreign competition which this bill would secure in its encouragement and maintenance of a connecting Asiatic, Australian, and South Pacific commerce? It seems to me that every consideration of public policy requires that we should legislate on this subject with that end in view. As a business proposition it is wise; as a national policy it is patriotic.

THE TEA TRADE.

The protest of the Boston tea party in 1773 against British exactions in the tea trade produced mighty results in being one of the inspiring causes that led to the independence of the colonies, and after the Revolution to the policy of protecting American shipping. But the spirit of that protest has unfortunately departed from our commercial policy, and we are again being brought into a state of wretched subserviency to British interests in this trade.

Prior to 1846 discriminating duties at varying rates were imposed from time to time on teas imported in foreign vessels. Under this protection we retained this important and valuable carrying trade for our own vessels. The act of July 30, 1846 (commonly known as the Walker tariff) and the "reciprocal liberty of commerce," previously mentioned as having been established in 1850 under the act of May 24, 1828, abolished all discriminating duties and made tea free. The war of the rebellion calling for revenue induced Congress, by the act of August 5, 1861, to place an import duty of 15 cents per pound on tea for revenue purposes. The rate was increased by the act of December 24, 1861, to 20 cents per pound. It was further increased by the act of June 30, 1864, to 25 cents per pound, reduced to 15 cents per pound by the act of July 14, 1870, and repealed by the act of May 1, 1872, since which time tea by direct importation has been free.

An additional discriminating duty of 10 per cent. ad valorem was also imposed by the act of July 14, 1862, on articles the growth or produce of countries beyond the Cape of Good Hope when imported from places this side of the Cape of Good Hope. This designation, of course, included tea, and, as was said by the Supreme Court of the United States in Russell *vs.* Williams (106 U. S. Reports, 623), the provision was intended to encourage direct importations as well as to benefit American shipping, and it had that effect, and during its continuance retained American tonnage for that trade. But this discriminating duty was repealed by the act of May 4, 1882.

Here is another one of those free-trade concessions so much admired by our Democratic friends and which they advise us should only be extended to secure the restoration of American shipping to its former glory. But what has been the effect of this particular step in that direction? It is the same old story, repeated so often as to be absolutely without novelty. Canada meets our concession by providing that tea may be imported into the Dominion free of duty, except from the United States. When imported from the United States it must pay a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem. But we have a provision for transit under which goods may be temporarily warehoused in the United States and afterwards exported. This provision has been of some value to our shipping and warehouse interests in retaining stock in this country for sale in other countries. But Canada repeals our laws on this subject so far as she is concerned by providing in an act passed in 1889 against the privilege of warehousing in the United States by limiting free importations across the territory of the United States *in transitu* to such goods as are not warehoused in the intermediate country. In addition to this discrimination against us by Canada the British importers and shipowners have been enabled by the repeal of our discriminating duties against indirect importations to divert our tea trade from direct lines of traffic between the United States and China and Japan and in American vessels to foreign routes in foreign subsidized vessels by the way of England. And to secure this diversion of trade to British channels and foster this shipping and importing monopoly to the fullest extent the British subsidized steamship companies have agreed with English importers to carry their teas from China and Japan to England and to forward the same in any quantities from England to the United States at any time within six months after the arrival of the tea in England free of freight charge from England to the United States.

In this way English merchants, who do not contribute in any way to the welfare of this country and who do not even incur the trifling expense of having offices in the United States, are enabled by the aid of free freight on British subsidized cruisers across the Atlantic to sell teas in any quantities throughout the United States in competition with our own merchants who pay taxes and rents and perform all the duties of citizens. Moreover these English merchants, while seeking customers in the United States, hold their teas in stock in English warehouses for their own profit and for the benefit of the labor and business interests of that country as against like interests in this country.

The loss sustained in our carrying trade is shown by a comparison of importations in 1881 (the year prior to the repeal of our discriminating duties) with importations in 1890.

In 1881 we imported 81,843,988 pounds of tea. Of this amount 81,207,559 pounds, or all but 636,429 pounds, came direct from China and Japan to the United States.

In 1890 we imported 83,886,829 pounds, of which amount 70,517,466 pounds came direct from China and Japan, and 13,369,363 pounds came by the way of England and other European countries and the Canadian Pacific Railway through Canada. Here we have lost the transportation, handling, and warehousing of 13,000,000 pounds of tea per annum. And this is not all. The loss to the business of the port of San Francisco and to the transportation of the overland railroads is shown by the following table of tea importations into the port of San Francisco from 1881 to 1890, furnished by the Bureau of Statistics:

Imports of tea into San Francisco.

Years ended June 30—	Pounds.	Values.
1881	23,465,794	$6,303,827
1882	17,399,473	4,746,330
1883	25,114,809	6,006,642
1884	20,343,136	3,595,616
1885	5,854,434	885,458
1886	8,313,230	1,268,438
1887	7,945,412	1,178,761
1888	8,561,066	1,165,315
1889	6,693,119	842,395
1890, China	1,571,128	279,545
Japan	6,033,316	690,057
Other countries	30,644	6,872
Total	7,635,088	976,474

It appears that we have lost in the annual importation of this article at San Francisco 15,830,706 pounds since 1881. As this amount is in excess of the indirect importations from Europe and the Canadian Pacific Railway it indicates that our merchants on the eastern side of the continent are transferring their importations from across the Pacific in American vessels and through the port of San Francisco to direct importations by the way of Suez in British subsidized vessels to New York and other eastern cities.

The average through rate for tea in 1885 from Asia across the Pacific Ocean and by overland railroads to eastern cities was $2.97 per 100 pounds. Here is, therefore, an annual loss of nearly $500,000 to our transportation lines in this one article, with the prospect of an increased loss every year, as we are day by day becoming more and more dependent on foreign transportation.

THE CALIFORNIA WHEAT AND FLOUR FLEET.

I come now to another feature of this bill, under which a navigation bounty of 20 cents per ton for each 1,000 miles of voyage to the limit of 7,000 miles will be paid to sailing vessels engaged in the foreign trade. The people of the Pacific coast are deeply interested in this provision of the bill. Our exports of wheat and flour are large and mainly to Europe by sailing vessels on a voyage which averages 14,000 miles, or double the limit of compensation in this bill. In my judgment if this provision is to be retained it should be so amended as to extend the bounty to the whole mileage of these voyages. The vessels now employed in the trade are largely under the British flag. They ought to all be under the American flag, but the discriminations in marine insurance and the additional expense of maintaining American vessels have operated in favor of the foreign vessels. The result is, our vessels have been practically driven out of the trade and the foreign vessels are able now to impose their own terms.

WHEAT EXPORT.

During the calendar year ending December 31, 1889, we exported from California in sail vessels wheat to the amount of 20,000,000 bushels in round numbers. The average export price of this wheat was 82 cents per bushel. The average price at Liverpool for the same period was $1.17 per bushel. Between the wharves at Port Costa and San Francisco and the Liverpool and Queenstown docks the price was raised 35 cents per bushel, or $7,000,000. The average freight charge was 22 cents per bushel, or a total of $4,400,000 for the export of the year. Insurance and profits absorbed 13 cents per bushel, or $2,600,000. In the transportation of this crop 234 sail ships were employed, aggregating 387,091 tons of registered capacity. This fleet carried 12,011,674 centals (or 536,235.44 tons gross), valued at

$16,430,076.60. Of this export 11,171,848 centals (or 498,821.8 tons gross), valued at $15,264,145, went to Europe, and the balance to other foreign countries. The fleet to Europe numbered 213 sail, aggregating 358,205 registered tons capacity; 167 ships, of 278,885 tons, were British; 11, of 14,551 tons, were German; 3, of 3,277 tons, were Italian; 2, of 2,891 tons, were Swedish and Norwegian; 30, of 58,601 tons, were American. The foreign shipping carried 416,697.05 tons of wheat, and the American 82,046.16 tons.

The average rate paid British ships was $8.58 per ton of cargo; the German rate was $8.40; the Italian rate was $8.92; the Swedish and Norwegian rate was $9.31; the average rate for the whole foreign fleet was $8.58, while the average rate paid American ships was $7.42.

The freight money paid to foreign ships was $3,567,244.17; the freight money paid to American ships was $609,027.64. The average proportionate excess of rate paid foreign shipping was over 15 per cent. Had the entire wheat export to Europe been carried by American ships at the average rate paid such ships the whole freight charge would have been $3,093,142.20, or $484,201.97 less than was paid.

And I will tell the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS], who asks in reference to American insurance on our vessels, that if this bill shall pass, and we place on the ocean American vessels, carrying the American flag, we will have American insurance companies and will save insurance and freight charges to American business men and American shippers.

Mr. ADAMS. There will be no insurance dicrimination against American ships if the insurance is in American companies.

Mr. MORROW. No, sir.

Mr. LIND. Let me interrupt the gentleman to ask whether the rates he last cited, $9 a ton, were the rates last year on wheat?

Mr. MORROW. No, sir; in 1889.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. And the other ships carried the freight although they charged a higher rate. Is that it?

Mr. MORROW. They have the insurance and they control the whole trade.

Mr. FARQUHAR. They control the brokerage and everything.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Will this bounty cover that, also?

Mr. MORROW. This bill will undoubtedly place the American ship upon such an even basis with the foreign ship that it will be able to overcome that difficulty.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Give it a fair show, that is all.

Mr. MORROW. That is all we ask. Now, the flour statistics also show the same state of facts, which I commend to members.

FLOUR EXPORT.

During the same year 30 sail ships were employed in carrying our flour exports to foreign markets. These ships aggregated 37,974 registered tons capacity and carried 485,245 centals of flour, valued at $1,951,184. Of this fleet, 21 ships, of 27,430 tons, were British; 4 ships, of 3,109 tons, were German; 1 ship, of 1,233 tons, was Norwegian; 1 ship, of 1,036 tons, was Hawaiian; 3 ships, of 5,160 tons, were American. Of this flour export, 429,654 centals, valued at $1,707,833, went to Europe, and the balance to China and Australia. The average rate paid British ships from San Francisco to Liverpool was $8.43 per ton; the German rate was $8.70, the Norwegian rate was $9.73; the average foreign ship rate was $8.52; the American rate was $6.51. The average proportionate excess of rate paid foreign shipping was over 31 per cent. The British flour fleet to Europe was composed of 19 vessels, carrying 335,879 centals, valued at $1,330,733; the four German ships carried 68,250 centals, valued at $274,100; the one Norwegian ship carried 19,525 centals, valued at $79,000; the single American ship in this flour export fleet carried 6,000 centals, valued at $24,000.

The freight money paid foreign ships was $161,139.78; the freight money paid one American ship was $1,743.70.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Will you tell me why the shippers prefer to pay a higher rate of freight in shipping their wheat and their flour?

Mr. MORROW. The wheat is bought by a purchaser, we will say, in San Francisco. It is placed on board a British ship and then from that time on it is controlled of course by the British merchant, the British insurance companies, and the British trade.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. No; but what I want to get at is why the shipper of wheat and flour or anything else prefers to ship it by the line which charges the higher rate.

Mr. MORROW. He does not.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The results show that they do.

Mr. MORROW. They do not prefer to, but they sell their wheat and it is transported under this monopoly by these people. There is no question about the facts.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Oh, I do not doubt the facts. I wanted to see how a bounty was going to make a man ship his wheat on one vessel rather than on another if he has a preference in the matter.

Mr. MORROW. It is not going to do that; but it is going to enable the American shipowners to compete with the British ships in the carrying trade.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. But the American shipowner offers to take it now for a less rate and yet he does not get the freight.

Mr. MORROW. He offers to do it because he is compelled to do it.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. According to your statement he offers to do it, and according to the statement of the Commissioner of Navigation he offers to do it, but yet he does not get the freight.

Mr. MORROW. Because the American ships are at a disadvantage, and they want to place their ships in service, and therefore they offer to carry the freight at the lower price because they can not get the higher price in this competition.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. And yet they do not get the trade.

Mr. MORROW. They get it to the extent that is mentioned.

Had the flour export to Europe been carried by American ships at the rate paid the American vessel, the whole freight charge would have been $119,341.78, or $41,798 less than the amount that was paid. Bringing forward the excess of freight that was paid on wheat, $484,201.97, and adding the amount to the excess paid on flour, and we have $526,000 as the excess or bounty paid to the monopoly of foreign shipping at the port of San Francisco for the year 1889. But the discriminations that have destroyed the competition of American shipping in our Pacific ports have transferred to British accounts not only the large excess of freight money just mentioned but a margin of about 13 cents per bushel for the year 1889, amounting to $2,600,000 absorbed, as we have seen, in insurance and profit.

Assuming that $600,000 of this last sum was legitimate, we find that this monopoly has plundered our farmers for the year named to the extent of not less than $2,500,000.

Foreign ships also enjoy almost an exclusive monopoly of the carrying trade in the exports of wheat and flour from Oregon and Washington. The monopoly is, however, a little closer in the North than in California, and increases its exactions by reducing the export price of wheat while charging an increased freight rate for transportation to foreign ports. The average rate last year from the Columbia River and Puget Sound to Liverpool was about $10 per ton.

From the Bureau of Statistics it appears that the export of wheat from Oregon for the year ending June 30, 1890, amounted to 2,895,676 bushels, valued at $2,199,137, or 76 cents per bushel. The export of wheat from Washington for the same period amounted to 1,735,931 bushels, valued at $1,321,354, or 76 cents per bushel. The export of wheat from California for the same period (which differs, of course, from the calendar year of 1889 previously referred to) amounted to 22,824,416 bushels, valued at $18,022,425, or 79 cents per bushel. Here is a difference of 3 cents per bushel in the home price of wheat and about $1.50 per ton in reduced freight charge in favor of the California farmer over his neighbor in the North by reason of the presence of a few competing American ships seeking cargoes in the port of San Francisco.

It is from such exactions we seek relief in the competition of American ships, provided for in this bill. That this foreign monopoly is tightening its grasp on this trade is shown by the report of the Commissioner of Navigation, who several years ago compiled statistics of four years' exports and transportation of products from San Francisco to Europe, an account of which may be found in his recent report. The period referred to extends from July, 1881, to July, 1885. It is shown in the tables of Captain Bates that the excess of freight money paid foreign shipping in that time averaged $363,796 annually. In 1889, as we have seen, the amount had risen to $526,000, and the American shipping in the trade had dwindled from 120 to 30 ships a year.

With regard to the character of performance of our sail ships in the California trade, that will be found fully and clearly elucidated by the Commissioner of Navigation in the report referred to. As he expresses it, "American ships are superior to European craft in safety, size, and speed; in efficiency they excel the world." The American fleet of 1889 excelled all former fleets, particularly in speed. The average ship made the run on the basis of time to Cork in 112.86 days. The average British ship was 131.32 days; the German ship, 131.45 days; the Swedish, 132.50 days; and the Italian, 157.33 days. The average foreign ship was 131.76 days, or 16.84 per cent. longer time than the American fleet. Notwithstanding superior performance, cargoes in our ships are charged from 15 to 30 per cent. higher premiums than those assessed for insurance by British iron vessels. The statistics compiled by the Commissioner of Navigation for the four-year period of 1881-'85 prove that "cargoes in British iron ships, if good risks at 2 per cent., then cargoes in American wooden ships should be written for 1.4 per cent."

It is proper to say here that I take no account in these calculations of our exports of wheat and flour to China and Japan by steam vessels. I find it stated in a California paper that we exported last year from California to Hong-Kong by steamships over 50,000 tons of wheat. This statement does not appear to be confirmed by the reports of domestic exports from the Bureau of Statistics, unless it is intended to refer to wheat flour of which the export by steamer to Hong-Kong was the equivalent of 50,000 tons of wheat, but whatever the trade is it is limited by the cost of transportation and the steam tonnage available for that purpose. With lower rates for transportation and an increase in our steam tonnage there is no reason why we should not enlarge this export to 500,000 tons and withdraw that amount from the European markets and from competition with the grain products of the Mississippi Valley. If we want

to help the farmers of the great West to profitable markets we must open up some of these new lines of traffic so as to distribute our trade to the best advantage.

I have discussed somewhat fully the Pacific coast commerce, the dangers to which it is exposed, and its probable destruction in the American carrying trade under our present policy, but the same conditions obtain elsewhere in the United States as with us.

COTTON EXPORT.

There can be no doubt that what is true in the California grain trade and transportation is true of the cotton trade and transportation of our Southern States. In this trade an American ship is rarely, if ever, found. British steamers have driven them out, not by fair competition, but by the premium policy of British underwriting. This policy is to ask double premiums on sailing ships, thus throwing the transportation into the hands of British steamship owners. This policy is for British protection, but it can not be worked to drive sailing ships out of the California trade until the Nicaragua or Panama Canals shall be finished. Cargoes in steamers from California to Europe now pay the same rate of insurance as charged in iron sailing ships, just for the reason that the voyage around Cape Horn is too long for steamers, and very few enter, while none seek the trade. Where British steamers can not gain and hold a trade by the aid of Lloyds, they are subsidized, or the protection is given to iron or steel sailing ships, as in the grain and flour carriage of California.

AN ANNUAL AMERICAN TRIBUTE OF TWO HUNDRED MILLIONS OF DOLLARS PAID TO FOREIGN SHIPPING.

The enormous tribute we pay annually to foreign shipping indicates how completely we have become subject to foreign interests. During last year there were entered and cleared at the several ports of the United States (excluding lake ports) 20,198 foreign vessels laden with cargoes. These vessels had an aggregate tonnage capacity of 21,200,080 tons, and every one of them carried cargo (I have already excluded all vessels arriving and departing in ballast).

There are no statistics showing the tonnage of cargoes, but it can be very closely estimated. In the California wheat trade in 1889, 183 foreign vessels of the registered capacity of 299,604 tons carried 416,697 tons of freight, or about 1.4 tons of freight to each registered ton of capacity. A fair average for all kinds of freight would be a ton of freight for each registered ton of vessel, and a further reduction of 6 per cent. gives 20,000,000 of tons of freight in round numbers as the estimated amount of cargo carried by foreign vessels in our foreign commerce last year.

The average freight charge was about $10 per ton, or an aggregate of $200,000,000, the amount we are now paying as an annual tribute to foreign shipowners to enable them to plunder our industrial interests. This sum is $50,000,000 more than the aggregate value of all our exports last year of barley, bread, corn, cornmeal, oats, oatmeal, rye, rye flour, wheat, wheat flour, and all other breadstuffs and food preparations. It is a sum more than double the annual product of all the gold and silver mines of the United States, and yet we claim to be an independent nation, charged with the responsibility of protecting the rights and preserving the liberties of a whole continent. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the time has come for us to demonstrate our ability to protect ourselves against European aggression.

But it is urged against this bill that it will take money out of the Treasury to build up our commerce in the manner proposed. So it will.

THE COST OF RESTORING AMERICAN SHIPPING.

The Commissioner of Navigation estimates that the tonnage of vessels of first-class A1 and A1½, which is the only tonnage eligible for bounty under this bill, would be for the first year 356,000 of sail and 153,000 of steam, and that such vessels would probably receive bounties to the amount of $925,600 for sail and $1,178,100 for steam, making a total of $2,103,100 for the first year. This tonnage would increase from year to year, and he estimates that at the end of ten years the eligible tonnage would be 310,000 sail and 913,000 steam, and that the sail tonnage would then be receiving $806,000 and the steam tonnage $7,395,000, or a total of $8,201,000 per annum. This would be a large expenditure, and the question is what compensation or return would we realize for the General Government beyond the patriotic pride of seeing the national flag restored to its former position on the high seas? We are now dealing with the practical rather than the ornamental side of this question. In the first place we would secure the frequent, regular, and direct dispatch of our foreign mails on American vessels to the countries with which our trade would invite communication, and, second, we would have a merchant fleet built upon naval plans and available for auxiliary cruisers or transports in case of war.

THE FOREIGN MAIL SERVICE.

In the transportation of our foreign mails we have an estimated revenue of $2,655,109 legitimately applicable to this expenditure, as appears from the last report of the Postmaster-General. In speaking of the foreign mail service he says:

The revenue from all sources for service to foreign countries can only be determined by estimates based upon weights of mails and statistics gathered during the first seven days of October and April last. The aggregate sum seems to be $2,655,108, and the actual net cost of the service is $573,882, showing a profit of over $2,000,000, exclusive of the cost of transportation from points of origin to the exchange post offices. This cost can not be ascertained from any existing data, as it forms a part of the general mail in transit from all points. For the facilities afforded by the transportation companies named as miscellaneous service in the table of the report of the Superintendent of Foreign Mails, comprising the lines of steamers to the Latin-American countries, the compensation allowed under the law is inadequate for the service performed.

Mail connections with the Australian colonies have been maintained with difficulty, owing to the disposition of the New Zealand Government to terminate the present arrangement on account of the alleged inadequacy of the compensation allowed by this Government, viz, the entire amount of postage collected. The Department can only act within the statutes, and the subject in detail has been laid before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives, whose chairman introduced a joint resolution which reached the House Calendar. Meanwhile the New Zealand Government has submitted to the contractors (the Oceanic Steamship Company) propositions for the continuance of the service for one year, the acceptance of which by the company probably depends largely upon the fate of the bill now before Congress in favor of American shipping and the joint resolution above referred to. I consider the matter of sufficient importance to the postal and commercial interests of the United States to urgently recommend that it receive prompt and favorable action.

The Department is wholly dependent upon steamers flying the flags of other nations and of foreign ownership for the transportation of the mail. Exceptions are the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, the Oceanic Steamship Company, the United States and Brazil Line, and the Red "D" Line. The total amount paid to all the other American companies is only $10,955.97.

Unexpected differences with steamship companies of foreign registry relating to charges, or for other causes, might at any moment cut off mail intercourse with Europe under the present circumstances. It must be apparent that this country should not be subject to foreign capitalists for means to distribute its mails. Without considering the inland charges on the foreign mail, the sea service shows a profit of not far from $2,000,000 per annum, which sum might be fairly considered for disposal in the encouragement of American shipping for American mails.

With additional and more efficient tonnage in our foreign carrying trade would come of course an increase in our foreign mails and increased revenues from that source, so that commencing with a revenue from our foreign mails sufficient to pay the bounties provided in this bill it might reasonably be expected that the increased revenue would continue to defray at least a large part of the expenses.

A NAVAL RESERVE.

The value and economy of a fleet of merchant vessels of a registered tonnage of nearly a million tons structurally adapted to conversion into cruisers or transports can not be accurately determined. They might be of enormous value in an emergency. The economy of having them available without the expense of maintaining them in the service when not required, may be roughly estimated. By reference to the report of the Paymaster General of the Navy it will be found that the cost of maintaining three of the new cruisers last year was as follows: The Atlanta, $215,855.42; the Boston, $206,002.80; and the Chicago, $309,838.77. These were the only cruisers of the new Navy in the service for the whole of the year ending June 30, 1890. The Baltimore was in the service seven months at an expense of $105,997.68, and the Charleston six months at an expense of $102,846.57. The average expense of each of these five cruisers for a year is therefore about $220,000.

If this bill should become a law and result in the construction of only ten vessels with a speed of 20 knots or over like the City of Paris of the Inman line, the Teutonic of the White Star Line, or the Etruria of the Cunard Line, now under subvention to the British admiralty, we would practically have on hand that number of cruisers equal in speed and efficiency to anything afloat in that line, with a saving of not less than $2,000,000 a year for maintenance during the time they would not be required. But I do not wish to be understood as claiming for such merchant vessel an efficiency for naval purposes equal to the same number of vessels equipped and manned and always ready for hostile action; such a claim would be manifestly absurd. In modern naval warfare the most destructive blow will be struck by the vessels that put to sea fully equipped for service simultaneously with the declaration of war. These merchant vessels would be valuable, however, as a reserve suitable for active service on short notice, and in this capacity would fully compensate the Government for whatever navigation bounties they might have previously received.

THE TONNAGE TAX.

The merchant-marine service has still another item to its credit in this account which may as well be entered up here as elsewhere. The tonnage tax imposed on merchant vessels entering ports of the United States from foreign ports amounted last year to the sum of $565,474.85. This revenue will continue at about this amount and may properly be expended for the benefit of America's shipping.

THE EXTENSION OF OUR FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The next and last item in this account relates to the extension of our foreign commerce. Here the line is sharply drawn, and our Democratic friends insist with some vehemence that any expenditure for that purpose is in aid of private enterprise, and, therefore, contrary to public policy. It is not certain that this bill would carry over a dollar of deficiency from postal and naval affairs to be charged up to the account of foreign commerce—but suppose it should?

It will not be the first bill that we will have passed for that purpose. The river and harbor bill of last year appropriated $25,136,295 for the improvement of the rivers and harbors of the country.

Why does the General Government appropriate large sums for this

purpose? Manifestly to open and keep open the water ways of commerce that the producers may obtain convenient access to markets, and that the markets may have the benefits derived from the exchange of products.

In this river and harbor bill, to which reference has just been made, there is an appropriation of $500,000 for the improvement of the harbor of Galveston, Tex., which contemplates further appropriations from year to year to the estimated amount of over $6,000,000 to secure deep water that the harbor may be made accessible to the largest vessel. Galveston is a city of about 30,000 population. It is not large in this respect as compared with other cities of the United States. This improvement will be of great local benefit. Her merchants will share in the bounty of the Government; but this was not the purpose in view in making this large appropriation. It is claimed with much force that Galveston can be made an outlet for the surplus productions of the Mississippi Valley, and for that reason a harbor should be constructed by the General Government at this point on the Gulf of Mexico. Now, mark the argument in favor of this aid to commerce. In debating this proposition in the Senate, the Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN], in explaining the great benefits to be derived from this improvement, said:

All the great West is interested in this, its commerce is interested in it, the cheapening of its transportation is interested in it, the value of its farms is interested in it because it will bring increased value to their products.

The other Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE] with equal earnestness urged that this improvement should be made that there might be an outlet for the producers of the great West seeking a market.

He said:

Mr. President, the States of Texas, Colorado, Kansas, and Arkansas and the Territories of Utah, and Wyoming, through their Legislatures, have memorialized Congress in favor of a deep-water harbor at Galveston. I hold in my hand a list covering three pages of petitions from the boards of trade, exchanges, etc., from the States of Iowa, Kansas, and Colorado, and in fact from all the States of the West, asking that the entrance to the harbor at Galveston be improved, and that Galveston be made a first-class seaport.

* * * * * * *

Now, that country—and when I speak of it I speak of all the States and Territories, for they are all represented in their memorials here—demands access to the sea by way of the Gulf of Mexico. They desire this outlet for their vast surplus. Every Farmers' Alliance, the Granges in all the States, all the agricultural people of the West demand this outlet to the sea for their productions. An outlet is needed to take the produce out of our country, where they have more than can be consumed, where they have to burn corn for fuel, where beef and pork have gone down so low that they do not pay the cost of production.

An outlet is desired upon the Gulf of Mexico for these products, and the only question is where that outlet shall be. They do not need a harbor with an entrance of only 15 or 20 feet; they need a harbor that will be open to the largest ships that engage in the foreign trade, for it will be remembered that while this vast area of country that I have spoken of lies behind the Gulf coast in the United States, in front, across the Gulf, are the Island of Cuba, and Brazil, and all the South American Republics, with which our commerce, already great, is to be indefinitely increased in the near future.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] favored the proposition for the reason, among others, that a deep-water harbor at Galveston would develop a carrying trade for the products of his State in competition with the transportation companies to Chicago and St. Louis. He said:

The people of the section of country which I in part represent here have a deep and abiding interest in this question, and they are interested in it whether they believe that any of their products will go to Galveston or not. I have sometimes doubted whether so great a portion of our trade would go that way as some of the more enthusiastic supporters of this proposition seem to think, but I do know at least that it will furnish a counter-irritant; and the very moment there is a prospect that the one, two, five, ten, fifteen, or fifty million bushels of grain of the State of Kansas which must be exported will really go that way, I know that the transportation companies which are interested in carrying this grain to Chicago, to St. Louis, and in other directions, will come in and say, "We will give you better rates if you will go our way in place of going this new way."

In response to this argument Congress has provided for the large expenditure necessary to make this improvement, and it is expressly for the benefit of commerce in reaching new markets, and in developing new channels for a portion of our export and import trade. This is the policy at the bottom of the commercial enterprise of all the leading nations of Europe who are paying subsidies in one way or another in aid of steamship lines to distant countries.

THE INLAND POSTAL SERVICE.

From what has been stated it appears that the Government of the United States is liberal enough in some directions. The inland postal service furnishes the best evidence on that point and all relevant to the question under consideration. It expended, for instance, last year $5,320,732.37 for the transportation of the mails over what are termed the "star routes," a designation which includes stage lines and all miscellaneous routes of mail carriage except railway and steamboat lines. It is not claimed that the postage received on the mails carried over such routes was sufficient to pay for the service, but the Government has adopted the wise and liberal policy of furnishing mail facilities to all parts of the Union, even though the cost of the service may for a time exceed the revenue. The prospect always is that such facilities will help to open up new country and will invite our people into these new sections to establish industries, build homes, and form communities for the benefit and welfare of the whole nation, and the expectation has always been realized. Look at the census returns and consider the effect that has been produced by the occupation and development of the far West. The increase of wealth and population has been enormous, and through business channels the whole country has shared in its prosperity. The only complaint has been that after having invited people into its new domain the Government has never been able to keep up with the requirements of the situation in furnishing its postal, judicial, and other facilities. The steamboat mail service is also evidence of a policy of liberality. The amount expended last year on this service amounted to $444,343.64 on water routes aggregating 10,456 miles.

No one complains of this expenditure or finds fault because $23,500 was paid last year for carrying the mails on the Ohio River from Louisville, Ky., to Paducah, in the same State, a distance of 356 miles. Nor do we hear of any protest because the Baltimore Steam Packet Company is paid $12,000 per annum for carrying the mails on Chesapeake Bay between Norfolk and Baltimore, a distance of 181 miles. In the new State of Washington the Government is struggling to keep up with the requirements of an increasing and an enterprising population by paying $18,846.15 for mail service for one year from Seattle across Puget Sound to Port Townsend, a distance of 80 miles. He would be a brave member of Congress, but not a wise one, who would propose to reduce the next appropriation on account of such expenditures.

MAIL SERVICE BETWEEN TAMPA BAY AND CUBA.

It is perhaps not generally known that the steamboat mail service includes the only subsidy paid by the Government for carrying the mails to a foreign port where the compensation is not limited by the amount of postage receipts, but such is the fact. In the act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the year ending June 30, 1886, it was provided that—

The Postmaster-General is authorized to contract for inland and foreign steamboat mail service, when it can be combined in one route, where the foreign office or offices are not more than 200 miles distant from the domestic office, on the same terms and conditions as inland steamboat service, and pay for the same out of the appropriations for inland steamboat service.

This provision being brought to the attention of the Postmaster-General [Vilas], he determined that it was designed wholly for the Gulf route, between the coast of Florida and the Island of Cuba. There had been for many years a steamboat mail service between Key West and New York and Key West and New Orleans, and for the years 1885 and 1886 between Tampa Bay and Key West.

The distance from Tampa Bay to Key West is 264 miles and from Key West to Havana is 103 miles. The Postmaster-General proceeded to negotiate for a service over this route, but as the first offers were deemed excessive they were declined.

A satisfactory contract was, however, secured with Mr. H. B. Plant, and the Postmaster-General in his report for the year 1886 sets forth the advantages secured by this service as follows:

The purpose of the Congress, further manifested during the last session, and the desirability in every aspect that a highly efficient mail service should be established with Cuba in connection with our Atlantic coast line from New England and New York, induced a renewal of negotiation, and resulted in a contract for service between Tampa, Key West, and Havana, by the new steamer Mascotte and a consort of equal excellence from August 1, 1886, to June 30, 1887, to be rendered three times a week between November 1 and April 30, and twice a week during the residue of the year, on schedules to be fixed by the Department, carrying all mails both ways, for $54,450. This service covers and dispenses with that before maintained between Tampa and Key West, at an annual cost of $22,565.74; performs our foreign mail carriage to Cuba and Porto Rico, which, computed in the foreign mails office at sea and inland postage on the quantity estimated by the weights of 1885 and ordinary increase, amounts to $24,159.07, and also the carriage of the open and closed mails of European countries to Cuba, for which we receive now about $3,500.

In addition, it is anticipated that arrangements will be made to transport the Cuban mails to this country, and to some extent their European mails, and thus add a substantial sum to the receipts of this route. Performance of this trip each way in twenty-five hours is stipulated, and the time between New York and Cuba is already reduced from the four and one-half days required by the sea voyage to three days by this service, besides a greater expedition for all mail originating in the South; and it is confidently expected that within no long period the railroad time will be so accelerated between Washington and Tampa that but sixty hours will separate Havana and New York. So soon as such celerity shall be acquired, in addition to the regularity and security of the new service, it must command the transportation of all mails both ways, and prove not only of high value to business correspondence, but perhaps directly remunerative.

Here again results have more than justified all expectations.

The first ship of this line, the Mascotte, was the first American ship in which the principle of triple expansion in marine engines was used for commercial purposes, and the Olivette, the second ship of the line, is said to be the fastest commercial ship carrying the American flag into a foreign port. Under the present contract the Government paid last year $57,578.74 for carrying the mails between Tampa, Key West, and Havana, but the revenue from postage on the mail matter carried is increasing, and it is probable that whatever deficiency there is will soon disappear. In the mean time two important ports are being built up on our Southern coast.

In 1884 the imports of Key West amounted in value to $554,193, the exports to $412,318, and the duties collected to $319,889.52. In 1890 the imports amounted to $1,100,389, the exports to $436,000, and the duties collected to $757,697.74. By the act of April 3, 1890, Tampa was made a port of entry and separated from Key West, with which customs district it had formerly been connected. From April 3, 1890, to June 30, 1890, a period of less than three months, the imports into Tampa alone amounted to $506,620, and the duties collected to $252,141.43. Here is an increase of business that certainly

justifies the Government even in this timid extension of its mail service under the protection of the flag, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that a policy that is wise and beneficial for 100 miles at sea would be of like value for 1,000 miles and 5,000 miles, and for the entire globe. If with fair encouragement our ships can profitably venture beyond the territorial jurisdiction of a marine league, I am sure the time has come for us to send them into all the ocean highways of commerce, that they may claim our share of the world's great traffic.

Mr. Chairman, the facts I have presented are encumbered with detail, and lacking, perhaps, in the grace of form that appeals to the sentiments, but this line of argument has been purposely pursued. This is a practical age and, whether we like it or not, we must answer the question "What is all this worth?"

In the wealth of nations the modern statesman makes no entry in the public ledger to the credit of "good will," or renown. In such an account actual transactions, as represented by the balance of trade and the percentages of imports and exports, must answer all questions, resolve all doubts, and determine all controversies as to the value of a national policy. The bill before us appears to have been the result of such an investigation. Adopting the best and most economical features of existing methods found elsewhere, it will foster our foreign commerce, extend our postal facilities to all parts of the business world, and, increasing our naval power, make us respected as a people and honored as a nation.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. EVANS having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, a message in writing from the President was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed acts and a joint resolution of the following titles:

An act (H. R. 11391) for the construction and completion of suitable school buildings for Indian industrial schools in Wisconsin and other States;

An act (H. R. 13060) to grant a pension to General Nathaniel Prentiss Banks;

Joint resolution (H. Res. 251) to correct an error of punctuation in the tariff act of 1890;

An act (H. R. 3449) for the relief of James M. Lowry;

An act (H. R. 12242) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth C. Custer;

An act (H. R. 12536) to facilitate the collection of commercial statistics required by section 2 of the river and harbor appropriation acts of 1866 and 1867;

An act (H. R. 9602) to constitute Nashville, Tenn., a port of delivery, and for other purposes;

An act (H. R. 8598) to amend section 4178, Revised Statutes, in relation to the marking of vessels' names at bow and stern; and also to provide for marking the draught;

An act (H. R. 6852) for the relief of North S. Storms;

An act (H. R. 2617) for the relief of Henry Clay and others, owners and crew of the whaling schooner Franklin, of New Bedford, Mass.;

An act (H. R. 10267) for the relief of the owners and crews of the American whaling vessels, Midas Progress, Lagoda, Daniel Webster, and Europa;

An act (H. R. 1574) for the relief of William Jewell College, of Liberty, Clay County, Missouri;

An act (H. R. 18) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Michael Flaherty;

An act (H. R. 8042) to remove the charge of desertion against Urs Ambrose Nunlist;

An act (H. R. 2526) authorizing the President of the United States to revoke the order of dismissal of William L. Lenan, first lieutenant Company B, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteers, and to accept his resignation;

An act (H. R. 2968) for the relief of Thomas W. Houts;

An act (H. R. 4806) for the relief of Abram F. McCurdy;

An act (H. R. 12499) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes;

An act (H. R. 12573) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes;

An act (H. R. 6586) amending the act of July 20, A. D. 1882, dividing the State of Iowa into two judicial districts;

An act (H. R. 12148) providing for a board to examine and report as to the physical condition of William C. Spencer at the time of his resignation from the Army;

An act (H. R. 5601) to authorize the proper accounting officers of the Treasury to audit and pay the claim of the county of Schuylkill, in the State of Pennsylvania, for money advanced by it under allotments made by soldiers from said county during the late rebellion, by virtue of section 12 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the employment of volunteers to aid in enforcing the laws and protecting public property," approved July 22, 1861;

An act (H. R. 8628) for the erection of a public building at Richmond, Ky.;

An act (H. R. 8970) for the relief of James Brown;

An act (H. R. 13055) to amend an act entitled "An act for the construction of a bridge at South St. Paul, Minn.;"

An act (H. R. 3647) granting a pension to Jonathan S. Brink;

An act (H. R. 4822) granting a pension to John Gallagher;

An act (H. R. 5546) granting a pension to H. W. Goodnight;

An act (H. R. 6392) granting a pension to Jane Boswell Moore Bristor;

An act (H. R. 7189) granting a pension to James H. Orr;

An act (H. R. 7875) granting a pension to E. Patton, of Benedict, Kans.;

An act (H. R. 7880) granting a pension to Mrs. G. W. Griffith;

An act (H. R. 8557) granting a pension to John McGregor;

An act (H. R. 8561) granting a pension to Martha Torrence;

An act (H. R. 9425) granting a pension to William Dunn;

An act (H. R. 9779) granting a pension to Mrs. Lydia N. Atkinson;

An act (H. R. 9819) granting a pension to Martha A. Kendrick;

An act (H. R. 9948) granting a pension to Mrs. Matilda Kent;

An act (H. R. 10742) granting a pension to Josephine S. Hansel (late Wilson);

An act (H. R. 10992) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary B. Floyd;

An act (H. R. 12118) granting a pension to Eliza Jane Saunders;

An act (H. R. 12347) granting a pension to Laura J. Haydon, formerly Burke;

An act (H. R. 12386) granting a pension to Mary S. Wheeler;

An act (H. R. 12478) granting a pension to Jane Falk;

An act (H. R. 12528) granting a pension to Maria M. C. Richards;

An act (H. R. 12614) granting a pension to Mary Williams;

An act (H. R. 13023) granting a pension to Mary E. Armstrong;

An act (H. R. 1634) for the relief of William M. Robinson;

An act (H. R. 5717) for the relief of Margaret Constable;

An act (H. R. 6686) for the relief of Coplin McKelvey;

An act (H. R. 10079) for the relief of Nancy Potter;

An act (H. R. 11972) for the relief of Montgomery Geiger;

An act (H. R. 12094) for the relief of John M. Wright, of Audrain County, Missouri;

An act (H. R. 1890) to pension Winemah Riddell;

An act (H. R. 11534) to pension Mrs. Letitia Staenglen;

An act (H. R. 11635) to pension Mrs. Margaret Walker;

An act (H. R. 2537) to increase the pension of James A. Underwood;

An act (H. R. 10873) to increase the pension of Robert Hall;

An act (H. R. 11173) to increase the pension of Elias D. Thompson;

An act (H. R. 12900) to increase the pension of Mrs. Elizabeth R. Gordon, widow of Maj. George A. Gordon, Fifth Cavalry;

An act (H. R. 11925) increasing the pension of William L. Horn;

An act (H. R. 2512) granting an increase of pension to Hugh McHugh;

An act (H. R. 12147) to grant a pension Elender Johnston; and

An act (H. R. 2456) for the relief of the legal representatives of Peter Lyle, deceased.

SHIPPING BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. FITHIAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CANDLER] for one hour.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who preceded me says that this is a practical age, and I shall endeavor to discuss this question, or the two questions which are before us, in a practical way.

No two propositions connected with legislation, it seems to me, engross the popular attention of the people or really command more the interest of this House than the two questions which relate to our foreign commerce and to the foreign carrying trade of this country. And I believe that a great deal of the discussion to which we have listened has been dealing with the past, and has not applied the important conditions of the present to the discussion of both of these subjects.

I claim, Mr. Chairman, that there is an honest difference of opinions upon the questions which we are now discussing, and men honestly differ in the theories which they present.

The theories and the arguments that I shall offer for your consideration are based upon the observation and experience of merchants, and I pay very little attention to the statements that have been made upon this floor and through the press that there is an insincerity on the part of gentlemen who advocate breaking the shackles which have bound the merchants of this country. I give no heed to the charges that British gold is influencing the opinions of men. I believe that that has been a statement which has tended to mislead the American people from a fair and reasonable and businesslike consideration of this subject.

I believe that the gentleman from Illinois, who comes here fresh to the study of this question, has brought to its consideration a sound judgment and has been influenced in his decision by a fair consideration of the question upon its merits. I refer to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. FITHIAN. It seems almost strange to me, considering the influence of the press and the large lobby which has everywhere poured its words and its persuasions into the ears of this House, that

we have not found more men whose minds have been diverted from the consideration of the measure upon sound legal and business principles.

I congratulate the House that these men who represent the agricultural interests of the country have come up here and been able to stand firm in what seems to be the right conclusion in regard to this question. And upon the other side, Mr. Chairman, I do not complain of the lobby. I am not surprised that men who differ with us should come here and perhaps use the press and have at every door men to persuade and to prove that the other view of the question is not correct. I do take exception, however, to their charges that there is a want of patriotism on the part of men who advocate different views from their own.

Mr. Chairman, in considering the different bills which are presented for legislation to promote our foreign commerce and increase the amount of tonnage in the foreign carrying trade under the American flag successfully, we are first called to consider the substitute bill which is offered by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, headed by my friend [Mr. FARQUHAR], and the principle which is the basis of that bill. It is a bill that advocates a general bounty system. It proposes to tax the people of the United States to make profitable a business which they claim is unprofitable. It in my judgment introduces into the legislation of this country a vicious principle.

I do not believe it is wise for us to tax the people generally for the success of any one branch. As a merchant and as a legislator I am opposed to appropriating the money of the people from the Treasury of the United States for such a purpose, and throughout this country there are many of the best, most experienced merchants that have stood and do stand upon that same ground. We protest—we do not ask, we protest against the introduction into this Government of a vicious principle at this time, which justifies or recognizes any idea in legislation that will tax the people to make profitable the business of any individual or the business of any class in foreign countries and foreign seas. I oppose this bill which is presented as a general bounty system because it is unsound and vicious in principle; and I oppose it still further because it introduces an uncertain element into the business of this country.

There are very few people here to-day who can explain the mysteries of this substitute bill or estimate the amount of money it involves. For one, I am opposed to legislation that increases the officeholders of this country; that introduces or indorses bills that members of Congress do not comprehend themselves; and I protest against legislation that proposes to tax the people based on the standard of the rating of a ship, whether it is A1 or A1½ at Lloyds' or in the American Insurance Association. But this bill is not only vicious in principle in taxing the people for one certain branch of trade, but it also has a confused and complicated series of sections which no man can readily understand.

And, further than that, it is not alone in regard to the insurance, but you are required to keep a record and to have men to inspect the record to see whether a ship sails a thousand or two thousand miles; and any man familiar with the insurance clause, or who knows anything about required estimates, statements, arguments, and proof that a man must produce and establish to demand and secure certain payments from the Government, knows such conditions are subject to every kind of exaggeration and abuse. Even further than that, I can scarcely blame a shipbuilder or shipowner who seeks to get a higher rating than his vessel is entitled to. It is a natural weakness. If you have ever been interested in a ship you are always inclined to think that the magnificent vessel you have built and sailed or owned is a little better than that of your neighbors; and when you go to the Government officer or the insurance officer, if she rates actually A1½ in the judgment of other men, you will find that you will always struggle to have her rated A1 and thus get a larger payment than you otherwise would.

If your old ship, that you have owned and sailed and at whose mast you have seen your colors, happens to get a rate of A1½, there is a faithful spirit, a constancy to the old ship, and a man is inclined really to think she is actually of a better class. I simply refer to these complications in this bill. I say that it is not only the introduction of the vicious principle of which I have spoken; we are enacting a law, if we pass it, that is uncertain and complicated in its provisions. There are sections in that bill that very few men can understand and which carry with them embarrassments for the future.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not leave it there. I oppose this bill because it does not recognize the inexorable laws and demands of modern trade. I say to you that as I have listened to these arguments that went back to the time of Charles II, advocating to-day that we should take up the exploded notions of the seventeenth century rather than that we should legislate in the light of the nineteenth century, I felt that in the arguments of the gentlemen who have sustained these old theories they have forgotten the progress and the change of modern times. To-day we do not transact our business in ships or in merchandise or in commerce as our grandfathers did.

The ships of fifty years ago, and even the ships before the war, that went out from the harbors of Boston and New York into the sunshine and storm did not have the same facilities for direction as we have in the telegraphic systems of modern times. The early merchants that we are so proud of for their courage and their intelligence and enterprise, when their ships started to sea and when they bade their captains good-by and saw the white sails fade in the distance, knew that they might have no tidings of that ship until their colors signaled once more her return.

It was the custom of the merchant to import his cargo and place it in his store and sell it himself, and perhaps it would last until another came. But now in these modern times we telegraph from Boston and New York on Monday to Calcutta to get a ship chartered; on Wednesday we have a telegram that the cargo is purchased and the ship chartered, and on Friday we can offer it, cost and freight added, to a customer. We do not wish to legislate to-day on the exploded notions of other times. We can have no sensible, business, practical legislation unless we base it upon the conditions of to-day.

Mr. Chairman, I say that no bounty bill, no taxation of the Treasury can do away with the importance of quick trading in ships as well as in everything else. Formerly the merchant laid out his voyages with certain regular and methodical plans adapted to his capital and for a long series of years, but in modern competition conditions have changed. An enterprising young man starting out in business, if he needs a ship to-day for foreign trade may find it to be for his interest, as it is, to seek where in the world he can buy ships cheapest, because he has to compete with the world on the highway of the world on which his ship has to sail. Perhaps he may want that ship for one year or for two years, and then there may come a time when he will sell that ship in a foreign port and buy another better adapted to the cargo he wishes to purchase.

The success of modern trade depends in this country and everywhere else upon a quick and prompt exchange of everything that is used or dealt in; and I assure you, gentlemen, I am satisfied that this bill which is so vicious in principle, which the best merchants that I know—I do not mean shipbuilders—which the best merchants that I know are opposed to, is not only unwise and unsound on account of its vicious principle, but it will absolutely fail, and you are leading your countrymen into a taxation and following a myth, for you will never have any foreign trade upon foreign seas unless you break the fetters with which you have bound your merchants and let them stand on an equal ground with others. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We must be permitted to conduct our foreign commerce as merchants with every advantage our competitors enjoy. Now, some protectionists would be refreshed by a little freedom, when we are doing business beyond the limits of the United States and her protective laws. We are charged here with being false to the principle of protection because we say that you have fettered the merchants as you have fettered no other class, and, when we prove to you that while we had 90 per cent. of the carrying trade formerly we have come down now to 12½ per cent., you will not accept that fact as indicating unwise legislation, which this country is largely responsible for by ignoring the laws of trade, but with party lines and party whip you try to drive us into indorsing a proposition that we believe to be vicious and that we know as well as we can know anything in the future will inevitably fail.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I suppose the gentleman concedes the importance of shipping, and I wish that in the course of his remarks he would state the policy which he favors.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. I will do so. Now, Mr. Chairman, I contend that you protectionists on this floor have no right to reflect on me as not being a protectionist. I am a protectionist. I voted for the McKinley bill, and I believe in the policy of endeavoring to protect American labor and American capital. And I say to gentlemen on the Democratic side that there is not one of them who can answer the best speech that John C. Calhoun ever made on economic questions, his speech in 1816 in favor of the protective principle.

But when I am asked to violate what seems to me a principle of sound legislation for the country and to admit that the principle of protection is involved here, I deny it. The ocean is the highway of the world. You have no control over it. The ship that competes with me at Calcutta may be French or English or Norwegian, but, if she takes the freight at one half-dollar less than the American ship, she does the business. You can control your harbors; you can control the commerce between your States; you can control your inland seas and your great rivers; but when you go out upon the highway of the nations of the world you must not shackle your merchants; you must give them the same freedom that the Englishman or the Frenchman has.

You have done wisely to take off the charges from all that enters into the construction of a ship. You have done that, and many of the merchants of this country have long believed in that policy as I will show you in a few moments. You have not repealed the unwise navigation laws of the country. You have done more for the shipyards of Maine and the shipbuilders of this country than you have done for any other class. You have not only given them your coastwise trade, which I think is right; you have enacted prohibitory laws.

You have prohibited the merchant, who has to compete with the foreign merchant, from using the only tools that he may be able or has been able to use profitably on a large scale.

If the cotton manufacturer or the manufacturer of bagging or any other goods wished to import a newly invented loom from England to use in his factory, he could do it with a duty, but when the merchant, who has to contend with capital and poor labor and everything else, asked to be allowed to procure his proper tools, you said no. You submitted to the unwise dictation of the shipbuilders of this country, and you forgot the merchants who furnished the cargoes for the ships.

Mr. Chairman, I say that assertion is proved by the facts of the past, and as a great deal has been said and published about the influences that are at work in this matter and about "British gold," and all that nonsense, in regard to the men who dare to stand up here before our committees in Congress and ask for freedom in competing with foreign nations, I would like to read to you some resolutions to show that this is no new theme with some of us; that it is no new policy which I propose in the bill which I have offered. That bill, which I propose as a substitute for the others, is based upon the convictions of as able men as I know in regard to this question.

In 1872, nineteen years ago, the members of the Boston Board of Trade were called together to propose measures for increasing the foreign trade of this country. We had suffered from unwise legislation—just such laws as the gentleman from Maine proposes to-day. When the war of the rebellion broke out the merchants has extended their credit; many of them owed a great deal of money for foreign exchange; many of them were interested in vessels, as I was.

At the opening of the conflict the Englishmen, after two or three little privateers had gone out upon the sea, were able to buy many of our ships for a reduced and often ruinous price, and many were obliged to put their ships under a foreign flag to save themselves from disaster. To be enabled to send assorted cargoes of merchandise to foreign countries—where their branch houses had a partial stock—they were obliged as a war measure to put our ships under a foreign flag to save their credit, to be enabled to pay their notes and their taxes during the great struggle for the preservation of the country. They thought that at the close of the war this unwise policy of chaining us would be abandoned. But what was done?

Mr. MILLIKEN. I would like to ask the gentleman a question right there. He does not mean to say that all the shipowners and shipmasters in the North put their vessels during the war under foreign flags?

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. "The gentleman does" not.

Mr. MILLIKEN. But the gentleman himself did that?

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. He did.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Exactly.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. Yes, sir; "exactly." I expected just that from the State of Maine, because I know that through your mistaken policy you have trammeled us in all our business. And now, gentlemen, let me tell you why it was necessary to put our vessels under a foreign flag. I was associated with other merchants doing business in foreign countries. We had branch houses there with stocks of merchandise, houses that by energy and enterprise we had built up. They were selling American goods. We exported plows, we exported lumber, we exported flour.

When the war came upon us we found that the Englishmen were our competitors. And I wish to refer the gentleman to one single man—because perhaps he knows him, who has done more in the way of enterprising shipbuilding than any man I know, the man who built the Bluejacket, the Redjacket, and vessels of that stamp. He was interested in the same trade with myself. At first he did not put his vessels under the British flag. In the pursuit of that business which he had given his lifetime to establish, he undertook to send a bark—I think I can recollect the name correctly, the bark Alvarado—to Port Elizabeth, Cape of Good Hope, with an assorted cargo under the American flag. His vessel was destroyed by privateers of the Confederate States. And this, Mr. Chairman, was the beginning of that loss of fortune, that embarrassment which came upon him in later times. Meeting this loss he was obliged, as a war measure and in order to protect himself, to put his vessels under a foreign flag.

Gentlemen, I do believe that if the merchants could come before you and discuss this question in a practical way, entirely outside of all these exaggerations and all this sentimentalism—if they could state the facts as I state them—the majority of this House would realize how unsound has been the legislation which a few shipyards and a few men have inflicted upon this country for the last thirty years.

But, Mr. Chairman, I was proceeding to read to you certain resolutions which, if I may be allowed a personal reference——

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman does not mean that the legislation which he complains of was "inflicted upon the country" during the last thirty years. It was "inflicted on the country" by Washington, Madison, and Jefferson.

Mr. HOPKINS and Mr. MCADOO rose.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. I desire to answer that question. That is just what I complain of; I complain that these men from Maine are legislating in the light of a hundred years ago. [Applause.] They close their eyes to modern things.

I wish to say to the gentleman that, although the Mayflower had no peer with her immortal cargo, we do not now cross the seas in a vessel built like a Dutch galiot with blunt bow and kettle bottom; we sail in steamers to cross the sea; steamers built as they should not be, by foreign nations; and we telegraph across and tell our friends we will meet them on the wharf and appoint the day. Now, that is the trouble, that under a false sentiment, almost a sentimentality, the people of this country have been led continually into unwise legislation.

Let me say here that I respect the sentiment of the country, East and West, the sentiment which thrills us all when we hear of the victories and success of the American flag on the ocean in the past in war and peace. And when arguments are made here by the gentleman from Maine and the gentleman from New York, and through the press, that the shipbuilding interests of this country are jeopardized, that the ship carpenter and the mechanic will forget the mysteries of their craft, when it is urged that a proper defense of the country requires that we should pay a bounty in order to preserve the flag in all its glory, I do not wonder that the people of the country, prompted by a spirit of patriotism, are led into unwise and unsound legislation.

Mr. Chairman, in the very opening speech of the gentleman from Maine, when he appealed to the memory of Thomas Jefferson and asked us to stand by the theories which Thomas Jefferson proposed for commercial supremacy on the sea and for the preservation of this country in time of war, he forgot that Thomas Jefferson was dealing with 1789, and not with 1891. Thomas Jefferson would never have asked the people of the United States, taxed and burdened as they are to-day, to go into a losing business in an unsound way and tax themselves to make a special branch of trade profitable. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I am dealing with facts; and I wish to go back to the history on our side. While I stand here advocating freedom for the merchant I desire to show you that intelligent men considered this question years ago. In 1872 (if, as I said, I may make a personal allusion) I happened to be a member of a committee appointed by the Boston Board of Trade to report on just such a subject as we have before us to-day.

When that committee met I found, very much in the same way as the methods of the Shipping League and the other leagues of that kind are in the habit of doing, that the report and the resolutions had been already drawn favoring the policy which has existed until to-day, and is now advocated, though not so bad as the propositions in this bill; and I had the confidence, you may call it, to submit a report and some resolutions as a minority of one.

I will say, Mr. Chairman, that the other six men on that committee were among the most experienced and intelligent ship builders and owners we had in the city of Boston. I will read these resolutions for the committee, because in the preamble that is attached to them we make an appeal which you gentlemen who represent a locality exporting five million bales of cotton each year should take home to yourselves before you vote on the pending bill, an appeal that you who represent agricultural States should consider well before your action is determined upon this measure, and that you who represent the great oil districts of Pennsylvania should remember and study.

For remember this, that annually 5,000,000 bales of cotton compete with India, Egypt, and Smyrna, and you who ship grain compete with India and Russia. They are the provinces and countries that you must compete with; and your prices are made in Liverpool and London. You have got to see to it that you protect yourselves in every possible way that wise legislation can aid you to have the cost of transportation as low as possible, untrammeled by monopolies or by unwise legislation.

The resolutions which I offered as a minority of one in opposition to the majority report are as follows:

Whereas it is desirable to remove, so far as possible, all obstacles which now impede the exportation of the domestic products of this country, and manifestly for the interest and welfare of those who produce the articles exported, that all the charges imposed upon these products, as well as upon the commodities imported in exchange for them, shall be reduced to the lowest point; and

Whereas the charge for freight by ocean steamships and sailing vessels is a heavy burden upon foreign commerce, and it is of the greatest importance to reduce the cost of the transportation of our grain, provisions, cotton, and manufactures exported, and of the tea, coffee, sugar, materials for clothing, railway bars, iron, steel, and other metals, and other articles of necessity or comfort, which, combined, constitute more than three-fourths of our imports; and

Whereas, recognizing the true commercial relations between nations, and in order to perform the necessary work of transportation at the lowest rates, it may be necessary for American merchants to own and sail ships built in foreign countries or that have been from any cause under a foreign flag; and—

You will see that that covers the vessels which we merchants had been obliged by the Confederate cruisers to place under a foreign flag to save our trade—

Whereas the existing laws prohibit the registration of vessels that have had a foreign register that may be owned by citizens of the United States, thereby depriving such citizens of the protection and full enjoyment of their property, exposing them to all the dangers of foreign wars in which their own country may have no part, denying them one of the most sacred rights asserted in the Declaration of Independence and guarantied by the Constitution of the United States: Therefore,

Resolved, That the construction of steamships and sailing vessels at low cost should be promoted by the abatement of all taxes imposed under the tariff of

duties upon foreign imports, upon articles of foreign production entering into their construction.

Resolved, That all articles of foreign product needed for subsistence on board vessels engaged in foreign trade, or in the sailing or repairing of steamships or sailing vessels, should be allowed to be withdrawn free of duty from bonded warehouses.

Resolved, That all vessels of foreign construction, or under a foreign flag, which may be purchased or owned by citizens of the United States, should be entitled to a register under the laws and protection of the flag of the United States.

Resolved, That in making contracts for the foreign-mail service of the United States preference should be given to vessels owned by citizens of the United States, provided the Department is satisfied that such service will be performed by them as well and at as low rates as by others.

Now, I repeat, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that report came in from a minority of one member of the board. The first day it was defeated; but, claiming I had not an opportunity to properly explain my minority report, the fairness of the meeting suggested an adjournment. For five days we discussed the resolutions in that Boston Board of Trade, in some of the most memorable meetings ever held by that body, and at the conclusion of the meeting, on the closing day, the resolutions were adopted.

We have adopted one of the more important resolutions in previous legislation and in the McKinley bill, that in relation to freeing from duty the articles entering into the construction of our ships. And it would be wise if we went still a step further, with the past in mind, and gave to our merchants the right to purchase their ships where they can purchase them cheapest. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKEN. It would give me great pleasure if my friend from Massachusetts would explain to me satisfactorily, for I would like to understand it, the difference between the doctrine of free trade and free ships or how he reconciles the fact that he would not give protection to the shipyards of this country while he does give it to the manufacturer. For my part I can not see the difference, and it will be a matter of information if the gentleman will oblige me with the logic on which he bases his position.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to answer the gentleman, but it would be a hopeless task for me to attempt to convince the member from Maine. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. Well, that may depend partly on my intelligence and partly depend upon the character of the intelligence of the man who attempted to give the explanation.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I accept that issue. [Laughter and applause.] We can have no difference of opinion upon that point.

Now, I will explain. I say that there are necessary inequalities in tariff and protection in this country. That I admit. And I can not offer anything that would be a perfect solution of it. I can urge a policy the nearest to it in my judgment. I wish to be perfectly fair to gentlemen on the other side. I find that Maine and its shipyards have given to them more than any other industry which we have. For instance, we are the second commercial nation, so far as navigation goes, in the world. We have half the tonnage of Great Britain, and we give to these shipyards in Maine the absolute exclusive control for the building of all vessels for the coastwise trade of a tonnage for their shipyards equal to one-half of the whole amount of tonnage owned in England and the United States. And we have done more than that.

We do not give to any other industry the privilege which we extend to the shipbuilder of returning to the buyer all his duties. We do that for the State of Maine, and we have done more. We have given to the State of Maine the right to bind the merchant so his tools could not be purchased, even, for the beggarly 12½ per cent. of the foreign carrying trade of the country.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will my friend allow me to ask him another question.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. I have not answered you yet, because nothing is either great or good except by comparison; and I want to compare your position with the cotton grower and the grain grower, the farmers of the country, to show that you get more than you are entitled to, and more than anybody else.

Mr. McADOO. They get everything in sight.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Had you not better compare Maine with Massachusetts? That is nearer.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. I will compare you with Massachusetts. I know that Massachusetts is nearer perfection than Maine, but I do not claim we are entirely perfect. Now, how is it with the great cotton-growing country? How is it with these gentlemen who have studied this proposition on sound, fundamental principles, and who stand against all this extravagant outlay? I should like to know if the men who ship 5,000,000 bales of cotton have any drawback on their plows or anything else entering into the cultivation of their cotton. I should like to know if there are any laws that give them the benefit the State of Maine gets.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will my friend allow me to say right there——

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. No, I will not. I have answered you two or three times.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Well, I would simply like to suggest to you that you had better read the McKinley bill, for which you voted.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. Now, Mr. Chairman, you can not protect the cotton grower and the agriculturist as you can the manufacturer and the shipbuilder, because we have an immense shipbuilding trade that we can control in this country. We can control all the markets of our country, but these gentlemen ship their 5,000,000 bales of cotton abroad, and are in competition with the cheapest labor in the world.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Seven millions of bales.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. I contend that John C. Calhoun was right when he advocated a protective tariff. I believe, as a whole, in this country, we are benefited by a protective tariff. I believe that it is unequal in some of its features as it bears upon the farmer, the producer of oil, and the cotton-grower, but as a whole, as a national policy, I am in favor of it, and I believe the result of it will be that the unlimited treasures of the mountains of the South will be developed as well as the treasures of the soil, until from this country we shall export iron and steel, and I believe the day is not far distant.

But, Mr. Chairman, we can not adjust the tariff so that in detail it will apply equally to every man. We, in New England, were forced into manufacturing. Our sterile soil was not adapted to raising great crops of cotton and wheat. We were a commercial people. Our ships were on every sea. We began with our little vessels to trade the codfish that we caught on the banks of Newfoundland with the West Indies and Europe, and we followed it up until we had as magnificent ships as ever sailed. You lay it to a protective tariff, which was exclusively for our section. Who would have believed with the sterile soil of New England, without the great water powers in many of its States, with very little to encourage the people, with a cold climate that made the laborer spend large amounts for his coal and clothing, who would have believed that we would have done what we have?

Mr. Chairman, it is not a problem that requires a great deal of explanation to interpret and understand. It was because New England accepted the issue you forced upon her of protection, which has proved to be a blessing to the whole country, and then devoted more hours to labor, with economy, with strict principles; devoted more hours to labor than her sister States; and her wealth in her savings banks and in her States is the saving of the people notwithstanding others had natural advantages which we did not possess, which the other sections of the country had. That is the history of protection in New England. And let me say one thing more.

When I hear my State attacked upon this floor I say to myself that though there may have been errors and omissions, as human nature is not perfect, the history of my State is so glorious and honorable it deserves to be cherished as faithfully by every other State as it is by us. We have shown an example of economy, of labor and industry, and we have been honorable in the discharge of our obligations. When the war of the Revolution closed, that little State, in 1783, owed more than her entire valuation, personal and real. For the expenses of the Federation and Revolutionary war her debts exceeded her entire valuation, but she did not repudiate it.

She left for the future an example of honor as well as of industry, and the people taxed themselves until they paid every dollar, principal and interest, in full. [Applause on the Republican side.] So much, Mr. Chairman, in regard to that. I have diverted a little from my argument to answer in spirit the sentiment of the gentleman from Maine that Massachusetts in her industries had more advantages than other sections of the country.

Mr. MILLIKEN. The gentleman did not understand me to attack Massachusetts?

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. I do not know what you intended to do. I took it as rather a reflection.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I did nothing of the kind. Just pardon me for a moment. I do not want to be misunderstood. When the gentleman talked about comparing Maine with the cottonfields of the South, I suggested that perhaps he had better compare Massachusetts and Maine, because they were nearer together.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. Gentlemen, I have dwelt a little too long on Massachusetts. I leave the result of the conversation and debate for you to decide.

Now, gentlemen, I have proposed a substitute for this bill, which I oppose as being vicious in principle, and I contend that it is not in accord with the best methods and the practical way of conducting business in this modern time.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. I would rather not. I have no written speech, and I will answer the gentleman when I get through.

I have, gentlemen, proposed a substitute, and I claim that the two propositions which the people are interested in are an extension of our foreign trade and reciprocal relations between our nation and other nations. It is the spirit of the times, and we should have commenced it years ago. We know that De Tocqueville in 1828 said that all of the South American republics were legitimate customers of the United

States, and it only depended upon the enterprise of the United States when they would take to themselves what belonged to them.

I am not going over the causes of delay; I shall not dwell upon changes that have taken place; but I will simply say that for the last ten years it has been growing upon the people that the idea of reciprocal trade has gotten to be almost a political principle in the minds of many. I believe that trade with the twenty millions of people living within from three to five days' sail of New Orleans, Mobile, Tampa, and Galveston, and those Southern ports, will bring prosperity to us when we have close relations with them, thus establishing close relations between those eighty-five million people.

I believe it is our duty, as I have felt in the past, to take advantage of the geographical position we possess and extend our foreign commerce, which is to-day more required than ever. Under the impulse of the enterprise and ingenuity of the United States and our protective tariff and the development of our produce and mineral wealth we are producing more than we can sell at home. You who have vast fields in the West, and you who have iron manufactories in the South, the product of which can be shipped from Southern ports in successsful competition with any nation of the world, are as much interested in the extension of reciprocal relations with the South American republics as any. And as a business man, I say to you that this extension of our commerce should be done in the promptest and most practical business way.

I opposed in 1872 the idea of subsidies. But I believe that the proper duty of the legislator is to take into consideration the demands and the changes of the age for which he is legislating. We have neglected to do so so long, and England has so strong a hold upon all those ports that it is a necessity that we should act upon some plan, and that we should adopt an independent course, under which we can successfully compete with England. I offer a substitute for the bill of the committee. It is the bill which was reported from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and which has passed the Senate with some amendments which I have incorporated, vesting in and giving authority to the Postmaster-General to contract for the carrying the mails by steamers, and to pay for carrying the mails to those ports selected.

I would enact the same practical legislation that I would apply to Alaska or any of the Western States. If our people in their enterprise should emigrate to a distant Territory or State, and it was expensive to send letters there, I would have the mail sent, cost what it might, satisfied that in a short time the expenditure would be returned by the growth and development that would follow. Now, it is the same with foreign mails. It is for the advantage of the country as an American policy. I do not believe in the "imperial policy" that the gentleman from Maine and some of those gentlemen talk about.

I believe in an independent "American policy." I do not care what has been the history of the English navigation laws. I take into consideration the condition of our own country and laws and legislate for the American people. I would establish these mail lines, and that would improve the condition of our shipyards and develop American seamanship. I would have these ships built in America and pay the cost of the transportation of the mails.

Mr. ADAMS. Is not that a bounty?

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. No, sir; it is not a bounty, but it is paying for carrying the mails. Call it what you like, so that it accomplishes the purpose for which it is intended.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him one question? What rate do you propose to pay these mail ships of the first class?

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. Just the amount that is in that bill that has passed the Senate.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Six dollars a ton?

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. Exactly what has passed the Senate and passed the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Then your bill is the Senate postal subsidy bill with a free-ship amendment.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. It is a little different.

Mr. FARQUHAR. If it is $6 a ton, is not that a subsidy, and a big one?

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. You may call it what you please, so that it accomplishes the purpose for which it is intended.

Mr. MOORE, of New Hampshire. Call it compensation.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. I believe the gentleman well understands what it is.

I wish to go a little further. I should not be afraid to stand even for that purpose upon the original principle of having the ships bought where they could be bought cheapest if there had not been legislation inimical to the United States. If England had not attained, through our unwise navigation laws, I say, such a strength in securing trade and in establishing mail routes, I should not be afraid to stand upon that principle for this purpose.

But I justify this simply by the circumstances of the case as it stands, and because the Government will have a *quid pro quo* for it. We oblige these shipbuilders to build ships of a certain character. They will be expensive ships, and if we should have any international trouble at some future time—though I take very little stock in that—if we should have trouble at any future time we would have a splendid array of ships which could be used for war purposes. However, that is a phase of the question which I shall take up further on, and I think the danger in that direction has been greatly exaggerated.

Now, this is a plain business proposition. I am willing to have steamers built by Americans to carry the mails. I have another reason for that. It is desirable, if you are carrying the mails from the United States to other countries, that they should be carried in the interest of the United States. Englishmen or Frenchmen carrying our mails would not have the same object that we would have in endeavoring to secure business. Another thing, within the last three weeks a subsidy which was paid by Australia to an American line has been withdrawn, and they pay it now to a British ship, which they have built for the purpose. There are a great many considerations of that kind which I lay before the committee simply as elements in the business proposition which I present.

And, Mr. Chairman, I say further that, with any system of paying for the mails which would strengthen monopolies, the people can only get protection if you have at the same time a free-ship clause. If you have a single railroad running to a single port and they build up with the mail system a line of steamers from that port, we must endeavor to protect our people. If they charge the men who ship cotton and grain and oil and other exports or imports more than they should exact for freight, the merchants and shippers can go to the cheapest markets in the world and buy tramp steamers or build ships where they can be built the cheapest for commercial purposes. With that safeguard you will soon find that if this proves to be a heavy burden on the people on account of the monopoly, some new line of railroad will run there and will have steamers to connect, so as to become a competitor.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am speaking longer than I intended, and now I must pass to the concluding sections of my bill. The substitute which I offer is the bill which came from the Senate, known as the Frye bill, with one amendment relating to vessels of the third class, giving the subsidy or payment to vessels of a high rate of speed though they may register less than 2,500 tons, as on the short trips of three to five days from the Southern ports speed and light draught are essential and size of less importance.

It passed the Post-Office Committee, and it has been amended by me by adding two sections, giving to the merchant or anyone else the right to buy in a foreign market ships to do his business if he can do it more economically with them than with others.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the gentleman, before he concludes, please explain how the rates to be paid under the so-called Senate bill compare with the rates in the bill proposed by the committee?

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts. It would take me too long. I should have to take up the bill and go through them, and I must depend upon gentlemen reading the bill and reading the very careful reports and elaborate speeches that have been made here. After the able and exhaustive speeches which I have heard, and which have been printed in the RECORD, I do not wish to weary the committee with all the details, or undertake again to compare these bills analytically; I wish rather to appeal to the legal and the business principles which I say should be the foundation of this legislation.

Now, in regard to the merchants, I call attention to the fact that when we had a civil war in this country the merchants and shipowners found that the rates of insurance and the uncertainty and want of safety in voyages obliged them to put their vessels under a foreign flag. At first they sold their vessels for less than their value. Now, if a merchant desires to be successful in competition with the world, business is conducted in these days upon so narrow a basis that that merchant must be accorded all the favorable conditions that are enjoyed by those who compete with him. If the merchants of England or Germany can build ships cheaper or buy ships more advantageously than American merchants we can not compete with them in the foreign trade.

This must be obvious when it is remembered that the commissions are often based upon three-quarters of 1 per cent. upon the cargo which the vessels carry. The merchants of Boston and New York were driven out of the Calcutta trade by the Greek merchants and other foreigners, and the saving of the banking commissions, very small, which they were required to pay often turned the scale in a large commercial transaction.

In all modern trade to-day success depends upon your having every advantage that your competitor has. If there were a war between England and Germany it might be of service, as it was to them during the rebellion: it might give a lift for some time if your merchants were able for awhile to buy their ships at the prices they would then be sold for. If there is a surplus of ships in England, France, or Norway your merchant who is to compete with those very ships must avail himself of all those advantages.

At the same time let me say that I believe if you give to your merchants freedom you will find that in a very few years, through American enterprise and through, as I believe, the better quality of the men who will manage the ships, we shall be able to compete with foreign nations with our own ships, built in our own shipyards; and this

bill which I offer will give a great impetus to shipbuilding for the regular mail lines, and in my judgment the change of the navigation laws will bring so many ships under the American flag that the repairing of ships in our own shipyards will give vastly increased employment.

In regard to the argument which has been made as to the necessity of ships in time of war, it seems to me that no man in this House can take counsel of the fears of our friend from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR] and our friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] when they tell you here and when you are told through the press that the American people will lose the art of shipbuilding or that they will not be able to command sailors and ships in time of war. I hope that no man will vote on a bill like this under the influence of any such exaggerated statement.

There is nothing in the history of the past, there is nothing in the facts of the present, there is no prophecy of the future, there is no anticipation as we look down the unmeasured way before us, that can justify any such statement as that. Look at the history of the past. We, through our coastwise trade, have become one of the greatest steamship and vessel-owning nations—the second in the world. Do you believe that as this country grows from 60,000,000 people to 100,000,000 our shipping interests will not continue to grow? Do you believe that the Cramps and all these great shipyards will lose their business because we have not more than 12½ per cent. of the foreign carrying trade?

You can not change the facts of our position. You can not change the enterprise of our people. We have an almost unbroken coast line from Alaska on the west to Maine on the east. We have great inland seas. We have great rivers; and the American people will always be a people with magnificent shipyards, and will continually improve in every possible way in the construction of vessels needed for their commerce and trade.

I will print in my remarks a statement that I read yesterday in a newspaper, giving an account of a new shipyard to be built at Newport News, a shipyard covering 61 acres. Does that look as if we were losing our ability to build ships because we have only 12½ per cent. of the carrying trade? That is not a question to be considered.

Now, as to another proposition. To me as a business man it seems an absurdity—I can not use any expression less strong—that every year the American people should be drained of $200,000,000 in gold which goes into the pockets of foreigners to pay for the carrying of our merchandise. [Long continued applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. FARQUHAR. I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] one hour, or so much of that time as he may desire to use.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, both the advocates and the opponents of this bill agree that something should be done to restore our foreign carrying trade. Both face the appalling fact that it has been driven from the ocean and that the nation suffers thereby. They do not, however, agree as to the means by which it shall be restored. Opponents of this bill say that a substitute ought to be passed, giving the privilege to shippers or merchants desiring to engage in the foreign carrying trade of buying foreign vessels and giving such vessels American registry. This done, many admit that the Government should encourage the establishment of steamship lines by paying as liberally for their support, and for all services rendered, as might be necessary to put them upon an equal footing with British or other competitors.

A free-ship substitute, indeed, is proposed by the minority report from the committee. This proposal will not commend itself to American mechanics and workingmen, nor can I conceive how it can bring about any beneficial result. Pass a free-ship substitute, and if American merchants buy English vessels gold enough must leave this country to pay for the two hundred and odd tramp steamships now awaiting purchasers in British waters. Either this, or these tramp steamships will be placed under the American flag with foreign owners. If subsidies were then granted, the foreign owners of these vessels would get the benefit of them.

What is a British tramp steamship? I read from the Boston Journal:

The vessels of the United States and Brazil Company carry out the bulk of our Brazilian exports, but our imports are chiefly carried under foreign flags. Nominally there are several regular lines of foreign steamers between our ports and Brazil, but actually all these foreign vessels are of the class expressively characterized as "tramps." They are nearly all old and rather small. They represent the era when shoddy ruled the day in English shipyards, and English builders were turning all the pot metal in the kingdom into iron ships. They are manned for the most part by the dregs of creation; they are slow and uncertain in their movements, and the rate of mortality among them is something appalling.

Nevertheless, on the same principle and by much the same methods by which Polish and Hungarian peasants have supplanted American miners in the coal fields of Pennsylvania, these foreign "tramps" have, to a large degree, supplanted fine and weatherly American barkes, brigs, and schooners, and wholesome and well-built steamers in the Brazilian trade. Some of these foreigners get considerable subsidies from Brazil or their own governments, but going about as they do, undermanned, shaky, and generally disreputable, they find it an easy task to underbid Yankees in the freight markets without any subsidy at all.

Mr. BLOUNT. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York whether the British Government subsidizes what he calls the "tramp steamers."

Mr. CUMMINGS. That is not the point at issue. If you have free ships you go to the British market and buy these tramp ships, which your law to-day prevents you from doing.

I read further from the Boston Journal:

The tonnage features of the shipping bill now before Congress are intended to help American shipowners and seamen to compete with these foreigners, and to regain the profitable business that was ours before the cheap labor of Europe was mustered on board these crazy pot-metal "hookers" to drive well-paid and well-fed Yankee mariners from the seas. The shipping bill, therefore, is the logical sequel of the Brazilian reciprocity treaty. Every argument that can be advanced in favor of the one applies equally to the other.

Such, Mr. Chairman, is a picture of the tramp steamships that would empty our coffers if a free-ship substitute carries.

But this is not all. A new fleet of tramp steamships would be built for the American market in Great Britain. This would give employment to many thousands of British workmen. British dockyards are perennial producers of these tramps. Their capacity for building them is limitless so long as we act as wet nurse. The money to pay for the new tramps would come out of American pockets. American mechanics would thus be robbed of work in America to provide work for English mechanics in England. This, sir, will not do. Over 20,000 mechanics, machinists, and laborers are to-day directly dependent for support upon American shipyards.

This includes indirectly more than three hundred trades. The business of these mechanics, machinists, artisans, iron-workers, miners, and other laborers would be irretrievably damaged by such action. The foreign-built vessels placed under the American flag would employ foreign sailors at less wages than American sailors can live on, for those who advocate this policy would doubtless assert that the owners of these vessels should be allowed to man them as they pleased. The American sailor would thus be driven into the coastwise trade, or, if that is full, into the streets. No man will assert that there could be any encouragement to American shipbuilding by such a proposition, nor could any benefit accrue to American workingmen, mechanics, or sailors.

The effort to maintain labor in its struggle with capital has been a long and a hard one. Sir, I come from a district that housed the mechanics who built the Niagara, the Adriatic, the Grand Admiral, and the Dunderberg. It was at one time the leading shipbuilding district in the United States. The tower containing the old mechanics' bell still stands upon its borders. Thirty years ago that bell called ten thousand calkers, ship-carpenters, blacksmiths, riggers, sail-makers, machinists, block-makers, oakum-pickers, cordage-makers, and other workmen to and from shipbuilding labor daily. There were similar scenes in Boston and Philadelphia. Then our Baltimore clippers had a world-wide reputation. Then even within sight of this Capitol, in quiet Alexandria, the music of a dockyard vibrated over the Potomac. To-day all is changed. The old mechanics' bell still rings in New York, but it recalls only past glories and futile regrets. Once it was a clarion call; now it is a requiem. Scores only answer to its call where formerly there were thousands.

I must remind this House that this is an American and not an English Government. We have a government modeled upon the English plan, but it was never intended that we should run it at the expense of Americans for the benefit of English workingmen.

Mr. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman explain why it is that in our coastwise trade, which is protected, a majority of the seamen are foreigners?

Mr. CUMMINGS. I am not talking and have not been talking about the coastwise trade. If I were, I might take issue with the gentleman. I, unlike the gentleman from Missouri, vote for no substitute that takes bread from the mouths of American workingmen to place it in the mouths of Englishmen. [Applause.] Not that I like the English workingman less, but that I like the American workingman more.

I can vote for no substitute that will injure the few remaining shipyards in this country. At the outbreak of the war we had over two thousand of them here. To-day we have far less than one hundred. We want more and not fewer American shipyards. We want more and not less of this work for American mechanics and workmen. Mine is a district filled with mechanics, artisans, and laborers. They would and ought to hold me to a strict accountability were I to vote for any measure detrimental to their interests.

These workingmen demand the passage of this bill. Nightly meetings of their trade associations have been held urging it upon the attention of Congress. I read resolutions adopted by a mass meeting of workingmen January 2, at Turn Hall, 66 East Fourth street, New York City:

Whereas there is now pending in the House of Representatives, having already passed the Senate, legislation for the revival of the merchant marine of the United States; and

Whereas Great Britain, by her policy of subsidy and subvention for fifty years, has taken the place on the ocean once represented by the American flag, a result that the thunder of her guns failed to accomplish in 1812: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That we most earnestly petition the House of Representatives to pass the Farquhar tonnage bill and carry our flag once more to the front on the broad ocean, thus stimulating the industries, from the mine to the finished ship, so important to the laboring man and artisan of the country, North, South, East, and West.

Resolved, That we most heartily applaud the earnest efforts, in the present as well as in the past, of the Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS for his advocacy of legislation to restore the American-built ship in the world's trade, thus securing prosperity for his constituents as well as for the laboring men of the country.

Resolved, That we approve the action of the International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron Shipbuilding Unions in calling this meeting, and that a copy of these resolutions be sent to the members of Congress from the State of New York, recommending that they use their best efforts for the passage of the tonnage bill.

THOMAS J. CURRAN, *President*.
A. H. GALLAHUE, *Secretary*.

The president of the Boiler Makers' Union of New York presided at this meeting, and John Quinn, the superintendent of the Morgan Iron Works, employing over two thousand workingmen, read the resolutions. Samuel Gompers, the president of the American Federation of Labor, a national association embracing all the trades unions in this country, addressed the meeting. A bill similar to this has been freely indorsed by the trade associations throughout the United States.

In the last Congress I myself received resolutions from nearly one hundred workingmen's organizations, trades unions, and Knights of Labor assemblies, expressing their appreciation of my efforts on behalf of a similar bill. There were at least a hundred other meetings held from which no return was received by me. As a proof of the national character of the feeling in support of this measure I may say that these indorsements came from every seaboard State, with a single exception, from Maine around to Texas. I shall take leave to print some of them without reading them to the House:

THE STEAM PACKERS' MEETING.

[From the New York Daily News, March 15.]

The Steam-packing Makers' Union, at a meeting at 69 Carmine street, on Tuesday night, indorsed the tonnage bill now before Congress. Congress is called upon to vote for the bill as a measure to relieve the overcrowded labor market, as a measure of national defense, by the formation of a naval reserve, and to revive American patriotism.

THE BOLT CUTTERS AWAKE.

[From the Evening Sun, April 4.]

The Archimedes Association of Bolt Cutters met last evening at 212 Ninth avenue, and indorsed this resolution unanimously:

"*Resolved*, That we call the attention of New York Representatives to the benefits to the people of this city and State to be derived by the passage of the bill introduced in Congress by the Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS, and known as the tonnage bill. By the passage of this bill American merchant vessels can compete equally with those of foreign nations, large numbers of workmen would receive employment, and the Government would have ready for its service a number of effective cruisers when needed."

A LABOR CLUB SPEAKS.

[From the New York Commercial Advertiser, March 27.]

The Oakland Labor Club, composed of lumber handlers, has indorsed the ship-bounty bill.

A TRADE UNION IN FAVOR OF THE BILL.

[From the Evening Sun, March 10.]

At a meeting of the Vulcan Association (foundrymen) at 426 West Forty-sixth street, held last night, the tonnage bill of Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS, which is to pay a bounty of 30 cents a ton for every 1,000 miles traveled by an American ship on a foreign voyage, was recommended for passage as a measure which would give a large amount of employment, and would place a large number of vessels at the disposal of the Government in case of war.

THE MACHINISTS FAVOR IT.

[From the New York Press, March 9.]

The Machinists' Open Union, No. 4, met last night at 351 West Sixteenth street and passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That it is the duty of Congress to pass the tonnage bill now before it, giving a bounty of 30 cents per thousand miles traveled by an American ship on a foreign voyage, so that our merchant marine may be on an equal footing with that of foreign nations."

THE DOCK COOPERS INDORSE IT.

[From the Evening Sun, April 11.]

The Bushwick Protective Association of Dock Coopers held their meeting last night at Excelsior Hall, 278 Spring street, and passed this resolution unanimously:

"*Resolved*, That, with the present condition of our shipping trade, prostrated as it is by the competition of foreign vessels, supported without exception by the subsidies or bounties of their government, while our vessels are afforded no protection whatever by our Government, the passage of the tonnage bill introduced in Congress by Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS to subsidize American built and owned vessels in foreign trade becomes a measure of national importance if we are to retain any share of the world's commerce."

BRASS WORKERS SUPPORT IT.

[From the New York Tribune, April 9.]

The Brass Model Makers' Protective Union passed the following resolution yesterday:

"*Resolved*, That the passage of the tonnage bill now before Congress to give a small bounty to American built and owned vessels engaged in foreign trade will have the same effect to encourage the shipping trade as the protective tariff on imports has on our other home industries, as they will then be able to compete equally with the subsidy-supported merchant vessels of foreign nations."

THE BURNISHERS AROUSED.

[From the Evening Sun, March 26.]

At a meeting of the Empire City Association (burnishers), held last evening at 517 Second avenue, the following resolution was passed:

"*Resolved*, That we call upon Congress to pass the bill introduced in Congress by the Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS, which will give a bounty of 30 cents per ton for every 1,000 miles sailed by an American built and owned ship on a foreign voyage, believing that if we can recover the carrying trade we can recover the commerce of the world."

THE BOILER MAKERS FAVOR BOUNTIES.

[From the Marine Journal, March 3.]

The Boiler Makers and Iron Shipbuilders' Union, at its meeting at 193 Bowery Tuesday night, adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That we call upon our Representatives in Congress to give their aid to the passage of the bill before Congress commonly known as the tonnage bill, which provides that a small bounty shall be paid to every American ship for every 1,000 miles traveled on a foreign voyage. We know that the failure to provide such bounty and the competition with foreign nations has driven our shipping from the sea, and that its payment would restore American shipbuilding and provide employment for many American citizens."

THE COPPERSMITHS WANT IT.

[From the Evening Sun, March 12.]

At a meeting of the Berwick Association of Coppersmiths this afternoon, at 54 Watt street, this motion was adopted:

"*Resolved*, That the thanks of this association are tendered to Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS for bringing into Congress what is known as the tonnage bill, which stimulates American shipbuilding by offering a subsidy of 30 cents a ton for every 1,000 miles traveled by an American ship sailing to a foreign port, believing as we do that no measure before Congress will have a greater effect on our overstocked labor market, while it will arouse American patriotism for our goods to be carried in American bottoms over seas from which our flag has nearly disappeared."

LUKE WALTON, *Secretary*.

NEW YORK, *March* 11.

THE WIRE DRAWERS TALK.

[From the New York Tribune, April 5.]

The Wire-Drawers' Protective Association, No. 347 West Twenty-ninth street, last evening adopted a resolution calling upon Congress to pass the tonnage bill now before it.

THE SPOON-OAR MAKERS FAVOR IT.

[From the Evening Sun, April 12.]

The Rob Roy Association Spoon-Oar Makers, at their meeting last night at Pabst's Hall, 2318 Third avenue, adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the thanks of this association are tendered to Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS for introducing in Congress the bill to give a bounty to American built and owned vessels on a foreign voyage, and by so doing enabling us to meet the competition of the pauper-labor built and manned and subsidy-supported vessels of other nations, and regain our old-time prestige on the seas."

THE WORKINGMEN'S MUNICIPAL REFORM LEAGUE.

[From the Mail and Express, April 4.]

The Workingmen's Municipal Reform League of this city is working hard for the passage of the tonnage bill introduced in the House by Congressman AMOS J. CUMMINGS, which provides for a bounty of 30 cents per ton per 1,000 miles traveled by an American ship on a foreign voyage, believing that it will aid in the restoration of American shipbuilding and provide work for many thousands of idle workmen.

* * * * * * *

All classes of our most intelligent workingmen are falling into line in support of this tonnage bill—so simple, so sure to be efficient, and so important to the great work of reviving the lost prestige of our merchant marine.

THE BAG-SEWERS AWAKE.

[From the Evening Sun, March 27.]

At a regular meeting of the Bag-Sewers' Protective Association, held last evening at 911 Tenth avenue, the following was passed:

"*Resolved*, That while all other industries of the nation are protected by the tariff, the shipping industry is at the mercy of its foreign competitors, because of their support by bounties and subsidies by their governments, and for this reason we indorse the tonnage bill introduced in Congress by Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS, by which American built and owned ships receive a bounty of 30 cents per ton per 1,000 miles traveled on a foreign voyage, thus placing them on an equality with the merchant vessels of foreign nations to compete for a share of the world's commerce."

THE EYES OF THE PATTERN MAKERS OPEN.

[From the New York Tribune, April 6.]

The Pattern-Makers' Union met last night at Hotze's Assembly Rooms, No. 263 Bowery, and passed this resolution:

"That as there is a large and everincreasing surplus of money in the Treasury and we dare not remove the present protective tariff on imports to prevent its accumulation because of the demoralizing effect it would have on our home manufactures, the best use we can make of part of this surplus income is in the manner prescribed by the tonnage bill now before Congress, to give a bounty to American built and owned ships in the foreign trade, thus using the products of the protective tariff to protect the American shipping trade and encourage American labor."

THE FLAX SPINNERS FAVOR IT.

[From the Evening Sun, April 3.]

At a meeting of the Flax Spinners' Union, No. 3, held last evening at 641 Tenth avenue, this resolution was passed:

"*Resolved*, That the condition of every workingman connected with the shipping trade will be bettered by the passage of the bill introduced in Congress by Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS, to give 30 cents per ton for every 1,000 miles traveled by an American ship on a foreign voyage, thus placing American shipping on an equal footing with the merchant marine of foreign nations in the matter of bounties and subsidies, and at the same time reviving the shipbuilding industry and providing employment for many men."

THE STATE ENGINEERS ON DECK.

[From the Marine Journal, March 3.]

The New York State Engineers' Society held a large meeting this week and unanimously resolved:

"That, with the present defenseless condition of our seacoast, it is the duty of our Government to provide an efficient naval reserve to act in conjunction with our Navy in case of war. That the most expeditious means to accomplish this result is to pay a small bounty per ton for every 1,000 miles sailed by American ships, such vessels to be at the call of the Government in times of need."

THE MACHINE BLACKSMITHS WANT IT.

[From the Evening Sun, April 7.]

The Machine Blacksmiths met last evening at 363 West Thirty-ninth street, and passed this resolution:

"*Resolved*, That instead of any reduction of the protective tariff on imports, that part of that surplus income from the source should be used in affording protection to American vessels in the manner outlined by the tonnage bill introduced in Congress by the Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS, to give to American built and owned vessels engaged in foreign trade the sum of 30 cents per ton per 1,000 miles traveled, thus putting them on an equality with the vessels of foreign nations to compete for their share of the world's commerce and provide employment for American labor."

THE FREIGHT HANDLERS ON THE BILL.

[From the Marine Journal, March 3.]

At a regular meeting of the "All for One" Association of Freight Handlers, held at 66 Clarkson street on the 26th instant, the following resolution was passed:

"*Resolved*, That we give our hearty support to the bill which has been introduced in Congress by the Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS, which provides for a bounty of 30 cents per ton per 1,000 miles traveled by an American ship on a foreign voyage, believing that it will aid in the restoration of American shipbuilding and provide work for many thousand idle workingmen."

THE COTTON-PRESS HANDS.

[From the Marine Journal, March 10.]

The following resolutions were passed this week at a meeting of the Ajax Association of Cotton-Press Hands in this city:

"Whereas there are thousands of skilled laborers in this country seeking and not finding employment, with the enormous accumulation of our manufactured products piled up in our warehouses awaiting a market, and while the eager watchfulness of the great manufacturing and commercial nations for opportunity to crowd their surplus products into our already overstocked markets, while they jealously exclude us from trade with the nonproducing nations by reason of their control by bounties and subventions of the merchant fleets that bear the world's commerce continue; and

"Whereas the welfare and prosperity of the whole people, employer and employé, include the restoration of our once proud supremacy of the seas by carrying American goods in American-built ships to all markets of the world:

"*Be it resolved*, That we give our hearty support and indorsement to the bill which has been introduced in the Congress of the United States by the Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS, of New York, which provides for a subvention of 30 cents per ton per 1,000 miles traveled of an American ship on a foreign voyage, and call upon our Representatives in Congress to vote for it, so that it may become a law; and

"*Be it resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS."

THE SHIP CALKERS.

At a regular meeting of the Oakum Association (ship calkers), held at 416 Water street, the following resolution was passed:

"*Resolved*, That with the many millions of unprotected property on our seacoast it is the duty of Congress to encourage American shipbuilding by the passage of the bill introduced in Congress by the Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS, which provides a bounty of 30 cents per ton for every 1,000 miles sailed by an American ship on a foreign voyage, such ships to act as a naval reserve for the defense of our seacoast."

RIGGERS AND SAILMAKERS.

The Riggers and Sailmakers' Protective and Benevolent Association met at Jackson street and adopted these resolutions last evening:

"*Resolved*, That the bounties paid to foreign merchant vessels by their governments have made competition with them by American vessels impossible.

"*Resolved*, That we indorse the bill now before Congress, which proposes a bounty of 30 cents per ton per 1,000 miles traveled by an American ship on a foreign voyage, as a measure calculated to revive American shipbuilding and provide a naval reserve which can be called on in time of war."

THE BLOCK MAKERS.

The Ansonia Association of Block Makers met this week at 174 Elizabeth street, New York, and passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the tonnage bill introduced in Congress by the Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS to pay bounties to American ships on foreign voyages deserves our hearty support as a measure that will give employment to many workers, and will provide a fleet that can easily be turned into cruisers or commerce destroyers in time of war."

THE TUGBOAT FIREMEN.

The White Star Association of Tugboat Firemen has sent to Congressman AMOS J. CUMMINGS a copy of resolutions, adopted by the association, warmly indorsing his shipping bill which provides a bounty of 30 cents a ton for every 1,000 miles traveled by an American vessel on a foreign voyage.

MAINE SHIP OWNERS, BUILDERS, AND WORKINGMEN.

A mass meeting of ship owners, builders, and workingmen was held in Damariscotta, Me., this week, and resolutions were unanimously adopted indorsing the action of Representative CUMMINGS, of New York, in introducing the bill granting tonnage money to vessels built and owned in the United States engaged in foreign trade.

STEEL-TOOL MAKERS.

The Steel-Tool Makers' Union of this city and vicinity has added its voice to the others in favor of the ship-bounty bill of Congressman CUMMINGS.

RIVETERS.

The Malthus Club of Riveters passed a resolution at their regular meeting at No. 23 Gansevoort street, heartily indorsing the tonnage bill now before Congress.

THE TONNAGE BILL INDORSED BY SIXTEEN WORKINGMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS.

The executive committee of the Workingmen's Municipal Reform League held a meeting at 28 Cornelia street, at which a subcommittee on the tonnage bill reported that sixteen workingmen's organizations had indorsed it. The tariff bill was condemned in the strongest terms. The chairman, Mr. A. H. Galabue, said that he felt like thanking the House committee for showing their hand and bringing in such a radical measure. It forces the tariff issue in the next campaign.

THE GRAIN SHOVELERS.

[From the New York News, April 7.]

The Grain Shovelers' Union, at its meeting last night at 59 West Sixty-ninth street, passed a resolution "that with the present condition of our shipping trade, which has been nearly swept from the seas by the bounty and subsidy supported merchant marine of foreign nations, it is the duty of Congress not to make any reduction in the protective tariff, but rather to use some of the surplus income arising therefrom in the manner indicated by the tonnage bill now before it."

THE COAL TRIMMERS.

[From the New York Tribune, April 11.]

The Coal Trimmers' Open Union last night adopted a resolution at Mallon's Hall, No. 449 East Twenty-ninth street, indorsing the bill in Congress to give a bounty to American vessels engaged in foreign trade.

THE OAKUM PICKERS.

[From the Evening Sun.]

The Stuyvesant Association, oakum pickers, at their meeting last evening at 634 East Tenth street, passed unanimously this resolution:

"*Resolved*, That we indorse the action of Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS in bringing into Congress what is known as the 'tonnage bill,' to give a bounty to American built and owned ships in foreign trade, believing that no measure of greater national importance has been introduced in Congress for years, as by its passage not only will employment be assured to a large number of workingmen, but we can regain our lost carrying trade, which has almost been taken from us by the subsidy supported merchant marine of other nations."

THE DROP-PRESS FORGERS.

[From the Marine Journal, April 3.]

A meeting of the Drop-Press Forgers was held March 27, at 401 West Twelfth street, and this resolution was passed:

"*Resolved*, That we indorse the tonnage bill introduced in Congress by Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS, as we recognize in it the means by which American merchant vessels can once more compete with the vessels of other nations on an equal footing, and with its adoption we can once more carry American goods in American vessels to all the markets of the world and open new avenues for the distribution of the products of American industry."

THE MACHINE RIVETERS.

The Open Union of Machine Riveters has indorsed the ship-bounty bill.

THE LUMBER HANDLERS.

The Oakland Labor Club, composed of lumber handlers, has indorsed the ship-bounty bill.

THE FOUNDRYMEN.

At a meeting of the Vulcan Association (foundrymen) at 426 West Forty-sixth street, held last week, the tonnage bill of Hon. A. J. CUMMINGS, which is to pay a bounty of 30 cents a ton for every 1,000 miles traveled by an American ship on a foreign voyage, was recommended for passage as a measure which would give a large amount of employment and would place a large number of vessels at the disposal of the Government in case of war.

THE ECONOMIC CLUB.

The Economic Club passed the following resolution at its meeting on the 16th instant, at No. 449 West Forty-first street, George Fletcher presiding:

"*Resolved*, That we indorse the bill in Congress to give a small bounty to American built and owned vessels in foreign trade, as its passage would give employment to many men, and at the same time provide the nucleus for a naval reserve."

THE PUMP MAKERS.

The Pump Makers' Beneficial League of New York passed the following resolution on the 16th instant at Guilford's Hall, No. 409 West Thirty-eighth street:

"Whereas the purpose of the protective tariff is to protect our workingmen against the competition of foreign pauper labor, and not for revenue only:

"*Resolved*, That the American shipping trade is as much entitled to protection from its foreign bounty-supported competitors as any other trade or industry, and for this reason we indorse the tonnage bill now in Congress, to give a subsidy to American built and owned vessels in foreign trade, so that they may be on equal footing with foreign vessels in their competition for commerce."

THE CORDAGE MAKERS.

The Diston Association of Cordage Makers passed the following resolution on the 13th instant, at their meeting in Pressel's Hall, at 413 West Fifty-third street:

"*Resolved*, That with the present condition of our shipping trade, which has been nearly swept from the seas by the bounty and subsidy supported merchant marine of foreign nations, it is the duty of Congress not to make any reduction in the protective tariff, but rather to use some of the surplus income arising therefrom in the manner indicated by the tonnage bill now before it."

THE EDGE-TOOL MAKERS.

The Peerless Association of Edge-Tool Makers, at a meeting at Koster Hall, in Tenth avenue, on the 13th, passed resolutions indorsing the tonnage bill now before Congress.

FROM THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE UNION LABOR PARTY AT SYRACUSE.

[From the New York Sun.]

Resolved, That the delegates to the national convention at Cincinnati be requested to secure the insertion in the national platform of a plank for the revival of American shipbuilding similar to the bounty system now in use by the French Government, and also one in favor of a naval reserve.

FROM LOCAL ASSEMBLY NO. 1899, KNIGHTS OF LABOR.

Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS,
Member of Congress from Sixth district of the State of New York:

SIR: We have learned that a bill called the "tonnage bill" has been presented in Congress, and referred to the Committee on Commerce and Fisheries. This bill provides for the payment by the Government to all American vessels engaged in the foreign trade a certain amount per ton for every thousand miles or fraction thereof traveled by the ship. This bill is urged to a passage by the "American Shipping and Industrial League," and would again revive our shipbuilding and provide all our workmen and skilled mechanics with employment: Therefore,

Resolved, That we, the Knights of Labor, use our best endeavors and solicit the aid of all members of Congress to use all their power and influence to press this bill to a successful passage.

We hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct copy of a resolution passed by Local Assembly No. 1899 of Knights of Labor of the city of New York and State of New York.

JOHN M. STOWELL, *M. W.*
[SEAL.] THOMAS P. SMITH, *R. S.*

Number of members present, 74, when adopted.

LOUISIANA KNIGHTS OF LABOR AROUSED.

A petition to Hon. THEODORE S. WILKINSON, member of Congress from the Fifth district of the State of Louisiana.

SIR: We have learned that a bill called the "tonnage bill" has been presented in Congress and referred to the Committee on Commerce and Fisheries.

This bill provides for the payment by the Government to all American vessels engaged in foreign trade a certain amount per ton for every thousand miles or fraction thereof traveled by the ship.

This bill is urged to a passage by the American Shipping and Industrial League, and would again revive our shipbuilding and provide all our workmen and skilled mechanics employment: Therefore,

"*Resolved*, That we, the Knights of Labor, use our best endeavors to solicit the aid of all members of Congress to use all their power and influence to press this bill to a successful passage."

We certify that the foregoing is a correct copy of a resolution passed by Local Assembly 3933 of Knights of Labor, of Algiers, and State of Louisiana.

PETER CLEMENT, *M. W.*
[SEAL.] JNO. G. GEYNER, *R. S.*

AMERICAN BROTHERHOOD OF STEAMBOAT PILOTS.

NEW YORK, *April* 11, 1888.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of Harbor No. 1, American Brotherhood of Steamboat Pilots, held 10th instant, the following was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the welfare and prosperity of the whole people, employer and em-

ployé, include the restoration of our once proud supremacy of the seas by carrying American goods in American-built ships to all markets of the world:

"*Resolved*, That we give our hearty support and indorsement to the bill which has been introduced in the Congress of the United States by Hon. AMOS. J. CUMMINGS, of New York, which provides for a bounty of 30 cents per ton per thousand miles' travel of American ships on a foreign voyage, and call upon our Representatives in Congress to vote for it so that it may become a law; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS."

Truly yours,

JAMES KEYES,
Grand Financial Secretary A. B. S. P.,
628 East Seventeenth street, New York City.

Hon. AMOS J. CUMMINGS.

That our merchants and business men are heartily in favor of the bill, is shown by resolutions passed by the chambers of commerce and boards of trade of our great cities, many of which are contained in the testimony printed by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution of the New York Chamber of Commerce was introduced by John H. Inman, a Southern man.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. A shipowner.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Possibly. Some Southern men own ships. His resolutions, however, were unanimously adopted by the New York Chamber of Commerce. The chambers of commerce of New Orleans, Galveston, Memphis, Charleston, Norfolk, Richmond, Baltimore, and other cities have passed similar resolutions.

As was well said at the mass meeting in Turn Hall, "We must do the carrying trade that belongs to us, and we must do it in ships built here. The prosperity and safety of the country require it."

The bill reported from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries would, in my opinion, eventually give us an American marine, built, manned, and used by Americans. If I thought it would not do so, I could not vote for it. It is a national requirement, essential to a fair participation in the trade of the world. It is also one vital to the independence and defense of the country.

I need hardly call attention to the distinction made in favor of vessels performing voyages of a thousand miles or less. The adjustment has been carefully framed so as to equalize the advantages and facilities of Southern and Northern ports. The committee believe that it will increase our trade with other American Republics and secure to the Gulf ports the shipping that should belong to them. The bill also offers an inducement for building larger and swifter steamers, which shall be both mail and passenger ships and a Government naval reserve. The ships are to be built from plans to be approved by the Navy Department, and are to be accepted upon the accomplishment of specified results. The bill thus not only encourages American shipbuilding and tends to increase the American foreign trade, but it will strengthen the American Navy and give us vessels that would be invaluable in case of war.

On this subject listen to William H. Webb, the great shipbuilder:

Our Government is now building a navy, and it is found that through lack of a merchant marine there are no sailors to man the Government ships.

Mr. Webb is right. Here is proof. I quote from one of the most enterprising journals of New York:

"UNCLE SAM" IN NEED OF SAILORS.

[From the New York Morning Journal.]

The new Navy needs more sailors, but finds it next to impossible to get any at all. Twelve hundred men are wanted at the present moment, and eight ships are delayed from going into commission because they can not get sailors. Something wrong; what is it? Before Uncle Sam undertakes to send forth any new ships from his navy yards he should remedy with legislation the difficulties which stand in the way of getting good sailors and plenty of them. He can not expect men to serve their country on the ocean unless some inducements and the chances of some honors are offered them.

Sir, years ago, when we had a large merchant marine, tens of thousands of hardy American sailors were ready to respond to the call of the Government. They were in truth the right arm of the Government in the war of 1812. Some may object to the payment of bounties to sailing ships. I do not especially favor it, but am willing to accept it if necessary. Sailing ships are training ships for sailors. We seem to be paying vast sums at the Kittery navy yard for training ships, which after all are only sailing vessels. What I desire is that the nation may resume its familiarity with the ocean, from which by some means it has been swept almost as clean as Van Tromp's broom swept the English Channel. [Applause.] Men may differ as to how it was done, but there can be no doubt that this bill is adapted to remedy the evil.

This bill would achieve results that can not be achieved by the passage of a free-ship substitute. The situation was well expressed by an Irishman. "If you hire the Englishman to carry your freight," said he, "why in blazes don't you hire him to fight your battles for you? They've lots of spare men-of-war in England, and they would be mighty glad to take the contract." [Laughter.]

I was surprised to hear the distinguished chairman of this committee, in his opening speech, go out of his way in support of this bill and use his great powers to uphold the tottering and more than half repudiated doctrine of protection. I disagree with him. I believe that but for the weight and hindrance of our protective laws our foreign carrying trade might have maintained itself, as my friend from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] said. The protective laws in this country have placed barriers in its way. I would simply apply steam enough to force those barriers. The situation demands it.

I will admit, Mr. Chairman—nay, I will declare—that with an enfranchised commerce and the large merchant marine that an enfranchised commerce would bring the situation would be very different. But that, it seems, we can not have for some time to come. Meantime I shall support this measure, because it seems to be the necessary way to break down the barriers. Shipping interests have always been allied with free trade.

The maritime prosperity of England may be cited as an example; but even with free trade hundreds upon hundreds of millions have been drawn from the British treasury to increase its carrying trade. It only serves to illustrate the skillful and efficient policy of England in its efforts to obtain and secure the carrying trade of other nations. It is by the use of such means that she outrivals all others and maintains her supremacy on the seas. She knows how essential it is to her greatness, and she does not, as we do, carp at methods and higgle over the expense.

She has practically subsidized her merchant marine, not mainly for maintaining her foreign-carrying trade, but for absorbing that of other nations and for purposes of self-defense.

"Free trade and sailors' rights" is good old Democratic doctrine. [Applause.] Democracy is the true friend of labor. I am a Democrat upon principle and conviction. I see no power in Congress to tax one man for the benefit of another. If this bill were such a measure I would not vote for it. But it is not. It is not a protective measure. It is not a gratuitous subsidy from Government to shipowners, like the sugar subsidies and the privileges given to monopolist manufacturers. To those who say that it is, I answer that it is rather like a patent—a contract between the Government and the citizen who takes advantage of it—a contract beneficial to both parties.

These ships are at the service of the Government if required. No manufacturing establishment holds that relation. The shipowners and shipbuilders give consideration for the benefits they receive. What do the manufacturers give? Money to buy elections? That is what is charged. But there is no pretense that they give anything to the Government, or are required to stand ready to do so. The shipowners and shipbuilders are bound in return for the assistance which they receive from Government to build their vessels as the Government requires and to turn their ships over to it upon requisition in its hour of need. Thus we see that this is the readiest, the most efficient, and I believe, the cheapest means of increasing our naval strength.

Look beyond your border. There are clouds gathering over Behring Sea. They show that something must be done. John Bull claims all the fisheries and acts as though he thought he owned the ocean. He will, unless we can contest the supremacy with him. We should at least be ready to do it. This is our destiny. It is, moreover, a national duty. Circumstances will eventually force us to do it whether you take action now or not. Armed in time is the measure of safety.

Sir, this bill is not only a measure of safety, but it will stimulate trade. Labor furnishes the means, but trade brings wealth. It is not only a measure of safety, but of prosperity. Its passage will bring trade. And it does follow, as the day the night, that every hindrance to trade is a barrier to national wealth as it does follow that every stimulant helps it. [Applause.] At the same time this measure will develop our shipping and shipbuilding interests to an enormous extent and be a boon to our workingmen. As a workingman, and as a representative of a district containing tens of thousands of hardy artisans and mechanics, I dwell upon this feature.

The bill proposed by the committee, if passed, would increase and not decrease the number of shipyards in the United States. It would revivify the shipyards of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and other cities, and result in the building of a fleet of American iron steamships in five years. A John Roach, a Cramp, a Hollingsworth, a Webb, a Herreshoff, might spring up in any seaboard city. Alabama, Virginia, Tennessee, Georgia, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Minnesota, and all the iron and coal producing States would reap especial benefits. The nation itself would be made more prosperous. Iron ships might be built within a few hours' journey from the iron deposits of Georgia, Alabama, and Tennessee. Shipyards would be planted on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico, on the Lakes, and on the Pacific coast, as well as on the Atlantic. A new army of laborers would be required to mine and to smelt the ore. New railroads would be built to convey the iron and coal to the seashore. The farmers would share in the prosperity. The demand for agricultural products at home would increase and new foreign markets open.

Here is the proof of it: I hold in my hand the report and manifest of the cargo laden at the port of New York on board the American steamer Seguranca, bound for Pernambuco, Bahia, Rio de Janeiro, and Santos, Brazil, in which I find shipments as follows: 150 kegs of lard, from Maryland; 1 case of agricultural implements, from Michigan; 5 barrels of vegetable oil, from New Jersey; 2 trusses gray sheetings, from Georgia; 2 bales gray drills, from Georgia; 36 boxes corn-shellers, from Ohio; 1 case two-feed mills, from Illinois; 1,000 cases refined petroleum, from Pennsylvania; 100 cases turpentine, from North Carolina;

1 case velocipedes, from Connecticut; one-half barrel glassware, from New Jersey; 2,575 bags wheat, from Illinois; 200 cases lard, from Ohio; 25 cases salmon, from Oregon; 30 cases oysters, from Maryland; 30 cases spirits turpentine, from North Carolina; 2 boxes iron pumps, from Indiana; 3,000 barrels flour, part from Virginia, balance from Illinois; 120 kegs lard, from Kansas; 2,000 kegs lard, repacked in Maryland from Western States; 100 barrels bacon, from Kansas; 2 cases cotton, from Georgia; 19 cases school slates, from Vermont; 8 cases cotton, from Georgia; 10 cases cotton, from Georgia; 2,000 kegs lard, repacked in Maryland; 1,000 cases petroleum, from Pennsylvania; 50 kegs lard, from Kansas; 100 barrels rosin, from North Carolina; 200 cases petroleum, from Pennsylvania; 500 kegs lard, repacked in Maryland; 1,000 kegs lard, repacked in Maryland; 200 cases petroleum, from Pennsylvania; 150 kegs lard, repacked in Maryland; 1 case pumps, from Ohio; 2 packages mowers and handles, from Ohio; 1 case castings, from Ohio; 13 cases colored cottons, from Georgia; 2 cases white cottons, from Georgia; 75 kegs lard, from Maryland; 30 barrels rosin, from North Carolina; 700 cases petroleum, from Pennsylvania; 25 kegs lard, from Maryland; 100 kegs lard, from Maryland; 12 crates refrigerators, from Illinois; 150 kegs lard, from Maryland; 9 cases agricultural implements, from Michigan; 12 crates shellers, from Michigan; 1,000 kegs lard, from Maryland; 15 cases butter, from New York; 500 cases kerosene oil, from Pennsylvania; 2,000 cases refined lard, repacked in Maryland; 800 barrels of flour, from Virginia; 60 boxes axes, from Connecticut; 2 boxes carriages, from Illinois; 1 bundle poles, from Illinois; 1 bundle shafts, from Illinois; 30 bales brown drills, from Georgia; 6 cases chairs, from Michigan; 2 cases sewing silk, from New Jersey; 1 case blue drills, from Georgia; 3,000 cases refined petroleum, from Pennsylvania; 500 barrels flour, from Virginia; 14 cases meat cutters, from Illinois; 2 cases bench screws, from Michigan; 3,000 barrels flour, shipped from Virginia; 300 kegs lard, repacked in Maryland; 500 kegs lard, repacked in Maryland; 100 kegs lard, repacked in Maryland; 500 kegs lard, repacked in Maryland; 1,000 kegs lard, repacked in Maryland; 100 kegs lard, from New York; 100 barrels toncinho oil, from Pennsylvania.

I call the attention of the representatives of the West and South to these figures and to the fact that the American line to which this steamship belongs could not exist to-day were it not that Brazil pays it $80,000 a year for its services, while the United States does not even pay it for carrying its mails. Brazil realizes the advantage of foreign commerce, and is willing to pay for it even to foreign vessels.

All trades would be stimulated by the passage of this bill. Artisans of every kind would be in demand. Innumerable workmen would be required. Our iron centers would become the iron depots of the world. Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Duluth, Birmingham, Anniston, Bridgeport, Atlanta, Chattanooga, and other iron towns would grow until they rivaled in population and prosperity the iron cities of England, and the accursed geographical distinctions of East and West, North and South might disappear from our political literature. The Glasgows, Birminghams, Manchesters, and Sheffields of the world would be found in the great Republic. It used to be said that all roads lead to Rome. Then it will be said that all roads lead to America. This will appear more clearly when we consider what a modern ship is, and who and what it takes to build it.

An iron steamship represents a wide range of trades and talents and labor. Few, if any, products of modern industry equal it in this respect. There are few in which so great a proportion of the whole cost goes to the workingman. The rule holds good to a great extent of vessels built of wood. I will speak of iron and steel vessels alone. Consider the labor in mining the ore and the coal, in transporting these from their native beds to where they are to be worked, the labor required to reduce the ore into shape for the construction of the vessel; the labor represented in and by the machinery and plant and apparatus required in the reduction, manufacture and working of this material; then consider the raw material—the ore and coal in the mine and the timber in the forest—and you will find that on an average it takes $19 in labor to work up $1 in raw material into its place in the finished structure of the ship. In other words, 95 per cent. of the ship represents labor, and 5 per cent. raw material. This is, of course, independent of the interest on the capital.

The reason for this is obvious. Let us look at what is used and what has to be done to build a ship. First, there is the mining of the coal and iron ore; second, the reduction of the ore to pig iron in the blast furnace; third, the conversion of the pig iron into wrought iron by puddling, or into steel by various processes; fourth, the rolling of the wrought iron or steel into plates, angles, beams, and rivet bars; fifth, the manufacture of the rivets and all the other little things which go to make up finished ship material. For the machinery you have castings for cylinders, bed plates, and all the heavy material required for marine engines. Some are of the most intricate character and require exquisite skill in molding. For the moving parts of the machinery elaborate and massive forgings are necessary. These require great skill in manipulation, in heating and handling, and in annealing and tempering.

Another branch of metallic industry is involved in the brass and other alloyed metals used for working bearings for shafts and other parts of the machinery. The art of the coppersmith is brought into play in conveying the steam from the boilers to the engines. A great part of all this work is done by machinery. For the building of an iron ship we require almost every kind of machinery and metal and wood-working plant known. All this machinery itself represents a vast amount of labor and but a small cost of original raw material. Its construction gives employment to nearly all the metal trades and involves the highest skill of the metal worker. There is practically no department of the real metal industry that is not stimulated in the building of iron and steam vessels.

Now let us look at the interior finish of such a vessel. The carpenter, the cabinetmaker, the decorator, the painter, the upholsterer, the carver, and all the arts and trades represented in the construction of a palace are necessary. The electrician must be employed to illuminate the vessel. The resources of sanitary engineering are wanted for ventilation, heating, etc. Most steam vessels require rigging. This calls into play another long list of trades and industries. The ropemaker, whether of wire or cordage, the block maker, the sailmaker, and many another artisan is needed. Over three hundred trades and professions are employed in the construction of such a vessel.

I will not detail how American vessels have been driven from the carrying trade of the world by war and by subsidies granted by foreign governments. I will not tell how the life is being sapped from the six American lines now existing. All can be found in the testimony taken before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It details facts and figures which ought to put every American to the blush. It tells how our foreign carrying trade was absorbed by other nations and why over two thousand shipyards in active operation in the United States in 1861, employing a vast number of American mechanics, have been reduced to the few yards now in existence.

That the passage of this bill would stimulate the building of ships in this country to an extraordinary extent, no one denies. That it would give profitable occupation as sailors to tens of thousands of our brave and venturesome farmer boys and city lads is unquestionable. That it would provide employment for from fifty to a hundred thousand American mechanics and machinists within ten years is beyond dispute. That the army of sailors, artisans, and mechanics and the fleets of ships thus brought into life would be of inestimable value in case of war is clear.

An objection is raised as to the expense involved in this measure. The Commissioner of Navigation places the expense for the first year at $2,150,000. I take his figures because he is an expert, a practical shipbuilder, and certainly ought to know as much about it as any living man. Now, I am told that the United States makes a profit of $2,000,000 a year on its foreign ocean mail service. If this is so, the profit will very nearly pay the cost for the first year. There is where it should go. But whether it does or not is not material. It can not cost more to revive this American carrying trade than it has cost to lose it. It can not cost as much as it has cost to lose it. Even if it be worth only what foreign nations have paid to secure it, it certainly is worth reclaiming at a lesser price. The little foreign carrying trade that we have is fast disappearing. We are practically defenseless to-day. This is, to a great extent, a measure of defense. The bombardment of the city of New York alone to-day would cost the American people more than would be required by the provisions of this bill in twenty years.

Sir, the passage of a free-ship substitute would not be a measure of defense, it would be injurious to national prosperity. It would throw upon the American market the tramp iron steamships now rusting in the waters of the Clyde, and pour millions of American gold into English pockets. It would give British shipowners an opportunity to save their merchant marine in case of war with Russia or any other naval power, and involve us in complications in which we would be measurably helpless. But this is not all. They could transfer their ships to nominal American owners and come out of such a war unscathed under cover of the Stars and Stripes.

No, sir; we want no such measure. What we must have is one that will practically increase our naval power and at the same time develop anew our commerce by the building of American ships, thus giving employment to thousands of American artisans and sailors. Then, and not till then, shall we have American sailors to man an American navy, and American designers, American builders, and American workmen employed in building American vessels in American shipyards from American steel and iron, launched from American ways, for the benefit of American commerce, to be used in reclaiming our foreign carrying trade and in national defense.

Mr. FITHIAN. I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEIL].

Mr. O'NEIL, of Massachusests. Mr. Chairman, I desire, in the brief time alotted to me, to enter my protest against the passage of this bill, which proposes not to reduce the surplus in the Treasury, because that has been already reduced; not to wipe it out, because that has already been done, but to fasten a vampire upon the Treasury of this country for the next twenty years to sap away the revenues of the people, every dollar of which must be wrung from the mechanic, the farmer, and the laborer.

This bill proposes by a hot-house process to revive American ship-

ping, and while every reason but the right one is given by the advocates of the bill for this decline, they hope by appealing to the patriotism of the people that they will be permitted to make just one more grab at the public Treasury before they die. They are proceeding on the theory of the great showman, Barnum, "that the American people like to be humbugged," and, like him, they might add, "and this is the greatest humbug." No man who loves his country but would be glad to see or to read of his country's flag flying in every port of consequence in the world, and it is a popular cry to raise that "American goods should be carried in American bottoms," but until the American people say by their votes that they are ready to adopt Bellamy's theories and that the Government shall conduct all business enterprises, I protest against the adoption of a policy as futile as it is fallacious.

If this policy had never been tried, and tried, too, by this country, then, perhaps, the friends of this bill might not be subject to the criticism they are now open to in their advocacy of this measure. While we might doubt the correctness of their prophecies, we would not have been able to show them a historical refutation; but when they tell us, as tell us they do, that with this bounty granted, the workshops and the shipyards will spring into new life; when they picture in rosy hue the brightness of the horizon should this bill become a law, we are tempted to doubt our own existence and to think we are living in a depressed, discouraged, and bankrupt community.

We are told that this bill is to cause the American flag to go all over the world, to carry trade from and to bring trade to our shores; that a market must be given to the American farmer for his products, and that his profits will be increased by increasing his taxes, already too burdensome.

We are told that the opponents of this bill are acting in the interest of British agents. This John Bull bogy, held up in front of the Treasury while the burglar with his jimmy breaks in at the back door, was repudiated by the people at the last election.

When we are told these things by the friends of this bill it is but right to recall to their minds the stories they told us of the magnificent home market which they declared was good enough and large enough and profitable enough for the American people. We who oppose this bill, while admitting the magnificence of the home market, believe in extending that market to other countries, but not by increasing the burdens of the people who are crying for relief.

In the address of Mr. MCADOO the other day he stated what was indisputable, that the money of the country had been diverted from seeking a foreign market by being used to build up this great home market of ours. If the American people do sometimes like to be humbugged it is not because they are fools, but because they like a little recreation, and it is because they are not fools that they have placed their money where it will bring in the largest returns; not in uncertain bottomry, engaged in a carrying trade at doubtful profits, but in investments and speculations in land and mines and railroads, which latter, owing to the outrageous system of capitalization permitted in this country, offer large inducements to capital in the hands of men who have the slightest speculative desire in them.

A study of the capitalization of the railroads of this country would startle the minds of the timid at the opportunities presented to some people of drawing to their coffers untold and unearned millions. The subsidized lines to the Pacific coast groan under an indebtedness that has puzzled Congress for twenty years to devise a plan to reduce and to provide for its ultimate payment, with the fact before them that the debt has gone on growing and growing, with the prospect of settlement seeming more and more vague and the burdens of the patrons of these great steel highways showing no signs of being lightened. When capitalists can find so prolific a source of profit, which has been sure and steady for so many years, why should they turn their backs on the friends which have been so good to them?

A blacker chapter in the business history of any country has never been written than the story of the indebtedness of the railroads of the United States. Roads running through almost the same country differ widely in their indebtedness. Let the indebtedness of three roads running through practically the same country, and which are to all intents and purposes parallel roads, be compared. The Union Pacific, with its land grants and subsidy bonds, has an indebtedness of almost $62,000 per mile; the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fé, by the terms of its recent plan of reorganization, by means of which millions of water was injected into its bonded indebtedness, has an indebtedness of about $51,000 a mile; and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, which has not, I believe, received an acre of land from the Government, though it may have from the States, has an indebtedness of about $37,000 per mile, a difference of almost $25,000 per mile; and of these roads the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, which has the lowest indebtedness of the three, is rated as far superior to the Union Pacific, which has the highest capitalization, as a blooded trotter is to a pack mule.

The enormity of this difference can be appreciated when it is known that this excess of $25,000 per mile extends over 3,000 miles of road, making the enormous margin of $75,000,000, and that sum does not begin to represent the amount of fictitious capital in those three roads, not all profitable to-day, perhaps, but piled upon the people, regardless of the cost of construction, to let the country grow up to it. These three roads are typical of nearly every road in the United States to a greater or less extent in their capitalization. Were these three roads capitalized at what the actual cost of construction would be to-day it would make a difference in round numbers of $300,000,000, and against this enormous amount it is proposed to offer as a sop a bounty of two millions for the first year, to increase gradually to $7,000,000, and then as gradually decrease. Nor is it less instructive if we take the fluctuations in value of these same three leading stocks during the decade from 1880 to 1889, inclusive.

ATCHISON, TOPEKA AND SANTA FÉ.

November, 1880	$145½ per share.	
November, 1889	31 per share.	
Making a difference of	114½ per share.	
On 750,000 shares, or a total difference of		$85,875,000

CHICAGO, BURLINGTON AND QUINCY.

January, 1881	$182½ per share.	
March, 1889	89½ per share.	
Making a difference of	92½ per share.	
On 763,935 shares, or a total difference of		70,759,480

UNION PACIFIC.

July, 1881	$131½ per share.	
June, 1884	28 per share.	
Making a difference of	103½ per share.	
On 608,685 shares, or a total difference of		63,151,068
Making a grand total of		219,785,548

Thus showing a fluctuation in the market value of the stock of these three great corporations of almost $220,000,000.

But it is not necessary to take a ten-years comparison of the fluctuations in value, for the showing for the year 1890 presents figures which may well call for thoughtful deliberation. The fluctuations were—

	Highest.	Lowest.	Total difference.
Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fé	50⅜	23⅜	$27,412,500
Chicago, Burlington and Quincy	111½	81	23,305,017
Union Pacific	68⅜	40⅜	16,967,076
Making a grand total difference in the value of			67,684,593

In one year. Can it be wondered at that with these opportunities for speculative investment, with the natural tendency of the American people to speculate, they should neglect a business bringing in a doubtful profit for one which opens up such great possibilities? When the American people take hold of this question of railroad capitalization and insist they shall be compelled to pay only a fair return on money actually expended, then the genius of the American will be turned towards other fields, and they will build ships and run them at a profit, which, according to the statements of the strongest advocates of this bill, it is doubtful if they could do at the present time.

When it is remembered that these figures are taken from but three of the vast number of roads in the United States, and that the capitalization of them all follow the same general plan, some idea may be formed of the necessity of strong measures to bring them, like any other business enterprise, down to a cost basis before the people feel the load too great even for their patience to bear, and following out the partnership plan embodied in this bill, seize the railroads in the name of the Government and have them run by it.

It may be said that the very fluctuations shown refute the statement that large profits have been made; but those who are familiar at all with the workings of the stock market know that while the innocent may have suffered, there are men whose fortunes are so high among the millions that the contemplation of them makes one feel dizzy, and who have made as much money by the depression of values as they ever made by taking their pay in bonds for their cash with the stock as a bonus, which has been kicked around like a football at their sweet will. They never lose when shearing the lamb, and it is only when they fall out among themselves that they sometimes get a taste of the misery they have inflicted on countless thousands.

Had the difference shown in the fluctuations of these three stocks been put into the building of American ships, we would have a fleet of the finest merchant marine in the world. Nay, had the difference in value of these three railroad stocks for the year 1890 alone, about $68,000,000, been put into American bottoms, it would not only be a greater sum than the committee claim will be expended by the provisions of this bill, but this difference would form a nucleus for a fleet of first-class merchant vessels and would duplicate the entire floating equipment on the Great Lakes during the year 1890.

The bounty will not do it; at the best it will leave the ships, like the subsidized railroads, depending less on the energy and ability of the investors than on the unhealthy, because uncertain, backing of the United States Treasury; and unable to pay a fair profit on the investment, owing to the lack of economy in construction, always engen-

dered by the receipt of Government aid. All this talk of building up trade with South America is of little avail until the American merchant is willing to meet the other merchants of the world on an equal footing. While the British, the French, and the German merchant is willing to sell his goods on six, twelve, and eighteen months' time, it is hard for the American to compete who is willing only to give thirty or sixty days' credit; and unless these conditions change, all the merchant marine that ride the waters will not bring the trade to our shores.

But a healthy feeling is being sown in the minds of the American people, and in a very short time, as things are going, some steps will be taken to scale down the enormous capitalization of quasi-public enterprises, and, the forbidding wall of the present outrageous tariff removed, then the enormous capital of the richest country in the world will open up to the markets of the United States, in a natural, healthy manner, the markets of other countries. That this tendency is growing is shown by the fact that conservative capital, which ten years ago insisted on 8 and 10 per cent. on investment, now casts a distrustful look at securities paying over 4; shown, too, by the large amount of money invested in Government bonds and the dislike of the holders to redeem them at the urgent calls of the Secretary of the Treasury, although the monthly statement from the Treasury Department shows that on account of the premium a 4 per cent. bond pays only $2\frac{3}{8}$ per cent. interest, and no one doubts the ability of the Government to float long-time 2 per cent. bonds.

These are the healthy signs of the times, and while capital is so plenty that the holders are satisfied with so small a return, it is the height of folly to increase the burdens of the people by giving a bounty to the capital of the country which it does not need.

The average American has sense enough to let some one else do a risky business at a doubtful profit, while he can do a safe one at a fair profit. Who has not read in the papers of late that it is doubtful if any of the great ocean greyhounds which cross the ocean are profitable or not? It is a doubtful question. Then why should the American put something into that enterprise when he has a safe business at home? It is because he is not a fool, and is willing to let somebody else do a fool's business. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, who is it that asks for this bill? Of course it is the people! [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.]

Are we here to legislate the money out of the Treasury for the benefit of one or two wealthy corporations, or a dozen or more wealthy individuals, for that is what this bill means? We are told, it is true, that this is a general bill, but the shrewdest schemes of special legislation are always framed in a general bill, and the fact is indisputable that the largest beneficiary under the bill is a single corporation, which enjoyed ten years of subsidy before, granted after just such promises were made as have been made by the shipbuilding interest who ask for this bill, and this corporation had little to show at the end of ten years and no preceptible growth in the amount of tonnage. So would it be should we pass this bill; but even if the contrary be true, aside from so ill-advised a public policy, the proposition is not one called for by any large element in the community. We are told that the people demand it. Well, of course everything of this kind is done for the people, but only for a few in this instance, and all the sentiment which has been exhibited for this bill has been carefully nursed and worked up.

As an illustration of how this was done the following editorial from the Boston Herald of January 11, 1890, will plainly show:

When those interested in shipping subsidy projects have met together in conventions, as has been the case on more than one occasion, an appearance of unanimity and harmony has pervaded the deliberations which has been looked upon by the subsidy claimants as fairly representative of public opinion. But perhaps in the history of Congressional agitations no scheme for the purpose of obtaining Government aid was ever worked with greater adroitness than has been shown by those interested in this matter.

The convention held in Boston three years ago was typical of those held in other American cities. The various trade organizations were invited to send representatives to take part in the deliberations of the body, but those who accepted this request found that the gathering was emphatically a cut-and-dried affair. Instead of a discussion on the merits of one or more plans for reviving the American shipping industry, the convention was asked to listen to the set speeches of prearranged speakers, whose names were on the list which the chairman of the meeting had handed to him. For this reason there was hardly anything in the way of a discussion. Indeed, it would have been utterly impossible, under such circumstances, to have a debate, and the one or two speakers who almost forced themselves to the front were, so far as possible, shut off and the criticisms they made were left unanswered.

But the presence of the representatives of our local business organizations at this convention was a fact made use of as an indication of the indorsement of the subsidy plan by these associations, although last year, when the subject was brought before the Boston Executive Business Association, the great representative of the trade organizations of this city, the subsidy project found not the least support, and a petition substantially in favor of free ships was adopted by an almost unanimous vote.

If such was the course pursued in one city it is fair to presume that the same course was pursued elsewhere, and that the same is a fair indication of the tremendous popular demand claimed for the bill, which unanimity is like the unanimity at a Republican caucus held once in the city of Boston. The chairman found himself in a hopeless minority of six out of three hundred, and determined that heroic measures alone could save him; so when the meeting was to be organized he recognized one of the six to put in nomination one of his friends for chairman. Amid a tremendous uproar from the other citizens he put the question, and the five men on the floor, including the nominee, voted "ay," whereupon the chairman decided it to be a unanimous vote. "But you never put the other side," said some one in the audience. "Well," was the retort, "there never is but one side in a Republican caucus," and the majority was squelched.

So it was at this meeting in Boston for the shipping bill; one side only was permitted to speak, while those who had been invited to be present, though opposed to the proposition, lent it support by their presence, being counted only to make a quorum.

Reference is made in the article quoted to the meeting of the Boston Executive Business Association, at which were represented nineteen of the great interests of that city. By a vote of almost 4 to 1 a resolution in favor of subsidies was defeated, and, as the sense of the business men of Boston, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That Congress be requested to consider the expediency of enacting a law which shall provide for a period of ten years the free admission of foreign-built ships to American registry, with the enjoyment of all the privileges thereby conferred, except participation in the coastwise trade and in any subsidies or bounties granted by Congress, which should be restricted to American-built vessels, except payment for carrying the mails.

The people of the country have been fooled often enough with these general bills for special purposes, and to-day ask that no special favors be granted which will add one dollar to the tax burdens of the people. Reference has been made to New England in the discussion of this bill. Whatever may be said of New England in the past, she wants nothing but fair play, and that she proposes to have while she is represented on this floor, and the sneers of any Representative from another section comes with ill grace, and without a grain of truth, when the statement is made that this is a bill in the interest of a few Yankee shipbuilders.

The Yankee shipbuilder can take care of himself and has always done so, and with the record before him of industries wiped out on account of the iniquitous tax on coal and iron ore, maintained only for the benefit of a few people in a single State, in spite of the opposition of some of the strongest advocates of the protective system, even, the Yankee shipbuilder will not willingly tie another millstone in the shape of this bill around his neck just when he sees the dawn of the morning that will remove existing burdens.

What does this bill mean? Only that as the public pulse is awakened on the question of overcapitalization of railroads, the great iron magnates of the country, who have profited and are profiting by a prohibitive tariff, think they have discovered a new field for their goods to be used in, providing the Government can be induced to enter into a partnership with them, furnishing part of the capital but not sharing in the profits.

It is not denied that the object of this bill is to encourage the building of steel ships and iron ships, for the day of the wooden ship is long gone by; and the proposition to pay a bounty to encourage their building is too thin to hold water, when it is admitted that at the time of American supremacy upon the ocean it was due to our ability to build wooden ships cheaper and better than any other nation in the world. So this bill is to encourage and aid the poor iron and steel manufacturers.

Can any one doubt what that means to the overprotected iron and steel industries of certain sections of the country? In an editorial published in the Boston Herald, January 15, 1891, the following remarkable statement is exhibited:

THOSE WHO GET THE BENEFIT.

It is not often that one gets so good an opportunity of determining the profits of a protected industry as is afforded by the carefully prepared figures of Mr. N. Dale, of Pittsburgh, which were printed a few days ago in the Dispatch of that city. This tabulation, prepared by an expert, gave the profits which had been earned during the year 1890 by the iron firms of Pittsburgh. The reading of this long list of large figures gives an easy answer to the question of why is it that these manufacturers are willing to exert their political influence, to freely spend their money, and to employ numerous and influential lobbyists for the purpose of maintaining a high customs tax upon iron and steel.

While, in consequence of the inability of our New England iron foundries and iron manufacturers to obtain the material they need, their business has been made unprofitable, and they have been forced in a large number of instances to abandon it, in Pittsburgh, in spite of depressions, the business, as the figures we give below will show, is a notably profitable one, made profitable, in part it may be added, by the forced contributions of the people of New England and those residing in other sections of the country. The following is Mr. Dale's list, with the profits of the year 1890 appended thereto:

Pennsylvania Forge Company	$21,000
Chess, Cook & Co	45,000
Pittsburgh Forge and Iron Works	5,000
Keystone Works	100,000
Milvale Works	140,000
Republic Iron Works	175,000
Moorhead Bros. & Co	100,000
Soho Iron Works	450,000
Sligo Iron Works	100,000
Lindsay & McCutcheon	100,000
J. Painter, Sons & Co	200,000
Sable Iron Works	144,000
Lloyd, Sons & Co	150,000
Solar Iron and Steel Works	100,000
Brown & Co	300,000
Howe, Brown & Co	400,000
Schoenberger & Co	750,000
Singer, Nimick & Co	500,000
Spang, Chalfant & Co	800,000
A. M. Byers & Co	900,000
Park Bros. & Co	2,000,000

Oliver Iron and Steel Company	$1,500,000
Jones & Laughlins	2,400,000
Carnegie Bros. and Carnegie, Phipps & Co	5,000,000
Linden Steel Works	400,000
Miller, Metcalf, Parkin & Co	500,000
Labelle Steel Mill	150,000
Spang Steel and Iron Works	600,000
Glendon Spike Works	125,000
Pittsburgh Tube Works	450,000
Pennsylvania Tube Works	2,000,000
A total of	20,553,000

It may be well to point out that the above exhibit does not include the profits which Mr. Carnegie obtains from his practical monopoly of the coke fields and pits of Connellsville, which are supposed to be nearly or quite equal to the profits realized from all of his iron and steel manufacturing enterprises. The extent of his control over the coke business may be fairly judged when it is said that by ordering a stoppage of coke-making at his pits he could probably cause a shutdown in two or three weeks' time of two-thirds of the blast furnaces of America, so dependent at the present time is the iron and steel manufacturing industry upon the fuel supply that Mr. Carnegie has under his direct and personal command. That he should entertain not only grave doubts as to the utility of lower rates of duty, or the removal of duty, upon the raw material of the iron industry, but should be actively and incessantly opposed to such a change, is not at all surprising. But, on grounds of public policy, it might be well urged that so great a power should not, in this country, rest in the hands of any single man, and that, on that account alone, if coking coal can be obtained from Canada it would be desirable to open up this source of supply.

We have referred to Mr. Carnegie individually because he is the largest individual beneficiary, as well as the most pronounced and aggressive champion of the Pennsylvania doctrine of protection. Its application in this country has wrung many millions of dollars from the pockets of those who could ill afford to spare the money for the benefit and enrichment of Mr. Carnegie and a few of his business associates But the time must come when an aroused public opinion will make a continuance of this method—which is, in its effect, as pernicious and unjust as any autocratic or aristocratic privilege which the world has ever known—utterly impossible.

Here are thirty-one firms in a single city making the enormous profits of twenty and a half million in a single year, and this city, while an important part, is only a small part of that great State which, more than any other, profits by the present tariff and, ever greedy, shouts for more by the passage of this shipping bill.

The people of the country will not stand it; and as New England has been referred to by the gentleman from Missouri as desirous of the passage of the bill, I desire to say as one of her Representatives that, the gentleman from Maine to the contrary notwithstanding, the people of that section do not favor its passage.

Let those who are fond of sneering at New England learn a lesson from the pluck, the thrift, the ingenuity, and the ability of the Yankee iron-worker, as illustrated by the reported recent decision of the Secretary of the Navy, that, in spite of prohibitive tariffs, built up and passed to fit special localities, despite the fact that the Yankee is far removed from the coal and iron fields of the country, he has shown to the world his superiority, and has manufactured plates of steel which stood the severest test imposed on them by the inspectors of the Navy Department, and let those who sneer know that steel plates made by Yankee mechanics, notwithstanding the inconvenience of location, will cover part at least of two ships now being built for our Navy by Yankee shipbuilders.

Give us free coal and iron ore and we will ask no subsidy, but will build ships with any nation in the world; and while New England thus proudly boasts and acts as well, she not only insists that her own burdens shall be lightened, but those of all the land as well, and, more than all, that no extra load be inflicted. Let those who are crying out for aid from the Government learn a lesson from these self-dependent residents of South Boston and Wareham that permanent prosperity comes from a surer foundation when based upon the triumph of American labor and American intelligence.

It will not do for the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] to quote Jefferson and Madison when it suits his convenience to show that measures are good, for it does not follow that what may be good to-day will be good to-morrow; and the attempt made by that gentleman to compare the condition of this great country, with its immense wealth and magnificent empire, to the early days of the struggling Republic is not up to the usually high standard of that gentleman's arguments. The early Republic, absolutely dependent on its commerce for the necessities of existence, can not be compared to this great country and its marvelous home market, for which no sturdier advocate has yet appeared than the gentleman from Maine.

No man knows better than does he that when the time comes that the building of ships for foreign trade will be a profitable venture millions upon millions of private funds will be available; and that if the time has arrived when such business is profitable, the sooner the Government, through Congress, says, "No partnership with the Government," then the sooner will private capital be available. It would be contrary to human nature to suppose that capitalists would refuse a Government bounty; but once shown they can not expect it the shipbuilding of the country will go along on its own bottom, and the refusal by the Government to grant it will be hailed with joy by the farmers, the mechanics, and the laborers of the land, to find that Congress has got through giving special privileges to capital which are denied to the laborer.

Let the men who are thinking of voting for this bill hesitate and reflect what will be the effect of the passage of a bill giving millions to the possessors of millions by a Congress which, when asked to vote for an eight-hour law for Government work, passed a bill so inoperative that any man who gets a contract from the Government may, by subletting it, have men employed ten or twelve hours; but if this bill passes there can be no evasion by the Government, for the beneficiaries will get every dollar which this bill can be construed to carry.

This bill should not pass. Its passage now is an insult to the intelligence of the people of the country, as shown by their votes cast at the election held last November. The issue was squarely presented, whether they favored an increase or a decrease in the burdens of taxation, and by an overwhelming vote they wiped out the party which had added to their burdensome load and in thunder tones demanded a halt.

Coming from a section where the overthrow was as great as in any other part of the country, it appears to me to be my duty to protest in the name of the people who, represented by but three men in the present Congress, will be represented by fifteen in the Fifty-second, against the passage of this bill not desired by the people, not dictated by a good sound public policy, and the enactment of which into a law will bury the party which fathers it beyond hope of resurrection.

That is the kind of public sentiment that is behind the bill. The people do not want it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FITHIAN. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITCH].

Mr. FITCH. Mr. Chairman, our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] who has just spoken is right in saying we all agree that something must be done to aid American commerce and the carrying trade of the United States. Those of us who oppose this bill are as anxious to see a revival in the shipping trade and to see the flag take its old place on the ocean as anyone can be. We are as anxious that the shipbuilding in his district shall be revived, and that the old mechanics' bell shall ring again to call the workmen together on the east side of New York City, as we are that that district may for many years send him back here to charm us with his eloquence and his wit. But we disagree with him as to the effect of this bill.

When I heard the gentleman's eloquent description of the effects this bill would have in the revival of prosperity, my mind went back to the 27th day of last September, when we sat here on this side and listened to the announcement from over there, in the last words of the debate, by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] of the prosperity which would immediately follow the enactment of the bill that was passed that day. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] Gentlemen, these predictions of prosperity on your side are based always on the present presentation of some money to some friends of yours. [Renewed laughter.] That is a condition precedent, and we have it repeated here again to-day. I know my friend from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] will pardon me if I say I turn from his well-meant and honest prediction to the record.

This experiment which we are asked to try has been tried. It was commenced in 1881 by France. She gave a franc and a half (which is 30 cents) a ton for a thousand miles, just as your bill provides; and when you say that will increase the tonnage and increase the number of men employed, I turn from your baseless predictions to what it has done in France and ask you to look at the record with me.

France passed her bill in 1881. She had then 919,298 tons. It took a year or two to get any benefit from it, but in 1884 her tonnage had risen a few thousand tons, to 1,300,000. In 1887 it was 993,000; in 1888 it was 972,000; in 1889 it was 961,000, and in 1890 it was 932,000, just about where she started, after an immense expenditure of money on the very lines that you lay down.

But there is another side to that picture. We are asked to train American sailors. What effect did this experiment have in France? In 1886, when she had had the full benefit of this experiment, she had 93,577 sailors in her merchant marine. In 1890, after lavishing her money upon the line that you want to take, she had 83,078. She had lost 10,479 sailors in five years. She had lost 2,000 a year. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, that is the result of the kind of legislation that you propose. Gentlemen, it is not the shipyards, it is not the laboring man, whose friend my friend from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] honestly is—it is not the laboring man who has been beseeching you and me around this city for months and months. The bill will have one absolute effect. It will put money into the pockets of people who are not laboring men or shipyard owners. The stock of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company was 38 yesterday; it is 40⅝ this afternoon, and $400,000 have been made by you gentlemen for the people over in Wall street whom you will abuse when you get back to the West and to the vicinities from which you come. You have appreciated the value of the stock of the Pacific Mail Steamship line over $2,000,000, and its owners are the honest workingmen that you are going to help. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FITHIAN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS]. How much time did the gentleman from New York occupy?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York occupied seven minutes.

Mr. FITCH. I yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has only charged the time that has been occupied.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman permit me to occupy one of those minutes in order to make a statement in regard to the figures used by the gentleman from New York with respect to the effect of the subsidy system in France?

Mr. FITHIAN. I yield a minute to my colleague [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. The facts were disputed this morning when stated by my colleague [Mr. HOPKINS] in regard to the decrease of tonnage after the passage of the subsidy law in France, and I went to the Congressional Library and have the Almanach de Gotha for 1891, and the Hof-Kalendar for 1884, printed in German, showing the latest statistics, which have been used by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITCH], which fully substantiate the statement made by him, and also by my colleague [Mr. HOPKINS] this morning.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, every Republican ought to vote for this bill, upon a principle which no man can afford to repudiate, unless he is ready to go into bankruptcy, namely, the principle of contracts, the law of contracts. Everybody knows all over the country that you bought the Presidency by buying up the State of Indiana and the State of New York in the last Presidential contest. You have paid back all the parties out of whom you "fried the fat" and got the means to do it, except the shipbuilders.

You have paid off the manufacturers with the McKinley bill; you have paid off the railroad corporations by impliedly confirming to them their land grants; you have now on hand a bill to pay back what you got from the shipbuilders and the shipowners of the country. You have got them to settle with. That you did this we have the very best evidence, for it was no less a distinguished person than the present Senator from Kansas, who will soon be the late Senator from Kansas, who wrote in the last campaign, in June, 1888, to a delegate at the Chicago convention as follows:

VICE PRESIDENT'S CHAMBER, *Washington, D. C., June 16.*

Yours of the 13th at hand. It does not make much difference who is nominated, in my judgment. The candidates will cut but a small figure in the fight. We can elect anybody or we shall fail. The least conspicuous, and therefore the least complicated man, will be the best—somebody like Hayes in 1876. Among all the men named there is not one "leader," no one whose personal or historical relations to the people would make a difference of 1,000 votes in the canvass. SHERMAN, ALLISON, Harrison, etc., have records that would be awkward on the tariff, the currency, the Chinese question, etc. Depew's connection with railroads and corporations would be a heavy load, especially in the agricultural States.

We might as well nominate Gould or Vanderbilt at once. My impression is that Alger or Gresham come nearer filling the bill than any of the others, with some fellow like Phelps, of New Jersey, who could reach the conservative forces of the East and get contributions from the manufacturers and Wall street. But you can judge much better than I what is best after consulting with the delegates.

I have the use of the wires during the convention, by the courtesy of the company, and you can therefore telegraph me fully at all times if anything of interest transpires.

Truly yours,

JOHN J. INGALLS.

This was when the Chicago convention was in session, and you were then engaged in nominating a candidate for President. Now, if you are going to keep your whole contract, you ought to pass this bill. Pass it if you may, and pay back the money you fried out of the shipbuilders and shipowners, and then you keep faith with the people that put you in power and fulfill the obligation that you then assumed. That this is so, no less distinguished a person than the Speaker of the House himself announced some time ago that—

Step by step we are fulfilling the pledges to the people.

[Laughter on the Democratic side.]

This is one of your pledges that were announced in Pittsburgh. [Renewed laughter.] You can either go into political bankruptcy or else pass this bill and keep your obligations and your contracts.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That is what we are going to do. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ROGERS. I have another witness of the truth of what I am saying. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] It comes from Maine. It comes from one who is the right bower of the Speaker, who tells us he is going to keep his contract and pay back this money to the shipbuilders from whom he got it to conduct the campaign. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the Speaker ought not to repudiate that testimony, for if the gentleman [Mr. BOUTELLE] had served his God as faithfully as he has the Speaker his future hope of salvation would be much better than it is now. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] There is only one thing that is left unsettled—and that is in entire harmony with all the balance of the legislation of this Congress—and that is, you repudiated the Blair bill, the money for which was going to educate the black man at the South, but where you get no support.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one word to my Democratic friends. A man can hardly get a seat at the House restaurant table to-day for the plethoric abdominal development of the lobby who are here for the purpose of advancing this bill. [Laughter.] Some of them are so big as to take one-half of a whole table, and they are down with their barrels as big as they are, I have no doubt. [Renewed laughter.] They have gone so far, I am told, as to tell some Democrats if they can not vote for this bill to leave the Hall. I advertise the fact that no Democrat on this floor shall leave this Hall on the final vote without the country's understanding why he is away from this Chamber. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

He must have the courage and manhood to vote his convictions upon this bill, either for or against it. Let him go upon record; but do not let him skulk if he is against it. Let him come here, state his views against it, and by his vote prove his loyalty to the country and to the people who have turned over the control of this House for the next two years to his party. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FARQUHAR. Before I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] I desire to have read from the Clerk's desk what I have marked. It is the testimony of M. Raynal, the best authority on the French subsidy question. It is thoroughly official, and I do not intend to discuss the French subsidy matter any further than by placing officially in the RECORD the well-considered opinion of one of the best friends of the whole French marine.

The Clerk read as follows:

The law relating to the merchant marine (known as the French bounty law) passed by Parliament and promulgated January 29, 1881, for a period of ten years, has produced all the useful results which its supporters anticipated. During the decade which preceded the year 1880 the sailing marine had decreased by 243,962 tons, and the steam marine had not been augmented except to a small extent, and that wholly through the increase of tonnage and lines under convention. The merchant marine was thus clearly destined to perish if no one had come to its aid. The law of January 29, 1881, at that crisis intervened.

The sailing marine has continued to decrease, but the steam marine has grown from 599 steamers, registering 255,959 tons, in 1870, to 1,015 steamers, registering 509,801 tons, in 1888. This is an increase of 243,832 tons—that is to say, nearly doubling the effective tonnage in nine years; and as each steamer ton is equal in commercial capacity to two and a half or three sailing tons, one may judge what benefit the merchant marine has derived from the law of 1881. Thus, if the payment of premiums or bounties for construction and equipment have been heavy upon the Treasury, one may say that they have accomplished large results.

Mr. HERBERT. If I heard the reading correctly, that speaks of the increase from 1870, but the French subsidy law was not passed until 1881.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I now yield one minute to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE].

Mr. BOUTELLE. I simply want to say to the gentleman from Arkansas that politeness prevents my characterizing the direction in which his service has been rendered during this Congress. I have no doubt he has intended to serve the general interests of the Democratic party, but I think the House and the country will both agree that he has not been serving either God or the Speaker. [Laughter.]

Mr. FARQUHAR. I now yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM].

[Mr. BINGHAM addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. FITHIAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT].

Mr. BLOUNT. I desire to have printed in the RECORD an extract from the report of Postmaster-General Vilas in 1885, containing a discussion of the question as to the net revenues of the Post-Office Department from the foreign mail service. There is a habit of considering it as a source of considerable profit. That has been the statement of previous officers, and the same thing has been repeated here to-day. In discussing the question, Mr. Vilas says:

The net revenue, if any, derived from our foreign mail service can not be stated with certainty, because of the impossibility of securing accurate information either of receipts or cost. Letters do not often reach exactly the full unit of weight, and therefore an estimate of receipts based upon weights would be probably less than the actual postages received, nor do the counts furnish very reliable means; and, upon the other hand, data for estimating the cost of inland service bestowed on foreign correspondence are difficult of satisfactory ascertainment. It is fairly certain this cost must have exceeded the domestic rates of postage, because those rates have proved insufficient to pay the cost of domestic mails carried in the same manner during the year.

Attention is called to the tabulated estimate of this business in the superintendent's report, in which he has stated the revenue upon the basis of a single rate of postage per single unit of weight, assuming that the weight of matter carried free equals the total difference between actual weights and the single-rate weights of paid matter; and on the other side has debited the account for inland transportation by the same rule, at the inland postage rates of this country, by which computation a net revenue is shown of $132,220.48 for the year.

But this table entirely omits from view one of the heaviest charges upon the Department in the foreign-mails service, which is our inland carriage and delivery of letters dispatched from other countries to persons here—a duty we must perform, under the Postal Union Convention, without reclamation of charges, in return for their similar carriage of our mails. Had this item been estimated in the table, the apparent net revenue would have disappeared, since by the same estimation applied to the outgoing mails (domestic postage at a single rate for each 15 grams), it will be seen, without computation, this item of cost must have largely exceeded the sum stated as net revenue.

That estimate of cost more likely produces an inadequate than an excessive result, because much of the incoming foreign mail matter is carried over long distances to our Western States and Territories, where our immigrant settlers reside, upon distributing routes and to remote post offices, whose maintenance much outweighs their pecuniary return in postages.

If the account be stated upon the results of the seven days' count, as given in the reported tables, no more favorable results appear. It is true the sum of the gross revenue is apparently much greater; indeed, so very much greater as to challenge immediate distrust of its correctness; but the corresponding expenses, calculated upon that scale, proportionably enlarge. Tabulated on the basis of the counts, the results of which are carried out for a year by that method of

estimation in the superintendent's report, and the account for the past year stands as follows:

Receipts of all kinds	$2,287,169.13
Expenses:	
Of sea conveyance	331,903.24
Of intermediary service	104,797.80
The United States' share of International Bureau expenses	756.56
Net cost of postal agencies	2,486.43
Cost of carrying the 70,708,078 single rates, as counted, estimated at domestic rates	1,414,161.56
Of 3,004,611 postal cards	30,046.11
Of 51,702,980 pieces of printed matter, at 1 cent	517,029.80
Total	2,401,181.50

I have quoted this with a view of inviting the House to an examination of this table which demonstrates to my mind that there is no profit in the foreign mail service at all.

Mr. FITHIAN. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE].

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Chairman, some time ago, in discussing this bill, I asked the gentlemen on the other side of the House to point out the manner in which it would benefit the people not engaged in shipbuilding or shipowning; how it would benefit the agricultural producers of the country and the manufacturing producers of the country. I have listened very carefully during all this debate to see what reply would be made to that reasonable request. Not a single gentleman who has advocated this bill has pointed out in any particular how the passage of this bill would benefit directly either the manufacturers of the interior or the farmers of the interior of this country. We have had plenty of patriotism as to the carrying of the flag, and so forth, and we have had continued repetitions of what Great Britain is doing, and of what the other countries of Europe are doing, by way of subsidizing their merchant marine.

We are invoked to follow the example of European countries in this direction, and it is insisted that they have built up their commerce by means of subvention to their merchant marine; in the face of the fact that the evidence is here before us that instead of having built up their shipping in that way, a very small portion, from 1 to 2 per cent. only, of the tonnage of Great Britain is receiving any such subvention; while with Germany the first subvention was in 1881, and with France about the same time. Yet all of those countries had built up their commerce and their shipping before that.

It is conceded by the makers of this bill, and it is conceded by the Commissioner of Navigation, that it is not expected or intended that the lines which receive this bounty will carry the products of this country to any other country at a single penny less freight than they charge now. It is not pretended that that is the intention, and I ask my friend from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER], how are the wheat producers in his country to be benefited by the passage of the bill, if it is not to result in the reduction of the freights in carrying that wheat to the markets? Let him answer it in his own time.

Mr. PICKLER. That is just what I am trying to find out for myself.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. If you listen to the friends of the bill, you will receive no information upon which you can direct your course of action.

One-half the wealth of this country to-day is in the possession of thirty-six thousand men, and the rest of it is that which belongs to the sixty millions of people. This state of affairs did not exist before the Republican party came into power; and using the apparent logic of the friends of this bill it would be as fair to say this is the result of the Republican party being in power, as it would be to say that the shipping of Great Britain is the result of the mail service that is paid to those ships that carry the mails. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] showed to this House this afternoon one of the methods by which great wealth is piled up in this country in the hands of the few.

I said that upon a fair showing half of the wealth of this country is in possession of less than 40,000 of its people. That is an astounding proposition, yet it is a truthful proposition, and it has resulted under legislation similar to this. At the risk of repeating, but for the purpose of putting in the RECORD some evidence on this subject, I will read from this morning's Post a very brief line or two. It has been stated here upon the floor that Pacific Mail stock has gone up to a certain price within the last forty-eight hours.

This paper, the Post, has been publishing at different times articles in favor of this bill and information calculated to influence the votes of members of this House in favor of it. Here is some of the information which may possibly reach some members of this House. I trust for the good name and fame of members of this House there will be very few who will be influenced to vote in favor of this bill by this information.

Bought Pacific Mail on a report that the House would take up the subsidy bill—

In the heading of the financial column of the Post this morning and lower down occur these words:

The opening was made at advances extending to one-half per cent. over those of last evening, but the pressure was begun immediately, and the opening prices were in the great majority of the list the best of the day, the downward movement being almost continuous though exceedingly slow in most stocks. The advancement of the shipping bill in the House of Representatives was sufficient to give Pacific Mail a spurt, which enabled it to score a large advance.

Then, in the list of stocks Pacific Mail is quoted: February 24, 38; February 25, after the passage of this rule, 39¾. That which was selling at $38 before the Committee on Rules brought in the rule that seemed to insure the passage of this bill immediately rose to $39.75. Gentlemen here upon both sides of the House were discussing but yesterday the question of the option bill and the passage of that bill. Every man who votes for this bill will vote to favor the gamblers in the stock of Pacific Mail. Every man who votes for this bill will have put from $1.75 upward into the pockets of the holders of that stock by virtue of the passage of the bill and their expectation of their share of the plunder that is to be doled out under this bounty law.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. As the stock can be sold "long" or "short," would it be any reply to the gentleman to say, perchance, that every man who voted against the bill would give a vote in favor of depressing the price of the stock; so that on the one hand——

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I do not know anything about selling stocks "long" or "short."

Mr. CANNON (continuing). So that on the one hand it would hit the bears and on the other the bulls, and therefore that we had better keep ourselves free from blame and not vote at all?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Well, I submit that the best thing for gentlemen to do is to keep themselves free from blame, and I trust there are very few else in this House. I simply said that the effect will result in that. I have not charged that it was the purpose or intention of those who vote for this bill to do this thing. I have simply said that it will result in that; that this is a legitimate consequence of their acts. And I want to say, if such is the case, that it should be that to vote against it and to defeat the bill the stock would go back to where it was, certainly nobody, long or short, ought to complain.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I now yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR].

[Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. FITHIAN. I now yield to my colleague [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, this bill should not be enacted into law, for its purpose is neither wise nor patriotic. Divested of all verbiage, it simply gives as a gratuity to such corporations and shipowners in nineteen years from $50,000,000 to $400,000,000 to be charged as an unjust assessment on the taxpayers of this country. It is true that in the last thirty-four years the proportion of our foreign commerce carried in American ships has fallen from 84 to 13 per cent., and in that time we have paid more than $4,500,000,000 freight money to foreigners which should have been paid to our own people and retained at home for our own benefit instead of being sent abroad to enrich the people of other countries.

But while it is true that during this period our ship interest has decayed we have experienced a season of internal development unknown in any other period of our history or in the history of any other country in the world. A vast territory constituting an empire in itself has been opened up to settlement capable of sustaining the population of four of the greatest States in Europe. We have constructed railroads, built towns and cities, tunneled mountains and spanned rivers, and developed our industries of every character to such an extent that our country now occupies the first position among the nations of the earth, and our shipping interest would keep pace with our domestic prosperity if our restrictive laws on navigation had been repealed, as should have been done years ago.

The experience of all nations is to the effect that subsidies will not build and maintain a permanent ocean trade. France tried it in 1881, and it proved of no avail, and from 1847 to 1879 the United States paid out in round numbers over $21,000,000 in subsidies, and yet at the latter date we were told that one-third of this amount would buy all the steamships engaged in commerce that sailed under the American flag in every ocean in the world, and that it bankrupted every prominent man who was the recipient of such subsidies.

The subsidy system should be abandoned, and the true development of our merchant marine should depend upon American shipbuilders and shipowners having unrestrained access to the same advantage in building and operating vessels as the most successful nations. Equal and exact justice to all and special privileges to none should be our creed; but the granting of bounties is class legislation of the most vicious character. Its object is to loot the Treasury in the interest of rich corporations. Ordinarily I content myself by simply voting against this class of legislation, but the measure under consideration is so far-reaching in its effects and so pernicious in its nature that I can not remain silent in justice to the people who sent me here. I am one of those who think that bounties and subsidies are un-American and should have no place in our jurisprudence. Subsidy is a twin brother of "pro-

tection," and protection is robbery of the farmers and laborers of this country.

Sir, this subsidy measure is simply supplemental to the McKinley bill. By the McKinley bill our whole population is burdened for the purpose of giving profit to our manufacturers, and by the bill under consideration this profit is to be extended to shipowners and shipbuilders, and the people to be further taxed to create and maintain millionaires on sea and ocean as well as on land. But the positive objection to the subsidy schemes is the radical one that they involve the employment of men by the Government to carry on their own private business. There is no reason why the people of the United States should be taxed to support Mr. H. K. Thurber's steamship line than there is why they should be taxed to support his grocery store.

The money which this bill proposes to pay to steamship owners is to come out of the United States Treasury, and the United States Treasury can only get the money by taking it from the pockets of the American people, and what are the people to get in return for this tax? It is not claimed by the friends of this bill that its passage will give the American shipowners such an advantage that they can make lower freight rates than foreign ships. In fact, it is admitted that the object of the bill is not to make lower freights for our farmers, but rather the fancied reason for granting these subsidies is that they will increase our exports.

There is no warrant for this last assumption. The reason that our export trade in the past has not been larger is not because of the fact that there were not enough ships. The means of transportation has been abundant, but foreign markets have been closed to us because we refuse to buy abroad.

Subsidy bills are unnecessary to secure transportation, because we already have steam and sail communication with foreign countries, both under our own and under foreign flags. Just as railroads are built wherever there is traffic to support them or where there is a prospect of building up such traffic, so lines of steamships and sailing vessels have been and will continue to be established wherever the traffic warrants it or promises to do so.

The two obstacles in the way of our South American commerce are our legal restrictions upon international trade, and the indifference of our manufacturers, who, having a vast home market, have not made one-fiftieth part of the effort to capture the South American market that the manufacturers of Europe have made. Let the American manufacturers seek by ordinary business methods to get South American orders for their goods, and there will be no lack of American steamers and sailing vessels in which to ship those goods.

Traffic will always secure the means of transportation. It may be true that we pay $150,000,000 annually to foreign ships for carrying our commerce, and if this is due to natural causes the thing is just as it should be. If, in the very nature of things, other nations can engage in commerce to greater advantage than our people, then it would be more profitable for our people to engage in some other industry or calling, and simply because we have paid in the last thirty years $4,500,000,000 to foreign ships for carrying our commerce we are not thereby necessarily any poorer, because our people may have been and doubtless were engaged in some business by which they made double that amount.

But be that as it may, I insist that our people should also possess our carrying trade and under natural laws our merchant marine would surpass the marine of any country on the globe. There are no natural causes that would compel us to pay foreign vessels for carrying our commerce nor to subsidize our own vessels. It strikes me that if we want more foreign commerce the wiser plan would be to reduce the penalties which our tariff law imposes upon it, to reduce the cost of manufacturing in this country by a repeal of the duties on crude materials, and to allow private citizens to carry on the shipping trade for their own profit and at their own risk.

I am willing to admit that the present condition of our shipping interest is a national disgrace, but I insist that it is due to past legislative blunders and can only be corrected by proper legislation, and subsidies and bounties are not of that class.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR], who opened the debate on this bill, said:

> Now as to free ships, it is utterly impossible for any nation that exists or that has ever existed since the Phœnicians to hold its power in the world unless it holds its power on the ocean.

Mr. Speaker, no person will deny in this enlightened nineteenth century the importance of navigation and that this great nation should hold its power on the ocean, but there are other interests in this country than that of navigation. That great statesman, Daniel Webster, said more than half a century ago:

> Let us never forget that the cultivation of the earth is the most important labor of man. Man may be civilized in some degree without great progress in manufactures, and with little commerce with his distant neighbors; but without the cultivation of the earth, he is in all countries a savage. Until he gives up the chase, and fixes himself in some place and seeks a living from the earth, he is a roaming barbarian. When tillage enters other arts follow. The farmers, therefore, are the founders of civilization.

When our fathers built this great Republic they laid its foundation on three great pillars of state, namely, agriculture, commerce, and manufacturing, the greatest of which is agriculture; and coming as I do from the great West, the seat of agricultural products, I would feel recreant to my trust if I did not bring forward at this time the wants of that great section of this country, and if bounties are to be given to industries because they languish and are not remunerative, I want to know what greater claim navigation or commerce has on the General Government than agriculture. That agriculture has ceased to be profitable in this country I believe is an admitted fact on every hand by those best informed.

The value of farms and farm products has greatly decreased in the last two decades, as we learn from the most reliable sources, and that both in the East and West farms are being abandoned, and what was once the leading industry of this country has in the last decade ceased to pay.

In Illinois, an agricultural State, which I have the honor in part to represent on this floor, what do the figures show? In 1889 we raised 259,125,000 bushels of corn, and yet it cost nearly $10,000,000 more to raise it than it was worth after it was raised. The farmers in Illinois on their crop of wheat, oats, and corn of 1889 lost nearly $27,000,000 for that single year; that is, the crop was worth that much less after it was raised than it cost to produce it.

The exact figures can be obtained by consulting the report of the State board of agriculture of the State of Illinois for 1889. The reports for other years will show a similar condition, and yet the Illinois farmer must be taxed more to raise the $50,000,000 or $100,000,000, as the case may be, carried by this bill. What is true in Illinois is also true of every other agricultural State. The reports from Iowa show that the cost of producing an acre of corn in that State is $8, and that the average crop for the last five years has been 33½ bushels per acre, and the price of the corn in the local market in that State has been 22 cents per bushel, making the entire value of the crop, when marketed, $7.33 per acre, or 67 cents less than the actual cost of production. And we are assured from the reports of the State of Iowa that what is true of the corn crop is also true of the other crops.

It is safe to say that no other business in this country could have withstood such a condition of adversity during so prolonged a period as agriculture has, and it is quite safe to say that if it had been practicable for the farmers of this country to withdraw their capital from farming the number of farmers would have been greatly reduced in the past five years. That agriculture is depressed there can be but one opinion, though there is a great diversity of opinion as to its causes and the remedy therefor.

This great industry has been radically misrepresented on the floor of this House in the past, and if we are to judge from the great number of Representatives from the West who were unhorsed in the late election we might hope for a change, but from present appearances we are still to adhere to our former policy of bounties and subsidies to every enterprise at the expense of agriculture. I know that many misinformed persons assume to believe that there is no depression in agriculture, while others are willing to admit that there is, but claim that it is due to overproduction and the like.

I am quite sure that the depression in agriculture in this country to-day is wholly due to legislation. If we stop for a moment to reflect, I think there can be no trouble in arriving at the true cause. Agriculture is the chief business of this country and out of which the nation gathers three-fourths of all its exports, and by reason of which it has been able to preserve a balance of trade in its favor that has constantly added to the aggregate of our national wealth. Yet this chief business of the country has been carried on at a loss, and although the country as a whole is becoming richer every year, so the conclusion is irresistible that there is a flagrant error in an industrial system that produces such results.

The fact can be demonstrated from statistics that the nation's wealth is being constantly increased and that such wealth is largely derived from agricultural resources, and that those persons engaged in that industry in this country are transacting business at a loss instead of a profit. I confess that it is difficult to understand why those who produce the greatest part of the wealth do not save that wealth and enjoy it. In 1850 our farmers represented 46 per cent. of our national wealth. In 1860 they represented 41 per cent. In 1880 our farmers represented but 23 per cent. of our national wealth, and since that time the chasm has still widened more and more. The disparity is now enormous. Consider the cost of a dollar to the farmer in hard labor, day in and day out, and then consider the luxury of the rich.

Behold the farmer, with his hoe at noonday in the burning sun, and the care he has in saving a dollar. We are taught in our very schoolbooks that to the laborer belong the fruits of his toil; but does he get them? Is there not some legislation framed ready to seize upon them? The ever-widening social chasm answers the question but too well. But it is said no matter, so the money stays in the country, no matter whether the farmer gets it or the favored class. But it does matter. The true object of government should be to keep it in the right hands and to prevent those who would unlawfully take it from him. Is it the duty of the Government to take it from the producer and give it to the nonproducer or the robber?

It seems that that is the end sought by this and similar legislation. What a state of society that must be when the law itself becomes a

plunderer. Think of plunder as a form of law and a government that sanctions the robbing of the many for the enrichment of the few. No plea for the nation's prosperity, however eloquent that plea may become, can smother the indefensible wrong that takes a single dollar from the earnings of one class of its citizens and bestows it as a bounty upon those of another.

No law that this or any other Congress can pass will ever make it right to tax one class of our citizens and give it by way of bounty or subsidy, as this bill does, to another class.

If the farmers and laborers of this country are required to contribute from their earnings to build up lines of industry in which they are not engaged, it is absolutely certain that those who give must become poorer thereby, while those who receive will grow rich from the avails of labor they do not perform, and it requires no stretch of the imagination to foresee that under such a system time alone is needed to divide these classes in this the proudest Republic of the globe, as the human family is already divided in the most aristocratic monarchies of the Old World. This is not all, but the fact remains, disguise as we please, that the person who has one-third of his earnings taken from him by unjust or unnecessary taxation is a slave one-third of his time, whether his skin be black or white. It is simply nonsense to talk about the fact that all the people will be equally benefited by a bounty or subsidy to some particular class.

It never was so, it is not now, and never will be. It is impossible in the very nature of things to so frame a bounty law. The word "fostering" in its present application is of recent origin and is a synonym of a rather hateful word, "protection," and protection is a synonym for robbery. It is taking the money of the people and giving it for the benefit of a class. It is an injury to the recipient as well as to the contributors. It destroys men's energies by quenching their spirit of self-reliance.

Labor, and not bounties and subsidies, is the great producer of wealth. It moves all other causes, and therefore labor is a duty from which no man living is exempt without forfeiting his right to his daily bread; and this is illustrated nowhere more fully than by the British shipbuilders who, when the Government ceased to protect them, they aroused themselves to action, and now they stand foremost in the world, perfectly self-reliant. While on the other hand American shipbuilders, not satisfied with their entire monopoly of the coasting trade, whereby they receive 30 per cent. more than they should, they come to Congress every year, begging for subsidies to build up our merchant marine, and to still enable the protected manufacturer and corporations to dwell in luxury and ease at the expense of the toiling millions.

The pretext for all this is to restore our merchant marine to the seas, and thereby to create a better market for our products. But will it do this, and can not the same end be attained by other means than by creating an additional burden upon the people? In the first place, we should bear in mind that this is not a paternal Government, although the tendency for the last few years has been in that direction. It is impossible for the Government to support everybody, or to enter into partnership with each separate industry. What right, under our Constitution, has the Government to tax the people and then pay it over to shipowners as a bounty for navigating ships?

If you subsidize one industry, then it logically follows that you must subsidize all others, and if the Government must support all industries, who will support the Government? Will this Congress hold that socialism is right? The doctrine of socialism is that the Government should find employment for and support every individual in it. This doctrine is as reasonable as a bounty or subsidy to a class. I have before me a report of the Legislative State Grange of Virginia, in which I find this recommendation to Congress:

> Let a law be passed to issue greenbacks to the amount of $60 per capita of the population, and distribute it in bounties upon the surplus sold off of the farms in the same proportion that our manufacturers are protected by a tariff on what they make.
>
> If the average tariff is 50 per cent., then let the bounty paid to the producers of farm products be 50 per cent., and let this be paid until the currency shall have reached the sum of $60 per capita, and then the country can take care of itself, for there will be money enough for all classes (except the robbing class), and with good prices and plenty of money life will be bright in the home of the American farmer. He will be encouraged to renewed exertions to retrieve his lost fortunes—to take again his position in the front ranks of American industry. Freed from debt and distress, with money to produce his crops, he will raise more, sell more, and consequently buy more, thereby becoming a consumer of the products of our manufacturers, giving employment to capital and labor. Our country will be rich, prosperous, and happy, because of the prosperity of its corner stone, the grandest, noblest, and purest of all pursuits—its agriculture.

If $100,000,000 is to be granted to subsidize ships, why not grant this relief to agriculture? The one is as just as the other. And how can gentlemen who vote to subsidize ships refuse to vote for a subsidy to agriculture when that question comes before Congress for consideration, as it evidently will in the near future? Then labor wishes to be subsidized by the Government purchasing all the railroad and telegraph lines in the country, so that the laborers of the country may be subsidized by increased wages to be paid by the Government. And then other industries would follow, and where would the matter stop?

No, the principle is all wrong. Such a policy would in the end destroy all individual enterprise and remove all incentive to industry, and would rather be a curse to the nation and the individual than a blessing. If American ships are to be maintained it must be in the spirit of self-reliance as declared by Daniel Webster fifty years ago, when he said:

> It is not, sir, by protection and bounties, but by unwearied exertion, by extreme economy, by unshaken perseverance, that manly and resolute spirit which relies on itself to protect itself. These causes alone enable American ships still to keep their element and show the flag of their country in distant seas.

The reports of our shipping interests teach us that our merchant marine has been on the decline since 1855, and I take it that it is the duty of wise statesmanship to discover the cause if possible and apply the proper remedies. I think that it is the true desire of every American to see the expansion of our commerce, the rebuilding of our merchant marine, and the restoration of our flag to the seas. But the serious question with us is, how is it to be done?

Under our law an American citizen can not buy a foreign-built vessel and sail it under the American flag and engage in the carrying trade between any foreign country and his own; but he may put the American flag upon it and trade with all the countries of the world except his own. All other nations except this buy their ships where they can buy them the cheapest. This is the natural law of trade, and any other is unwise as well as unjust.

The law might as well prohibit Americans from wearing foreign-made clothing as from purchasing foreign-made ships. All such restrictions are in the nature of "protection" that protects the wrong man. Our restrictive navigation laws should be repealed and admit free of duty every article that goes into the construction of a ship. Then our shipbuilders and shipowners would have an equal chance with the shipbuilders of other nations, and American pluck, intelligence, and enterprise would soon re-establish our merchant marine, and our flag would compete with the world in commerce and navigation.

Prior to the Revolution our marine interest steadily grew, until it became a rival of the "maternal mistress of the seas," and this was accomplished under conditions of absolute free trade in ships and shipping. But in 1789, by one of the first laws enacted under the Constitution, all foreign-built ships were excluded from registry under the American flag. The object of that law, which has remained in force until the present time, was to make it profitable to build, own, and use ships in America by cutting off foreign competition in shipbuilding.

The result of that is, as I have stated before, that no foreign-built ships, even though owned by American citizens, could be used on the ocean unless they sailed under a foreign flag. This was supposed to be protection to our then infant industry of shipbuilding. It was further enacted in 1792 that no foreign-made vessel should take any part in the coasting trade of the United States. That is still the law in this country. Thus it will be seen that our shipping interests have been protected to the point of prohibition for nearly a century.

Under our tariff in the past it has been impossible to build ocean ships in this country in competition with foreign countries because of the high tariff, which raised the cost of iron, steel, lumber, duck, cordage, and all materials entering into the construction of shipbuilding. The result has been that for many years our people found themselves in the strange condition that it was unlawful to buy ships and impossible to build them. Was it any wonder, therefore, that our marine degenerated under such conditions?

The percentage of exports and imports carried in vessels of the United States and foreign vessels is shown by the following table:

Years.	Tonnage in foreign trade.	Tonnage in coastwise trade.	Value of exports and imports.	Per cent. carried in American vessels.	Per cent. carried in foreign vessels.
1840	762,838	1,176,694	$231,227,465	82.9	17.1
1845	904,476	1,223,218	231,901,170	81.7	18.3
1850	1,439,694	1,797,825	330,037,038	72.5	27.5
1855	2,348,358	2,543,255	536,625,366	75.6	24.4
1860	2,379,396	2,644,867	762,288,550	66.5	33.5
1865	1,518,350	3,381,522	604,412,996	27.7	62.3
1870	1,448,846	2,628,247	991,896,889	35.6	61.4
1875	1,515,598	3,219,698	1,219,434,544	25.8	74.2
1880	1,314,402	2,637,686	1,613,770,633	17.4	82.6
1881	1,297,035	2,646,011	1,675,024,318	16.0	84.0
1882	1,259,492	2,873,638	1,567,071,709	15.5	84.5

This table speaks volumes. It is here shown that in 1855 75 per cent. of the entire tonnage, both of rail and of steam, entering our ports from foreign countries was American and 25 per cent. foreign, but in 1882 only 15 per cent. is American and 85 foreign; in 1860 seven-tenths of our foreign commerce was carried in our own ships; in 1870 35 per cent. was carried, and in 1875 25 per cent., while in 1882 only 15 per cent.

The facts show, under our present navigation laws, the marine service of every commercial nation has greatly increased—several of them more than 100 per cent.—except the United States alone. This is not due to natural causes. No country in the world is so well endowed

as ours for the purpose of shipbuilding. Our timber supply is unequaled in any quarter of the globe. We have mountains full of iron and a vast territory underlaid with coal. In the South we surpass all countries in the growth of cotton for sails, and we produce a great abundance of hemp for cordage.

Our sailors equal any in the world, and the inventive genius of Americans outstrips the world. Yet it is a conceded fact that we can not build ships in our dock yards as cheaply as they can be built in other countries; and this fact does not arise from excessive wages paid in this country for labor. It is mainly due to the artificial dearness of the material we use in the construction of ships. I do not claim that protective taxation alone is the cause of the decline of our marine, but I think it is the chief cause. When John Roach, the great shipbuilder, in 1869 was before the House committee on investigating the cause of the decline of our shipping interest, he said:

America has lost her commerce, and what has she obtained in exchange for it? Simply the right of a few men to charge $9 per ton in gold on the importation of pig iron. Pig iron is the basis of all other metals connected with the making and repairing of ships. There has been a revolution in shipbuilding, and iron is the material from which they are now built. The high cost of iron produced by the tariff upon it is one of the principal difficulties our commerce has to contend with. I did not come here to ask a bounty. I came here to tell you that while all other articles of American produce are protected to a great extent there is no protection for American ships. If Congress will take off all the duties from American iron, reducing it to the price of foreign iron, then we are prepared to compete with foreign shipbuilders. The labor question is misstated; we are prepared to meet that difficulty, and to ask no further legislation on the subject.

Charles H. Cramp, on the same subject, who is now largely engaged in shipbuilding, in reply to a question as to the average rate of duty on material entering into the construction of ships, said:

About 40 per cent.; and if our shipbuilders could be relieved from that, they could compete successfully with foreign builders. The difference in the cost of labor would be overcome by the superiority of American mechanics. Wooden ships will no longer be built, since iron ships are superior in every respect.

The Select Committee on American Shipbuilding and Shipowning Interests of the Forty-ninth Congress, in their report, among other things, said:

The increase in our shipping from 1830 to 1840 was 60 per cent.; from 1840 to 1850, 75 per cent.; and from 1850 to 1860, 60 per cent. Had the then existing conditions continued we should soon have been mistress of the seas. England had become thoroughly alarmed, and to counteract the danger repealed all her restrictive shipping laws in 1849, and enacted instead her present liberal and enlightened shipping laws, permitting all vessels, wherever built, belonging wholly to English subjects, to be registered as English vessels, and removing all taxes and burdens. She also opened the doors of competition wide by making even her coasting trade free to the vessels of all nations.

This wise and wholesome policy was gradually bearing its rich and valuable fruits when another most important factor came to her relief, and in connection with these liberal laws completely restored her dominion upon the seas. It was discovered that ships could be built of iron and steel and propelled by steam, and that these could be built in England cheaper than in the United States.

About the year 1856 England commenced to build iron and steel steamships, and as fast as they were built and equipped the commerce of the world was transferred to them because of their superior speed and supposed safety. To compete with such vessels with wooden sailing ships was, of course, as futile as it would be now to send an army of savages armed with bows and arrows against a modern army with guns and artillery of the most improved type.

There was but one hope left us for further effort at maintaining our position and interests in the carrying trade, and that was to do what all other countries wisely did—repeal our antiquated restrictive navigation laws, and allow our people to buy iron and steel steamers where they could get them as cheaply as their foreign competitors and register them as vessels of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the fact then is, that when it was discovered that wood was less desirable than iron in the building of ships America lost the great advantage which she had of cheap material, for we could not at that time produce iron as cheaply as Great Britain, and the high tariff prevented its importation. For ten years our railroads were allowed by act of Congress to import their iron free of duty, but this privilege was not extended to our shipping interest; hence the decline in that great industry, caused by a restrictive tariff.

We have lost our merchant marine because of a high tariff and prohibitive navigation laws, and we can never restore our flag to the ocean by subsidies.

At the last session of Congress the people were taxed 62 per cent. by the McKinley bill to keep out foreign manufactured goods. Now by this bill the people are to be taxed millions of dollars more to enable us to import foreign goods to this country. What criminal folly has ever induced the American Congress to adopt such a policy? What a sad spectacle, to see American freemen on their knees before Congress asking its members to rob the public Treasury in order to give bounties to shipbuilders, and to forget the great truth that "a public office is a public trust."

What warrant is there in the Constitution for granting this bounty? The courts of this country, from Maine to California, including the Supreme Court of the United States, by repeated decisions have held this class of legislation unconstitutional. They declare taxation, by the very meaning of the term, implies the raising of money for public uses, and excludes the raising of it for private objects and purposes, and when it is not raised for public purposes only it ceases to be taxation and becomes plunder.

Numerous decisions of the courts could be produced that hold this view of the question, but it would be of no avail. Members of Congress seem to treat the Constitution with less consideration than any other class. When they enter on the discharge of their duties as members with uplifted hand they take a solemn oath to support the Constitution, and call upon the ever-living God to witness the sincerity of their purpose, but it seems to be simply an idle ceremony. At the last session of Congress a law was passed by which $10,500,000 of the people's money by way of bounties is to be given to manufacturers of sugar in this country. Millions of dollars in bounties are given annually to manufacturers of iron and manufacturers engaged in other industries, and now the shipowners of this country are here on bended knees as paupers begging Congress in the name of charity to give bounties or subsidies for the promotion of American commerce.

The Legislative State Grange of Virginia is asking that greenbacks to the amount of over $800,000,000 be issued and paid out in bounties to the producers of farm products in this country in order to even up with the manufacturers, who are protected by a tariff on what they make. And why should not this be done? If it is constitutional, expedient, and just to tax the people for the purpose of raising money to pay bounties to the manufacturers of sugar in Louisiana and iron in Pennsylvania, it is equally constitutional, expedient, and just to tax the people for the purpose of raising money to pay bounties for the production of corn, wheat, and other farm products in Illinois. And then other industries have the same right to receive bounties and subsidies, and where will the matter stop?

But it is said that Great Britain pays bounties or subsidies to her merchant marine, and therefore the United States should do the same. Those best informed say, however, that no English statute can be found where Great Britain ever paid a subsidy to her marine. But, for the sake of the argument, grant that she has; that proves nothing, for the conditions of the two countries are wholly dissimilar.

The tariff tax of England is only $100,000,000 annually, and this is collected on sixteen articles, 98 per cent. of it being derived from five only—fruits, spirits, tea, tobacco, and wine.

To this is added an excise tax which makes up the total of what the people of Great Britain pay in tariff taxes. When, therefore, the English Government collects a dollar in taxes the people only pay a dollar, but when our Government collects $100,000,000 under our tariff laws the people pay at least $500,000,000, the protected manufacturers getting five dollars while the Government gets but one.

And then, again, our tariff is mainly on the necessaries of life, and therefore chiefly paid by those least able to pay, while in Great Britain the tariff is mainly on luxuries, and therefore paid by the rich.

Then, again, the conditions are dissimilar in this: The State of Texas alone contains more square miles than England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales combined. Great Britain is connected only by water ways with her various territories, while the various States of this Union are connected by rail; therefore, the interest of the English Government is in the line of the development of her ship interests, while our interest is the development of our great railroad system, which surpasses any railroad system in the world and is of greater value many times over than all the fleets of Great Britain combined.

Now, is there any argument in the statement that we should have more ships to be used as a navy in case of war? There is no more danger to this country from any foreign power than there is from earthquakes or cyclones, and we might as well guard against the one as the other. The protection of the Government is not the object of this measure. The parties who receive the money under this bill care very little for the Government. All they want is the mighty dollar, and when they get it from the labor of others they will be satisfied.

But conceding that we should have a better merchant marine, still I insist that a system of bounties and subsidies will never give us a permanent one. Is it not well known to every student of commercial history that prior to 1850 Great Britain possessed similar restrictive navigation laws to those now in force in the United States, and that in the year 1851 or 1852 she repealed those laws and adopted her present free-ship policy, and that since that period her shipping interests have marvelously developed and she has become in name and in fact the mistress of the ocean? What was done in England by free ships can also be done in this country, without injury to any class and with great advantage to all our industries.

But that is not what the friends of this bill desire. They want something for nothing; to tax the people of the West for the benefit of the East.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to be compelled to speak of this subject in a sectional sense, but the truth demands it, for this class of legislation has gone too far already.

The McKinley bill was passed in the interest of Eastern manufacturers and for the benefit of the East.

The farmers of the West and South are taxed millions of dollars annually to enrich the East. Not a farmer in the country is benefited by a protective tariff to the amount of a single dollar, and yet members of Congress who represent agricultural districts in Kansas, Iowa, and Illinois voted for the McKinley bill.

It is true that in the late election the farmers rebuked many of the members who voted for that measure and retired them to private life, as they should have done. We are now, however, confronted with very nearly a similar measure; and who are the instigators and chief movers in its behalf? Eastern lobbyists paid by Eastern capital. Who are the

chief advocates of the measure here on the floor of the House? Gentlemen from the East, whose constituency are largely engaged in the carrying trade and who will receive the money paid under this bill. They vote for it because it will be money in the pockets of the people they represent.

But how can a gentleman representing an agricultural constituency vote to tax his people millions of dollars so that it may be given as a gratuity to Eastern shipbuilders and shipowners?

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the time has come when we should be all Americans and know no section nor class. By the McKinley bill nearly all material entering into the construction of ships is placed on the free list or the tariff greatly reduced thereon. Why should not the lumber and other material used by farmers in the construction of their houses, barns, and fences be placed on the free list? Have they not the same rights in this country as shipbuilders? Why not place the clothing, food, and other necessaries of life of poor laboring people on the free list?

These are the questions the farmers and laborers of the country are now asking, and this can not be regarded as a free country until these things are done.

Let us hope that this so-called protection will soon pass away, and that the taxing power of the country will be used only to raise money to pay the expenses of the Government economically administered. This is democratic doctrine pure and simple; and if we adhere to it and enact just laws for all our people, the people will take care of our shipping interests without bounties or subsidies.

The history of the merchant marine of Norway, without subsidies or bounties or any government aid, teaches the grand possibilities of self-help when it is shown that the Norwegian flag heads the list of foreign nations in our navigation returns. The evidence is that bounties and subsidies do not work where they ought to and where they have been tried. France and Italy, although relying upon liberal government aid to their entire shipping and shipbuilding interests, exhibit a marked reduction in their tonnage, whereas Norway shows an increase.

But in conclusion, sir, permit me to say that we should now and forever abandon this false and wicked theory of subsidies and bounties, and at once return to the true principles of self-government and self-help as taught by the founders of the Republic.

No government can be free that taxes one class of its citizens to enrich another class, even if the object should be to carry our flag in foreign seas.

The freedom of government does not depend upon the wealth or power of our merchant marine, but rather upon the justice of our laws; and to secure the freedom of men under government is to so frame our laws that every man shall have an equal chance in the race of life; the Government giving to no one what he has not earned, nor taking from another the reward of his labor. If we wish to repossess our ocean trade, then, let us make our navigation laws free; and with free ships, manned by American freemen, we will soon surpass all other nations on sea and ocean—the great highways of the world. If we wish our flag to be free on land and sea, then let liberty and equality be extended to all under its protection.

Mr. FITHIAN. I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, anyone who has given the slightest consideration to the subject will admit that our merchant marine is at present in a most unprosperous condition, and that unless the causes which have produced this condition are speedily removed or overcome we shall soon witness the complete destruction of this important industry. This being admitted it would be strange if any fair or just measure looking to the relief of our ocean commerce should meet with the slightest opposition in any quarter.

But it is not strange, when the propriety and justice of the policy which this bill seeks to inaugurate are considered, that it should have provoked the fiercest opposition, both here and throughout the country.

Without attempting to deal in any degree with the causes that have undermined our ocean traffic and lost us our place as a first-class maritime nation, this bill simply undertakes that the Government, by a system of subsidies raised by taxing the people, will guaranty that certain individuals and corporations engaged in conducting our foreign commerce shall realize profits out of their business.

I am opposed, Mr. Chairman, to this character of legislation, not only because I believe it is unauthorized and because it ignores the personal and property rights of every citizen upon whom the burdens of these subsidies rest, but because I believe the sure effect of such a policy would be to paralyze the self-reliance of the individual upon whom the subsidies and bounties are bestowed, and encourage him to rely on the Government for success in his private business, rather than on his own enterprise and prudent economy.

The theory of this bill is, if a private enterprise is unprofitable the Government must sustain it; if losses are incurred, the Government must pay them. But I deny that the Government has either the right or authority to aid the people in conducting their private affairs. It can only do so by exercising the power of taxation, and it has no power to levy and collect taxes for other than public purposes.

The doctrine that the Government should administer public affairs only, leaving the people to manage their own private affairs, is, I know, somewhat obsolete; it is none the less a very conservative and safe doctrine, but a doctrine which this bill wholly fails to recognize. It proposes, on the contrary, so far as our merchant marine is concerned, that the doctrine of paternalism, pure and simple, shall prevail, and the promoters of this scheme should be required to produce a clear, legal sanction for such a policy before it is adopted.

But, Mr. Chairman, I not only challenge the justice and integrity of the scheme proposed by this bill, but I deny the efficiency of the remedy it offers. Our merchant marine, once one of our leading interests, second only in importance to agriculture, can not be rescued from the bankruptcy that menaces it by methods such as this bill proposes Our people of every class and occupation would be glad to see the Stars and Stripes carried by our commercial marine upon every ocean and to every foreign port and harbor wherever money could be made and profits earned by our shipowners and seamen, but it is neither a lack of national pride or patriotism to say that such a result can not be accomplished by the methods proposed in this measure.

There is nothing in any of its provisions, if it should become a law, to inspire a hope that it will enable those engaged in our foreign carrying trade to overcome in any degree the difficulties that now embarrass them and which have rendered them powerless to challenge competition with even the most insignificant fleet that sails under a foreign flag.

Congress may, it is true, by an extravagant and unauthorized use of the public revenue induce the owners of ships to sail them under the American flag, but it would be an unwarranted presumption, in view of our own experience, to suppose that we can succeed in recapturing our lost commerce or in adding anything to the efficiency of our marine service by voting bounties to those who prefer to rely on the questionable methods of the lobbyist, rather than on their own skill and industry, which at last is the only sure guaranty of success in all legitimate ventures.

I do not care to discuss the details of this bill, except to say the policy it proposes seems to be fairly in line with the system of protection as embodied in the McKinley tariff bill, especially that feature of it granting a bounty to the producers of sugar, which became a law at the last session of this Congress.

The McKinley bill as a whole seems to have been condemned by the people at the late elections, but its most obnoxious provisions were those which grant a bounty to the producers of beets in the Northwest and to the producers of sugar cane in the South.

There is no difference in principle between paying bounties to ships and paying them to the producers of sugar.

It will not do to assume that the people do not understand this, or that they can be convinced that there is any difference between subsidizing industries on shore or enterprises at sea, or that either is anything less than a proposition to tax the public that the business of those to whom the subsidies are paid may be made more profitable and to enable them to declare dividends they have not earned.

Everyone understands perfectly well that this is class legislation, pure and simple, however much the attempt may be made to cover up the fact by calling this bill a shipping bill, a tonnage bill, or by any other ambiguous name. No pretext, however plausible, or argument, however ingenious, will convince the people that Congress is justified in taxing them to promote the private enterprise of any class, however lawful or important the business of that class may be.

But if this legislation could succeed it would be of no lasting benefit even to those whom it proposes to assist, as our own experience illustrates.

The proposition to pay bounties and subsidies to shipbuilders and owners in order to restore the lost prestige of our merchant marine, and to get back again the fair share of the carrying trade we have lost, is not a new or untried experiment; we have tried it before, not once, but on several separate occasions, and each time the test proved a signal failure.

If past experience teaches anything it teaches the utter folly of attempting to keep our ships afloat, or to prevent them from decaying on the stocks or rotting at their moorings by means of subsidies and bounties.

The arguments in support of this measure are much the same as those made in favor of subsidizing the Collins line in 1847, and other lines subsidized before the war.

It was confidently claimed at that time that a liberal system of bounties would enable us to check the encroachments of foreigners on our commerce.

It was by such methods, rather than by the repeal of our unreasonable and ancient system of navigation laws and trusting the result to the energy and intelligent enterprise of our shipowners and seamen, that we proposed to build up our merchant marine and drive the English sailing and steamships off the ocean. The advocates of that pioneer ship-subsidy scheme had no doubt that the result would verify the wisdom of their policy and fully justify the large expenditure then proposed for that purpose.

It was argued by the opposition at the time that if the Government extended aid to a part only of those engaged in our foreign carrying

trade and withheld it from the rest, the result would be to diminish rather than increase our business. The subsidy scheme succeeded, but the expectations of those who advocated it were never realized.

With a subsidy of nearly $1,000,000 per annum the Collins line began under favorable circumstances its hopeful but brief career.

With the false stimulant of a munificent bounty raised by taxing the people, this pretentious but ill-fated enterprise set about its task of building up our ocean trade and of driving its British rival off the Atlantic.

Its ships, it is said, surpassed all others of that period in speed, but a recklessness born of liberal bounties, and increased no doubt by the hope of still greater bounties to follow, seems to have controlled the actions of those charged with the management and operation of those ships, and in less than eight years the Collins line ceased to exist. Its ships either went to the bottom of the ocean or mysteriously disappeared with their passengers and cargoes, leaving no trace of how or why or where they were lost.

The other lines running between New York and Havre, and between New York and Bremen, subsidized about the same time as the Collins line, were as unfortunate, and proved equally a disappointment to those who had supposed our supremacy on the seas could be achieved and maintained by the modern dogma of subsidies and bounties.

About the close of the war the policy of subsidizing ships was again revived, the theory that the Government is everything and the people nothing, and that national aid was the only sure guaranty of material progress and might be rightfully invoked to promote private enterprise, was not without its advocates.

The costly and disastrous experiment we had made before the war in trying to maintain first-class American sea-going ships by means of bounties either failed to teach any useful lesson or had been forgotten, and the passage of acts among which was what has since become familiarly known as the Pacific Mail subsidy act, and other similar legislation, found its way into our Federal statutes.

It is unnecessary now to discuss the evils resulting from that legislation or the national scandals that grew out of it; everything connected with the subject is fresh in the memory of all.

Although enormous sums of money, amounting in the aggregate to more than $20,000,000, have been expended in subsidies for the purpose of building up our merchant marine and to aid in encouraging our carrying trade, we are confronted here with the fact, as disclosed in the report which accompanies this bill, that our commerce by sea has in substance become a thing of the past.

Captain Bates, United States Commissioner of Navigation, in his testimony before the committee in charge of this bill, made the following statement:

The continued decline of our ocean freighting can not be better illustrated than by a comparison with the carriage of our conquering rival. In 1855 British shipping in our trade, sailing from the United Kingdom, constituted 18 per cent. of the whole tonnage so engaged. American shipping constituted 79 per cent., the balance belonging to other nations. In the statement following the British gains and American losses clearly appear:

	1855.	1865.	1875.	1885.
British percentage	18	65	70	84
American percentage	79	26	9	10

From this statement, the correctness of which will not be questioned by the friends of this bill, it appears, notwithstanding the bounties which have been paid, our shipping interest has steadily declined.

But this costly and melancholy experience has not abated the ardor of those who affect to believe if men "embark in an unprofitable business they should not be left to suffer the consequences of their own folly, or gain wisdom by experience, but should be encouraged to continue and have their losses made good out of the public Treasury." I suppose it is on this idea that Congress is again asked to expend large sums of the public money in bounties, the annual cost under this bill, if it becomes a law, being variously estimated at from $3,000,000 to $5,000,000.

If this character of legislation could be justified on any grounds, this would be a large sum of money to hand over gratuitously to a single industry; but when it is remembered, after the fullest and fairest test, bounties, however liberal, have failed to check the decline in our foreign trade, it would seem that the granting of further bounties would not only be a reckless but inexcusable waste of the public money.

If the important shipping industry once controlled by our people, but which has been lost, is to be regained, we should seek the real causes that lead to its decay, and endeavor, if possible, to remove them.

Forty years ago we not only built ships and navigated them with success and profit, but we built and supplied foreigners with a large per cent. of the ships they owned and operated.

In those days of wooden sailing vessels we had no rivals either in shipbuilding or ship navigation. One-third of the world's carrying trade was ours; the American clipper ship was not only the fastest, but the best that sailed the sea. Those engaged in building and operating them, without the aid of bounties or support from the Government, were afforded honorable and remunerative employment.

In 1855, 2,027 vessels, with an aggregate of 583,450 tons burden, were built with American capital in American shipyards and by American workmen.

Our total exports and imports that year amounted to $641,604,850, of which three-fourths were carried in American ships.

At that prosperous period the combined fleets of all foreign countries were only able to control about one-fourth of our entire export and import trade.

This gratifying condition of our ocean freighting business was in no wise the result of subsidies or bounties, but due to the prudent energy and enterprise of our merchants and seamen, and to a system of tariff laws that did not exclude us from all commercial intercourse with foreign nations as the present tariff law does.

The following table, furnished by the United States Commissioner of Navigation, shows the condition of our shipping interest between 1886 and 1889, as compared with its condition between 1851 and 1855:

Year.	Tonnage in the foreign trade.	Shipping per capita.	Commerce per capita.	Proportion of American carriage in foreign trade.	
				Imports.	Exports.
	Tons.	*Cubic feet.*		*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
1851	1,544,663	6.47	$18.22	75.6	69.8
1852	1,705,650	6.93	17.18	74.5	66.5
1853	1,910,471	7.50	19.60	71.5	67.1
1854	2,151,918	8.18	22.16	71.4	69.3
1855	2,348,358	8.63	19.72	77.3	73.8
Average	1,932,212	7.54	19.37	74.06	69.3
1886	1,988,041	1.81	23.80	20.	13.6
1887	989,412	1.63	24.89	18.6	12.2
1888	919,302	1.48	24.60	18.5	11.7
1889	999,619	1.57	22.37	17.08	11.62
Average	999,093	1.62	23.91	18.51	12.28

The mute figures of this table conspicuously illustrate the decline in our shipping within the last thirty years, in which time we have lost nearly two-thirds of our tonnage, 56 per cent. of our import and 56 per cent. of our export trade; and the only remedy this bill suggests for this melancholy state of affairs is a proposition to pay bounty and subsidies to those engaged in this unprofitable industry.

But bounties and subsidies have proved as powerless to build up our shipping interests as did the predatory excursions of Confederate cruisers in driving the commerce of the United States from the ocean during the war.

Mr. David A. Wells, an acknowledged authority on the subject, in discussing the virtue of subsidies, says:

It is claimed that the decadence of American shipping can be arrested and an era of marine prosperity inaugurated in some other and better manner than by the repeal of the navigation laws—that is, by the payment of bounties or subsidies.

In other words, having almost completely destroyed a great branch of domestic industry by compelling it to submit to the unnatural restraints of an artificial system it is now proposed to repair the damage, not by removing the cause, but by resorting to another artificial experiment, namely, the hiring of men to do what the first artificial system makes it for their interests not to do.

On its very face could any proposition be more economically monstrous and impractical?

The first objection to this scheme is, that it is a mere palliative, and if remedial in part and unobjectionable as a matter of public policy, bears no proportion to the magnitude of the trouble to be dealt with.

It is a good deal like the old method of using perfumes to cover up the results of organic nastiness, or of bathing a swollen limb with liniment when it is a fractured bone that needs setting.

Suppose that the Government should appropriate several millions of dollars to compensate several American-built lines of steamers for running at a loss in competition with steamers of foreign construction.

Undoubtedly this policy would benefit the lines so subsidized.

Capitalists can unquestionably be bribed to float the American flag to a certain extent.

But how about the rest of our commercial marine that is threatened with annihilation?

Does anybody suppose, with the present temper of a large proportion of the American people in respect to subsidies protection, and the expenditure of public moneys raised by taxation, that the policy of paying bounties can be continued indefinitely as to both time and amount?

But they must be so continued on the bounty theory, unless the causes which will not allow citizens of the United States to build and use ships as cheaply as foreigners are removed; and if they are removed, bounties will no longer be necessary, for ships will then be secured without bounties.

The application of bounties is therefore a mere temporizing policy, and does not meet the broad problem, how to prevent the transfer of our whole ocean service to foreigners.

What the country needs is a system that will enable it to run steamships everywhere on the ocean in successful competition with those of other countries.

* * * * * * *

In these days, when space and time are no obstacles to the intercourse of nations, when international barriers, formerly so obstructive to trade, are being rapidly removed, days and weeks count as much in the world's business as months and years once did; and the United States can not afford to wait for the slow construction of the few ocean lines of steamers that it is proposed to put in operation under the subsidy system.

One of the potent causes, in the estimation of many intelligent and experienced seamen, which has contributed to the decline in our for-

eign shipping was the substitution of steam for sails as a moving power for navigation and the use of iron and steel for wood as a material in constructing sailing and steam ships. As long as wood constituted the chief part of the material used in constructing vessels the advantage was altogether with us, but with the substitution of iron and steel for wood and steam for sails the advantage we had hitherto enjoyed over our British rivals was lost.

As early as 1857, in an article in the New York Journal of Commerce, Captain Codman, an intelligent and practical American sailor, called attention to the effect which this revolution in shipbuilding and ship navigation was likely to produce. He said:

In an article written some months since it was assumed that steam was destined to become the great moving power for navigation, and that it would supplant almost entirely the use of sails.

Experience is every day justifying this view, and still more is it becoming evident that steam will serve for the transportation of very much of the merchandise now carried by sailing vessels.

In fact the time is not far distant when the latter class of ships will be required for only articles of great bulk and comparatively little value.

The only question now is, who are to be the gainers by this revolution in navigation?

Maintaining then as now that the screw must supersede the side-wheel for all purposes, and that iron screw steamers are in all commercial respects preferable to wood steamers, the argument was advanced that England, being able to construct this class of vessels more economically than we can, must of necessity have the monopoly of building.

Her monopoly in this respect we can not prevent, but it depends on ourselves and our Government whether she shall share with us the monopoly of owning and sailing them.

I have taken—

Continues Captain Codman—

a bold and it may be apparently an unpatriotic stand in assuming that the only way in which we can participate in ocean steam navigation is in so changing our laws that we may buy her (England's) steamers as she now buys our sailing vessels, because she finds it for her interest to do so.

The evidence of this same Captain Codman is reported in the hearings had before the committee in charge of this bill, and an observation and experience of more than thirty years since he expressed these views seem only to have confirmed him in his original opinion. I am not unaware of the fact that the friends of this measure seek to invalidate the testimony of this witness by assailing his motives, but their assault is no answer to the facts he states.

With the introduction of iron and steel we not only lost the advantage of cheap material, but as the iron ship was shown to be more durable, of greater stability and strength, and better adapted to the perils of the sea, especially when driven by steam, it ought to have been apparent to all, from the beginning, if we were to hold our commerce we would have to abandon our wooden ships and substitute the more modern and better vessels of iron and steel.

There has never been a period since iron ships were shown to be safe upon the ocean when it did not cost from 20 per cent. to 50 per cent. more to build them in the United States than in England or Scotland.

To insure successful competition our shipowners and shipbuilders had the right at least to expect that the Government would, as far as possible, place them on an equal footing with foreigners; but this it has refused to do, not only by preventing our citizens from buying ships where they could get them cheapest, but by steadily maintaining a system of high protection not alone on iron and steel, but on almost every article that enters into the construction of a ship, as the following statement will show.

The following are the duties on the principal materials for shipping as they exist at present:

Wrought iron for ships and steam engines, 2 cents per pound.

Cables and cable chains: Of iron or steel of not less than ⅞ inch diameter, 1¾ cents per pound; of iron or steel of less than ⅞ inch diameter, 2 cents per pound.

Anchors and parts of anchors, 2 cents per pound.

Boiler and other plate iron, 1½ cents per pound.

Nails and spikes: Brass composition and copper, 45 per cent.; iron or steel, cut, 1½ cents per pound; wrought spikes, 2 cents per pound; wrought nails, 4 cents per pound.

Cast-iron steam pipes, 1 cent per pound.

Rolled or hammered iron, .8 cents, 1 cent, or 1.1 cents per pound.

Screws: For wood, of 2 inches or greater length, 6 cents per pound; for wood, of 1 inch and less than 2 inches, 8 cents per pound.

Sheet iron, 1.1 cents or 1.2 cents per pound.

Copper sheathing, 35 per cent.

Wire rope, strand, or chain, pay in addition to the rates on the wire of which they are made: Iron, 1 cent per pound; steel, 2 cents per pound.

Wrought rivets and bolts, 2½ cents per pound.

Wrought steam and water tubes: Boiler tubes, 3 cents; other than boiler tubes, 2½ cents.

Steel in forms not otherwise specified: Value not over 4 cents a pound, 45 per cent.; above 4 cents and not above 7 cents, 2 cents per pound; above 7 cents and not above 10 cents, 2½ cents per pound; above 10 cents, 3½ cents per pound.

Tarred cable and cordage, 3 cents per pound.

Manilla (untarred) cable, 2½ cents per pound.

Other descriptions, untarred, 3½ cents per pound.

Sail duck, or canvas for sails, 30 per cent.

Tar and pitch: Tar, 10 per cent.; pitch, 20 per cent.

Plank, deals, and other sawed lumber of hemlock, $1 per 1,000 feet, board measure.

Timber for spars, free.

But it has been said during this discussion that material for shipbuilding is now admitted free of duties, and that this argument no longer illustrates anything. But it is pertinent in considering the causes which have operated so disastrously on our marine service, for it should be borne in mind that for nearly thirty years, and during which time there has been a steady falling off in our export and import trade and also in our tonnage, that almost every item, from the copper in the keel of a ship to the flag that floated over it, has been burdened with the onerous import duties shown in the preceding table.

If the present tariff law helps the shipbuilder by at last recognizing his right to untaxed materials in the construction of his vessels, it is none the less true that the provisions of that bill are well calculated to destroy his business, for the present tariff virtually excludes our people from all commercial intercourse with other nations, since many of its provisions amount to prohibition and are clearly in restraint of trade.

There will be no motive to build ships if we decline to trade. No country will trade with us if we refuse to take from them in exchange for their products nothing but gold. If we want to sell to others we must buy from them; we must barter and exchange, otherwise our ships can secure no business. If they run they will sail without a cargo.

The extension of our markets for the constantly increasing surplus of our products renders it a matter of the first importance not only that we establish fair trade relations with others, but that we should place ourselves in a condition to conduct that trade. In order to do this we must have what we have not got, a merchant marine; we must re-establish our position as a marine nation, and the best means for accomplishing this end ought to be adopted.

Discussing this subject, Mr. Wells says:

Viewing, then, the case from the standpoint of the relative importance of the several interests involved, and preferring the greater interest to the less, the policy which would seem to be in accordance with all true business principles and also with common sense would be for the Government to promptly allow every citizen of the United States who desired to purchase and use ships to freely exercise his own judgment in respect to sources of supply and not attempt to dictate to him, either directly or indirectly, what kind of ships he shall use, where he shall buy, or how much he shall pay for them.

And in recommending this policy it should be borne in mind that the nation is not asked to walk in any new or untried path, but upon a course whose every step is brilliantly illuminated by experience.

The view expressed by this author implies the necessity for a repeal of our present navigation laws, which have so often been the subject of severe criticism by those who have studied the causes of the decline in our foreign trade.

They have repeatedly pointed out the harshness and injustice of these statutes and steadily maintained that our ocean trade could never become prosperous until they were repealed or radically modified.

A brief examination of some of the provisions of this ancient and obsolete code will well illustrate the justice of the criticism made against it.

Turning to the chapter of the Revised Statutes entitled "Regulations of commerce and navigation," we are met on the very threshold with some of the glaring absurdities of these laws.

In section 4132 it is provided that to entitle a vessel to registration as an American ship it must be built in the United States, belong wholly to American citizens, or have been captured by American citizens and legally condemned as a prize of war.

It will be observed that there are two methods, and but two, by which our people can acquire title to ships with the privilege of sailing them under the United States flag—they must build them or capture them. It makes no difference that we can buy them from others from a third to one-half cheaper than we can build them. If they are to be sailed under the Stars and Stripes they must be built at home.

Section 4165 is not more liberal in its terms than the section already referred to. It provides among other things that a vessel once registered as such, but afterwards condemned by a foreign government or which by sale becomes the property of a foreigner, can not again be registered as an American ship, though it belong wholly to citizens of the United States.

Our citizens may sell their ships to foreigners, but they do so under the penalty of never thereafter being allowed to purchase them back. If they suffer them to be captured and condemned they lose their character as American ships.

Under the provisions of section 4135 an American vessel once registered as such, but afterwards authorized to sail under a foreign flag, shall not be entitled again to register as an American ship, although it may have become the property of American citizens.

Section 4142 requires the owner of a vessel, in order to obtain registry, to subscribe to a long and complicated affidavit, stating the name of his vessel, its burden, when and where built, the name of every joint owner, if any, the place of his abode, that such joint owner is a citizen of the United States, the interest of each joint owner, and that there is no subject or citizen of any foreign prince or state directly or indirectly, by way of trust or confidence or otherwise, interested therein, or in the profits or issues thereof, and that the master of the vessel is a citizen of the United States, and stating the manner in which or the means whereby he became a citizen; and the forfeiture of the ship and all its belongings is the modest penalty under this section for a false statement on any subject to which the affidavit relates.

Foreign capital invested in a vessel in any form disqualifies it for registry as an American ship. We invite and in many ways encourage foreign capital to come to this country. It may be lawfully embarked

in all manufacturing, agricultural, and mercantile enterprises, save alone in shipbuilding and ship navigation.

Upon what idea or sound rule of public policy these statutes are founded would be difficult to imagine. It is not strange, however, when their effect on our shipping interests is considered, that they should have been the subject of so much severe criticism. They ought to be repealed at once.

The following comment of Mr. Wells on these statutes is fully authorized. He says:

> We are accustomed, as we read of the sumptuary laws and arbitrary restrictions on commercial freedom in years long past, to congratulate ourselves as it were involuntarily that we live on a higher and different plane, and that among nations calling themselves civilized and enlightened such things are no longer possible.
>
> It would be difficult, however, to find in any record of past experience more absurdities and iniquities than are embodied in the so-called navigation laws of the United States at present existing, and in the details of their administration during the last quarter of a century.

In addition to the hardships and ruinous expenses which result in every instance to shipowners and shipbuilders under the operation of these harsh statutes, those who are struggling in an unequal contest to retain even a small per cent. of our carrying trade are not only constantly embarrassed and annoyed, but placed at a disadvantage by unreasonable collectors, surveyors, consular and diplomatic fees, and tonnage duties from which they should and must be relieved if we are in earnest about regaining our foreign trade.

The fact that this bill is molded after the French law neither increases its merits nor entitles it to more favorable consideration. France is not and never was our greatest rival, its exploits on the ocean do not furnish the best example of success.

But whatever the defects of the French navigation laws may be, it should be said to the credit of the French people that they are not so stupid as to prevent their citizens from buying their ships in whatever market they can get them the cheapest. Great Britain furnishes the best example of a successful maritime nation, and if we are to imitate the example of others or profit by the experience of those whose success illustrates the wisdom of their policy, it is to England rather than to France we must look for the model after which to fashion our shipping laws. The prosperous condition of England's commercial marine is in no wise due to a system of bounties, as is sometimes claimed.

Whatever progress that country has made as a marine nation has not been obtained by a systematic policy of appropriating large sums of money to encourage either ship using or shipbuilding; such has never been its policy.

All the assertions which have been made to that effect will be found, says Mr. Wells, "on examination to rest on no truthful or substantial basis, and are what may be properly designated 'historic lies,' originating in the first instance, without intent to deceive, through an imperfect understanding of the subject, and consequently repeated and given credence on the basis of some personal and supposed trustworthy authority, without any attempt to inquire further as to their accuracy."

The evidence is abundant and conclusive that the British Government has never at any time adopted a policy like that proposed by this bill; they have not attempted to encourage shipbuilding or ship using by paying bounties, as will be seen from the following extract taken from the published report of the late British postmaster-general. He says:

> And as a further proof that postal subsidies are not granted with the object of giving to English shipping any protection against the competition of the shipping of other countries, it may be mentioned that when a contract for the conveyance of mails is advertised, no restriction whatever is imposed upon any foreign vessel competing, and the subsidy would be paid to foreign-owned and foreign-built vessels if it were considered that the best and cheapest conveyance of mails would be thus secured.
>
> For some years a subsidy was paid by the English post office to a German steamship company for the conveyance of mails from Southampton to New York.

England has not expended a penny directly as a means of developing her merchant marine. If for commercial or military reasons she has deemed it expedient to establish mail communications with remote provinces, she has gone into the open market and in a business-like way invited the whole world to bid for the service, in every instance awarding the contract to the lowest and best bidder; and to secure the faithful performance of the contracts, bonds with heavy forfeitures and penalties are required.

If her navy was to be strengthened, plans and specifications for the character of ships needed were furnished, the kind of service to be rendered specified, and the price at which the Government should have the option to purchase the ship stated. The element of bounty in no instance entered into the contract; it was purely a business matter, in which the contracting parties stood upon an equal footing.

Regarding her navigation laws, which were, much the same as our own, a positive hindrance to her commercial prosperity, she dealt with them as she did with her corn laws—repealed them.

As a result of this wise policy, English tonnage rose from 6,490,485 tons in 1840 to 41,348,984 tons in 1880.

And now while we stand idly deploring the ruin that has overtaken our ocean trade, English ships are carrying the freight of the world; passing in sight of our very doors, they have not only monopolized the trade of our neighbors in the South and Central American Republics, but control our own export and import trade.

It may not be a pleasant reflection, but if we are to continue the struggle for a place in the race for trade upon the seas we shall have to adopt, at least so far as our navigation laws are concerned, the policy which Great Britain has adopted, and which in less than fifty years has made that country the greatest maritime nation in the world.

The people of the district which I have the honor to represent are not engaged in shipbuilding or ship navigation, but they are engaged in a business quite as important, that of agriculture.

These sturdy farmers are industrious, frugal, and enterprising, cultivating the most fertile lands on the continent. They ought to be prosperous and happy, but they are not.

For years these patient tillers of the soil have struggled, against the odds which a discriminating tariff and a contracted currency necessarily imposes upon them, to support themselves and families, but each succeeding year has brought them deeper in debt.

These farmers, grown weary in toiling and suffering, have correctly come to the conclusion that much of their ill-fortune is directly attributable to the evil character of our legislation. They have played the part of "hewers of wood and drawers of water" so long that they have at last concluded to demand class legislation in their own behalf.

Encouraged by scheming and impracticable individuals, they are asking now that the Government shall establish what they designate as "subtreasuries," in which they may store their corn, wheat, oats, cotton, and tobacco. But I have not heard of anyone in this House who was willing to become the advocate of this scheme. Of course it is a reckless, impracticable, and unconstitutional project, calculated to destroy those who demand it, but it is neither more unjust nor unconstitutional than the system this bill proposes to establish.

If the Government is to enter into partnership with shipowners and shipbuilders it ought, on principle, to assume the same relation towards the farmers. One of these schemes is just as bad as the other, and both are as bad as they can be, and I will not support either.

There is but one solution for the difficulties that confront us. Class legislation, the parent of high and unjust taxation, should cease, the free coinage of the silver dollar should be restored, and when this transpires the just clamor which the farmers and laboring people all over the country have raised will cease.

Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has disposed of three hours and fourteen minutes; the other side, three hours and nineteen minutes.

Mr. FITHIAN. I yield the residue of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have not time to discuss fully the question before the Committee of the Whole. I wish to call the attention of members to some details of the pending bill as distinguished from the principle involved in granting subsidies. The Senate bill differs materially from the substitute which has been reported by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The recommendation of our committee is to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert certain provisions which they have reported. I desire members to examine the details of this proposed substitute, for the reason that there will be found in them, as I think, some provisions which are very peculiar, to say the least.

The first section provides a sliding scale of bounties to be granted various classes of vessels. I have not time to read the section in full; but it prescribes various rates of payment to be made to different kinds of vessels, first as to sailing vessels, then as to steamers, and in regard to steamers the rate of payment is to depend upon the number of miles they travel in an hour. Now, I want to call attention to the fact that the rate of speed which a ship can make under favorable circumstances is "to be ascertained from a trial of four hours' run with the free board of an unarmed cruiser, by the Secretary of the Navy, and by him to be certified to the Treasury and Post-Office Departments." It will thus be seen that the highest possible speed a vessel may make on a trial trip, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Navy, is to be the test of the capacity of the vessel. But after its capacity has thus been marked and certified, the vessel may run as slowly as it pleases in carrying the freight contemplated by the bill.

In the second section there is a provision in regard to the amount of freight that a ship must carry in order to be entitled to a share of this bounty; and if I correctly understand this second section, its effect is that vessels of less than 16 knots of speed (ascertained as I have stated) not carrying the United States mails are not to receive any of this bounty unless they have one-fourth of the registered capacity in actual freights on board. That is correct, I believe.

Mr. FARQUHAR. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. But if on this trial a vessel runs over 16 knots an hour and does carry the mails, then it need not carry any freight at all in order to be entitled to share in the bounty provided by the bill. In this respect the bill differs from the Senate bill, and I think these are very important provisions and worthy of consideration.

It appears from the seventh section of the bill that these vessels are not required to carry the mails except on an outward voyage. On the return voyage they can refuse to carry the mails except for compensa-

tion, and may demand a price for doing so, to be ascertained, I suppose, afterward by the Post-Office Department. It also appears that in the second section of the committee's substitute there is omitted a very important provision which is found in the Senate bill. That provision is this:

Nor shall a vessel be entitled to payment under this act that makes any discrimination between or gives unequal facilities to competitive transportation lines in the receiving or forwarding of freights or passengers at any port or ports in the United States or at any foreign port.

For what purpose this very important provision of the Senate bill is omitted from the substitute of the House committee I do not know.

Taking the bill altogether, it seems to me the substitute proposed by the House committee has been prepared by the owners or agents of the shippers themselves, in order to get out of the bill all the advantages they can possibly derive.

The title of this bill is somewhat deceptive. It is styled "A bill to place the American merchant marine engaged in the foreign trade upon an equality with that of other nations."

Now, what is "an equality with that of other nations?" It would seem from this title that other nations have something like a uniform basis; but the record will show that in fact no two nations in the world have the same system of aid to ships. With what foreign nation are you going to put us on an equality? The system proposed in this bill differs from that of England, from that of France, from that of Italy; it is unlike the system of any other government with respect to aid to ships. Now, where is the "equality" to come in?

Under the policy of every other nation on earth that gives aid to ships the citizens of that government are allowed to purchase ships wherever they can get them, in any market of the world. There is nothing in this bill that even proposes to put us upon an equality with any other nation of the world. I can not see, therefore, the appropriateness of the title which has been selected, and before the consideration of the measure is concluded I shall offer an amendment to this title.

Mr. FARQUHAR. The committee has reported an amendment to the title.

Mr. SPRINGER Let us see what it is.

Mr. FARQUHAR. It is found on page 13 of the printed bill.

Mr. SPRINGER (reading):

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to place the American merchant marine engaged in the foreign trade upon an equality with that of other nations, to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and to strengthen the naval establishment."

Now, this does not change the point. If it is to strengthen the naval establishment, it ought to be proven that there will be more men in the merchant marine than before. But according to the example of France, as shown by the report here and by the statistics obtainable, that country is losing two thousand men each year from the naval service with a subsidy like this.

Again, Mr. Chairman, as to the cost. There is no definite estimate as to what that will be. It costs France about $2,000,000 a year, with less than one-fourth of our tonnage. I think that the total cost to us under the provisions of this bill will equal $8,000,000 a year for the first ten years, and for the next ten years there will be a gradual reduction of the bounty, but it will average a full bounty for five years, or $120,000,000 for the entire time—this is on the basis of the amount paid in France. Any increase in the tonnage will increase the bounty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FARQUHAR. You are counting the coastwise tonnage.

Mr. SPRINGER. I shall have to amend the title of the bill, I see.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I move that the committee now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. In obedience to the order of the House, all general debate is now closed on the bill. The gentleman from New York moves that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURROWS reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill S. 3738, had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (S. 1826) granting pensions to Powell's Battalion of Missouri Mounted Volunteers; and

A bill (S. 3046) granting a pension to Fanny L. Davis.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report of the Secretary of State, and accompanying documents, in relation to the execution of laws rogatory in foreign countries.

BENJ. HARRISON.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *February 26, 1891.*

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SWENEY], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. STONE], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINLEY], resign their positions on the following committees, respectively: On Education, Labor, Civil Service, and Claims, and if there be no objection the resignations will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will make the following committee appointments: Mr. ATKINSON, of West Virginia, on the Committee on Education; Mr. WADDILL, on the Committees on Claims and Labor; Mr. HARVEY, on the Committee on Indian Affairs and the Committee on Territories; Mr. WHITELAW, on the Committee on Civil Service Reform; and Mr. GEISSENHAINER, on the Select Committee on the Election of President and Vice President.

And then, the hour of 6 o'clock having arrived, the Speaker declared the House in recess, under the special order, until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 8 o'clock p. m. by Mr. BURROWS, who directed the reading of the following communication:

SPEAKER'S ROOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *February 26, 1891.*

I hereby appoint Mr. BURROWS as Speaker *pro tempore* for this evening.

T. B. REED, *Speaker.*

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the general deficiency appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. PAYSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question before the committee is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] to strike out the paragraph relating to the Pacific railroads in this bill.

Mr. SAYERS. Before the committee proceeds to consider that question I believe there is an amendment to be offered by some gentleman on the other side.

Mr. CLARK, of Wyoming. Either before or after the discussion.

Mr. SAYERS. I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that it will be better to let the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Wyoming be offered before the general debate begins on the paragraphs reserved.

The CHAIRMAN. It can be offered at the proper time, either before or after the discussion.

Mr. SAYERS. I would prefer that it be offered now before the discussion begins.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order passed by unanimous consent two hours remain for general debate. The gentleman from Illinois will control the first hour, the gentleman from Texas the other.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I do not know about that. I think the gentleman from Texas has the affirmative.

Mr. SAYERS. I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that if he proposes to open the bill to an amendment in regard to an agricultural college, that he do so now.

Mr. CANNON. I am not ready to do so yet. I have not been able to examine the amendment. By unanimous consent we can wait for a few moments until members come in.

Mr. SAYERS. Very well.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, pending that can I be recognized? I rise to discuss this question with reference to Pacific railroads. I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to proceed.

Mr. FITHIAN. For how long?

Mr. BIGGS. Well, not to exceed twenty minutes.

Mr. FITHIAN. I have no objection to that. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded. If members do not desire to discuss the pending motion the Chair will submit the question.

Mr. SAYERS. But the gentleman from Illinois has suggested that we wait for a few minutes until members come in, and it does occur to me that the Chair might bear with us for a little while.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is perfectly willing, but thought the time might be occupied.

Mr. BIGGS. The time could be occupied, but my distinguished friend from Illinois objects. [Laughter.]

[Mr. BIGGS withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding I would like to have the clauses read which are proposed to be stricken out.

Mr. BREWER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of my friend from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] to the suggestions made by the gentleman from California, and I sincerely hope that he will be able to answer the argument that has been presented.

Mr. SAYERS. If it suits the gentleman to make a suggestion in that line, I am very glad that it satisfies him.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out from line 23, on page 12, down to and including line 4, on page 14; and also line 16, on page 56, down to line 23, on page 56.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to this amendment.

Mr. SAYERS. I would like to have the clauses read.

The CHAIRMAN. That will come out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. SAYERS. It ought not to come out of my time to have read for the information of the committee the clauses which are to be stricken out.

Mr. CANNON. I am perfectly willing that it shall be read without coming out of the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

From line 23, on page 12, to line 4, on page 14:

"Payment to the Pacific railroads: The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to cause a careful examination to be made of the claims heretofore reported to Congress for services performed for the Government by the several Pacific railroads, their branches and leased lines, as set forth and described in House Executive Documents numbered 71 and 122, and Senate Executive Documents numbered 132 and 135, Fiftieth Congress, second session, House Executive Documents numbered 141, 174, and 394, and Senate Executive Documents numbered 210 and 211, Fifty-first Congress, first session, and House Executive Documents numbered 167 and 171, Fifty-first Congress, second session, and upon ascertainment of the amounts respectively due for services over the aided and nonaided or leased lines of said roads, to pay the same out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated; the amounts due for services over the aided lines to be paid into the Treasury on account of the indebtedness of said Pacific roads, as now required by law, and the amounts due for services over the nonaided or leased lines to be paid to the respective companies by whom the services were rendered, care being taken that the several amounts found upon such examination to be due and payable shall not include any claims that have been or may be included in any judgment obtained against the Government for like services rendered by either of the roads specified in the executive documents to which reference is made herein."

From line 16 to line 23, on page 56:

To Central Pacific Railroad Company, $801,094.31, with interest as provided by law from March 28, 1889, to January 26, 1891;

To Central Pacific Railroad Company, balance of a judgment not covered by the foregoing one, $1,113.32.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, if I can get the attention of the committee I will briefly state the effect of the amendment. The motion which I have made applies to three clauses in the bill. One of them is an indefinite appropriation and carries about $2,292,298.53; the other two clauses amount to $805,270.63; so that the entire sum involved is in the neighborhood of $3,097,506.16.

Now, I desire to invite the attention of the committee to the indebtedness of these roads to the Government, and this may be seen from the following statement, made by the Acting Secretary of the Treasury on the 3d instant:

Bonds issued in aid of the construction of the several Pacific railroads and interest paid thereon by the United States, and condition of Pacific Railroad sinking fund created by act of May 7, 1878.

Name of railway.	Principal outstanding.	Interest accrued and not yet paid.	Interest paid by the United States.	Interest repaid by companies.		Balance of interest paid by the United States.	Sinking fund.		
				By transportation service.	By cash payments, 5 per cent. net earnings.		Bonds.	Cash.	Total.
Central Pacific	$25,885,120.00	$123,425.60	$35,100,859.27	$6,184,058.02	$658,283.26	$28,258,517.99	$3,920,000.00	$7,821.44	$3,927,821.44
Kansas Pacific	6,303,000.00	31,515.00	8,965,683.09	3,857,092.11		5,108,590.98			
Union Pacific	27,236,512.00	136,182.56	37,214,280.81	12,567,388.23	438,409.58	24,208,483.00	9,546,450.00	44,764.78	9,591,214.78
Central Branch, Union Pacific	1,600,000.00	8,000.00	2,269,808.26	459,996.32	6,926.91	1,802,885.03			
Western Pacific	1,970,560.00	9,852.80	2,555,000.94	9,367.00		2,545,633.94			
Sioux City and Pacific	1,628,320.00	8,141.60	2,197,041.49	170,755.73		2,026,285.76			
Total	64,623,512.00	323,117.56	88,302,673.86	23,248,657.41	1,103,619.75	63,950,396.70	13,466,450.00	52,586.22	13,519,036.22

Mr. BIGGS. Is that upon both of the roads?

Mr. SAYERS. It is the indebtedness of all the bonded roads as shown in the monthly statement of the public debt. From this statement, the accuracy of which can not be questioned, we observe that their entire indebtedness to the Government on February 3, 1891, after deducting all payments made by them and including their sinking fund, was $115,377,990.04.

It will also be noted that the balance of interest paid by the United States on these bonds was $63,950,396.70. All of this indebtedness will become due and payable within the next six or seven years. Some of these roads, especially the Central Pacific, are in a confessedly bankrupt condition, and according to the statements repeatedly made to Congress by their officers, agents, and attorneys, they can not and will not pay this indebtedness. No gentleman will call in question this statement. The official records of the two Houses bear undisputed witness to the fact.

Those of us who are opposed to these items of appropriation do not deny that the Government is indebted to the roads in the sums which I have mentioned. We do not seek to impeach the validity of the judgment rendered. Our contention is that in view of the bankrupt condition of these roads, and in view of the further fact that the security which the Government holds to protect their indebtedness is wholly inadequate, it is our bounden duty to withhold payment, and apply the $3,097,506.16 as a credit upon their indebtedness to the Government.

Mr. BIGGS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. SAYERS. I can not. My time is very limited, and others desire to speak upon the question.

Mr. BIGGS. I did not suppose the gentleman would.

Mr. SAYERS. During the preceding administration no payment was made by the Government under appropriations by Congress for such items as these, and it was not until the present Comptroller of the Treasury gave the opinion which I will read that the Government committed itself to the policy of such an expenditure:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, SECOND COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1891.

SIR: Referring to your verbal inquiry this morning as to when payments were authorized to be made for current appropriations for claims for transportation services rendered to the Government over the nonbond-aided lines of railroad leased by the Southern Pacific Company of Kentucky from the Central Pacific Railroad Company April 1, 1885, I have the honor to state that since my decision of July 21, 1890, authorizing such payments, transportation services rendered over such nonbond-aided leased lines of railroad as were formerly regarded by the Treasury Department as being part of the Central Pacific Railroad have been paid for in cash from current appropriations.

With regard to your inquiry as to whether or not the earnings of the nonbond-aided portions of the Union Pacific Railway are used in payments to the sinking fund under the act of May 7, 1878 (20 Stat., 56-61), commonly known as the Thurman act, I have to state that they are so used, under the circular of the Treasury Department, dated June 23, 1887, but that a number of the nonbond-aided lines formerly constituting a part of the Union Pacific Railway are now controlled by the Oregon Short Line and Utah Northern and the Union Pacific, Denver and Gulf Railway Companies, with which the corporations owning them have consolidated, and payment for their transportation services since the consolidation is now made to them by direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, by indorsements dated January 31, 1890, and October 6, 1890, respectively.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully,

B. F. GILKESON, *Comptroller.*

Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

The propositions which I wish to submit to the committee for its consideration are:

First. The clause, involving $2,292,298.53, is indefinite in its character and it is not, in my judgment, fair or wise that such a method of appropriation should be permitted.

Secondly. These roads are, beyond all question, in a bankrupt condition, and according to their own deliberate confessions, made time and again in the most emphatic manner, they will not be able to pay their indebtedness when it matures, say in five or six years. The security which the Government holds is also confessedly inadequate, and for these reasons these sums due them and aggregating $3,097,506.16 should be withheld, to be applied as a credit upon their indebtedness to the Government, now amounting to about $115,377,990.04. And in view of the fact that these roads have been so extravagantly and so recklessly aided by the Government in lands, moneys, and special legislation of an exceedingly valuable character, it does occur to me that they should be more than willing to allow the credit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAYERS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, from the monthly statement of the public debt of the United States, which I hold in my hand, it appears that the Central Pacific Railroad, to whom this claim is due, on the 1st day of this month was owing the Government $50,215,816.55. You may say in round numbers $50,000,000. That is the net sum due after deducting the sinking fund, the bonds, and cash held in the Treasury under the Thurman law. The sum which it is proposed here to appropriate to that company is in round numbers $3,000,000. The debt due the Government by this road is not due and will not mature until the beginning of 1895. Ordinarily our claim could not be set off against theirs, for the reason that our claim is not due. As a legal proposition there is no dispute upon that.

Mr. BIGGS. I am glad of that admission.

Mr. COOPER, of Indiana. Yes, but there are other than strictly legal propositions involved in this settlement, and it is to these that I desire to invite the attention of gentlemen during the time assigned to me.

By the terms of the act of 1862, under which this road was built, it was provided that all compensation for services rendered for the Government should be applied to the payment of the bonds and interest advanced to the road by the Government. The law of 1864 changed this to one-half, but the law of 1878, commonly called the Thurman act, restored the original provision; and as the law now stands the Government has the right to retain and apply upon its debt the entire sum earned by said road in the service of the Government.

As to the original or bond-aided portion of the road this has been the practice, and no claim is made for that part of its service by the road. But this same corporation has built and leased and has been operating additional lines of road, and it is over these branches that the services were performed for which these claims are here made. It is not disputed, however, that these claims belong to and are the absolute property of the original corporation; in fact, judgments have been taken on them in its name, and the appropriation is here asked in its name. So it would seem that no question could arise as to the mutuality of the claims of the Government on the one side and this corporation on the other.

It is contended, however, and is not disputed, that the Supreme Court has decided that, because these services were rendered by the branch lines, they are not governed by these provisions of the statute; and that the amount due therefor can not by the authority thereof be retained by the Government and applied upon its debt. This the Supreme Court has decided, and this is all that the Supreme Court has decided. That is the only, the sole question that was before it. It was decided upon a demurrer to a complaint which contained only these facts, namely, that the services were performed by the road upon its branch lines and not upon the bond-aided line. No answer was filed, nor any affirmative matter set up by the Government, and judgment was pronounced accordingly.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is not only our right but our duty as the agents and representatives of the Government, to consider all the facts in this case and to pass upon this question in view of the situation as we find it.

Now, as I have said, ordinarily and at law, we would not have the right to withhold payment of this claim for the reason that our debt against the road is not yet due. But in this case we find an additional element, one which was not presented to the court, and one which I contend must control our action. And that is the insolvency of the claimant.

I do not know what range this debate may take, but I apprehend that it will hardly be denied that the Central Pacific Railroad Company, which owns and makes this claim, is an insolvent company. I hold in my hand the annual report of the Commissioner of Railroads, and read from page 7, where, speaking of this and other roads, he says:

> It is apparent beyond controversy that the subsidized roads can not discharge their obligations to the Government at maturity. Existing laws are wholly inadequate to secure the payment of the debts due and shortly to become due.

The commissioners appointed under the law to inquire into the conditions and management of these roads, in their report which I have before me, treat of and speak of them as insolvent debtors. In the very concluding sentences of their report, Commissioners Anderson and Littler, constituting the majority of the commission, in submitting a recommendation for a compromise with them, say:

> We do not recommend such reduction as one to which these companies are meritoriously entitled, but suggest it merely as a business method of effecting the best adjustment possible with these insolvent debtors.

Commissioner Pattison not only declares them insolvent, but recommends that proceedings be at once instituted to forfeit their charters, foreclose the Government's mortgage, and that the property be sold for whatever it would bring.

But not only so, Mr. Chairman, this corporation admits its own insolvency. It comes here in the person of its officers and by attorneys at each succeeding session of Congress, and declares its inability to meet its obligation to the Government and asks for new terms and further time.

Now, the question which presents itself to us, and which we are to decide is, shall we pay to this corporation this $3,000,000, which we acknowledge we owe to it, when it is indebted to us for more than $50,000,000, which is soon to fall due, but which it confesses it can not pay, and which the most sanguine of us never hope to be able to collect?

Mr. Chairman, we are not compelled to fall back upon our right to exercise the power of the sovereign and refuse to pay this claim because we are above the courts. We ought not to pay it. This is not a novel situation; courts of equity have often been called upon to meet this precise question, and so far as I am able to learn they have never failed to afford the remedy which we here invoke, namely, a suspension of the collection of a debt by an insolvent claimant where the debtor has a greater debt against the claimant but which is not yet due. It would be against all conscience to compel one man to pay a debt to another to-day because it was due, when that other has a greater claim which he might offset against it to-morrow, but which he would lose entirely on account of the insolvency of the first.

I call the attention of members to an authority, High on Injunctions, section 243 of which is as follows:

> The question of whether insolvency of the judgment creditor will of itself justify an injunction against the enforcement of a judgment at law upon the ground of set-off, especially when the set-off is of such a nature that it might have been pleaded at law, is one upon which there has been some conflict of judicial opinion. The affirmative of the proposition has been broadly asserted, and it has been held that such insolvency affords sufficient reason for enjoining the judgment, although the set-off was of such a character that it might have been urged in defense of the suit at law; and where the judgment creditor is indebted to the judgment debtor largely in excess of the judgment which he has obtained against him, and refuses to allow his judgment to be set off against such indebtedness, it has been held proper to enjoin the judgment, upon the ground that its enforcement under such circumstances would be unconscientious and a violation of moral duty.

This doctrine is, I think, uniformly upheld by our courts, and I do not doubt that had this phase of the question been presented to the Supreme Court in the case before us it would have so held.

It seems, Mr. Chairman, that this corporation has not at any time intended to meet its obligation to the Government. It could have done so long ago if its earnings had not been diverted and appropriated to build up the private fortunes of the men who were intrusted with the bounty of the Government.

I wish to call attention to the vast sums of money which this road has earned and to show where they have gone. From the report of the Commissioner to which I have alluded I call your attention to the following remarkable showing:

> The operation of the company appears to have been successful from its very inception. During the earlier years the company was entirely free from competition and charged very high rates both for freight and passengers. The result of this is shown in the percentage of operating expenses as compared with gross earnings, which, during the early period of the company, were as low as 23½ per cent. per annum, and at no time prior to 1875 exceeded 40 per cent. per annum.

From 1863 to the 31st of December, 1869—	
The gross earnings were	$10,807,508.76
Operating expenses	4,700,624.56
Leaving net earnings	6,106,884.20
Other credits	374,045.63
	6,480,929.83
Interest and taxes paid and Government requirements	4,053,396.03
Leaving absolute net	2,427,533.80
From the 1st of January, 1870, to the 31st of December, 1873, in which latter year the first dividend was paid—	
The gross earnings were	41,128,618.21
Operating expenses	17,485,371.69
Leaving net earnings	23,643,246.52
Other credits	2,167,318.29
	25,810,564.81
Interest and taxes paid and Government requirements	19,235,045.49
Leaving absolute net	6,575,519.32
From the 1st of January, 1874, until the 1st of January, 1884, which was the end of the dividend-paying period of the company—	
The gross earnings were	194,126,239.24
Operating expenses	108,431,267.78
Leaving net earnings	85,694,971.46
Other credits	8,191,532.17
	93,886,503.63
Interest and taxes paid and Government requirements	41,349,586.64
Leaving absolute net	52,536,916.99

During the period last mentioned the Central Pacific Railroad Company distributed to its stockholders in dividends the sum of $31,308,055. (See volume 5, page 2547.) But little stock was sold by Stanford, Huntington, Hopkins, and Crocker until 1880. Between 1873 and 1877 they were substantially the only stockholders of the Central Pacific Railroad. Nearly the entire amount of dividends declared during these years was therefore received by those four persons.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with these facts before us, showing beyond controversy that no effort has been made, and no purpose shown to pay the Government her debt, and it being practically conceded that it can not be collected, what excuse or justification will we find for turning over this money which we now have in our hands to further enrich the men who have so shamefully betrayed us? For my part I can not withhold the expression of some indignation that the claim should be made and of surprise that any Representative should seriously insist upon its payment.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SAYERS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. REILLY].

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Chairman, although the proposition before the committee involves the question of the general relations existing between the Government and these Pacific railroad companies, yet I do not deem it at all essential to enter into a discussion of that branch of the subject in order to arrive at a just, proper, and honest determination of the question now before the committee. Neither do I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is at all necessary from a legal standpoint, even if propriety permitted, that we should constitute ourselves a tribunal to

pass in review upon the judgment of the Supreme Court upon which payment of the present claim is based.

As has been well stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS], there is no one who questions that decision. We all cheerfully accept it and bow to it as good law; not only because it is announced by the highest judicial tribunal, but, speaking for myself, because in my own humble opinion it was a sound conclusion and the only one the court could arrive at under the state of facts before it. The whole foundation upon which this claim rests is based upon that decision.

Let us see what it is and what it involves and to what extent it goes. The Central Pacific Railroad as originally constructed was aided by the Government in the loan of funds and grants of public land. Since the construction of that road it has acquired and operates, owns or controls, a number of other lines which are termed nonaided lines as contradistinguished from the main road which was aided by the Government as I have stated. Upon this system, including both the aided and the nonaided lines——

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman allow me to suggest that the Southern Pacific operates the Central Pacific and the leased lines?

Mr. REILLY. Yes, the Southern Pacific now operates the Central Pacific system under leases, but all the services and the contracts and the claim that is now before the House have been and are in the name of the Central Pacific, and so far as this question is before us, our consideration of it is confined to that. Now, Mr. Chairman, under the Thurman act (act May 3, 1878), which provided that compensation for services rendered by this company to the Government in the transportation of troops and supplies, etc., and 25 per cent. of its net earnings should be paid annually by the company into the Treasury as a sinking fund to meet its debt at maturity, the Government undertook to retain or withhold all of the compensation due to the railroad company for services rendered in the transportation of troops and supplies.

Mr. CLUNIE. Has the company defaulted to the Government under the Thurman act?

Mr. REILLY. No, sir; it has not defaulted under the Thurman act. The railroad company denied the right of the Government to withhold from it any of the amounts due for services rendered in the transportation of troops and supplies over what were called the nonaided lines. To settle this controversy between the company and the Government, the suit in which the judgment in this case was rendered was instituted, and all that was decided in that case was simply and solely the question that, as to the nonaided portion of the system, the Government could not withhold compensation for services rendered by the company under the provisions of the Thurman act.

But we are now confronted with an entirely different proposition. It is admitted on all sides that these companies are insolvent, hopelessly so, and that they are to-day, and will be at the maturity of the debt, totally unable to discharge a single dollar of the indebtedness to the Government. It is admitted that the liens upon the property of the Central Pacific Company prior to that of the Government's security is equivalent to the value of the property and will exceed it. Now, I assert here, without fear of successful contradiction, that in all the litigation that has ensued in past years between these railroad companies and the Government, growing out of the transaction, no decision can be found in which it was held that under the state of facts now appearing before this House the Government would not be entitled to set off its indebtedness against this claim of the company. In other words, I plead "payment" to this judgment and contend that in law and in equity it has already been paid.

Let us see, remembering always the admitted insolvency of the company, what the facts are as to the financial status of this company to the Government. Let me show it:

The subsidy bonds issued to aid in its construction amounted to $27,855,680, and the United States had paid as interest thereon the sum of $36,820,189.81. There had been repaid by the company, in transportation services and cash, the sum of $11,349,104.42, making a net liability on June 30, 1890, of $53,326,765.39. The excess of interest paid by the United States over all credits amounted to $25,471,085.39. The amount found due under the act of May 7, 1878, for the year ending December 31, 1889, was $158,242.89, whilst the United States paid during the corresponding period the sum of $1,671,310.80 interest on the bonds issued to this company.

Therefore, I contend, Mr. Chairman, that we would not be justified under this state of facts in making any appropriation for the payment of this claim. Although the claim here is founded on services performed on what are called nonaided lines, yet we must bear in mind that the claimant is the debtor of the Government, and that said lines are owned and operated by it. No third party seeks to intervene, and the case therefore stands as between the company and the Government.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, not at all questioning the judgment of the court, we have some duty here in the premises. It devolves upon us to say, as a matter of duty, whether we are justified under the facts now before us, we will vote the money of the people to pay this claim.

The Committee on the Pacific Railroads have considered the relations of these companies to the Government, and a majority of that committee have reported a bill favoring an extension of time and a new security in lieu of the old.

I have not assented to the report on that bill, and I had hoped that I might have opportunity to express my views on this subject at more length, but as it appears that subject will not be called up for action at this Congress, and not deeming it pertinent to the question now before us, I shall not attempt to dilate upon it, especially as my time is limited. There is no court of equity or law in the land; there is no member of this House, who, in his individual capacity, related in like circumstances to a debtor would entertain seriously the proposition to pay any such claim. I shall therefore vote for the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] to strike out this appropriation.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CLUNIE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for five minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] controls the time.

Mr. CLUNIE. But I have a right to make that request.

The CHAIRMAN. Not under the order of the House.

Mr. CLUNIE. I wanted to ask the gentleman two or three more questions, and he was just getting into the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas controls the time.

Mr. SAYERS. I trust that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] will now proceed.

Mr. CANNON. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN].

Mr. CRAIN. Mr. Chairman, the motion of my colleague [Mr. SAYERS] is, as I understand, to strike out the two paragraphs which provide for appropriations for the aided and the nonaided lines controlled by the Central Pacific Railroad Company; and he bases that proposition on two grounds: First, that the appropriation on pages 12 and 13 is an indefinite appropriation; and secondly, that the Central Pacific Railroad Company is indebted to the Government. Both of these statements are inaccurate.

There is not a particle of proof in the record of the history of the Central Pacific road and the nonaided roads to justify the statements made by my colleague and by other gentlemen who have spoken on this subject. Against their statements I put a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. In the case of the Union Pacific Railroad Company (and the status of that company and of the Central Pacific are exactly identical) the Supreme Court says:

The company owes the Government nothing that is due; and the Government has the security which by law is provided.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the paragraph on pages 12 and 13 does not specify the exact amount which is to be appropriated; but it is a familiar maxim that "that is certain which can be rendered certain;" and the very object of the paragraph is to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to determine the exact amount of the indebtedness of the Government to these roads.

What can be more certain than the authorization conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury to ascertain by proper methods the exact amount which the Government owes these roads? And, Mr. Chairman, as an evidence of the fact that this appropriation is not indefinite, we have the statement of the gentleman himself when he calls the attention of the committee to the fact that it will necessitate the expenditure of over $3,000,000.

Mr. SAYERS. Will my colleague allow me to interrupt him a moment?

Mr. CRAIN. If you give me time I will; otherwise I will not. I repeat that the very statement of the gentleman himself as to the amount shows conclusively that his proposition is not tenable. And I will add for the information of this committee that this paragraph which he seeks to strike out by his amendment is an exact copy of a suggestion made by the Treasury Department itself, which is contained in the report of the committee. It is *verbatim et literatim* the same. The Secretary of the Treasury suggests what should be incorporated in this bill, and the majority of the committee have incorporated the proposition embodied in the letter of the Secretary, just as it has been sent to the committee.

Now, my friend states that under the Democratic administration no payment was made on account of this claim; that this matter was ignored. Why, sir, my friend has certainly forgotten the fact that Secretary Fairchild, on the 2d day of June, 1886, issued an order to the accounting officers of the Treasury to abide by the decision of the Supreme Court upon the very question involved in this paragraph. He tells the accounting officers of the Treasury Department that the Supreme Court of the United States, upon a case carried up from the Court of Claims, has decided that these roads are entitled to their money, and that the Central Pacific Railroad Company, which represents them, is entitled to receive it, and he instructs them to act accordingly.

Yet the gentleman has the temerity—perhaps, however, he may not know the facts and I withdraw the term "temerity"; for some reason or other he asserts before this committee that under the Democratic administration these roads were ignored in reference to these accounts and claims which they presented for adjudication and payment.

But if we admit for argument's sake (though I deny it absolutely as a fact) that the appropriation in the paragraph, on pages 12 and 13, is indefinite, what has the gentleman to say about the appropriation on page 56? Is not that definite enough?

Does not that specify exactly the amount which the Supreme Court of the United States decided that the Government owed the Central Pacific Railroad and the nonaided roads? Eight hundred and four thousand dollars in round numbers constitutes the amount which the Supreme Court adjudicated as due to this road. Upon what was this adjudication based? An acknowledgment of the Government through the Attorney-General that the debt was due. Both parties appealed this case from the Court of Claims; but the claimants dismissed their case in the Supreme Court, and the representatives of the Government agreed that the Supreme Court should affirm the judgment of the lower court as to the amount embraced in the paragraph on page 56. Those are the facts in the case.

As to the second proposition, that the Central Pacific Railroad Company is indebted to the Government and is insolvent, I will ask any lawyer on this committee whether there is any such thing as perpetual insolvency. I will ask any lawyer on this committee to answer this question: What constitutes insolvency? The answer is, the inability of an individual or a corporation to pay his or its debts.

Mr. MCKENNA. As they fall due.

Mr. CRAIN. As they fall due. Is this railroad company insolvent? It does not owe one dollar in the world—not one dollar.

Mr. CLUNIE. Not one dollar which is due.

Mr. CRAIN. There is an obligation outstanding against this company which it hereafter has to meet. As to its capacity and ability to meet that obligation I shall have something further to say; but at present I will only remark that the Supreme Court of the United States has said that this company owed nothing to the Government. It has complied with every obligation entailed upon it by the law of 1862, by the law of 1864, by the law of 1878, known as the Thurman act.

Every dollar that it earns from the Government is retained for the payment of the interest on the Government bonds. Twenty-five per cent. of its net earnings are paid into the Treasury annually, in order to pay the principal of the bonds as they mature. Let any man who opposes these paragraphs, who favors the amendment of my colleague, put his finger on a single item of indebtedness of this company to the Government which it has failed to pay up to date.

Ah, but says the gentleman, the debt will become due after awhile and you must hold this money to meet the obligations at maturity. Now, I ask this question: Suppose I borrow $10,000 from my friend and I give a mortgage upon a piece of land—a lot in a town—with the understanding that the money is to be used to erect a storehouse for business purposes on the lot, and I agree to pay him 10 per cent. interest semiannually upon the loan, and 25 per cent. on the net profits arising from the business carried on in the storehouse which I have built on the land. So long as I pay the semiannual installments of interest, so long as I pay the 25 per cent. of net profits of the business conducted in that storehouse, has he any right to ask me to pay him 25 per cent. of any profits on business I may conduct in other storehouses that I have built out of the proceeds of the concern I established upon the lot I mortgaged to him? That is exactly the case with these Pacific railroads. It is none of his business what I do with the proceeds of my business provided that I pay him the semiannual installment of interest and the 25 per cent. of the net proceeds of the business I conduct in my storehouse.

But is it true, as said by my colleague, that we have the power to do this? Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have the power. But there is a vast difference between power and right. He has the power to beat every boy he meets on Pennsylvania avenue, as he retires to his home. But has he the right to do it? The United States has the power to send troops to Nicaragua, or Guatemala, or any of the other small states of Central America, to take possession of any one of those countries and establish a protectorate over it. But has the United States the right to do that? Not at all.

The gentlemen who are in favor of this amendment would condemn a man as dishonest who would refuse to pay his debt, having the money in his possession. They would say that he was a criminal and ought to be sent to the penitentiary, and yet representing the Government of the United States they advocate the same policy on the part of the Government which they reprobate and condemn in the individual citizen. By what right do you propose to hold this money?

The Supreme Court of the United States say you have no right. You had an opportunity, why did you not present your equities if you had any there? Simply because, Mr. Chairman, the court would have stricken out your answer, on demurrer or exception, from the docket, because you could not plead against the payment of this debt an obligation to mature in the future.

Mr. REILLY. Will the gentleman allow an interruption right in the line of that remark?

Mr. CRAIN. I can not yield. My time is limited.

As suggested by my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON, of Texas], if all of the creditors of this road and the other roads proposed to treat it as the Government proposes to treat it, the company would never be able to pay any of its debts. It goes on and improves its road within certain limits, because the Thurman act, and the Supreme Court passing on that act, decided that certain betterments should not be included in the charges to be taken out of the gross receipts to produce the net receipts, 25 per cent. of which are paid over to the Treasury of the United States.

But there is one thing which is lost sight of when these gentlemen talk of equities that do not exist; it is this: The road was built seven years before the act required it to be built, and the Government paid to the road for freight, for transportation, between seven and eight million dollars. The same freight, the same transportation, under the rates that were paid by the Government prior to the completion of the road would have amounted to the sum of about $56,000,000. So that this company and the Union Pacific by building their roads seven years in advance of the time required by law saved to the Government $48,000,000, and the portion saved by the Central Pacific road to the Government amounted to over $21,000,000.

But this has nothing to do with the issue before us. The question simplifies itself into this proposition: Has the Government of the United States, through Congress, the right—not the power, but the right—to set at defiance the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States upon the very items, upon the very accounts, upon the very claims that are incorporated in this act, and which the gentleman from Texas, my colleague [Mr. SAYERS], and those acting with him propose to strike out? Not only has the Supreme Court of the United States said this, but the Commissioner of Railroads has said the same thing.

The railway commission, appointed to investigate the accounts of the Pacific railway companies, has repeated it; and I appeal to my colleagues, Mr. GEARY, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. CLUNIE, and other gentlemen who have traveled over this road, to say whether the requirements of the law granting the charters to these companies have not been complied with, so far as the roadbed is concerned, and whether the roadbed is not in a good condition?

Mr. BIGGS. I answer yes.

Mr. CRAIN. The Railroad Commissioner has said the same thing. The Pacific Railroad Commission, in its report to the President of the United States, a Democratic President, has suggested to the Congress of the United States the adoption of some plan whereby there could be an extension of the time of the roads in the event of the inability of the roads to comply with the obligations at maturity.

I submit the order of Secretary Fairchild and the decisions of the Supreme Court:

ORDER OF SECRETARY OF TREASURY.

[Circular letter.—Central Pacific Railroad earnings.]

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., June 4, 1886.

The attention of the accounting officers of the Treasury Department is invited to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the United States, appellants, *vs.* The Central Pacific Railroad Company, respondents, No. 1291, calendar October term, 1885, rendered May 10, 1886, as to the right of the Government to withhold and apply, under the Thurman act, the compensation due the Central Pacific Railroad Company for transportation and other services for the Government over the nonaided portions of the lines owned, leased, or operated by such company, and hereafter the accounts and claims of the company for such services will be settled, adjusted, and paid in conformity to such decision.

All Department circulars heretofore issued upon the subject are modified accordingly.

C. S. FAIRCHILD, *Acting Secretary.*

SUPREME COURT DECISION.

[Supreme Court of the United States. No. 1291.—October term, 1885. The United States, appellants, *vs.* The Central Pacific Railroad Company. Appeal from the Court of Claims. May 10, 1886.]

The appellee, the Central Pacific Railroad Company, brought this suit in the Court of Claims against the United States to recover compensation for services rendered the United States in transporting persons and freight over those parts of its railroad in the building of which it had not been aided by the Government. The United States demurred to the petition on the ground that it did not allege facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action. The demurrer was overruled and judgment rendered in favor of the claimant for the sum demanded. From that judgment the United States have brought this appeal.

The appellee alleges in its petition that it was originally incorporated on June 28, 1861, under the laws of the State of California; that, with the aid of the grant of lands in alternate sections, and of bonds of the United States issued to it under the acts of Congress approved July 1, 1862, and July 2, 1864, it built, either directly or indirectly, and became the owner of, 865.65 miles of railroad. In addition to this line of road, the construction of which was so aided by the United States, the appellee, during the period covered by the petition, controlled and used 383.67 miles of railroad acquired by consolidation with other companies, and 1,791.35 miles of railroad leased by it from other companies, making 2,175.02 miles, all of which had been constructed, without any aid from the United States, under the said acts of Congress. The petition demanded pay for service of transportation rendered the United States over the 2,175.02 miles of railroad which had been so constructed without their aid.

The contention of the United States was that they were justified in withholding the compensation sued for by virtue of the provisions of section 2 of the act of May 7, 1878 (chap. 96, 20 Stat., 56), commonly known as the Thurman act. We do not think this contention is well founded.

The act of July 1, 1862 (chap. 120, 12 Stat., 489), was passed to "aid," so the title declared, "in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure to the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes." The act of July 2, 1864 (chap. 216, 13 Stat., 356), was an amendment to the act of July 1, 1862.

By these acts certain railroad companies were aided in the construction of their roads. Among them was the appellee, which built the 856.66 miles above mentioned. It was aided in the construction of this part of its road by an issue of bonds made to it by authority of the acts of July 1, 1862, and July 2, 1864. The act of July 1, 1862, made the following provisions to secure the payment of the principal and interest of the bonds issued:

SEC. 5. * * * "The issue of said bonds and delivery to the company shall *ipso facto* constitute a first mortgage on the whole line of the railroad and telegraph," etc.

SEC. 6. "The grants aforesaid are made upon condition that said company shall pay said bonds at maturity, and shall keep said railroad and telegraph line in repair and use, and shall, at all times, transmit dispatches over said telegraph line, and transport mails, troops, and munitions of war, supplies, and public stores upon said railroad, for the Government, whenever required to do so by any Department thereof, and the Government shall at all times have the preference in the use of the same for all the purposes aforesaid; * * * and all compensation for services rendered for the Government shall be applied to the payment of said bonds and interest, until the whole amount is fully paid; * * * and after said road is completed, until said bonds and interest are paid, at least 5 per cent. of the net earnings of said road shall also be annually applied to the payment thereof."

By the act of July 2, 1864, it was provided as follows:

"SEC. 5. * * * Only one-half of the compensation for services rendered for the Government by said companies shall be required to be applied to the payment of the bonds issued by the Government in aid of the construction of said roads."

These sections, taken together, constitute the contract between the United States and the appellee. (United States *vs.* Union Pacific Railroad Company, 91 U. S., 72; Sinking-Fund Cases, 99 U. S. 700, 718; Union Pacific Railroad Company *vs.* United States, 104 U. S., 662.) This contract is binding on the United States, and they can not, without the consent of the company, change its terms by any subsequent legislation. (Sinking-Fund Cases, *ubi supra.*)

These provisions of the statute law of the United States being still in force, Congress passed the act of May 7, 1878, being the Thurman act, above referred to. The preamble of this act mentions by name the companies which had been aided by bonds of the United States under the acts of July 1, 1862, and July 2, 1864. The first section declares how the net earnings referred to in those acts shall be ascertained, and the second section provides as follows:

"That the whole amount of compensation which may, from time to time, be due to said several railroad companies respectively for services rendered for the Government shall be retained by the United States, one-half thereof to be presently applied to the liquidation of the interest paid and to be paid by the United States upon the bonds so issued by it as aforesaid, to each of said corporations severally, and the other half thereof to be turned into the sinking fund hereinafter provided, for the uses therein mentioned."

The case turns on the true interpretation of this section, the appellants contending that it authorized them to retain compensation earned for transportation over all the roads owned or leased by the appellee, whether the construction of such roads had been aided by the issue of Government bonds or not, and the appellee contending that the compensation referred to was that earned by transportation over that part only of its lines which had been assisted by the Government subsidy.

The acts of July 1, 1862, July 2, 1864, and May 7, 1878, all relate to the same subject. The latter act is declared by its title to be amendatory of the first two, and its last section provides that each and every of its provisions shall be "held as an alteration and amendment" of the two acts first mentioned. The three acts are, therefore, to be construed together as one act, and one part to be interpreted by another. (United States *vs.* Freeman, 3 How., 556, 564; Crespigny *vs.* Wittenoom, 4 T. R., 793; Commonwealth *vs.* Slack, 19 Pick., 304.)

One of the provisions of the act of July 1, 1862, closely allied to the one under consideration, was construed by this court in the case of United States *vs.* Kansas Pacific Railway Company (99 U. S., 455). The Kansas Pacific Railway Company was one of the companies to which the United States issued bonds in aid of the construction of its road under the act just mentioned. Assisted by this issue of bonds, it had built 393⅛ miles of road. It afterwards built 245 miles without aid from the Government. The United States brought suit against the company to recover the 5 per cent. of net earnings, to be applied to the payment of the bonds and interest, as provided by section 6 of the act of 1862.

One of the controversies in the case was whether the Government was entitled to the 5 per cent. net earnings on the part of the road which had been built without Government aid. This court decided that it was not. Speaking by Mr. Justice Bradley it said: "We are of the opinion * * * that the subsidy bonds granted to the company, being granted only in respect of the original road, * * * are a lien on that portion only, and that the 5 per cent. of the net earnings is only demandable on the net earnings of said portion." With this decision in view it would be impossible to hold with any show of reason that the compensation for services rendered the United States, which by the same section was required to be applied to the payment of the same bonds, included compensation for services rendered by a road the construction of which had not been aided by the issue to the company of Government bonds.

In the case of United States *vs.* Denver Pacific Railway Company (99 U. S., 460), decided at the same term, and in which the judgment was delivered by the same justice, it was held that the United States had no right, under the sixth section of the act of 1862, to retain compensation for services rendered upon a road the construction of which it had not aided by its bonds. The ground upon which the court placed its decision was that the Government had no lien except upon a road which it had so aided, and could retain neither the 5 per cent. of the earnings of a road to which it had issued no bonds nor compensation for transportation services thereon.

This court having thus interpreted the act of July 1, 1862, we can not, consistently with the established rules of construction, give a different meaning to substantially the same words in the act of May 7, 1878 (Reiche *vs.* Smythe, 13 Wall., 162). In the act of July 1, 1862, the provision is, that "all compensation for services rendered for the Government shall be applied to the payment of said bonds." In the act of May 7, 1878, the words are, that "the whole amount of compensation * * * for services rendered for the Government shall be retained by the United States," one-half to pay interest and the other half to be turned into the sinking fund. If the two acts are to be construed together and as one act we must give the same meaning to like expressions in both. We can not say in one case that the compensation mentioned means compensation only for services on aided roads, and in the other that it includes compensation for services on roads not aided.

There is another view of this controversy which seems to us conclusive. As the contract between the United States and the railroad company contained in the acts of July 1, 1862, and of July 2, 1864, has been interpreted by this court to authorize the retention by the Government of compensation for services only on those roads which the United States aided in building, the construction which the appellants seek to put on the second section of the act of May 7, 1878, would not only render that section a breach of faith on the part of the United States, but an invasion on the constitutional rights of the appellee.

We are bound, if possible, so to construe the law as to lay it open to neither of these objections (Broughton *vs.* Pensacola, 93 U. S., 266; Red Rock *vs.* Henry, 106 U. S., 596; Hobbs *vs.* McLean, decided at the present term, and cases there cited; United States *vs.* Coombs, 12 Pet., 72). The construction contended for by the appellee preserves the good faith of the Government, and frees the act from the imputation of impairing rights secured by the Constitution of the United States.

In our view the construction of the second section of the act of May 7, 1878, is plain, and not fairly open to controversy. By the act of July 1, 1862, "all compensation for services rendered for the Government" was to be applied to the payment of the bonds issued by the United States to aid in building the road. By the act of July 2, 1864, only "one-half of the compensation for services rendered for the Government" by said company was required to be applied to the payment of the bonds. The act of May 7, 1878, merely restored the provisions of the act of July 1, 1862, and again required all compensation for services rendered the Government to be applied to the payment of the bonds. This compensation, as we have seen, has been limited by the decisions of this court to compensation for services rendered by the aided roads. The construction of the second section of the act of May 7, 1878, contended for by the appellees is therefore right.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, I will answer my colleague briefly. He says that this is not an indefinite appropriation. If the gentleman will examine the clause on the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth pages of the bill he will find that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to examine and audit certain accounts, and after it shall have been determined what is due, to pay them. He will find no appropriation of a definite sum of money.

Mr. CRAIN. That is certain which can be made certain, and you yourself have told us the amount, and you are no accountant.

Mr. SAYERS. That is what constitutes an indefinite appropriation. My friend should inquire into the difference between a definite and an indefinite appropriation before he proposes to criticise me. Let me tell him another thing. Not a dollar was paid during the Cleveland Administration under specific appropriations by Congress for such items as these, and I have the testimony of the present Comptroller of the Treasury to support the statement. That gentleman says:

Referring to your verbal inquiry this morning as to whom payments were authorized to be made for current appropriations for claims for transportation services rendered to the Government over the nonbond-aided lines of railroad leased by the Southern Pacific Company of Kentucky from the Central Pacific Railroad Company April 1, 1885, I have the honor to state that since my decision of July 21, 1890, authorizing such payments, transportation services rendered over such nonbond-aided leased lines of railroad as were formerly regarded by the Treasury Department as being part of the Central Pacific Railroad have been paid for in cash from current appropriations.

And this officer has directed to be paid in pursuance of this opinion the sum of $25,744.28 during this Administration, leaving a balance of over $3,000,000, as embraced in the items in this bill.

Now, let me say to my colleague, that in this contest between these bonded railroads whose owners have grown rich, have become millionaires, who own large principalities of domain through the bounty and munificence of the Government—in this contest between them and the people, I shall stand by the people, whatever he may say to the contrary notwithstanding [applause], and I appeal to this side of the House, who are not dependent upon the Pacific roads, to see to it that no injustice is done the people in this matter. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]. I will ask how much time I have occupied.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has occupied four minutes.

Mr. DOCKERY. I will give to the gentleman from Texas two minutes.

Mr. SAYERS. I yield fourteen minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, the real question in the discussion, as I understand it, is whether under existing circumstances it is incumbent upon this committee to appropriate certain moneys for services rendered to the United States over and upon the nonaided Pacific railroads. For such services in part the Central Pacific Railroad Company already has a judgment rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States against the Government.

Any argument against this appropriation must successfully meet, I recognize, that aspect of the case. I shall confine myself to the Central Pacific Railroad Company's claim, because it is easier to gather the facts with respect to one particular company, and because the principle that applies to the Central Pacific Railroad Company applies to all the others. The first proposition to which I call the attention of the committee is this: That no relation of debtor and creditor exists, or can by any possibility exist, between the United States Government and the nonaided railroads.

The relation of debtor and creditor exists simply between the aided railroads and the United States Government, for the reason that the nonaided railroads belong to the aided railroads, either by virtue of a proprietorship of stock, or by virtue of a lease, or by virtue of an operating contract. So that we may just as well now dismiss the nonaided railroads from our discussion, so far as the question of debtor and creditor is concerned.

Let me illustrate. The Pennsylvania Railroad Company owns the line from Pittsburgh to Philadelphia. It leases the line from Philadelphia to New York. For services rendered over the line between Philadelphia and New York you are debtor to the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, not to the united railroads of New Jersey. So that the only party we have to deal with here now in this discussion is the Central Pacific Railroad Company. The question then is, what is the relation existing and what are the equities between the Central Pacific Railroad Company and the United States Government?

Some years ago Congress authorized the President of the United States to appoint a commission to examine into the relations existing between the United States and the bond-aided railroads. That commission made a report, and that report, together with a message from President Cleveland, was transmitted to Congress, and is now before this House. In the discussion of this question I shall rely upon the facts to be found in that report, and I shall therefore be in a position where nobody can question my statement of facts. What then, I ask,

is the relation of the Central Pacific Railroad Company to the United States Government?

Well, first and foremost, it owes it about $71,000,000. Under the acts of 1862 and 1864 the United States Government gave to the Central Pacific Railroad Company in bonds equivalent to cash $27,855,680.

The interest account that will accrue up to the date of the maturity of those bonds amounts to $50,140,224, and giving credit for the bond and interest account, it appears that at the maturity of the bonds the Central Pacific Railroad Company will owe the United States Government $71,792,524.65. It owes it in round numbers $70,000,000 to-day, a present debt, though payable in the future, as every lawyer knows.

Such being the case, my next proposition is that the Central Pacific Railroad Company is insolvent, not only insolvent, but fraudulently insolvent, to the detriment of the United States Government and of the people of the United States. [Applause.]

Let me show you how. And these are facts that no man can blink. The company is insolvent, in the first place, as a result of the difference between the apparent and the actual expense of construction, a matter that affects the capital stock; and I want to say here now that there is no such infamous story of political and commercial crime in all the one hundred years of our history as is to be found in connection with the construction of these railroads. [Applause.]

The Central Pacific Railroad cost in cash—and I use only round numbers—$41,000,000; it cost in bonds $18,000,000; it cost in stock $60,000,000, a total of $120,000,000 apparently. It actually cost $58,000,000, and four men constituting the stockholders of the Central Pacific Railroad Company, and at the same time the directors of the Central Pacific Railroad Company, and at the same time the construction company that built the Central Pacific Railroad, pocketed of the money of the people of this country, and have it to day, $62,000,000 of profits that they added to their capital stock account. [Loud applause.]

That is not all. They built a number of other roads, the total cost of which apparently was $82,000,000, but the actual cost of which was $27,000,000, and they pocketed in that connection $55,000,000. And when you read the finding of this commission of these disinterested men, acting in a judicial capacity—and I am quoting from the report of the majority of the commission, who found as much as they could in favor of these railroad companies—you will read this. I quote:

In general, it may be said to be established by the evidence that all the construction contracts and all the important contracts for materials and supplies were made between the Central Pacific Railroad Company and companies controlled by Stanford, Huntington, Hopkins, and Crocker. These four persons determined the terms of all these contracts and the result has been that through the payments made by the Central Pacific Railroad Company they have received as profits a vast amount of stocks and bonds. Those resulting from the construction contracts above stated represent over $100,000,000 in stocks and over $5,000,000 in bonds.

That is the first reason why, in my judgment, this railroad company is hopelessly and fraudulently insolvent.

The second reason I now proceed to give you. From 1863 to the 31st of December, 1869, the Central Pacific Railroad Company distributed to its stockholders in dividends the sum of $34,308,055. Between 1863 and 1869 Stanford, Huntingdon, Hopkins, and Crocker were substantially the only stockholders of the Central Pacific Railroad.

Nearly the entire amount of dividends declared during these years was therefore received by those four persons.

Now, let me give you the conclusions of the commission with respect to that:

Tested by the simple question of earnings, it is true that all of the above-mentioned dividends appear by the income account of the company to have been earned. But the distribution of this vast sum of money to these four persons, whose stock represented substantially no contribution whatever to the actual value of the railroad, was most improvident, and was in plain disregard of the obligation incurred by the company to the United States. The company had agreed to repay the debt and interest at the expiration of thirty years. How could it be possible, if the stock represented no actual contribution to the earning power of the company, and the earnings themselves were divided up among the stockholders, that adequate security could be found for the debt due to the United States, increased by the vast amount of its deferred interest, at the maturity of the debt?

The actual amounts put into the enterprise were the proceeds—

Mark you—

the proceeds of the first-mortgage bonds and of the United States loan; in all, about $10,000,000. By what magic was it expected that this property, after the wear and tear of thirty years' use, could afford any sufficient security for the repayment of its extravagant cost, increased by the interest accruing on a large portion of its debt, if all its current earnings were distributed to its stockholders, without making provision for the constantly increasing obligations? The ordinary dictates of prudent and honest management should have impelled the directors of this company to make suitable provision out of the large earnings, during the profitable years of its operation, to cover this impending debt.

That is the second reason why I say that this road is hopelessly and fraudulently insolvent. The third reason I allege is, that as this commission (and I can not stop here to read, as I see that the time flies) reports the earning power of the company is scarcely more than sufficient to pay the interest on the first-mortgage bonds and keep the road in running repair. That is the third reason why I say the company is fraudulently insolvent.

But there is a fourth reason, and that is this: The total funded debt of this company is $90,242,680, and Government experts in the employ of this commission in a report, which the commission thinks is an exaggerated report, testify that the entire system can be replaced for $50,000,000; so that the Government——

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SAYERS. I yield two more minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DALZELL. So that the Government's security is the second mortgage on a road not worth by $40,000,000 the amount of its funded debt. Another reason why I say it is insolvent is because this commission say that it is insolvent.

Another reason why I say it is insolvent is because the President of the United States, in his message sending this report of the commission here, declares it to be insolvent; but, last of all, better than all, because the company itself, in two Congresses at least to my knowledge, has sent its officers to the room of the Committee on Pacific Railroads and told them that if the Government did not make such terms as they saw fit to concede the Government never could get anything.

Now, then, since I must stop for want of time, what is the situation? A bankrupt, insolvent, broken corporation, that owes the Government $70,000,000, seeks to collect a debt of $3,000,000 against the Government.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is the whole of it.

Mr. DALZELL. And it seeks it why? Because it has the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States in its favor. I concede that judgment and its sacred character; I concede the right of the company to recover that judgment; and I want no lawyer to misunderstand my position. This is not a case, in my judgment, of a setting off of a judgment against judgment, nor of recoupment, nor of set-off at all. It is simply a case that comes within a principle that is hornbook law, and which I find expressed in terser and better terms than I could express it in 1 Black on Judgments, section 391:

As equity may order one judgment to be set off against another, so also it has the power to restrain the execution of a judgment when it is made to appear that the judgment defendant has a debt against the plaintiff—

A debt, mind you—

exceeding the judgment in amount, and that the latter is insolvent.

[Applause.]

Only one word more. I put it to every man upon this floor, I put it to your consciences, if the Central Pacific Railroad Company owed you $70,000,000 and got a judgment against you for $3,000,000 is there any legitimate power that you would not exercise to restrain the execution of that judgment? [Applause.] You would go into a court of equity for relief. But no execution can issue against the Government without its consent, and it does not need to go into a court of equity. We are that court of equity to administer its relief by withholding this appropriation.

Will you deal otherwise with the money of the people, of which you are a trustee, than you would deal with your own under the rules of prudence and good business management? [Applause and cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. CANNON. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKENNA].

Mr. MCKENNA. Mr. Chairman, as the chief beneficiary of the provision under discussion is, in a sense, a California road, I am justified in taking interest in what concerns it, and if the claim it has against the Government is legal and just, I am justified in advocating it. It has been asserted in this debate, and it is true, that the Union Pacific Railroad Company has been paid for the same kind of services that the appropriation in this bill is intended to compensate the Central Pacific Railroad for. If that is so, sir, I submit that the Central Pacific Railroad Company should be paid too. To pay one and not to pay the other is flagrant and unjust discrimination. Both roads owe the Government, or will owe the Government, millions of dollars. Both roads are, if we use the language and the reasoning of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], bankrupt. There is an equality of condition between them. Let us have an equality of treatment. And as a Representative from the West I dare express a hope that railroads owned in the West will receive the same consideration as railroads owned in the East. That much sectionalism I confess; or, rather, that much nationalism I proclaim.

And why should there be discrimination? Is it because, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania says, of a distinction in their management? Why, Mr. Chairman, the most frightful slanders of our politics fester about the management of the Union Pacific Railroad. The deepest crimson of shame that has ever come to the cheeks of this nation has come on account of those slanders. Yet the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], justifying himself by decisions of the Supreme Court, addressed to the House a calm and dispassionate argument in which he invoked beneficial and indulgent legislation for the Union Pacific Railroad! Now he exercises his indignation and his most artful and most ingenious power of discrimination against the Central Pacific Railroad. It makes a difference, evidently, where the road is owned, or where a gentleman comes from.

Mr. DALZELL. Not in my case.

Mr. MCKENNA. It appears to have done it in your case, and I commend you again to a consideration of your speech made in the last Congress in contrast with your speech this evening.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is conceded, because it could not be denied, that the legality of these claims, and to a legislative body which knows its duty legality means justice—it is conceded, I say, that the legality of these claims has been established by emphatic and elaborate decisions of the Supreme Court.

But gentleman think there is something in the nature of a set-off, although they deny it the legal term. A set-off! What set-off can there be which was not foreclosed by the judgment and in the judgment? And are we to be treated to or astonished by the anomalous spectacle of the lawmaking power of this Government evading or defying the law as established by the legal tribunals of the country, tribunals to which the Government is or ought to be as amenable as the humblest subject and citizen?

Why, sir, what respect can we, or our deliberations, or our conclusions, demand or hope for if we set this bad example? And, sir, the badness of the example will not be disguised by vituperation of only one railroad or of all railroads. But gentlemen feel the force of the decision and try to evade it, and, in a certain sense, intimate that the counsel who conducted the Government's case did not urge its defense, or that the court did not consider it—a severe arraignment of counsel and of the court.

Will gentlemen say that counsel or court were ignorant or corrupt? I opine not. Yet, sir, to that length their recklessness conducts; and because it does it will be wiser and more modest for us to consider that possibly our hasty judgments are not correct ones; that counsel as eminent as the Government counsel was, that a court as eminent as the Supreme Court was, did not neglect or overlook any of the defenses the United States had against the claim of the company.

Mr. Chairman, I have the highest respect for every lawyer who has engaged in this debate; but I insist that the Supreme Court knows some law, and knowing it and administering it and feeling its responsibility, that court would not have rendered a judgment which takes from the Government many millions of dollars, if there had been any offset to it or anything in opposition that could be recognized by a court as a legal or equitable defense. Therefore, I aver that the Supreme Court, with learned and complete care, not neglecting nor overlooking any defense of the Government, has established the legality and justness of the claims for the payment of which the bill appropriates. I propose to prove it.

The first case in which this question was considered is in 91 United States Reports. Mr. Chairman, to understand rightly the relations of the Government to the railroads, and the decisions explanatory and decisive of them, we must recur to the condition of the country and the purpose of Congress at the time these grants were made. We know, sir, that the grants to the railroads had their impulse in patriotism—a patriotism enterprising and conservative. In the graphic language of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, uttered in the speech to which I have already referred, "we cemented union and grasped at empire as well." And, sir, we were not disappointed. We achieved "empire as well." We gave wastes; we got back States and commonwealths. We gave solitudes; we got back busy and bright cities and towns. For the haunts of the buffalo we received the haunts of men.

And who, regarding the magnificent results that we achieved, and from what achieved, would undo what was done because, forsooth, it has brought to us problems whose solution may tease our prosperity as an insect might tease a leviathan? But, sir, if it should come to us as a serious problem how to secure or reimburse the liability of the Government, I am sure that we can and will solve it—solve it, I hope, with intelligence and propriety, and judgment, and firmness; solve it completely and at once, not in the piddling way proposed in this debate. Until that time comes let us keep our intermediate obligations faithfully and exactly, not anticipating our rights, being sure, as I have said, of insisting on them and providing for them when they do accrue. The company is not yet in default.

Mr. Chairman, we care too much about money and money reimbursements, but even in this we have not yet been losers. I was struck with the statement of my colleague [Mr. MORROW] in a speech made to-day on the shipping bill. He drew the attention of the House to the fact that the commissioners from whom the gentleman from Pennsylvania has quoted, in estimating the benefits to the Government by the construction of these roads and by the subsequent saving of expenditure, estimated from 1870 to 1885, at the rate for the cost for transportation before that time, the railroads had saved for the Government the enormous sum of $139,000,000—$25,000,000 more than the principal and interest of the bonded indebtedness. Of course, Mr. Chairman, this is no reason why these roads should not be compelled to fulfill their obligations in their time and according to their degree, or why we should pay anything that we do not owe. But, sir, such considerations will give us soberer judgment of our risks, soberer thoughts of our remedies.

But, sir, to recur to the authority I cited, The Supreme Court in the case of United States *vs.* Union Pacific Railroad Company (91 U. S., 72) defined the rights and relations of the Government and the roads under the acts of 1862 and 1864. It decided as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] says.

It—

The company, say the court—

owes the Government nothing that is due, and the Government has the security which by law is provided.

Under the act of 1862 the Government had a right to retain all the compensation earned by the roads for transportation of the mails, etc. Under the act of 1864 it had the right to retain only one-half. But the Government claimed the right to retain all, notwithstanding the act of 1864, on the ground of set-off, among other grounds, on account of interest paid by it. The court say that—

The general right of set-off exists in the Government and is commonly exercised by it when settling with those having claims against it. But manifestly the rules applicable to ordinary claimants for services rendered the United States do not apply to this controversy.

This, mark you, as to the subsidized and bond-aided roads.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MCKENNA. I should like a few minutes more to refer to other decisions.

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman three minutes additional.

Mr. MCKENNA. Thanks. But I submit to gentlemen of the House that it is impossible in three minnutes or in any short speech to answer that which has been thrown around this case by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and other gentlemen on this floor. But in the case to which I have referred the Supreme Court decided, as to the aided roads, that they could not recover one-half of the indebtedness. In 118 California Reports we have a case, comprehensive in its investigation, in which the language of the decision was so strong as to declare that not to allow the companies these transportation charges would be to invade their constitutional rights. I will append the decision to my remarks. It reviews the cases and defines the relations of the Government to the nonaided roads.

It is said that insolvency cut some figure. I deny it. I deny the application of the case urged before this House by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I say that insolvency does not entitle a court of law or a court of equity to set off a debt not due against a debt due. I deny as a legal proposition that this is a debt presently owed but only the payment postponed. That is an economical definition of a debt; but no lawyer ever heard that as a legal definition of a debt. Why, sir, if it were applied in our business affairs it would produce wholesale confusion and panic—insolvency everywhere.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing to justify the refusal of this payment except a false sentiment, and possibly some false politics.

A MEMBER. Claptrap.

Mr. MCKENNA. And, as a gentleman near me suggests, claptrap. It would be claptrap if it were not adorned by gentlemen of ability and sanctioned by them.

Now, I submit, in answer to the analogies of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that if there is any analogy between the Government and an individual, his analogy is against him. And why? Why, Mr. Chairman, this Government, as the sovereign power of the land, not only provides tribunals for rendering judgments, but provides law and procedure for making individuals pay the judgments when rendered. And if this Government was an individual, instead of a corporation, by to-morrow's sundown, by the mere processes supplied by this sovereign body, that judgment would be collected. It is only by a political power and refusing to do what it is our duty to do that we avoid payment by not making an appropriation. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The following is the decision of the Supreme Court referred to in the above remarks:

[Supreme Court of the United States. No. 1291.—October term, 1885. The United States, appellants, *vs.* The Central Pacific Railroad Company. Appeal from the Court of Claims. May 10, 1886.]

The appellee, the Central Pacific Railroad Company, brought this suit in the Court of Claims against the United States to recover compensation for services rendered the United States in transporting persons and freight over those parts of its railroad in the building of which it had not been aided by the Government. The United States demurred to the petition on the ground that it did not allege facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action. The demurrer was overruled and judgment rendered in favor of the claimant for the sum demanded. From that judgment the United States have brought this appeal.

The appellee alleges in his petition that it was originally incorporated on June 28, 1861, under the laws of the State of California; that, with the aid of the grant of lands in alternate sections, and of bonds of the United States issued to it under the acts of Congress approved July 1, 1862, and July 2, 1864, it built, either directly or indirectly, and became the owner of, 865.65 miles of railroad. In addition to this line of road, the construction of which was so aided by the United States, the appellee, during the period covered by the petition, controlled and used 383.67 miles of railroad acquired by consolidation with other companies, and 1,791.35 miles of railroad leased by it from other companies, making 2,175.02 miles, all of which had been constructed without any aid from the United States under the said acts of Congress. The petition demanded pay for service of transportation rendered the United States over the 2,175.02 miles of railroad which had been so constructed without their aid.

The contention of the United States was that they were justified in withholding the compensation sued for by virtue of the provisions of section 2 of the act of May 7, 1878 (chapter 96, 20 Stat., 56), commonly known as the Thurman act. We do not think this contention is well founded.

The act of July 1, 1862 (chapter 120, 12 Stat., 489), was passed to "aid," so the title declared, "in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure to the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes." The act of July 2, 1864 (chapter 216, 13 Stat., 356), was an amendment to the act of July 1, 1862. By these acts certain railroad companies were aided in the construction of their roads. Among them was the appellee, which built the 856.65 miles above mentioned. It was aided in the construction of this part of its road by an issue of bonds

made to it by authority of the acts of July 1, 1862, and July 2, 1864. The act of July 1, 1862, made the following provisions to secure the payment of the principal and interest of the bonds issued:

SEC. 5. * * * "The issue of said bonds and delivery to the company shall *ipso facto* constitute a first mortgage on the whole line of the railroad and telegraph," etc.

SEC. 6. "The grants aforesaid are made upon condition that said company shall pay said bonds at maturity, and shall keep said railroad and telegraph line in repair and use, and shall, at all times, transmit dispatches over said telegraph line, and transport mails, troops, and munitions of war, supplies, and public stores upon said railroad, for the Government, whenever required to do so by any Department thereof, and the Government shall at all times have the preference in the use of the same for all the purposes aforesaid; * * * and all compensation for services rendered for the Government shall be applied to the payment of said bonds and interest, until the whole amount is fully paid; * * * and after said road is completed, until said bonds and interest are paid, at least 5 per cent. of the net earnings of said road shall also be annually applied to the payment thereof."

By the act of July 2, 1864, it was provided as follows:

"SEC. 5. * * * Only one-half of the compensation for services rendered for the Government by said companies shall be required to be applied to the payment of the bonds issued by the Government in aid of the construction of said roads."

These sections, taken together, constitute the contract between the United States and the appellee. (United States *vs.* Union Pacific Railroad Company, 91 U. S., 72; Sinking-Fund Cases, 99 U. S., 700, 718; Union Pacific Railroad Company *vs.* United States, 104 U. S., 662.) This contract is binding on the United States, and they can not, without the consent of the company, change its terms by any subsequent legislation. (Sinking-Fund Cases, *ubi supra.*)

These provisions of the statute law of the United States being still in force, Congress passed the act of May 7, 1878, being the Thurman act, above referred to. The preamble of this act mentions by name the companies which had been aided by bonds of the United States under the acts of July 1, 1862, and July 2, 1864. The first section declares how the net earnings referred to in those acts shall be ascertained, and the second section provides as follows:

"That the whole amount of compensation which may from time to time be due to said several railroad companies, respectively, for services rendered for the Government shall be retained by the United States, one-half thereof to be presently applied to the liquidation of the interest paid and to be paid by the United States upon the bonds so issued by it as aforesaid to each of said corporations severally, and the other half thereof to be turned into the sinking fund hereinafter provided, for the uses therein mentioned."

The case turns on the interpretation of this section, the appellants contending that it authorized them to retain compensation earned for transportation over all the roads owned or leased by the appellee, whether the construction of such roads had been aided by the issue of Government bonds or not, and the appellee contending that the compensation referred to was that earned by transportation over that part only of its lines which had been assisted by the Government subsidy.

The acts of July 1, 1862, July 2, 1864, and May 7, 1878, all relate to the same subject. The latter act is declared by its title to be amendatory of the first two, and its last section provides that each and every of its provisions shall be "held as an alteration and amendment" of the two acts first mentioned. The three acts are, therefore, to be construed together as one act, and one part to be interpreted by another. (United States *vs.* Freeman, 3 How., 556, 561; Crespigny *vs.* Wittenoom, 4 T. R., 793; Commonwealth *vs.* Slack, 19 Pick., 304.)

One of the provisions of the act of July 1, 1862, closely allied to the one under consideration, was construed by this court in the case of United States *vs.* Kansas Pacific Railway Company (99 U. S., 455). The Kansas Pacific Railway Company was one of the companies to which the United States issued bonds in aid of the construction of its road under the act just mentioned. Assisted by this issue of bonds, it had built 393⅓ miles of road. It afterwards built 245 miles without aid from the Government. The United States brought suit against the company to recover the 5 per cent. of net earnings, to be applied to the payment of the bonds and interest, as provided by section 6 of the act of 1862. One of the controversies in the case was whether the Government was entitled to the 5 per cent. net earnings on the part of the road which had been built without Government aid. This court decided that it was not. Speaking by Mr. Justice Bradley, it said:

"We are of opinion * * * that the subsidy bonds granted to the company, being granted only in respect of the original road, * * * are a lien on that portion only, and that the 5 per cent. of the net earnings is only demandable on the net earnings of said portion."

With this decision in view, it would be impossible to hold with any show of reason that the compensation for services rendered the United States, which by the same section was required to be applied to the payment of the same bonds, included compensation for services rendered by a road the construction of which had not been aided by the issue to the company of Government bonds.

In the case of United States *vs.* Denver Pacific Railway Company (99 U. S., 460), decided at the same term, and in which the judgment was delivered by the same justice, it was held that the United States had no right, under the sixth section of the act of 1862, to retain compensation for services rendered upon a road the construction of which it had not aided by its bonds. The ground upon which the court placed its decision was that the Government had no lien except upon a road it had so aided, and could retain neither the 5 per cent. of the earnings of a road to which it had issued no bonds, nor compensation for transportation services thereon.

This court having thus interpreted the act of July 1, 1862, we can not, consistently with the established rules of construction, give a different meaning to substantially the same words in the act of May 7, 1878 (Reiche *vs.* Smythe, 13 Wall., 162). In the act of July 1, 1862, the provision is, that "all compensation for services rendered for the Government shall be applied to the payment of said bonds." In the act of May 7, 1878, the words are, that "the whole amount of compensation * * * for services rendered for the Government shall be retained by the United States," one-half to pay interest and the other half to be turned into the sinking fund. If the two acts are to be construed together, and as one act, we must give the same meaning to like expressions in both. We can not say in one case that the compensation mentioned means compensation only for services on aided roads, and in the other that it includes compensation for services on roads not aided.

There is another view of this controversy which seems to us conclusive. As the contract between the United States and the railroad company contained in the acts of July 1, 1862, and of July 2, 1864, has been interpreted by this court to authorize the retention by the Government of compensation for services only on those roads which the United States aided in building, the construction which the appellants seek to put on the second section of the act of May 7, 1878, would not only render that section a breach of faith on the part of the United States, but an invasion on the constitutional rights of the appellee. We are bound, if possible, so to construe the law as to lay it open to neither of these objections. (Broughton *vs.* Pensacola, 93 U. S., 266; Red Rock *vs.* Henry, 106 U. S., 596; Hobbs *vs.* McLean, decided at the present term, and cases there cited; United States *vs.* Coombs, 12 Pet., 72.) The construction contended for by the appellee preserves the good faith of the Government, and frees the act from the imputation of imparing rights secured by the Constitution of the United States.

In our view the construction of the second section of the act of May 7, 1878, is plain, and not fairly open to controversy. By the act of July 1, 1862, "all compensation for services rendered for the Government" was to be applied to the payment of the bonds issued by the United States to aid in building the road. By the act of July 2, 1864, only "one-half of the compensation for services rendered for the Government" by said company was required to be applied to the payment of the bonds. The act of May 7, 1878, merely restored the provisions of the act of July 1, 1862, and again required all compensation for services rendered the Government to be applied to the payment of the bonds. This compensation, as we have seen, has been limited by the decisions of this court to compensation for services rendered by the aided roads. The construction of the second section of the act of May 7, 1878, contended for by the appellee is therefore right.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BROSIUS having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, a message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 5110) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

THE DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SAYERS. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND].

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, the issue in this matter has been so graphically stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] in the course of his remarks that I can not add anything, especially in the limited time allotted to me. But there are one or two points which have been suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKENNA] who last spoke to which I would like to call the attention of the committee.

He says that the law as laid down by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not sound. Before I conclude I shall ask the privilege of reading a citation from the decision of Chancellor Walworth that clearly substantiates the position taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Another point suggested was that by reason of the great benefits conferred on the country by the building of this railway we ought to be lenient in dealing with it, and that we ought to consider that by reason of its construction the Government has saved upwards of $100,000,000 in the cost of transporting Government property. This fact is assigned as a reason for making concessions to the road.

Applying the same principle to ourselves, what would be the result? The fare for traveling from my own State to this city by rail is, in round numbers, $30. I apprehend if no railway had been built it would cost nearly or quite $500. Now, if the argument of the gentleman is a sound one, and means anything as to the Pacific railroads, it would be equally just and reasonable to levy a tribute of $500 in behalf of the railroads on every member of Congress who travels that distance.

If the logic is good in one case, it is good in the other. I submit that there is absolutely nothing in that argument. I hold that the country, the people, the nation, and the Government itself are entitled to the benefits and privileges which have resulted from the improvements of communication and discoveries of modern times, and that the benefits resulting from these modern appliances, the results of the advance of civilization and the intelligence of man, shall not be appropriated by the railroad companies alone.

Another suggestion the gentleman makes is that if we refuse to make the appropriation to pay these items it will reflect upon the Government's counsel. There is absolutely nothing in that point, for the simple reason that if this had been a suit between citizens, one situated with reference to the other as the Government is with reference to the railroad company, the creditor situated as the Government is could have applied to the court to stay the execution of the judgment until the maturity of the other debt.

In this case it was not necessary to make that application. We have the execution in our own hands, under our control, and the Government counsel knew it. It was not necessary to suggest to the Supreme Court that a stay of execution should be granted, because none can issue except under our seal, and that is a sufficient answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from California in that regard.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the committee to a decision on page 580 of the second Paige's Chancery Reports. I will read the statement of the case:

This was an appeal from a decision of the vice chancellor of the first circuit. In May, 1831, the complainants gave to the defendants two negotiable promissory notes, for the sum of about $1,500 each, payable in six months, without interest. About the same time the defendants became indebted to the complainants on an acceptance for $4,000 payable on the 13th of June. A few days before this acceptance became due the defendants became insolvent and stopped payment.

In July, 1831, the complainants filed their bill in this cause to restrain the defendants from negotiating or transferring the notes, and praying that the amount to become due thereon might be set off or applied in part satisfaction of the $4,000 due on the acceptance. An injunction having been granted according to the prayer of the bill, the defendants applied to the vice chancellor for a dissolution of the same. The vice chancellor denied the motion, and from that decision the defendants appealed to the chancellor.

After reviewing the authorities and discussing the question elaborately, the chancellor concludes:

The decision of the vice chancellor in refusing to dissolve the injunction was therefore right. It must be affirmed with costs; and the proceedings are to be remitted to the vice chancellor.

And let me say right here, in addition to the able arguments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as to the question of insolvency, that the legal definition of insolvency, as I recollect it, is inability to pay your debts in the ordinary course of business.

These corporations have confessed time and time again, and it is a matter of record, that when these debts mature they will be unable to pay them. That constitutes insolvency in law. Insolvency does not mean that they are unable to pay anything at all. It simply means the inability to pay in the ordinary course of business, and that they admit. So the insolvency exists here.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LIND. I ask the gentleman from Texas to yield to me two minutes more.

Mr. SAYERS. I would if I had the time, but I have none that has not been promised to others.

Mr. LIND. Then I will simply add that in this matter we should do as common sense and justice dictate. We should withhold the money due these insolvent roads until our own claim matures. This is but doing what a court of equity would do in a like case between citizens.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that general leave may be granted to print upon this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks general leave to print upon this question, and without objection it will be considered as granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYERS. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS].

Mr. McCOMAS. Mr. Chairman, in three minutes I can only reiterate my purpose to vote against the payment of this money, a vote I have cast heretofore, and which I will repeat now with less hesitation than ever before. This road, the Central Pacific, which is claiming more than $2,000,000 that it asks Congress to appropriate, owes more than twenty-five times that sum. It has been masquerading under other corporation names. I respect the decisions of the courts, as all good citizens do.

The lower courts are bound by them, but Congress in its power to appropriate is bound by rules of justice and charged with a duty to the public interests which it can not hide behind the mask of a new corporate name. A suit brought in 1885 is coincident with a new charter of the Southern Pacific Railroad of Kentucky in the same year. The company owning practically the 2,175 miles of railway of the aided lines, this company is here asking this payment. I can not, in the short time allowed me, state the reasons why I say this is all practically the property of this corporation, but I nevertheless assert that to be the fact, and it is susceptible of proof.

Within five years the debt of this company to the Government will become due and the time for settlement will be at hand. This railroad, which once seemed ready to settle, is now indifferent to settlement, and from broad principles of justice and public policy this Congress should exercise its power of appropriation and withhold the money and not give it to a corporation confessedly bankrupt, everywhere claiming its inability, and now more than ever showing its want of desire to pay, but should hold back this money until the day of settlement comes. When it does come every right will be protected, every dollar can be allowed, but until it does come no money should be now passed except to its own credit, and it will work no hardship to these companies.

The just demands of the few stockholders here and there can be met as between this company and those who are in the branch lines; but the great body of interest in the giant corporation is in all the branches and in all the feeders; and, working out a broad justice between the country and the company, I shall vote, and I hope this House will vote, against the payment of this money, that the payment may be deferred and credit given when the time comes, so that the money may not be hopelessly lost in the great body of this vast debt. [Applause.]

Mr. SAYERS. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. TURNER].

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that even if I had unlimited opportunity I could re-enforce the admirable statement of this case which has just been made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]. It appears, from the statement of facts which I get from the memorial of the attorney of the Central Pacific Railroad, and not from statements of those opposed to the interests of the road, that the corporation has recovered judgments against the Government in the Court of Claims, which were afterward affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States, for a large amount of money.

It also appears from the record in those causes that these sums due to the Central Pacific Railroad Company accrued to that corporation by virtue of its ownership or lease or control of certain unaided lines. But the fact is nevertheless obvious that it is a debt which the Central Pacific Railroad itself has recovered against the Government, and not these unaided lines. These original owners of the unaided lines are not here asking any payment from the Government. They themselves are making no intervention here, but it is a question solely and exclusively between the Central Pacific Railroad corporation and the Government.

All, therefore, that has been said about the rights of these unaided roads is entirely irrelevant to this issue and has nothing to do with its settlement. The question remains then in this way, that the Central Pacific road is a creditor of the Government under a judgment to the amount of several millions of dollars. On the other hand, that corporation undoubtedly owes the Government many millions more, hereafter to become due to the Government. It is a case of mutual liabilities, in which one party has obtained judgment and the other party holds its debt without judgment, it not being due.

Now, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, in this state of the case it would be monstrous in a court of equity that the chancellor should direct that the fund should be paid by the one party into the pocket of the other when it is perfectly apparent on the record that that other is insolvent and unable to answer for its liabilities. There is no court in Christendom whose decision I have any knowledge of that would enter any such decree.

And why is it that here in the House we should be attempting to do in a spirit of generosity what no court would as a matter of justice or equity? Have we not been generous to this corporation? Has not this Government squandered untold millions upon it? As I have said before, Mr. Chairman, it is impossible for me to add to the clear statement of this issue made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman from Illinois has thirty minutes, and I have only thirteen; and I ask him to have some of his time occupied.

Mr. CANNON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, it appears that the Central Pacific Railroad had a judgment against the United States for about $3,000,000. That judgment has been affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States. The proposition is to appropriate sufficient money to pay that judgment. The defense is that the Central Pacific Railroad Company will in 1897 owe the United States some $70,000,000. The question is whether the House and Congress may set off this debt to become due against a debt already due from the United States to the Central Pacific road.

Now, I undertake to say that there is not a court in the United States that has ever held that a debt not due, whether the debtor be insolvent or not, can be set off against a judgment. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COOPER], in the early part of the evening, made an assertion that the text-book from which he quoted said that such set-offs could be made, no matter when the judgment became due. I looked at the text of the writer and I found that it said no matter when the debt "became" due, showing clearly that it referred to two debts that were past due, and of course in that way they could be set off.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] quoted from the text of Black on Judgments a single sentence, and did not claim even that that came up to the position which he occupied, that a debt not due could be set off against a judgment in any court. I looked at that book, and found that it referred to a section of Johnson's Chancery, in the Sixth Johnson's Chancery, in New York Reports. And I am surprised that my friend, who is so learned in the law, this afternoon, when he was preparing to talk upon this case, did not step down into the library and look at the original reports and see whether it was an attempt to set off a debt that was due or not, and not come in here before the House and attempt to play upon the word "debt" as though it was applied in this text-book to a debt to become due.

Johnson's Chancery in the reported case holds no such doctrine as he has attempted to read from the text-book. I have looked at this decision, in the Second of Paige, quoted by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND], and I find that where the plaintiff had obtained judgment against the defendant for $4,000 upon an acceptance which was past due, and at the same time the defendant held notes of the plaintiff for $1,500 that were not due, the court stepped in and enjoined the defendants, who were insolvent, from transferring the notes; and that was all that there was in that case.

It comes far from the doctrine that is sought to be enforced here; and yet that is all the defense urged against this appropriation to pay a judgment against the United States. Has it come to this, Mr. Chairman? As representatives of the people are we to stand here in behalf of the Government of the United States, the proudest, richest government on the face of the earth, and seek to enforce a rule of law, a rule of equity, or some other rule against a judgment pronounced by the Supreme Court of the United States that the Government does not afford to the meanest citizen beneath its jurisdiction?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE].

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, our Government is divided into three departments—the executive, legislative, and judicial. A question is made under the Constitution of the United States, according to the statute, between litigants, and is decided by the judicial department of the Government; it is necessarily binding upon both litigants, and when one of them is the United States of America

its honesty is as much an obligation upon that litigant as upon any other litigant that appears at the bar of the courts. While the Congress of the United States has power in the sense of might to emancipate itself from that rule of honesty, it has not the power in the sense of right so to do.

Now, this is the reason why, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I feel that the Congress of the United States should be a law-abiding body and should carry out the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States by paying a judgment which had been rendered in a case properly made and decided against it.

I do not deny, nor do I affirm, anything connected with this company or with the historic allusions that have been made in the debate to-night, which debate I have not heard.

I planted myself, as did two of my colleagues on the Democratic side in that committee (the Democratic six being equally divided), upon the simple, plain, intelligible proposition that the duty of the legislative department of the Government is to appropriate whatever sum may be necessary to pay a judgment against the United States legally rendered by the judicial department of the Government. How anyone can escape from that would be surprising to me if I had not lived long enough to know that exceedingly able and just men often come to opposite conclusions upon the same premises. There can not be in law or in logic any answer to it at the bar of conscience.

So far as I am concerned that question arose in my first term in Congress. There was a judgment of the Supreme Court in what was known as the Choctaw case, and the great Democratic leaders of the Committee on Appropriations decided that we ought not to pay it; that this House was a supervisory board of appeals and errors. I thought otherwise, and I voted to pay that judgment. We had to pay it, and it has been paid, with a large accumulation of interest which might have been saved. I have voted upon all occasions, without regard to the merits of the litigation, to pay judgments found by the courts.

I have no power to relitigate those cases which the courts have litigated, nor do I assume that I am wiser, upon the bare statements made here in excited debate, than the judicial tribunal is upon a careful, calm, and deliberate examination of the record submitted. I have heard a great deal in this Congress about arbitrary power. I have united with friends on this side in protesting against despotic and arbitrary power. I know of no spectacle of arbitrary power more dangerous to the good morals of the country than the Congress of the United States exercising its might in refusing to pay judgments which the courts of the country have rendered against the United States.

I know of nothing more dangerous in its subtle influence through all the country than for the representatives of the people to hold themselves superior to the obligations of law and, by the might which resides in them, to refuse to pay a debt which the courts have found to be due from the Government of the United States.

As to the part of the claim which is not in judgment, but which the accounting officers are given the power to settle, I voted to pay that upon the principle that as the questions involved in it had been settled by this judgment, it was an unwise and niggardly economy to refuse to pay those amounts which could be enforced by a judgment of the court; that it was better to submit to the judgment rendered and pay all sums coming within the principle thus settled.

I thought, too—and I say this in no spirit of criticism of anybody—I thought that when the majority of that Committee on Appropriations, about going out of power, were willing to assume the responsibility of settling this debt so tainted by prejudice, against which so much might be said to the plain people of the country, it was not unbecoming in me to meet them half way; that if they were willing to take the odium of this settlement, surely I might well say to them that, as a court had decided the question and this appropriation was in accordance with the principles of that decision, I would not harp and criticise and oppose their action. And having said this in the privacy of the committee, I know of no rule of life that I hold dearer than to say in the most public way, and take whatever responsibility it brings upon me, that which I have already said either in private life or in the privacy of the committee room. This, Mr. Chairman, is the ground upon which I put my support. This is the ground on which it seems to me the Congress of the United States ought to vote this provision. This is the honest, the just, the legal, the constitutional ground, and not the original merits. I go not into that, for I am not a court of revision. But we are the legislative department of the Government, trusted with the honor of the Government, which Government consists in part of a judicial tribunal, which, on a case legally and constitutionally made, has decided that that debt is due. These two facts bring the conclusion that our duty is to honestly appropriate the money found to be due by the supreme tribunal of the land.

Mr. SAYERS. I yield now to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN].

[Mr. HOLMAN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SAYERS. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY].

[Mr. DOCKERY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has twelve minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I crave the attention of this committee for the twelve minutes remaining to me, and especially do I crave the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

There were 865 miles of the Central Pacific Railroad constructed in part by a loan of bonds from the Government. That is known as the aided branch of the road. Since that was constructed there have been over 2,000 miles of nonaided road constructed and leased.

This 2,000 miles is owned by different stockholders from the aided line, and each one of the 2,000 miles has bonds issued upon it in the name of a separate corporation which are owned by third parties.

Now the question was presented to the Supreme Court of the United States as to all of the earnings of the 865 miles of this road that was built by the aid of the Government. Under the law all of these earnings are set aside to meet the debt falling due the Government six years from now. That presents one part of the question.

As to the earnings of the 2,000 miles of nonaided road, not a mile of it built by the aid of the Government, with different stockholders and bondholders from the Central Pacific—as to the earnings upon these nonaided lines for Government transportation, the Government claimed it was entitled to apply the same to payment of advances made to the aided lines. They said no, the Government is not entitled to these earnings. The question was submitted, and suit was brought, and the Supreme Court entered judgment against the United States for the earnings upon the 2,000 miles not built by Government aid.

That judgment draws interest now. I am sorry I have not time to read the Supreme Court decision. It is published in the RECORD. But the courts say it will be unconstitutional; that it will be confiscation to take the earnings upon the nonaided lines and apply them to the indebtedness of the aided lines falling due in the future to the Government.

Now, gentlemen may talk until they are blind, but this is the fact the court decides. And yet there are more chief justices here to-night, headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania with his fiery declamation, who have not yet taken the oath of office, than you can shake a stick at. [Laughter.] Nevertheless the Constitution says there is but one Chief Justice and one Supreme Court.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania in his fiery eloquence spoke of the Central Pacific. I crave his attention. The Union Pacific he did not denounce; yet it has as many nonaided lines as the Central Pacific; yet every dollar, amounting to over $3,000,000, earned by the nonaided lines of the Union Pacific has been paid in cash or its equivalent, and was paid year by year under Grover Cleveland's administration, and year by year under this.

Ah, why did not the fierce voice of my fierce friend from Pennsylvania rise when this was happening? But he is as gentle as a cooing dove in the light of that fact, and yet when we come to say that we will mete out even-handed justice and obey the mandate of the Supreme Court, placing the Central Pacific on the same ground we did the Union Pacific, then for the first time his loud protest is sounded.

Mr. DALZELL. Will you allow me a moment?

Mr. CANNON. Well, I have only twelve minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. I only want to say that I made no distinction in my argument between the two roads. I mentioned one as an illustration. I understand that the provision on pages 12 and 13 of the bill which I attacked is applicable to the Union Pacific, but the same principle to which I alluded in my argument applies to both roads.

Mr. CANNON. I state again that over $3,000,000 upon the nonaided Union Pacific lines have been paid to the Union Pacific Company.

Mr. DALZELL. Two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. CANNON. Now, gentlemen, I call your attention and the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] to another fact. Last year and this year both, the Central and Union Pacific have been paid for the quarterly earnings of the nonaided lines, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], at the head of the Pacific Railway Committee, has sat still and seen the appropriations made, knowing that they were made for the service upon these nonaided lines.

Mr. DALZELL. No, I beg your pardon; I did not.

Mr. CANNON. You did not know it?

Mr. DALZELL. I did not know it; no, sir. Perhaps I ought to have known it.

Mr. CANNON. It is known of all people whose business it is to investigate touching these matters.

Mr. DALZELL. That may be.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman, occupying the position he does, had no right to be ignorant.

Mr. MOORE, of New Hampshire. That was not explained by the chairman.

Mr. CANNON. The Supreme Court decided in 1884, and in January of this year again, that there was no right anywhere to withhold this money, and the appropriations were made by Congress in pursuance of those decisions.

One further question of my friend from Pennsylvania. The Thur-

man act provided in 1878 that the provision as to the 5 per cent. net earnings of these aided Pacific railroads should be increased to 25 per cent; that is, that all service that they rendered for the Government on these lines should go to the sinking fund to wipe out the Government's indebtedness, and that 25 per cent. of their net earnings besides, which was an increase of 20 per cent., should go to that fund, and every dollar of that has been paid.

Mr. DALZELL. I beg your pardon. Now, let me say right here——

Mr. CANNON. Now, if I can have a little more time I will yield to the gentleman. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The CHAIRMAN. This comes out of the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], unless by unanimous consent.

Mr. DALZELL. I wish to ask the gentleman a question——

Mr. CANNON. I say again that substantially every dollar of that 25 per cent. of the net earnings has been paid by both companies. That is legal. That legislation was upheld by the Supreme Court. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] claimed in 1878 in this House that we had the power to amend their charters as to the aided lines which the Government helped to build, so that we could take not only 5 per cent. but 25 per cent.

Yet with that right adjudicated, and with these bankrupt roads that the gentleman from Pennsylvania spoke about, with that power fully affirmed, he has allowed his harp to hang upon the willows and his voice has been dumb. Why did not you, sir, knowing that the Thurman act had been sustained, taking 25 per cent. instead of 5 of the net earnings of the aided lines, with this indebtedness that you say is to accrue in 1897 against these bankrupt roads—why did not you, sir, bring in a bill here increasing the amount so as to take 50 per cent. of their net earnings or all their net earnings?

Mr. DALZELL. Well, one reason is because my committee would not agree to any such thing. I happen to be on the minority of my committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Did you try it? Was that matter brought up in your committee?

Mr. DALZELL. It was discussed in the committee; yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Did you ever introduce a bill?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Was there ever a minority or adverse report?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes, a minority report at this Congress, which I wrote and filed myself.

Mr. MCKENNA. You advocated a different bill in the last session of Congress.

Mr. DALZELL. I advocated a different bill in the last session of Congress; yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Now, here is this whole thing in a nutshell. We have a perfect right to amend the Pacific railroad act so as to take not only 25 per cent. of their earnings but all their net earnings, and that has been affirmed by the courts. I am for pursuing the rights of the Government under the law and the Constitution, and this committee has been amiss, and I say it with all respect—in my opinion the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has not been as swift as he ought to be to do what we had the right to do under the law and under the Constitution as adjudicated by the courts.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is not a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. COOPER, of Indiana. Why not take this $3,000,000 as a part of their net earnings?

Mr. CANNON. But now when the Supreme Court has said you can not take the earnings upon the nonaided lines with different stockholders and confiscate those earnings and turn them in as against the indebtedness of the Central and Union Pacific that is to fall due, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is swift to come in with his fiery declamations and talk about frauds, advising a nullification of the findings and decision of the Supreme Court. In other words, he leaves undone that which we have a right to do, and seeks to do that which we have no right to do.

As for myself, I will walk in the light of the Constitution and the law——

Mr. COOPER, of Indiana. Take a walk.

Mr. CANNON. And the judgments of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the gentleman can do otherwise if he chooses. Oh, yes; the gentleman says "take a walk." [Laughter.] Any fool can say that who can not answer the position that has been taken.

Mr. FITHIAN. But he is not so much of a fool as to have his mouth photographed for the newspapers.

Mr. CANNON. Go into a hole and pull the hole in after you. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITHIAN. There are a plenty of men upon the floor of the House who have as much sense as you have.

Mr. CANNON. I think that is so. I think my colleague from Illinois has as much as I have and all the rest of Congress; he thinks so, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITHIAN. I may not have as much as you, but I have never had my mouth photographed in the newspapers of this country for vulgarity. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. The time for debate is exhausted.

Mr. CANNON. If I can get just a second of time——

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment is exhausted, and the committee will be in order.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say one thing. I think I have enough reputation, good, bad, or indifferent, that my colleague may get a notoriety he does not have by attacking me out of order.

Mr. FITHIAN. You have been tried and found wanting. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. COLEMAN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, a message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12922) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892.

THE DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate is exhausted. Will the gentlemen please resume their seats. [After a pause.] The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was put; and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. SAYERS. Division.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the Chair please state the question? I do not think gentlemen on this side heard it.

The question was again stated.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 147, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to. [Applause.]

Mr. BIGGS. I want to give notice that we will demand the yeas and nays when we get into the House. [Laughter and renewed applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state that there was one matter that was passed by unanimous consent that has not been determined so far as the Chair knows. That was the proposition as to a certain agricultural college in Wyoming.

Mr. CANNON. I do not desire to yield to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the consideration of the bill in the committee is closed.

Mr. CLARK, of Wyoming. I withdrew this amendment last night on a distinct understanding with the chairman of the committee that it would be in order to-night, and no objection or point of order raised against it. I ask that it now be considered and a vote taken upon it.

Mr. CANNON. I have only a word to say about it. I find, on examination, and reading a letter from the Secretary——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming submit a proposition?

Mr. CLARK, of Wyoming. I submit the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Let it be sent to the Clerk's desk and read, and the committee proceed in order.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 25, page 43, insert the following:

"To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the State of Wyoming, for the use of Wyoming University, the sum which said State would have been entitled as a Territory to receive for the years 1888 and 1889 under the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to establish agricultural-experiment stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of the act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplementary thereto,' and of other acts making appropriations to carry into effect the provisions of such acts, $30,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available until satisfactory proof shall be furnished to the Secretary of the Treasury that said university maintained such experimental stations in compliance with said law during said years 1888 and 1889."

Mr. CANNON. Upon that I make the point of order that there is nothing before the House to show that this is a debt, that it is an appropriation in pursuance of existing law, or is a deficiency that is noted. On the contrary, from a letter which the gentleman from Wyoming exhibited to me I understand the facts to be that the Treasury Department has no official information that the Territory or State of Wyoming has ever complied with the act so as to entitle it to this money, and therefore I think, in the absence of such information as the law provides, that the provision is not in order. I did not promise last night to let it in. I said if on investigation it seemed that this amount was due I would not interpose an objection.

Mr. SAYERS. That was the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois. The gentleman from Illinois has stated it correctly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised by gentlemen at the Clerk's desk that the understanding was that this matter was passed and that the gentleman from Wyoming should have permission to submit his amendment.

Mr. CANNON. The Clerk's desk! I appeal from the Clerk's desk to the notes as to what was said. I have a very clear recollection of the matter.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I interposed the point of order myself. This question came up at that time, and I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] fairly states what took place.

The CHAIRMAN. That there was no agreement as to the matter?

Mr. ROGERS. I did not understand that we were deprived of the right of making a point of order, but that if it turned out that this was a deficiency the gentleman from Illinois agreed that he would not make the point of order.

Mr. CLARK, of Wyoming. I believe I can settle this matter of the point of order. I claim nothing but what I believe I am entitled to under the minutes of the proceedings as they appear in the RECORD. I do not confess for one moment that any gentleman on this floor except the chairman of the committee himself [Mr. CANNON] is estopped from making this point of order. If any other gentleman wishes to make the point I do not claim that he is estopped from doing it, but I do claim, upon the minutes of last night's proceedings as they appear in the RECORD, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is estopped.

Mr. CANNON. Let us have the RECORD read.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman allow me to read the RECORD?

Mr. CLARK, of Wyoming. In one moment. The statement I made at that time I make now, that through the fault of the authorities of Wyoming State University they did not comply with the terms of the law, but that they had in fact maintained an agricultural department and an experiment station. I am restating it in substance.

Mr. SAYERS. Let me read what actually occurred:

Mr. CANNON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will state that I would be glad to have an understanding that this bill is closed except as to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] and one other exception. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] desires to go to the Treasury and inquire whether it is necessary that this bill should carry for a couple of years, in connection with the agricultural college, a deficiency appropriation that was referred to on the agricultural bill, and if it is he will bring a letter here and that will cause no discussion, and I shall be very glad to yield to him.

Mr. CLARK, of Wyoming. That is correct. The question arose simply on this point.

Mr. SAYERS. Where is the letter?

[Cries of "Read!" "Read!"]

Mr. CLARK, of Wyoming. It was the judgment of the chairman of the committee and of the gentleman who last addressed me [Mr. MORGAN] that this appropriation was provided for all the States and Territories in a lump sum.

Mr. MORGAN. That was my impression.

Mr. CANNON. Let the letter of the Secretary be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will overrule the point of order and submit it to the House if there is an appeal. On the merits of the question the Chair will recognize any gentleman who desires to be heard.

Mr. CANNON. Well, let the Secretary's letter be read.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Wyoming has the letter of the Secretary will he please send it to the desk? [A pause.] If the letter can not be produced the gentleman can perhaps state the substance of it.

Mr. CLARK, of Wyoming. The substance of the letter is this——

Mr. SAYERS. Let us have the letter itself.

Mr. CLARK, of Wyoming. I have not got the letter. I gave it to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and if anybody has it he has.

Mr. CANNON produced a letter, which was sent to the desk, but when the Clerk began to read, it proved not to be the one in question.

The CHAIRMAN. Several members desire the gentleman from Wyoming to state the substance of the letter.

Mr. CLARK, of Wyoming. The substance of the letter is exactly as I stated the case.

Several MEMBERS. State it again.

Mr. CLARK, of Wyoming. It was that the Treasury Department had no official knowledge that this experiment station had been established; that they had the information from unofficial sources, but that they were not at liberty to furnish estimates on unofficial information.

Mr. MORGAN. But the stations have in fact been established.

Mr. CLARK, of Wyoming. They have in fact been established. Not only the experiment station at the home institution at Laramie City, but since this law went into operation three other experiment stations have been established in the State.

Mr. MORGAN. How long has the station been established at Laramie City?

Mr. CLARK, of Wyoming. Since 1887.

Mr. CANNON. A single word, Mr. Chairman. If these stations have been established in Wyoming the law provides how that fact shall be made known, namely, that notification shall be made to the Secretary of the Treasury, and then Congress is officially notified and the estimate comes. The gentleman [Mr. CLARK, of Wyoming] says he understands that they have been established. I do not believe that under the rules of the House, or outside of the rules of the House, it is safe to legislate in a matter of this kind, except upon the official information for which the law provides and a proper estimate formally submitted.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, in the first instance, these appropriations were made without any reports. Now, a new State has come in, for which appropriations were made at one time while it was a Territory. The State occupies the position of the Territory, and there is no reason why this appropriation should not be put in now, and let the State Legislature accept it at the proper time and receive the money.

There is no reason why this appropriation should not be put in here now, so that the State Legislature may accept it at the proper time and receive the money. It can never be drawn until the original law is complied with.

Mr. CLARK, of Wyoming. One word more. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"] Very well; I will not detain the committee.

The question being taken on agreeing to the amendment of Mr. CLARK, of Wyoming, it was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. This completes the consideration of this bill in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CANNON. I move that the committee now rise and report the bill and amendments to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. BURROWS having taken the Chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. PAYSON reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13658) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, and for prior years, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report back the same with sundry amendments and with the recommendation that it be passed as amended.

Mr. CANNON. I move the previous question on the bill and amendments.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is a separate vote desired on any of the amendments?

Mr. OATES. I demand a separate vote upon the amendment proposing a month's extra pay to officers and employés of the two Houses of Congress.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the amendment upon which a separate vote has been demanded by the gentleman from Alabama.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "cents," in line 15, page 50, insert the following:

"To enable the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay to the officers and employés of the Senate and House, borne on the annual and session rolls on the 1st day of October, 1890, and the 3d day of March, 1891, including the Capitol Police, for extra services during the Fifty-first Congress, a sum equal to one month's pay at the compensation then paid them by law, the same to be immediately available."

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (having put the question on agreeing to the amendment). The ayes seem to have it.

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

The question being taken on ordering the yeas and nays; there were—ayes 26, noes 187, less than one-fifth voting in the affirmative.

Mr. OATES. I ask for tellers on ordering the yeas and nays.

Tellers were not ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Tellers are refused, the yeas and nays are refused; the ayes have it; and the amendment is agreed to. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If a separate vote is not demanded on any of the remaining amendments the vote will be taken in gross. [A pause.] In the absence of any such request, the question is on agreeing to the various amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. BIGGS. Is it in order now to make a motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is.

Mr. BIGGS. I move that the bill be recommitted with instructions to insert an amendment to pay the amount that is due the Central Pacific Railroad Company.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from California [Mr. BIGGS] moves to recommit this bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to insert the provision stricken out by the Committee of the Whole in reference to the Central Pacific Railroad Company.

The question being taken, the motion of Mr. BIGGS was rejected.

The bill was then passed.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

POLICE COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CASWELL. I desire the consent of the House for the appointment of a committee of conference on the bill (H. R. 13218) to define the jurisdiction of the police court of the District of Columbia. Everybody is in favor of the bill, but the Senate in acting upon it made a mistake by inserting in one place "jury" instead of "judge." I ask

that the amendments of the Senate be nonconcurred in and the request of the Senate for a conference agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. In the absence of objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* announced the appointment of Mr. CASWELL, Mr. STEWART of Vermont, and Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina as the conferees on the part of the House.

CORRECTION.

Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a correction of the RECORD.

On yesterday, during the debate, in a colloquy between the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. FUNSTON] and myself, I am reported as saying:

I left the House, but it was the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] who led that filibuster.

What I did say was, in response to the question of the gentleman from Kansas:

I left the House? I did not leave the House, but it was the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] who led that filibuster.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The correction will be made.

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

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 11 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE MINT.

Letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report of the Director of the Mint, upon the production of the precious metals in the United States for the calendar year 1890—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

Letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in reply to the House resolution of the 14th instant, relating to the Regents' of the Smithsonian Institution, etc., the report of the First Comptroller upon that subject and a communication from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

BAYOU TÊCHE, LOUISIANA.

Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, a copy of the report of the examination and survey of Bayou Têche, Louisiana—to the Committee on River and Harbors.

EXPENDITURES, COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, 1890.

Letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a statement of expenditures on account of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year, ended June 30, 1890—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, the following resolution was introduced and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARTER:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the report of the Director of the Mint on the production of precious metals in the United States for the calendar year 1890 be printed, and that 9,000 extra copies be printed, 4,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate, and 3,000 copies for the use of the Director of the Mint;

to the Committee on Printing.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk and disposed of as follows:

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 6878) for the relief of Michael Carling, assignee of Joseph R. Shannon, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 4007)—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, reported favorably the joint resolution of the House (H. Res. 271) asking that a commission be appointed to see if increased post-office facilities are needed in New York City, accompanied by a report (No. 4008)—to the House Calendar.

Mr. CASWELL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the following resolution of the House:

Whereas the second section of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States declares that "when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State:" Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and is hereby, instructed to inquire into, ascertain, and report to this House whether or not any one or more of the States of the Union has, by any constitutional or statutory provision, violated the said second section of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, so that a proper apportionment of representation may be made by Congress.

Resolved further, That said committee shall have the right to report at any time;

reported the same favorably, accompanied by a report (No. 4009), which was referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OATES, in behalf of the minority of said Committee on the Judiciary, submitted their views in writing thereon; which were ordered to be printed as part of said report (No. 4009).

Mr. ROGERS, as one of the minority of the said committee, submitted his views in writing thereon; which were also ordered to be printed as part of said report (No. 4009).

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 6849) providing for the payment of awards made to Creek Indians who enlisted in the Federal army, loyal refugees, and freedmen, accompanied by a report (No. 4010)—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 13743) for the relief of F. H. Barnitz—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13744) for the relief of John N. German—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 13745) for the relief of Milton P. Chaffin—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13746) for the relief of the legal representatives of Robert Lawrence—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. CLARK, of Wyoming: A bill (H. R. 13747) for the relief of Hiram Mealman—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13748) for the relief of Charles Sorrell—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. COMSTOCK (by request): A bill (H. R. 13749) for the relief of Henry Foster—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. DORSEY: A bill (H. R. 13750) for the relief of the legal representatives of Moses F. Abernathy—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13751) for the relief of A. A. Alderman—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13752) for the relief of A. T. Fordham—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13753) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Rooney—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. GEARY: A bill (H. R. 13754) for the relief of J. W. Shoemaker—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. HEARD: A bill (H. R. 13755) for the relief of William Hale—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13756) for the relief of Mrs. Surrilda Lagston—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13757) for the relief of M. M. Marmaduke—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. JOSEPH: A bill (H. R. 13758) for the relief of the legal representatives of Archuleta, of New Mexico—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13759) for the relief of the legal representatives of Antonio Annaya, of New Mexico—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13760) for the relief of the legal representatives of Francisco C. de Baca, of New Mexico—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13761) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Casey, of New Mexico—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13762) for the relief of the legal representatives of José Maria Chavez, of New Mexico—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13763) for the relief of John Foster, of Lone Pine, N. Mex.—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13764) for the relief of Louis L. Fountain, of New Mexico—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13765) for the relief of Manuel Gallegos, of New Mexico—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13766) for the relief of José Manuel Garcia, of New Nexico—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13767) for the relief of Policarpio Garcia, of New Mexico—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13768) for the relief of Rafael Lobato, of New Mexico—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13769) for the relief of C. S. McIntire, of New Mexico—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13770) for the relief of Rumaldo Montoya, of New Mexico—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13771) for the relief of the legal representative of Manuel Sanchez, deceased, of New Mexico—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. LANHAM (by request): A bill (H. R. 13772) for the relief of Jesse Hart—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 13773) for the relief of T. J. Lindsey—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 13774) for the relief of the legal representatives of J. A. McClarin—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 13775) for the relief of Casmiero Romero—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 13776) for the relief of the legal representative of James N. Walker—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. LAWS (by request): A bill (H. R. 13777) for the relief of James Baintee—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. OWENS, of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 13778) for the relief of Nathan Finnegan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 13779) for the relief of Sion Barbee—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 13780) for the relief of Eli Spurgeon—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. STONE, of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 13781) for the relief of William F. Berrien—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13782) for the relief of Aureely New—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13783) for the relief of the legal representative of Levi Smith, deceased—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 13784) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury Department—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND, of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 13785) for the relief of the legal representatives of Trinidad de Baca—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13786) for the relief of Graeme W. Hood, late major Enrolled Missouri Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13787) for the relief of Grear Stoner—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. WADE: A bill (H. R. 13788) for the relief of Stephen Adams—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R 13789) granting a pension to L. D. Bolen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13790) for the relief of William P. Buckmaster—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13791) for the relief of Wiley B. Faught—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13792) for the relief of Andrew J. Mackey—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13793) for the relief of J. W. Shields—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. WIKE (by request): A bill (H. R. 13794) for the relief of G. W. Stamps—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. WILSON, of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 13795) for the relief of Carl Steffens—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ALDERSON: Petition of M. P. Wingrove, trustee of French Creek Presbyterian Church, Upshur County; also of James H. Miller and Miles Mansur, trustees of Ganley Bridge Baptist Church, of Fayette County, West Virginia, praying that their war claims be referred to the Court of Claims, under the act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ATKINSON, of Pennsylvania: Memorial of 25 granges of the Patrons of Husbandry, of the Eighteenth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, praying for an increased supply of currency and the remonetization of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BECKWITH: Petition of Passaic Board of Trade, Passaic, N. J., against the free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Petition of Lancaster branch of Women's National Indian Association, in favor of the application of civil-service rules to Indian affairs—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CHEATHAM: Letter in support of House bill 37647 for pension for Marin Parke, dependent mother of Calvin McLelland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COGSWELL: Petition of N. W. Withington and others, in favor of Senate bill 3146 and House bill 8287, giving preference in appointments to veterans of the late war—to the Select Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Petition of 46 citizens of Humboldt County; also, of 32 citizens of Grant Township, Boone County; also, of 16 citizens of Carroll County; also, 34 citizens of Calhoun County; also, another petition of 18 citizens of the same county; also, resolutions of Grant Center Alliance, No. 1929; also, of Algoun Grange, No. 1684, Patrons of Husbandry; also, of Greenfield Township, Calhoun County, No. 1962, Iowa, urging the passage of the option bill; also, resolutions of Alliance No. 1930, at Bradgate, Humboldt County, Iowa, for the Conger lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DORSEY: Resolutions adopted by a convention assembled at Lincoln, Nebr., to consider questions relating to irrigation—to the Select Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands in the United States.

By Mr. ELLIS: Proof to accompany bill for the relief of J. F. Covington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. Mr. FLICK: Petition of 22 farmers of Fremont County; also, resolutions of the Knox Alliance and Industrial Union; also, petition of 29 farmers of Clarke County, Iowa, urging the passage of House bill 5353, against gambling in options; also, resolutions of Jackson Township Alliance, No. 1981, Taylor County, Iowa, urging the passage of the Conger lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and over 200 women of Rockford, Ill., to pass bill to prohibit the opening on Sunday of any exhibition where appropriations of the United States are expended—to the Select Committee on the Quadro-Centennial of the Discovery of America.

By Mr. KELLEY: Petition of citizens and neighbors of Robert Allen and Martha Allen in support of House bill 12380, for the relief of Martha Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAWS: Petition of 21 citizens of Saline County; also, of 46 citizens of Seward County; also, of 12 citizens of Webster County; also, of 56 citizens of York County; also, of 70 citizens of Red Willow County, Nebraska, urging passage of House bill 5353—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCORMICK: Resolutions of General Assembly of Producers' Protective Association of Warren, Pa., in favor of amendments to interstate commerce law as to petroleum, common carriers, etc.—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MAISH: Memorial of Grange No. 505, of Stoughstown, Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, favoring the passage of a law providing for the free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. RAY: Petition of citizens of Monongahela City, Pa., for the passage of the bill to prohibit the opening of any exhibition or exposition on Sunday where appropriations of the United States are expended—to the Select Committee on the Quadro-Centennial of the Discovery of America.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: Petition of Monroe Robinson, of Shelby County; also, of Gideon Fox, of Obion County; also, of F. W. Crutchfield, administrator of the estate of William Crutchfield, late of Hamilton County; also, of the estate of John Day, of Rhea County, Tennessee; also, of John Deasley, late of Hamilton County, Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims under the provisions of the Bowman act; also, papers in the claim of Joseph R. Kryser, of Page County; also, of John W. Driver, of Timberville, Rockingham County; also, of Samuel H. Myers, of the same place; also, of Mary L. Homan, of Rockingham County; also, of David and Lewis Driver, of the same county; also, of William S. Thompson of same county, Virginia—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STRUBLE: Petition of C. T. Vanderhof and 18 others, citizens of Buena Vista County; also, resolutions of Coon Valley Alliance, Iowa, urging the passage of House bill 5353—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOWNSEND, of Colorado: Statements and official papers, to accompany House bill for the relief of Graeme W. Hood, late major of the Enlisted Missouri Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITELAW (by request): Petition of citizens of Oak Ridge, Mo., in favor of the Torrey bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON, of Missouri: Petition of ex-Governor Silas Woodson, Judge Henry M. Ramey, Judge A. M. Woodson, Judge Willard P. Hall, T. H. Parrish, H. M. Garlich, and 500 others, citizens of the city of St. Joseph, Mo., in favor of the resolution introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. CUMMINGS, of New York, indicative of the sorrow and horror with which the members of that body and the people of the United States heard of the cruel and barbarous treatment of the Jews in Russia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia: Petition of Marseen Smith, trustee of the Methodist Episcopal Church at South Boothsville, Marion County, West Virginia, praying that their war claims be referred to the Court of Claims under the provisions of the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.